CELEBRATING CHURCH

NETHERLANDS STUDIES IN RITUAL AND LITURGY 7

Een uitgave van:
Instituut voor Liturgiewetenschap, Rijksuniversiteit Groningen & Liturgisch Instituut, Universiteit van Tilburg, 2008
Redactiesecretariaat: liturgischinstituut@uvt.nl
Bestellingen: lit.inst@rug.nl

Onder redactie van:
Prof.dr Marcel Barnard (Utrecht), dr Justin Kroesen (Groningen), prof.dr Paul Post (Tilburg, eindredacteur), prof.dr Gerard Rouwhorst (Utrecht), prof.dr Ton Scheer (Nijmegen), dr Regnerus Steensma (Groningen), dr Louis van Tongeren (Tilburg)

ISBN: 978-90-367-3450-9
ISSN: 1571-8808

© Mattijs Ploeger
No part of this book may be reproduced in any form whatsoever without prior written permission from the publishers.

Cover photograph: a Sunday celebration of the eucharist in the Old Catholic parish church of St Agnes, Egmond aan Zee, the Netherlands
© Marja Bak-Aal, Egmond aan Zee, 2007

Druk: Ridderprint, Ridderkerk

The research for and publication of this study was made possible by contributions from Vereenigde Weezen- en Brabantsche Kas, Fonds Hermanus Heykamp, Verenigde Oud-Katholieke Studiefondsen Rens en Seminarie, INTEGON.

Eerder verschenen in deze reeks:
1. Paul Post: *Space for Liturgy Between Dynamic Ideal and Static Reality. An exploration of the development of the Roman Catholic liturgical space in the Netherlands (ca. 1850-present day) with particular focus on the role of liturgical booklets, the microphone and church pews*. Groningen/Tilburg, 2003
2. Justin E.A. Kroesen: *Het middeleeuwse altaarretabel op het Iberisch Schiereiland. Vorm, plaats boodschap*. Groningen/Tilburg, 2003
3. Willem Marie Speelman: *Liturgie in beeld. Over de identiteit van de rooms-katholieke liturgie in de elektronische media*. Groningen/Tilburg, 2004
4. Justin E.A. Kroesen & Regnerus Steensma (red.): *Nieuwe vieringen onder oude daken. De spanning tussen liturgie en monumentenzorg.* Groningen/Tilburg, 2004
5. Ineke Albers: *Heilige kracht wordt door beweging losgemaakt. Over pelgrimage, lopen en genezing*. Groningen/Tilburg, 2007
6. Geurt Henk van Kooten: *Het Oecumenisch Leesrooster (1977-2010). Geschiedenis, filosofie en impact*. Groningen/Tilburg 2007

CELEBRATING CHURCH
Ecumenical Contributions to a Liturgical Ecclesiology

VIERENDE KERK – DE KERK VIEREN
Oecumenische bijdragen tot een liturgische ecclesiologie
(met een samenvatting in het Nederlands)

Proefschrift

ter verkrijging van de graad van doctor
aan de Universiteit Utrecht
op gezag van de rector magnificus, prof.dr. J.C. Stoof,
ingevolge het besluit van het college voor promoties
in het openbaar te verdedigen
op maandag 16 juni 2008
des middags te 2.30 uur
door

Mattijs Ploeger

geboren op 20 juli 1970
te Westervoort

Promotoren: Prof.dr. A.W.J. Houtepen
Prof.mr. J. Hallebeek

Thus the first need of the Christians,
in face of the apathy and the bewilderment about the Church,
is to know and to be able to say plainly what the Church really *is*.

Michael Ramsey, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*, London 1936, 5

To seek and confess the ecclesiological location of one's community
is an act of discerning and proclaiming the gospel itself.

Geoffrey Wainwright, *The Ecumenical Moment*, Grand Rapids 1983, 190

The entire body of the faithful pours forth instant supplications
to the Mother of God and Mother of men
that she, who aided the beginnings of the Church by her prayers,
may now, exalted as she is above all the angels and saints,
intercede before her Son in the fellowship of all the saints,
until all families of people,
whether they are honored with the title of Christian
or whether they still do not know the Saviour,
may be happily gathered together in peace and harmony
into one people of God,
for the glory of the Most Holy and Undivided Trinity.

Second Vatican Council, *Lumen Gentium* 69

To my parents

CONTENTS

	PREFACE	xix
	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS & ABBREVIATIONS	xxi
1	LOOKING AT THE CHURCH FROM THE ANGLE OF THE LITURGY	
	Introduction	1
1.1	VISION AND DISCUSSION	1
1.1.1	Vision	1
1.1.2	Discussion	2
1.1.3	This Study	2
1.2	QUESTION AND METHOD	3
1.2.1	Question and Aim	3
1.2.2	Method and Structure	4
1.3	LITURGICAL THEOLOGY	5
1.3.1	Liturgical Theology in the Context of Liturgical Studies	5
1.3.2	Liturgical Theologians of the Strict Observance	8
1.3.3	A Wider Understanding of Liturgical Theology	12
1.3.4	Conclusion	15
1.4	LITURGICAL ECCLESIOLOGY	16
1.4.1	Ecclesiology	16
1.4.2	Eucharistic Ecclesiology	18
1.4.3	Liturgical Ecclesiology	20
1.4.4	Conclusion	22
1.5	CONCLUSION	23

2 THE FORMATION OF A EUCHARISTIC ECCLESIOLOGY
Orthodox Contributions to a Liturgical Ecclesiology 25

2.1 INTRODUCTION 25
2.1.1 An Orthodox Theological Approach 25
2.1.2 Pneumatology and Eschatology 26
2.1.3 The Church Local and Universal 27
2.1.4 Estrangement from and Rediscovery of the Orthodox Theological Tradition 28
2.1.5 Foreshadowing a Eucharistic Ecclesiology? 29
2.1.6 The Call for a Neo-Patristic Synthesis 31

2.2 NICHOLAS AFANASIEV 35
2.2.1 Life and Work 35
2.2.2 Baptismal or Eucharistic Ecclesiology? 36
2.2.3 The Charismatic and Organised Character of the Church 38
2.2.4 The Relationship between the People and the Liturgical Presider 40
2.2.5 The Administrative, Doctrinal and Pastoral Ministries of the Liturgical Presider 41
2.2.6 Other Ministries and their Relationship to the Local Church 44
2.2.7 The Development towards 'the One Bishop' 45
2.2.8 The Bishop 47
2.2.9 Universal and Eucharistic Ecclesiologies 49
2.2.10 Conclusion 52

2.3 JOHN ZIZIOULAS 55
2.3.1 Life and Work 55
2.3.2 Zizioulas's Corrections of Afanasiev 55
2.3.3 The Eucharist: Ecclesial and Eschatological 56
2.3.4 Christology and Pneumatology 57
2.3.5 The Concept of Personhood 58
2.3.6 The Church and the Eucharist 61
2.3.7 The Church Local and Universal 63
2.3.8 The Problem of the Parish in a Eucharistic Ecclesiology 65
2.3.9 Societal and Ecological Catholicity 68
2.3.10 Conclusion 68

2.4 CONCLUSION 69
2.4.1 The Local Assembly 69
2.4.2 The Universal Communion 69
2.4.3 The Whole People of God 70
2.4.4 The Bishop 70
2.4.5 All Aspects of the Church's Life 70

3 'THE EUCHARIST MAKES THE CHURCH' *Roman Catholic Contributions to a Liturgical Ecclesiology* 73

3.1 INTRODUCTION 73
3.1.1 The Second Vatican Council 73
3.1.2 Theological Reassessment 74
3.1.3 The Liturgical Movement 78
3.1.4 This Chapter 81

3.2 HENRI DE LUBAC 82
3.2.1 Life and Work 82
3.2.2 The Social Character of Christianity 83
3.2.3 The Church 85
3.2.4 The Eucharist 88
3.2.5 The Body of Christ: Historical, Eucharistic, Ecclesial 89
3.2.6 The Eucharist Makes the Church—The Church Makes the Eucharist 92
3.2.7 The Historical Character of Christianity 95
3.2.8 On de Lubac's Theological Method 96
3.2.9 Conclusion 99

3.3 JOSEPH RATZINGER 100
3.3.1 Life and Work 100
3.3.2 An Heir of the *Nouvelle Théologie* and the Liturgical Movement 103
3.3.3 A Eucharistic Ecclesiology from the Outset 104
3.3.4 The Paschal Origins of Israel and the Church 107
3.3.5 The People of God from the Body of Christ 109
3.3.6 Old and New Testaments, Priestly and Prophetic, Cultic and Non-Cultic 112
3.3.7 The 'We-Character' of God and the Church 114
3.3.8 'The Church is Eucharist' 115
3.3.9 The Universal Church and the Local Churches 117
3.3.10 Never Just a Cult 123
3.3.11 A 'Providential Coincidence' 125
3.3.12 Conclusion 125

3.4 LEONARDO BOFF 126
3.4.1 Life and Work 126
3.4.2 Liberation Theology 127
3.4.3 Liberation Ecclesiology and the Eucharist 129
3.4.4 The Church as a Sacrament 130
3.4.5 Sacramentality 133
3.4.6 Testing Questions for a Liturgical Ecclesiology 135
3.4.7 A Trinitarian Theology of Communion 136
3.4.8 Conclusion 138

3.5	JEAN-MARIE TILLARD	139
3.5.1	Life and Work	139
3.5.2	The Ecclesiology of Communion	140
3.5.3	Eucharistic Communion, Zones of Communion	143
3.5.4	Church of Churches, Communion of Communions	146
3.5.5	The Ordained Ministry as a Service to Communion	148
3.5.6	The Primacy of the Bishop of Rome as a Service to Communion	151
3.5.7	Conclusion	153
3.6	CONCLUSION	154
3.6.1	Communion Ecclesiology	154
3.6.2	The Eucharist as the Centre of Communion	156
3.6.3	The Bishop of Rome in the Service of Communion	158
3.6.4	Communion Beyond the Church	159
4	'A UNITY IN A GIVEN PLACE AROUND A BISHOP WITH THE EUCHARIST AS ITS CENTER' *Old Catholic Contributions to a Liturgical Ecclesiology*	161
4.1	INTRODUCTION	161
4.1.1	A Eucharistic Self-Understanding	161
4.1.2	Ecclesiological Jansenism: Jurisdiction and Mentality	162
4.1.3	Neo-Gallican Liturgical Principles: An Ecclesial Liturgy	166
4.1.4	The Appeal to the Early Church	167
4.1.5	This Chapter	170
4.2	ANDREAS RINKEL	171
4.2.1	Life and Work	171
4.2.2	The Church and the Kingdom	173
4.2.3	The Church and Faith	175
4.2.4	The Church and the Sacraments	177
4.2.5	The Church and the Ordained Ministry	180
4.2.6	The Church Local and Universal	184
4.2.7	The Church and Ecumenism	187
4.2.8	Conclusion	188
4.3	URS KÜRY	189
4.3.1	Life and Work	189
4.3.2	A Catholic Church of the West	190
4.3.3	The Early Church	190
4.3.4	Ecumenism	191
4.3.5	The Ordained Ministry	192
4.3.6	Local and Universal	193
4.3.7	Conclusion	194

4.4	WERNER KÜPPERS	195
4.4.1	Life and Work	195
4.4.2	The Liturgy	195
4.4.3	The Ordained Ministry	197
4.4.4	The Early Church	198
4.4.5	The Eucharist	199
4.4.6	Conclusion	199
4.5	KURT STALDER	200
4.5.1	Life and Work	200
4.5.2	Salvation as the Restoration of Communion	200
4.5.3	The Church as 'Proof' of the Reality of Salvation	201
4.5.4	Participation in the Trinitarian Life	201
4.5.5	Community Shaped by 'Over Against' (*Gegenüber*)	202
4.5.6	Conciliarity	203
4.5.7	Apostolic Succession	204
4.5.8	The Local Church	205
4.5.9	The Eucharist	206
4.5.10	Conclusion	207
4.6	JAN VISSER	207
4.6.1	Life and Work	207
4.6.2	A Hermeneutical Approach	208
4.6.3	The Church	209
4.6.4	The Eucharist	212
4.6.5	The Bishop	213
4.6.6	Conclusion	214
4.7	HERWIG ALDENHOVEN	215
4.7.1	Life and Work	215
4.7.2	A Trinitarian Ecclesiology	216
4.7.3	An Ecclesiology of the Local Church	217
4.7.4	The Eucharist	219
4.7.5	The Ordained Ministry	220
4.7.6	Primacy	222
4.7.7	Conclusion	222
4.8	URS VON ARX	223
4.8.1	Life and Work	223
4.8.2	'Old Catholic Mainstream Theology'	224
4.8.3	Ecclesiological Credentials	225
4.8.4	Ecclesiology of the Local Church	227
4.8.5	Ecclesial and Eucharistic Communion	229
4.8.6	Advocating the Old Catholic Proprium	230
4.8.7	Conclusion	231

4.9	CONCLUSION	231
4.9.1	The Emergence of a Eucharistic Ecclesiology	231
4.9.2	Elements of Continuity	232
4.9.3	Elements of Transformation	232
4.9.4	Conclusion	233
5	PARTICIPATION AND TRANSFORMATION *Anglican Contributions to a Liturgical Ecclesiology*	235
5.1	INTRODUCTION	235
5.1.1	Sources of Anglican Theology	235
5.1.2	An Anglican Theological Method?	235
5.1.3	The Anglican Catholic Context	237
5.1.4	This Chapter	238
5.2	GABRIEL HEBERT AND THE PARISH COMMUNION MOVEMENT	239
5.2.1	The Background	240
5.2.2	Christian Socialist Influence	240
5.2.3	The Parish Communion	241
5.2.4	The Ecclesiology of Hebert's *Liturgy and Society*	243
5.2.5	The Ecclesiology of *The Parish Communion*	245
5.2.6	Conclusion	250
5.3	GREGORY DIX	250
5.3.1	The Shape of the Liturgy	250
5.3.2	Middle Ages, Reformation, Counter-Reformation: Three of a Kind	252
5.3.3	The Eschatological Christ and the Church	253
5.3.4	Conclusion	255
5.4	MICHAEL RAMSEY	255
5.4.1	Excursus: Evangelical and Catholic Anglicans	255
5.4.2	The Gospel and the Church	257
5.4.3	The Church Shares in Christ	258
5.4.4	The Eucharist	260
5.4.5	Episcopacy	261
5.4.6	The Church Local and Universal	263
5.4.7	Conclusion	265

5.5	PAUL AVIS	265
5.5.1	The Quest for a Distinctive Anglican Ecclesiology	266
5.5.2	The 'Erastian Paradigm'	267
5.5.3	The 'Apostolic Paradigm' and the 'Anglican Consensus'	268
5.5.4	Evaluation of the 'Erastian' and 'Apostolic' Paradigms	270
5.5.5	The 'Baptismal Paradigm'	272
5.5.6	An Ecumenical Anglican Ecclesiology: Baptism and the Eucharist	272
5.5.7	An Ecumenical Anglican Ecclesiology: Episcopacy and Ministry	274
5.5.8	An Ecumenical Anglican Ecclesiology: Comprehensiveness as Ecumenical Model	276
5.5.9	An Ecumenical Anglican Ecclesiology: Mission through Word, Sacraments and Pastoral Care	277
5.5.10	Conclusion: A Liturgical Ecclesiology?	281
5.6	ROWAN WILLIAMS	283
5.6.1	Life and Work	283
5.6.2	A Methodology of Celebration	285
5.6.3	An Anthropology of Relation	286
5.6.4	The Church as the Start of a New Humanity	287
5.6.5	The Sacraments as Defining Christian Identity	289
5.6.6	Incarnation and Judgement	291
5.6.7	Being Transformed	293
5.6.8	A Radical Traditionalist	294
5.6.9	Conclusion	296
5.7	CATHERINE PICKSTOCK	297
5.7.1	Radical Orthodoxy	297
5.7.2	A Doxological Ontology	302
5.7.3	Spatialisation	302
5.7.4	Aquinas and Scotus	305
5.7.5	Modern Society and Modern Liturgy	306
5.7.6	A Liturgical Vision	308
5.7.7	The Liturgical Gift	310
5.7.8	Conclusion	311
5.8	CONCLUSION	313
5.8.1	Christ and the Church	313
5.8.2	Incarnation	314
5.8.3	Episcopacy and Primacy	314
5.8.4	The Corporate Character of the Liturgy and the Sacraments	315
5.8.5	Ecclesiology beyond the Church	315

6 THE BREAKING OF SYMBOLS
Protestant Contributions to a Liturgical Ecclesiology 317

6.1 INTRODUCTION 317

6.2 OEPKE NOORDMANS & GERARDUS VAN DER LEEUW 319
6.2.1 A Theological Debate 319
6.2.2 Mystery 320
6.2.3 Fragmentary Liturgy 321
6.2.4 The Holy Spirit 323
6.2.5 Brokenness 323
6.2.6 Eschatology 325
6.2.7 The Participant 327
6.2.8 The Centre of Protestant Liturgy 328
6.2.9 Can the Liturgy Constitute the Church in Protestant Theology? 330
6.2.10 Conclusion 332

6.3 JEAN-JACQUES VON ALLMEN 333
6.3.1 Life and Work 333
6.3.2 Protestantism and Ecumenism, Prophetism and Sacramentality 334
6.3.3 The Church, the World and the Kingdom 335
6.3.4 The Liturgy 338
6.3.5 The Eucharist 340
6.3.6 The Ordained Ministry 344
6.3.7 Conclusion 347

6.4 GEOFFREY WAINWRIGHT 348
6.4.1 Life and Work 348
6.4.2 Ecumenism 349
6.4.3 *Lex Orandi Lex Credendi* 350
6.4.4 Eschatology 351
6.4.5 The Liturgy 353
6.4.6 The Church 354
6.4.7 Baptism 355
6.4.8 The Eucharist 357
6.4.9 The Ordained Ministry 359
6.4.10 Conclusion 360

6.5 GORDON LATHROP 361
6.5.1 Life and Work 361
6.5.2 Ordo 361
6.5.3 Juxtaposition 362
6.5.4 Breaking 364
6.5.5 Antiliturgica 366
6.5.6 The Church 367
6.5.7 The Ordained Ministry 369
6.5.8 Local and Universal 370
6.5.9 Conclusion 372

6.6	ALBERT PLOEGER & JOKE PLOEGER-GROTEGOED	373
6.6.1	Practical Theology	373
6.6.2	Longing	374
6.6.3	The Church	374
6.6.4	*Leitourgia, Diakonia, Martyria, Koinonia*	375
6.6.5	The Church between *Martyria* and (Post-) Modern Culture	376
6.6.6	Anamnesis and Epiclesis	377
6.6.7	The Individual and the Community	378
6.6.8	Liturgy and the Formation of Identity	379
6.6.9	Liturgy and Longing	380
6.6.10	The Church as the Body of Christ	381
6.6.11	The Local Congregation and the Supra-Local Church	383
6.6.12	The Ordained Ministry	384
6.6.13	Conclusion	385
6.7	CONCLUSION	386
7	'VISIBLE UNITY IN ONE FAITH AND ONE EUCHARISTIC FELLOWSHIP' *Contributions to a Liturgical Ecclesiology from Ecumenical Texts*	389
7.1	INTRODUCTION	389
7.1.1	Common Ground	389
7.1.2	The Ecumenical Movement	390
7.1.3	Goal and Method of the Ecumenical Movement	391
7.1.4	Modernity and Postmodernity, Unity and Plurality	393
7.1.5	From Unity to *Koinonia*	395
7.1.6	This Chapter (1): Multilateral Texts	396
7.1.7	This Chapter (2): Bilateral Texts	398
7.2	*BAPTISM, EUCHARIST AND MINISTRY*	401
7.2.1	A Eucharistic-Ecclesiological Centre	401
7.2.2	Liturgical Ecclesiology in the Baptism Text	404
7.2.3	Liturgical Ecclesiology in the Eucharist Text	406
7.2.4	Liturgical Ecclesiology in the Ministry Text	407
7.2.5	Conclusion	412
7.3	*CHURCH AND WORLD*	413
7.3.1	A Soteriology of Communion	413
7.3.2	The Church	414
7.3.3	The Eucharist	415
7.3.4	Conclusion	416

7.4	*CONFESSING THE ONE FAITH*	417
7.4.1	The Body of Christ: Eucharistic and Ecclesial	417
7.4.2	*Leitourgia* and *Diakonia*	418
7.4.3	The Local Church	419
7.4.4	Conclusion	420
7.5	*TOWARDS KOINONIA IN FAITH, LIFE AND WITNESS*	420
7.5.1	*Koinonia*	420
7.5.2	Faith	421
7.5.3	Life	421
7.5.4	Witness	423
7.5.5	Conclusion	424
7.6	*THE NATURE AND MISSION OF THE CHURCH*	424
7.6.1	A Communion Ecclesiology	425
7.6.2	Mission: Individual and Societal	427
7.6.3	Soteriology: Personal and Corporate	428
7.6.4	The Eucharist	429
7.6.5	The Ordained Ministry	430
7.6.6	Conclusion	431
7.7	THE ANGLICAN—ROMAN CATHOLIC DIALOGUE	432
7.7.1	Communion Ecclesiology	433
7.7.2	Eucharistic Ecclesiology	435
7.7.3	Excursus: The Nature of Salvation and Participation	436
7.7.4	The Ordained Ministry from the Perspective of a Eucharistic Ecclesiology	439
7.7.5	The Church Local and Universal from the Perspective of a Communion Ecclesiology	440
7.7.6	Conclusion	442
7.8	THE ORTHODOX—OLD CATHOLIC DIALOGUE	443
7.8.1	A Soteriology of Communion	443
7.8.2	A Eucharistic Ecclesiology	445
7.8.3	Consequences of a Eucharistic Ecclesiology: The Church Local and Universal	447
7.8.4	Consequences of a Eucharistic Ecclesiology: The Ordained Ministry	448
7.8.5	Consequences of a Eucharistic Ecclesiology: Ecclesial Unity as Eucharistic Communion	451
7.8.6	Conclusion	453
7.9	CONCLUSION	454
7.9.1	*Koinonia*	454
7.9.2	The Church	454
7.9.3	The Eucharist	455
7.9.4	Mission	455
7.9.5	The Ordained Ministry	455
7.9.6	The Church Local and Universal	456

8 TOWARDS A LITURGICAL *KOINONIA* ECCLESIOLOGY IN ECUMENICAL PERSPECTIVE
Conclusion 457

8.1 INTRODUCTION 457
8.1.1 An Attempt at a Synthesis 457
8.1.2 Four Criteria 458

8.2 *KOINONIA* 459
8.2.1 A Theology of Communion 459
8.2.2 An Anthropology of Communion 460
8.2.3 A Soteriology of Communion 461
8.2.4 An Ecclesiology of Communion 463
8.2.5 Communion as Incorporation and Participation 465
8.2.6 The Eucharist as the Paradigm of Communion 467
8.2.7 Conclusion 468

8.3 CHRIST, THE SPIRIT AND THE CHURCH 468
8.3.1 The Body of Christ 468
8.3.2 *Totus Christus*: Head and Body 469
8.3.3 People of God, Body of Christ, Temple of the Spirit 470
8.3.4 Christ and the Church: Identity or Over Against? 473
8.3.5 Theological and Empirical, Spiritual and Institutional 476
8.3.6 Conclusion 476

8.4 BAPTISM, THE EUCHARIST AND THE LITURGY 477
8.4.1 Baptism is the Basis 478
8.4.2 Baptism and Ecumenism 479
8.4.3 The Eucharist is the Centre 480
8.4.4 The Eucharist and Ecumenism 485
8.4.5 The Centrality of the Liturgy: The Gathering of the People of God and the Constitution of Christian Meaning 489
8.4.6 The Centrality of the Liturgy: The Proclamation of the Word of God 491
8.4.7 The Centrality of the Liturgy: Doxology 493
8.4.8 Conclusion 494

8.5 PRESIDERS OF THE CHURCH 495
8.5.1 Exploring a 'Topological' Theology of Ministry 495
8.5.2 A Full Celebration with All 'Special Liturgies' 496
8.5.3 Presiding *In Persona Christi* 498
8.5.4 Extensions of the Assembly 502
8.5.5 An Ecumenical *Relecture* of the Bishop, the Presbyterium and the Deacons 504
8.5.6 Excursus: Scale and Mentality of the Diocese 510
8.5.7 Apostolic Succession 512
8.5.8 Conclusion 514

8.6	COMMUNION OF COMMUNIONS	515
8.6.1	The Catholicity of the Local Church	515
8.6.2	The Communion between the Local Churches	517
8.6.3	Instruments of Communion: The Eucharist	520
8.6.4	Instruments of Communion: The Bishop	522
8.6.5	Instruments of Communion: Conciliarity	523
8.6.6	Instruments of Communion: Primacy	524
8.6.7	Conclusion	527
8.7	A CENTRIFUGAL CENTRE	527
8.7.1	On 'Centre' and 'Margin' in Church, Liturgy and Society	528
8.7.2	Mission	531
8.7.3	Eucharistic Ethics	534
8.7.4	Doxological Living	537
8.7.5	Conclusion	539
8.8	CONCLUSION	539
8.8.1	A Liturgical *Koinonia* Ecclesiology in Ecumenical Perspective	539
8.8.2	Celebrating Church	540
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	543
	SAMENVATTING	563
	CURRICULUM VITAE	571

PREFACE

In writing this study, I have been supported by many people and organisations. First of all, the Board of Governors of the Old Catholic Seminary at Utrecht University decided to fund the position of a half-time research assistant among their staff. I am grateful for having obtained this position, and I hope the present book will be received as a contribution to the continuous rethinking of theology, and particularly of the Old Catholic tradition within theology, which takes place at our seminary in conversation with the theological faculty of Utrecht University and with the Old Catholic academic institutions in Berne, Bonn and Warsaw. I also thank the governors of the *Stichting Vereenigde Weezen- en Brabantsche Kas* and the Foundation *Hermanus Heykamp*, who made the research assistant post financially possible, the governors of the United Old Catholic Study Funds *Rens* and *Seminarie*, who kindly met the expenses made during the project, and the Utrecht theological research institute INTEGON for its contribution towards the printing of this book. I am grateful that the Dutch Liturgical Institute accepted this study as volume 7 of their series *Netherlands Studies in Ritual and Liturgy* and I thank Justin Kroesen and Ike de Loos at the Liturgical Institute, as well as the staff at Ridderprint, for their valuable assistance.

From beginning to end, the process of reading and writing has been accompanied by inspiring discussions with and valuable help from a number of people, of whom I particularly want to thank Urs von Arx, Paul Avis, Marcel Barnard, Angela Berlis, Martin Hoondert, Jan Bodisco Massink, Jeremy Morris, Harald Münch, Koenraad Ouwens, Catherine Pickstock, Paul Post, Angus Ritchie, Els Rose, my bishop Dick Schoon, Peter-Ben Smit, Hans Uytenbogaardt, Jan Visser, Sytze de Vries, Bernd Wallet, Christiaan Winter, my late bishop Bert Wirix and the abbot and monks of the Benedictine Abbey of St Adelbert, Egmond.

Much gratitude I owe to my doctoral supervisors. They encouraged me with enthusiasm and corrected me with wisdom. I experienced our regular meetings as precious moments of reflection, learning and enjoyment. More particularly, I thank Anton Houtepen for letting me benefit from his vast theological, ecclesiological and ecumenical experience and insight. Jan Hallebeek has, in addition to his expertise as an Old Catholic canonist and ecclesiologian, showed me, during the ebb and flow of my research project, the meaning of the German word *Doktorvater*.

I thank my supervisors for allowing me to include the work of my parents in this study. Dedicating this book to them is the best I can do to acknowledge what they gave and continue to give me as parents and friends, as fellow

Christians and fellow theologians. I owe to them both the 'vision' and the 'discussion' with which this book starts and from which it originates.

Finally, my studying and writing about celebration and communion have not occurred in a vacuum. Celebrating in community and living in communion are by no means gratuitous phrases, but realities of daily living and striving, as I had the privilege to experience throughout the period in which this book was prepared. The small, dedicated Old Catholic parish of Krommenie-Zaandam and, most of all, my wife Astrid and our sons Stijn and Sem, embraced me in their sharing of communion and their celebration of life. It is right to give thanks and praise.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS & ABBREVIATIONS

Throughout this study, biblical quotations are generally taken from the *New Revised Standard Version: Anglicized Edition* (Oxford-New York: OUP, 1995). Copyright 1989, 1995 by the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America. Used by permission. All rights reserved.

For general information, helpful use was made of E.A. LIVINGSTONE, *The Concise Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, Second Edition (Oxford-New York: OUP, 2000), of H. VORGRIMLER, *Neues Theologisches Wörterbuch* (Freiburg-Basel-Wien: Herder, 2000) and of the online edition of the *Biographisch-Bibliographisches Kirchenlexikon* (Nordhausen: Bautz) at www.bautz.de.

Documents of the Roman Catholic Church, for example the constitutions of the Second Vatican Council and instructions of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, can be found in Latin and other languages at www.vatican.va. References in footnotes refer to paragraph numbers.

Library facilities were primarily used at the University Library, Utrecht, and at the Old Catholic Seminary Library, Amersfoort.

In the bibliographical references, the following abbreviations are used:

COKB	Centraal Oud-Katholiek Boekhuis
CUP	Cambridge University Press
DLT	Darton, Longman and Todd
IKZ	*Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift*
OUP	Oxford University Press
SVSP	St Vladimir's Seminary Press
TLP	The Liturgical Press
WCC	World Council of Churches, or: WCC Publications

1 LOOKING AT THE CHURCH FROM THE ANGLE OF THE LITURGY

Introduction

1.1 VISION AND DISCUSSION

1.1.1 Vision

St Anne & St Mary's Church, the cathedral of the small Old Catholic diocese of Haarlem, the Netherlands, during an evening in Holy Week. The bishop has just blessed the chrism for the anointing of those who are going to be baptised, confirmed and ordained in the diocese. He has also blessed the oils for the catechumens and for the sick. Now the eucharist is being celebrated. The nave of the church is full of representatives of the parishes in the diocese, who are here to receive the blessed oils for their communities and to strengthen the unity with their bishop just before the major festival of Easter. Bread and wine are placed upon the altar, which has a central place in the chancel of the church. The bishop stands behind it, singing the eucharistic prayer, assisted by a deacon and surrounded by priests of the diocese.

An icon of the church. All that we are as a church is here. Community—the gathering of sisters and brothers in Christ. Proclamation of the Word through which we grow in faith—readings from the Scriptures, explanation and witness in the sermon, internalisation by the prayers and hymns. Being brought into communion with God and one another through worship and sacraments—a key element of the whole gathering, particularly manifested by Christ's presence in the eucharist. Pastoral care and responsibility for the community—expressed by our being together, expressed by the presence of our pastors and above all by the one who represents the Good Shepherd in a special way: the bishop. Diaconate and social outreach, ethics and politics—the breaking of bread, the act of sharing without social or economic, sexual or racial differences, and personified in the deacon who reminds the community of the relationship between bread of life and daily bread. Mission—being sent out from this gathering with renewed strength and enthousiasm.

An icon of the church. The whole diocese is represented, all lay and ordained ministries are present and fulfill their particular charisms in the context of the community. All aspects of Christian living are represented. All that we are as a church is here.

1.1.2 Discussion

Two Christians talking together. One telling the other about the vision in the cathedral. The other asking, 'Do you really think that Jesus has meant all this liturgy?' A discussion follows. What has the liturgy of today's churches to do with Jesus Christ? Did he ask for buildings and ritual? How could you possibly say that Jesus has meant this eucharist, with this congregation and these ordained ministers? And how about those who are bored with the service and stay outside—are they beyond Jesus's reach and presence?

Questions as these are familiar and seem so obvious. But could it be that the church has proven to be a form in which Jesus Christ—his person and work, his life and message—has survived the centuries? Moreover, could it be that the liturgy of the church is not the worst manifestation of Jesus's life and work? The reading and explanation of Moses and the prophets, Jesus and the apostles, has been preserved—and in our time revived—within the context of the liturgy. The fundamental pattern of Christ's life and message—to share, even if it means being broken—has been preserved in the ritualised but still recognisable act of the eucharist. The aim of God's salvation, to unite humanity and all creation to himself and to one another, has been preserved in the community of the church, exemplified in the communion of the eucharist. It may not be impressive, but still it is there—in the church, in the liturgy—to be enjoyed, shared and lived.

1.1.3 This Study

The present study originates from this dialectic. It originates as much from the vision as from the discussion. Without the *vision* there would have been no book on the relation between the liturgy and the church. It requires no less than a vision, to recognise the meaning of Jesus Christ's church in the often helpless liturgical assembly of Christians on an average Sunday or weekday. It requires a theological vision to recognise in this congregation the people of God, the body of Christ and the temple of the Spirit, to recognise in this eucharist an anticipation of the wedding banquet of the Lamb. No liturgy can be celebrated with integrity without the vision which recreates this group of sinners into the communion of saints. On the other hand, without the *discussion* there would have been no need for a book. Celebrating the liturgy would have been enough to confirm those who share the vision. The discussion is able to 'earth' the vision, and enables the vision to be communicated between those who share it and those who doubt it. The discussion focuses on the presuppositions of the claim that the liturgy stands for 'all that we are as a church'. What is the theology behind—or rather, intrinsic to—the ritual and the music, the architecture and the poetry? How does the liturgy relate to 'all that we are as a

church' if one agrees that Christian and ecclesial living reaches beyond the place and the time of the liturgical celebration?

This introductory chapter refines question and method (1.2), places the term 'liturgical ecclesiology' into perspective by investigating concepts of liturgical theology (1.3) and ecclesiology (1.4), and gives a preliminary indication of how this study is situated within those discourses. The largest part of this book (chapters 2 to 7) is an exposition of various possible ways to answer the question why the liturgy, particularly the eucharist, should be seen as the centre of the church, and what this view means for one's understanding of the church. The final chapter (8) attempts to construct, though not a complete ecclesiology, at least a consistent synthesis of major findings from the heuristic experiment of 'looking at the church from the angle of the liturgy'.

1.2 Question and Method

1.2.1 Question and Aim

The main question of this study is: how does looking at the church from the angle of the liturgy affect one's theology of the church? In other words, how does it affect one's ecclesiology, if one takes the liturgical—particularly the eucharistic—celebration as the central ecclesial event?

The choice to approach ecclesiology from a liturgical point of view wants to be understood as a heuristic not an exclusive one. The question of this study is *heuristic*, because it asks for possible insights into ecclesiology resulting from the liturgical viewpoint, which are perhaps not acquired if the church is viewed from another perspective. The question is *non-exclusive*, because ecclesiologies with other heuristic focuses may be equally legitimate, as long as they root their viewpoint theologically, and relate their focus to other elements of intra- and extra-ecclesial living, as this study attempts to do.

By analysing and comparing not the least of theologians throughout the main Christian churches who deal with the relationship between the church and the liturgy, this study first aims at elucidating the amount of congeniality which exists with respect to basic theological, ecclesiological and liturgical presuppositions. Second, this study will also point out the existing convergence and dissensus between these theologians as they (theologically and ecclesiastically) work out their basic presuppositions. The result of such an approach is, hopefully, relevant to an increasing ecumenical convergence in ecclesiology.

The main question of this study asks for the fundamental ecclesiological consequences of approaching the church from the heuristic angle of the liturgy.[1] This main question can, of course, be specified into various sub-questions. As the investigation of particular authors in the following chapters will reveal, particularly relevant sub-questions for a liturgical ecclesiology are the theory and practice of the ordained ministry,[2] the dialectic between the local and the universal church,[3] and the intrinsic relationship between the liturgy and daily life.[4] This introductory chapter confines itself to the main question.

1.2.2 Method and Structure

This study's primary methodical orientation is of a systematic-theological nature. As formulated above, the main question is how the understanding of the church as liturgical gathering affects one's theology of the church, that is, one's (systematic-theological) ecclesiology. As a systematic-theological investigation into the relationship between the liturgy and the church, this study is situated within the disciplines of liturgical theology (see section 1.3) and ecclesiology (see section 1.4).

The answer to the question, formulated in the previous paragraph, is sought in the work of selected authors—representing various Christian churches, all of them from the twentieth century, most of them from Europe—who have contributed to a theology of the church from a liturgical or eucharistic perspective. The context is ecumenical: each chapter is devoted to one church or, as in the case of Protestantism, one group of churches. In view of a liturgical or eucharistic ecclesiology, it seems natural to start with the Orthodox Church as the seedbed of this 'school' of ecclesiology. The inclusion of the Roman Catholic Church is self-evident, and even more so when one realises how important eucharistic ecclesiology has become in Roman Catholic theology since the Second Vatican Council. The presence of a chapter on the Old Catholic ecclesiological tradition, insofar as it reflects a liturgical ecclesiology, originates from my own ecclesial context: as an Old Catholic theologian it would be illogical to bypass my own tradition, particularly as some of its leading theologians so thoroughly represent a eucharistic ecclesiology. Not to subsume Anglicanism under Protestantism is given both by mainstream Anglican self-understanding and by the fact that, especially in the area of ecclesiology, Anglican theology and practice have their own distinctive character. In this study, the term 'Protestantism' refers to authors from Reformed, Lutheran and Methodist Churches. Finally, to complete the

1 Cf. my synthesis in sections 8.2 (*Koinonia*), 8.3 (Christ, the Spirit and the Church) and 8.4 (Baptism, the Eucharist and the Liturgy).
2 Cf. my synthesis in section 8.5 (Presiders of the Church).
3 Cf. my synthesis in section 8.6 (Communion of Communions).
4 Cf. my synthesis in section 8.7 (A Centrifugal Centre).

ecumenical approach and to underline the ecumenical potential of a liturgical or eucharistic ecclesiology, a number of relevant ecumenical dialogue texts is investigated.

Within each chapter, a selection of theologians is discussed. In every separate chapter, the choice of theologians is not meant to represent 'the' theology of that particular church, but to represent ways in which, within the context of that particular church, versions of liturgical ecclesiology are developed. I am aware that the choice of authors is far from exhaustive. Every chapter could be expanded into a book, by adding theologians who contribute similar or additional thought. Nevertheless, I believe that every chapter includes most of the main liturgical-ecclesiological insights offered by systematic theologians from the church in question, and that the balance of some twenty-five authors throughout this study gives not an exhaustive but a representative overview of versions of a liturgical ecclesiology.

Something similar applies to the discussion of the separate theologians. This study is not a monograph on any one of them. Although I hope, of course, to do justice to every author, my purpose is to present his or—admittedly, only in two cases—her thought on those aspects relevant to a liturgical ecclesiology. In other words, each author is both selected and investigated through the lens of this study's particular question.[5]

1.3 LITURGICAL THEOLOGY

This study is about ecclesiology. More specified, this study tries to depict main issues of the church from the angle of its communal worship, the liturgy. Such an ecclesiology with a liturgical focus could be called a 'liturgical ecclesiology'. This is a rather new phrase. Better known are the terms 'liturgical theology' and 'eucharistic ecclesiology'. This section (1.3) introduces the reader to the field of 'liturgical theology' by a brief encounter with some leading liturgical theologians. The next section (1.4) introduces 'eucharistic ecclesiology'. The aim of these sections is to clarify how this study's concept of 'liturgical ecclesiology' is situated within both 'liturgical theology' and 'eucharistic ecclesiology'.

1.3.1 Liturgical Theology in the Context of Liturgical Studies

In the nineteenth century, the study of the liturgy shifted from a study of rubrics, practised in the context of canon law, to a study of the history of the liturgy. Liturgical books from various ages were critically edited, the genesis of

[5] The study consists of eight *chapters* (*e.g.*, 1). Each chapter is subdivided into a limited numbers of *sections* (*e.g.*, 1.1), which are in turn subdivided into *paragraphs* (*e.g.*, 1.1.1).

liturgical rites was unfolded, denominational boundaries were crossed in order to discover the historical background and meaning of contemporary liturgy. The *history of the liturgy* can therefore be seen as the first of three pillars of the 'Liturgical Movement', a movement which started in the nineteenth century and became an international and widely respected movement in the twentieth century. A second pillar of the Liturgical Movement was the *theology of the liturgy*, or liturgical theology, and a third pillar was the practical *pastoral-liturgical action* which was taken throughout the twentieth century, and which can in hindsight be seen as forerunning the revision of the liturgy introduced by Vatican II (1962-1965), such as the enhancement of active participation of the people and clarification of the structure of the rite. Recognisable throughout the twentieth century was the interdependence between a growing liturgical and a growing ecclesiological awareness.[6]

Not only the Liturgical Movement, also the discipline of Liturgical Studies can be characterised by an *historical*, a *theological* and a *pastoral* approach, of which the historical one used to be dominant. However, through the 'anthropological turn' in theology (and humanities in general), the approach known as *ritual studies*—originating from anthropology and comparative religion—entered Liturgical Studies as a fourth pillar in the nineteen sixties. Through post-modern relativisation of the possibility to acquire univocal historical knowledge and through the movement away from official texts and specialist interpretations towards ordinary people's 'small narratives', prominence in Liturgical Studies is shifting from the history of liturgy to ritual studies.[7] This development can be interpreted as the 'liturgical' equivalent of the 'theological' shift from Christian theology to religious studies, as it takes place in many academic institutions. Related to this equivalence is a certain suspicion against ritual studies in more traditional theological circles. Such suspicion is, however, unnecessary, since not only liturgical types regarded as 'modern', but also liturgical types commonly called 'traditional' can be—and have been—advocated from the point of view of ritual studies.[8]

Whilst the *historical* approach (the Liturgical Movement's *first* pillar) and the *ritual* approach (the *fourth* pillar) are the dominant ones in the field of academic Liturgical Studies, the *pastoral* approach (the *third* pillar) is the

6 H.A.J. WEGMAN, *Riten en mythen. Liturgie in de geschiedenis van het christendom* (Kampen: Kok, 1991), 349-351. A similar account is given by A. SCHMEMANN, *Introduction to Liturgical Theology* (Crestwood NY: SVSP, 1986[3] [1966[1]]), 9-15. Cf. paragraph 3.1.3 (The Liturgical Movement).

7 A.J.M. VAN TONGEREN, 'Een gemeenschappelijke oriëntatie. Over de *Ritual Studies* en ontwikkelingen binnen het liturgiehistorisch onderzoek', *Jaarboek voor liturgie-onderzoek* 22 (2006), 135-151.

8 P.G.J. POST, 'Ritual Studies. Einführung und Ortsbestimmung im Hinblick auf die Liturgiewissenschaft', *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 45 (2003), 21-45; P.G.J. POST, 'Na de lange jaren zestig. Liturgiewetenschap en *Ritual Studies*: opkomst, typering en actuele uitwerking van een relatie', *Jaarboek voor liturgie-onderzoek* 22 (2006), 89-111.

dominant one in the context of the education of ordained ministers. In many theological institutions, therefore, the study of the liturgy—concentrating either on the 'official' liturgy of a particular church or on ever newly emerging shapes of liturgy, the 'liturgia condenda'—is subsumed under 'pastoral theology' or 'practical theology'. Diagnosing this situation, some contemporary liturgical scholars—in the German-speaking world most notably the Roman Catholic Reinhard Messner (born 1960)—ask what, then, is left of the *second* pillar of the Liturgical Movement, the *theological* approach to the liturgy. More directly than the historical, pastoral and ritual approaches, the theological approach concentrates on the Christian *faith*, as it is *in actu* present in the liturgical celebration of the Christian *church*. The study of the liturgy 'cannot have a different subject than theology as a whole: the faith of the church or the church as faithful'. In the context of such a systematic theology of the liturgy, the historical, pastoral and ritual approaches will find their natural place.[9] This embedding of Liturgical Studies in a systematic theology of the liturgy means, for example, that the practical-theological approach to the liturgy, with its emphasis on the *experiences* of contemporary people, should not take as its norm 'any possible human and Christian experience', but '*liturgical* experience'.[10] In other words, 'systematic Liturgical Studies' gives the study of the liturgy a particular theological and ecclesial focus.

After its famous beginnings in Germany—Romano Guardini (1885-1968), Odo Casel (1886-1948)—the systematic-theological aspect of Liturgical Studies

[9] R. MESSNER, *Einführung in die Liturgiewissenschaft* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2001), 26 ('Die Liturgiewissenschaft als eigenständiges theologisches Fach kann kein anderes Thema haben als die Theologie insgesamt: den Glauben der Kirche oder die Kirche als glaubende'), 29. 'Church' is meant here in an ecumenical sense. See also G. WINKLER & R. MESSNER, 'Überlegungen zu den methodischen und wissenschaftstheoretischen Grundlagen der Liturgiewissenschaft', *Theologische Quartalschrift* 178 (1998), 229-243; H. HOPING, 'Symbolik und Pragmatik des Glaubens. Die Bedeutung der Liturgie für die Theologie', *Liturgisches Jahrbuch* 52 (2002), 3-20.

[10] R. MESSNER, 'Die vielen gottesdienstlichen Überlieferungen und die eine liturgische Tradition. Liturgiewissenschaft zwischen historischer und systematischer Theologie', in: H. Hoping & B. Jeggle-Merz (eds.), *Liturgische Theologie. Aufgaben systematischer Liturgiewissenschaft* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2004), 33-56, at 49 ('Nicht gemeint ist [...], dass in der Liturgiewissenschaft oder wo immer in der Theologie alle möglichen menschlichen und christlichen Erfahrungen zum Massstab der Theologie gemacht werden'. 'Damit ist nicht jegliche, sondern eine ganz bestimmte Erfahrung gemeint, nämlich—im Fall der Liturgiewissenschaft—die gottesdienstliche Erfahrung'), emphasis added. A similar position is taken by K.W. IRWIN, *Context and Text: Method in Liturgical Theology* (Collegeville MN: TLP, 1994), when he defines the determining 'context' of the liturgy only in the third instance as 'the contemporary cultural and theological context of liturgical celebration', but in the first instance as 'the historical evolution of a given liturgical rite in order to determine its origin, component parts, and variations in history both liturgically and theologically' and in the second instance as 'liturgical acts as a whole' (as opposed to interpreting liturgy merely as a text) 'where words, symbols, and gestures are interpreted and understood in relation to each other' (54-55; cf. 44-81).

is currently mainly developed in the United States under the name of 'liturgical theology' and can be regarded as 'a sister-discipline of dogmatics'.[11] Most of the following two paragraphs is, therefore, devoted to this American approach to liturgical theology.[12]

1.3.2 Liturgical Theologians of the Strict Observance

Based on the ancient rule *lex orandi lex credendi*, liturgical theology is, in the words of the Russian Orthodox Alexander Schmemann (1921-1983), 'the elucidation of the rule of prayer as the rule of faith, it is the theological interpretation of the rule of prayer'. Whereas historical liturgics is mainly occupied with the development of the various forms of service and their details, liturgical theology focuses on 'the basic structures of worship', although sometimes the details, particularly when related to other details with the same meaning, can have an important theological significance as well. The task of liturgical theology is to 'find the Ordo behind the "rubrics"', that is, to detect the basic theological intuitions which regulate the ritual shape of the liturgy.[13]

For Schemann, then, as for the Roman Catholic Aidan Kavanagh (1929-2006), the liturgy is a *locus theologicus*: a place where one can find the teaching of the church. For Schmemann and Kavanagh, however, it would be too little to say that the liturgy is one possible *locus theologicus* among others. They regard the liturgy as the *locus theologicus par excellence*: 'A liturgical act *is* a theological act of the most all-encompassing, integral, and foundational kind'.[14] Liturgy is 'the ontological condition of theology'. Liturgy 'is *theologia* itself'.[15]

In such an interpretation, liturgical theology becomes an indispensable part of systematic theology. Because the liturgy is a substantial part of the tradition of the church, the liturgy is an authoritative means of discovering what the church has to teach, not by its dogmatic definitions, but by its prayers, hymns, ceremonies and by the very structure of its rites. 'Without liturgical theology our understanding of the Church's faith and doctrine is bound to be

11 R. MESSNER, 'Was ist systematische Liturgiewissenschaft? Ein Entwurf in sieben Thesen', *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 40 (1998), 257-274, at 262 ('eine Schwesterdisziplin der Dogmatik'). Cf. A. CATELLA, 'Theology of the Liturgy', in: A.J. Chupungco (ed.), *Handbook for Liturgical Studies*, vol. II: *Fundamental Liturgy* (Collegeville MN: TLP, 1998), 3-28, who refers to the Americans A. Schmemann, A. Kavanagh, D. Fagerberg and G. Lathrop, but also to Italians such as C. Vaganini and S. Marsili.

12 Exceptions are Lukken and Hughes, who are from the Netherlands and Australia respectively.

13 SCHMEMANN, *Introduction to Liturgical Theology*, 17, 21-23, 39; cf. paragraph 6.5.2 (on 'ordo' in Schmemann and Lathrop).

14 A.J. KAVANAGH, *On Liturgical Theology: The Hale Memorial Lectures of Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, 1981* (Collegeville MN: TLP, 1984), 89.

15 KAVANAGH, *On Liturgical Theology*, 75.

incomplete.'[16] This extends to the part of systematic theology that is devoted to the church:

> If liturgical theology stems from an understanding of worship as the public act of the Church, then its final goal will be to clarify and explain the connection between this act and the Church, i.e. to explain how the Church expresses and fulfils herself in this act.[17]

Such an explanation of the church as it becomes manifest in the liturgy is what this study calls a 'liturgical ecclesiology'.

In the tradition of Schmemann and Kavanagh, David Fagerberg (born 1952), a former Protestant converted to Orthodoxy, radicalises the understanding of liturgical theology by only allowing it to be applied to the liturgy itself before it is theologically abstracted, that is, to the *lex credendi* as it is inherent in the *lex orandi*. Consequently, he applies the word 'liturgists' not to the liturgical scholars in the academy but to the celebrating people in church: the liturgist is 'the one who commits liturgy', the baptised one, lay and clergy alike. Fagerberg regards it the task of the academic theologian to reflect on both 'liturgical theology' and 'liturgical asceticism'—the former is Christian meaning as it is liturgically enacted, the latter is Christian living as it is liturgically shaped. Thus, the actual liturgical celebration rehearses Christian faith and living.[18]

Fagerberg distinguishes his understanding of liturgy in two ways from a different, perhaps more frequently applied, view on liturgy. Firstly, he calls it 'thick liturgy' as opposed to 'thin liturgy'. 'Thin' liturgy is liturgy understood as 'mere' ritual. Ultimately, thinks Fagerberg, this means liturgy as a human-made way to God. 'Thick' liturgy, however, is Christian ritual understood as Christian faith and living *in actu*, that is, not an expression of 'how we see God' but of 'how God sees us'. Secondly, he explains the same difference by using the terms 'liturgy' and '*leitourgia*'. In Fagerberg's language, 'liturgy' is ritual viewed as such, whereas '*leitourgia*' is the particularly Christian way of using ritual, so that it is transformed from general ritual into Christian celebration. According to Fagerberg, '*leitourgia*' means that the people of God (*laos*) perform Christ's work (*ergon*).[19]

16 SCHMEMANN, *Introduction to Liturgical Theology*, 18.

17 SCHMEMANN, *Introduction to Liturgical Theology*, 17.

18 D.W. FAGERBERG, *Theologia Prima: What Is Liturgical Theology?* (Chicago-Mundelein: Hillenbrand, 2004 [revised and expanded edition of *What Is Liturgical Theology? A Study in Methodology*, 1992]), 4-8, 219-235 and *passim*.

19 FAGERBERG, *Theologia Prima*, 7-19, 110-117, 220-227 and *passim*. What Fagerberg calls 'thick liturgy' or '*leitourgia*' I have called an 'unliturgical' view on liturgy, that is, a view not concentrating on what is often regarded as the essence of 'liturgy', namely the ritual-as-such; cf. M. PLOEGER, 'Het "onliturgische" karakter van de Liturgische Beweging', *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 61 (2007), 109-122, at 113, 121.

This study's understanding of liturgy is similar to Fagerberg's. Liturgy will not be treated as ritual-as-such—although it is, of course, true that liturgy is a kind of ritual and can, therefore, adequately and helpfully, though not exhaustively, be investigated from the point of view of 'ritual studies'[20]—but rather as the enactment of Christian faith and living. This study, though, is not exactly what Fagerberg would characterise as a book on liturgical theology. He would call most of it 'theology of worship' or 'theology from worship'. The former is an *a priori* theological view applied to worship, the latter a theological view derived from worship. Both approaches presuppose a distinction between liturgy and theology, whereas Fagerberg's understanding of liturgy claims to include theology intrinsically.[21]

The problem I have with Fagerberg's insistence that theology should neither be *applied to*, nor *derived from*, but found to be *resident in* the liturgy, is that this view—with which I agree in principle—requires quite a lot from the liturgy about which we are talking.[22] The *a priori* theological decision, denied entrance by Fagerberg at the front door, slips in through the back door by an *a priori* qualification of the kind of liturgy in which liturgical theology is acknowledged to be resident.[23] This qualified kind of liturgy is, for Fagerberg, the traditional eucharistic liturgy of an Orthodox or Catholic shape. Self-made liturgies, or liturgies not based on or related to the eucharist, are dismissed by Fagerberg because they do not include the kind of liturgical theology he is looking for.[24] That it is a *particular* kind of liturgy in which Fagerberg finds liturgical theology to be resident, is confirmed by his statement that it may be

20 Cf. MESSNER, 'Was ist systematische Liturgiewissenschaft?', 270-271; MESSNER, *Einführung*, 30-31. CATELLA, 'Theology of the Liturgy', 19-20, explains that the very principle (also shared by Schmemann, Kavanagh and Fagerberg) that liturgical theology is not 'a content placed within a container (= the liturgy)' but 'a matter of studying the concrete liturgical praxis in order to grasp therein "the faith as it is celebrated": the *mysterium* celebrated by the Christian community', implies a constant interaction between studying how (general) ritual works and studying how (particular) salvation history, especially the *mysterium Christi*, is present in it.

21 FAGERBERG, *Theologia Prima*, 39-69.

22 Cf. M. PLOEGER, 'Lex orandi lex credendi. Over liturgie als kenbron van geloofsleer', *Eredienstvaardig. Tijdschrift voor liturgie en kerkmuziek* 15 (1999), 192-194.

23 The website of the North American Academy of Liturgy shows that its 2004 Liturgical Theology Seminar, where Fagerberg presented a chapter from his book, concluded: 'The overriding question, then, is *where is thick liturgy found*' (www.naal-liturgy.org/seminars/theology; emphasis added). The same criticism can be found in P.V. MARSHALL, 'Reconsidering "Liturgical Theology": Is there a *Lex Orandi* for All Christians?', *Studia Liturgica* 25 (1995), 129-150, at 137-138.

24 Cf. FAGERBERG, *Theologia Prima*, 97-99, 138 (against liturgy which 'has plenty of *orandi* but not enough *lex*'), 143 ('*Leitourgia* is ordered, logical, grammatical, canonical, meaningful, deeply structured, and it functions according to tradition'), 146 ('To agree that liturgy is theological, one must admit that liturgical rite is ruled, shaped, traditional' = 223 nr. 24), 191 (liturgical theology is resident in the full eucharistic liturgy including laity and clergy).

expected from the ordinary 'liturgists' (the celebrating congregation) that they know that their liturgy implies

> a doctrine of creation that asserts matter was made to be sacrament; [...] an eschatology that asserts everything is destined for glory; [...] an anthropology that asserts the image of God can attain the likeness of God (deification); [...] a christology that asserts the reign of God brings with it obligations to the poor, imprisoned, and outcast; [...] an ecclesiology that asserts the Church manifests the potency of the world.[25]

One can conclude that Fagerberg has quite a distinct theology—probably not very different from the one proposed in this study—which he claims to be resident in the liturgy itself, but which of course requires the choice of liturgy to be limited to those—as he calls them—'traditional' and 'canonical' liturgies in which this meaning is actually implied.[26] This study makes a similar choice, but admits that *this is a choice*—especially in an ecumenical context amidst a plurality of liturgical concepts—by not being afraid of acknowledging that there is also 'theology of worship' and 'theology from worship' at stake, as long as they always relate to the 'liturgical theology' and the 'liturgical asceticism' intrinsic to the celebration itself. Perhaps Fagerberg means the same, when he allows for a *chronological interdependence* between liturgy and theology—he does not want to engage with the 'chicken-or-the-egg' question—as long as the *foundational primacy* is given to the liturgy. Theology, thus, sometimes influences liturgy (and *vice versa*), but theology is always done because of liturgy (not *vice versa*).[27]

My conclusion is that the maxim *lex orandi lex credendi* should be interpreted as pronouncing a deep mutual interaction between liturgy and theology. Those who appeal to the original phrasing *ut legem credendi lex statuat supplicandi* in order to claim that the liturgy is normative for theology and not *vice versa*, conceal that their preliminary choice of *which* liturgy they regard as normative, already implies a theological decision.[28] This study, then,

25 FAGERBERG, *Theologia Prima*, 226 (nr. 42); cf. 141.

26 KAVANAGH, *On Liturgical Theology*, 139-142, identifies the following 'canons' that 'assure, insofar as canons may, that the liturgy of Christians does not drift into delusion and fantasy but remains worship in Spirit and in truth': the canon of Scripture, the canon of baptismal faith, the canon of eucharistic faith and the canons that regulate ecclesial and personal life.

27 FAGERBERG, *Theologia Prima*, 117-121.

28 One has to recognise that even the original patristic reliance on the liturgy as a trustworthy source for theology rooted in the assumption that the liturgy—its basic intuitions or even its very form and wording—originated from the apostles. *Apostolic tradition* was, then, the background of the principle *ut legem credendi lex statuat supplicandi*, which is in the end a theological, not a strictly liturgical argument. Cf. M. FIEDROWICZ, *Theologie der Kirchenväter. Grundlagen frühchristlicher Glaubensreflexion* (Freiburg-Basel-Wien: Herder, 2007), 246-254.

is situated not so much within the stricter observance of liturgical theology, as in the broader interpretation to be introduced in the next paragraph.

1.3.3 A Wider Understanding of Liturgical Theology

When the choice of 'traditional', 'canonical' liturgies conceals an *a priori* theological decision, the same is true, of course, of less traditional liturgical concepts. As the Roman Catholic Gerard Lukken (born 1933) shows, a concept of *liturgy* that does not start with the 'grand narrative' of the Christian tradition, but with the pluriform spirituality of contemporary people and their 'small narratives', is deeply connected to a particular type of *theology*. Lukken calls his liturgical concept 'inductive liturgy', that is, liturgy which starts with the particularity of those who celebrate *this* ritual at *this* moment, as distinguished from 'deductive liturgy' which starts with the transcendent. Inductive liturgy is 'trans-ascendent' (ascending from the human to the divine), whereas deductive liturgy is 'trans-descendent' (descending from the divine to the human). In practice, the style and contents of inductive liturgy differs considerably—through such elements as contextual opening talks and self-made prayers, reflecting contingent situations—from deductive liturgy which is called 'uniform' and 'a-historical'.[29] Lukken connects his concept of 'inductive liturgy' to what he calls a 'Christology from the bottom up', that is, a christology which emphasises Jesus's earthly existence. Adherence to the 'Christology from above'—the christology 'of the Nicene Council' with its emphasis on the incarnation, the sacramental economy of salvation, and the liturgy as an epiphany of God—seems, says Lukken, incompatible with 'our culture'.[30] The interesting thing is that the *mutual* interdependence of liturgy and theology is not concealed, as in Fagerberg, but made explicit. The consequence is, of course, that other, no less legitimate theological presuppositions will lead to different, no less legitimate liturgical concepts.[31]

[29] G.M. LUKKEN, *Rituals in Abundance: Critical Reflections on the Place, Form and Identity of Christian Ritual in our Culture* (Louvain: Peeters, 2005), 333-358. That 'uniform' liturgy need not be experienced as 'a-historical' is indicated by M.J.M. HOONDERT, *Om de parochie. Ritueel-muzikale bewegingen in de marge van de parochie. Gregoriaans—Taizé—Jongerenkoren* (Heeswijk: Abdij van Berne, 2006), 344.

[30] LUKKEN, *Rituals in Abundance*, 515. Following his own terminology of 'inductive' versus 'deductive' liturgy, he also calls his christology 'inductive'. As opposed to some contemporary christologies in the Netherlands, Lukken does not mean this in what he calls an 'objective' (one could also say, positivist) way. Lukken regards 'the paradox of the Easter mystery'—as both an anthropological category and the theological breaking through our anthropology (suffering and death becoming a way to resurrection)—as the central notion of Christianity and Christian liturgy (516-524).

[31] LUKKEN, *Rituals in Abundance*, 502-505, acknowledges the existence of such a different school of liturgical theology which lays more emphasis on the particularity of Scripture and salvation history, on the discontinuity between nature and salvation, on eschatological tension, and on sharing in the fruits of Christ's death and resurrection.

Lukken's awareness of the *mutual* interaction between liturgy and theology can be situated in the context of a broader definition of liturgical theology than given in the previous paragraph. The Roman Catholic Kevin Irwin, for example, reviews a number of important European and American liturgical theologians,[32] and concludes that liturgical theology has to include the following approaches. First, 'theology of liturgy' describes what liturgy 'is' and 'does'. Here belong the theological understanding of anamnesis and epiclesis, and the ecclesiological meaning of the liturgy. Second, 'theology drawn from liturgy' elucidates the Christian faith directly from the words and symbols of the liturgy. This approach takes the liturgy as the source for a deeper understanding of God, Christ, the Spirit, the church and humanity. The liturgy will, Irwin asserts, give a rich and varied perspective on the Christian faith, not in descriptive (as in dogmatics) but in symbolic terms which invite to personal appropriation. Third, 'doxological theology' is the type of liturgical theology that emphasises the celebratory character of all Christian life and thought. This approach can, for example, help systematic theology to rediscover a different mode than just the cerebral. These three possible understandings of liturgical theology circle around the *lex orandi* and the *lex credendi*. Additionally, Irwin mentions the *lex agendi* or *lex vivendi* as another theme with which 'a more adequate method for liturgical theology' should engage. Here Irwin includes the study of enacted ritual using 'methods from the social sciences', and pays attention to the practical *ars celebrandi*. But he also points beyond the liturgy to spirituality and daily life as informed by the meaning of the liturgical celebration.[33] Compared to Irwin's description of the field of liturgical theology, the present study includes elements of, at least, the first two approaches. It sometimes investigates the theological meaning of the liturgy, while at other times it elucidates systematic theology (ecclesiology) from the perspective of the liturgy.

The Methodist Dwight Vogel likewise offers a broad definition of liturgical theology. He allows the area to be as large as to embrace theological reflection on ritual in general ('theology of worship'), the liturgy itself as *theologia prima* ('liturgy as theology'), theological investigation into the meaning of the liturgy ('theology of liturgy'), particular treatises of systematic theology informed by the liturgy ('theology in liturgy'), systematic theology as a whole conceived as doxological ('theology because liturgy') and reflection on the relationship

32 K.W. IRWIN, *Liturgical Theology: A Primer* (Collegeville MN: TLP, 1990). Among those reviewed are Kavanagh, Lukken, Schmemann and Wainwright.

33 IRWIN, *Liturgical Theology*, 64-73. These methodical distinctions are further elaborated in IRWIN, *Context and Text*, 46-50 (theology of liturgy), 50-52 (theology drawn from the liturgy), 266-278 (doxological theology), 311-346 (*lex vivendi* and spirituality). On the interrelatedness of liturgy, faith and ethics, cf. also T. BERGER, 'Lex orandi—lex credendi—lex agendi. Auf dem Weg zu einer ökumenisch konsensfähigen Verhältnisbestimmung von Liturgie, Theologie und Ethik', *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 27 (1985), 425-432.

between liturgy and life, especially ethics ('liturgy and life').[34] This study will probably best fit into Vogel's fourth category: it studies the particular treatise of systematic theology called ecclesiology from the angle of—informed by—the liturgy. In the meantime, the awareness expressed by the other approaches will not be absent.

In addition to Irwin's and Vogel's many strands of liturgical theology, the Presbyterian Graham Hughes (born 1937) interestingly detects liturgical theology even beyond what is generally labelled as such. He identifies three approaches of 'making sense of the signs of worship', all three of which he allows to be called 'liturgical theology'.[35] The first school of liturgical theology is constituted by the writers commonly regarded as liturgical theologians. Notwithstanding their differences, they operate largely in the same field: the type of liturgical theology which emerged out of the Liturgical Movement and (neo-) patristic *ressourcement*. Most of the authors whose thought will be presented in this study, as well as my own conclusions in the final chapter, find themselves at home in this first school of liturgical theology, which Hughes calls the 'church theology' approach.[36] A second school of liturgical theology is 'evangelical'. Although emphatically not clothed in 'liturgical' terms, this approach to Christian worship has, of course, its own particular liturgical theology.[37] Thirdly, Hughes points to 'mainline Protestants' as a third group—otherwise defined as 'liberal Protestantism'—with its own approach to liturgy and its meaning.[38] Hughes's own proposal can be read as a corrective to this third approach. 'A liturgical theology for late modern times must show how worship can "make sense" for people shaped within the modern paradigm.'[39] Hughes appeals to 'limit experiences' in order to point to God as 'alterity'. Only in a second move can the fundamentally unknowable be named with names from religious traditions that always come 'from below'. Hughes claims that this way of doing theology, and this way alone, is compatible with the way in which contemporary people can be religious and liturgical with integrity.[40] However one evaluates Hughes's own position, his typology of schools of liturgical theology is helpful and indicates, again, the mutual interdependence of liturgy and theology.

34 D.W. VOGEL, 'Liturgical Theology: A Conceptual Geography', in: D.W. Vogel (ed.), *Primary Sources of Liturgical Theology: A Reader* (Collegeville MN: TLP, 2000), 3-14.

35 G. HUGHES, *Worship as Meaning: A Liturgical Theology for Late Modernity* (Cambridge: CUP, 2003), 254; cf. 222.

36 HUGHES, *Worship as Meaning*, 222, 225-233. I have reservations concerning Hughes's assumption that this school of liturgical theology operates within a 'first naiveté' (233, 253, 287-294).

37 HUGHES, *Worship as Meaning*, 223, 233-244.

38 HUGHES, *Worship as Meaning*, 223-224, 244-252.

39 HUGHES, *Worship as Meaning*, 276.

40 HUGHES, *Worship as Meaning*, 259, 286-291.

Finally, the wider understanding of liturgical theology may be illustrated with categories offered by the American Lutheran Gordon Lathrop (born 1939). Approaching the liturgy as the paramount theological *locus* presupposes that the liturgy itself, the very act of the corporate celebration, is Christianity's primary theology. Liturgical theology as the systematic-theological reflection upon the celebration is secondary to the celebration itself and its implicit and explicit meaning.[41] Therefore, Lathrop distinguishes between 'primary liturgical theology' (the meaningful act of worship itself) and 'secondary liturgical theology' (academic theologising about the meaningful liturgy). He also identifies a third phase of liturgical theologising, namely the phase when 'secondary' liturgical theology becomes critical and practical, with the intention of reshaping contemporary worship. Lathrop calls this third phase 'pastoral liturgical theology'.[42] The present book is, as a systematic-theological study, at best a work of 'secondary liturgical theology'. It is, nevertheless, important that Lathrop reminds us that secondary liturgical theology should always be connected to the actual celebration of the liturgy, from which it starts and to which it returns (primary liturgical theology), and that it should contribute to the ongoing renewal of the actual celebration of the liturgy (pastoral liturgical theology). The task of (secondary) liturgical theology is, according to Lathrop, 'to articulate the Christian faith as it comes to expression in a communal gathering, as such faith is the meaning of the meeting'. Lathrop immediately points to the ecclesiological character of such an enterprise:

> From the viewpoint of liturgical theology, the most basic and constitutive sense of the word 'church' refers to the communal gathering around washing, texts, and meal, as these are interpreted as having to do with Jesus Christ. [...] To be part of the assembly, then, is to be part of the church. To interpret the meaning of the assembly is to interpret the meaning of 'church' and the church's faith.[43]

Doing 'liturgical theology' is, then, interpreting the Christian faith as it occurs in the liturgical assembly. Doing 'liturgical ecclesiology' is interpreting the meaning of the Christian church as it occurs in—and as—the liturgical assembly.[44]

1.3.4 Conclusion

Liturgical theology is, broadly defined, theological reflection in relationship to the liturgy. The relationship may be very close, as in Messner's proposal for

41 See also paragraphs 5.6.2 (Williams), 6.4.3 (Wainwright) and 6.5.6 (Lathrop).

42 G.W. LATHROP, *Holy Things: A Liturgical Theology* (Minneapolis MN: Fortress, 1993), 4-7.

43 LATHROP, *Holy Things*, 8-9.

44 Lathrop's work will be further investigated in paragraph 1.4.3 and especially in section 6.5.

'systematic Liturgical Studies', and as in Schmemann's, Kavanagh's and Fagerberg's liturgical-theological concepts that regard the *lex credendi* as inherent in the *lex orandi*. Or the relationship may be somewhat more loose, as in Hughes's three ways in which Christians make 'sense of the signs of worship', and as in Lathrop's 'secondary' and 'pastoral' liturgical theology. Moreover, the term 'liturgical theology' can, as Irwin and Vogel describe, also apply to systematic thought on ritual in general, and to systematic theology 'informed by' the liturgy. In most liturgical theologies, all these aspects will be present with different emphases.

Common to these approaches is the awareness that the Christian liturgy is of major importance for the formation of Christian theology. The authors disagree on how the opposite truth should be formulated—that Christian liturgy is also *determined by* Christian theology. Nevertheless, the above discussion of liturgical-theological concepts reveals that, however one defines the discipline and method of liturgical theology, there is always—implicitly or explicitly—a *mutual* interaction between theology and liturgy. It seems, therefore, appropriate to explicitly acknowledge this interaction, as is exemplarily done by Lukken and Hughes. One's theological and liturgical concepts, interpretations and preferences engage with one another in a reciprocal process.

This study can be situated in a broad understanding of liturgical theology. It is not a theological commentary on particular liturgical rites and texts, and therefore not liturgical theology in the stricter sense as defined by Messner, Schmemann, Kavanagh and Fagerberg. It is, however, a systematic-theological investigation into the concept of 'church' as approached from the angle of the liturgical gathering and the eucharistic celebration. As such, this study may fit Lathrop's broad category of 'secondary' liturgical theology. It certainly includes elements of Irwin's and Vogel's 'theology of liturgy' (investigating the theological meaning of the liturgy) and 'theology drawn from liturgy' or 'theology in liturgy' (investigating liturgy as a source for systematic theology). Finally, in Hughes's typology, this study belongs to the 'church theology' approach in the tradition of the Liturgical Movement.

1.4 Liturgical Ecclesiology

1.4.1 Ecclesiology

This study is about ecclesiology, that is, theological investigation into what the church essentially is and how its distinctive features are related to this essence. The Anglican Paul Avis (born 1947) defines ecclesiology as 'the department of

Christian theology that takes the Church's self-understanding as its object. It is pursued in biblical, historical, systematic and practical modes'.[45]

In this study, the systematic-theological approach is dominant. This approach is, of course, deeply related to interpretations of biblical views on God, Jesus Christ, the Spirit, the church, humanity and the world. Neither can the systematic approach do without the history of church and dogma, as will become especially clear in the 'neo-patristic' way of thought, which on the one hand tries to do justice to the patristic era and on the other hand synthesises it into contemporary concepts.[46] Finally, the systematic-theological approach becomes practical when it offers ways of renewal to the church, especially by letting ecclesiological theory and empirical ecclesial life be mutually corrective.

Thought on the church—its nature, mission and structure—is, of course, as old as the church itself. In biblical, patristic, early medieval and high medieval times, however, this thought was not yet synthesised in a treatise of dogmatic theology. During this period, theological reflection on the church—clothed in 'symbolic' rather than 'abstract' terms—was to be found in the context of christology and soteriology and had immediately to do with the liturgical, sacramental celebration.[47] The Eastern and Western liturgies, crystallised from the fourth to seventh centuries, call the church *ecclesia tua*, *populus tuus*, *plebs tua*, *familia tua* and refer by these terms to the actual liturgical gathering. 'The *ecclesia* is people gathered by faith to receive the gift of salvation and to give glory to God.'[48]

Ecclesiology as a systematic treatise dates from the Investiture Controversy around the twelfth century. In systematic-theological and canonist terms, the realms of spiritual and temporal power were distinguished and defined.[49] Subsequently, from the sixteenth century onwards, the treatise *de ecclesia* gained new importance through the Reformation and Counter-Reformation polemic. Originating from these conflictual contexts, the ecclesiological treatise was, for the larger past of its history, of a predominantly apologetic and, from the Roman Catholic side, 'hierarchological' nature.[50] This line was continued up to the First Vatican Council (1869-1870), but the nineteenth century also saw

45 P.D.L. AVIS, *The Anglican Understanding of the Church: An Introduction* (London: SPCK, 2000), 7. Avis's thought is further explored in section 5.5.

46 Cf. paragraph 2.1.6. (The Call for a Neo-Patristic Synthesis).

47 J.R. LERCH, 'Ecclesiology', in: *New Catholic Encyclopaedia*, vol. V (New York etc.: McGraw-Hill, 1967), 34-35, at 34; Y.M.J. CONGAR, *L'Église. De saint Augustin à l'époque moderne* (Paris: Cerf, 1970 [reprint 1997]), 42-45 (patristic), 68-73 (Eastern), 157-176 (early scholastic), 215-219 (high scholastic).

48 CONGAR, *L'Église*, 39-40 ('L'*ecclesia*, ce sont les hommes que la foi assemble pour recevoir le don du salut et rendre gloire à Dieu').

49 M. KEHL, 'Ekklesiologie', in: *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*[3], vol. III (Freiburg-Basel-Wien: Herder, 1995), 568-573, at 570. Cf. CONGAR, *L'Eglise*, 89-122.

50 LERCH, 'Ecclesiology', 34.

the emergence of a more 'organic' ecclesiology as first proposed by the *Tübinger Schule* around Johann Adam Möhler (1796-1838).[51]

This nineteenth-century ecclesiological renewal became a dominant current in the twentieth century through the intertwined biblical, patristic, liturgical and ecumenical movements.[52] Generally, the polemical, apologetical nature of the treatise *de ecclesia* gave way to the rediscovery of a different approach, found in Scripture, the *patres* and the Middle Ages. This more 'organic' embedding of the church in the larger context of God's ways with the world, especially in salvation history and in Jesus Christ, also opened up the possibility to reflect positively on 'the world' in its relation to the church. The Second Vatican Council (1962-1965) stands for the breakthrough of this ecclesiological approach.[53] It is this both ancient and renewed ecclesiology, which forms the background of the eucharistic and liturgical ecclesiologies now to be introduced.

1.4.2 Eucharistic Ecclesiology

> When we consult our traditional dogmatic handbooks, we will find little, or even nothing, on the theme that occupies us here, 'the eucharist—sacrament of unity'. Everything is concentrated on the words of institution, the real presence and the sacrificial character. When we open Scripture or read the Fathers of the church and the great scholastic theologians, a different and much more wide-ranging picture occurs. [...] Scripture, the Early Church and the tradition of the high Middle Ages consider the personal communion with Christ in the eucharist always in the larger context of the communion (*communio*) of the church.[54]

With these words, the Roman Catholic Walter Kasper (born 1933) opens a discussion of the ecclesial character of the eucharist and the eucharistic character of the church. Awareness of the interdependence of church and eucharist is, he says, to be found from Paul through Augustine to Aquinas, but

51 KEHL, 'Ekklesiologie', 571. Cf. CONGAR, *L'Eglise*, 417-424.

52 More detailed introductions are given in paragraphs 2.1.6 (The Call for a Neo-Patristic Synthesis), 3.1.2 (Theological Reassessment), 3.1.3 (The Liturgical Movement), 7.1.3 (The Ecumenical Movement) and 7.1.4 (Goal and Method of the Ecumenical Movement).

53 LERCH, 'Ecclesiology', 34; KEHL, 'Ekklesiologie', 572. Cf. CONGAR, *L'Eglise*, 461-466 (twentieth-century movements), 472-477 (Second Vatican Council).

54 W. KASPER, *Sakrament der Einheit. Eucharistie und Kirche* (Freiburg-Basel-Wien: Herder, 2004), 117-118 ('Wenn wir in unseren traditionellen dogmatischen Schulbüchern nachschlagen, dann finden wir zu dem Thema, das uns hier beschäftigt, "Eucharistie—Sakrament der Einheit", wenig oder gar nichts. Alles ist auf die Wandlungsworte, auf Realpräsenz und Opfercharakter konzentriert. Wenn wir die Heilige Schrift aufschlagen, bei den Kirchenvätern und den grossen Theologen der Scholastik nachlesen, dann ergibt sich ein anderes und viel umfassenderes Bild. [... D]ie persönliche Gemeinschaft mit Christus in der Eucharistie stehen in der Bibel wie in der frühen Kirche und in der hochmittelalterlichen Tradition immer im grösseren Zusammenhang der Gemeinschaft (*communio*) der Kirche').

was subsequently virtually non-existent, until it was rediscovered in the nineteenth and particularly in the first half of the twentieth century.[55]

Kasper sketches how the communal (rather than individualist) understanding of salvation and the church, with its culmination in the eucharist where this communal understanding becomes most manifest, was regained through such 'romantic' theologians as the Roman Catholic Johann Adam Möhler (1796-1838)[56] and the Russian Orthodox Alexis Khomiakov (1804-1860)[57] and how it especially benefited from the rediscovery of patristic theology in the twentieth century.[58] He also points to documents of the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965), in which this approach to both the church and the eucharist is prominent.[59] The eucharist is not just one sacrament among many, but the celebration of the church *par excellence*. The other way round, the church does not just celebrate the eucharist as one of many activities, but can fundamentally be considered as the eucharistic community. This is the basic conviction of a 'eucharistic ecclesiology', which Kasper summarises in the phrase, *Ubi eucharistia, ibi ecclesia* (Where the eucharist is, there is the church).[60]

One could also point to the phrase from the Apostles' Creed, *sanctam ecclesiam catholicam, sanctorum communionem*, in order to describe this focus of eucharistic ecclesiology. If *sanctorum communio* is not just interpreted as the 'communion of saints' (*sancti*) but also as the 'communion with the sacred things' (*sancta*), the church is in this phrase said to be 'participation (*communio*, *koinonia*) in the eucharist (the sacred things)'.[61]

The term 'eucharistic ecclesiology' was coined by the Russian Orthodox Nicholas Afanasiev (1893-1966). In the broader context of a rediscovery of the distinctive characteristics of Orthodox theology,[62] Afanasiev placed the eucharistic community at the heart of his thought about the church. In doing this, he went so far as to identify 'the church' with the local eucharistic community presided over by the bishop.[63] The Greek Orthodox John Zizioulas (born 1931) modified eucharistic ecclesiology into a view on the eucharist which is both local and universal: it is always *the local church* which celebrates

55 KASPER, *Sakrament der Einheit*, 117-119.

56 Cf. paragraph 3.1.2 (Theological Reassessment).

57 Cf. paragraph 2.1.4 (Estrangement from and Rediscovery of the Orthodox Theological Tradition).

58 Cf. paragraph 2.1.6 (The Call for a Neo-Patristic Synthesis).

59 Cf. paragraph 3.1.1 (The Second Vatican Council).

60 KASPER, *Sakrament der Einheit*, 130-134.

61 Cf. A.H.C. VAN EIJK, *Teken van aanwezigheid. Een katholieke ecclesiologie in oecumenisch perspectief* (Zoetermeer: Meinema, 2000), 193-194, 210-214.

62 Cf. paragraph 2.1.4 (Estrangement from and Rediscovery of the Orthodox Theological Tradition).

63 P. PLANK, *Die Eucharistieversammlung als Kirche. Zur Entstehung und Entfaltung der eucharistischen Ekklesiologie Nikolaj Afanas'evs (1893-1966)* (Würzburg: Augustinus-Verlag, 1980), 49, 61-62. Afanasiev's thought is further explored in section 2.2.

the eucharist, but it is always the eucharist *of the whole church* which is celebrated.[64]

Through the intertwined movements of the (neo-) patristic *ressourcement*,[65] the Liturgical Movement[66] and the Ecumenical Movement,[67] the concept of eucharistic ecclesiology entered Roman Catholic, Old Catholic, Anglican and Protestant theology.[68] Not least, ecumenical dialogue and the kind of 'ecumenical theology' developed in the process, profits from the insights offered by approaching the church from the focus of the eucharist.[69] Eucharistic ecclesiology has, thus, become a respected approach to ecclesiology throughout the churches.

Much of the thought presented in this book is eucharistic ecclesiology of one sort or another. The phrase 'eucharistic ecclesiology' will, therefore, be present throughout this study. Although I will in the next paragraph define 'liturgical ecclesiology' as including 'eucharistic ecclesiology', some ecclesiological concepts are so much concentrated on the eucharist and the eucharistic communion, rather than on the liturgical gathering as a whole, that I feel free to use the term 'eucharistic ecclesiology' in such cases. My own desire is, however, to see the eucharist as the *kernel* of the liturgy, but not as *all* of it. The liturgical community is a eucharistic community, but also a community hearing and proclaiming the Word, praising and beseeching, meeting and sharing, singing and celebrating. All this is summarised in, but not swallowed by, *the sacrament of the eucharist*, although it is of course all included in *the liturgy of the eucharist*. This consideration explains why this study uses the term 'liturgical ecclesiology'—which will be further explained in the next paragraph—rather than 'eucharistic ecclesiology', although the former is meant to imply the latter.

1.4.3 Liturgical Ecclesiology

As a sequel to his 'liturgical theology' (*Holy Things*), Lathrop has written a 'liturgical ecclesiology' (*Holy People*). What Lathrop understands by liturgical ecclesiology is directly derived from his understanding of liturgical theology.[70] Liturgical theology points towards liturgical ecclesiology, because 'to interpret the meaning of the assembly is to interpret the meaning of "church" and the

64 J.D. ZIZIOULAS, *Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church* (Crestwood NY: SVSP, 1985), 23-25. Zizioulas's thought is further explored in section 2.3.

65 Cf. paragraphs 2.1.6 (The Call for a Neo-Patristic Synthesis) and 3.1.2 (Theological Reassessment).

66 Cf. paragraph 3.1.3 (The Liturgical Movement).

67 Cf. paragraphs 7.1.3 (The Ecumenical Movement) and 7.1.4 (Goal and Method of the Ecumenical Movement).

68 Cf. chapters 3 (Roman Catholic), 4 (Old Catholic), 5 (Anglican) and 6 (Protestant).

69 Cf. chapter 7 (Ecumenical).

70 Cf. paragraph 1.3.3.

church's faith'.[71] As liturgical theology investigates the Christian faith from the perspective of the liturgy, liturgical ecclesiology is the specification of this investigation in view of the church.

For Lathrop, a liturgical ecclesiology has to be 'consonant with the Eucharist'.[72] In this phrase he understands the eucharist not just as the Lord's Supper, but as 'the whole economy' of such 'juxtapositions' as Sunday and weekdays, word and meal, baptism and the eucharist, Scripture and preaching, thanksgiving and beseeching, the assembly and its presiders, being gathered and being sent out. In other words, Lathrop's use of the term 'eucharist' refers to the *celebration* of the eucharist—including the gathering of the people, praying, singing, Scripture reading, preaching, presiding—rather than to the *sacrament* of the eucharist which is just a part of the eucharistic liturgy. In such a broad understanding, 'eucharist' is not the prerogative of some churches, but 'the inheritance of all the churches'.[73]

To describe the exercise practised in this study, I borrow Lathrop's phrase 'liturgical ecclesiology'. Like Lathrop, I regard the approach known as 'eucharistic ecclesiology' as being *included* in a 'liturgical ecclesiology'. The focal point of a eucharistic ecclesiology is the eucharistic communion of and with the body of Christ (the eucharistic communion is the church). The focal point of a liturgical ecclesiology is the liturgical gathering of and as the whole people of God (the liturgical assembly is the church). The latter includes the former: the liturgical gathering includes the eucharistic communion, a liturgical ecclesiology includes a eucharistic ecclesiology.

The value of the phrase 'liturgical ecclesiology' is that the attention is not exclusively focused on the eucharist, but also on the very act of the gathering (important in view of the *ekklesia*) and on the juxtapositions of which the liturgy consists (important in view of the liturgy conveying Christian meaning). A potential reduction of eucharistic ecclesiology to the 'sacrament' and the 'ministry' is countered by a more inclusive approach to the liturgy as a corporate celebration with many aspects. Styling my approach 'liturgical ecclesiology' also allows theologians to be included whose thought is not specifically eucharistic but more widely liturgical. Finally, choosing the phrase

71 G.W. LATHROP, *Holy People: A Liturgical Ecclesiology* (Minneapolis MN: Fortress, 1999), 8. The term 'liturgical ecclesiology' is also used and helpfully explained in N.D. MITCHELL, 'Liturgy and Ecclesiology', in: Chupungco (ed.), *Handbook*, vol. II, 113-127, esp. at 123-126. Cf. FAGERBERG, *Theologia Prima*, 16-17: 'Liturgical theology is ecclesiological self-analysis. [...] *Church* is the noun form of the verb *liturgy*'; MESSNER, *Einführung*, 20-21, 26.

72 LATHROP, *Holy People*, 14. Lathrop borrows the phrase 'consonant with the Eucharist' (*consonans eucharistiae*) from Irenaeus (*Adversus haereses* 4:18:5). The concepts of liturgy used by other liturgical theologians is also rooted in the eucharist; cf. SCHMEMANN, *Introduction to Liturgical Theology*, 24-26; FAGERBERG, *Theologia Prima*, 83, 88, 233 nr. 88; HUGHES, *Worship as Meaning*, 166-168.

73 Cf. LATHROP, *Holy People*, 14-18. For more about Lathrop's concept of 'juxtaposition', cf. paragraph 6.5.3.

'liturgy' rather than 'eucharist' (but, still, liturgy including the eucharist) may also be understood as an opening up of eucharistic ecclesiology towards Protestant contexts, in which the eucharist exists, but not always as the central form of liturgy.

Whether termed 'liturgical' or 'eucharistic' ecclesiology, both phrases are in danger of being understood as exclusive rather than inclusive, as inward-looking rather than centrifugal. One of the claims of this study, however, will be that 'liturgy' and 'eucharist' bear meanings far beyond themselves. The eucharist is an icon of the kingdom.[74] The liturgy leads into doxological living and eucharistic ethics.[75] The liturgy and the eucharist point beyond the liturgical moment and beyond the eucharistic circle. The celebration opens perspectives on church and humanity, society and culture, politics and economics.[76] 'This is the ecclesiology that the liturgy rehearses and promotes. It offers not only an ideal icon of who and what the Church should be but a lively sacrament of the whole world's future.'[77] If the Christian celebration is not that, it is not the centre of the Christian faith and church.

1.4.4 Conclusion

The term 'liturgical ecclesiology' is in this study borrowed from Lathrop. It can be read as a contraction of 'liturgical theology' and 'eucharistic ecclesiology'. Regarding its method, liturgical ecclesiology is a specification of liturgical theology: it investigates the systematic-theological meaning of 'church' as it occurs *in* and *as* the liturgical assembly. Regarding its contents, liturgical ecclesiology is synonymous with eucharistic ecclesiology, if the latter is taken in a wider sense than just concentrating on the celebration of the sacrament. Liturgical ecclesiology investigates the ecclesial character of the liturgy which includes the gathering of the members of the church,[78] prayer, song, baptism, the Word, the eucharist, its implications for daily life in and outside the church, and all those other 'juxtapositions' which make Christian liturgy what it is.

74 Cf. paragraph 2.3.7 (Zizioulas).

75 Cf. paragraph 6.4.8 (Wainwright). See also 5.7.2 and 5.7.8 (Pickstock). This is what Fagerberg calls the 'liturgical asceticism' next to the 'liturgical theology', both of which are intrinsic to the liturgical celebration. Cf. FAGERBERG, *Theologia Prima*, 5-7, 17-32, 219-235.

76 Cf. A.W.J. HOUTEPEN, *Geloven in gerechtigheid. Bijdragen tot een oecumenische sociale ethiek* (Zoetermeer: Meinema, 2005), 158-165, 255; M. PLOEGER, 'De kerk als Maaltijd vierende gemeenschap', *Eredienstvaardig. Tijdschrift voor liturgie en kerkmuziek* 22 (2006), 13-17.

77 MITCHELL, 'Liturgy and Ecclesiology', 122.

78 In this study, the term 'members' (of the church) is used in the sense of members of the body of Christ through baptism. This study does not engage in the complications of the term 'member(ship)' as they occur in canon law, for example regarding heresy, apostacy, excommunication and one's own deliberate termination of church membership. Cf. K. WALF, *Vragen rondom het nieuwe kerkelijk recht* (Hilversum: Gooi & Sticht, 1988), 59-62.

1.5 CONCLUSION

These introductory sections serve a preliminary clarity about the general liturgical and theological scope of this study. As the discussion of 'liturgical theology' made clear, there is neither *one* type of liturgy, nor *one* type of liturgical theology and, for that matter, liturgical ecclesiology. To do justice to the many-sided field of liturgy, theology and ecclesiology, this introductory chapter indicated where this study can approximately be situated within the general discourse. The following chapters aim at working out and making plausible such a 'liturgical ecclesiology'. The final chapter will synthesise the major findings into building blocks for ecumenical thought on the church from a liturgical perspective.

2 THE FORMATION OF A EUCHARISTIC ECCLESIOLOGY

Orthodox Contributions to a Liturgical Ecclesiology

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The quest for a liturgical ecclesiology starts with a chapter on Orthodox ecclesiology. This is not surprising, as the school of 'eucharistic ecclesiology' was originally founded by Orthodox theologians. In this chapter, the Russian Orthodox *émigré* theologian, Nicholas Afanasiev, will be studied as the father of eucharistic ecclesiology. Subsequently, the Greek Orthodox theologian, John Zizioulas, will be treated as an important contemporary thinker who reshaped and developed Afanasiev's pioneering ideas.

2.1.1 An Orthodox Theological Approach

The theological context in which Afanasiev's eucharistic ecclesiology emerged, was the rediscovery of a particularly Orthodox way of theologising. Although every distinction between Western and Eastern theology should be put into perspective by pointing to the common patristic and early medieval history of both strands of Christianity, and at the varieties within Western and Eastern theology themselves, nevertheless some general differences can be detected. These differences should not be regarded as a purely dogmatic matter. Different dogmatic presuppositions developed together with different traditions of personal and ecclesial spirituality. Dogma, spirituality, and mysticism are intertwined.[1]

For our subject, the most important aspects of a particularly Orthodox theology are its view on the Holy Spirit within the Trinity, its eschatological awareness, and its attitude towards the relation between local churches and the universal church.

[1] T. WARE, *The Orthodox Church* (London: Penguin, 1997[5]), 46, 48; V. LOSSKY, *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church* (Crestwood NY: SVSP, 1998[4] [1976[1]; French original: Paris 1944]), 14, 22.

2.1.2 Pneumatology and Eschatology

One of the differences between a Western and an Eastern theological approach is the way they perceive the Trinity. Western thought tends to stress the *unity*—the principle of the Godhead—within the Trinity, whereas Eastern thought has a tendency to emphasise the *persons*.[2]

This is one of the reasons behind the *Filioque* controversy. Orthodox theology gives priority to the *personal* relations of the three persons, which means for the Father that he is the source of the Godhead, from whom the Son is begotten and the Spirit has proceeded. According to the Orthodox, the Western view that the Spirit proceeds from the Father *and the Son* (*Filioque*), does not do justice to both the person of the Father and the person of the Spirit. To the Father, because he then ceases to be the unique source and principle of unity within the Trinity. To the Spirit, because he then is reduced to a bond of union between the Father and the Son, instead of being an active person of the Trinity of his own.[3]

Another reason behind the *Filioque* controversy, and behind the different views on the Trinity in general, is the fact that Western theology tends to start from salvation history (the 'economy'), wheras Eastern theology always links history both to its beginnings before creation (the eternal relations within the Trinity) and to its goal at the end of time (the eschaton). Western thought tends to see the Trinity as a projection of God's historical revelation, which easily leads to the 'chronological' schemes Father-Son and Son-Spirit, while Orthodoxy sees the historical revelation as the appearance in history of the eternal trinitarian God. The effect is that in Orthodox ecclesiology the communion of the church is an icon of the internal communion of the Trinity. More than the West, Orthodoxy regards the church as constituted by Christ *and* the Spirit. Moreover, it regards the church not primarily as an historical, but as an eschatological phenomenon. It is not (only) *Christ* who once instituted the church, but it is (also) the *Spirit* who once constituted *and* constantly re-constitutes the church by connecting it to its eschatological goal.[4] That these Orthodox views on the pneumatological and eschatological nature of the church are important for a liturgical ecclesiology, will be seen in the course of this chapter.

2 J. MEYENDORFF, *L'Eglise orthodoxe. Hier et aujourd'hui* (Paris: Seuil, 1960), 168.
3 LOSSKY, *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*, 56-62.
4 J.D. ZIZIOULAS, *Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church* (Crestwood NY: SVSP, 1985), 19-20, 131, 140.

2.1.3 The Church Local and Universal

Orthodox ecclesiology thinks in terms of 'local churches' which are in communion with their 'sister churches'. Each local church is headed by a bishop, and the communion between the churches is manifested by the communion between the bishops. Every bishop is ordained by a number of other bishops, and the bishops gathering together in a council form the ultimate authority of the Orthodox Church. This is not to mean, though, that the proclamations of a council are automatically revelations of divine truth. Its teaching has to be received by all Orthodox—the process of reception is essential.[5]

Both Western and Eastern ecclesiology started with the concept of the equality of bishops (e.g. Ignatius of Antioch, around 107), grouped into provinces presided over by metropolitans (Council of Nicea, 325), and eventually organised into five patriarchates (Council of Chalcedon, 451): Rome, Constantinople (the 'Second Rome'), Alexandria, Antioch and Jerusalem. The problem which eventually separated East and West was the *interpretation* of this organisation. In the West, the patriarchal primacies—and particularly the only patriarchate on Western territory, that of Rome—became more and more regarded as an institution of divine right, while the East never ascribed such a divine authority to the Pentarchy. In Orthodoxy, the Pentarchy has always remained a matter of ecclesiastical organisation.[6]

The Pentarchy arose out of the ideal of a non-uniform church, with respect for the character of the people, culture and traditions of each region of Christianity. But in practice the Pentarchy gave rise to competition among the patriarchs, particularly between those of Rome and Constantinople.[7] Although the importance of the year 1054 should not be overestimated—problems between East and West occurred before that date, and contacts existed and reunion efforts were made afterwards—it nevertheless marked the formal rupture between the two parts of Christianity. 1054 was both the result and the beginning of mutual estrangement.[8]

During the Middle Ages, the West saw the birth of scholasticism, which had a major impact on Western ecclesiological thought. The ancient ecclesiological tradition—common to East and West—thought along the lines of salvation history and biblical symbolism. But in the Western Middle Ages this ecclesiological tradition was joined by the new approach of speculative theology and by those who occupied themselves mainly with the problem of the

5 N. LOSSKY, 'The Orthodox Churches', in: P.D.L. Avis (ed.), *The Christian Church: An Introduction to the Major Traditions* (London: SPCK, 2002), 1-17, at 6-7, 9.

6 MEYENDORFF, *L'Eglise orthodoxe*, 22, 37-39.

7 K. OUWENS, *De theorie van de pentarchie en het primaatschap in de kerk* (Amersfoort: COKB, 1986), 43-44, 47-48, 55.

8 MEYENDORFF, *L'Eglise orthodoxe*, 41-42.

day—the relationship between *sacerdotium* and *regnum*. This medieval shift in mainstream Western ecclesiological thought—mainstream, because the previous emphases were preserved in minority schools of thought—was not followed in the East, which stuck to the ancient ways of theologising, as a summary of thirteenth-century Byzantine ecclesiology shows: equality of apostles and therefore of bishops; collegial Pentarchy; decision-making by synods and not by bishops alone; no automatic authority of ministry but dependence on the Holy Spirit; in short: a communal and pneumatological ecclesiology.[9]

2.1.4 Estrangement from and Rediscovery of the Orthodox Theological Tradition

The fall of Constantinople to the Turks (1453) had its effects on Orthodox theology. From that day, it became difficult to maintain a distinctive Greek theological tradition. The seventeenth and eighteenth centuries were a period of Western influence upon Orthodox thought. Orthodox theologians studied in the West, and at their return brought with them either Roman Catholic or Protestant influences.[10] The most remarkable of those influences can be found in patriarch Cyril Lukaris of Constantinople, who published a confession of faith (Geneva, 1629) of a strong Calvinist persuasion. That it was condemned by several Orthodox councils in the same century makes it no less remarkable as an example of the influence of Protestant thought in official Orthodox circles. Cyril's Roman Catholic influenced counterpart was metropolitan Peter Moghila of Kiev, who wrote 'the most Latin document' ever formally accepted by the Orthodox Church—a confession of faith written in 1640 and accepted by several Orthodox synods.[11]

A similar situation occurred in eighteenth-century Russia. At the beginning of that century, Peter the Great suppressed the Moscow Patriarchate and installed a 'Holy Synod' (1721-1917) to govern the Russian Church. At the end of the same century, Catherine the Great suppressed half of the number of monasteries. Like the Greeks, the Russians turned for inspiration to the Western Catholics and Protestants, which resulted in a decline of Orthodox thought due to Western influence during this period.[12]

The nineteenth century, however, saw a gradual rediscovery of the Orthodox tradition. If the Crimean War (1853-1856) is interpreted as 'the result of a struggle of two essentially different worlds which opposed each other not only as political enemies, but as the embodiments of two disparate spiritual

9 Y.M.J. CONGAR, *L'Église. De saint Augustin à l'époque moderne* (Paris: Cerf, 1970 [reprint 1997]), 132-141, 264-267.
10 WARE, *The Orthodox Church*, 92.
11 MEYENDORFF, *L'Eglise orthodoxe*, 84-86 ('le document le plus latin').
12 WARE, *The Orthodox Church*, 114-115.

principles or ideologies', it can be seen as the watershed between two eras in the Russian attitude towards the West.[13] In opposition to continuing influence of the Enlightenment, including the development of social and political thought which would culminate in the Russian Revolution,[14] there occurred a 'Slavophile' movement, which advocated a renaissance of Russian culture and identity. To this movement belonged the lay theologian Alexis Khomiakov (1804-1860), who pointed to the necessity of rediscovering the authentic Orthodox theological tradition instead of using Western scholastic patterns of thought. As he said, Catholics and Protestants are not so different from each other as may be thought; both give answers to Western questions, whereas Orthodoxy has to rediscover its own questions and answers.[15]

In addition to this changing theological paradigm, there were also spiritual and liturgical impulses. The Russian monk Seraphim (1759-1833) of the Sarov monastery revived the distinctively Orthodox spirituality of Hesychasm as well as the tradition of spiritual guidance by *startsy* ('elders'). Parish life was reinvigorated by parish priests like John of Kronstadt (1829-1908), who combined his active pastoral, diaconal and catechetical work in a St Petersburg suburb with attempts at a more vivid liturgical parish life, by advocating frequent communion and by lowering the iconostasis in order to make the service more visible for those who participated in it.[16]

2.1.5 Foreshadowing a Eucharistic Ecclesiology?

Peter Plank has studied the relationship between these revivals of Orthodox spirituality, liturgy and theology in the nineteenth century, and the emergence of a 'eucharistic ecclesiology' in the next century. According to Plank, Seraphim of Sarov and John of Kronstadt considered the eucharist in a rather isolated way, important as a 'means of grace' for the individual believer, but without the communal and ecclesiological emphasis that marks a eucharistic ecclesiology. Nevertheless, one could say that their renewed eucharistic awareness paved the

13 A.E. BUSS, *The Russian-Orthodox Tradition and Modernity* (Leiden: Brill, 2003), 120.

14 R. HOTZ, *Sakramente—im Wechselspiel zwischen Ost und West* (Zürich-Köln: Benziger; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1979), 175. BUSS, *The Russian-Orthodox Tradition and Modernity*, 127, 171-173, 183-184 explains Leninism rather as a combination of Western and Russian thought.

15 WARE, *The Orthodox Church*, 1-2, 122-124; HOTZ, *Sakramente*, 173-178; cf. BUSS, *The Russian-Orthodox Tradition and Modernity*, 120-126.

16 WARE, *The Orthodox Church*, 118-122; N. KIZENKO, *A Prodigal Saint: Father John of Kronstadt and the Russian People* (University Park PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000), 39-66.

way for the emergence of an approach of theology and ecclesiology in which the eucharist had a more central place.[17]

The relation between Khomiakov and the school of eucharistic ecclesiology is somewhat more complicated. Eucharistic ecclesiology is unthinkable without Khomiakov, not because he advocated a eucharistic ecclesiology himself, but because he was the founder of a reshaped Orthodox theology of which eucharistic ecclesiology is an exponent. Like others in the 'Romantic' era—Johann Adam Möhler (1796-1838), John Henry Newman (1801-1890), and the German Lutheran liturgical movement—Khomiakov returned to a view on the church as a living organism, the body of Christ, rather than as just an institutional, legal corporation.[18] He interpreted the catholicity (*sobornost*) of the church not only as a *quantity* (the church throughout all times and places) but primarily as a *quality* (the church as an assembly of those who form a 'unity of Spirit and life'). Yet Khomiakov developed no eucharistic ecclesiology. In his ecclesiological thought the eucharist plays only a subordinate part—it unites the individual believers with Christ, and the local churches with the universal church, but it does not have the constitutive status it possesses in a eucharistic ecclesiology. Ironically, Khomiakov's keyword *sobornost* could have been the best description of a eucharistic ecclesiology, because the Russian expression *sobornaja cerkov* (Khomiakov's translation of *katholike ekklesia* in the creed) litterally means, 'the church assembled together'.[19]

The nineteenth-century rediscovery of a particularly Orthodox way of theologising did not include the development of a eucharistic ecclesiology. This development was left to the twentieth century, with its marked reappropriation of the patristic tradition, as opposed to denominational and national—including 'Slavophile'—theologies.[20] Nevertheless, the nineteenth century paved the way. It rediscovered the biblical and sacramental principles of Byzantine theology, including the centrality of the eucharist, the perception of the church as a living organism, the importance of eschatology, and the role of the Holy Spirit. The renewed awareness of the centrality of these aspects of Orthodox thought is the background against which a eucharistic ecclesiology could emerge.[21]

17 P. PLANK, *Die Eucharistieversammlung als Kirche. Zur Entstehung und Entfaltung der eucharistischen Ekklesiologie Nikolaj Afanas'evs (1893-1966)* (Würzburg: Augustinus-Verlag, 1980), 68-71.

18 J. PELIKAN, *Christian Doctrine and Modern Culture (since 1700)* (Chicago-London: University of Chicago Press, 1989), 289.

19 PLANK, *Die Eucharistieversammlung als Kirche*, 85-94; HOTZ, *Sakramente*, 182-184.

20 R.D. WILLIAMS, 'Eastern Orthodox Theology', in: D.F. Ford with R. Muers (eds.), *The Modern Theologians: An Introduction to Christian Theology since 1918*, Third Edition (Oxford: Blackwell, 2005), 572-588, at 574-575. See the next paragraph.

21 P. EVDOKIMOV, 'Les principaux courants de l'ecclésiologie orthodoxe au XIX^{e} siècle', in: M. Nédoncelle *et al.*, *L'Ecclésiologie au XIX^{e} siècle* (Paris: Cerf, 1960), 57-76, at 74-76.

2.1.6 The Call for a Neo-Patristic Synthesis

The school of Orthodox eucharistic ecclesiology which will be introduced in this chapter and, moreover, the ecumenical approach to the interrelatedness of the eucharist and the church which will be presented throughout this study, are inconceivable without the 'patristic turn' which took place in the first half of the twentieth century, particularly in the nineteen thirties. In the West, this rediscovery of patristic themes and concerns—known as *ressourcement*—not only led to a new theological approach, but also played its part in the emergence of the liturgical and ecumenical movements.[22] In Orthodoxy, the patristic turn is known as the quest for a 'neo-patristic synthesis'.

The neo-patristic school in Orthodoxy followed the Slavophiles' interest in rediscovering the particularly Orthodox tradition rather than remaining dependent upon Western concepts,[23] but radicalised this aim by seeking the *proprium* of Orthodoxy not in Slavonic identity but in its faithfullness to the Fathers of the Church, especially the Greek ones.[24] As its starting-point one takes generally the two lectures given by the Russian Orthodox *émigré* theologian Georges Florovsky (1893-1979), delivered at the first Orthodox theological congress, held in Athens in 1936,[25] when he was Professor of Patristics at the Russian Orthodox theological institute *Saint-Serge* in Paris (he later taught at St Vladimir's Seminary in New York, at Harvard Divinity School and, after his retirement, at Princeton University).[26] In his first lecture, Florovsky programmatically says,

> The *Western influences in Russian theology must be conquered*. [...] This conquest [...] has for a long time begun in the Russian school [...]. But Orthodox theology can finally only restore its independence from Western influences through its *spiritual return to the patristic sources* and foundations.[27]

22 Cf. paragraphs 3.1.2 (Theological Reassessment) and 3.1.3 (The Liturgical Movement).

23 This element of continuity is emphasised by HOTZ, *Sakramente*, 188, 190, and acknowledged by WILLIAMS, 'Eastern Orthodox Theology', 582.

24 This element of discontinuity is emphasised by S.S. KHORUZHII, 'Neo-Patristic Synthesis and Russian Philosophy', in: W. Helleman (ed.), *The Russian Idea: In Search of a New Identity* (Bloomington IN: Slavica, 2004), 165-183, and by WILLIAMS, 'Eastern Orthodox Theology', 574. Williams also hints at the possibility of interpreting the neo-patristic approach as a means to overcome the Orthodox tendency towards 'ethnic religiosity' (581).

25 G. FLOROVSKY, 'Westliche Einflüsse in der russischen Theologie', in: H.S. Alivisatos (ed.), *Procès-verbaux du premier congrès de théologie orthodoxe à Athènes 29 Novembre – 6 Décembre 1936* (Athens: Pyrsos, 1939), 212-231; G. FLOROVSKY, 'Patristics and Modern Theology', in: Alivisatos (ed.), *Procès-verbaux*, 238-242. According to the editor, the papers were published in the language in which they were delivered.

26 Cf. A. BLANE, 'A Sketch of the Life of Georges Florovsky', in: A. Blane (ed.), *Georges Florovsky: Russian Intellectual and Orthodox Churchman* (Crestwood NY: SVSP, 1993), 11-217.

27 FLOROVSKY, 'Westliche Einflüsse', 231 ('Die *westlichen Einflüsse in der russischen Theologie müssen überwunden werden*. [...] Diese Überwindung [...] hat längst in der

Florovsky sees a felicitous tendency towards Orthodox thought, including the beginning of a return to the Fathers, in the nineteenth century,[28] but regards it as too much overshadowed by German idealist philosophy.[29] In opposition to this, Florovsky claims that the task of theology is

> not so much to translate the tradition of the faith into contemporary language, so to speak to transfer it into the terms of the newest philosophy, but rather *to learn to find in the ancient patristic tradition the invariable principles of the Christian love for wisdom*.[30]

The Fathers, says Florovsky in his second lecture, '*have created a new philosophy*', a '*Christian Hellenism*'. All Christian thinking should understand itself as a continuation of this particularly Christian philosophy.[31] Although Florovsky recognises that the Fathers do not represent a uniform corpus of theological thought, he nevertheless claims that their thought reflects 'a common mind'. It is this common mind of the Fathers—particularly the post-Nicene Fathers of the fourth to eighth centuries—for which Florovsky originally used the term 'synthesis'.[32]

But such a patristic turn implies a 'hermeneutical' appropriation and application of patristic ways of thought rather than a 'naive', 'positivist' 'parrot[ing]' of patristic 'slogans'.[33] The theologians of the neo-patristic school

russischen Schule begonnen [...]. Doch kann endgültig die orthodoxe Theologie ihre Unabhängigkeit von den westlichen Einflüssen nur durch ihre *geistige Rückkehr zu den väterlichen Quellen* und Grundlagen wiederherstellen'); original italics.

28 FLOROVSKY, 'Westliche Einflüsse', 225-226.

29 FLOROVSKY, 'Westliche Einflüsse', 226-228, referring particularly to Khomiakov and Soloviev. Cf. G.H. WILLIAMS, 'The Neo-Patristic Synthesis of Georges Florovsky', in: Blane (ed.), *Georges Florovsky*, 287-340, at 293-294, 309-312.

30 FLOROVSKY, 'Westliche Einflüsse', 228 ('nicht so sehr die Überlieferung des Glaubens in die gegenwärtige Sprache zu übersetzen, sozusagen in die Chiffre der neuesten Philosophie zu übertragen, als vielmehr *in der alten väterlichen Tradition die unveränderlichen Grundsätze christlicher Weisheitsliebe finden lernen*'), original italics. The citation continues: 'nicht die Dogmatik mit Hilfe der gegenwärtigen Philosophie zu überprüfen, sondern umgekehrt die *Philosophie aus der Erfahrung des Glaubens selbst aufzubauen*, sodass die *Erfahrung des Glaubens zum Quell und Massstab der philosophischen Betrachtung wird*.'

31 FLOROVSKY, 'Patristics and Modern Theology', 241.

32 WILLIAMS, 'The Neo-Patristic Synthesis', 291-292, 329.

33 WILLIAMS, 'Eastern Orthodox Theology', 581-582. The same applies to the Western pioneers of *ressourcement*. Scholars like Jean Daniélou and Henri de Lubac did not just study the Fathers out of historical curiosity, but in order to establish 'a renewal of speculative theology in a new mode that would restore its closeness to the exegetical, mystical, and liturgical reading of revealed signs'; J. MILBANK, 'Henri de Lubac', in: Ford with Muers (eds.), *The Modern Theologians*, 76-91, at 77.

'were and are sophisticated modern theologians',[34] who advocate, not merely a backward tendency, but 'a return which serves as a precondition of advance'.[35] This is already indicated by Florovsky himself when he says in 1936 that a return to the patristic sources does not erase history or the present. Neither does it discharge the East from coming to terms with—'experience and suffer through'—the real problems with which Western theology and philosophy struggles.[36] As he says in his second lecture:

> This call to '*go back*' to the Fathers can be easily misunderstood. It does *not* mean a return *to the letter* of old patristic documents. [...] What is really meant and required is not a blind or servile imitation and repetition, but rather a further *development* of this patristic teaching, but homogeneous and congenial. We have to kindle again the creative fire of the Fathers, to restore in ourselves *the patristic spirit*. [...] What is of real importance is not so much an identity of spoken words, as the real continuity of lifes and mind, and inspiration.[37]

Towards the end of his life, in what comes nearest to a theological testament, Florovsky takes another opportunity to explain

> what I am calling now 'the Neo-Patristic Synthesis'. It should be more than just a collection of Patristic sayings or statements. It must be a *synthesis*, a creative reassessment of those insights which were granted to the Holy Men of old. It must be *Patristic*, faithful to the spirit and vision of the Fathers, *ad mentem Patrum*. Yet, it must be also *Neo*-Patristic, since it is to be addressed to the new age, with its own problems and queries.[38]

Practising theology in the tradition of the neo-patristic synthesis includes, therefore, not only the historical study of the Fathers, but also the continuing

34 P. VALLIERE, *Modern Russian Theology: Bukharev, Soloviev, Bulgakov: Orthodox Theology in a New Key* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000), 379 (it should be mentioned that Valliere acknowledges this while criticising the neo-patristic school).

35 KHORUZHII, 'Neo-Patristic Synthesis and Russian Philosophy', 174; cf. A. NICHOLS, *Light From the East: Authors and Themes in Orthodox Theology* (London: Sheed & Ward, 1995), 135-136.

36 FLOROVSKY, 'Westliche Einflüsse', 231 ('Zu den Vätern zurückkehren heisst jedoch nicht, aus der Gegenwart oder aus der Geschichte verschwinden, vom Schlachtfelde abtreten. [...] Auch der orthodoxe Gedanke muss alle westlichen Schwierigkeiten und Anfechtungen erfühlen und durchleiden, gegenwärtig kann und darf er sie nicht mehr umgehen oder totschweigen').

37 FLOROVSKY, 'Patristics and Modern Theology', 240 (with the correction of an 's' into a comma).

38 BLANE, 'A Sketch', 154. Blane transcribed this text from a manuscript he found after Florovsky's death.

task of creating a synthesis which re-interprets their testimony in the context of contemporary questions and needs.[39]

Since the nineteen thirties, the neo-patristic approach has become the dominant Orthodox theological school,[40] and at approximately the same time a patristic turn can be found in Western churches as well. Why was a return to the sources so obviously 'in the air'? Was it because of the cross-fertilisation, made possible by the Russian *émigré* theological institutes in Paris and, later, New York? Was it because of a common reaction—more or less contemporary in East and West—against idealist philosophy and liberal Christianity, a reaction catalysed by the atrocities of the First World War?[41]

One can conclude that, throughout the churches, the first decades of the twentieth century saw a 'patristic turn' in reaction to the philosophical, theological, political and cultural atmosphere of the time. But what was, apart from the formal return to the sources, the theological *contents* of this movement? Firstly, the patristic era saw the emergence of the canon of Scripture and the ecumenical Creeds, reflecting the Christian faith on the Trinity and on Jesus Christ. Secondly, the emerging church developed a more or less consistent way of life. The consistency of this ecclesiality may not be clear from every New Testament book or every patristic author.[42] Yet there is an unmistakable development towards such elements of ecclesial living as a believer's incorporation into the body of Christ by baptism, the centrality of the eucharistic celebration on the Lord's Day, the ministry of bishops, presbyters and deacons in the context of the whole assembly, and the synodical, conciliar ways in which the *communio* of churches reached decisions,[43] in communion with the church of Rome and its bishop.[44]

39 Cf. H. ALFEYEV, 'The Patristic Heritage and Modernity', *Ecumenical Review* 54 (2002), 91-111.

40 Cf. VALLIERE, *Modern Russian Theology*, 373-403. Valliere's book is an effort to bring another school, the 'Russian school', largely overshadowed by the neo-patristic school, back onto the theological stage. This 'Russian school' was prepared to go 'beyond the Fathers' and could, Valliere claims, therefore be potentially fruitful for a renewal of Orthodox theology in the twenty-first century.

41 WILLIAMS, 'Eastern Orthodox Theology', 574, likens the 'polemic' between the Slavophile and the neo-patristic tendencies to 'the rejection of liberal Protestant conventions by the new theologies of the Word in Germany' about the same time. The same is done by VALLIERE, *Modern Russian Theology*, 375. BLANE, 'A Sketch', 139, records that Florovsky himself said in hindsight, 'I am more in sympathy with Barth than I am with his opponents'. 'To begin with the world instead of the Word is the wrong method'.

42 For the ecclesiology of the 'third generation', reflected in the later New Testament writings, cf. J. ROLOFF, *Die Kirche im Neuen Testament* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993). I agree with Roloff that one must let the biblical authors speak for themselves (312), but not that one, bypassing patristic developments, should jump from the New Testament to our present ecumenical situation (322).

43 Cf. G.R. EVANS, 'Introduction', in: G.R. Evans (ed.), *The First Christian Theologians: An Introduction to Theology in the Early Church* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004), 1-11; M. FIEDROWICZ, *Theologie der Kirchenväter. Grundlagen frühchristlicher Glaubensreflexion*

In the context of this study it is important to realise the character which these aspects had in the patristic era. Most of them—particularly the ecclesiological and sacramental aspects—were not yet objectified into systematic-theological treatises, but were elements of ecclesial living.[45] Therefore, perhaps the most fundamental feature of the patristic turn in the first half of the twentieth century was not the rediscovery of the Fathers' thought as such, but the rediscovery of an ecclesial way of life as the context of their thought. The freshness and enthousiasm which the patristic turn—and in its wake the liturgical and ecumenical movements—brought about, had to do with the awareness that here the ecclesial, spiritual, existential character of the Christian faith was being rediscovered.

2.2 NICHOLAS AFANASIEV

2.2.1 Life and Work

Born in Odessa (Ukraine) in 1893, Nicholas Afanasiev became part of the Russian emigration after the victory of the Bolsheviks in 1920. He studied theology in Belgrade (Serbia) and became a religious education teacher at Skopje (Macedonia), while he continued his theological studies and started a lifelong ministry of advising his bishops on matters of canon law.[46]

From 1930 he worked at *Saint-Serge* in Paris, where he was Professor of Canon Law for a large part of his life, and where he also became interested in dogmatic and particularly ecclesiological themes. Afanasiev's first thoughts on eucharistic ecclesiology date back to this period.[47]

(Freiburg-Basel-Wien: Herder, 2007), 44-96 (apostolic tradition), 97-187 (Scripture), 188-236 (creeds), 237-254 (liturgy), 291-322 (conciliarity).

44 FIEDROWICZ, *Theologie der Kirchenväter*, 72-80, 311-314.

45 Cf. EVANS, 'Introduction', 2, 10. It should also be mentioned that exactly these elements of ecclesial living, which emerged in patristic times, are also the pillars of twentieth-century ecumenism insofar as it is works along the lines of the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral. Cf. J.R. WRIGHT, 'Heritage and Vision: The Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral', in: J.R. Wright (ed.), *Quadrilateral at One Hundred: Essays on the Centenary of the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral 1886/88-1986/88* (Cincinnati OH: Forward Movement Publications; London-Oxford: Mowbray, 1988), 8-46, at 43-45.

46 M. AFANASSIEFF, 'La genèse de "L'Église du Saint-Esprit"', in: N. Afanassieff, *L'Église du Saint-Esprit* (Paris: Cerf, 1975 [Russian original: Paris 1971]), 13-23, at 14-16; PLANK, *Die Eucharistieversammlung als Kirche*, 19-28.

47 AFANASSIEFF, 'La genèse', 17; Plank, *Die Eucharistieversammlung als Kirche*, 28-32. Afanasiev presented the idea—although not the term—of eucharistic ecclesiology for the first time in the Russian article 'Dve idei vselenskoi Tserkvi' (Two Conceptions of the Universal Church), *Put* 45 (1934), 16-29; cf. PLANK, *Die Eucharistieversammlung als Kirche*, 49; A. NICHOLS, *Theology in the Russian Diaspora: Church, Fathers, Eucharist in Nikolai Afanas'ev (1893-1966)* (Cambridge: CUP, 1989), 83-93.

Priested in 1940, he was driven into another emigration by the outbreak of the Second World War. Staying with his family in the South of France, and subsequently serving as a parish priest in Tunisia, he started writing his principal work, *The Church of the Holy Spirit*, for the first version of which he received a doctorate from *Saint-Serge* (1950) after his return to France (1947). He revised his dissertation during the years 1950 and 1955, but this revised version was not published before 1971 (French translation 1974), after his death in 1966.[48]

In the nineteen sixties Afanasiev followed the developments of the Second Vatican Council with interest. In one of the schemes he was explicitly named as one of the originators of eucharistic ecclesiology, which was presented to the fathers of the council as a potentially fruitful contribution towards a Roman Catholic understanding of ecclesiology. Nevertheless, Afanasiev kept a distance, because he felt the universalist approach of Roman Catholic ecclesiology was not abandoned.[49]

2.2.2 Baptismal or Eucharistic Ecclesiology?

We will now turn to Afanasiev's eucharistic ecclesiology, mainly on the basis of his principal work, *The Church of the Holy Spirit*, but referring to some of his other writings as well. The first interesting feature of *The Church of the Holy Spirit* is that it sets out not as a eucharistic, but as a baptismal ecclesiology. Afanasiev emphatically insists on 'the royal priesthood' of the whole people of God, that is, of all baptised. To the mind of the church in apostolic and post-apostolic times, every believer is a *laikos*—a full member of the *laos* (people) of God.[50] All 'laity' together are the church, and all are priests.[51] At the same time, all 'laity' (*laikoi*) are 'clergy' (*klerikoi*), because all are called to be part of God's 'inheritance' (*kleros*).[52]

So, in the apostolic and post-apostolic period, the church did not know of a separation between clergy and laity. What it did know, was a variety of ministries. At his or her baptism, the gifts of the Holy Spirit are granted *to every Christian*—hence the ontological unity (*unité ontologique*) within the church, because all are gifted by the one Spirit. But the Spirit confers his gifts to every Christian *in a particular way*, that is, according to the ministry to which this

48 AFANASSIEFF, 'La genèse', 18-21; PLANK, *Die Eucharistieversammlung als Kirche*, 33-38, 40.

49 AFANASSIEFF, 'La genèse', 21; PLANK, *Die Eucharistieversammlung als Kirche*, 11-13, 15, 38-39.

50 For Afanasiev, the word 'member' (*membre*) refers to all who have been baptised (and chrismated and made partakers of the eucharist) and by that fact together form the church; cf. N. AFANASSIEFF, *L'Église du Saint-Esprit* (Paris: Cerf, 1975 [Russian original: Paris 1971]), 35.

51 AFANASSIEFF, *L'Église du Saint-Esprit*, 36-37.

52 AFANASSIEFF, *L'Église du Saint-Esprit*, 41.

particular Christian is called—hence the functional variety (*différence fonctionelle*) of ministries within the church. If there had been no royal priesthood of all members of the church, the distinction between laity and clergy would have been ontological. In that case, some (the clergy) would have had a ministry, while others (the laity) would have had no ministry. Likewise, some would have received the Spirit, while others would not have received the Spirit. The laity would have been 'non-charismatic' members of the church. But, according to Afanasiev, the church has no non-charismatic members. All baptised have received the charism of the Spirit, all have one ministry or another. You cannot be received into the church *gratuitement*; you can only become a member of the church in order to fulfill some kind of ministry, for example the ministry of being part of the *laos theou* (people of God). And as much as there are no members of the church without some kind of ministry, there is no area of activity within the church for which no gift of the Spirit is needed.[53]

In Afanasiev's view, things went wrong as soon as 'foreign influences', particularly the influence of Roman law,[54] led to a separation of 'consecrated' and 'non-consecrated' people within the church. Originally, all who had been baptised, chrismated, and made partakers of the eucharist, were regarded as 'consecrated' (*consacrés*). From the third century onwards, the idea was introduced that the majority of the consecrated (the laity) had to be regarded as non-consecrated. The particular (*particuliers*) ministries of bishop, priest and deacon became to be seen not as differences of 'ministry' (*ministère*) within a church full of ministries, but as ontological (*ontologique*) differences in 'nature' (*nature*) accomplished by ordination.[55]

Afanasiev is critical of the modern habit of calling baptism (together with chrismation and first communion) the 'ordination of the laity'. He opposes this term, if it is meant to give the laity—as opposed to the clergy—their own little 'ordination'. Nevertheless, he assents to the use of the term if it is meant as a really *general* term, comprising all members of the church, clergy and laity alike. Whatever particular ministry they may fulfill, all are ordained by baptism to be members of the people of God. The ancient liturgies confirm the interpretation of baptism and chrismation as a kind of 'ordination'. Anointing turns people into kings and priests; those baptised were crowned as to emphasise their royal dignity; the tonsure was applied to all baptised as a sign of absolute dedication to God, and as a witness to the fact that the whole people of

53 AFANASSIEFF, *L'Église du Saint-Esprit*, 43-45, 127.

54 Afanasiev is not very precise about what he means by 'Roman law' or its influence. Terms such as 'law' (*droit*) or 'legal' (*juridique*) appear everywhere in Afanasiev's works where he detects a deviation from strictly local and strictly eucharistic lines of thought. In a rather Romantic way—reflecting the thought of Rudolf Sohm—Afanasiev sees an unbridgeable gulf between Law and Love as organising principles, the first of secular life, the second of ecclesiastical life. Cf. AFANASSIEFF, *L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit*, 349-360.

55 AFANASSIEFF, *L'Église du Saint-Esprit*, 47-48.

God are 'clerics'; and even the Orthodox ritual of being led three times around the altar was originally not reserved for priests, but was applied to all the (albeit male) baptised.[56]

The important conclusion which Afanasiev draws from the view on baptism as an 'ordination', is that every baptised has been ordained into a certain *ordo*, into a certain position within the church. Someone who is baptised is established into the *ordo* of the *laikos*, with the aim of functioning within the community of the church. And this answers the question about the relationship between a baptismal and a eucharistic ecclesiology. Baptism is not an isolated rite, but an initiation *into* an activity. One is baptised in order to occupy one's position within the community of the church, that is, to take part in the *leitourgia* of the people of God, which is first of all the eucharist. Hence the white robe of the newly baptised, which represents not only the baptismal robe, but also the wedding garment for those who are worthy to take part both now in the eucharist and eschatologically in the wedding banquet of the Lamb.[57]

The relation between a baptismal and a eucharistic ecclesiology cannot be shown more clearly than by the ancient way of Christian initiation, still practised by the Orthodox Churches. The one who is to be initiated—whether infant or adult—is baptised, chrismated (confirmed) and made partaker of the eucharist in *one* act of initiation, or at least in close connection to each other. Whereas a purely baptismal ecclesiology could have the effect of rendering baptism—in Afanasiev's words—*gratuitement*, a eucharistic ecclesiology both *implies* a baptismal ecclesiology and accepts its *consequence*, namely, that one is always baptised *into* something. The 'establishment of the laity' (*l'établissement des laïcs*) through baptism and chrismation is immediately followed by their 'first "concelebration"' (*la première 'concélébration'*) of the eucharist, because *that* is into which they are ordained.[58] 'Living *in* the church means living *with* the church.'[59]

2.2.3 The Charismatic and Organised Character of the Church

One of the main battles fought in *The Church and the Holy Spirit* is against what Afanasiev regards as the nineteenth-century invention of the historical concept of 'charismatic anarchy' in the Early Church. According to this theory—Afanasiev relates it to Adolf von Harnack (1851-1930)—the more original form of Christianity consisted in an unorganised life, directly guided by the Spirit, wheras the later form of an institutionalised church reflected the

[56] AFANASSIEFF, *L'Église du Saint-Esprit*, 53-55, 60-62.

[57] AFANASSIEFF, *L'Église du Saint-Esprit*, 52, 57-60, 62-63, with reference to Galatians 3:27 and Matthew 22:11.

[58] AFANASSIEFF, *L'Église du Saint-Esprit*, 65, 67.

[59] AFANASSIEFF, *L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit*, 120 ('La vie dans l'Eglise signifie la vie avec l'Eglise'), emphasis added.

gradual shift from the Spirit's role in the guidance of the church to the role of ordained ministers.[60]

Afanasiev detects two mistakes in this theory. Firstly, Spirit and organisation must not be seen as opposites. 'The Spirit is in the church not a principle of anarchy but of organisation.'[61] Both the ministry of the laity and the particular ministries originate from the *Spirit*, who confers his charisms upon those whom he chooses. Secondly, it is always the *church* in which those charisms are recognised and exercised.[62] And because Afanasiev places the eucharistic assembly at the heart of the church, the church has always had and should always have some organisational form. 'The church, the assembly of the people of God in Christ, manifests itself empirically in the eucharistic assembly'.[63] The fact that the church is an ordered assembly leads Afanasiev to the conviction that every church needs its presider, because 'without the ministry of the presider, the ecclesial assembly would be nothing but a shapeless crowd'; 'no church can live without its presider'.[64]

This means that in Afanasiev's thought there is no room for charismatic phenomena outside the church. All charisms come from the Spirit, and the church is the realm of the Spirit's activity.[65] On the other hand, the church can be nothing but charismatic. The whole life of the church is a life in the Spirit. All members of the church are charismatics, because all have received the Spirit. The church is the beginning of the new aeon, because in the church the prophecy has been fulfilled: 'In the last days it will be, God declares, that I will pour out my Spirit upon all flesh'.[66]

60 AFANASSIEFF, *L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit*, 27-30, 130, 191. Afanasiev refers to Harnack but without mentioning his publications (130).

61 AFANASSIEFF, *L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit*, 30 ('L'Esprit n'est pas dans l'Eglise un principe d'anarchie, mais d'organisation').

62 AFANASSIEFF, *L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit*, 130.

63 AFANASSIEFF, *L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit*, 195-196 ('L'Eglise, assemblée du peuple de Dieu dans le Christ, se manifeste empiriquement dans l'assemblée eucharistique').

64 AFANASSIEFF, *L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit*, 196 ('Sans le ministère des proéstôtés, l'assemblée ecclésiale ne serait qu'une masse informe'), 192 ('aucune église ne pouvait vivre sans son proéstôs'). On Afanasiev's use of the word 'proéstôs', cf. paragraph 2.2.4.

65 AFANASSIEFF, *L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit*, 25 ('Elle [the church] est le lieu de son [the Spirit's] action'), 156 ('L'Eglise est le lieu où agit l'Esprit').

66 AFANASSIEFF, *L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit*, 27; cf. Acts 2:27; Joel 2:28. The title of Afanasiev's main work, *The Church of the Holy Spirit*, is a quotation from Tertullian, who used it in a Montanist sense, in order to dissociate himself from the 'Great Church' and in order to claim the Spirit for Montanist prophecy. Afanasiev's book title can be regarded as a reclaiming of the Spirit for the (Catholic/Orthodox) tradition of the 'Great Church'. Cf. AFANASSIEFF, *L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit*, 25-27, 193.

2.2.4 The Relationship between the People and the Liturgical Presider

The next step in Afanasiev's line of thought is to clarify the relationship between the people of God—who are priests and kings, who in baptism and chrismation are ordained by the Holy Spirit to the ministry of concelebrating the eucharist—and the bishop or priest who presides at the eucharist.[67] Starting point is Afanasiev's principle that every member of the church is *equally* gifted by the Holy Spirit, but gifted *in different ways*, according to the particular ministry that every member is destined to fulfill within the church. Now Afanasiev introduces the presupposition that all those ministries are mutually dependent upon each other. The church consists of all baptised, but there can be no church without the ministry of a presider, and neither can there be a presider without the community of the church. All ministries together form the church, and without one of those ministries the church cannot exist at all.

The effect of this important presupposition is that there can be no eucharistic celebration without a presider—not because the people of God don't possess the priestly dignity (they do), and not because the bishop or priest is the only celebrant (all are concelebrants, *co-liturges*), but because there is *no Chuch at all* (and therefore also no royal priesthood of believers) without a presider. The opposite is equally true: according to Afanasiev a bishop or priest cannot preside without the people of God—simply because without the people there *cannot be* a bishop or priest. Both the idea that a minister could celebrate a sacrament without the people, and the idea that the minister is ordained and the people are non-ordained, turn the sacrament into magic. Without the people there is no sacrament.[68]

Afanasiev regrets the gradual introduction of liturgical elements which underline the growing separation between laity and clergy, such as the iconostasis which has become higher and more massive than in the Early Church, but also the rule that the presider is obliged to communicate every time he presides at the eucharist, whereas the people do not have this obligation. In the Early Church all received communion, because all were concelebrants. As soon as the people were no longer seen as concelebrants, they no longer needed to communicate at every liturgy they attended. The opposite is also true: the liturgy has retained many indications of the ancient view on the laity as

[67] For the presider, Afanasiev uses the Russian word *prédstoyatel*, which not only means 'presider' or 'president', but also the shepherd who marches in front of the flock. The French translation uses the (transliterated) Greek word 'proéstôs'. Cf. 'Avertissement', in: AFANASSIEFF, *L'Église du Saint-Esprit*, 6. In my rendering of Afanasiev I use the word 'presider', because it largely coincides with *proestos*, and because it is an ecumenically agreed term with the general meaning of someone who takes the lead in a liturgical service without denying the (con-) celebrating role of all others present.

[68] AFANASSIEFF, *L'Église du Saint-Esprit*, 68-72.

concelebrants, for example the plural form of all prayers, indicating that the presider prays in the name of and together with all those who are present.

Afanasiev is not only opposed to a celebration of the eucharist without people, but also without *all the people*. The eucharist should be—as in the Early Church—the gathering *epi to auto* (in the same place) of the whole congregation. Ironically—says Afanasiev—the more frequent celebration of the eucharist (that is, more frequently than the ancient use of Sundays and Feasts only) has not improved but deteriorated the participation of the whole people of God. To Afanasiev's regret, the attitude that *the sacrament* has to be administered frequently, even if we are not present, has superseded the ancient conviction that *we celebrate* the sacrament, and that there is only a celebration if we are all gathered together. Afanasiev's conclusion is, 'The sacramental domain is open to the laity, and without their participation no liturgical acts can be accomplished in the church.'[69]

2.2.5 The Administrative, Doctrinal and Pastoral Ministries of the Liturgical Presider

Flowing from his role as presider at the eucharist, the presider—particularly the bishop—fulfills some other functions within the community. One of these functions is the ministry of administration (*kubernesis*). This is a 'particular ministry' (*ministère particulier*), which means that it is not part of the ministry of the royal priesthood. Only those who have been established into this ministry, may exercise the gift of administration or management of the church. This means that it is only the bishops who are the shepherds of—in the sense of those who guide—the flock.[70]

It is part of a eucharistic ecclesiology to deduce these other functions from the main function of presiding over the eucharistic assembly. As the centre of the church's life, the eucharistic assembly is the place for all important acts in the life of the church, such as the establishment of new members, the ordination to the particular ministries, and the decision upon important issues. Because it is the presider who safeguards the structure and order of the eucharistic assembly, it is also the presider who is the administrator of the community.[71]

[69] AFANASSIEFF, *L'Église du Saint-Esprit*, 95 ('le domaine sacramentel est ouvert aux laïcs et, sans leur participation, les actions liturgiques ne peuvent pas être accomplies dans l'Eglise'); cf. 72, 78-79, 82-86, 91-95. It is remarkable that Afanasiev's theory and practice did not match altogether, as Afanasiev used to celebrate the eucharist in a corner of *Saint-Serge*'s chapel, only in the company of his family and some other people; cf. NICHOLS, *Theology in the Russian Diaspora*, 59. For the same inconsistency in Dix, cf. paragraph 5.2.5.

[70] AFANASSIEFF, *L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit*, 96-99.

[71] Cf. AFANASSIEFF, *L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit*, 198.

But the laity, the royal priesthood, are not completely excluded from the administration of the church. In the first place, Afanasiev describes the way in which the people have to imitate their leaders as 'a personal act, not a blind obedience'. But moreover, the laity have their own role, which is the task to weigh and test the episcopal administration. The people of God safeguard that everything in the church happens according to the will of God, and not according to the will of human beings such as the bishop or members of the laity individually. The people of God exercise their 'ministry of discernment' not by means of democratic election, but in a continuous process of consensus and reception. The consensus of the people may well be implicit, or restricted to agreements on major decisions, because the main point is not a kind of democratic control of the bishop by the people, but the assurance of the unity of the people of God (bishops and laity). Afanasiev emphatically denies that the bishop is a 'representative' of the diocese. He thinks of representation as a legal and not an ecclesiastical term. The people of God do not govern themselves according to their own will and by means of the bishop as their representative, but the bishop (as presider and therefore as administrator) and the laity (as the body where the process of reception takes place) both have their role in fulfilling the will of God.[72]

According to Afanasiev, as soon as the juridisation of the church took place—from Constantine onwards—the bishop gradually became an ecclesiastical 'official' and the laity became passive. In modern times—Afanasiev is particularly critical of the Council of Moscow (1917-1918)—the legal concept of *delegation* entered the church. But, says Afanasiev, a ministry, being a charism of the Spirit, cannot be delegated. Both the bishop and the laity have their own indispensable ministry within the process of the government of the church. As we will see in some more instances below, it is Afanasiev's conviction that every particular ministry in the church is given by a special gift of the Spirit to the person who is to exercise this ministry. In order to underline this theory, Afanasiev refers to biblical lists of charisms, where indeed leadership is presented as a charism given to some but not to all.[73] In Afanasiev's strict line of thought, this means that such a particular ministry can only be fulfilled by someone upon whom the Spirit has conferred this particular charism. This leaves no room for delegation: one cannot delegate a gift of the Spirit to someone who has not received this gift from the Spirit. According to Afanasiev, it is not *a human person*—a bishop for example—who decides who is to exercise a certain ministry, but it is *God*—more precisely, the Spirit—who chooses upon whom He is going to confer his charisms.[74]

72 AFANASSIEFF, *L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit*, 99-103. This is the people's 'don du discernement et de l'épreuve' (99), cf. I Thessalonians 5:21. The people of God have the task and the gift to discern whether an ecclesiastical decision or development is 'of the Spirit' or not.

73 Cf. 1 Corinthians 12: 7-10, 28-30; Ephesians 4:11.

74 AFANASSIEFF, *L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit*, 98, 102-107.

The same is true of the ministry of instruction (*didache*). The role of the teacher (*doctor*) is also a particular ministry, which can only be exercised by those who are established into this ministry by a particular charism of the Spirit. The examples of lay preachers in the Early Church are interpreted by Afanasiev as exceptions to the rule: very soon preaching became the prerogative of the bishop and of presbyters whom the bishop had appointed for this task. The ordination of bishops and priests implies the bestowal of the pneumatic charism of instruction, and because such a ministry cannot be delegated, Afanasiev regards it as an impossibility that others than bishops or priests should preach.[75]

Like the ministry of administration, the ministry of instruction is also completed or counterbalanced by the laity's ministry of discernment. The people of God give judgement and testimony of the doctrine presented to them by the bishops and priests. Bishops—and the meetings of bishops, the councils—decide about doctrinal matters, but their decisions need to be accepted by the whole people of God in the process of reception.[76]

Unlike the proclamation of *doctrine*, the development of *private opinions* is open to every layperson. Theology is one of the charisms the Spirit can confer upon laypersons. Theology can be a means by which the ministry of prophecy finds its way into the church of today. The ultimate test of all theology is in the end again with the whole people of God, who do or do not accept theological thought in the process of reception.[77]

Afanasiev concludes that the laity are *co-liturges*, but neither *co-administrateurs* nor *co-docteurs*. It is Christ himself, who governs and teaches through those who have received these particular ministries. In Afanasiev's perception, modern theology has turned this principle upside down: the celebration of the liturgy has wrongly become a matter of the clergy only, while the laity has wrongly received a part in the government and teaching of the church.[78]

Another function flowing from the presider's role in the eucharistic assembly is his ministry as a shepherd. In interpreting this ministry, Afanasiev keeps together the two aspects of 'pastoral care' (*oikodome* of the souls) and 'guidance of the flock', the latter of which tends to coincide with the ministries of administration and doctrinal leadership.[79]

75 AFANASSIEFF, *L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit*, 109-115.
76 AFANASSIEFF, *L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit*, 116-117.
77 AFANASSIEFF, *L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit*, 117-119. The East has, more than the West, a tradition of lay theologians.
78 AFANASSIEFF, *L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit*, 96-107, 120-121.
79 AFANASSIEFF, *L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit*, 199-200, 231.

2.2.6 Other Ministries and their Relationship to the Local Church

Based on such lists as Paul and his followers give in some of their letters, Afanasiev discusses a variety of ministries within the church. His main object is to make sure that every ministry is in some way or another linked to the church, and more precisely, to a concrete local church.

One example is his discussion of the early Christian *prophet*. Contradicting those who see the prophet as an independent minister of the universal church, Afanasiev presents him as someone who is embedded in a certain local church, where he is a member of the eucharistic community, and by which he is occasionally sent to other churches with the mission of prophesising.[80] Moreover, even the *twelve apostles* were not unorganised charismatic travellers without a relationship to one particular local church. They were members of the local church of Jerusalem, and later perhaps of those churches to which they dispersed after the Jerusalem church had been built up sufficiently. Their missionary work originated as a 'mission' of the local church of Jerusalem. The goal of their mission was to establish other local churches, other local eucharistic assemblies.[81]

But how was this relationship of seemingly independent ministers to a particular local church expressed? Afanasiev warns against adopting a too limited view on 'ordination'—as has become usual in the Catholic and Orthodox traditions—which excludes all ministries from being regarded as 'ordained' as soon as their way of ordination does not fit the standard pattern of the ordination of bishops, priests and deacons. Afanasiev describes three aspects of ordination, which are necessary in some way, but not in the same form. The first aspect is the fact that it is *God* who chooses the minister. As we have seen, it is Afanasiev's conviction that grace or charism cannot be transmitted or delegated, so it is not the *bishop* who transmits the gift of the Spirit to the ordinand—as, Afanasiev suspects, both Eastern and Western scholastic theology allege—but it is the *Spirit* who ordains. The role of the church is to recognise this divine appointment, which *may* take the form of an election. The second aspect of ordination is what we are accustomed to call the ordination proper: the laying-on of hands and the prayer to the Holy Spirit. The third aspect is the confirmation by the church, which can be compared to the above mentioned role of the whole people of God in 'discerning' and 'receiving' the act which has taken place. The reception by the church is the moment the minister starts to exercise his ministry.[82]

[80] AFANASSIEFF, *L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit*, 132-137, 184.
[81] AFANASSIEFF, *L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit*, 138, 162, 250, 263.
[82] AFANASSIEFF, *L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit*, 138-145, 177.

Of course, the ordination of bishops, priests and deacons reflects this threefold pattern in the most obvious way. Afanasiev explains this by the fact that the episcopate, the presbyterate and the diaconate are the basic ministries that every local church needs for its existence. But it should not lead to the conclusion that the threefold pattern of ordination—divine election, ordination proper, and ecclesiastical reception—has to be so obvious in each case, before a certain minister can be regarded as 'ordained'. Still less should it lead to the scholastic conviction that the second aspect is the only part of ordination that really counts. People like Paul, but also the other apostles, evangelists, prophets and teachers should be regarded as 'ordained', because the Spirit has chosen them, and the church has confirmed their ministry. According to Afanasiev, the third phase of ordination—the recognition by the church—is the ultimate proof of any ministry. Otherwise, there would have been a ministry without any relationship to the local church, and that is in Afanasiev's concept the same as a ministry outside the church. Afanasiev concludes that there is no ministry which is not charismatic (given by the Spirit) and no ministry which is not organised (established by the church). Moreover, there is no ministry without a relationship to a particular local church.[83]

2.2.7 The Development towards 'the One Bishop'

By means of exegetical investigation into New Testament texts, Afanasiev sheds light on the emergence of the bishop as the sole presider of the eucharistic community. The story starts with no more than the 'presider', to whom the texts refer by different words (*proestos, hegoumenos, presbyteros, poimen, episkopos*—all synonyms, according to Afanasiev).[84] Building upon his theory that there can be no local church without its presider, Afanasiev interprets Paul's activities as follows. It is the task of an apostle to establish local churches. In that sense, the apostle has no successors.[85] But in every local church he establishes presbyters (*presbyteroi*) or bishops (*episkopoi*). These, says Afanasiev, were the presiders of the local churches. This means that the *later* development of the bishop as the sole presider of the local church is already present in apostolic times in the person of the presider. Thus, the later bishop has not developed out of the apostles, but out of the ancient *évêques-presbytres* who were the presiders of the local eucharistic communities.[86]

It is unnecessary to mention that Afanasiev dismisses the theory that *Paul* was the predecessor of the bishop, by being 'bishop' of an enormous 'diocese'

[83] AFANASSIEFF, *L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit*, 132-152, cf. 153-189. Afanasiev regards the *Didache*'s 'universal' concept of the ministry of the prophet, which does not fit Afanasiev's theory, as an aberration (130-133, 179-184, 297).

[84] AFANASSIEFF, *L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit*, 200-216.

[85] AFANASSIEFF, *L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit*, 153, 167.

[86] AFANASSIEFF, *L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit*, 216-220.

consisting of all local churches established by him. Paul had no authority over the local churches he had established. To prove this, Afanasiev refers to the way in which Paul gives exhortation in his letters—never in an authoritarian way as if he were in the position to decree solutions, but always by means of advice and appeal. Moreover, the defence of himself as an apostle—a recurring subject in his letters—would be senseless if Paul had possessed the authority of a bishop over 'his' local churches.[87]

How is the relationship between the *presbyteroi* and/or *episkopoi*—of which most local churches had more than one—and the later bishop as the *only* presider at the eucharist? Afanasiev knows of no signs of disagreement between presbyters and bishops during the formative decennia of the bishop as the sole eucharistic presider. If the concept of a 'sole presider' would have been a novelty, quarrels between the college of the former *presbyteroi* and/or *episkopoi* and the new pretender to sole presidency would certainly have occurred. Because this is not the case, Afanasiev concludes that there has ever been one presider amidst the college of *presbyteroi* and/or *episkopoi*.[88]

The group of Jesus and the twelve apostles was formed according to the Jewish pattern of a 'circle of friends' (*une 'amicale'*). The meals of such a *chaburah* had a liturgical pattern, which included thanksgivings over the cup of wine and over the bread. The thanksgivings were always said by one and the same person. In a family this was the *pater familias*. In the case of Jesus and his apostles this one and the same person was undoubtedly *Jesus*.[89] Although the eucharist is not a repetition of the Last Supper,[90] it takes place according to the *pattern* of the Last Supper. Afanasiev repeatedly says that the eucharist—and, for that matter, the church—was 'instituted' (*instituée*) by Christ at the Last Supper, but 'actualised' (*actualisée*) by the Spirit at Pentecost, when the meal became the eucharist and the disciples became apostles.[91] As the eucharist of the apostles followed the pattern of the Last Supper, including the principle of one person saying the thanksgivings, it was *Peter* who took that role during the first period of the Jerusalem church. The other apostles were his equals; Peter was no more and no less than the first or senior among them. From their role at the eucharist it followed that the apostles were the leaders of the local church of Jerusalem, again with Peter as the first or senior leader. Afanasiev concludes

87 AFANASSIEFF, *L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit*, 220-222.
88 AFANASSIEFF, *L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit*, 240-242, 278.
89 AFANASSIEFF, *L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit*, 245-246.
90 The eucharist is an ecclesiological and pneumatological-eschatological 'prolongation' of the Last Supper; cf. N. AFANASSIEFF, 'The Church which Presides in Love', in: J. Meyendorff *et al.*, *The Primacy of Peter* (Leighton Buzzard: The Faith Press, 1963 [French original: Neuchâtel 1960]), 57-110, at 77.
91 AFANASSIEFF, *L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit*, 26, 40, 246.

that the principle of a sole presider of the eucharist has been part of the church's essential structure from its very beginning.[92]

At a certain moment, the apostles handed over their leadership of the local church of Jerusalem to a group of seven people. Unlike the usual interpretation of the establishment of 'the Seven' (Acts 6) as the institution of the ministry of the *deacon*, Afanasiev sees the Seven as the successors of the apostles as *presiders over the local church*. The later ministry of the diaconate was still included in the ministry of the college of presiders. Afanasiev points to *Stephen* as the senior member of this college. The fact that Stephen gave speeches and was executed, confirm his role as leader of the local Christian community.[93] After Stephen's martyrdom, James the Less, 'the brother of the Lord', took over his position of *primus inter pares* of the Jerusalem college of presiders.[94] So, when Paul and Barnabas instituted *presbyteroi* or *episkopoi* in the local churches they established, they did so according to the pattern of the local church of Jerusalem, where the Seven were the first college of *presbyteroi* or *episkopoi* in the ancient sense of the word. There was still no 'particular ministry' of the bishop; there was only the 'particular place' of one of the presbyters, the senior one, who presided over the eucharist. The only 'particular ministry' in apostolic times was the ministry of the presiders, who formed a college of equals, headed by the one who said the thanksgivings, not as bearer of another ministry, but as the senior of the presiders.[95] Afanasiev relates the vision of Revelation—one throne surrounded by twenty-four elders on thrones—to the eucharistic assembly of apostolic times: a college of presbyters, one of whom, the first or senior presbyter (*premier presbytre*), occupied the central place. By the fact that he occupied this central place, and not by any particular ministry, he presided at the eucharist and was the senior leader of the community.[96]

2.2.8 The Bishop

It is Afanasiev's conviction that the church knows of no developments out of the blue. So the episcopate as a ministry of its own—as it appears in the writings of Ignatius of Antioch—must have a consistent history. Without claiming that the bishop already existed in earlier times, Afanasiev sees the first or senior presbyter (*premier presbytre*) as the precursor of the bishop.

92 AFANASSIEFF, *L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit*, 248-249. The word 'presider' ('proéstôs') can become somewhat confusing in the course of Afanasiev's argument, because although he uses the term 'college of presiders', the only one who actually 'presides' is the first or senior presider.

93 AFANASSIEFF, *L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit*, 250-265.

94 AFANASSIEFF, *L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit*, 262, 264, 269-270. The fact that Afanasiev calls him 'Jacques le Majeur' must be a slip of the pen.

95 AFANASSIEFF, *L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit*, 267-268, 288.

96 AFANASSIEFF, *L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit*, 283-284, 296-298.

The difference between the senior presbyter and the bishop is that the latter is no longer a member of the presbyterium, but bearer of a ministry of its own (*ministère particulier*). In Afanasiev's reconstruction, the root of this change was the fact that the priestly function of the senior presbyter started to be interpreted as an *other* priesthood than the priesthood of the whole people of God, including the presbyters. The senior presbyter became regarded as the 'high priest'. It does not surprise Afanasiev that this development took place. If the presider at the eucharist is always the same person, it is only natural that sooner or later the ministry of this person will be regarded as a ministry of its own.[97]

It is interesting that Afanasiev points to the development of metropolitans and patriarchs over against 'ordinary' bishops in order to explain the development from senior presbyter to bishop. If a person exercises his ministry in a way that differs from the way others exercise the *same* ministry, the former person will sooner or later be regarded as the bearer of an *other* ministry. Applied to patriarchs and 'ordinary' bishops, the *common* ministry of the episcopate will sooner or later be regarded as *different* ministries: the patriarchate and the episcopate (Afanasiev sees tendencies in this direction within Orthodoxy). Applied to the senior presbyter and the other presbyters, the *common* ministry of the presbyterate has become regarded as *different* ministries: the episcopate and the presbyterate. So, one of the functions of the senior presbyter—his role as sole presider at the eucharist—has developed into a ministry of its own: the episcopate.[98]

Afanasiev rejects the distortions which this 'high priestly' view on the bishop has introduced into ecclesiological thought. Afanasiev has no room for a difference in priesthood between ministers and laypeople, because all are bearers of the royal priesthood of Christ. Nevertheless, he allows for an interpretation of the development of the bishop which purely thinks from a eucharistic point of view. He calls this the 'topological' theory, because it is solely related to the place (*topos*) within the eucharistic assembly. His argument runs as follows. At the Last Supper, Christ occupied the central place, he was the presider. Now the bishop sits in the place of Christ, the central seat, the place of the presider. Afanasiev thinks that from this 'topological' similarity the 'high priesthood' of Christ has been applied to the bishop.[99]

At the same time this topological theory explains why at a later stage the bishops were seen as the successors of the apostles. Topologically speaking, in the first Christian communities the central place of Christ as presider had been occupied by an apostle, and after the apostle the senior presbyter—who finally became the bishop—took this place. Although Afanasiev, as we have seen, does not regard the bishops as the successors of the apostles, he allows for this theory

97 AFANASSIEFF, *L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit*, 299-300.
98 AFANASSIEFF, *L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit*, 301-303, 307.
99 AFANASSIEFF, *L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit*, 300-301, 318-319.

on topological grounds. In a limited sense, the bishops are the successors of the apostles, that is, not as *apostles*, but as *presiders*. This 'topological' succession has gradually moved into the direction of a more 'essential' succession (the apostolic succession), that is, the bishops became regarded not only as *presiders* but as *apostles*—and we have seen that Afanasiev rejects this view.[100]

Afanasiev sums up a number of consequences of the 'high priestly' view on the senior presbyter, which led to the particular ministry of the bishop. Because Ignatius's criteria have been forgotten, the consequences are mainly negative. Firstly, the 'high priestly' ministry of the bishop became detached from the eucharist, giving way to a line of thought in which the 'high priestly' ministry was handed down by Christ to the apostles, by the apostles to the bishops, and by the bishops to the priests and deacons. A distortion of the royal priesthood of the whole people of God was the result. Secondly, the primacy of argument moved from the eucharist to the bishop. No longer the eucharistic assembly was the point of reference, but the bishop. The bishop was no longer the bishop because he occupied the central place within the eucharistic assembly (the topological theory), but, the other way round, he presided over the eucharist because he was the bishop.[101] There could appear a number of eucharistic assemblies, led by presbyters, within the jurisdictional area of the bishop. Afanasiev sees this as the reverse of the original pattern: *jurisdiction* became the criterion for the power of a bishop, instead of the *eucharistic assembly* which made the bishop by the fact that he sat in the central place. Finally, the role of the presbyter changed, from being a member of the presbyterium as the presiding council of the local *church*, to being leader of a local eucharistic assembly and member of the presbyterium as the council of the *bishop*. Afanasiev concludes that only one half of Ignatius's idea was taken over, namely, the bishop as bearer of the senior ministry in the church, and not the primacy of the one eucharist within the church, thus distorting the balance in Ignatius's ecclesiology.[102]

2.2.9 Universal and Eucharistic Ecclesiologies

The basis for Afanasiev's eucharistic ecclesiology is the identity between the eucharistic bread as the body of Christ and the Christian community as the body of Christ, both expressed in Paul's first letter to the Corinthians[103]. When a concrete community celebrates the eucharist, Christ is in their midst because his body is there in the eucharistic bread *and* because the community becomes his

100 AFANASSIEFF, *L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit*, 332-342.

101 Although it is true that Afanasiev's thought is centred around 'the bishop's Eucharist' (NICHOLS, *Theology in the Russian Diaspora*, 188), an inverted formulation like 'the Eucharist's bishop' would reflect Afanasiev's line of argument more effectively.

102 AFANASSIEFF, *L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit*, 321-328.

103 1 Corinthians 10: 16-17; 11: 23-24; 12: 12-13, 27.

body. This means that Christ—and the body of Christ, the church—is fully present in every community that celebrates the eucharist. And each eucharistic assembly is not only *the church in its fullness*, it is also *independent*, because there can be nothing above Christ's own body.[104]

This makes Afanasiev's eucharistic ecclesiology fundamentally an ecclesiology of the local church. He regards 'eucharistic ecclesiology' and 'universal ecclesiology' as mutually exclusive concepts, of which the latter has generally taken the initial place of the former, both in Western and Eastern theology.[105] According to Afanasiev, the *Didache* is the first Christian document witnessing the idea of a universal church, while Cyprian of Carthage (d. 258) was the first patristic writer who spread this idea. Afanasiev regards the concept of a universal church as an alien element in Christian thought, for which he blames the influence of Judaism, Gnosticism and Montanism.[106] The effect of a universal ecclesiology is that local churches can only possess part of the fullness of the church. It is Afanasiev's conviction that thinking about the church from the angle of a universal ecclesiology should sooner or later result in the concept of universal primacy. For if there is no unity apart from the universal church, this unity should be safeguarded by a universal primate.[107]

Afanasiev does not dismiss the idea of universality, but he arrives at the universality of the church from the other side. He does not start with a universal church, of which the local churches are necessarily only 'parts', but he starts with the local eucharistic assembly, which by the very fact that it celebrates the eucharist is connected to all other local churches. For in all local churches the eucharist is the same, just as Christ and his body are the same everywhere. Everyone who takes part in a local eucharistic assembly is united to all who take part in eucharistic assemblies anywhere. This is even true throughout different ecclesiastical denominations, because there is only one eucharist. Afanasiev calls this an 'interior universalism'—a universalism based on the wholeness of the eucharist in every local church, which coincides with the wholeness of the eucharist in every other local church. He also calls it an 'intrinsic universalism'—a universalism based on the intrinsic quality of the eucharist—over against the 'extrinsic universalism' of the concept of a universal church.[108]

104 AFANASSIEFF, 'The Church which Presides in Love', 74-75. In this article, Afanasiev brings together his thought earlier expressed in his articles 'Dve idei vselenskoi Tserkvi' and 'La doctrine de la primauté à la lumière de l'ecclésiologie', *Istina* 4 (1957), 401-420. In the first article the term 'eucharistic ecclesiology' did not yet appear. In the second, the term 'priority' was not yet applied as an alternative to 'primacy'. So 'The Church which Presides in Love' can be seen as a synthesis of Afanasiev's thought on this issue. Cf. NICHOLS, *Theology in the Russian Diaspora*, 127.

105 AFANASSIEFF, 'The Church which Presides in Love', 73, 102, 107.

106 AFANASSIEFF, 'The Church which Presides in Love', 106.

107 AFANASSIEFF, 'The Church which Presides in Love', 58-65.

108 AFANASSIEFF, 'The Church which Presides in Love', 76; AFANASSIEFF, *L'Eglise du Saint-Esprit*, 29. Cf. N. AFANASSIEFF, 'L'Eucharistie, principal lien entre les Catholiques et les

Because every local church is the church in its fullness, every local church must be related to all other local churches, which also are the church in its fullness. This bond of 'love and concord' between the churches implies that everything that happens in one local church, also happens in—or should at least be accepted by—all other local churches. This is the process of reception, which we have seen earlier as, in Afanasiev's thought, the main task of the people of God. The reception by the people of God witnesses to the truth of anything that happens in the church.[109]

It is precisely this idea of 'witnessing' which leads Afanasiev to allow for a hierarchy among the local churches. The witness (in the process of reception) of every local church has the same 'value' but not always the same 'authority'. The church that presents the fullness of the church in the most vivid way and in the way most serving the other churches, has the highest authority. But because this is an authority of witnessing to the truth of what happens anywhere in the churches—in other words, a service amidst the churches—it cannot be an authority of power, but only an authority of love. Such a church that takes the first place among the churches cannot impose anything on any other church, because every local church has to ratify every decision first. In Afanasiev's vocabulary, this means that the church-in-priority has no power or rights based on law, it only has the task of serving unity by love and concord, based on grace. This concept of 'priority' exists on several levels. A group of local churches accept one of them as their church-in-priority (a metropolitan or patriarchal church), and all local churches in the world accept one local church as their common church-in-priority.[110]

Afanasiev is determined that the *priority* of one local church, accepted by the other local churches on the basis of freedom and love, is completely different from the *primacy* of one bishop over the universal church. In his view, primacy implies a primacy of *power*, while priority implies, as we just saw, a priority of *reception*. Priority is given to a local *church*, and through that church to its bishop. Primacy is exercised by a *bishop*, as if he were the sole bishop of the universal church. As we have seen, Afanasiev regards the latter as a distortion of the ancient relations between the local churches, and he relates this distortion to the influence of concepts such as power and legalism.[111]

Orthodoxes', *Irénikon* 38 (1965), 337-339, at 339. Afanasiev calls the division of churches a canonical matter (on the basis of doctrinal disagreements), which is not able to disturb the fundamental 'eucharistic unity' between the churches, even if the doctrinal disagreements are related to the theology of the eucharist itself.

109 AFANASSIEFF, 'The Church which Presides in Love', 78.

110 AFANASSIEFF, 'The Church which Presides in Love', 78-81, 108.

111 AFANASSIEFF, 'The Church which Presides in Love', 81-82, 102, 108. LOSSKY, 'The Orthodox Churches', 11, doubts whether Afanasiev is right in relating primacy to legalism only, particularly in view of John Paul II's utterances on rethinking Roman primacy in his encyclical *Ut unum sint*.

Afanasiev finds proof for his theory of priority in the Early Church, prior to Cyprian of Carthage. Paul's letters and the book of Acts witness to the priority of the local church of Jerusalem in the formative years of Christianity. Jerusalem did not exercise power over other churches, but served as a reference point for consensus, that is, as the church with the greatest authority in witnessing to the truth.[112]

At the end of the first century the priority was taken over by Rome. This did not happen by an official act, because priority is something which emerges and has to become accepted by all local churches. We only know that Rome *did* become the church-in-priority.[113] The expression Afanasiev likes best is given by Ignatius of Antioch in his letter to the church of Rome. In this letter he calls the church of Rome the church 'which presides (*prokathemene*) in love (*agape*)', and *agape* means to Ignatius 'the local church in its eucharistic aspect'. So each church is *agape*, but the bond of churches is also *agape*.[114] Afanasiev concludes that according to Ignatius the church of Rome, figuratively speaking, sits in the chair amidst the other churches, using the 'topological' imagery of the bishop who presides over the eucharistic assembly, sitting literally in the chair amidst the presbyters and all the people. There is no mention of power, only of love. Neither is any reason mentioned why the church of Rome should occupy the central place, it is simply regarded as a consensus among the churches.[115] Another patristic author on whom Afanasiev relies is Irenaeus. His phrase, *potentior principalitas*, used to describe the character of the church of Rome, is interpreted by Afanasiev as 'the greatest authority', which he regards as a synonym of his own 'priority' and of Ignatius's 'which presides in love'.[116]

2.2.10 Conclusion

What kind of interest is served by the particular angle of Afanasiev's eucharistic ecclesiology? Firstly, it serves as an alternative for a universal ecclesiology. It is Afanasiev himself, who defines 'eucharistic ecclesiology' as the early Christian alternative for the later predominant 'universal ecclesiology'.[117] Afanasiev does not forget the bond between the churches—which, as we saw, is effected by the fact that the eucharist of one local church is the same as the eucharist of the

[112] AFANASSIEFF, 'The Church which Presides in Love', 86-87.
[113] AFANASSIEFF, 'The Church which Presides in Love', 90.
[114] We already saw that for Afanasiev the bond between the local churches is the eucharist, or more precisely the fact that the body of Christ (Christ, bread and people) in this particular local eucharist is the same as the body of Christ (again Christ, bread and people) in the eucharist of another local church.
[115] AFANASSIEFF, 'The Church which Presides in Love', 93-94.
[116] AFANASSIEFF, 'The Church which Presides in Love', 101. Tillard translates differently; cf. paragraph 3.5.6.
[117] AFANASSIEFF, 'The Church which Presides in Love', 73, 102, 107.

other local churches[118]—but the relationship between the churches is not his point of departure. His point of departure is the local church: the local eucharistic community, presided over by the bishop.[119] From this point of departure, there *is* room for thought about the worldwide church, but this thought will always start from the local church and not from the worldwide church as a concept of its own.[120]

For Afanasiev, the local eucharistic gathering is the source of all ecclesiological thought. This should not be understood in the sense that Afanasiev advocates a particularly 'sacramental' ecclesiology.[121] It is not *the sacrament of the eucharist* which is central to Afanasiev's thought, not the eucharist as 'one of the sacraments', but *the eucharistic gathering*, the eucharist as an act, as a celebration of the whole people of God in one place (*epi to auto*).[122] It is the *ecclesial* aspect of the eucharist which makes the eucharist central to Afanasiev's thought. This nuance should be kept in mind not only in relation to Afanasiev, but to all eucharistic or liturgical ecclesiologies investigated in this study.

Secondly, Afanasiev advocates an approach of the church which is fully determined by theological arguments and not by what he sees as legal arguments. Afanasiev's own experiences with the overlapping jurisdictions of the Orthodox Churches in Europe, which devided Orthodoxy and alienated its members from each other, could have been an underlying reason for Afanasiev's fierce opposition towards everything which he regards as legal

118 In section 2.3 we will see that this idea is worked out by Zizioulas, but it is already present in Afanasiev's thought. Cf. ZIZIOULAS, *Being as Communion*, 25.

119 The problem of local eucharistic communities presided by *priests* is mentioned but not solved by Afanasiev. The fragmentarisation of the one eucharistic community presided by the bishop into eucharistic communities presided by priests is seen by Afanasiev as one of the reasons why the eucharist ceased to be regarded as *the sacrament of the church* and became *one of the sacraments within the church*. Cf. N. AFANASSIEFF, 'Le sacrement de l'assemblée', *IKZ* 46 (1956), 200-213, at 206-207. In section 2.3 we will encounter Zizoulas's practical proposal to cope with this situation.

120 In virtually all literature on the subject, Afanasiev is both acclaimed as the genius behind the rediscovery of eucharistic ecclesiology and criticised for having neglected the universal (or at least supra-local) dimension of the church. Again in virtually all literature, Zizioulas is mentioned as the one who took up Afanasiev's thought and corrected it in this respect. This generally received view can be accepted, but not without emphasising that Afanasiev himself was aware of the supra-local dimension, although without being sufficiently able to integrate it fundamentally into his thought.

121 So Zizioulas's criticism that eucharistic ecclesiology is often interpreted as 'a sacramentalization of theology' does not hold in Afanasiev's case; cf. ZIZIOULAS, *Being as Communion*, 23.

122 According to Afanasiev and his followers, the phrase *epi to auto* has become a *terminus technicus* for the eucharistic gathering, both in Paul's letters and in early patristic writings such as Ignatius of Antioch's. The term *epi to auto* for the eucharistic gathering indicates the ecclesial character as the most important aspect of the eucharist. Cf. AFANASSIEFF, 'Le sacrement de l'assemblée', 200-201, 207-208, 212-213; ZIZIOULAS, *Being as Communion*, 148, 231, 256; NICHOLS, *Theology in the Russian Diaspora*, 113-117.

influence.[123] Moreover, Afanasiev's conviction that the local church—and in particular the local church celebrating the eucharist—should be the source of all ecclesiology, implies that at least some legal categories—for example when they start thinking from the concept of a universal church—are alien to Afanasiev's pattern of thought. It should be remarked, however, that Afanasiev's absolute watershed between Love and Law, or between charismatic and legal organisation, makes a somewhat forced impression. Why, for example, should 'priority' be a non-legal concept, and 'primacy' a legal one? And why should Afanasiev be so afraid of canon law, if he himself builds quite an ecclesiologial structure upon his eucharistic starting point? Parallel to his own affirmation that the role of the Holy Spirit in the church need not (or indeed does not) lead to anarchy but to organisation, one could say that the use of canon law, or legal concepts, *can* but *need not* lead away from the basis presuppositions of ecclesiology. It is more a question of how to apply canon law, than of whether canon law should be used.[124]

These two interests, served by Afanasiev's ecclesiology, are mainly negatively formulated—over against a universal ecclesiology and over against a juridicised view on the church. But what Afanasiev *positively* did, was to create an ecclesiology that not only starts but also remains at the core of the church's life: the celebrating community. No matter what ecclesiological theme is under discussion—such as the ministry of a bishop, or the priority of a patriarch—the centre of the church's empirical life is never lost out of sight: the eucharistic gathering of the local Christian community. This gives to Afanasiev's ecclesiology a sensation of concreteness and cohesion. Concreteness, because everything of which the theologian can think in relation to the church, is not allowed to disappear into theological abstraction, but has to be linked in some way or another to the gathering of the whole people of God in this place on this Sunday. Cohesion, because this ecclesiology has no more than one presupposition, to which all ecclesiological details are related: the centrality of the eucharistic gathering.

Afanasiev is the founding father of eucharistic ecclesiology, an approach of ecclesiology which has become important in modern Orthodox theology. Moreover, some of its aspects have been adopted by the Second Vatican Council, as will be seen in the next chapter. But first attention is drawn to an Orthodox scholar, John Zizioulas, who has taken up and modified Afanasiev's thought. It is mainly through Zizioulas, that Afanasiev's heritage has become respected as an important contribution to contemporary ecumenical theology.

[123] Plank draws this conclusion from no less than five episodes of Afanasiev's life; cf. PLANK, *Die Eucharistieversammlung als Kirche*, 23, 25, 29, 31, 35.

[124] This was also the position that Afanasiev adopted in practice. He was, after all, Professor of Canon Law at *Saint-Serge*. Cf. NICHOLS, *Theology in the Russian Diaspora*, 75-83.

2.3 JOHN ZIZIOULAS

2.3.1 Life and Work

John D. Zizioulas was born in Greece in 1931. He studied theology, and particularly patristics, in Athens and Harvard, and received a doctorate from Athens University with the thesis *The Unity of the Church in the Divine Eucharist and the Bishop during the First Three Centuries* (1965).[125] After having been a staff member of the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches in Geneva, he became a Professor of Systematic Theology in Glasgow, London and Thessaloniki respectively. Zizioulas's deep involvement into ecumenical relationships as a lay theologian was deepened by his 1986 ordination as (titular) Metropolitan of Pergamon, when he became the Patriarch of Constantinople's representative at ecumenical commissions and dialogues. Particularly his book, *Being as Communion* (1985),[126] has introduced an international and ecumenical readership into the coherent vision of a eucharistic ecclesiology, including christology, pneumatology and anthropology. In 2006, this book was followed by another volume of articles, *Communion and Otherness*.[127]

2.3.2 Zizioulas's Corrections of Afanasiev

Zizioulas sees his own work explicitly as an elaboration and correction of Afanasiev's work.[128] As the latter bears all the marks of the rediscovery of an important truth—its frequent repetition of arguments, its limitation of subjects, its *catena*-like presentation of biblical and patristic 'proof texts'—the former has a more systematic character. Whereas Afanasiev's name will always be connected to the re-establishment of the eucharistic approach into ecclesiological thought, Zizioulas can be regarded as the one who gave eucharistic ecclesiology a mature place in theological thought by enriching it from philosophical, anthropological and ecumenical points of view.

In this context the emphasis will be on those aspects of Zizioulas's thought which are either meant by himself or regarded by others as corrections of or additions to Afanasiev's concept of a eucharistic ecclesiology. These are the

[125] In Greek, Athens 1965. Now available in English as J.D. ZIZIOULAS, *Eucharist, Bishop, Church: The Unity of the Church in the Divine Eucharist and the Bishop during the First Three Centuries* (Brookline MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2001).

[126] J.D. ZIZIOULAS, *Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church* (Crestwood NY: SVSP, 1985). This work was preceded by the largely overlapping French volume J.D. ZIZIOULAS, *L'être ecclésial* (Genève: Labor et fides, 1981).

[127] J.D. ZIZIOULAS, *Communion and Otherness: Further Studies in Personhood and the Church*, edited by P. McPartlan (London-New York: T&T Clark, 2006).

[128] ZIZIOULAS, *Eucharist, Bishop, Church*, 17, 256-262; ZIZIOULAS, *Being as Communion*, 23.

synthesis between history and eschatology, christology and pneumatology, related to Zizioulas's anthropology, and his view on the relation between the local and the universal church. The choice of these aspects of Zizioulas's thought implies that the following sketch has not the intention to be an exhaustive account of Zizioulas's theology. It rather wants to highlight what is generally regarded as Zizioulas's main contribution to a general understanding of eucharistic ecclesiology in contemporary Orthodox—and, with variations, ecumenical—thought.[129]

2.3.3 The Eucharist: Ecclesial and Eschatological

In the introduction to his book, *Being as Communion*, Zizioulas points to two presuppositions that are of primary importance to a eucharistic ecclesiology, at least in its Orthodox fashion. These presuppositions are also at the root of Afanasiev's thought, but it is Zizioulas who advances them most clearly.

The first principle is that the eucharist should not be seen as one sacrament among many, as an objectified means of grace which can be administred by the church or its ministers. On the contrary, it should be seen as *the* sacrament of the church, as a gathering of the whole people of God, as an act which calls the church into being.[130] This principle is important in two respects. On the one hand, this view on the eucharist is the only one that enables the eucharist to become the centre of the church, or at least the centre of ecclesiological thought. If the eucharist were just one of many sacraments, there would be no reason why it should play such a dominant role in ecclesiology. On the other hand, this view on the eucharist means that upholding a eucharistic ecclesiology is something else than making eucharistic *sacramentality* or liturgical *devotion* the centre of ecclesial life and ecclesiological thought. When eucharistic ecclesiology bases itself upon the eucharist, it does *not* so in the sense that it gives normative value to a certain sacramental theology or a certain liturgical style. As in Afanasiev, it is rather the celebration of the eucharist *tout court* which matters than the exact theological or liturgical form in which it appears,[131] although of course some forms and theologies are more apt to the ecclesial interpretation of the eucharist than others.

The second presupposition is that the eucharist should be seen as an *eschatological* phenomenon. In the eucharist the historical and the eschatological are interwoven. The eucharist is both an affirmation of history—

[129] Cf. J. MEYENDORFF, *Catholicity and the Church* (Crestwood NY: SVSP, 1983), 27, 53, 134-135; LOSSKY, 'The Orthodox Churches', 4-5; C. RUDDY, *The Local Church: Tillard and the Future of Catholic Ecclesiology* (New York: Crossroad, 2006), 15-30.

[130] ZIZIOULAS, *Eucharist, Bishop, Church*, 14; ZIZIOULAS, *Being as Communion*, 20-21, 145; cf. above, paragraph 2.2.10.

[131] AFANASSIEFF, 'L'Eucharistie, principal lien entre les Catholiques et les Orthodoxes', 339; cf. above, paragraph 2.2.10.

it is a remembrance of the historical events of the *oikonomia*, among which Christ's life, death and resurrection are paramount—and a manifestation of the *eschata*. It is the Holy Spirit who accomplishes this simultaneity of history and eschatology, or rather, this eschatologisation of history. In every eucharist the Spirit constitutes the church by taking up history into eschatology.[132] Moreover, in the next two paragraphs, this interaction between history and eschatology will be related to Zizioulas's synthesis between christology and pneumatology.

2.3.4 Christology and Pneumatology

As we have seen at the beginning of this chapter, the role of the Holy Spirit has received more emphasis in Eastern than in Western ecclesiology.[133] Zizioulas acknowledges this fact, but he is critical of the lack of synthesis between the two. It is not enough simply to add some Eastern pneumatology to Western christology. There is need for a rethinking of both christology and pneumatology in relation to each other.[134]

For this relation, Zizioulas turns to the interdependence of history and eschatology. Everything Jesus Christ has done, and moreover, everything which has taken place in the *oikonomia*—including, for example, the event of Pentecost—belongs to history. And it *must* belong to history, not reluctantly, but because this is the way in which God enters the world: it is the particular task of the *Son* to *become* history. In turn, it is the particular task of the *Spirit* to *transcend* history. If there had been no Spirit, Christ would have been nothing else than an historical figure. It is the Spirit who raised Christ from the dead, it is the Spirit who makes that Christ is not only an historical, but also an eschatological figure. By the Spirit, *anamnesis* is no longer a memorial of the *past*, but a celebration of *presence*—both of the past and of the future.[135] As long as christology and pneumatology are seen separately, there will be a dichotomy between history and eschatology. But a synthesis of christology and pneumatology will show that 'history is a real bearer of the ultimate', because Christ—as an eschatological figure—has become flesh. The Spirit brings into history already 'a real presence of the eschatological'. It is the *eucharist* that most evidently reflects this synthesis of history (*paradosis*) and eschatology (*anamnesis*). The eucharist brings together the past and the future in the present. Not by denying the tension between the *iam* ('already') and the *nondum* ('not yet'), but epicletically, or in Western terminology, sacramentally.[136]

132 ZIZIOULAS, *Being as Communion*, 20-22.
133 Cf. paragraph 2.1.2.
134 ZIZIOULAS, *Being as Communion*, 123-126.
135 ZIZIOULAS, *Being as Communion*, 130, 180.
136 ZIZIOULAS, *Being as Communion*, 186-187, 206; see also the end of the next paragraph.

2.3.5 The Concept of Personhood

Apart from the relationship between history and eschatology, there is another way in which Zizioulas regards christology and pneumatology as mutually related. The Spirit does not only turn the historical Christ into the eschatological Christ—rather, there is no historical Christ at all, who has not from the outset been transfigured by the Spirit. This assertion is rooted in Zizioulas's anthropology, which is in turn rooted in Zizioulas's trinitarian theology.

Zizioulas's thought is derived from his reading of the Fathers of the Church, especially the Cappadocians—the fourth-century bishops and theologians Basil of Caesarea, Gregory of Nazianzus and Gregory of Nyssa. The greatest contribution of these Fathers to philosophical and theological thought is, according to Zizioulas, the invention of the concept of the person. The Fathers could not simply borrow this concept from the Greek thought of their time, because in ancient Greek philosophy the concept of the person (*prosopon*) had no ontological meaning. Originating from theatrical vocabulary, the *prosopon* was no more than the mask used by an actor to assume the identity of his dramatic character. The relationship between the mask and the actor was that the mask (*prosopon*) was added to his being or substance (*hypostasis*). The ancient Roman concept of the *persona* did not essentially differ from the Greek concept of the *prosopon*. The *persona* was the 'role' one played in social life, and was therefore not ontologically knit together with one's essential identity. This essential identity, the human essence or substance (*hypostasis*), was seen as something different from the person (*prosopon*). In Platonic thought, the human essence is the soul, which can be incarnated into more than one individual, thus making a 'person' no more than a temporary—and certainly not an ontological—phenomenon. In Aristotelian philosophy a rather opposite way of thought leads to the same conclusion: the individual only exists until death, death being its definitive end, so that in Aristotelism a 'person' is a concept as temporary and as far from ontological as in Platonism.[137]

The philosophical 'revolution' accomplished by the Church Fathers was the identification of *prosopon* and *hypostasis*. This means that the person (mask or role) and the substance or being (essence) were no longer seen as two different phenomena, only temporarily linked together, but as one and the same, thus creating the concept of the *person* as we know it since. The importance of this invention is that there is no longer an abstract essence which precedes the identity of the person. On the contrary: it is the *personal* identity which constitutes the human *being*.[138]

[137] ZIZIOULAS, *Being as Communion*, 16, 28, 33-35.

[138] ZIZIOULAS, *Being as Communion*, 36, 39. Zizioulas remarks that, in spite of the modern humanist use of the concept of the person, this concept is a Christian creation (27).

This patristic concept of the person is, still according to Zizioulas, deeply rooted in trinitarian theology. The trinitarian definition—one substance (*ousia*), three persons (*prosopa*)—must not be interpreted in the sense that there is first one divine substance, out of which three persons flow. Rather, the personal identity (*prosopon*) determines the divine being (*ousia*). It is God *as person*—that is, as the Father—who makes God the God he is. And this God is a God in communion. Not because the divine essence flows into three persons, but because the divine person, the Father, has the will to beget the Son and to bring forth the Spirit. The will of the Father determines God as the triune God, the God-in-communion.[139] This trinitarian basis of the concept of personhood is, then, at once personal and communal. Personhood means difference but not division.[140] *Being* is—as the book titles indicate—both *communion* and *otherness*.[141]

But a human being is not automatically a person in the fullest sense of the word. Seen from the 'biological' point of view, human beings tend to be individuals. In Zizioulas's thought, individualism is a barrier to true personhood. Only a human being who has by baptism become an 'ecclesial' person, is able to become an 'authentic' person. In the church there is not individualism but communion. Baptism is the incorporation into the community and therefore the passing from individualised being to personal—that is communal—being.[142]

This is the point at which some of Zizioulas's critics reproach him for working with 'existentialist' categories.[143] Zizioulas admits that he has used 'existentialist personalism [...] extensively in [his] writings, for without that theology would remain irrelevant to the human condition'.[144] Indeed, Zizioulas concurs with twentieth-century philosophers in his description of 'the tragedy of the human being'.[145] He is convinced that such an approach will 'help us to appreciate the limitations, the antinomies and the tragic experience of personhood'—but only the personhood of *fallen* ('biological') humanity.[146] It is, according to Zizioulas, precisely the contribution of *Christian* thought, that humanity as we know and experience it, is not true humanity. The existentialist condition is not *true* personhood. True personhood is conceived, not when a

139 ZIZIOULAS, *Being as Communion*, 41, 44.

140 ZIZIOULAS, *Communion and Otherness*, 3.

141 The title *Being as Communion* reflects that being, if grounded in the triune God, is always determined by communion. The title *Communion and Otherness* reflects that such communion is not the enemy of personal difference, but its guarantee.

142 ZIZIOULAS, *Being as Communion*, 56, 58, 64, 113.

143 Cf. A. BROWN, 'On the Criticism of Being as Communion in Anglophone Orthodox Theology', in: D.H. Knight (ed.), *The Theology of John Zizioulas: Personhood and the Church* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 35-78, at 43-45.

144 ZIZIOULAS, *Communion and Otherness*, 141.

145 Cf. ZIZIOULAS, *Communion and Otherness*, 43-62.

146 ZIZIOULAS, *Communion and Otherness*, 140-141; BROWN, 'On the Criticism', 60-62.

'fallen' anthropology is left on its own, or when the 'biological' human condition is projected into the Trinity, but when, the other way round, divine personhood is applied to humanity—created as it is, and recreated as it will be, in the image of God.[147] *Then* it becomes clear that true personhood is simultaneously marked by 'communion' and 'otherness'. The personhood of the Father, the Son and the Spirit implies, on the one hand, the otherness of every divine person ('unconfused'). Their personhood is, on the other hand, intrinsically determined by loving *koinonia* with one another ('undivided'). Zizioulas concludes, '*The Person is otherness in communion and communion in otherness*'.[148] 'Biological', 'fallen' personhood cannot be restored from categories intrinsic to its own condition, but can be restored when it is taken up into divine personhood (*theosis*):

> The highest form of capacity for man is to be found in the notion of *imago Dei*. [... W]hat it in fact means is not that man can become God in his 'nature', but can be in communion with God. The word *Dei* in this expression implies not a Deistic view of God but a Trinitarian one: man can himself live the event of communion which is realized in divine life and he can do this with and for the entire creation; he is in fact made as *imago Trinitatis*, and this is possible for him only because of his ability to be a *person*.[149]

It is Jesus Christ who pre-eminently demonstrates personhood in its non-individualist, communal ('ecclesial') sense. But this is only so, because from the very beginning of the incarnation—the annunciation, but also his baptism—it is the Spirit who constitutes Christ as Christ. In Zizioulas's view, christology and pneumatology are ontologically interwoven, because it is only by the Spirit that Christ exists at all. Because Christ is constituted by the Spirit of communion (*koinonia*), Christ is not an *individual*, but a *person*, a relational being. This means that Christ cannot be seen apart from his body, the church. Christ is always a 'corporate personality'. The church is the body of Christ, not in a symbolic, but in an ontological way. The church and all its members have become Christ. Christ is the One who is at the same time many, and the many are simultaneously united into the One. This is only possible because the Spirit transcends history and individualism, recreating it into eschatology and communion.[150]

147 ZIZIOULAS, *Communion and Otherness*, 171-177, 206.

148 ZIZIOULAS, *Communion and Otherness*, 5, 9.

149 ZIZIOULAS, *Communion and Otherness*, 249. Cf. 206: 'I use the word "man" [...] in the sense of *anthropos* or human being, which includes both male and female'.

150 ZIZIOULAS, *Eucharist, Bishop, Church*, 16, 118, 199, 248, 252; ZIZIOULAS, *Being as Communion*, 58, 110-112, 130, 145, 182, 188, 211, 226.

2.3.6 The Church and the Eucharist

What is the impact of this anthropology and christology of personhood on the eucharist, particularly in relation to ecclesiology? Firstly, Zizioulas's theory of personhood defines Christ as a corporate personality. Christ does—so to speak—not have to be *related* to the church, he rather already *is* the church. Christ cannot be thought without his body. He is not an 'individual'. *As Christ*—that is, as constituted by the Holy Spirit—he includes his body, the church. Secondly, the same applies to all members of the church. Every Christian has become a person, and in Zizioulas's definition a person is an 'ecclesial' person, ontologically destined to communion. By being a person, every member of the church *is* the church and *is* Christ,[151] because personhood implies communion.

But this close relationship—amounting to an identity—between Christ, the church and every member of the church, is an *eschatological* relationship. The tension between the 'biological' and the 'ecclesial' person in every member of the church is identical with the tension we earlier encountered between *iam* and *nondum*. Being an ecclesial person, being in the church and in Christ, is being what we *shall* be. In other words, it is an eschatological way of being, and for Zizioulas it is always the *Spirit* who brings the eschatological into the present. This manifestation of the eschatological is realised most vividly in the *eucharist*. There, Christ is most clearly 'One' and 'many' simultaneously. There, Christ and the church are most clearly one and the same body. There, every member of the church is related most closely to Christ and to the church.[152] The eucharist, then, is the incorporation of the many into the One.[153]

Zizioulas's anthropology of the person, and the way he combines christology and pneumatology, make it necessary to have a conception of the church in which the temporal and the eschatological are interwoven, and it is Zizioulas's conviction that the eucharist is the only occasion where these two realities fully coincide. So, for Zizioulas the centrality of the eucharist is an absolute condition for ecclesiology. Without an occasion where the Spirit unites all constitutive elements of the church—Christ, the people, their gathering, their transformation—there can be no church.

The centrality of the eucharist in Zizioulas's anthropology, christology and ecclesiology does not, however, amount to a view in which there is no personhood, no Christ and no church outside the very moment of the eucharistic

[151] ZIZIOULAS, *Being as Communion*, 58; cf. ZIZIOULAS, *Eucharist, Bishop, Church*, 31-32, 72, 74.

[152] ZIZIOULAS, *Being as Communion*, 59-61.

[153] ZIZIOULAS, *Eucharist, Bishop, Church*, 53-56, 118. Cf. ZIZIOULAS, *Communion and Otherness*, 286-306, where Zizioulas calls the corporate, sacramental reality of the church and the eucharist the real Christian 'mysticism' (union with God and one another), as opposed to an understanding of mysticism as an individual, spiritual experience.

celebration.[154] If that would be the case, it would be justified to suppose that Zizioulas's ecclesiology requires a 'permanent' celebration of the eucharist and to ask why, outside the act of the eucharistic celebration, the church should be called 'church' at all.[155] Such an interpretation of Zizioulas—an absorption of everything into the few moments in which the eucharist is actually celebrated—neglects Zizioulas's emphasis on baptism as the birth of the ecclesial person,[156] and on the faith, hope and love of the Christian life, that makes the world 'eucharistic' in an 'ethical' sense.[157] It seems, therefore, more fitting to summarise Zizioulas's view as follows. Outside the eucharistic celebration, the church and its members find themselves in the dialectic between their membership of the eschatological communion and their membership of this world (*iam* and *nondum*). During the eucharistic celebration they are lifted up into the eschatological communion, not because this is the only moment in which they are church, but because this is the moment in which they are church *par excellence*.[158]

For the sake of clarity—not only in view of Zizioulas's theology but in view of all 'liturgical' and 'eucharistic' ecclesiology to be presented throughout this study—the criticism must be refuted that a eucharistic ecclesiology would be 'simply "eucharistic"' and that the maxim 'the eucharist makes the church' would be a 'simplistic notion'.[159] Such verdicts betray, first, a seriously deficient view on the eucharist (as an isolated sacrament rather than as the celebration of the ecclesial Christ in which all Christian faith and life becomes epiphanic) and, second, a superficial misreading of eucharistic ecclesiology. In Zizioulas—as in any serious exponent of eucharistic ecclesiology—the eucharist is central precisely because it is interpreted in a multi-layered sense. If there is one who teaches that the meaning of the eucharist includes the trinitarian, the christological, the pneumatological, the eschatological, the

154 Paul McPartlan's insistence that, for Zizioulas, the earthly church is the body of Christ *only* in the eucharist seems to enhance such a view. Cf. P. MCPARTLAN, *The Eucharist Makes the Church: Henri de Lubac and John Zizioulas in Dialogue* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993), 280-288.

155 As is done by M. VOLF, *Trinität und Gemeinschaft. Eine ökumenische Ekklesiologie* (Mainz: Matthias-Grünewald-Verlag; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1996), 98-99, 112 n. 232.

156 Cf. ZIZIOULAS, *Eucharist, Bishop, Church*, 199; ZIZIOULAS, *Being as Communion*, 53, 56, 113; ZIZIOULAS, *Communion and Otherness*, 80.

157 Cf. ZIZIOULAS, *Eucharist, Bishop, Church*, 17, 112, 257; ZIZIOULAS, *Being as Communion*, 114, 119-120; ZIZIOULAS, *Communion and Otherness*, 88-98. Because of its rooting in the concept of personhood, the ethical aspect has, for Zizioulas, ontological meaning. Cf. paragraph 2.3.9.

158 Cf. ZIZIOULAS, *Being as Communion*, 59, 114.

159 As exemplarily put forward by P. COLLINS, 'Authority and Ecumenism', in: Knight (ed.), *The Theology of John Zizioulas*, 147-158, at 150-152.

ecclesial, the personal, the ethical, it is Zizioulas. 'We can therefore describe the church, fundamentally, as a *eucharistic way of being*'.[160]

2.3.7 The Church Local and Universal

Afanasiev's eucharistic ecclesiology is generally criticised for its 'congregationalist' tendency. As mentioned above, he defines his 'eucharistic ecclesiology' as the opposite of a 'universal ecclesiology'.[161] Afanasiev thus uses the term 'eucharistic ecclesiology' as a synonym for 'ecclesiology of the local church'. The risk of such an ecclesiology is that the church becomes so identified with the local church, that there is no substantial role for the supra-local communion between the local churches. Zizioulas wants to remedy this weakness in Afanasiev's thought without compromising the fundamentally eucharistic character of his ecclesiology. It is the eucharist itself, which Zizioulas uses to open up eucharistic ecclesiology to the awareness of the universal church.[162]

First of all, the local eucharistic community is the whole church, the whole body of Christ, and therefore the catholic church. Moreover, every local eucharistic gathering foreshadows the eschatological unity of all. This means that there can be no superstructure above the level of the local church, because the necessity of such a superstructure would deny the sufficiency of the catholicity of each local eucharistic assembly. At the same time, however, a local eucharistic assembly cannot be catholic if it is not in communion with all other local communities in which the whole Christ is present. However, this communion between the local churches is not established by a supra-local structure, but by the fact that the whole Christ is present in all local churches. Zizioulas calls this a '*unity in identity*'.[163] Sometimes, Zizioulas differs from Afanasiev by refusing to give priority to the local church. In those cases he rather speaks of a simultaneity of the local and the universal. The eucharist

160 ZIZIOULAS, *Communion and Otherness*, 79.

161 AFANASSIEFF, 'The Church which presides in love', 58, 73; cf. above, paragraph 2.2.9. Zizioulas regards the antithesis between 'local' and 'universal' as foreign to the thought of the Early Church, and as a product of cosmopolitanism and of the dispute between Protestantism and Roman Catholicism. Cf. ZIZIOULAS, *Eucharist, Bishop, Church*, 12-13, 46, 69, 108, 110-111, 252-253, 260.

162 It should be mentioned, however, that it was Afanasiev himself who first introduced this idea in order to fill the gap between his 'local' eucharistic ecclesiology and the existence of the universal church; cf. paragraphs 2.2.9 and 2.2.10.

163 ZIZIOULAS, *Eucharist, Bishop, Church*, 33, 155, 161, 192 n. 334, 260; ZIZIOULAS, *Being as Communion*, 158; cf. 148, 153-157. Not a unity of 'parts' added to each other (ZIZIOULAS, *Eucharist, Bishop, Church*, 33, 251-252, 255, 260, 262), but a unity because every local church is theologically 'identical' with the others. We saw that Afanasiev called this an 'interior' or 'intrinsic' universalism, over against the 'extrinsic' universalism of a universal superstructure; cf. paragraph 2.2.9.

points to a universal *as well as* to a local dimension.[164] On other occasions, Zizioulas affirms that a local concept of the church must always have priority over a universal concept.[165]

The practical expression of universality is *conciliarity*. Because the heads of the local eucharistic communities—the bishops—form the council, a council is not to be seen as a superstructure *above* the local churches, but as the expression of the communion *of* the local churches. The Orthodox rule that only *diocesan* bishops may vote in council reflects the fact that it is their being head of the local church—and not, for example, their ordination as such, or their ordination as incorporation into a universal episcopal college—which makes them members of the council. Another indication of the importance of the local church within the concept of conciliarity is that councils do not have authority of themselves, but only as far as their decisions have been received by the local churches. 'All structures aiming at facilitating the universality of the church create a *network of communion of Churches, not a new form of Church*.' If it is asked what actually has to be called 'church', it is always the local eucharistic community that gets priority. The universal church only exists in the concrete forms of local churches, because the church has always to be incarnated into particular local cultures and contexts. There is not one universal Christian culture. Therefore the universal church cannot be anything else than a communion of incarnated local churches.[166]

This is not to be interpreted in a 'democratic' way or in the sense of late medieval Conciliarism. Zizioulas's theory of the 'one' and the 'many' also applies to this level of ecclesiology—the question of primacy. As the 'one' and the 'many' are simultaneously present in Christ, in the eucharist, and in the local church, the same is true of the leadership of the communion of churches. Every province—and may we say, the totality of churches on a universal level?[167]—has its prime bishop (*protos*). The many—that is, the bishops of this province—cannot work without the one, and the one can do nothing without (the consent of) the many. So Zizioulas makes room for a concept of primacy, as long as it is based on an 'ontology of communion' and not on pyramidal structures.[168]

164 ZIZIOULAS, *Eucharist, Bishop, Church*, 259-262; ZIZIOULAS, *Being as Communion*, 133.

165 ZIZIOULAS, *Eucharist, Bishop, Church*, 45, 47, 66, 113-114, 117-118, 125, 153, 248, 256; ZIZIOULAS, *Being as Communion*, 237.

166 ZIZIOULAS, *Eucharist, Bishop, Church*, 157, 193, 261; ZIZIOULAS, *Being as Communion*, 133, 157, 241, 258-259.

167 MCPARTLAN, *The Eucharist Makes the Church*, 203-211, uses published and unpublished material by Zizioulas to show that this is actually the case. Based on the 'the one and the many' dialectic, Zizioulas affirms the bishop of Rome (not as the bearer of *the* Petrine ministry, because Zizoulas follows Cyprian in regarding each bishop to occupy the *Cathedra Petri* in his local church, but) as the *protos* on a universal level. Such a role is, for Zizioulas, 'not simply a primacy of honour'.

168 ZIZIOULAS, *Being as Communion*, 133-134, 141-142.

2.3.8 The Problem of the Parish in a Eucharistic Ecclesiology

An important conceptual problem for a eucharistic ecclesiology is the phenomenon of the parish. In Orthodox—as well as in Roman Catholic, Old Catholic and Anglican—ecclesiological theory, the 'local church' is the episcopal church, the diocese, and the 'local eucharistic assembly' is headed by the diocesan bishop. A problem arises as soon as the 'local eucharistic assembly' is no longer identified with the cathedral church and the bishop, but with the parish church and a priest. Given the fact that the ecclesiology of Afanasiev and Zizioulas is mainly built upon (a synthesis of) patristic material from the first three centuries, the focus on the bishop is not surprising—because at that time the bishop was still the main presider of a eucharistic gathering—but at the same time the contemporary problem is nearly irresolvable. How could we speak of the local eucharistic gathering as the constitutive element of ecclesiology, if most local eucharistic gatherings do not match the requirement of being the one eucharist under the presidency of the one bishop?

Zizioulas's dissertation is largely devoted to showing that the formative centuries of the church presupposed the local church to be *one* eucharistic community presided over by *one* bishop. According to Zizioulas, the Christian community—the church—in one place celebrated the eucharist in no more than one house ('Church in the household') at the same time, under the leadership of one 'presiding presbyter'.[169] As Christianity spread to the countryside, villagers participated in the one town or city eucharist. Where this became practically impossible, Zizioulas shows that rural areas were turned into separate eucharistic communities, not as a 'parish' under a 'priest', but as a new local church under its own 'rural bishop' (*chorepiscopus*). The phenomenon of the *chorepiscopi* perished when the increasing honour and standing of the office of bishop rendered the existence of village bishops inappropriate[170]—an argument not held in high esteem by Zizioulas.[171]

Zizioulas recounts that from the middle of the third century the principle of the one eucharist, over which the one bishop presided, gradually gave way to many eucharists presided over by presbyters. This gradual and, in Zizioulas's eyes, natural development was prepared by the ancient 'concelebrating' position of the presbyterium around the bishop and, moreover, by the already existing possibility that, in the absence of the bishop, the presidency over the one eucharist of the local church was assigned by the bishop to a presbyter. Nevertheless, the splitting up of the one eucharist into many eucharists, and the

[169] ZIZIOULAS, *Eucharist, Bishop, Church*, 49-53, 89-93, 163 n. 8. In Afanasiev's thought we already encountered the emergence of the bishop out of the presiding presbyter; cf. paragraphs 2.2.7 and 2.2.8.

[170] ZIZIOULAS, *Eucharist, Bishop, Church*, 95-98, 104, 167 n. 51, 168 n. 58, 168 n. 62, 169 n. 65, 216.

[171] ZIZIOULAS, *Eucharist, Bishop, Church*, 169 n. 63.

development of the bishop's incidental appointment of a presbyter as eucharistic presider into eucharistic presidency as a proper presbyterial function, was a possible threat to the unity of the local church—a unity which was rooted in the one eucharist and the one bishop. And it endangered the bishop to become an administrator rather than the central liturgical presider.[172]

Zizioulas describes how the Early Church accepted the emergence of the parish but refused to interpret it as a splitting up of the local church into autonomous eucharistic congregations. In a number of ways it underlined the unity of the many presbyterial eucharists with the one episcopal eucharist, that is, the unity of the many parishes within the one diocese.[173] As Zizioulas describes it in a way not dissimilar to Afanasiev's 'topological' theology of ministry,[174] the development of the one episcopal eucharist into many presbyterial eucharists has to be seen as '*the spatial distribution of the Presbyters' synthronon, while the one and only center of eucharistic unity was still the episcopal throne, from which every parish Eucharist drew its substance*'.[175] The image Zizioulas uses here, is that of the apse, in which the central throne of the bishop is surrounded on either side by the *synthronon* of the presbyterium. Rather than allowing a conceptual change from the *one episcopal* eucharist into *many presbyterial* eucharists, Zizioulas's image serves to sketch the continuation of the *one* eucharist only spatially distributed throughout the diocese, as well as the continuation of the *episcopal* eucharist 'concelebrated' by the presbyterium, the presbyters no longer being visually together with the bishop, but—notwithstanding their 'spatial distribution'—essentially still one with the bishop in their 'concelebration' of the eucharist.[176]

Building upon this groundwork, Zizioulas states in *Being as Communion* that the parish and the presbyterial eucharist cannot be seen as ecclesiological entities in their own right. The increasing centrality of the parish, Zizioulas

172 ZIZIOULAS, *Eucharist, Bishop, Church*, 23, 40 n. 72, 197-217. In this context, Zizioulas remarks that before the fourth century only the bishop was called 'priest'; from the fourth century onwards this title is given to the presbyters as well, consistent with—as Zizioulas says—their having become regular eucharistic presiders.

173 Examples include the *fermentum*: a piece of consecrated bread from the cathedral eucharist brought into the parish eucharist, because such a eucharist '*needed the Bishop's presence within it in some way* (...) so that *in reality* ['reality' used here, as often by Zizioulas, in the sense of 'ontological' or 'essential', MP] *there was not more than one Eucharist in the same Church*' (221-222); the fact that all ancient liturgies bear the name of a bishop rather than a presbyter (222); '*the commemoration of the Bishop's name*, and that indeed at the supreme moment of the Anaphora [... as] an absolutely indispensable element in the Presbyter's liturgy' (222); the celebration at an episcopally consecrated altar with an episcopally blessed and signed antimension (corporal) (223-224); the reluctance to admit a proliferation of eucharists, as is shown by canonical restrictions (224-225). The page numbers in brackets refer to ZIZIOULAS, *Eucharist, Bishop, Church*.

174 Ministry described by the (literal) 'place' one occupies at the eucharistic celebration; cf. paragraph 2.2.8.

175 ZIZIOULAS, *Eucharist, Bishop, Church*, 225.

176 ZIZIOULAS, *Eucharist, Bishop, Church*, 218-227, 254-255, 259.

says, has made both the bishop and the deacon redundant, and in the end the private Mass has even made the laity redundant. For a local eucharistic assembly to be called 'church' it should consist of all Christians of that place, and of all ministries, including the bishop.[177] 'In practical terms the only proper solution would be the creation of *small* episcopal dioceses.' This would restore the bishop to his place as perhaps not the sole, but at least the primary eucharistic presider; it would restore the presbyterium to its collegial character; it would make the 'scandalously uncanonical institution of the *assistant bishop*' unnecessary.[178]

The fact that Zizioulas wants the whole local church and all its ministries to be present at the eucharistic celebration is to be understood as a theological principle. In practice—probably according to the principle of *oikonomia*—there are various stages in which this ideal is reflected in higher or lower degrees. Zizioulas calls a liturgy which reflects the theological principle to a lesser extent a less 'perfect "icon of the Kingdom"'.[179]

Some critics maintain that Zizioulas's theological convictions are, at the end of the day, 'substantially defences of traditional polity, and lend weight to the contemporary expression of this polity and exercise of authority'.[180] Zizioulas's endorsement of 'institutional ecclesiology' would neglect the charismatic aspect of the church, especially as it occurs among the laity. This would be particularly due to his tendency to 'over-emphasize the bishop'.[181] Such criticisms seem, however, to overlook Zizioulas's thorough *relecture* of the bishop, the ordained ministry in general and the whole church. For all its (ecclesiological) importance, the episcopate is (empirically) certainly not aggrandised, rather simplified, by Zizioulas. Moreover, the fundamental embedding of ministry—and the whole church—in a *local* and a *liturgical* context points to an ecclesial way of life that is rather different from what is generally understood by institutionalism. Eventually, of course, the implementation of ecclesiological lines of thought remains a matter of *mentality*. To what extent are clergy and laity prepared to 're-read' their own ecclesial existence in the light of the eucharistic centre?[182]

177 Note that in this ecclesiology the episcopate is (conceptually) not a supra-local but a local ministry (although it is, together with the eucharist itself, the link between the local and the universal church).

178 ZIZIOULAS, *Being as Communion*, 250-252.

179 MCPARTLAN, *The Eucharist Makes the Church*, 135 (cf. 178, 199), referring to a personal conversation with Zizioulas.

180 COLLINS, 'Authority and Ecumenism', 153.

181 D. BATHRELLOS, 'Church, Eucharist, Bishop: The Early Church in the Ecclesiology of John Zizioulas', in: Knight (ed.), *The Theology of John Zizioulas*, 133-145, at 139, 142.

182 Cf. paragraph 8.5.6 (Scale and Mentality of the Diocese). See also ZIZIOULAS, *Communion and Otherness*, 145-149.

2.3.9 Societal and Ecological Catholicity

One of the consequences of Zizioulas's communal ecclesiology is his emphasis on the transcendence of ethnic, social, sexual and other differences between people. In order to be worthy of the name of 'church', a community should be really 'catholic', all-embracing. Unlike other theologians, who probably would base this ecclesiological requirement on *ethics*, Zizioulas bases it on his *ontology*. As we have seen, Zizioulas regards baptism as the birth of a new ontological person, the 'ecclesial' person. This ecclesial person is not an individual, but a person who longs for, and is placed into relationships of, communion. Within the church one becomes 'a catholic person', that is, someone who has left behind every form of exclusiveness. Because the eucharist brings together the present and the future, it is in the eucharist that people become fully what they have become ontologically in baptism: a new, ecclesial, catholic person. The implication is that the eucharist should be an expression of this transcendence of divisions. The actual form of the eucharist has to be an image of the kingdom. That is, there should be no eucharist if the whole local church is not represented. Gatherings of subgroups according to age, cultural preference, profession or sex can be useful within a church but should not be confused with the eucharist, which can only be the eucharist of the *whole* church.[183]

The eucharist should transcend other divisions as well, such as the dichotomy between body and soul, the material and the spiritual, the secular and the sacred. The eucharist teaches 'a "catholic" view of existence', a way of life characterised by harmony not dichotomy. Moreover, the whole cosmos is involved in this transcendence. The eucharist should lead humans to make the world 'a eucharistic reality', by not enslaving nature and by living in harmony with all creation.[184] Here Zizioulas's ontology, anthropology and ecclesiology overflow into his strong ecological interest.[185]

2.3.10 Conclusion

Probably the most important of Zizioulas's contributions to the school of eucharistic ecclesiology is the fact that he gave this ecclesiology a theological-philosophical foundation. Compared to Afanasiev, Zizioulas covers a larger field by relating the eucharist, the local church, the bishop and the universal church not only to each other, but also to main theological concepts such as christology, pneumatology and anthropology.

183 ZIZIOULAS, *Being as Communion*, 57-58, 121, 255. But see the end of the previous paragraph.
184 ZIZIOULAS, *Being as Communion*, 119-120, 162.
185 Cf. ZIZIOULAS, *Communion and Otherness*, 92-96.

Particularly important is Zizioulas's synthesis of christology and pneumatology, based on the fact that Christ himself is constituted by the Spirit. Equally important is the insight that it is the task of the Spirit to bring about a simultaneity of the historical and the eschatological, and that this simultaneity is most clearly manifested in the eucharist. Zizioulas's anthropology, with its 'biological individual' and its 'ecclesial person', links his pneuma-christology to the church and its members by asserting that Christ as a *person* is always 'one' and 'many' simultaneously, so that he can never be seen apart from his body, the church. Like Christ, the church is characterised by the same simultaneity of 'one' and 'many', so that it is local and universal at the same time, not by the addition of 'parts', but by a 'unity in identity'. Finally, Zizioulas contributes to a liturgical ecclesiology an in-depth consideration about the relationship between the bishop and the presbyterium, between cathedral eucharist and parish eucharist.

2.4 CONCLUSION

2.4.1 The Local Assembly

The ecclesiological implications of the Orthodox school of 'eucharistic ecclesiology', as founded by Afanasiev and developed by Zizioulas, can be summarised as follows. Firstly, in a eucharistic ecclesiology the local eucharistic assembly is the centre of ecclesiological thought. This emphasis on the local church makes eucharistic ecclesiology concrete and direct, which is the attractive side of this form of ecclesiology. It is an ecclesiology which, although it is deeply informed by theology, does not start with theological abstractions, but with the tangible celebrating community, so that it appeals to the experience of every member of the church.

2.4.2 The Universal Communion

Notwithstanding this fundamentally 'local' starting point, a eucharistic ecclesiology has room for the universal church and even for a kind of primacy or priority of (the bishop of) one local church within the communion of all other local churches.

In a eucharistic ecclesiology the eucharist itself is the basis of any concept of the universal church. By celebrating the eucharist, the sacrament of the whole Christ, the local church is united with all other local churches which celebrate the same eucharist where the whole Christ is present in the same way. The universal church is the communion of local churches, and is made manifest in the assembly of the heads of all local churches—the bishops in council.

It is not foreign to a eucharistic ecclesiology to allow for some kind of 'primacy' or 'priority' of one bishop in a region or even in the worldwide church. But this should always be a concept of primacy that respects the episcopal diocese as the formative entity of ecclesiology. It should be a priority of 'reception' (Afanasiev) or a primacy which acts as the 'one' with—and never without—the 'many' (Zizioulas).

2.4.3 The Whole People of God

Eucharistic ecclesiology is fundamentally an ecclesiology of the whole people of God. The eucharist is seen as the centre of ecclesial life, and it is always the whole people of God who are the actors in this central celebration. Eucharistic ecclesiology regards the laity not as non-ordained, but as ordained (by baptism and chrismation/confirmation) into the ministry of those who celebrate the eucharist, together with the bishop, the presbyterium, the deacons and all other ministries. In this ecclesiology, the eucharist is not regarded as just one of the sacraments, but as the gathering of those who become church by the very fact of being gathered together into the eucharistic community.

2.4.4 The Bishop

In a eucharistic ecclesiology, the bishop exercises a pivotal ministry. Eucharistic ecclesiology's paradigm is not the parochial eucharist presided over by a priest, but the gathering of a local church presided over by the bishop and celebrated by all 'orders' (including the *ordo* of the laity). This means that a convincing implementation of the concept of a eucharistic ecclesiology needs small dioceses where the bishop is regarded as the main presider, pastor, teacher and administrator of the church, where the priests are able to act together as a presbyterium, and where the whole people of God—with all their racial, social, sexual and age differences—have the opportunity to gather together in the one eucharistic celebration. The importance of the bishop *outside* the local church is his relationship with the other bishops in provincial and universal councils.

2.4.5 All Aspects of the Church's Life

One of the implications of a eucharistic ecclesiology is that all aspects of the church's life are in some way or another regarded as related to the eucharist. This means that everything that happens in the church bears a communal character. Within the boundaries of the church nothing takes place—be it of a diaconal, ethical, catechetical, pastoral or organisational character—which has no relationship to the central gathering of the whole people of God in the eucharist.

This places phenomena such as—for example—leadership and dogma in a particular light. Leadership derives its status not primarily from ordination or jurisdiction, but is seen as an extrapolation of liturgical leadership. Dogma appears not primarily as a rule of faith in an abstract sense, but as an aid to worship, as an expression of doxology. In other words, eucharistic ecclesiology implies that everything which deserves a place in the life of the church should have some relationship to, and should derive its place in the church's life from, the eucharistic gathering.

3 'THE EUCHARIST MAKES THE CHURCH'

Roman Catholic Contributions to a Liturgical Ecclesiology

3.1 INTRODUCTION

3.1.1 The Second Vatican Council

The church lives and grows by the celebration of the eucharist under the leadership of the bishop or his deputy. In every eucharistic community the church becomes present. The participation of the body and blood of Christ brings about our transformation into that which we eat and drink.

In these terms, the Second Vatican Council's Dogmatic Constitution on the Church, *Lumen Gentium* (1964), expresses the meaning of the church.[1] Words which remind us of the eucharistic ecclesiology we encountered in the previous chapter. Moreover, previous to the council, a preparatory scheme explicitly mentioned the Orthodox school of eucharistic ecclesiology, connected with Afanasiev's name, as of importance for Roman Catholic ecclesiological self-understanding.[2]

Thus, the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965) shows traces of a eucharistic approach in its ecclesiological statements. The same is true if we look at the matter the other way round: the council's view on liturgy is remarkably ecclesial in its orientation. According to the Constitution on the Liturgy, *Sacrosanctum Concilium* (1963), the liturgy accomplishes the work of redemption (2). Christianity is not only a religion of preaching and believing,

1 *Lumen Gentium* 26. The Eucharist is source and summit of the Christian life (11); in the Eucharist all aspects of daily Christian life are offered to God (34); the Eucharist unites the earthly pilgrim Church with the heavenly Church into one celebrating Church (50). Traces of eucharistic ecclesiology are also to be found in, for example, *Unitatis Redintegratio* 15; *Christus Dominus* 11, 15, 30; *Apostolicam Actuositatem* 3, 4; *Ad Gentes Divinitus* 15; *Presbyterorum Ordinis* 5, 6.

2 The same comment is made of 'High Church' Anglicanism and Protestantism. Cf. *Acta Synodalia Sacrosancti Concilii Oecumenici Vaticani II*, vol. I: *Periodus prima*, pars IV: *Congregationes generales XXXI-XXXVI* (Rome: Typis Polyglottis Vaticanis, 1971), 87. The context is the part of the scheme which later would become the decree on ecumenism. See also P. PLANK, *Die Eucharistieversammlung als Kirche. Zur Entstehung und Entfaltung der eucharistischen Ekklesiologie Nikolaj Afanas'evs (1893-1966)* (Würzburg: Augustinus-Verlag, 1980), 11, 38-39.

but also of celebrating the paschal mystery through baptism and the eucharist (6). The liturgy is celebrated by Christ (the head) and the church (his body). Christ is nowhere nearer to his church than in the celebration of the liturgy (7). Although the church has many tasks, the celebration of the liturgy—and particularly of the eucharist—is its main task. The eucharist is both the church's source and the church's summit (10). The liturgy is the act in which all faithful exercise their royal priesthood. Therefore, all have to partipate fully, consciously and actively (14). The liturgy manifests the church. Liturgical acts are always acts of the whole people of God, presided over by bishops (26). The church becomes most manifest in the eucharist celebrated by the whole people of God under the presidency of the bishop with his priests and deacons around the one altar, particularly in the cathedral (41). The parish should be brought to awareness of its being a liturgical community in relation to its bishop (42). The sacraments have the purpose of sanctifying the people, building up the body of Christ and giving worship to God (59).

This pre-eminent conciliar document represents a remarkable shift of emphasis regarding the theology and spirituality of the liturgy. The liturgy, in particular the eucharist, is no longer primarily seen from the point of view of neo-scholastic sacramentology, but rather from the point of view of ecclesiology, or perhaps one could better say, ecclesiality. Liturgy is no longer reduced to the administration of 'a means of grace' to an individual, but is perceived as the corporate act of the church. Liturgy is no longer something done by the clergy for the laity, but it is the church celebrating, it is the whole people of God exercising their royal priesthood. Liturgy is no longer some ecclesiastical activity among others, but it is the culmination of everything the church does and is.

3.1.2 Theological Reassessment

How was this shift of emphasis prepared? The ideas which found official recognition at the Second Vatican Council originated in the theological and liturgical movements of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries.

The German *Tübinger Schule* of, among others, Johann Sebastian Drey (1777-1853) and Johann Adam Möhler (1796-1838) laid the foundation for this renewal. As a reaction to an ecclesiological and liturgical atmosphere which—through the Counter-Reformation and the Enlightenment—was based on jurisdiction and authority, structure and rubric, the *Tübinger* re-emphasised the role of the Spirit in the church, the church as the body of Christ and the church as the communion of all faithful. More generally, this school tried to exceed the

methodological limits of neo-scholasticism through a recourse to biblical and patristic ways of thinking and reasoning.[3]

The leading neo-scholastic 'Roman School' had little appreciation either for this organic, communal, liturgical and mystical approach to the church, or for John Henry Newman's (1801-1890) non-scholastic, historical and philosophical theology. Newman used analogy, metaphor and parable instead of their syllogisms and preferred 'probability' to their logic.[4] Even less, of course, did they appreciate the attempts at a synthesis between Catholicism and contemporary historical and scientific thought as presented by the different theologians whom they classified and rejected as 'modernists'.[5]

In spite of the suspicion of leading neo-scholasticism, movements of renewal during the semicentury before the Second Vatican Council have succeeded in changing the shape of Roman Catholic theology. Two approaches proved fruitful. The first was a more 'popular' way of doing theology outside the boundaries of 'theology' as it was then understood, namely, neo-scholastic systematic theology. By not claiming to do systematic theology, personalities with great spiritual and liturgical influence like Romano Guardini (1885-1968) were able to introduce—to theologians and non-theologians alike—concepts of faith, church and liturgy as living realities within, and related to, the modern world.[6]

The second approach came from within systematic theology itself. Dominicans from *Le Saulchoir* (Paris) like Marie-Dominique Chenu (1895-1990) and Yves Congar (1904-1995) and Jesuits from Fourvière (Lyon) like Henri de Lubac (1896-1991) reinterpreted systematic theology from its roots in Scripture and the *patres*, but no less from its roots in medieval theology—they read the scholastics themselves in order to correct neo-scholasticism.[7]

This way of doing theology met with fierce opposition from theologians who wanted to remain within the neo-scholastic tradition. The best-known

3 T.M. SCHOOF, *Aggiornamento. De doorbraak van een nieuwe katholieke theologie* (Baarn: Het Wereldvenster, 1968), 30-38, 172-177; Y.M.J. CONGAR, *L'Église. De saint Augustin à l'époque moderne* (Paris: Cerf, 1970 [reprint 1997]), 416-423; C. RUDDY, *The Local Church: Tillard and the Future of Catholic Ecclesiology* (New York: Crossroad, 2006), 32-38. See also paragraph 2.1.6 (The Call for a Neo-Patristic Synthesis).

4 W.O. CHADWICK, *From Bossuet to Newman* (Cambridge: CUP, 1987[2] [1957[1]]), 164-184; SCHOOF, *Aggiornamento*, 48-50, 178-182.

5 SCHOOF, *Aggiornamento*, 53-80, 189-197; CONGAR, *L'Eglise. De saint Augustin à l'époque moderne*, 459-461.

6 SCHOOF, *Aggiornamento*, 87-98, 201-202.

7 SCHOOF, *Aggiornamento*, 105-131, 203-220; A.W.J. HOUTEPEN, *Theologen op zoek naar God. Twintig portretten van katholieke theologen uit de tweede helft van de 20[e] eeuw* (Zoetermeer: Meinema, 2001), 13-15, 22, 46-63, 233; cf. P. MCPARTLAN, *The Eucharist Makes the Church: Henri de Lubac and John Zizioulas in Dialogue* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993), 30-42; P. MCPARTLAN, *Sacrament of Salvation: An Introduction to Eucharistic Ecclesiology* (London / New York: T&T Clark, reprint 2003 [1995[1]]), 47-53. For an example, see paragraph 3.2.8 (On de Lubac's Theological Method).

opponent was the Dominican Réginald Garrigou-Lagrange (1877-1964), himself a leading neo-thomist theologian.[8] He took up the (pejorative) term *nova theologia*, used by Pope Pius XII in a 1946 address (and perhaps inspired by Garrigou-Lagrange himself), in order to repudiate recent French theology as *nouvelle théologie*. According to critics like Garrigou-Lagrange, the theologians in question returned to Modernism.[9] Subsequently, Pius XII's encyclica *Humani Generis* (1950) was generally interpreted as a condemnation of the 'new' theological approach.[10]

Nevertheless, these theologians were able to transform Roman Catholic theology from the inside. After having been distrusted and opposed by the theological and ecclesiastical authorities, and sometimes deprived from their professorial chairs up to the end of the nineteen fifties, they were rehabilitated in the sixties by being made *periti* of the Second Vatican Council or by being created cardinals.

The fate of this theological approach after the Council is ambivalent. Its potential for theological reassessment and ecclesial renewal is continued by two quite different currents in Roman Catholic theology, spirituality and ecclesial practice. The two currents are often illustrated by reference to the two international post-conciliar journals, *Concilium* and *Communio*, the latter of which started as a breakaway movement from the former. One of the ways the dissensus is defined, is to say that those associated with *Concilium* want to *extend* the work of the Council, whereas those associated with *Communio* want to *continue* the theology of the Council. Moreover, the dissensus 'concerns the balance to be maintained between the need to renew Catholic faith in the light of what can be appropriately learned from the world and the need to offer back a richer understanding than the world can achieve of its own resources'.[11]

Nevertheless, both approaches regard themselves with some right as the contemporary continuation of the *nouvelle théologie*. If the *nouvelle théologie* is primarily understood as a 'movement'—the continuing search for renewal of theological method and ecclesial practice—the *Concilium* approach is the continuation of this movement. If the *nouvelle théologie* is primarily understood as a 'theology'—a distinct theological approach deeply marked by its (neo-) patristic, ecclesial and liturgical character—the *Communio* approach is the continuation of this theological school. De Lubac, himself not the least representative of the *nouvelle théologie*, is an advocate of the latter interpretation. In his memoirs he levels a rather harsh verdict upon a type of

8 Cf. F. KERR, *Twentieth-Century Catholic Theologians: From Neoscholasticism to Nuptial Mysticism* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2007), 10-16; see also the characterisation of 'Suárezianism' at 124-126.

9 C. FREY, *Mysterium der Kirche—Öffnung zur Welt. Zwei Aspekte der Erneuerung französischer katholischer Theologie* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969), 55-74.

10 FREY, *Mysterium der Kirche—Öffnung zur Welt*, 90-104.

11 P.D. MURRAY, 'Roman Catholic Theology after Vatican II', in: Ford with Muers (eds.), *The Modern Theologians*, 265-286, at 269.

post-conciliar theology—identified with 'the theologians of the *Concilium* group'—which he denies the right to claim that it 'continues' or 'carries forward' the theology of the Council or that it works in the 'spirit' of the Council.[12]

There is still another paradoxical fact to be observed. On the one hand—as just indicated—the patristic turn in the first half of the twentieth century caused a major methodical shift, which was in *that* time experienced as renewing and liberating, and opposed by traditionalists. Those who were attracted to this type of theology for its theological *contents* (for example, its ecclesiological and liturgical thought), remained faithful to this school and are *now* regarded as rather 'traditional'. In the above typology, they form the *Communio* approach. On the other hand, however, the approach identified with *Concilium* is not only determined by the wish to carry further the theological *method* (rather than the theological contents) of the *nouvelle théologie*—as just indicated—but also by the continuation of a 'traditional' theological and ecclesiological line of thought which did *not* join the methodical shift of the patristic turn, but which has over a period of a century transformed itself into a 'modern' current of Roman Catholic thought and practice. An example is the paradoxical *methodical* continuum between Vatican I's *socio-philosophical* approach to the church as *societas perfecta* and the post-Vatican II emphasis on the 'people of God' as it is *sociologically* understood.[13] This analysis makes two things understandable. First, it explains why both groups tend to misunderstand and misrepresent one another: they argue from different methodical presuppositions. Second, it explains why both groups can appeal to the Second Vatican Council: the council took up insights from both theological currents. Perhaps one may identify these currents as a *ressourcement* current and an *aggiornamento* current. At Vatican II, the renewing forces were a composite of both approaches. In the aftermath of the Council, however, these currents showed themselves to have rather different roots and, consequently, different objectives.[14]

12 H. DE LUBAC, *Mémoire sur l'occasion de mes écrits* (Namur: Culture et Vérité, 1989), 151-152 ('prolonge', 'dépasse', 'esprit'), 369 ('les théologiens du groupe de "Concilium"'); cf. 149-153. I take the fact that 'some of the great theologians of Vatican II' opposed some of the post-Conciliar developments as a case in point and not as an instance of the danger 'that, as we become elderly, we run the risk of reversing the intellectual journey that we have gone in the beginning of our adult life'; *contra* P.-M. GY, '*L'esprit de la liturgie* du cardinal Ratzinger est-il fidèle au Concile, ou en réaction contre?', *La Maison-Dieu* 229 (2002/1), 171-178, at 178 ('que dans les années où nous devenons vieillards, nous risquons de refaire en sens inverse le chemin intellectuel que nous avons parcouru au début de notre maturité? L'un ou l'autre des grands théologiens de Vatican II n'ont pas échappé à ce danger').

13 Cf. P. NAPIWODZKI, 'Eine Ekklesiologie im Werden. Mannes Dominikus Koster und sein Beitrag zum theologischen Verständnis der Kirche' (unpublished PhD thesis, University Freiburg CH, 2005, available at http://ethesis.unifr.ch/theses/#theologie).

14 Cf. R. SHORTT, *Benedict XVI: Commander of the Faith* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 2006^{2} [2005^{1}]), 3.

In the meantime, such 'opposition between both aspects of the deepest meaning of "catholic" is, of course, unprofitable. It must and can be overcome by a dynamic hermeneutics of the living tradition'.[15] In this chapter, the *nouvelle théologie* is represented by de Lubac, and the two post-conciliar currents by Ratzinger and Boff. Perhaps Tillard may be regarded as a representative of the much-needed 'dynamic hermeneutics of the living tradition' which is, in an ecumenical context, able to reconcile tradition and renewal.[16]

3.1.3 The Liturgical Movement

The origins of the Liturgical Movement are connected with the names of a number of Benedictines, of whom Dom Prosper Guéranger (1805-1875) of Solemnes (France), Dom Lambert Beauduin (1873-1960) of Mont-César (Belgium) and Dom Odo Casel (1886-1948) of Maria Laach (Germany) are outstanding.[17] Guéranger became the opponent of Neo-Gallicanism and nationalism by advocating the celebration of the uniform Roman liturgy in all its splendour. In hindsight, the Solesmes tradition has proven more influential in the area of Gregorian chant than in the area of liturgical-theological renewal. The development of liturgical theology and ecclesiology is more indebted to the Maria Laach theologians, who opposed Guéranger's Tridentine views and promoted a return to early Christian liturgy and theology, and to Mont-César, where the practical work on liturgical renewal originated, through such forms as congresses and accessible publications.[18]

The Dutch liturgist Herman Wegman describes the Liturgical Movement as founded on three pillars. The first was liturgical history. The rediscovery of the historical genesis of the liturgical rites contributed largely to the restoration of the rites and their meaning. The second pillar was liturgical theology. Examples of pioneering liturgical theology are Casel's *Mysterienlehre*, but also the rediscovery of the Jewish roots of Christian worship. Moreover, Wegman ascribes an important role to the Liturgical Movement in bringing about the change within the ecclesiological climate—the rediscovery of the notions of people of God and the royal priesthood of all faithful. Thirdly, the movement

15 HOUTEPEN, *Theologen op zoek naar God*, 20 ('De tegenstelling tussen beide aspecten van wat "katholiek" ten diepste betekent is uiteraard onvruchtbaar. Ze moet en kan door een dynamische hermeneutiek van de levende traditie worden overwonnen').

16 On this chapter and these authors see paragraph 3.1.4.

17 A. BUGNINI, *The Reform of the Liturgy 1948-1975* (Collegeville MN: TLP, 1990 [trans. of *La riforma liturgica 1948-1975*, Rome 1983]), 6.

18 J. LAMBERTS, 'Active participation as the gateway towards an ecclesial liturgy', in: C. Caspers & M. Schneiders (eds.), *Omnes circumadstantes: Contributions towards a history of the role of the people in the liturgy: Presented to Herman Wegman* (Kampen: Kok, 1990), 234-261, at 239-249; K.F. PECKLERS, *Worship* (London-New York: Continuum, 2003), 87-88, 91-95.

rested on practical pastoral-liturgical activity, which Wegman connects with the name of Beauduin.[19]

Far from being just a 'ritual' movement, occupied with 'liturgical' externals, the Liturgical Movement was indissolubly related to the theological *ressourcement* to which the previous paragraph referred. Even more adequately, one could call the Liturgical Movement the liturgical manifestation of this theological movement.[20] This should especially be kept in mind when the concept of *participatio actuosa* is at stake.[21] If the Liturgical Movement is primarily interpreted as a 'ritual' movement, the *participatio actuosa* of all who are present at the liturgy can be considered as one of the *principles* of this movement. The term is then translated as 'active participation' and relates to 'ritual' acts in which all who are present 'act, sing or pray together'.[22] If the Liturgical Movement is, however, primarily interpreted as a movement generated by liturgical-theological and liturgical-ecclesiological considerations, the wish to reconstitute the *participatio actuosa* of all baptised in the liturgical celebration is rather an *effect* of its theological and ecclesiological principles. The term is then more aptly translated as 'genuine participation' and relates first of all to the conscious awareness of being part of and engaged in the communal celebration—an awareness that, of course, seeks ritual expression.[23]

The contemporary fate of the Liturgical Movement shows an ambivalence very similar (and related) to the fate of the *nouvelle théologie* as briefly discussed in the previous paragraph. Again, two approaches claim to continue

19 H.A.J. WEGMAN, *Riten en mythen. Liturgie in de geschiedenis van het christendom* (Kampen: Kok, 1991), 351-353. Cf. section 1.3 (Liturgical Theology).

20 An earlier and a more recent example of an account of the Liturgical Movement which does justice not just to liturgical *renewal* but also to liturgical *theology* (including liturgical *ecclesiology*) are L. BOUYER, *Liturgical Piety* (Notre Dame IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1954) and K.F. PECKLERS, *The Unread Vision: The Liturgical Movement in the United States of America: 1926-1955* (Collegeville MN: TLP, 1998). See also M. PLOEGER, 'Het "onliturgische" karakter van de Liturgische Beweging', *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 61 (2007), 109-122.

21 Cf. S. SCHMIDT-KEISER, *Aktive Teilnahme. Kriterium gottesdienstlichen Handelns und Feierns. Zu den Elementen eines Schlüsselbegriffes in Geschichte und Gegenwart des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Bern: Lang, 1985). Although Schmidt-Keiser chooses the 'active' interpretation of *participatio actuosa* and a 'ritual' approach to the liturgy (already indicated by the title and the first sub-title), he fully acknowledges the theological and especially the ecclesiological background of the concept (vol. I, 37-91, 141-146, 171-308, 324-347, 521-528).

22 Cf. M.J.M. HOONDERT, *Om de parochie. Ritueel-muzikale bewegingen in de marge van de parochie. Gregoriaans—Taizé—Jongerenkoren* (Heeswijk: Abdij van Berne, 2006), 198-199 ('meedoen, meezingen, meebidden').

23 Cf. A. KAI-YUNG CHAN, 'Participation in the Liturgy', in: A.J. Chupungco (ed.), *Handbook for Liturgical Studies*, vol. II: *Fundamental Liturgy* (Collegeville MN: TLP, 1998), 145-159. An interesting recent development is that the 'ritual' approach also returns to this rather 'interior' interpretation of *participatio actuosa* (though not for the theological-ecclesiological reasons that generated the concept in the first place), including a different translation of the term; cf. HOONDERT, *Om de parochie*, 199, 253, 329, 351-353.

the movement in the present. And again, one of these approaches emphasises the movement's potential for *renewal*, while the other concentrates on its—no less ground-breaking—*theology* (including ecclesiology, sacramentology, 'liturgical theology' and spirituality). The dissensus is traceable in the historiography of the Liturgical Movement (a history of liturgical renewal or a history of liturgical-theological reassessment) and in the methodology of liturgical studies.[24] But, of course, the dissensus is most manifest in the considerably different concepts of what contemporary liturgy should look like and why it should look like that.

The Liturgical Movement, then, started with theological, spiritual and ritual-liturgical views which can be summarised as strongly related to the church and to ecclesiology, deeply reverent of the liturgy as a dwelling-place of God, dedicated to—primarily patristic—ressourcement, committed to the enhancement of liturgical knowledge among laity and clergy, devoted to the eucharist and to the liturgy of the hours, interested in liturgical music and iconography, inspired by Orthodox theology, spirituality and liturgy, indebted to biblical studies, and having a monastic anchoring.[25] Controversy begins, when concrete liturgical renewal is evaluated and is interpreted as either a continuation or a betrayal of the intentions of the liturgical forebears. In the Roman Catholic context, the particular pitfall to be avoided is that liturgical views are classified according to ecclesiastical-political positions rather than according to liturgical-theological views. It is, therefore, important to point to the ecumenical breadth of the Liturgical Movement. As one reads the writings of liturgical theologians throughout Orthodoxy, Roman Catholicism, Old Catholicism, Anglicanism and Protestantism, the resemblance of their basic biblical-patristic-theological outlook is astonishing, even if they subsequently take different stances on such highly disputed matters as ecclesiastical polity and morality.[26] In this study, therefore, the Liturgical Movement is understood

24 Historiographically, it seems helpful to divide the Liturgical Movement into four phases: (1) the nineteenth-century forerunners, (2) the 'heyday' in the first half of the twentieth century, (3) the liturgical renewal period around the Second Vatican Council and (4) the contemporary phase of 'Reform of the Reform' in conflicting directions, which are open to various evaluations, but which have in common that they reassess the third phase. I owe this analysis to a lecture by Professor Paul Post, Tilburg, 11 September 2007. Cf. P.G.J. POST, 'Na de lange jaren zestig. Liturgiewetenschap en *Ritual Studies*: opkomst, typering en actuele uitwerking van een relatie', *Jaarboek voor liturgie-onderzoek* 22 (2006), 89-111.

25 S. KELEHER, 'Whatever Happened to the Liturgical Movement? A View from the East', in: S. Caldecott (ed.), *Beyond the Prosaic: Renewing the Liturgical Movement* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 69-96, at 70-72.

26 Most of the authors presented in this study can be regarded either as belonging to (Hebert, Dix, van der Leeuw) or as explicitly (Ratzinger, Williams, Pickstock, von Allmen, Wainwright, Lathrop) or implicitly indebted to the Liturgical Movement.

as a liturgical-theological current deeply related to the neo-patristic and ecumenical movements.[27]

3.1.4 This Chapter

A common denominator of these theological and liturgical movements is their aim to break through the traditional boundaries of theology, ecclesiology and liturgy. They have in common a wish to go beyond the neo-scholastic presuppositions in which Roman Catholic theology and practice were caught. By returning to biblical, patristic and medieval sources, they prepared the way for the new—or rather, ancient—understandings of the church as the people of God and of the liturgy as the celebration of the whole church. After initial suspicion, these new paradigms were ratified in the documents of the Second Vatican Council.

This chapter will look at four theologians who in very different ways contributed to the concept of a liturgical or eucharistic ecclesiology within the Roman Catholic Church. The first is Henri de Lubac, one of the leaders of the *nouvelle théologie*. Particularly his book, *Corpus Mysticum*, has proved to be seminal in the rediscovery of the relationship between the eucharistic body of Christ and the ecclesial body of Christ.[28] Although an historical study, this book has inspired many systematic theologians in rediscovering the close connection between the eucharist and the church.

The next theologian to be discussed in this chapter is Joseph Ratzinger. As a Professor of Dogmatics, Ratzinger contributed to the conciliar theological developments, and as the prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, he contributed to the post-conciliar development of—and controversy within—Roman Catholic ecclesiology. Although Ratzinger is now best known as Pope Benedict XVI, this chapter is not primarily interested in his pontificate, but in the distinct way in which he, as a theologian, interprets a liturgical or eucharistic ecclesiology.

Thirdly, something of the worldwide perspective of the Roman Catholic Church, and of the variety of approaches within Roman Catholic theology, will be encountered in the work of Leonardo Boff. Boff's liberation theology is based on a trinitarian communion ecclesiology and on an understanding of the church 'as a sacrament'. This will provide the opportunity to investigate the relationship between a eucharistic ecclesiology and a church-as-sacrament ecclesiology. Moreover, Boff's theology will prove to be open to a liturgical,

[27] Cf. paragraphs 2.1.6 (The Call for a Neo-Patristic Synthesis), 3.1.2 (Theological Reassessment), 5.1.4 (The Anglican Catholic Context), 7.1.1 (Common Ground) and 7.1.2 (The Ecumenical Movement).

[28] The majority of authors discussed in the several chapters of this study refer once or more to de Lubac's *Corpus Mysticum*.

eucharistic approach of the church, but not without putting such an approach to the test by asking some fundamental questions.

Finally, Jean-Marie Tillard will be studied as an important contributor to 'communion ecclesiology'. In addition to his thorough theological approach of God, humanity and the church, Tillard offers a particularly helpful insight by writing in an ecumenical context. The link between the eucharistic circle and the other baptised and non-baptised, as well as the role of the bishop of Rome in the context of a communion ecclesiology, will prove important contributions to an ecumenical liturgical ecclesiology.

As in all chapters, the limits of this study dictate that a restricted number of authors has to be selected out of many theologians who in their own ways contribute to a liturgical ecclesiology. Particularly in the Roman Catholic world, the field of communion ecclesiologies and eucharistic ecclesiologies is vast. Nevertheless, the choice of a founding father (de Lubac), a 'classical' representative (Ratzinger), a more critical contributor (Boff) and a representative deeply involved in the ecumenical movement (Tillard), gives the reader a limited but balanced introduction to the various possibilities within Roman Catholic liturgical ecclesiology.

3.2 HENRI DE LUBAC

3.2.1 Life and Work

The French Jesuit Henri de Lubac (1896-1991) studied theology at Jesuit institutions in England and at Lyon-Fourvière. He became a Professor of Dogmatics, Fundamental Theology and History of Religion at Fourvière. During the Second World War he started, with Jean Daniélou (1905-1974), the series *Sources Chrétiennes*, which continues to be one of the leading publication series of patristic texts. In 1950 de Lubac was compelled to suspend his professorship because of Roman suspicions of heresy in his work. It took ten years before he was fully rehabilitated. During the 1960s he served as an adviser to the Second Vatican Council and to the Vatican Secretariat for Non-Christian Religions. In 1983 Pope John Paul II made him a Cardinal.[29]

For many theologians who will be discussed throughout this study, de Lubac's writings have been seminal in gaining an understanding of the church in which the trinitarian God, Christ, the church, the eucharist and humanity play interrelated parts. Particularly the awareness that the ecclesial community and the eucharistic communion are closely related, or even the same, was aroused in many minds by reading de Lubac's *Catholicisme* (1938)[30] and *Corpus Mysticum*

[29] HOUTEPEN, *Theologen op zoek naar God*, 46-48, 53; cf. also DE LUBAC, *Mémoire*.
[30] H. DE LUBAC, *Catholicisme. Les aspects sociaux du dogme* (Paris: Cerf, 1938).

(1944).[31] Therefore, this chapter—and also, together with the previous chapter on Afanasiev and Zizioulas, this entire study—should begin with a presentation of these two seminal books, together with the related publication, *Méditation sur l'Eglise* (1953).[32]

With Hans Urs von Balthasar[33] one could say that all de Lubac's later studies are detail commentaries on aspects of the united, nearly holistic vision as presented in *Catholicisme*. Therefore, the following presentation of de Lubac's theology of church and eucharist will be arranged according to the themes of *Catholicisme*, inserting the additional insights from *Corpus Mysticum* and *Méditation sur l'Eglise* at the appropriate places.

3.2.2 The Social Character of Christianity

In this, as in other chapters of this study, the nineteen thirties are the starting point of a renewed appreciation of the church, of the liturgy and—through these—of the Christian faith in general. As de Lubac advocates, it is possible to overcome boundaries and dichotomies in order to retrieve a more ancient unity of thought. This unity of thought—learned from Scripture and the Fathers[34]—is what de Lubac lapidarily calls 'Catholicism'.

In the word 'Catholicism', de Lubac summarises the essence of the Christian faith. He does not use it in a confessional, but in a broadly theological sense. Catholic, he says, does not primarily mean 'geographically wide-spread', but 'all-embracing', and this exactly reflects, in de Lubac's view, the meaning of Christianity. The meaning of Christianity is to embrace all and everything. The Christian faith believes that God and creation, God and the whole human race, and all people among each other, will ultimately be one, as God has *meant* them to be one and as God *himself* is one.[35]

31 H. DE LUBAC, *Corpus Mysticum. L'Eucharistie et l'Eglise au Moyen Age. Etude historique*, Deuxième édition, revue et augmentée (Paris: Aubier, 1949 [1944[1]]).

32 H. DE LUBAC, *Méditation sur l'Eglise*, Troisième édition revue (Paris: Aubier, 1954 [1953[1]]).

33 H.U. VON BALTHASAR, *Henri de Lubac. Sein organisches Lebenswerk* (Einsiedeln: Johannes, 1976), 20, 24-25, 50, 62, 76, 86.

34 S.K. WOOD, *Spiritual Exegesis and the Church in the Theology of Henri de Lubac* (Grand Rapids MI: Eerdmans; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998) importantly points out how de Lubac's eucharistic-ecclesiological vision is rooted in the patristic way of reading Scripture. 'The spiritual senses of Scripture provide a theology of history from the perspective of its Christological center that reaches into the past and illumines it in reference to Christ at the same time that it strains toward the future fulfillment and union of letter and spirit, which is to say, the union of humanity and divinity into the "whole Christ". The real symbolism inherent in this form of exegesis can properly be called sacramental as well as mystical' (51).

35 DE LUBAC, *Catholicisme*, 23-24, 27, 215, 228, 244. MCPARTLAN, *The Eucharist Makes the Church*, 30, 49, 59, 73, 291, draws attention to the fact that de Lubac wants to aim at all creation, the whole cosmos, but seems unable to effectively transcend a human perspective.

Therefore, de Lubac is as much able to start with God as he is able to start with humanity. The human race is essentially one, because everyone is shaped in the image of the one God. Before there is talk about salvation, or talk about the church, there is the unity of God and the unity of the whole human race, created in the image of God.[36] Moreover, the 'social' character of humanity is rooted in the 'social'—trinitarian—character of God. In God is no egotism, but only giving and sharing. Thus, personhood in the image of God is not individualism, but being a member of a social community, being part of the human race. 'Christian mysticism of unity is trinitarian mysticism.'[37]

Sin, therefore, is essentially nothing else—nothing less—than a breach with God which is also the rupture of the unity of humanity. Sin means separation; sin means individualisation in its worst sense. Sin is not—as de Lubac thinks is mostly done in contemporary theology—primarily to be sought in the inner depth of each individual, but in the very fact that human beings understand themselves as individuals, that is, not as interdependent members of one communion.[38] Consequently, salvation is—for de Lubac—the healing of separation, the restoration of communion between God and humanity and, indissolubly, between the members of the human race. As all people are represented by their ancestor Adam, all are again represented by their redeemer Jesus Christ. The incarnation is the embodiment of the Word of God in the human race and, vice versa, the reunion of the human race in Jesus Christ. Salvation in Christ brings unity and peace. The mystery of Christ is to unite everything.[39]

In the ultimate goal of creation—eternal life, the kingdom of God—there can, says de Lubac, be no exception to this 'social' character of Christianity. The Christian view on the consummation of the world is as 'social' as its view on God and humanity, creation and salvation. The kingdom of God is expressed in social terms like 'city', 'company of saints', 'family'. The resurrection of the dead will be their *congregatio*—their being brought together like they were brought together in the church. The fulfillment of creation will be its ultimate unity with the trinitarian God, that is, its ultimate unity in communion.[40]

Because someone might think that the social, common, corporate character of Christianity is emphasised at the cost of the personal character of Christianity, de Lubac adds a chapter in which he professes the interdependence of the person and the community. He roots personhood in the Trinity: very different persons though united in the one Deity. Real unity, real communion,

36 DE LUBAC, *Catholicisme*, 3, 6-9.

37 DE LUBAC, *Catholicisme*, 79 ('La mystique chrétienne de l'unité est une mystique trinitaire'); cf. 256, 258-259, 260, 267.

38 DE LUBAC, *Catholicisme*, 9-11.

39 DE LUBAC, *Catholicisme*, 12-13, 17-22, 196.

40 DE LUBAC, *Catholicisme*, 75-76, 78-80, 83, 90, 206-208; cf. DE LUBAC, *Corpus Mysticum*, 315-317, 322.

strives at the fulfillment, not the suppression, of personhood. In a Christian anthropology, de Lubac says, the person can never be defined as an individual or a monad. One being needs another being in order to find itself. Both God and fellow humans are the eyes through which the person can learn to see himself or herself. This kind of personhood, rooted in the trinitarian God and in the unity of the human race, is devoid of egotism. Denying this anthropology leads either to lonely individualism or to a standardised suppression of personhood. The world view of Christianity envisages a city in which every person can live freely and in communion with others. 'Conversion' is always 'vocation': the personal relationship with God is at the same time the task to turn oneself to others in love. Finally, according to de Lubac, one becomes only a full person when one takes part in Christ, who is fulfilled humanity in himself. Participation in Christ means, therefore, becoming a true person, as well as becoming one with all others who are in the church, in Christ, in God.[41]

3.2.3 The Church

The church is the present form of this restored communion. Because the church is 'Christ extended and communicated', the church on its way through time 'is' the salvific process of the reunion of humanity to itself and to God.[42] Hence the church's name: 'Catholicism' is not the name of an organisation, but the indication of the essence of Christian salvation: to unite everyone. The church reveals that, in spite of breaches, humanity is essentially, and should be effectively, one.[43] The church is in some sense nothing else than 'the human race itself', in so far as it is united in Christ and vivified by the Spirit.[44] *Mundus reconciliatus, Ecclesia* (Augustine).[45]

The fact that salvation happens through the church, is explained by de Lubac as follows. In both the Old and New Testaments, salvation does not

41 DE LUBAC, *Catholicisme*, 253-267.

42 DE LUBAC, *Catholicisme*, 23 ('Jésus-Christ répandu et communiqué'; a citation from Bossuet). The same in: DE LUBAC, *Méditation*, 39. With the *patres*, de Lubac calls the church 'Christ continued' and the eucharist a 'prolongation of the incarnation': DE LUBAC, *Corpus Mysticum*, 34 ('le Christ continué'), 52 ('Prolongement [...] de l'Incarnation'); cf. 270 ('Les sacrements [...] continuent l'Incarnation'). He also calls the church 'the mysterious extension of the Trinity in time': DE LUBAC, *Méditation*, 206 ('mystérieuse extension de la Trinité dans le temps'). See also the end of paragraph 3.2.6, where the identity between Christ and the church is established through the identity of the three forms of the body of Christ.

43 DE LUBAC, *Catholicisme*, 23-27; DE LUBAC, *Méditation*, 44-45, 50-54, 85-86, 152-158, 205-209.

44 DE LUBAC, *Catholicisme*, 138 ('l'Eglise n'était point autre que le genre humain lui-même, dans toutes les phases de son histoire, en tant qu'il devait aboutir au Christ et être vivifié par son Esprit').

45 DE LUBAC, *Méditation*, 158. Cf. AUGUSTINE, *Sermones ad populum*, sermo 96, 8 (PL 38, 588).

happen between God and an individual, but between God and the social fabric (the people of Israel; the Christian church) into which individuals are incorporated. People are called (*kletoi*)—not to believe individually, but to take part in being church (*ekklesia*). Understood this way, de Lubac is able to say that the church, understood this way, is not a *means* towards salvation and fulfillment, but that the church is *itself* salvation and fulfillment. Because, as far as the church is the restored unity of God and humans, and of the human race, the church is—on its way to the eschatological consummation—the present form of salvation and fulfillment, namely: unity, communion.[46]

The other way round, de Lubac can say that the ultimate fulfillment is when the body of Christ will be complete. The salvific meaning of the church will, eschatologically, not be limited to the present boundaries of the visible church. Nevertheless, de Lubac upholds both the traditional statement that everyone is called to salvation *and* the traditional statement that salvation is not to be found outside the church. If the whole human race is one by its common creation in the image of the trinitarian God and by its common goal of being reunited with and in the trinitarian God, then this redeeming reunion—that happens by Christ through his body, the church—is not perfected until it embraces the whole human race. Whether one is a member of the visible church or not, ultimate salvation cannot be anything else than that the whole creation will be 'church', that is, one reunited communion. *Totus ergo mundus Ecclesia est* (Augustine).[47] Everyone will be saved, because everyone is 'an essential part of the human race that must be saved'.[48] In other words, the church is a 'substitute' representing humanity on its way to salvation.[49]

The empirical church does not automatically coincide with this restored communion (*communio sanctorum*, *corpus Christi*), but neither can it be separated from it. The same is true of the relationship between Christ and the church. Although one may never abuse the identity between Christ and the church in order to deny the sins of the church, one cannot talk about the head

46 DE LUBAC, *Catholicisme*, 32-33, 35-36, 40-41, 81. No private Christianity: DE LUBAC, *Méditation*, 35-36, 43, 83-84, 153 n. 43, 176, 183-184, 208, 229, 265-266, 271.

47 DE LUBAC, *Catholicisme*, 81-82, 85, 91-92, 159-161, 164, 167-168, 174-176, 211-213. Citation from Augustine: 213 n. 2; cf. AUGUSTINE, *In Joannis evangelium*, tractatus 87, 2 (PL 35, 1853). However, by claiming that the *mundus perditionis* is not a real part of the one human communion, Augustine—and De Lubac with him—reserve the possibility that some will perish and avoid the heresy of the *apokatastasis panton*. That the latter is latent in de Lubac is also said by J. MILBANK, *The Suspended Middle: Henri de Lubac and the Debate concerning the Supernatural* (Grand Rapids MI-Cambridge UK: Eerdmans, 2005), 108.

48 DE LUBAC, *Catholicisme*, 173 ('Bref, ils pourront être sauvés parce qu'ils font partie intégrante de l'humanité qui sera sauvée').

49 DE LUBAC, *Catholicisme*, 173 ('suppléance'); cf. 173-176, 179.

(Christ) without implying the body (the church).[50] The visible church, although both holy and sinful, is the visible manifestation of Christ and his salvation in this world. If Christ can be called the 'sacrament of God', the church is for us the 'sacrament of Christ', because the church 'represents' Christ in the most literal sense: the church gives us Christ's 'real presence'. The church does not only continue Christ's work, but himself.[51]

St Mary is the person in whom this ecclesial ideal has already become a reality. Through her election, her faith, her receptivity for the Word of God, her faithfulness to Christ and suffering with Christ during his life, passion and death, her prayerful presence in the midst of the disciples awaiting Pentecost, and her assumption into heaven, Mary is the 'archetype' of the church, the embodiment of what the church and all its members will become. She bears already in herself what the church has still to work out.[52] Sometimes this takes the form of analogy or typology. Images that can be applied to the church—second Eve, Jerusalem, bride, mother—can also be applied to Mary, and *vice versa*.[53] Sometimes the connection becomes more ontological. According to de Lubac, Mary and the church are connected to one another in a relationship of 'perichoresis', of 'communicatio idiomatum'. Both together form 'one mystery'.[54] Compared to Christ, Mary stands, of course, on the side of all the other members of the church. Compared to the other members of the church, however, Mary is the first of all. As de Lubac emphasises, it is precisely through the 'perichoresis' between Mary and the church, that Mary is not isolated from the other faithful, but remains one of them. Her singularity consists in the fact that she exemplifies and embodies what most members of the church still have to become.[55]

Finally, because it is the church's task—and the church's being—to reunite humanity, de Lubac regards heresy and schism as grave sins. It is of the

50 DE LUBAC, *Catholicisme*, 38-43, 142-143. McPartlan emphasises, however, the ontological distinction which de Lubac maintains between the head and the body; MCPARTLAN, *The Eucharist Makes the Church*, 60-61, 86, 88-97, 281-287.

51 DE LUBAC, *Catholicisme*, 45 ('Si le Christ est le Sacrement de Dieu, l'Eglise est pour nous le Sacrement du Christ, elle le représente, selon toute l'ancienne force du terme: elle nous le rend présent en vérité. Elle ne poursuit pas seulement son oeuvre, mais elle le continue lui-même'); cf. 133. The same meaning of the church as the 'sacrament of Christ' in: DE LUBAC, *Méditation*, 175-176, 181, 185, 189; cf. 267. De Lubac was a pioneer of the concept of the church as the sacrament of Christ; cf. MCPARTLAN, *The Eucharist Makes the Church*, 22. 'Thus the image of the Church as sacrament is, in [de Lubac's] thought, another manner of speaking of the Church as the body of Christ. The category of sacramentality functions as a healty corrective to the bodily imagery because it limits too close an identification between Christ and the Church'; WOOD, *Spiritual Exegesis*, 127. See also paragraph 3.4.4 (The Church as a Sacrament).

52 DE LUBAC, *Méditation*, 278, 296.

53 DE LUBAC, *Méditation*, 275-279.

54 DE LUBAC, *Méditation*, 275 ('un seul et unique mystère'), 285 ('une certaine "communication des idiomes"'), 291 ('cette "périchorèse"').

55 DE LUBAC, *Méditation*, 289-290, 304, 321-322.

church's very essence that it is *one*.[56] The other side of the same coin is that, for de Lubac, the church cannot limit itself to one cultural realm. Every form of human striving for divine-human unity can be taken up into the church. No political, economic or cultural (Greek, Latin, European) shape is the definite shape of the Catholic church. The church has not to oppose, but to embrace.[57]

3.2.4 The Eucharist

The chapter on the sacraments in *Catholicisme*, together with its elaboration in *Corpus Mysticum*, has for many in and beyond the Roman Catholic Church marked the start of a new approach to the eucharist and the liturgy. De Lubac denies nothing of the view that prevailed from the later Middle Ages, through the Counter-Reformation, to his own days, namely a sacrament as a 'means of grace' and as participation of the believer with and in Christ, but he connects this individual approach to the sacraments with a corporate, ecclesial approach. As means of grace, the sacraments are instruments of unity. As they unite people with Christ, the sacraments unite people with each other in the Christian community.[58]

Baptism is the incorporation into the church as much as personal rebirth. Reconciliation is the restoration of communion with the church as much as personal forgiveness of sins. The eucharist is the constitution of the one (ecclesial) communion, which is the body of Christ, as much as the personal communion with the (eucharistic) body of Christ.[59]

Focusing on the eucharist, de Lubac presents a number of (mainly patristic) descriptions of the eucharist which all point to its social, ecclesial character. The *catena* begins with Paul's phrase, 'Because there is one bread, we who are many are one body, for we all partake of the one bread'[60] and with the comment in the Acts of the Apostles, that the church was one *in communicatione fractionis panis*,[61] continues with an expression like *sacramentum unitatis*,[62] and includes the well known words of Augustine, 'Be what you see, receive what you are'.[63] The very word 'communion' (*koinonia*/*communio*) points both to the

56 DE LUBAC, *Catholicisme*, 46-48. VON BALTHASAR, *Henri de Lubac*, 87 n. 10, comments that de Lubac does not engage with the ecumenical problems arising at moments like this. Cf. MCPARTLAN, *The Eucharist Makes the Church*, 5.

57 DE LUBAC, *Catholicisme*, 225-230. De Lubac assures the reader that he does not mean this in a naive, or syncretistic, or liberal, but in a 'Catholic' way (230-232).

58 DE LUBAC, *Catholicisme*, 51.

59 DE LUBAC, *Catholicisme*, 52-53, 56-59.

60 DE LUBAC, *Catholicisme*, 57 (1 Corinthians 10:17).

61 DE LUBAC, *Catholicisme*, 74 (Acts 2:42 in the Vulgate).

62 DE LUBAC, *Catholicisme*, 56 (*Summa Sententiarum* 6,2)

63 DE LUBAC, *Catholicisme*, 59. Cf. AUGUSTINE, *Sermones ad populum*, sermo 272 (PL 38, 1247-1248): 'Estote quod videtis, et accipite quod estis. Hoc Apostolus de pane dixit' (with reference to 1 Corinthians 10:17). WOOD, *Spiritual Exegesis*, 53-70, points at the patristic

personal participation of the believer with and in Christ *and* to the communal, corporate incorporation into the community.[64]

According to de Lubac, this understanding of the eucharist as both communion with the body and blood of Christ and the communion of the church has been the 'classical doctrine' of the church. Paul and the *patres* taught it, Scholasticism—certainly Thomas Aquinas—took it up, it still resounded at the Council of Trent, and it has always been preserved in the liturgical texts.[65] Nevertheless, the doctrine largely disappeared into obscurity, because of an increasing emphasis on the *praesentia realis* as a result of internal and external polemics, but, says de Lubac, most of all because of a changing philosophical attitude towards reality. To see the spiritual (the universal) through the visible (the particular) fell out of fashion. So, the eucharist was increasingly regarded to refer to the 'historic' body of Christ rather than to *totus Christus* (the whole Christ, both the earthly and resurrected Christ and the church as part of Christ himself) or to the *corpus triforme* (the earthly and resurrected body, the sacramentally present body, and the ecclesial body).[66] It is in this context, that de Lubac already mentions the reversal of the meaning of *corpus verum* and *corpus mysticum*, which would become the theme of his later work, *Corpus Mysticum*.[67]

De Lubac's effort was to restore the corporate, ecclesial character of the eucharist to the prominent place it deserves in theology and spirituality. He did not mean to do so at the cost of a view on the eucharist as a personal means of grace and as the sacrament of Christ's *praesentia realis*, but in addition to it and, most of all, as the completion of it. Having communion with Christ and being incorporated into the communion of the church are two sides of the same coin. Their connection is the—earthly, resurrected, eucharistic, ecclesial—body of Christ.

3.2.5 The Body of Christ: Historical, Eucharistic, Ecclesial

In his detailed case study, *Corpus Mysticum*, de Lubac worked out the relationship between the eucharistic body of Christ and the ecclesial body of Christ as introduced in *Catholicisme*. Paul, the Fathers—with Augustine as 'the summit of the patristic era'[68]—and the early Middle Ages (up to the ninth century) used the word *corpus* (without *mysticum*) to describe both the eucharist and the church. Eucharist and church were related as cause and effect, as sign

way of reading Scripture as the background of both the Fathers' and de Lubac's view on the eucharist in relation to the church.

64 De Lubac, *Catholicisme*, 60.

65 De Lubac, *Catholicisme*, 63 ('doctrine classique'); cf. 62-64, 67-72.

66 De Lubac, *Catholicisme*, 64-67; cf. 245-247, 312-313.

67 De Lubac, *Catholicisme*, 66; cf. paragraph 3.2.5.

68 De Lubac, *Corpus Mysticum*, 262 ('le sommet de l'âge patristique').

and reality.[69] The church—the communion of the faithful with Christ and with one another—was 'the goal [...] of the sacrament'.[70] Christ, present in the eucharist, together with his church, united in the eucharist, constituted *totus Christus*, the fullness of head and body.[71] If one had to choose, the real *corpus*, the real body of Christ—*corpus verum*—was not so much the eucharist but the church, because the church was seen as the fullness of the body of Christ.[72]

In the same patristic times, the words *mysterium* and *mysticus* indicated anything related to the sacraments, particularly the eucharist.[73] *Mysticus* had little to do with our present 'mysterious'. Rather, it referred to an act *in mysterio*, that is, a sacramental act. Thus, when first used in combination, *corpus mysticum* referred to the sacramental body of Christ, as distinguished from his historical body.[74] This change from *corpus* to *corpus mysticum*—referring to the eucharist—dates from the ninth century. It became a standard expression, irrespective of the theological school to which an author might belong. During this period, the term *corpus mysticum* referred to the eucharist but not without implying the ecclesial *corpus*.[75]

It took until the twelfth century before *corpus mysticum* no longer referred to the eucharist but to the church. According to de Lubac, the most notable contribution to this change was the controversy over the eucharistic doctrine of Berengar of Tours (c. 1010-1088), which necessitated the development of new terminology. As de Lubac analyses, Berengar presented himself as a champion of tradition by using patristic (Augustinian and pseudo-Augustinian) vocabulary, without, however, realising that neither he nor his contemporaries could understand this vocabulary any longer in the context of patristic ways of thought. After centuries, the same words had received new meanings, at least new connotations. Berengar used patristic 'symbolic' terminology. But, says de Lubac, the Fathers understood 'symbolism' in a way different from, perhaps even opposite to, the way Berengar understood and used it. For the Fathers, 'symbolism' referred to a *reality* of faith, whereas for Berengar, 'symbolism' had come to receive the *non-realist* meaning we still use to associate with the word 'symbolic'. The patristic understanding of 'truth' gave way to the rationalist concept of 'reality'; the patristic meaning of 'symbolism' gave way to the fideistic idea of a 'miracle'. Therefore, in order to say the same, Catholic orthodoxy had to coin new phrases, while heterodoxy, although using traditional words, said something new and different. 'Eternal history of all archaisms!'[76]

69 DE LUBAC, *Corpus Mysticum*, 23 ('cause' and 'effet', 'signe' and 'réalité').
70 DE LUBAC, *Corpus Mysticum*, 34 ('la fin [...] du mystère'); cf. 211-212, 216.
71 DE LUBAC, *Corpus Mysticum*, 34, 83-84, 103-104, 118, 202, 254.
72 DE LUBAC, *Corpus Mysticum*, 89, 94-95, 211-214, 279.
73 DE LUBAC, *Corpus Mysticum*, 47-51, 55-64, 243; cf. 258-267.
74 DE LUBAC, *Corpus Mysticum*, 42 n. 108, 63-64, 281-282.
75 DE LUBAC, *Corpus Mysticum*, 39-44, 67-83.
76 DE LUBAC, *Corpus Mysticum*, 165 ('Eternelle histoire de tous les archaïsmes!'). On the role of the Berengar controversy, cf. 95, 105, 162, 181, 183, 210, 238, 249-250, 252-257, 273-

To the new vocabulary belonged the terms *corpus verum* for the eucharist and *corpus mysticum* for the church. De Lubac welcomes this development in so far as it secures Christ's real presence in the eucharist, in this new era aptly indicated by the word *verum*. But he deplores the side-effect which it had on the doctrine of the church and on the relationship between the eucharist and the church. This relationship became virtually non-existent and the doctrine of the church suffered increasing externalisation, among other reasons due to the fact that *mysticum* was no longer understood as 'sacramental' but as 'not real'. The church as the body of Christ came to be regarded as a mere metaphor, rather than as the patristic reality of *totus Christus*: Christ and the church, head and body.[77]

As an illustration of this process, de Lubac follows the changing theology of the *corpus triforme*—the 'threefold body' which was already encountered in the previous paragraph—throughout the centuries. Originally used by Amalarius of Metz (c. 780-850), the term received its current meaning—especially through a false attribution to Augustine—in the writings of Paschasius Radbertus (c. 790-860), who used it to distinguish *and* connect Christ's earthly and resurrected body, Christ's sacramental body and Christ's ecclesial body. In the ninth and tenth centuries, the term primarily distinguished the former from the two latter bodies: Christ's earthly and resurrected body as distinguished from the eucharistic and ecclesial bodies, the two latter being closely connected.[78] From the eleventh century onwards, however, the term came to be used in order to distinguish—on the one hand—the earthly and resurrected body *and* the eucharistic body, which were virtually equated, from—on the other hand—the ecclesial body, which was no longer seen to be ontologically connected to the two former bodies, but only in a metaphorical relationship.[79]

Throughout the book, de Lubac emphasises that the original ecclesial approach of the eucharist, and the fact that this approach gradually fell into desuetude, constitute a natural development rather than a discontinuity. Therefore, *Corpus Mysticum* can be read as a study in doctrinal development.

274, 291. On patristic symbolism, cf. 151-152, 249-260, 274-277, 284-285, 287 ('symbolisme ontologique'), 310-312. On truth versus reality, and mystery versus miracle, cf. 252-258, 267-274, 276.

77 According to de Lubac, the tradition to call the church *corpus mysticum* started with 'Magister Simon' (c. 1170) and became widespread through William of Auxerre's *Summa aurea* (c. 1225). Albert the Great, Bonaventure and Aquinas used it as a customary technical term. Cf. DE LUBAC, *Corpus Mysticum*, 18, 114-115, 119, 121-135, 209-210, 274-277. On *mysticum—verum*, cf. 123, 185, 210, 213-214, 234, 236, 239, 241, 247, 248, 279-280. On the metaphoric understanding of the church as the body of Christ, cf. 100-101, 275, 280, 285.

78 DE LUBAC, *Corpus Mysticum*, 32-42, 84-91, 95-96, 112, 142-143, 293. In an appendix, de Lubac presents a separate case study on the *corpus triforme*: DE LUBAC, *Corpus Mysticum*, 295-339 (esp. 298-299, 301, 303, 338-339).

79 DE LUBAC, *Corpus Mysticum*, 104-115, 143-145, 184-188, 248, 281, 288.

De Lubac affirms the gradual development, although he deplores the loss of some aspects in the process. Particularly in view of heresy, de Lubac acknowledges that, in the course of time, theologians had to change terminology in order to express the same truth. In eucharistic doctrine, heresy not seldom occurred as the use of traditional formulations in a new context, while the meaning of the traditional sayings had changed by the different context.

Primarily, however, *Corpus Mysticum* can be read as a plea for a rediscovery of the inseparability of the three aspects of the body of Christ. Christ's historical body (the earthly and resurrected Christ) is present in the sacramental body—both *verum* (real) and *mysticum* (sacramental)—but no less in the ecclesial body (*totus Christus*, head and body). On several pages, de Lubac intersperses his historical argumentation with pleas for a return to the ancient understanding of both eucharist and church as the two intertwined ways in which Christ is present in this world.[80] This understanding, de Lubac says, is ecumenically important, particularly in view of Orthodoxy. Moreover, it enriches ecclesiology on the one hand with its complex systematic-theological depth and on the other hand with its tangible concreteness.[81]

3.2.6 The Eucharist Makes the Church— The Church Makes the Eucharist

It is Henri de Lubac who has coined one of eucharistic ecclesiology's most famous phrases, 'The eucharist makes the church'. Sometimes even mistaken for a patristic citation,[82] it first occurred in de Lubac's *Corpus Mysticum* and subsequently in his *Méditation sur l'Eglise*. In *Corpus Mysticum*, the phrase 'The eucharist makes the church' functions in the context of the strong relationship between the church and the eucharist as described in the previous paragraphs.[83] The same applies to *Méditation sur l'Eglise*: the church, which

[80] Not because de Lubac thinks the emphasis on the real eucharistic presence is wrong, but because it had a reducing effect on the doctrine of the church by eleminating its relationship to the eucharist. Cf. DE LUBAC, *Corpus Mysticum*, 47, 248 ('fatal'), 250 ('L'orthodoxie est peut-être sauve, mais la doctrine, en revanche, est sûrement appauvrie'), 287 ('on se prive délibérément d'une part *essentielle* de la doctrine eucharistique des anciens'), 291-293.

[81] H. DE LUBAC, *Corpus Mysticum. Kirche und Eucharistie im Mittelalter. Eine historische Studie*, übertragen von H.U. von Balthasar (Einsiedeln: Johannes, 1969), 9-10 (from de Lubac's 1969 introduction to the German translation).

[82] MCPARTLAN, *The Eucharist Makes the Church*, xv. Some patristic phrases approximate de Lubac's formula, cf. DE LUBAC, *Méditation*, 129 (Augustine: 'sacramenta [...], quibus Ecclesia fabricatur'; cf. Thomas Aquinas: 'Per sacramenta [...] dicitur esse fabricata Ecclesia Christi').

[83] DE LUBAC, *Corpus Mysticum*, 104 ('A la lettre, donc, l'Eucharistie fait l'Eglise'); cf. 292. See also paragraphs 3.2.4 and 3.2.5.

is—really, not metaphorically—the body of Christ, is constituted through its participation in the eucharistic body of Christ.[84]

In the *Méditation*, however, the phrase 'The eucharist makes the church' is joined by its counterpart 'The church makes the eucharist'. This occurs in the context of de Lubac's exposition of the double identity of the church. The church is both active and passive—both calling and called, both sanctifying and sanctified, both creating members by baptism and created by baptism, the *sanctorum communio* both as the communion with the (sanctifying) holy things and as the community of the (sanctified) saints.[85] Both a Mother and the recipient of the Mother's grace.[86] Both made by the eucharist and making the eucharist.[87]

With the phrase 'The church makes the eucharist', an emphasis on the ordained ministry enters de Lubac's writings, which hardly matches his usual ecclesiological language. If—as we saw so far—the church aims at embracing all humankind into one communion with God and one another, if the (whole) church is the body of Christ, and if the (whole) church is *totus Christus*, it surprises the reader to learn that, according to de Lubac, the liturgy is not celebrated by the whole church[88] and the eucharistic consecration is 'in no way' the work of the whole church.[89] 'The "hierarchical" church makes the eucharist.'[90] This is especially surprising because it is explained by the fact that the making of the eucharist is 'the cult *of the Lord*', which requires 'a power received from Christ',[91] as if the (whole) church—emphatically called *totus Christus* and *corpus Christi* by de Lubac—has not received a power from Christ and is not able to celebrate, or concelebrate, the cult of the Lord.[92] The clericalist trace here is not the requirement of the presidency of an ordained minister, but the exclusivity with which the ordained minister is said to 'make' the eucharist. Consequently, the liturgical role of the non-ordained part of the

84 De Lubac, *Méditation*, 113 ('C'est l'Eglise qui fait l'Eucharistie, mais c'est aussi l'Eucharistie qui fait l'Eglise'), 113 ('L'Eglise fait l'Eucharistie'), 117 ('L'Eglise "hiérarchique" fait l'Eucharistie'—a comment on this phrase follows below), 128 ('l'instant sacré où l'Eglise s'apprête à *faire l'Eucharistie*'—namely, the words of institution understood as the consecration), 129 ('à son tour, au sens le plus strict, l'Eucharistie *fait l'Eglise*'), 333 ('L'Eglise fait l'Eucharistie'; 'L'Eucharistie fait l'Eglise').

85 De Lubac, *Méditation*, 86-94.

86 De Lubac, *Méditation*, 279, 293.

87 De Lubac, *Méditation*, 113.

88 De Lubac, *Méditation*, 117 ('Mais ce sacerdoce du peuple chrétien ne concerne pas la vie liturgique de l'Eglise. Il n'a pas de rapport direct à la confection de l'Eucharistie').

89 De Lubac, *Méditation*, 121 ('celle-ci n'est en rien le fait de la communauté').

90 De Lubac, *Méditation*, 117 ('L'Eglise "hiérarchique" fait l'Eucharistie'); cf. 126. This position is critically evaluated in paragraph 8.5.3.

91 De Lubac, *Méditation*, 120 ('le culte *du Seigneur*', 'un pouvoir reçu du Christ').

92 Of course under the presidency of a bishop or one of his priests, who exercise a 'service spécial'; cf. de Lubac, *Méditation*, 119.

church is—contrary to de Lubac's usual emphasis on the dignity of the whole church—reduced to a passive one.[93]

Nevertheless, de Lubac's usual inclusive language can also be found in the *Méditation*. The (whole) church is 'a cultic community'.[94] 'The eucharist is the effective sign of the spiritual sacrifice offered to God by *totus Christus*.'[95] Because 'church' means 'assembly', the church 'never deserves its name more than when the people of God gather at a given place around their shepherd for the eucharistic celebration'.[96] Although each local eucharistic community is just a 'cell of the large body', the whole body is present in it.[97] There is but one church, which is *per mysterium* present in all its parts. The unity of the one church exists through the bishops who are in eucharistic communion with one another and with the bishop of Rome.[98] Throughout all the eucharistic celebrations, the church has but one altar. In celebrations great and small, far and near, '[e]verywhere happens the great assembly'.[99]

The eucharist makes the church: the eucharistic communion and the ecclesial communion, the eucharistic body and the ecclesial body, are identical.[100] According to de Lubac, the Pauline and patristic use of the word 'body' for Christ's historical, eucharistic and ecclesial body is never a metaphoric play upon words, but indicates the same reality in all three senses.[101] For de Lubac, 'body of Christ' is the central ecclesiological category.[102] It indicates the incorporation of the whole church into Christ, it indicates to a

93 McPARTLAN, *The Eucharist Makes the Church*, interestingly explains this clericalist trace by pointing at de Lubac's 'narrow understanding of the Eucharist' (51), being exclusively focused on bread and wine as consecrated by the priest (88-89, 97, 103-104, 113-114). The idea that it could be 'the eucharistic celebration', in which 'the gathered community was itself the eucharistic presence of Christ' (72), the idea that 'the Eucharist is the assembled community', was emphatically denied by de Lubac in a personal conversation with McPartlan (73 n. 128).

94 DE LUBAC, *Méditation*, 127 ('communauté cultuelle'), a citation from C. Spicq.

95 DE LUBAC, *Méditation*, 130 ('L'Eucharistie est le signe efficace du sacrifice spirituel offert à Dieu par le Christ total').

96 DE LUBAC, *Méditation*, 127 ('Le mot même d'Eglise [...] veut dire assemblée. [...] Jamais elle ne mérite mieux son nom que lorsque, dans un lieu donné, le Peuple de Dieu se presse autour de son Pasteur pour la célébration eucharistique').

97 DE LUBAC, *Méditation*, 127 ('une cellule du grand corps').

98 DE LUBAC, *Méditation*, 127 ('*in pluribus una, in singulis per mysterium tota*', a citation from Peter Damian). McPARTLAN, *The Eucharist Makes the Church*, 101, 114, remarks that de Lubac gives here a eucharistic foundation of the *structures* of the church, of which he usually claims that it is impossible (cf. paragraph 3.2.9).

99 DE LUBAC, *Méditation*, 129 ('Partout le grand rassemblement s'opère').

100 DE LUBAC, *Méditation*, 131, 133.

101 DE LUBAC, *Corpus Mysticum*, 33 ('Car le corps du Christ qu'est l'Eglise n'est point *autre* que ce corps et ce sang du mystère. Il n'y a point là, à proprement parler, de jeu de mots'); cf. DE LUBAC, *Méditation*, 109-113, 129-130, 133 n. 117, 181, 308.

102 DE LUBAC, *Méditation*, 101-106.

certain extent the identity between Christ and the church,[103] but it also indicates the differentiation—although not the separation—between the head (Christ) and the body (the church).[104] Christ's 'real' presence in the eucharist 'realises' his presence in and as the church.[105] Through the eucharist, the groom and the bride become 'one flesh'.[106] So, de Lubac can summarise, the eucharist is 'the heart of the church'.[107]

3.2.7 The Historical Character of Christianity

Complementary to the *social* character of the Christian faith is, according to de Lubac, its *historical* character. Christianity has 'a social and historical vision of the world'.[108] Its world view is, then, not circular but linear—from creation, through history, to fulfillment. The world makes sense, because it has a goal. Christianity has inherited its historical character from Judaism. It is confirmed by the incarnation, which implies that the redemption of history takes place in and through time, not by a docetic escape from it. The world is the good creation of the good Creator, and proceeds through time towards its redemption by the Redeemer who is the same as the Creator.[109]

Both the social and the historical character of Christianity lead de Lubac to his affirmation of cultures and religions. If the human race is essentially one, and if history is the essentially good creation on its way towards consummation, then all human and historical aims at unity and fulfillment should be taken seriously. For this reason, says de Lubac, the church has never hesitated to incorporate 'pagan' thought (e.g., philosophy) and practice (e.g., ritual) into its own world view. Especially the other religions are taken (relatively) seriously by de Lubac, who regards them as humanity's longing for the restoration of divine-human communion, that is, as preparation for the religion of the incarnation.[110]

This view of de Lubac's is based upon his conviction that unredeemed human nature is weakened but not wicked. The divine is not completely

[103] The best-known biblical reference for this identity is 1 Corinthians 12:12, where Paul says 'Christ' where he means the church as the body of Christ. Cf. DE LUBAC, *Méditation*, 103. The same is expressed when the church is called the 'sacrament of Christ'; cf. paragraph 3.2.3.

[104] DE LUBAC, *Méditation*, 103-104; cf. 195. On de Lubac's balance between identity and difference regarding the relationship between Christ and his body the church, cf. WOOD, *Spiritual Exegesis*, 85-89.

[105] DE LUBAC, *Corpus Mysticum*, 284 ('Présence réelle, parce que réalisante').

[106] DE LUBAC, *Méditation*, 135; cf. Ephesians 5:29-32.

[107] DE LUBAC, *Méditation*, 107, 137 ('le coeur de l'Eglise'); cf. 285-286.

[108] DE LUBAC, *Catholicisme*, 185 ('vision sociale et historique du monde').

[109] DE LUBAC, *Catholicisme*, 95-101, 106, 109-120, 187.

[110] DE LUBAC, *Catholicisme*, 107, 116-117, 215-224.

banished from its sight. The image of the Creator is veiled, but still present in the creature.[111]

His openness to religions and cultures, human knowledge and science, does not mean that de Lubac affirms them unreservedly. Particularly in view of Marxism, de Lubac is eager to differentiate between materialist forms of collectivity and his own social Catholicism. Immanent forms of collectivism lead, suspects de Lubac, to the privilege of some—some individuals, one people, one generation. Only a transcendent centre liberates humanity from its self-centredness and grants personhood and communion.[112]

The incarnation—redemption in and through time—implies that historical reality 'is' salvific process. God's way through history—his covenant relationship with Israel, his covenant relationship with the church—is the way salvation takes place. Understanding Christianity is not interpreting a book, but living a historical reality—the social and historical reality of God and humanity, Christ and the church.[113]

3.2.8 On de Lubac's Theological Method

When one looks back at the themes discussed so far, it is not surprising that de Lubac's works—not least his first, programmatic work *Catholicisme*—had the effect of an eye-opener to many theologians of his generation and the next. Here was a consistent overall picture of Christianity as a living faith within a living community. By its fresh insights from biblical, patristic and high medieval sources, it was received with relief by those who welcomed this transcending of the fixed patterns of the later Middle Ages, the Counter-Reformation and the Enlightenment.

De Lubac's contribution to Roman Catholic and ecumenical theology surpasses the specific themes to which his detailed studies are devoted, such as exegesis, ecclesiology, eucharistic doctrine, knowledge of and respect for other religions.[114] More general was his influence through his new (or rather, rediscovered) method—theology not as neo-scholastic reasoning on the basis of a set of propositions, but as the (time and again reassessed) effort to describe a living faith (de Lubac's holistic concept of Catholicism) in a living Lord (God incarnated in Jesus Christ) within a living community (both the church and the world in their relationship—their communion—with God). This theology aims

111 DE LUBAC, *Catholicisme*, 216, 288, 291-292; cf. DE LUBAC, *Méditation*, 166 n. 115. This line of thought, already present in *Catholicisme*, was to be elaborated in de Lubac's *Surnaturel* (1946) and, after much controversy, *Le mystère du surnaturel* (1965). Cf. paragraph 3.2.8.

112 DE LUBAC, *Catholicisme*, X, 238-239, 277-278, 280-284.

113 DE LUBAC, *Catholicisme*, 121-123, 129.

114 With these studies he influenced the thought of Vatican II on the corresponding themes; cf. HOUTEPEN, *Theologen op zoek naar God*, 54.

rather at including than at excluding. Most importantly, it does not envisage God as a supernatural power separated from the created world. Precisely such a concept of 'theism' has naturally given rise to 'atheism': faith in the 'supernatural' can be 'respectfully laid aside' when it is only a 'storage place of dead truths'. De Lubac's theology rather thinks of God as a personal and incarnated God, living in a relationship with those whom he has created in his own image.[115] As Susan Wood explains:

> The supernatural is not a 'supernature' with its own consistency and its own subsistence, something that would be 'added' to human nature. Yet the tension is continually between union and distinction [... which] resolves itself finally into an association of intimate union. However, even in the closest union, there is a distinction. [...] Therefore the alternative to extrinsicism is not immanentism but transformation, incorporation, adoption.[116]

De Lubac, then, challenged leading Thomist theology by questioning the adequacy of its reading of Aquinas. Is the distinction between the 'natural' and the 'supernatural' a divide which leaves room for a completely secular understanding of 'pure nature', so that humanity and the world can, in themselves, be adequately interpreted 'with the help of a strictly analytic rather than intuitive reason'? Or is it—as de Lubac thinks—impossible to have such an 'unassisted vision' of the natural, because full creatureliness is only possible 'under the *aegis* of grace'?[117] John Milbank explains what this principle means for de Lubac's ecclesiology:

> [W]hile human social nature in its entirety can only be judged rightly in the light of the supernatural, the latter is not a sort of additional 'something' operating a theocratic usurpation of natural human debate and action. Nor is the authority of grace within the Church something extrinsic and invisible, in contrast to visible church structures that can be justified on merely rational principles (often a post-Tridentine view). Instead it arrives intrinsically, in the symbolism and liturgy of the Eucharist which 'makes' the Church.[118]

115 '[La foy] n'est pas un dépôt de vérités mortes qu'on met "respectueusement à part"', de Lubac as cited in FREY, *Mysterium der Kirche—Öffnung zur Welt*, 75. Cf. HOUTEPEN, *Theologen op zoek naar God*, 49-51; MCPARTLAN, *Sacrament of Salvation*, 50.

116 WOOD, *Spiritual Exegesis*, 119.

117 MILBANK, *The Suspended Middle*, 17-19. Cf. KERR, *Twentieth-Century Catholic Theologians*, 72-75, where, moreover, de Lubac's theology is related to the context of French laicism, which banned Catholicism from public space and stimulated its self-understanding as a rather individualist, spiritual affair. In this sense, paradoxically, 'the emergence of Enlightenment modernity was created by a neoscholastic theology, which forgot that we have by nature a desire for God' (85).

118 MILBANK, *The Suspended Middle*, 60.

That de Lubac did not expect an easy reception of his work is indicated by the extremely large amount of references, both in his main text and in his footnotes, to authorities from Scripture and the Early Church, but also from the ongoing Catholic tradition throughout the centuries. De Lubac claims not to present his personal theology, but the theology of the great tradition, to be found in Catholic writers of various times and places—primarily the Early Church—and in the Catholic liturgy.[119] The corporate and historical character of Christianity may have been obscured in some periods—and is perceived by de Lubac as largely forgotten in his own time—but it is nevertheless 'the constant teaching of the church'.[120]

According to de Lubac, the forces that contributed to the neglect of this view on faith and church include Aristotelian logic and Roman law. He says that the Platonism of the Fathers was more apt to describe the Christian mystery than the analytical method of Aristotelianism. Helpful as the latter can undoubtedly be for theological clarity, it runs the risk of obscuring the organic and united reality of the Christian faith. Something similar applies to Roman law, that has introduced into church and faith a legal atmosphere that is not congenial to it. Moreover, de Lubac points to the role controversy (both internal controversies and the controversy with the Reformation) has played in forgetting the consistent, united overall view of Christianity. Particularly in the field of ecclesiology and sacramentology, controversy has given rise to a one-sided view on the matter. De Lubac's view on Catholicism does not accept the dichotomies evoked by controversy. Catholicism is not 'inverted Protestantism'.[121] But most of all, says de Lubac, has the social and historical character of Christianity been neglected because of 'a general emergence of individualism'.[122]

The rediscovery of the social and historical character of Christianity has, according to de Lubac, started with Möhler's *Tübinger Schule*. De Lubac wants this rediscovery process to go on, by getting to know the Fathers of the church (with their 'broad humanism') better, by restoring the notion of the mystical body of Christ to its deserved prominence in ecclesiology, and by realising that Christ cannot be seen otherwise than as the head of both his body the Church *and* the whole human race. This rediscovery must not mean a rejection of the

119 De Lubac, *Catholicisme*, xiii, 67, 239, 249-251, 287.

120 De Lubac, *Catholicisme*, 51 ('Tel est l'enseignement constant de l'Eglise'); cf. 56-57.

121 De Lubac, *Catholicisme*, 236-244 (citation 244: 'Le catholicisme (...) se réfuse à n'être qu'un protestantisme retourné'). De Lubac mentions the fact that the dogmatic treatise on the church has largely been evoked by two opponents: the secular power (against which the church upheld its prerogatives) and Protestantism (against which the church upheld the Papacy). Hence the unbalanced character of the ecclesiological treatise in the centuries preceding de Lubac's time (243). The same line of thought applies to the eucharist (245-247), cf. paragraph 3.2.5.

122 De Lubac, *Catholicisme*, 238 ('un développement général de l'individualisme').

periods after the Early Church, nor an escape from the present day by hiding in the past, but the retrieval of the continuous thread throughout the centuries.[123]

When de Lubac thus relativises his recourse to the Fathers, this recourse is nevertheless unmistakably present. Although the Fathers are never played off against the later theological developments, de Lubac simply gives them priority because, he says, they were the first to systematically interpret Scripture and the liturgy. Moreover, de Lubac emphasises that the theology of the early and high Middle Ages is not to be seen in opposition to the Fathers, but as largely based upon their teaching.[124]

Probably the most important aspect of de Lubac's approach is its interrelatedness. De Lubac presents the various themes of the Christian faith—trinity, christology, soteriology, ecclesiology, sacramentology, eschatology—not as separate 'truths' which belong only coincidentally together, but as different angles to look at the same matter, the matter being the one truth that God and humanity are destined to be united into one communion.[125]

3.2.9 Conclusion

It is not difficult to see the importance of de Lubac's writings for a liturgical ecclesiology. In the first place, because de Lubac presents a eucharistic ecclesiology himself.[126] In the second place, because de Lubac's overall approach to Christianity is centred around communion.

Firstly, de Lubac is one of the pioneers of eucharistic ecclesiology. From the Fathers of the church, but also from the early and high Middle Ages and from the liturgy, he presents a view on the church which is inseparable from the eucharist. It is the eucharist by which the church is built up. The church can be described as 'no more' than the effect of the eucharist ('the eucharist makes the church'): the eucharistic communion leads the participants into the ecclesial

123 DE LUBAC, *Catholicisme*, 248-250 (citation 249: 'le large humanisme des Pères').

124 DE LUBAC, *Catholicisme*, XIII, 15-16, 59-60, 119, 126-133, 247-250; DE LUBAC, *Méditation*, 210, 213-214.

125 Cf. DE LUBAC, *Catholicisme*, 23, 244, 280. VON BALTHASAR, *Henri de Lubac*, 94-95, describes de Lubac's 'Einheit des Glaubens [...] inhaltlich als Glaube an den einen drieeinigen Gott in seiner Bewegung im Christusereignis auf die Welt zu, formal als Empfang dieser Bewegung durch die Kirche (in dynamischer Stellvertretung der Welt), die in sich alle einzelnen Glaubensakte einbirgt. So enthält das Credo letztlich auch nur ein einziges 'Dogma', dessen Mysterium sich in viele Aspekte auseinanderfalten kann und muss.'

126 This can be upheld even when de Lubac himself thinks 'the term "eucharistic ecclesiology" is "too short"', because he claims that not *everything* in the church can be explained from the eucharist, particularly not its structure, especially the Papal ministry (MCPARTLAN, *The Eucharist Makes the Church*, 98, 114, 119). When we do not follow de Lubac in his 'narrow understanding of the Eucharist' (cf. paragraph 3.2.6), de Lubac's ecclesiology can appropriately be regarded as eucharistic (even in its relation to the structures of the church; cf. paragraph 3.2.6).

communion. The other way round, the eucharist can be described as 'no more' than the church in celebratory action ('the church makes the eucharist'): the ecclesial communion is manifested by its celebration of the eucharistic communion.

The Pauline and patristic term 'body of Christ' is the key to de Lubac's eucharistic ecclesiology. According to de Lubac, Christ's historical body—that is, the living person of Christ himself—pervades both the eucharist and the church *in mysterio*. This 'mystical' way in which the eucharist and the church are Christ's body is neither 'mysterious' nor 'not real', but 'sacramental' in the very 'realistic' way in which the Fathers understood sacramental symbolism. Although Christ remains the head of his body the church, Christ is not an entity separate from the church. The church is in Christ and Christ is in the church; head and body together are *totus Christus*. The reality of Christ's eucharistic body realises the same reality in Christ's ecclesial body.

Secondly, de Lubac's eucharistic ecclesiology is in no sense an inward-looking liturgical or ecclesial paradigm. On the contrary, it is a large world view, which starts with the trinitarian God and the whole human race, and which has the aim to end again—through Christ, the eucharist and the church—with the trinitarian God and the whole human race. Its keyword *Catholicisme* means all-embracing communion. In de Lubac's view, a full eucharistic ecclesiology is only reached when the whole creation will be 'eucharist' and 'church', that is, when the whole redeemed creation will have returned to participation in the trinitarian communion.

3.3 JOSEPH RATZINGER

3.3.1 Life and Work

Before 2005, when he became Pope Benedict XVI, Joseph Ratzinger (born 1927) was a leading Roman Catholic theologian. A Professor of Dogmatic Theology from age 30, he has always since taken part in the international theological debate. He held professorial chairs in Freising, Bonn, Münster, Tübingen and Regensburg, and was connected to the Second Vatican Council, first as the archbishop of Cologne's adviser and later as an official theologian (*peritus*). Since those days, some critics distinguish the 'earlier' and the 'later' Ratzinger, a distinction often connected to his participation in the foundation of, first, the journal *Concilium* and, later, the journal *Communio*.[127] In 1977 he became archbishop of München-Freising, the metropolitan see of his native land

[127] Cf. L. BOEVE, 'Kerk, theologie en heilswaarheid. De klare visie van Joseph Ratzinger', *Tijdschrift voor theologie* 33 (1993), 139-165, at 139-140. See also paragraph 3.1.2 (Theological Reassessment).

Bavaria. When Pope John Paul II asked him to become the Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, Ratzinger agreed on the condition that he was allowed to remain, next to his office within the curia, a theological author on his own account. He moved von Munich to Rome in 1982.

Like all other sections in this study, this one will present those thoughts of the author which are relevant to an ecumenical quest for a liturgical ecclesiology. This section is, therefore, far from an assessment of Pope Benedict's theological position in general. Neither is it a complete overview of Ratzinger's ecclesiological thought,[128] or of his sometimes controversial opinions concerning the liturgy. Ratzinger is discussed in this study for one important reason—because he upholds a thoroughly eucharistic ecclesiology. Compared to the usual emphasis on Ratzinger's opposition to, initially, the political theologies of the nineteen seventies and eighties and, subsequently, the liberalism and relativism of Western society after the *Wende* of 1989,[129] a study of the theological foundations of Ratzinger's eucharistic ecclesiology may shed light on another side of Ratzinger's lifelong theological *oeuvre*.

During half the century between his dissertation, published in 1954, and his election as bishop of Rome in 2005, Ratzinger has published no less than fifty books,[130] most of which refer to ecclesiological themes and many of which contain contributions to eucharistic ecclesiology. This continuous line throughout his life is remarkably illustrated by the fact that Ratzinger's dissertation can be read as his first ecclesiological publication, in which he laid the foundation for the biblical, patristic, eucharistic ecclesiology which would remain characteristic for all his theological work, and that—at the other end of half a century—he took up the theme of the centrality of the eucharist for the life of the church in his first address as bishop of Rome, the very morning after his election. Therefore, the dissertation[131] and the first papal address[132] will serve as starting point and conclusion of this section.

128 It should be particularly mentioned that Ratzinger's views on the relationship between the local and the universal Church and on the 'Petrine ministry' will only be discussed when they flow directly from the eucharistic principles of his ecclesiology. For Ratzinger's ecclesiology at large see M. VOLF, *Trinität und Gemeinschaft. Eine ökumenische Ekklesiologie* (Mainz: Matthias-Grünewald-Verlag; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1996); T. WEILER, *Volk Gottes—Leib Christi. Die Ekklesiologie Joseph Ratzingers und ihr Einfluss auf das Zweite Vatikanische Konzil* (Mainz: Matthias-Grünewald-Verlag, 1997); M.H. HEIM, *Joseph Ratzinger—Kirchliche Existenz und existenzielle Theologie. Ekklesiologische Grundlinien unter dem Anspruch von Lumen gentium* (Frankfurt: Lang, 2005^2 [2004^1]).

129 On this change in Ratzinger's polemical interest, cf. J. RATZINGER, *Glaube—Wahrheit—Toleranz. Das Christentum und die Weltreligionen* (Freiburg-Basel-Wien: Herder, 2003), 93-111 (= 'Die in den 1990er Jahren aufgebrochenen neuen Fragestellungen. Zur Lage von Glaube und Theologie heute').

130 Cf. the bibliography in HEIM, *Joseph Ratzinger*, 489-491.

131 J. RATZINGER, *Volk und Haus Gottes in Augustins Lehre von der Kirche* (München: Zink, 1954 [reprint St. Ottilien: EOS-Verlag, 1992]).

In between, reference will be made to his books explicitly meant to be read as two volumes of ecclesiological essays—*Das neue Volk Gottes* (1969)[133] and *Kirche, Ökumene und Politik* (1987).[134] The first assembles articles originally published between 1956 and 1969, the second is a compilation of articles published between 1972 and 1986. In order to cover the most recent period, a third compilation of articles—originally published between 1993 and 2001—will be added: *Weggemeinschaft des Glaubens* (2002).[135] Within the limits of this study, these three books may serve as milestones on the way of Ratzinger's eucharistic-ecclesiological development.[136]

In addition to these ecclesiological books, attention will be paid to a publication specifically devoted to the centrality of the eucharist in the church—*Gott ist uns nah* (2001), which is a collection of sermons mainly from Ratzinger's years as archbishop of Munich (1977-1982)[137]—and to three books specifically devoted to liturgical themes. These books containing 'liturgical theology' are *Das Fest des Glaubens* (1981), containing articles from the seventies,[138] *Ein neues Lied für den Herrn* (1995), containing articles mainly from the eighties and nineties,[139] and one of Ratzinger's few books originally conceived as a monograph and not as a collection of articles: *Der Geist der Liturgie* (2000).[140]

Although this selection of publications would allow for a chronological presentation of Ratzinger's thought, this would be out of context in this study,

132 [J. RATZINGER], 'First Message of His Holiness Benedict XVI at the End of the Eucharistic Concelebration with the Members of the College of Cardinals in the Sistine Chapel, Wednesday, 20 April 2005', English translation from the Latin original, © Libreria Editrice Vaticana (source: www.vatican.va). Cf. [J. RATZINGER,] BENEDIKT XVI., *'Ich vertraue auf euch'. Die Predigten und Reden zum Beginn des Pontifikats*, herausgegeben und eingeleitet von M. Posselt (München: LangenMüller, 2005), 61-80.

133 J. RATZINGER, *Das neue Volk Gottes. Entwürfe zur Ekklesiologie* (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1969).

134 J. RATZINGER, *Kirche, Ökumene und Politik. Neue Versuche zur Ekklesiologie* (Einsiedeln: Johannes, 1987). See page 9 for the relationship ('zweiter Band') to *Das neue Volk Gottes*.

135 J. RATZINGER, *Weggemeinschaft des Glaubens. Kirche als Communio*. Festgabe zum 75. Geburtstag herausgegeben vom Schülerkreis. Redaktion: S.O. Horn und V. Pfnür (Augsburg: Sankt-Ulrich-Verlag, 2002).

136 Of the books necessarily left outside this choice, the following deserve particularly to be mentioned: J. RATZINGER, *Theologische Prinzipienlehre. Bausteine zur Fundamentaltheologie* (München: Wewel, 1982), consisting of articles originally published between 1967 and 1981; J. RATZINGER, *Zur Gemeinschaft gerufen. Kirche heute verstehen* (Freiburg-Basel-Wien: Herder, 1991), consisting of addresses given in 1990.

137 J. RATZINGER, *Gott ist uns nah. Eucharistie: Mitte des Lebens*. Herausgegeben von S.O. Horn und V. Pfnür (Augsburg: Sankt-Ulrich-Verlag, 2001).

138 J. RATZINGER, *Das Fest des Glaubens. Versuche zur Theologie des Gottesdienstes* (Einsiedeln: Johannes, 1981).

139 J. RATZINGER, *Ein neues Lied für den Herrn. Christusglaube und Liturgie in der Gegenwart* (Freiburg-Basel-Wien: Herder, 1995).

140 J. RATZINGER, *Der Geist der Liturgie. Eine Einführung* (Freiburg-Basel-Wien: Herder, 2000).

which is not a monograph on Ratzinger's ecclesiology. As in all other sections, the presentation will be structured thematically. Where the study of Ratzinger's works makes it worthwile to distinguish between earlier and later phases of thought, this will be mentioned. In the general debate on the question whether or not Ratzinger has 'changed' his views—for example, from a 'progressive' position before the Second Vatican Council towards a 'conservative' one after the Council—I take the stance that *the biblical, patristic and eucharistic basis of his ecclesiology* has not changed in any significant sense. It is this basis which is primarily under observation in this study.[141]

3.3.2 An Heir of the Nouvelle Théologie and the Liturgical Movement

Ratzinger regards himself an heir of the theology of the first half of the twentieth century,[142] with its renewed emphasis on Scripture and *patres*, and with its historical (in hindsight by Ratzinger evaluated as sometimes exaggeratedly *historistisch*) rather than philosophical methodology.[143] De Lubac's *Catholicisme* and *Corpus Mysticum* opened his eyes for this approach of the Christian faith, marked by a farewell to individualism and moralism and by a retrieval of the living and social character of faith, church and eucharist.[144] According to Ratzinger, a scholastic, neo-scholastic, or otherwise primarily philosophical attitude has remained foreign to his way of theologising. The same, he says, is true for the liberal attitude, which uses the dogma as the boundary of one's free thought rather than as its inspiring source. Rather than to

[141] Cf. WEILER, *Volk Gottes—Leib Christi*, 286, 334-335, and HEIM, *Joseph Ratzinger*, 178-197, 453-457, who sees continuity except for a growing centralism in practical matters. The same is said, in an extremely critical context, by H. HÄRING, *Theologie und Ideologie bei Joseph Ratzinger* (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 2001), 35; cf. 28-29. In other words, both friend and foe recognise the theological consistency throughout Ratzinger's life. It is inaccurate and anachronistic to read 'liberalism' in the early Ratzinger, as is done by SHORTT, *Benedict XVI*, 3, 14, 23, 24, 25; cf. 44. VOLF, *Trinität und Gemeinschaft*, 28 n., remarks: 'Geändert hat sich nicht Ratzinger's Theologie, sondern seine Einstellung und Funktion'. Ratzinger himself affirms that it is rather the changed context that gives his largely unchanged views a different meaning; cf. J. RATZINGER, *Salz der Erde. Christentum und katholische Kirche im 21. Jahrhundert. Ein Gespräch mit Peter Seewald* (München: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1996), 84-85, 123-124.

[142] Cf. paragraphs 3.1.2 (Theological Reassessment) and 3.1.3 (The Liturgical Movement).

[143] J. RATZINGER, *Aus meinem Leben. Erinnerungen (1927-1977)* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1998), 55, 60, 65.

[144] RATZINGER, *Aus meinem Leben*, 69. Similar importance had E. MERSCH, *Le corps mystique du Christ. Etudes de théologie historique* (Louvain: Museum Lessianum, 1933), which was written to the same effect as de Lubac's *Corpus Mysticum*—to present biblical, patristic and later material on the relationship between the eucharist and the church. Cf. RATZINGER, *Volk und Haus Gottes*, 100 n. 36, 197-198, 234 n. 51.

these attitudes, Ratzinger pays tribute to the biblical-patristic school in which he was educated and which he claims to have upheld throughout his life.[145]

It is in this theological school, Ratzinger says, where he also discovered the centrality of the liturgy within the church, and the importance of the liturgy for theology.[146] The relationship between the liturgy and the church is, for Ratzinger, so close that he can state 'that the crisis of the church, which we experience today, is largely based on the decay of the liturgy'. The intentions of the Liturgical Movement and of the Second Vatican Council, he says, have to be rediscovered and revived—liturgy as manifestation of the community of faith, manifestation of the worldwide unity and history of the church, manifestation of the mystery of the living Christ, in short, liturgy as the manifestation of the 'church in its spiritual essence'.[147]

3.3.3 A Eucharistic Ecclesiology from the Outset

Already in his doctoral thesis, which he wrote in less than one year at the age of 23 (1950-1951),[148] Ratzinger committed himself to the patristic period and to the subject of ecclesiology, more specifically, to eucharistic ecclesiology. Describing the notions of *domus Dei* and *populus Dei* in the thought of Augustine, the dissertation may be regarded as the first stage in Ratzinger's own ecclesiological formation. Three themes seem to be lasting characteristics of Ratzinger's ecclesiology from the outset—the importance of the concrete, historical, visible church for the Christian faith, the relatedness of the terms 'people of God' and 'body of Christ', and the fact that the eucharist is central in his description of the church.

The first theme is a rather general one, but is not without importance. It is the emphasis on the visible church. It took Augustine some time, says Ratzinger, to accommodate himself to the fact that Christianity is not only a religion of the intellect, but also—and foremost—a religion of tangible reality in a visible community. As an effect of the incarnation, the church makes the invisible visible. The church means for its contemporaries what Christ meant for his contemporaries: the presence of the divine in tangible form. Moreover, the church is the consummation of Christ—as his body, the church is the pneumatic

145 RATZINGER, *Aus meinem Leben*, 49, 57-58, 131. A reading of Ratzinger with special reference to the amount in which he differs from neo-scholasticism is offered by KERR, *Twentieth-Century Catholic Theologians*, 183-192. (Surprisingly, the second half of the chapter on Ratzinger, 193-202, is little more than a critique of one specific document from the Congregation of the Doctrine of the Faith.)

146 RATZINGER, *Aus meinem Leben*, 60.

147 RATZINGER, *Aus meinem Leben*, 174 ('Ich bin überzeugt, dass die Kirchenkrise, die wir heute erleben, weitgehend auf dem Zerfall der Liturgie beruht', 'Kirche in ihrem geistlichen Wesen').

148 RATZINGER, *Aus meinem Leben*, 68-71.

presence of the living Christ.[149] This leads Augustine to a growing awareness of the importance of the church: the church is the historicity of Christianity. There is no Christianity—faith, salvation—outside the concrete, historical community of the church.[150] For the philosopher Augustine, it was initially hard to accept that the Christian faith requires this humiliation, this condescendence. He nevertheless came to the conclusion that this is necessary, because God has undergone this humiliation and condescendence in Christ. Christian *humilitas* is to incorporate oneself into the 'weak form' of the historic church.[151]

The second theme is the interrelatedness of the ecclesiological terms 'people of God' and 'body of Christ'. In later years, Ratzinger criticises an isolated use of the term 'people of God', which he detects in some circles after the Second Vatican Council. He then says that the definition 'people of God' should be balanced by the definition 'body of Christ'.[152] This is, however, not just a 'conservative' position of Ratzinger after the Council; it already appears in his dissertation. 'The terms "people of God" and "body of Christ" are [...] not only closely related, they explain each other.'[153] The people of God is the liturgical community (Ratzinger says that Augustine interprets a people primarily as a *Kultgemeinschaft*)[154] and this people is, thus, the community which shares in, and becomes, the body of Christ. 'The church is [...] the people of God which exists as the body of Christ.'[155] According to Ratzinger, 'body of Christ' and 'people of God' are Augustine's two basic ecclesiological categories.[156]

Thirdly, we come to the theme of most immediate interest for this study. Ratzinger sketches Augustine's ecclesiology as a thoroughly eucharistic ecclesiology. Already for his African forebear Tertullian, the church's essence is being a eucharistic community. Being 'in' the church, having 'peace' with the church, means taking part in the eucharistic act. Ratzinger points to the fact that this has not a limited 'liturgical' meaning, but that 'our whole existential *imitatio* is part of the sacramental *communicatio*'.[157] The same is true for

149 RATZINGER, *Volk und Haus Gottes*, 9, 33, 156.

150 RATZINGER, *Volk und Haus Gottes*, 17, 155. According to Ratzinger, in Augustine's ecclesiology not every member of the church will be actually saved, but everyone who *will* be saved, will be saved through the church (144, 145 n. 37, 148), including those who belonged to the church before the incarnation of Christ, by their faith in the (still to come) incarnation which made them part of the church (296-298).

151 RATZINGER, *Volk und Haus Gottes*, 151 ('Schwachheitsgestalt'), 233.

152 RATZINGER, *Aus meinem Leben*, 136; cf. paragraph 3.3.5.

153 RATZINGER, *Volk und Haus Gottes*, 174 ('Die Begriffe "Volk Gottes" und "Leib Christi" sind [...] nicht nur eng benachbart, sondern sie deuten einander').

154 RATZINGER, *Volk und Haus Gottes*, 290, 293, 295.

155 RATZINGER, *Volk und Haus Gottes*, 327 ('Die Kirche ist [...] das als Leib Christi bestehende Volk Gottes').

156 RATZINGER, *Volk und Haus Gottes*, 253-254.

157 RATZINGER, *Volk und Haus Gottes*, 60, 62, 84: 'Wir dürfen also auch hier den Begriff der Kirche als Eucharistiegemeinde im umfassendsten Sinn gegeben finden (in jenem Sinn also,

another African father, Cyprian. Breaking off from the church is ceasing to be part of the eucharistic community around the bishop. The eucharistic act and the eucharistic community are inseparable—the church is the body of Christ inasmuch as it partakes in the sacramental celebration of the body of Christ. The 'centre' of the church is 'its unity in the body of the Redeemer'.[158] These *patres*, Ratzinger says, are not occupied with the eucharist itself (too concrete), neither have they a 'spiritual' understanding of the church (too abstract), but they give voice to 'a eucharistic understanding of the church'.[159] A third African writer, Optatus, likewise interprets the church as the eucharistic community, and uses the term 'peace' for being a member of the eucharistic circle.[160]

Like those who preceded Augustine in the African church,[161] Augustine himself upholds the view that the church has its kernel 'in the sacrament of participation in Christ, in the eucharistic mystery of the body of Christ'.[162] The community of the church is the eucharistic community; church and eucharist have the same meaning.[163] The church is 'the Christian cultic community, which manifests itself visibly in the eucharistic celebration'.[164] Although Augustine is, according to Ratzinger, both the summit of patristic times and the gate to the Middle Ages, he does not yet know the isolation of the eucharistic species from the community, which would become characteristic of the medieval (and post-medieval) understanding of the eucharist 'from which, through the emphasis on transubstantiation and real presence, every other [aspect] seems to have disappeared'.[165] An aspect of this eucharistic-ecclesiological view is the fact that, for Augustine (in Ratzinger's interpretation), Christian salvation, being united with Christ, is never a matter between God or Christ and the individual, but always a matter of being incorporated into Christ's body, the church.

in dem unsere ganze existenziale imitatio mit in die sakramentale communicatio einbezogen ist)'; cf. 213 n. 73, 244.

158 RATZINGER, *Volk und Haus Gottes*, 95 ('die Mitte des Geheimnisses der Kirche, ihre Einheit im Leibe des Erlösers').

159 RATZINGER, *Volk und Haus Gottes*, 95 n. 21 ('ein eucharistisches Kirchenverständnis').

160 RATZINGER, *Volk und Haus Gottes*, 116-117.

161 In addition to these African fathers, Ratzinger presents the eucharistic-ecclesiological thought of, among others, John Chrysostom. For him, the church is the body of Christ because in the eucharist it becomes one with the body of Christ, but also because it shares and continues the love of Christ. Cf. RATZINGER, *Volk und Haus Gottes*, 202-204.

162 RATZINGER, *Volk und Haus Gottes*, 156 ('im Sakrament der Christusteilhabe, im Leib-Christi-Mysterium der Eucharistie').

163 RATZINGER, *Volk und Haus Gottes*, 158, 211, 217-218.

164 RATZINGER, *Volk und Haus Gottes*, 175 ('die christliche Kultgemeinde, wie sie sich in der Eucharistiefeier sichtbar darstellt'); cf. 183. Again, this is not meant in an isolated 'liturgical' sense. For Augustine—according to Ratzinger—cult and ethics are interwoven. Cf. paragraph 3.3.10.

165 RATZINGER, *Volk und Haus Gottes*, 218 n. 87 ('denen über Transsubstantiation und Realpräsenz alles andere entfallen zu sein scheint'), 322 n. 27.

Although every single Christian is also a microcosm of Christ and his body, this is only the case because every single Christian is part of the body.[166]

Through this third characteristic we return to the first again. Being a eucharistic community makes the church also a very tangible, historical, empirical reality. Therefore, Ratzinger—still interpreting Augustine, but at the same time forming his own ecclesiological position—does not accept a contradiction between church and law, or between sacrament and discipline. The fact that the church is most essentially a eucharistic community implies that questions of order (membership, discipline, ministry, jurisdiction) belong to the church and are not foreign or additional to it.[167] Words like 'peace' (Tertullian, Optatus)[168] and 'love' (Augustine's *caritas*)[169] are not descriptions of vague feelings, but refer to the concrete 'peace' and 'love' of the eucharistic community, and even function as synonyms for the eucharist. In other words, the spiritual essence of Christianity coincides with the tangible reality of the eucharistic celebration.

Having introduced Ratzinger's thought by referring to his dissertation, I will now thematically present the most important themes of Ratzinger's eucharistic ecclesiology. Initially, four biblical-theological lines of thought will be explored (paragraphs 3.3.4 to 3.3.7). These will lead into a paragraph on the centrality of the eucharist (3.3.8). Subsequently, the relationship between the local and the universal church will be investigated (3.3.9), followed by a paragraph on Ratzinger's 'not just cultic' view on liturgy (3.3.10). An impression of Pope Benedict's first address (3.3.11) and a short summary (3.3.12) will conclude this section on Ratzinger's eucharistic-ecclesiological thought.

3.3.4 The Paschal Origins of Israel and the Church

Ratzinger's liturgical theology is rooted in a biblical theology centred around the Jewish and the Christian *pascha*—the Exodus and Christ's death and resurrection. In Ratzinger's account, Israel came into being as a people (*Volk*) by its delivery from Egypt. This liberation did not stand on its own, but occurred in order to make Israel the people of God, the people of the covenant (*Bund*) with God. The ultimate goal of the Exodus was, therefore, the constitution of the people of God as the community that worships God and lives

166 RATZINGER, *Volk und Haus Gottes*, 210, 216-217, 245.

167 RATZINGER, *Volk und Haus Gottes*, 60, 257, 318-320. It seems an inconsequence, that in his section on Cyprian, Ratzinger himself creates a distinction between Cyprian's 'juristische', 'hierarchische' and his 'sakramentale' understanding of the church (88, 93, 96), while it seems to be more justified to consider these aspects as related, just as Ratzinger usually advocates.

168 RATZINGER, *Volk und Haus Gottes*, 117.

169 RATZINGER, *Volk und Haus Gottes*, 138, 182, 184, 190 n. 8, 212-213, 218, 289, 318-320.

accordingly.[170] Israel is a cultic people (*Kultvolk*). Its cult is the continuous reaffirmation of its liberation and, thereby, the continuous reconstitution of itself as the people of God. The 'calling together' (*synagoge*, *ekklesia*) of Israel took place so that cult be possible.[171]

Jesus took up these themes when he deliberately created the new people of God under the new covenant. For Ratzinger, the vocation of the twelve apostles—as the 'tribes' of the new people—most clearly indicates that Jesus really wanted a church (*Kirche*), a people (*Volk*). Again for Ratzinger, the institution of the eucharist most clearly indicates that Jesus wanted this people to be a cultic people (*Kultvolk*). Like Israel, which came into being as the cultic people of God by the paschal events of Exodus (liberation) and Sinai (covenant), the church came into being as the new cultic people of God by the paschal events of Jesus's death and resurrection, explained as liberating and covenanting by himself when he instituted the eucharist. The new covenant is made by Jesus's death and resurrection, *together* with the institution of the eucharist which interprets them as a cultic act and makes them continuously accessible. As the Jewish paschal meal is the heart of Israel's identity, so the Christian paschal meal—the eucharist—is the heart of the church's identity, the bond of unity between the members of the church and between God and the church. The constitutive character of the Jewish paschal meal ('in this night *we* were liberated') applies also to the eucharist: because it makes the Christians partakers of the paschal event, it is constitutive of the church as the body of Christ and the people of God. As the temple was the cultic centre of Judaism, by his death and resurrection Christ's body has become the new temple around which the Christian cult is centred. 'The paschal mystery is the enduring form of the church's existence in this world.'[172]

It is important to mention that the focus of Ratzinger's thought on the 'new people of God' is not the relationship between Israel and the church, between Jews and Christians. The idea that Israel has lost its meaning since there is a

[170] Notwithstanding the importance of *Volk* and *Kultvolk* as goals of the exodus, it is legitimate to ask what in Ratzinger's synthesis is left of *liberation* as a goal of the exodus. Cf. A.A. HÄUSSLING, '*Der Geist der Liturgie*. Zu Joseph Ratzingers gleichnamiger Publikation', *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 43/44 (2001/2002), 362-395, at 371-372.

[171] RATZINGER, *Das neue Volk Gottes*, 78-79, 96-97, 107, 224; RATZINGER, *Kirche, Ökumene und Politik*, 236-238, 240-241; RATZINGER, *Weggemeinschaft des Glaubens*, 91-92; RATZINGER, *Ein neues Lied für den Herrn*, 29-30, 94-95, 97; RATZINGER, *Der Geist der Liturgie*, 13-16, 23, 35, 56, 88, 117-118, 128.

[172] RATZINGER, *Das neue Volk Gottes*, 162 ('Das österliche Geheimnis ist die bleibende Form der kirchlichen Existenz in dieser Welt'); cf. 77-80, 96-97, 109, 202, 251, 253, 291, 351, 358; RATZINGER, *Kirche, Ökumene und Politik*, 36; RATZINGER, *Weggemeinschaft des Glaubens*, 60, 64-65, 73, 83, 85, 92, 104, 137, 149; RATZINGER, *Gott ist uns nah*, 28, 31, 37, 42-43, 48, 60-62, 64, 68, 97, 108; RATZINGER, *Das Fest des Glaubens*, 53-54, 58-59, 117, 130; RATZINGER, *Ein neues Lied für den Herrn*, 33-35, 71, 89, 106-107, 110-112, 121, 133, 157, 206, 213; RATZINGER, *Der Geist der Liturgie*, 29, 31, 36-37, 40, 49-50, 81-83, 85, 89, 92, 114, 118-119, 138.

'new' people of God, cannot be found in Ratzinger's writings.[173] His focus is rather the internal Christian debate on the identity of the church. Against what he identifies as a tendency to play off Jesus against the church, Ratzinger argues that Jesus *wanted* the church: by stressing the parallels between the paschal origins of Israel and the church, Ratzinger points out that the church is really a new covenant people, willed by God. Against a primarily ethical understanding of Christianity, Ratzinger uses the Old Testament parallels to stress the church's cultic character, centred around the eucharist. And against a tendency to talk about the church as 'the people of God' in a rather abstract way, Ratzinger emphasises the church's dependence upon Jesus and his *pascha*. This latter theme leads to the next paragraph.

3.3.5 The People of God from the Body of Christ

As one of the themes of Ratzinger's dissertation we encountered the balance between the ecclesiological terms 'people of God' and 'body of Christ'. The relationship between these terms had been made a public debate by Mannes Dominikus Koster (1901-1981), who in 1940 criticised the then leading concept of the body of Christ on the ground that this was only an 'image' (*Bild*), and—compared to the concrete institutional church—a rather vague concept, instead of which he favoured the 'clear and image-less factual designation' (*deutliche und bildlose Sachbezeichnung*) people of God.[174] It was in the context of this debate, that the supervisor of Ratzinger's dissertation, Gottlieb Söhngen (1892-1971), made his students write dissertations on the debate's main concepts.[175] As we have seen, Ratzinger's dissertation did not confirm Koster's view. From Augustine, Ratzinger showed that 'body of Christ' is not a metaphor, but refers to the concrete, visible church which is transformed into the (ecclesial) body of Christ by partaking in the (eucharistic) body of Christ. Neither is it a vague term—if one uses the term *mysticum* in relation to *corpus Christi*, one should realise that *mysticum* did originally not mean 'mystical' but 'sacramental'.[176]

[173] Cf. RATZINGER, *Das neue Volk Gottes*, 238; RATZINGER, *Weggemeinschaft des Glaubens*, 237-238; RATZINGER, *Aus meinem Leben*, 59.

[174] M.D. KOSTER, *Ekklesiologie im Werden* (Paderborn: Bonifacius, 1940), 145. Apart from the polemic concerning 'body of Christ and people of God', the book treats the dialectic 'person and community' and the relationship 'ecclesiology and theology'; cf. NAPIWODZKI, 'Eine Ekklesiologie im Werden'. Napiwodzki shows that some regard Koster as a 'conservative' defender of Vatican I, while others regard him as a 'progressive' forerunner of the 'people of God' line of thought at Vatican II (41 and *passim*), and offers a nuanced evaluation. See also paragraph 3.1.2 (Theological Reassessment).

[175] On this context see RATZINGER, *Volk und Haus Gottes* (edition 1992), XI-XIII; RATZINGER, *Das neue Volk Gottes*, 76-77, 84, 95; RATZINGER, *Kirche, Ökumene und Politik*, 22-23, 25; cf. WEILER, *Volk Gottes—Leib Christi*, 31-35.

[176] RATZINGER, *Volk und Haus Gottes*, 292, 324.

After the Second Vatican Council, the debate gained new importance. The term 'people of God' now became to be used in an, according to Ratzinger, 'reduced' (*reduziert*) way. Disconnected (*losgelöst*) from the idea of the 'body of Christ', the term 'people of God' became rather 'Old Testament' (*alttestamentlich*) and sometimes 'horizontal' in its meaning. Since these days, Ratzinger emphasises that the term 'people of God' *in itself* is an insufficient description of the New Testament idea of the church.[177] Ratzinger affirms the term 'people of God' in the sense in which—according to himself—the Council used it: firstly as an ecumenical bridge to those who do not fully share the sacramental life of the church; secondly as a theological notion that made it possible to make a critical distinction between Christ and the church, correcting an ecclesiology in which Christ and the church virtually coincided; thirdly as an eschatological term, indicating that Israel and the church are still on their pilgrimage through the ages; and finally as a uniting concept, embracing both lay and ordained. But he cannot accept other uses of the term 'people of God', particularly not those disconnected from the idea of the church as the body of Christ. 'Only the new birth in Christ makes the non-people a people. [...] The non-people of the Christians can only be the people of God by being incorporated into Christ'.[178]

These two lines remain characteristic for Ratzinger's view on 'people of God' and 'body of Christ' throughout his writings. On the one hand, Ratzinger emphasises the concreteness of the body of Christ as the eucharistic community, including the ministerial structures of the church. In other words, against the alleged vagueness of the term 'body of Christ', Ratzinger stresses its tangible character. On the other hand, Ratzinger makes the term 'body of Christ' a necessary ecclesiological category against those who, in his opinion, relate the church insufficiently to Jesus Christ, his *pascha*, and his enduring presence within the church. The church is only the people of God in so far as it is the body of Christ by (especially eucharistic) participation in Christ. In Ratzinger's favourite expression, the church is the 'people of God [that originates] from the body of Christ' (*Volk Gottes vom Leib Christi her*).[179] Christ's body, which died and resurrected, and which is present in the eucharist where it feeds its people, makes this people Christ's body and *thereby* God's people.

The term 'body of Christ' is Ratzinger's central ecclesiological category. Important for Ratzinger is that this term helps to overcome the separation

177 RATZINGER, *Das neue Volk Gottes*, 241; RATZINGER, *Weggemeinschaft des Glaubens*, 114.

178 RATZINGER, *Kirche, Ökumene und Politik*, 26 ('dass erst die neue Geburt in Christus das Nicht-Volk zum Volk werden lässt. (...) Das Nicht-Volk der Christen kann Gottes Volk nur sein durch die Einbeziehung in Christus'); cf. 22-27, 32; RATZINGER, *Weggemeinschaft des Glaubens*, 91-92, 110-112, 114, 143; RATZINGER, *Gott ist uns nah*, 76, 122; RATZINGER, *Ein neues Lied für den Herrn*, 171.

179 RATZINGER, *Das neue Volk Gottes*, 80, 97, 108; RATZINGER, *Kirche, Ökumene und Politik*, 26; RATZINGER, *Weggemeinschaft des Glaubens*, 89, 92, 143. These references are not meant to be exhaustive.

between 'institutional' (organisational, hierarchical) and 'dogmatical' (biblical, theological) ecclesiologies. Without its often misunderstood appendix *mysticum*,[180] the term *corpus Christi* describes for Ratzinger in an ideal way both the innermost ('dogmatical') kernel of Christian identity, related to Christ and his *pascha*, and the visible, tangible ('institutional') reality of the church, including the ministry and the sacraments. The eucharist unites both approaches, being both the theological and the visible centre of the church.[181]

The deep relationship between Christ and the church is exemplified and embodied in Mary. Ratzinger acknowledges that everything that can be said about Mary is in the first instance developed out of christology and soteriology. Secondly, however, he states that a coherent mariology could only emerge from a combination of *Christ*-related teaching about Mary with the patristic teaching about the *church*: 'everything that later becomes mariology, is first conceived as ecclesiology'. Because of this place in between christology and ecclesiology, mariology witnesses to the intimate connection between Christ and the church. On the one hand, Mary always (even in an ecclesiological context) refers to Christ, whose mother she is, to whom she points, and on whom all mariology depends. On the other hand, Mary always (even in a christological context) refers to the church, which she exemplarily embodies as (for instance) faithful, mother, bride.[182]

Ratzinger affirms the decision of the Second Vatican Council to interpret mariology in the context of ecclesiology, rather than as an isolated treatise. He warns, however, for a complete swallowing-up of mariology by ecclesiology. If mariology is reduced to no more than a chapter of ecclesiology, it becomes a merely conceptual matter: Mary becomes a typology or allegory rather than a living person, the mother of the Lord and the first of the saints. Therefore, Ratzinger says,

> mariology can never simply be dissolved in the abstraction of ecclesiology: the patristic idea of *typos* is fundamentally misunderstood when it reduces Mary to nothing more than a (therefore exchangeable) exemplification of theological matters of fact. Rather, the meaning of the *typos* is only safeguarded when the church becomes recognisably itself in its personal form through the

[180] In the wake of de Lubac (cf. paragraph 3.2.5), Ratzinger describes the history of the term *mysticum*: sacramental (Early Church), allegorical (Middle Ages) and mystical (Romanticism); RATZINGER, *Das neue Volk Gottes*, 98-99.

[181] RATZINGER, *Das neue Volk Gottes*, 76-77, 94-95.

[182] J. RATZINGER, 'Erwägungen zur Stellung von Mariologie und Marienfrömmigkeit im Ganzen von Glaube und Theologie', in: J. Ratzinger & H.U. von Balthasar, *Maria. Kirche im Ursprung* (Einsiedeln-Freiburg: Johannes, 1997 [fourth, enlarged edition]), 14-30, at 22 ('alles, was später Mariologie sein wird, ist zunächst als Ekklesiologie vorgedacht worden'); cf. 22-24.

> inexchangeable personal figure of Mary. In theology, persons are not to be derived from concepts, but concepts from persons.[183]

In other words, Mary not only *exemplifies* the church, she also *embodies* it. The Marian element enlivens ecclesiology by bringing in the personal and the feminine. Looking at Mary, the church sees itself as it should be (in faith, in suffering and joyful commitment) and as it will be (in eschatological consummation).[184]

> Mary is identified with the Daughter Sion, with the nuptial people of God. Everything that is said about the *ecclesia* in Scripture, applies to her, and *vice versa*: by beholding Mary, the church learns concretely what it is and should be. [...] God does not work with abstractions. He is a person and the church is a person. The more we, each of us, become a person [...], the more we become one, the more we are church, the more the church is its very self.[185]

For Ratzinger, Christian meaning is never just spiritual, but always also embodied. Mary embodies the church in its full meaning and in its final consummation. The next paragraph will show how Ratzinger applies the same theme of personal embodiment to the fulfillment in Jesus Christ of several lines of the Old Testament.

3.3.6 Old and New Testaments, Priestly and Prophetic, Cultic and Non-Cultic

Throughout the Old Testament there is a tension between a cultic and a non-cultic interpretation of Israel's faith. The cult of the temple with its priests is often counterbalanced by the critique of the prophets, crying for righteousness.

183 RATZINGER, 'Erwägungen zur Stellung von Mariologie und Marienfrömmigkeit', 17, 21 ('dann kann die Mariologie niemals einfach ins Sachliche der Ekklesiologie aufgelöst werden: Der Typus-Gedanke der Väter ist gründlich missverstanden, wenn er Maria zur blossen und damit austauschbaren Exemplifikation theologischer Sachverhalte reduziert. Der Sinn des Typus bleibt vielmehr nur gewahrt, wenn die Kirche durch die unvertauschbare persönliche Gestalt Marias in ihrer persönlichen Form erkennbar wird. Nicht die Person ist in der Theologie auf die Sache zurückzuführen, sondern die Sache auf die Person').

184 RATZINGER, 'Erwägungen zur Stellung von Mariologie und Marienfrömmigkeit', 20, 28.

185 J. RATZINGER, '"Du bist voll der Gnade". Elemente biblischer Marienfrömmigkeit', in: Ratzinger & von Balthasar, *Maria*, 53-70, at 57 ('Maria ist mit der Tochter Zion, mit dem bräutlichen Gottesvolk identifiziert. Alles, was über die *ecclesia* in der Bibel gesagt wird, gilt von ihr, und umgekehrt: was die Kirche ist und sein soll, erfährt sie konkret im Hinschauen auf Maria. [...] Gott handelt nicht mit Abstrakta. Er ist Person, und die Kirche ist Person. Je mehr wir, jeder einzeln, Person werden [...], desto mehr werden wir eins, und desto mehr sind wir Kirche, desto mehr ist die Kirche sie selbst').

To describe this line of Old Testament spirituality, Ratzinger refers to Isaiah's 'Suffering Servant' and to the Psalms, like 51:16-17—

> you have no delight in sacrifice;
> if I were to give a burnt-offering, you would not be pleased.
> The sacrifice acceptable to God is a broken spirit.

Of particular importance in Ratzinger's reasoning is Psalm 40:6-7 as it was taken up by the Letter to the Hebrews (10:5-7) from the Septuagint version—

> Sacrifices and offerings you have not desired,
> but a body you have prepared for me;
> in burnt-offerings and sin-offerings you have taken no pleasure.
> Then I said, 'See, God, I have come to do your will, O God'
> (in the scroll of the book it is written of me).

Ratzinger affirms the New Testament exegesis of these texts, namely that Christ has lived and died according to this kind of 'offering', interpreted as righteousness. Christ's body has become the new temple and the new offering. Christ, says Ratzinger, has fulfilled the prophetic line of the Old Testament.[186]

Ratzinger emphasises, however, that this does *not* mean that Christianity is only the continuation of the anti-cultic strand within the Old Testament, so that in Christianity the cult has lost its place. Rather, Christ is in himself priestly temple and offering as well as prophetic critique aiming at righteousness. By instituting the eucharist, Christ has revealed the cultic meaning of his death and resurrection, to be continually present in the eucharistic cult of the church. Christ himself, and particularly his body—on the cross as well as in the eucharist—has become 'the holy cult for all times'. Precisely through its both cultic and prophetic character, the New Testament *fulfills* the Old Testament. Through Christ (again, through his death and resurrection *and* through the eucharist), the church not just continues elements of the synagogue, but also of the temple.[187] In one of Ratzinger's favourite expressions: the New Testament way of 'spiritualising' the Old Testament is by 'incarnating' it in Jesus Christ. Fulfillment is embodiment. The relationship between the Old and New Testaments is not spiritual in a vague, but 'spiritual' in a very real and tangible sense: the relationship exists through (the body of) Christ.[188]

[186] RATZINGER, *Das neue Volk Gottes*, 249-254; RATZINGER, *Gott ist uns nah*, 27, 36; RATZINGER, *Ein neues Lied für den Herrn*, 128, 133, 213.

[187] RATZINGER, *Weggemeinschaft des Glaubens*, 84-85, 149, cf. 83, 133, 159; RATZINGER, *Gott ist uns nah*, 57-58, 61, 103; RATZINGER, *Das Fest des Glaubens*, 52-53, 93-97; RATZINGER, *Ein neues Lied für den Herrn*, 30, 91, 114-115, 117-118, 212-213; RATZINGER, *Der Geist der Liturgie*, 30-43, 55-56, 78, 82-83, 99, 125.

[188] RATZINGER, *Ein neues Lied für den Herrn*, 95-96, 98-99, 112.

Those who deny the cultic character of Christianity are, according to Ratzinger, erring on either of the following two sides. The first possibility is that they move Christianity back into the Old Testament phase, without realising that both temple and prophecy are fulfilled in the very person—body—of Jesus Christ. The other possibility is that they move Christianity forward into the eschatological phase, in which cult will have given way to full vision. Instead, Ratzinger argues that the church lives no longer in the period of 'shadow' (*Schatten*) and not yet in the situation of 'reality' (*Wirklichkeit*), but in the intermediate state of 'image' (*Bild*). The reality of redemption *has taken place*; this is the distinction over against the Old Testament. Christian liturgy is therefore no longer a cult of 'shadows', but a real 'image' of salvation, although its final 'realisation' is still to be awaited. In this intermediate state, the Christian cult is the 'liturgical mediation' of the 'christological concentration of all history'.[189]

3.3.7 The 'We-Character' of God and the Church

A fourth line of thought which starts with biblical theology and ends at the church and its manifestation in the eucharist, is the trinitarian emphasis throughout Ratzinger's writings. Although God is one, he is also a loving 'we'. The purpose of God's revelation in Christ is to unite humans with God by their participation or incorporation into God's being, God's love, God's 'we'. Therefore, the Christian faith has a fundamental 'we-character' (*Wir-Charakter*).[190]

The church consists of those who are re-created in the image of God, that is, restored from isolation to relation.[191] Therefore, the church is a 'we' that unites people—as God himself is a united 'we'—across social and political boundaries and even across the boundary between life and death.[192] To become a Christian, says Ratzinger, is 'to become communio' (*communio werden*), to become a member of the communion of love—ecclesiologically, eucharistically

189 RATZINGER, *Der Geist der Liturgie*, 101 ('Die christologische Konzentration der ganzen Geschichte ist zugleich liturgische Vermittlung dieser Geschichte'); cf. 43, 47-54, 80, 119, 168; RATZINGER, *Das neue Volk Gottes*, 224, 240.

190 RATZINGER, *Das neue Volk Gottes*, 213-214, 272, 284, 387; RATZINGER, *Kiche, Ökumene und Politik*, 178; RATZINGER, *Weggemeinschaft des Glaubens*, 66-67, 112; RATZINGER, *Das Fest des Glaubens*, 120.

191 In one of his popular interview books, Ratzinger frequently identifies sin with separation, isolation, autonomy, self-centredness and egotism. The alternative offered by Christianity is an anthropology and soteriology of communion, based on a trinitarian theology of communion. Cf. J. RATZINGER, *Gott und die Welt. Glauben und Leben in unserer Zeit. Ein Gespräch mit Peter Seewald* (München: Knaur, 2000), *passim*.

192 RATZINGER, *Kirche, Ökumene und Politik*, 15, 36, 38-40, 112, 121, 232-235, 243.

and ethically.[193] The church is communion with the trinitarian love of God through communion with the resurrected body of Christ. Eucharistic communion transforms people into the likeness of Christ, into the relational people whom God has created in his own image.[194] It is Ratzinger's conviction that church and sacraments, including the centrality of the eucharist, are ultimately only intelligible when we realise that God—and humans created in the image of God—are fundamentally characterised by being in—or created towards—communion.[195]

3.3.8 'The Church is Eucharist'

The previous four paragraphs already indicated the centrality of the eucharist within Ratzinger's thought. Firstly, the paschal origins of both Israel and the church point to the paschal meal as constitutive for their identity. Secondly, Ratzinger's ecclesiological keyword 'body of Christ' points to the inseparability of church and eucharist. Thirdly, the fulfillment of both temple and prophecy in the very body of Jesus Christ makes this body—in Jesus's incarnation, life, death and resurrection as well as in the eucharist—the new temple and the centre of the new cult. And fourthly, the church as participation in the trinitarian communion of God himself is most clearly manifested by participation in the eucharistic communion. All these biblical, historical and theological lines of thought lead with unmistakable consistency towards the centrality of the eucharist within the church.

Ratzinger grants the institution of the eucharist an indispensable role in the constitutive events of the Christian faith and church. Not just Jesus's death and resurrection have made Christianity what it is, but Jesus's death and resurrection *as interpreted by* the eucharistic words of institution, which declare his death and resurrection a cultic, redeeming act that will, in the sacrament, be perpetually present and available for participation. Ratzinger can also say—the other way round—that the eucharist is Jesus's church founding act, the reality of its meaning being confirmed by Jesus's death and resurrection. Ratzinger does not deny that in some sense the church already begun when Jesus called his followers, particularly the apostles with Peter in their midst. But this church did not receive its real meaning until Jesus gave the church its specific contents by his dying and rising again and by enabling the church to participate in his death and resurrection through the eucharist. By doing so, Jesus made himself

193 RATZINGER, *Weggemeinschaft des Glaubens*, 37, 46; RATZINGER, *Das Fest des Glaubens*, 28.

194 RATZINGER, *Weggemeinschaft des Glaubens*, 66, 69, 88, 114; RATZINGER, *Gott ist uns nah*, 92, 130.

195 RATZINGER, *Weggemeinschaft des Glaubens*, 143; RATZINGER, *Das Fest des Glaubens*, 15-16.

(his 'body') the centre of the church, and the eucharist the 'self-realisation' (*Selbstverwirklichung*) of the church.[196]

In relating church and eucharist, Ratzinger's main line of thought is the 'body of Christ' language as used by Paul and the Early Church, particularly Augustine. This became already clear in view of Ratzinger's dissertation, but Ratzinger has remained faithful to this theme ever since. For Ratzinger, *koinonia*/*communio*, *corpus Christi* and *ecclesia* are to a large extent interchangeable terms.[197] They do not just refer to inward, invisible spiritual ideas, but to the visible, tangible eucharistic community/communion which is the church.[198] People are Christians, members of the church, because and in so far as they are united to Christ. This happens once in baptism: baptism makes a person a member of the church. But being a member of the church means being part of the eucharistic community. Participation in the eucharistic body of Christ time and again (re-) constitutes the church as the ecclesial body of Christ.[199] God, says Ratzinger, continues the incarnation by drawing people eucharistically into *totus Christus*, which is Christ as head *and* body. 'Christ exists only in his body, never just as an idea.'[200]

Through this way of reasoning, Ratzinger erases every sense of the eucharist as 'additional' to the central salvific facts of Christianity. For him, the eucharist itself belongs to these central salvific facts and, therefore, the reality of Christian salvation cannot be conceived without reference to the eucharist. This is reflected in Ratzinger's choice of words, for example where he defines Christ's *pascha* as consisting in his death, his resurrection *and* the institution of the eucharist.[201] The same we find in a sentence like, 'A eucharistic doctrine that is not directed at the community of the church falls short of its essence as much as an ecclesiology that is not conceived from the eucharistic centre',[202]

196 RATZINGER, *Das neue Volk Gottes*, 84-85; cf. 78, 97, 163; RATZINGER, *Kirche, Ökumene und Politik*, 17; RATZINGER, *Weggemeinschaft des Glaubens*, 73, 137; RATZINGER, *Gott ist uns nah*, 48-49, 78-79; RATZINGER, *Das Fest des Glaubens*, 127.

197 RATZINGER, *Das neue Volk Gottes*, 14, 99, 157-160, 217-218, 234-235, 290; RATZINGER, *Kirche, Ökumene und Politik*, 91; RATZINGER, *Weggemeinschaft des Glaubens*, 53, 57, 78.

198 RATZINGER, *Das neue Volk Gottes*, 47, 84, 98, 231; RATZINGER, *Kirche, Ökumene und Politik*, 125; RATZINGER, *Weggemeinschaft des Glaubens*, 113-114.

199 RATZINGER, *Das neue Volk Gottes*, 82, 98, 102; RATZINGER, *Kirche, Ökumene und Politik*, 133, 180; RATZINGER, *Weggemeinschaft des Glaubens*, 68-69, 90, 105-106, 126, 216; RATZINGER, *Gott ist uns nah*, 42, 59, 83 (with emphasis on the individual believer), 98-100, 114, 121-122, 130, 134; RATZINGER, *Der Geist der Liturgie*, 75-77, 143.

200 RATZINGER, *Das neue Volk Gottes*, 83, RATZINGER, *Kirche, Ökumene und Politik*, 15 ('Christus gibt es nur in seinem Leib, nie bloss ideell'); cf. RATZINGER, *Weggemeinschaft des Glaubens*, 68, 82, 89.

201 RATZINGER, *Gott ist uns nah*, 42-43.

202 RATZINGER, *Das neue Volk Gottes*, 218 ('Eucharistielehre, die nicht auf Gemeinschaft der Kirche hinbezogen ist, verfehlt ebenso ihr Wesen wie Ekklesiologie, die nicht von der eucharistischen Mitte her konzipiert wird').

and finally in the lapidary words, 'the church exists as liturgy and in liturgy',[203] 'the church *is* eucharist'.[204]

In comparison to the eucharist as the primary and ordinary gathering and manifestation of the church, Ratzinger regards the synod or council a secondary and (especially in case of the council) extraordinary gathering and manifestation of the church. Rather than regarding the church as a kind of prolongated, continuous council, and rather than calling 'conciliarity' the primary attribute of the church, Ratzinger considers the council (*synodos*) as a necessary event '*in*' the church, after which the church returns to what it essentially '*is*': a eucharistic gathering (*synaxis*). According to Ratzinger, *synaxis* and *communio* are synonymous with *ekklesia*, while *synodos* and *concilium* are not. Although the council, like the eucharist, serves ecclesial communion, the council 'has not the same level of reality as the eucharist' as a sacramental source and celebration of unity.[205]

3.3.9 The Universal Church and the Local Churches

Probably the most controversial aspect of Ratzinger's ecclesiology is his view on the relationship between the universal church and the local churches. Whereas most eucharistic ecclesiologies lead to some kind of emphasis on the local church (most often understood as the diocese), Ratzinger indefatigably advocates an emphasis on the universal church, of which the local churches are the concrete manifestations and representations. Because this aspect of Ratzinger's thought is sometimes seen as the only aspect on which he has changed his mind over the years, this paragraph is structured chronologically.[206]

In the dissertation (1954) on Augustine the question is not yet an explicit issue. Nevertheless we can already trace Ratzinger's later insistence on, so to speak, the 'idea' of the universal church as prior to its concrete manifestation(s). This trace can be found in Ratzinger's account of Augustine's view on the church as present through all times, the *ecclesia ab Abel*. Throughout all times and places people have, 'by special divine enlightenment', belonged to the church, even when the church did not yet exist visibly in human history. This is, of course, only possible if there exists such a thing as a universal church apart

203 RATZINGER, *Gott ist uns nah*, 130 ('Kirche besteht als Liturgie und in Liturgie').

204 RATZINGER, *Weggemeinschaft des Glaubens*, 90 ('Kirche wird in der Eucharistie aufgebaut, ja, die Kirche *ist* Eucharistie').

205 RATZINGER, *Das neue Volk Gottes*, 151-163 ('[Das Konzil] hat nicht dieselbe Realitätsstufe wie die Eucharistie'); RATZINGER, *Kirche, Ökumene und Politik*, 91.

206 I confine myself to the dissertation and the three 'ecclesiological' books introduced in paragraph 3.3.1. The years of publication are given in parentheses. The 'liturgical' books confirm the overall picture; cf. RATZINGER, *Gott ist uns nah*, 51-52, 65, 97, 115, 127-128; RATZINGER, *Das Fest des Glaubens*, 61, 108, 127-128; RATZINGER, *Ein neues Lied für den Herrn*, 76-77, 100, 104 n., 114, 119-120, 146-155, 172-173, 178-179, 185, 190, 217; RATZINGER, *Der Geist der Liturgie*, 42, 58, 142.

from its historical manifestation, including its local manifestations.[207] In Ratzinger's dissertation we also already encounter his universal, 'geographical' understanding of catholicity, which he learned from Augustine and which remained self-evident for Ratzinger throughout his writings.[208]

In *Das neue Volk Gottes* (1969), Ratzinger presents his version of a eucharistic view on the relationship between the local and the universal church. Characteristic is his phrasing that the eucharistic community is the 'realisation' of the local church, which in its turn is the 'concrete way of existence' of the one church.[209] This formulation gives priority to the 'idea' of the universal church, of which the local churches are the concrete manifestations. Nevertheless, Ratzinger is also able to formulate the other way round: the universal church 'consists of', is 'built up out of', or is 'composed of' the local churches.[210]

The fact that all the local churches share in the same body of Christ, in the one bread, unites them into one church. The local church is one by being one eucharistic communion, but the same applies to the universal church: it is not the sum of all local churches, but it is in itself already one because it is the one eucharistic communion of all. In the meantime, Ratzinger has no problem saying that, as a eucharistic communion, the local church *is* the church, as long as it is secured that this local church regards itself as a part of the universal church. From his knowledge of the Early Church, Ratzinger affirms that the fullness of the eucharist implies the ecclesial fullness of the local, episcopal, eucharistic communion, as long as it is embedded into the universal network of eucharistic communions.[211]

The guarantee of this network is the bishop of Rome. Those who are in communion with him belong to the true 'net of communions'.[212] This is not to say, Ratzinger warns, that all local churches are swallowed by the local church of Rome. The church of Rome is not the universal church, but a local church. The universal church consists of local churches in communion with the bishop of Rome, who is 'the common bishop of the "sedes apostolica" at Rome'. *As* the bishop of Rome, he is 'episcopus episcoporum'.[213]

207 RATZINGER, *Volk und Haus Gottes*, 296-309.

208 RATZINGER, *Volk und Haus Gottes*, 324. This understanding of catholicity is critically evaluated in paragraph 8.6.1.

209 RATZINGER, *Das neue Volk Gottes*, 97 ('realisiert sich in'; 'existiert konkret in'); the same choice of words on pages 108, 205.

210 RATZINGER, *Das neue Volk Gottes*, 205 ('besteht aus'), 211, 220 ('auferbaut aus'), 382 ('sich zusammensetzt aus').

211 RATZINGER, *Das neue Volk Gottes*, 97, 108, 120, 123, 159, 179, 184-185, 194, 220.

212 RATZINGER, *Das neue Volk Gottes*, 206 ('Netz der Kommunionen'); cf. 88, 125, 179, 212, 219.

213 RATZINGER, *Das neue Volk Gottes*, 219 ('des gemeinsamen Bischofs der "sedes apostolica" zu Rom'), 185; cf. 117, 136, 229.

In this early work, Ratzinger is also already concerned about those local churches which regard themselves as self-sufficient. The strictly local, geographically determined jurisdiction of the diocesan bishop and of the parish priest should, says Ratzinger, be counterbalanced by the more missionary ministries of the universal church under the supervision of the bishop of Rome. This should not lead to the victory of centralism over diocesan administration, but neither should the counterbalance be opposed by an undue affection for Early Church and medieval structures. Ratzinger warns for the danger that the structure of the local (diocesan) church can become rigid and petrified. In these cases, Ratzinger says, the universality of the church should prevail over local rights.[214]

In *Kirche, Ökumene und Politik* (1987) these ideas have not changed. Christ and the church are everywhere where the eucharist is celebrated, as long as it is celebrated in a communion which is in unity with the other communions. Unity is 'not an external addition to eucharistic ecclesiology, but its internal condition'.[215] The local churches 'form' the universal church; the universal church exists 'in' the local Churches.[216] The local church should be respected as the 'fundamental *Gestalt*' of the church, and the local church, in turn, should realise that it is not self-sufficient, but open to the 'catholic' whole.[217] The openness of the local churches towards each other is visualised and led by the bishop of one local church, the bishop of Rome.[218] Therefore, unity with the bishop of Rome is not an external matter, which adds nothing to the ecclesiality of the local church, but an 'internal, formative power'.[219] Again, Ratzinger condemns a strict ecclesiology of the local church as 'romanticism' and as 'repristination of the structure of the Early Church'. 'Just to return to the Early Church is not possible, not even theologically.'[220] In the meantime, Ratzinger also repeats that the Petrine ministry should not be equated with Romanism.[221]

It is in this book, that Ratzinger for the first time introduces a second 'front' against which he advocates the universality of the church. The first front is the originally Orthodox, but nowadays broadly ecumenical version of a 'communio ecclesiology', or of a 'eucharistic ecclesiology', which emphasises

214 RATZINGER, *Das neue Volk Gottes*, 53-55, 138. This position is critically evaluated in paragraph 8.5.5.

215 RATZINGER, *Kirche, Ökumene und Politik*, 19 ('nicht eine äussere Zutat zur eucharistischen Ekklesiologie, sondern ihre innere Bedingung'); cf. 17-19, 72, 75, 110.

216 RATZINGER, *Kirche, Ökumene und Politik*, 54; cf. 74: the local church manifests ('darstellt') the universal church.

217 RATZINGER, *Kirche, Ökumene und Politik*, 57 ('Grundgestalt').

218 RATZINGER, *Kirche, Ökumene und Politik*, 58.

219 RATZINGER, *Kirche, Ökumene und Politik*, 75, 77 ('eine von innen her prägende Kraft'). This view is evaluated in paragraph 8.6.6.

220 RATZINGER, *Kirche, Ökumene und Politik*, 75 ('Romantizismus der Teilkirche', 'Repristinierung der Bauform der alten Kirche'); 76-77 ('Die blosse Rückkehr zur alten Kirche ist kein Weg, auch theologisch nicht').

221 RATZINGER, *Kirche, Ökumene und Politik*, 77-78.

the full ecclesiality of every local church (diocese). Towards this front, Ratzinger's focus is on the Petrine ministry—belonging to the universal church, hold together by (and under) the Petrine ministry, is in his view an intrinsic aspect of the ecclesiality of every local church. The second front is the modern tendency to reduce the church to the local congregation (parish or group). Towards this front, Ratzinger's focus is on the universality of faith and liturgy. In his view, the local community is not the 'creative' author of liturgical texts and rites. Rather, each local congregation should realise that it is part of the wider—and eventually the worldwide—church with its common faith and common liturgy.[222]

The most recent ecclesiological book under observation, *Weggemeinschaft des Glaubens* (2002), takes up the same themes. The eucharist builds up the local congregation, but because there is only one Lord in one eucharist, the eucharistic celebration of the local congregation *implies and requires* that the local congregation is in communion with the whole body of Christ. 'All eucharistic gatherings are together only *one* gathering, because the body of Christ is only *one* and therefore the people of God can only be *one*.'[223]

It is in this book, that Ratzinger elaborates the theme of the 'ontological precedence' of the universal over the local church, introduced by himself in a document of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith.[224] Referring to the patristic idea of a pre-existent church and to the New Testament ecclesiological images of body and bride, Ratzinger states that it must be obvious for everyone that the church as a universal 'idea' takes precedence over the church in its concrete, historical manifestations. But Ratzinger also claims that *historically* there was a universal church before there were local churches. The twelve apostles as tribes of the new universal people, Paul's universal apostolic ministry and Luke's picture of Jerusalem (at Pentecost and immediately after) not as a local church but as the prototype of the universal church, serve as proof for this claim.[225]

222 RATZINGER, *Kirche, Ökumene und Politik*, 111, 174-175.

223 RATZINGER, *Weggemeinschaft des Glaubens*, 92 ('Alle eucharistischen Versammlungen sind zusammen doch nur eine Versammlung, weil der Leib Christi nur *einer* ist und das Volk Gottes daher nur *eines* sein kann'); cf. 78, 114.

224 CONGREGATIO DE DOCTRINA FIDEI, *Litterae ad catholicae ecclesiae episcopos de aliquibus aspectibus ecclesiae prout est communio* ('*Communionis notio*', 1992): The universal Church *ontologice et temporaliter praecedit* the local Churches (9). Cf. the discussion between the Cardinals Kasper (priority of the local church) and Ratzinger (priority of the universal church) as analysed in M. KEHL, 'Der Disput der Kardinäle. Zum Verhältnis von Universalkirche und Ortskirchen', *Stimmen der Zeit* 221 (2003), 219-232 and in P. MCPARTLAN, 'The Local and the Universal Church: Zizioulas and the Ratzinger—Kasper Debate', in: D.H. Knight (ed.), *The Theology of John Zizioulas: Personhood and the Church* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 171-182. See also Tillard's concept of the *simultaneity* of locality and universality in paragraph 3.5.4.

225 RATZINGER, *Weggemeinschaft des Glaubens*, 55-56, 61-62, 116-119, 160-161. This view of Ratzinger's can be traced back to *Das neue Volk Gottes*, where the twelve, Paul, and

In *Weggemeinschaft des Glaubens*, as much as in *Das neue Volk Gottes*, Ratzinger emphasises that the universal church should not be equated with the church of Rome or with the Roman Curia. Only if one makes this mistake, Ratzinger can understand the opposition against his thesis about the precedence of the universal over the local church. But in Ratzinger's thought, the universal church is not Rome, neither is it a theological rationale to give the local church of Rome and its bishop as many prerogatives as one likes. In Ratzinger's thought, the universal church is an entity of faith, that is, an entity of an 'ontological', 'theological' or 'internal' nature. This entity of faith—the universal church—is described by Scripture and tradition in such images as body, bride, family, temple, city, mother, and becomes tangible in baptism, the Word, the eucharist and the ministry. Wherever one has been baptised, one is at home in the church anywhere in the world. Wherever the Word of God is proclaimed, it builds the same community of the church anywhere in the world. Wherever one celebrates the eucharist, it is the same eucharist within the same church anywhere in the world. Wherever a bishop or a priest is, is the communion with the worldwide church. The church is—still according to Ratzinger—not built up in or by the local church, but by Christ himself, who comes to the particular church from the whole church, to the particular part of the body of Christ from the whole body of Christ.[226]

In *Das neue Volk Gottes* we encountered Ratzinger's tendency to suspect the local church to be static and passive, while he grants the universal church a more missionary and dynamic character. The same he expresses in *Weggemeinschaft des Glaubens*. From post-apostolic times onwards, the local, episcopal church tends—says Ratzinger—to be self-centred and to lack missionary vigour.[227] Early monasticism and medieval mendicants were the much needed counterbalance. In our times, this missionary dynamic can be found in the modern international movements within the Roman Catholic Church. The 'ecclesial backing' of these universal movements is the Papacy. Here, says Ratzinger, we see 'perhaps the deepest sense and the truest essence of the Petrine ministry [...]: the bishop of Rome is not just the bishop of a local church; his ministry is always related to the universal church'. He is 'bishop for the whole Church and in the whole Church'. He does not exercise this ministry

Jerusalem have already this universal meaning. It is, thus, not a recent idea in Ratzinger's thought, although it has not been elaborated this much before, perhaps because it has not been contested this much before. Cf. RATZINGER, *Das neue Volk Gottes*, 113-114, 123-124, 128-129, 379. It should be mentioned that we have earlier seen how Afanasiev argues the other way round: for him, Jerusalem was a local church and Paul a missionary sent out by the local church of Jerusalem or Antioch. According to Ratzinger, the local church is rather static and the missionary comes from the universal church; according to Afanasiev there is no universal church otherwise than as manifested in the local churches, which can very well be missionary in character (cf. paragraph 2.2.6).

226 RATZINGER, *Weggemeinschaft des Glaubens*, 115, 119, 121-124, 207, 217.

227 This position is critically evaluated in paragraph 8.5.5.

on his own—which would lead to exaggerated Papalism—but together with those ministers and movements that place themselves at the service of not just the local, but the universal church. Of this supra-local aspect of the church, the bishop of Rome is the guarantor and coordinator.[228]

We can conclude that Ratzinger's view on the relationship between the universal church and the local churches has not fundamentally changed throughout his life, although it has become a more important and more emphasised aspect of his thought in later years. In Ratzinger's eucharistic ecclesiology, the universal church is *a theological idea*—those who share in Christ's death and resurrection by baptism and the eucharist, are united into *one* universal fellowship, of which every local church is an expression and manifestation—and at the same time *an empirical phenomenon*, namely the visible universal 'net of [eucharistic] communions' in communion with the bishop of Rome.[229] For Ratzinger, the unity of the church, guaranteed by being in communion with the bishop of Rome, is intrinsic to the ecclesiality of each local church.

A more detailed investigation into Ratzinger's view on the bishop of Rome or, as he prefers to say, the Petrine ministry,[230] does not add to the function the bishop of Rome has within the overall shape of Ratzinger's eucharistic ecclesiology. On the one hand, one can say that the bishop of Rome is of supreme relevance within Ratzinger's ecclesiology—communion with him is both condition and guarantee for belonging to the true 'net of communions' that is the universal church. On the other hand, however, Ratzinger's ecclesiology is not built upon the Pope,[231] but on the *pascha* of Jesus Christ, that has been made

228 RATZINGER, *Weggemeinschaft des Glaubens*, 167 ('ekklesialer Rückhalt', 'der tiefste Sinn und das wahre Wesen des Petrusamtes', 'Der Bischof von Rom ist nicht nur Bischof einer Ortskirche; sein Amt ist immer auf die Universalkirche bezogen'), 173 ('Bischof für die ganze Kirche und in der ganzen Kirche'); cf. 152-153, 163-173, 177-178.

229 I find this interpretation confirmed by MCPARTLAN, 'The Local and the Universal Church' (esp. 172-174), who helpfully adds that the continuous blurring (especially in intra-Western debates) of these two meanings of the concept 'universal church' is an important reason for the controversy on this issue. He further adds that the former meaning—when interpreted correctly and with aid from Eastern theology—is first and foremost the *eschatological* meaning of 'universal church'.

230 See particularly RATZINGER, *Zur Gemeinschaft gerufen*, 43-75. Ratzinger sees the fundamental role of the bishop of Rome rather from his being the successor of Peter than from his being the patriarch of Rome. It would be interesting to study how Ratzinger's high regard for the indispensable role of the Petrine ministry relates to his repeated conviction that Roman centralism (explained by Ratzinger as a *patriarchal* phenomenon) is not necessarily the way in which the Petrine ministry should be exercised. A similar stance is taken by Tillard; cf. paragraph 3.5.6. Another interesting study could be devoted to the exegetical, historical and theological implications of Ratzinger's emphasis on the Petrine character of the bishop of Rome's primacy.

231 With VOLF, *Trinität und Gemeinschaft*, 50 (similar: WEILER, *Volk Gottes—Leib Christi*, 351; RUDDY, *The Local Church*, 100), one could say that, althought the ministry—including the Petrine ministry—is an integral part of Ratzinger's view on the community of the

'communicative' by the sacraments. Participation—through baptism—in the eucharist constitutes people as the body of Christ and therefore as the people of God. Where most eucharistic ecclesiologies conclude that this sacramental way of being incorporated into Christ leads to the precendence of the local sacramental assembly (the local church), Ratzinger argues that this sacramental way of being incorporated into Christ means in the first place that people are incorporated into *totus Christus*, his whole body, the universal church, of which each eucharistic assembly is the local expression and manifestation.

Finally it should be added that Ratzinger has yet another way in which he speaks about the universal church. The universal church is not just the earthly church but also, as he likes to formulate, the 'cosmic' church—the church of those on earth and in heaven (departed, saints, angels). Particularly in his 'liturgical' books, Ratzinger emphasises that the individual believer may know that he or she is part of the communion of saints. In the liturgy, especially in praise, the earthly church joins the heavenly church as one universal communion.[232]

3.3.10 Never Just a Cult

Ratzinger never allows his eucharistic ecclesiology—nor his liturgical theology—to endorse liturgy as 'just a cult'. Words like *nie bloss kultisch* (never just cultic) keep occurring in his writings. This is one of those aspects of his thought which he probably learnt from Augustine at the time he wrote his dissertation, and which he never lost since. For Augustine, cult and ethics are intertwined. *Agape* (love) is one of the patristic words for the eucharist as well as for the Christian life.[233] That the church is most fundamentally manifested around the eucharistic table also means that the church should be a 'table community' (*Tischgemeinschaft*) in the most physical and social sense of the word. The communion with the body of Christ creates a community of love in and beyond the liturgy. Having become Christ's body in the liturgy, the church lives its daily life as the 'liturgy' of Christ's love, as a kind of continued

church, his ecclesiology is so far from a 'hierarchology' that its essential shape can be sketched without even mentioning the ministry ('Seine Ekklesiologie ist aber so wenig Hierarchologie, dass das Entscheidende über sie gesagt werden könnte, ohne das Amt einmal zu erwähnen'). Unfortunately, Ratzinger's conservative position and strict policy as Prefect of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith has given the opposite impression, namely that for Ratzinger the church is more or less to be equated with a centralised magisterium. Cf. BOEVE, 'Kerk, theologie en heilswaarheid', 161-162.

232 E.g., RATZINGER, *Gott ist uns nah*, 51-52; RATZINGER, *Das Fest des Glaubens*, 59, 67; RATZINGER, *Ein neues Lied für den Herrn*, 164, 173, 178, 181, 222; RATZINGER, *Der Geist der Liturgie*, 42.

233 Cf. paragraph 3.3.3.

eucharist. We have to *become* eucharist. Daily life has to become 'liturgical', that is, transformative.[234]

To describe this both cultic and non-cultic character of the Christian concept of worship, Ratzinger frequently uses Paul's expression *logike latreia*,[235] which he prefers to translate as 'worship according to the *logos*' (*logosgemässer Gottesdienst*). According to one strand within the Old Testament, taken up by the New Testament, to worship God truly is to live a life of righteousness. Not the sacrificial cult, but the 'words' (*logoi*) of our praise and of our righteousness are an acceptable offering to God. This 'word' (*logos*) has been incarnated in Jesus Christ, so that the offering of our praise and our righteous life are personified and embodied in him. Therefore, the Christian cult is the unbloody cult of prayer—the words (*logoi*) of the liturgical remembrance, effective words, making present what is remembered—*and* the Christian cult is the daily cult of righteousness, that is, the life as it was lived by the Word (*logos*) incarnate, Jesus Christ. Christian cult is 'logisation' (*Logisierung*)—being transformed into the likeness of the Word (*logos*) incarnate, being made the body of Christ, being made contemporary with Christ's self-offering. 'The logos himself has become body and gives himself to us in his body. Therefore we are called to give our bodies as a liturgy according to the logos.'[236]

As we will see in many other authors in this study, eucharistic ecclesiology crosses the limits of the eucharistic liturgy into a 'eucharistic' way of life. For Ratzinger, this is not a social extension of a theological principle, but an integral part of his view on Christ, the church and the liturgy. As Christ himself is the (in incarnation, death and resurrection) embodied love of God, the same love is lived by the church and its members, mediated by the eucharist.[237]

234 RATZINGER, *Das neue Volk Gottes*, 43, 85-86, 272, 312; RATZINGER, *Weggemeinschaft des Glaubens*, 61, 64, 86, 97-106; RATZINGER, *Gott ist uns nah*, 88, 92-93, 136; RATZINGER, *Der Geist der Liturgie*, 15, 17-18, 79, 138, 151, 186.

235 Romans 12:1; 'reasonable service' (Authorised Version); 'spiritual worship' (Revised Standard Version and New Revised Standard Version). This theme could as well have been brought in at the paragraph 'Old and New Testaments—Priestly and Prophetic—Cultic and Non-Cultic' above, because the themes are related, as so many of Ratzinger's themes are.

236 RATZINGER, *Weggemeinschaft des Glaubens*, 102 ('Der Logos selbst ist Leib geworden und gibt sich uns in seinem Leib. Deshalb werden wir aufgefordert, unsere Leiber als logosgemässen Gottesdienst darzubringen'); cf. 100-102; RATZINGER, *Gott ist uns nah*, 32, 47-50, 64, 70; RATZINGER, *Das Fest des Glaubens*, 34, 50-51, 106; RATZINGER, *Ein neues Lied für den Herrn*, 121, 128-129, 131, 134, 156-158, 174; RATZINGER, *Der Geist der Liturgie*, 38-42, 51, 121, 128-134, 148-152, 181.

237 Ratzinger complains that his intentions are misunderstood if one 'does not do justice to the fact that the notion of adoration, as I present it, is not limited to prayer in its proper sense, but embraces the whole life'; J. RATZINGER, 'Réponse du cardinal Ratzinger au Père Gy', *La Maison-Dieu* 230 (2002/2), 113-120, at 119 ('il ne s'est pas rendu compte que la notion d'adoration, telle que je la présente, n'est pas limitée à la prière proprement dite, mais embrasse toute la vie').

3.3.11 A 'Providential Coincidence'

In the afternoon of Tuesday, 19 April 2005, the College of Cardinals elected their Dean, Joseph Ratzinger, to be the next bishop of Rome. The following morning, Pope Benedict XVI celebrated the eucharist with them in the Sistine Chapel. In his address, the Pope referred to the 'Year of the Eucharist', proclaimed by his predecessor, John Paul II.

> My Pontificate begins in a particularly meaningful way as the Church is living the special Year dedicated to the Eucharist. How could I fail to see this providential coincidence as an element that must mark the ministry to which I am called? The Eucharist, the heart of Christian life and the source of the Church's evangelising mission, cannot but constitute the permanent centre and source of the Petrine ministry that has been entrusted to me.
>
> The Eucharist makes constantly present the Risen Christ who continues to give himself to us, calling us to participate in the banquet of his Body and his Blood. From full communion with him flows every other element of the Church's life: first of all, communion among all the faithful, the commitment to proclaiming and witnessing to the Gospel, the ardour of love for all, especially the poorest and lowliest.[238]

In continuity with his lifelong theological approach, Ratzinger mentions the eucharist as the source and heart of the church and as the centre of his own ministry. A better summary of the principal conviction of a eucharistic ecclesiology could not be given: from the eucharistic *koinonia* with the risen Lord 'flows every other element of the Church's life': the ecclesial *koinonia*, flowing over in *kerygma*, *martyria*, *agape* and *diakonia*.

3.3.12 Conclusion

Ratzinger's eucharistic ecclesiology can be summarised as follows. In his body, Jesus Christ has incarnated and fulfilled the Old Testament, both in its cultic (temple, priest, sacrifice) and its prophetic (righteousness, love) sense. His death and resurrection, which are through the eucharist perpetually open for participation, constitute the body of Christ, the new people of God. This is salvation: the restoration of the original intent of God, who is unity-in-communion in himself, to create people in his image, that is, to create humans as people-in-communion. The church is this restored people, who are (ecclesially) in communion with each other and (spiritually) with God through their (primarily eucharistic) communion in the sacraments, which overflows in a

238 [RATZINGER], 'First Message'. RUDDY, *The Local Church*, 154, gives a similar comment on this programmatic address.

(social) life of communion in the world. In other words, the church is the ecclesial body of Christ through its participation in the eucharistic body of Christ, which is at the same time participation in the triune God. Although this church is everywhere manifested wherever the eucharist is celebrated, it is primarily a universal divine-human communion. This communion is the universal church in communion with the successor of Peter, the bishop of Rome. But it is also the cosmic church on earth and in heaven, as it is exemplarily embodied in Mary.

Ratzinger's eucharistic ecclesiology unites biblical, patristic and dogmatic thought into a consistent view on God, humanity, the church, the liturgy and the Christian life. Every aspect of Ratzinger's thought is rooted in the notion of 'communion' or 'participation'. Therefore, the centre of Ratzinger's thought is the eucharist—eucharist as communion with God through participation in his triune life; eucharist as communion with Jesus Christ through participation in his life, death and resurrection; eucharist as communion with the church local, universal and cosmic; and eucharist as manifestation of salvation: the restored unity of humankind and all creation.

3.4 LEONARDO BOFF

3.4.1 Life and Work

Leonardo Boff[239] was born in Brazil in 1938 as a member of the third generation of an Italian immigrant family. He entered the Franciscan order (1959) and was ordained priest (1964). After philosophical and theological training in Petrópolis (Rio de Janeiro, Brazil), Boff continued his studies in Munich (Germany), where he obtained his doctorate in 1970 under the supervision of Leo Scheffczyk and Heinrich Fries. For 22 years he served as Professor of Systematic and Ecumenical Theology at the Franciscan Theological Institute in Petrópolis, while also acting as Visiting Professor at universities in the Americas and in Europe.

Scrutiny by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith led to Boff's being silenced and suspended from ecclesiastical functions during 1985. Under the threat of a second investigation in 1992, he 'promoted himself to the state of

[239] This introductory information is taken from L. BOFF, *Die Kirche als Sakrament im Horizont der Welterfahrung. Versuch einer Legitimation und einer struktur-funktionalistischen Grundlegung der Kirche im Anschluss an das II. Vatikanische Konzil* (Paderborn: Bonifacius, 1972), 15-16; L. BOFF, *Sacraments of Life—Life of the Sacraments* (Portland OR: Pastoral, 1987 [trans. of *Os sacramentos da vida e a vida dos sacramentos. Mínima sacramentalia*, Petrópolis: Vozes, 1975]), 37; and www.leonardoboff.com, 'personal information', 'biography'.

the laity'. He continues writing and lecturing on the theology and spirituality of liberation, ecology and human rights.

It may be surprising to find Boff in this chapter together with Ratzinger, who in many respects represents his opposite, and who had part in his 1985 silencing.[240] The emphasis here is, however, not on their polemics, but on what both of them independently have to offer to the ecumenical quest for a liturgical ecclesiology. For the same reason, this section does not primarily investigate Boff's liberation theology a such, but his insights into themes related to an ecclesiology in which the liturgy, primarily the eucharist, has a central place.

Two themes will attract our particular attention: sacramentality and the Trinity. The fundamental role of sacramentality in Boff's thought will be presented from his dissertation, *Die Kirche als Sakrament im Horizont der Welterfahrung* (1972), and his introduction to sacramental theology, *Sacraments of Life – Life of the Sacraments* (1975).[241] The Trinity as the root of Boff's thought on community will be discussed from *Trinity and Society* (1986) and *Holy Trinity, Perfect Community* (1988).[242] Prior to that, some introductory remarks will be made about his theology and ecclesiology in general, making reference to the introductory book he wrote together with his brother Clodovis, *Introducing Liberation Theology* (1986) and to his ecclesiological works *Ecclesiogenesis* (1977) and *Church: Charism and Power* (1981).[243]

3.4.2 Liberation Theology

Boff's sacramental and trinitarian thought is situated in his liberation theology.[244] In at least two instances, the quest for a liturgical ecclesiology can benefit from the methodology of liberation theology as described by Boff. First, though liberation theology is also practised academically, it takes primarily

240 For an ecclesiological-theological evaluation of the Boff-Ratzinger debate, cf. B.M.J. KLEIN GOLDEWIJK, *Praktijk of principe. Basisgemeenschappen en de ecclesiologie van Leonardo Boff. Een wetenschappelijke proeve op het gebied van de godgeleerdheid* (Kampen: Kok, 1991), 185-202.

241 See the first footnote of this section.

242 L. BOFF, *Trinity and Society* (Maryknoll NY: Orbis, 1988 [trans. of *A Trindade, a sociedade e a libertação*, Petrópolis: Vozes, 1986]); L. BOFF, *Holy Trinity, Perfect Community* (Maryknoll NY: Orbis, 2000 [trans. of *A Santíssima Trindade é a melhor comunidade*, Petrópolis: Vozes, 1988]).

243 L. BOFF & C. BOFF, *Introducing Liberation Theology* (Maryknoll NY: Orbis, 1987 [trans. of *Como fazer Teologia da Libertação*, Petrópolis: Vozes, 1986]); L. BOFF, *Ecclesiogenesis: The Base Communities Reinvent the Church* (Maryknoll NY: Orbis, 1986 [trans. of *Eclesiogênese: As comunidades eclesiais de base reinventam a Igreja*, Petrópolis: Vozes, 1977, with the addition of two more recent articles]); L. BOFF, *Church: Charism and Power: Liberation Theology and the Institutional Church* (London: SCM, 1985 [trans. of *Igreja: Carisma e poder*, Petrópolis: Vozes, 1981]).

244 For Boff's position between Western European 'liberal' theology and Latin American 'liberation' theology, cf. KLEIN GOLDEWIJK, *Praktijk of principe*, 201, 207-227.

shape at a local and non-professional level. It 'is primarily oral; it is a spoken theology'. It is rooted in the daily experiences of ordinary people, which makes it, in Boff's terminology, 'a "sacramental" theology, expressed in gestures and symbols'.[245] As we will see below, Boff has a broad understanding of sacramentality. In this case he means that liberation theology is 'sacramental' because it is incarnated in the words, lifestyles, situations and needs of ordinary people, particularly the poor. Liberation theology is to be found in local communities and contingent situations.[246]

The link between this description of liberation theology and a liturgical ecclesiology is its relationship to the local, the oral and the ordinary. A liturgical ecclesiology should likewise be informed by, and relevant to, the concrete, local celebration. That is why the local church is so important in liturgical ecclesiology, and why the methodology of liturgical theologians often starts from and returns to the actual celebratory event.

Second, liberation theology is rather a hermeneutic approach than a detailed theology. It is a way of reading the Bible, taking it as a 'book of life' with a '*practical* meaning', offering '*transforming energy*'. In the hermeneutics of liberation theology, Scripture is read from the perspective of the oppressed, that is, as a story of liberation.[247] 'As for classic spirituality, liberation theology seeks to correct its ahistorical interiority, its elitism and its deficient sense of the presence of the lord of history in liberative social processes.'[248] Liberation theology seeks to establish a practical connection between spirituality—including the liturgy and, as we will see below, primarily the eucharist—and the socio-political processes which effect people's lifes.[249] Thus, liberation theology does not want to be 'a new faith', but 'the faith of the Apostles, the faith of the church linked to the sufferings and hopes for liberation of the oppressed of this world'.[250] Rather than a separate theology, it aims at being 'an appeal to all theologies'.[251]

This appeals to liturgical ecclesiology in a twofold way. Formally, a comparison can be made between liberation theology and liturgical ecclesiology to the extent that both are characterised by a heuristic, hermeneutical approach to theology and church practice—looking at the church from the angle of either liberation or liturgy—rather than a defined theology in itself. But the 'material' comparison is more important. If liberation is an appeal to all theologies, then also a liturgical ecclesiology should ask itself to what extent it reinforces power structures—in the case of the liturgy perhaps ministerial power and cultural

245 BOFF & BOFF, *Introducing Liberation Theology*, 16.
246 BOFF & BOFF, *Introducing Liberation Theology*, 19.
247 BOFF & BOFF, *Introducing Liberation Theology*, 32, 34.
248 BOFF & BOFF, *Introducing Liberation Theology*, 36.
249 BOFF & BOFF, *Introducing Liberation Theology*, 39.
250 BOFF & BOFF, *Introducing Liberation Theology*, 43.
251 BOFF & BOFF, *Introducing Liberation Theology*, 91; cf. 83.

elitism—and to what extent it enables full and varied participation and communion.

3.4.3 Liberation Ecclesiology and the Eucharist

Liberation theology includes an ecclesiology.[252] Boff is known for the ecclesiological rationale he gives to the *comunidades eclesiales de base*, the Base Ecclesial Communities. It is Boff's conviction that, as the subtitle of his book *Ecclesiogenesis* says, 'the base communities reinvent the church'. In these local communities people share faith and share daily life with its difficulties, so that communion and participation become realities. Therefore, says Boff, the church in its very essence is reinvented in and through these communities, because the essence of the church is communion and participation. In the Base Ecclesial Communities, Boff sees the realisation of the people of God in '*koinonia* (communion), prophecy and *diakonia* (service)'.[253]

Seen from the perspective of a liturgical ecclesiology, Boff seems to have something of a love-hate relationship with the centrality of liturgy and the eucharist. When defending the ecclesiality of Base Ecclesial Communities, Boff focuses on the centrality of faith, Scripture, gathering, sharing and relativises the importance of the eucharist, which is seldom celebrated in these communities. Boff compares two extremes—a papalist, uniform understanding of the church versus a popular, local understanding of the church—and opts for the latter. In such a comparison of extremes, the eucharist and the bishop necessarily seem to belong to the 'wrong' party and are regarded as examples of 'top down' thinking. Consequently, the Base Ecclesial Communities are granted full ecclesiality, as long as they are embedded in concentrical circles of leadership—local, episcopal, papal. Here, the eucharist does not appear as an instrument of ecclesial unity.[254]

There is, however, another strand in Boff's thought, in which the eucharist does have a central place. As an anticipation of the kingdom of God, as the presence of the continuing life and work of Jesus Christ through the Holy Spirit, and as a symbol of unity, 'the Eucharist is a constitutive element of the church. Without it the church would not be what it is'.[255] Struggling with the structures of his own church, particularly regarding the limited access to the ordained ministry, Boff sometimes emphasises the worth of nearly-eucharistic celebrations of the Word and the sharing of food,[256] at other times emphasises

252 For a general survey of Boff's ecclesiology, cf. KLEIN GOLDEWIJK, *Praktijk of principe*, 259-309.

253 BOFF, *Church: Charism and Power*, 9; cf. BOFF & BOFF, *Introducing Liberation Theology*, 59-60.

254 BOFF, *Ecclesiogenesis*, 10-22. This position is critically evaluated in paragraph 8.5.5.

255 BOFF, *Ecclesiogenesis*, 54.

256 BOFF, *Ecclesiogenesis*, 62.

the need for the full eucharist being celebrated in every Base Ecclesial Community by a local leader, be he or she priest or not,[257] and at still other times pleads for the ordination of non-celibate men and women to the priesthood.[258]

Evaluating Boff's thought in the context of an ecumenical liturgical ecclesiology, the latter line of thought appears more fruitful than the former. When the admission to the ordained ministry is limited to such an extent that ordained ministry is disconnected from community leadership and the frequent celebration of the eucharist is endangered, the solution should, from a eucharistic-ecclesiological point of view, not be sought in relativising the centrality of the eucharist or in denouncing the eucharist as an element of 'top down' clericalist ecclesial policy, as Boff does in his first line of thought, but in restoring the ordained ministry to its ordinary place of local eucharistic presidency and, flowing from it, local community leadership, as in the second strand in Boff's thought. Rather than seeking refuge in quasi-eucharistic celebrations (unhappily disconnecting 'consecration' from celebration),[259] or non-ordained ministries (unhappily disconnecting the 'ontological' from the functional),[260] Boff's plea for non-celibate male and female priests suggests a way consistent with eucharistic ecclesiology.

3.4.4 The Church as a Sacrament

The theme of sacramentality in Boff's writings can be divided into church-as-sacrament ecclesiology, to which this paragraph is devoted, and sacramentality in general, which will be discussed in the next paragraph. Boff's doctoral dissertation is a major study into the history and meaning of the ecclesiological concept of the church as a sacrament. In the context of my study on liturgical or eucharistic ecclesiology, it is important to understand the affinity but also the distinction between eucharistic ecclesiology and church-as-sacrament ecclesiology.

Church-as-sacrament ecclesiology uses the word 'sacrament' *analogically*—Christ as the 'sacrament' of God, the church as the 'sacrament' of Christ.[261] The concept of sacramentality is abstracted from the sacramental rites to serve as an analogy for something else—Christ or the church.[262] The

257 BOFF, *Ecclesiogenesis*, 64-73.

258 BOFF, *Ecclesiogenesis*, 63, 76-97.

259 This tendency is present in BOFF, *Ecclesiogenesis*, 62, 64.

260 This tendency is present in BOFF, *Ecclesiogenesis*, 67.

261 This concept was briefly encountered in the work of de Lubac; cf. paragraph 3.2.3 (The Church).

262 For example, the eucharist serves *as a model for* the church-as-sacrament; cf. L.J. KOFFEMAN, *Kerk als sacramentum. De rol van de sacramentele ecclesiologie tijdens Vaticanum II* (Kampen: Van den Berg, 1986), 99.

church is *so to speak* a sacrament.[263] If church-as-sacrament ecclesiology is called a 'sacramental' ecclesiological model, the term 'sacramental' refers (analogically) to the church. Eucharistic ecclesiology, however, does not work with the conceptual term *sacrament*, but, rather concrete, with the event of the *eucharist*. In eucharistic ecclesiology, the liturgical gathering, the eucharistic community, is regarded as the primary and most fundamental form of the church. If eucharistic ecclesiology is called a 'sacramental' ecclesiological model, the term 'sacramental' refers (concretely) to the eucharist.[264]

Boff's distinction between the German words *sakramental* and *sakramentell* may be helpful to illustrate the point. Both words mean 'sacramental', but Boff defines *sakramental* as referring to the concept of sacramentality and *sakramentell* as referring to the concrete sacraments.[265] Following this definition, church-as-sacrament ecclesiology is a *sakramental* ecclesiological model, whereas eucharistic ecclesiology is a *sakramentell* ecclesiological model. Perhaps one could lapidarily say that the former approach sees 'the church as a sacrament', whereas the latter sees 'the sacrament (namely the eucharist) as the church'. In Boff's own words, 'Living the primary sacrament, the church, is the previous condition for receiving the seven sacraments'[266]—not the other way round, as would be the case in eucharistic-ecclesiological terminology.

This emphasis on the distinction between church-as-sacrament ecclesiology and eucharistic ecclesiology is meant as a clarification, not a depreciation. Ecclesiologically, the terms *mysterion* and *sacramentum* can be applied in a threefold way.[267] Firstly—closest to the New Testament use of the former—they can refer to the whole economy of salvation. In this first sense, the church has its place within the mystery of God, the mystery of Christ, the mystery of salvation.[268] Secondly—a development taking place during patristic times—the terms *mysterion* and *sacramentum* can denote the sacred acts of the church, the 'sacred mysteries', originally in a large, comprehensive sense, later reduced to 'the' seven sacraments. In this second sense, the eucharist is a

263 Cf. Vatican II's expression *veluti sacramentum* (as it were a sacrament); *Lumen Gentium* 1.

264 An example of underestimation of the distinction between eucharistic ecclesiology and church-as-sacrament ecclesiology is Avery Dulles's mentioning of eucharistic ecclesiology under the heading of 'The Church as Sacrament' (which he calls 'the sacramental model') rather than under 'The Church as [...] Communion', where it more consistently belongs. Cf. A. DULLES, *Models of the Church*, Expanded Edition (New York: Doubleday, 2002 [1974[1]]), 55-67.

265 BOFF, *Die Kirche als Sakrament*, 143.

266 BOFF, *Church: Charism and Power*, 134.

267 For the nuances of the Greek and Latin terms, cf. R. HOTZ, *Sakramente—im Wechselspiel zwischen Ost und West* (Zürich-Köln: Benziger; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1979), 57-63.

268 BOFF, *Die Kirche als Sakrament*, 49-66; HOTZ, *Sakramente*, 23-25; KOFFEMAN, *Kerk als sacramentum*, 16-18, 128, 259-275, 315-319.

mystery or sacrament.[269] Thirdly, a certain 'sacramental way of thought' is detectable throughout the history of Christian theology. In the nineteenth century, this sacramental atmosphere sedated into a terminology in which the church was called a *sacramentum*. In this third sense, therefore, the church can be called a sacrament.[270] All three applications of the term 'sacrament' are, of course, fully legitimate. For conceptual clarity, however, it is important to be aware of the different use of the term in eucharistic ecclesiology (second sense) and church-as-sacrament ecclesiology (third sense).

Illustrative of this distinction is the fact that—as Boff's extensive historical and systematic study reveals—the discourse of church-as-sacrament ecclesiology is, most of the time, not a eucharistic-ecclesiological discourse.[271] Sometimes, eucharistic-ecclesiological notions are acknowledged as auxiliary material for church-as-sacrament ecclesiology.[272] More interesting in the context of this study are the passages in which eucharistic ecclesiology is displayed as a *concretisation* of church-as-sacrament ecclesiology. This approach indicates that, while eucharistic ecclesiology conceptually proceeds from the particular to the general (from the eucharistic celebration to the church), the line of thought in church-as-sacrament ecclesiology is from the general to the particular: Christ is called 'the sacrament of God', the church is called 'the sacrament of Christ', and the concrete sacraments are further particularisations of this concept of sacramentality.[273]

However, Boff does acknowledge the eucharistic-ecclesiological approach, albeit as a secondary movement. After his primary movement of proceeding from the general to the particular, Boff mentions that most people become acquainted with the church through one of its particularisations, most probably through its sacraments.[274] People learn what the church is from engaging in the acts 'where the people, and at the same time the church itself, enact their essence': in the seven sacraments.[275] Therefore, Boff says, the sacraments are not just 'means of grace', but the 'church [...] in fragment'. The sacraments are 'the very essence of the church [...] made concrete in particular [...] signs'.[276]

269 BOFF, *Die Kirche als Sakrament*, 67-80; HOTZ, *Sakramente*, 48-56.

270 BOFF, *Die Kirche als Sakrament*, 48 ('sakramentale[s] Denken'); KOFFEMAN, *Kerk als sacramentum*, 28 ('sacramentele denkwijze'). Boff (45, 113, 307-314) and Koffeman (58-62) present the Tübingen theologian Matthias Joseph Scheeben (1835-1888) as the initiator of the church-as-sacrament terminology.

271 BOFF, *Die Kirche als Sakrament*, 83-123, 182-295.

272 BOFF, *Die Kirche als Sakrament*, 233-234, 326.

273 BOFF, *Die Kirche als Sakrament*, 380-386, 389-392; cf. KOFFEMAN, *Kerk als sacramentum*, 89, 95.

274 BOFF, *Die Kirche als Sakrament*, 387.

275 BOFF, *Die Kirche als Sakrament*, 389 ('wo der Mensch und die Kirche selbst zugleich ihr Wesen vollziehen').

276 BOFF, *Die Kirche als Sakrament*, 389 ('Die Sakramente sind das Ganzsakrament Kirche selbst im Fragment, das Wesen der Kirche selbst [...], konkretisiert in partikulären [...] Zeichen').

Although the movement from the general to the particular is still obvious in these formulations, here Boff comes closest to the intentions of a liturgical or eucharistic ecclesiology: in the very celebration of the sacraments, people encounter the church. Consequently, Boff follows 'modern theology [...] in unison with ancient tradition'—the neo-patristic *ressourcement* theology of the twentieth century—when it does not regard the sacraments as connecting the individual believer to God, but as connecting the individual believer to his or her fellow believers in the church and, by doing so, as connecting the believers corporately to God.[277] This particularly applies to the eucharist. In a phrase characteristic of a eucharistic-ecclesiological line of thought, Boff says, 'The eucharist is central: the common eating from one bread (1 Corinthians 10:14-18) constitutes the people of God as the mystical body of Christ'.[278] Likewise, baptism is the incorporation into the church. In some sense or another, all sacraments serve the receivers' connection to and functioning within the church.[279]

To this liturgical-ecclesiological awareness, Boff appends the adhortation that the church, if its wants to continue to relate people to God through the sacraments, needs to revise its liturgical formularies and rituals. Sacraments can only fulfill their relating function if they catch people in their concrete way of life.[280]

3.4.5 Sacramentality

This critical note is taken up in Boff's short introduction to sacramental thinking, *Sacraments of Life – Life of the Sacraments*. According to Boff, the whole world is sacramental if one regains the fundamentally human ability to see the world sacramentally. One could say that, in this book, Boff presents the Christian faith as the invitation to humanity to return to an insight intrinsic to human beings but lost through our material and technical world view. Boff does not blame secularised humanity, but Christianity itself, for the situation that people have ceased to look at the world as a sacramental universe. The 'ritual mummification' of the Christian church has obscured sacramentality rather than revealed it. It is Boff's conviction that people can regain their human capacity to 'turn an object into a symbol and an action into a rite'.[281] It is a matter of not just looking at the world from the outside, but also from the inside.[282] In order to

277 BOFF, *Die Kirche als Sakrament*, 390 ('Die moderne Theologie [...] im Einklang mit der alten Tradition'); cf. paragraph 3.1.2 (Theological Reassessment).

278 BOFF, *Die Kirche als Sakrament*, 390-391 ('Im Zentrum steht die Eucharistie: Das gemeinsame Essen von einem Brot (1 Kor 10, 14-18) konstituiert das Volk Gottes zum mystischen Leib Christi').

279 BOFF, *Die Kirche als Sakrament*, 391.

280 BOFF, *Die Kirche als Sakrament*, 392.

281 BOFF, *Sacraments of Life*, 2-3.

282 BOFF, *Sacraments of Life*, 11-12, 17-19.

illustrate this, Boff takes as examples such daily objects as a mug (the mug from which the family once drunk can become a sacrament of the family), a cigarette butt (the sight, smell and taste of his father's last cigarette butt, carefully kept, can become a sacrament of his father's presence), a loaf of bread, a candle and a home, such ordinary people as a schoolteacher (sacrament of self-surrender in order to give others a better chance in their lives), and such recognisable experiences as the power of someone's promised word and the meaning of one's life-story, in order to bring to light their potential sacramentality.

Objects, people and situations become sacramental when they reflect 'transparence' between their material 'immanence' and the 'transcendence' to which they point. It is important for Boff that a sacrament participates in the immanent as well as in the transcendent. Without *transcendence* there is no sacrament, because sheer immanence is exactly the material and technical world view from which the sacraments can rescue us. But without continuing participation in the *immanent* there is no sacrament either, because in such a case the sacrament looses its tangibility and concreteness and becomes an abstraction. The meaning of the sacrament lies, therefore, in its *transparence*.[283] Boff calls this sacramental transparence the 'diaphanous' character of the sacraments. Rather than God's 'epiphany' ('appearance'), which could suggest their absorption by the transcendent, sacraments are God's 'diaphany' ('transparence'): the divine is revealed *in and through* the daily, earthly signs.[284]

The primary 'sign' that participates in both the immanent (humanity) and the transcendent (divinity) and so becomes transparent, is Jesus Christ. He is the 'fontal sacrament' of God. Through him and like him, all people and all things can become sacramental.[285] The secondary sign, 'the prolongation of Christ',[286] the great sacrament of Christ in the world, is the church. 'The church becomes a sacrament insofar as it participates in, and daily actualises, the sacrament of Christ'.[287] In their turn, the seven sacraments are sacramental insofar as they are particularisations of the great sacrament which is the church.[288] But the unfolding of sacramentality does not stop there. From God, through Christ, the church and 'the' sacraments, sacramentality overflows into daily life. And because Christ is the eternal Word through and for whom all things were made, all sacramentality, in and outside the church, refers in some way or another to Christ, and through Christ to God.[289]

Finally, Boff points to the original meaning of the word 'sacrament': an oath of commitment. The sacramental ceremony, he says, is only the top of the

283 BOFF, *Sacraments of Life*, 24-25, 31.
284 BOFF, *Sacraments of Life*, 30-33, 47, 77. Boff borrows the term 'diaphany' from Pierre Teilhard de Chardin (31).
285 BOFF, *Sacraments of Life*, 46-47.
286 BOFF, *Sacraments of Life*, 90; cf. 73.
287 BOFF, *Sacraments of Life*, 51-52.
288 BOFF, *Sacraments of Life*, 53, 68.
289 BOFF, *Sacraments of Life*, 56-61, 64-66.

mountain. From this top leads a way of life according to what has been ritually enacted. In the context of the Early Church, *sacramentum* meant the commitment of being subversive, and ultimately the commitment to martyrdom.[290] Therefore, Boff counts it among the 'diabolic' (separating, dividing) effects of sacramentality when the celebration of the sacraments becomes a 'magic' goal of its own, separated from commitment in daily life. Rather than 'diabolic' (dividing), sacraments should be 'symbolic' (uniting): uniting faith and experience; bringing together one's life with the life of the church; embodying past, present and future; combining celebration and commitment.[291]

3.4.6 Testing Questions for a Liturgical Ecclesiology

Boff's sacramentology confirms the observation that his approach to the church and the sacraments reflects a church-as-sacrament ecclesiology rather than a eucharistic ecclesiology. The insights he offers are concerned with the *concept* of sacramentality, which he regards as central to what the Christian faith has to contribute to humanity. Boff teaches how to see the world transparently in the light of God.

Boff's vision overlaps with liturgical or eucharistic ecclesiology, when Boff affirms the sacraments of the church as central to his broad sacramental world view. Perhaps not so much in *theory* (his theory, as we saw, descends from God, through Christ and the universal church, to the particular sacraments) but in *practice*, the concrete sacraments of the church are the means by which humans are invited into seeing the world in the light of God. Most prominently, the eucharist 'turns the new community of the redeemed into a reality'.[292]

What Boff has to offer to a liturgical ecclesiology is his insistence that sacramentality transcends the liturgy of the church, and his warning that the liturgy can be in danger of preventing people from discovering the world's sacramentality rather than inviting them into it. If, according to Boff, people need to be made aware of the 'diaphanous' capacity of objects, people and situations, a liturgical ecclesiology has to ask itself: Does this liturgy enhance people's ability to discover the transcendent in and through the immanent? Is this liturgy really transparent? Does it point beyond itself? That is, does it act as a *sacrament* of the church, of Christ, of God? Is the liturgy experienced as exclusive and inward-looking, or can the sacramentality of the liturgy be experienced as exemplary for the sacramentality—including both God's presence and our commitment—in daily life?

290 BOFF, *Sacraments of Life*, 77-79, 92.
291 BOFF, *Sacraments of Life*, 81-87.
292 BOFF, *Sacraments of Life*, 72.

Welcoming Boff's opening-up of the concept of sacramentality,[293] a question could nevertheless be whether Boff's concept of sacramentality is stretched to such an extent that 'everything', particular all history, is to be understood as a sign of God. Isn't history too ambivalent for being regarded as a sacrament of God? Should sacramentality not be reserved for those situations in which God is more univocally revealed?[294]

3.4.7 A Trinitarian Theology of Communion

Another contribution to a liturgical ecclesiology is Boff's exploration of trinitarian theology in the context of ecclesial and societal communion. The liturgical-ecclesiological relevance of Boff's trinitarian thought starts with his affirmation that God—the trinitarian God—is in the first and in the last instance to be worshipped rather than analysed. Doxology comes before and after theology.[295] And when trinitarian theology begins, it starts—both historically and systematically—in the texts of the liturgy and the sacraments.[296]

Boff has chosen to explore trinitarian thought for its liberating capacity.[297] In Boff's own words, 'the Trinity is our true social programme'.[298] The quest for a theological rationale of a more liberated and communal society—and of a less hierarchical church—is present throughout his thorough investigation into trinitarian theology. Liberation of the oppressed, justice to the poor, egalitarian sharing of goods, a revision of the balance between developed and underdeveloped countries, are Boff's central concerns.[299] Rejecting both capitalism (for its unchecked individualism) and socialism (for its undifferentiated, impersonal collectivism), he pleads for a democratic society, based on participation and communion, with room for personal and group differences.[300]

293 Cf. A.H.C. VAN EIJK, *Teken van aanwezigheid. Een katholieke ecclesiologie in oecumenisch perspectief* (Zoetermeer: Meinema, 2000), 101. Van Eijk especially welcomes a broader sacramental understanding because it provides a context for 'the' sacraments. Purifying the sacramental realm runs the risk of making 'the' (remaining) sacraments incomprehensible by eliminating the sense of sacramentality.

294 Cf. A.H.C VAN EIJK, 'Het pleidooi voor een ruimer sacramentsbegrip', in: A.H.C. van Eijk & H.W.M. Rikhof (eds.), *De lengte en de breedte, de hoogte en de diepte. Peilingen in de theologie van de sacramenten* (Zoetermeer: Meinema, 1996), 105-131, at 130-131.

295 BOFF, *Trinity and Society*, 1-2, 31, 44, 106-107, 155, 159, 218, 231.

296 BOFF, *Trinity and Society*, 27, 35, 37, 45, 114, 139, 232.

297 BOFF, *Holy Trinity, Perfect Community*, xi-xvii. Apart from the preface and the introduction, *Holy Trinity, Perfect Community* is a popular version of *Trinity and Society*. Therefore, references will be to the latter, although the same thoughts can be found in the former.

298 BOFF, *Trinity and Society*, 16.

299 BOFF, *Trinity and Society*, 6, 11-13, 18, 28, 33, 124, 133, 157-158, 162, 167, 176-177, 180-181, 188, 194, 208, 225, 228-229, 236-237.

300 BOFF, *Trinity and Society*, 149-152.

The theological model of this community is the Trinity. More particularly, an understanding of the Trinity in which, according to Boff, neither the Eastern emphasis on the Father, nor the Western empasis on the divine unity, but the perichoresis of the persons is central. Perichoresis is the key to Boff's understanding of Trinity and communion. The Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit interpenetrate and interpret one another. Both in the internal trinitarian essence and in the outward trinitarian actions—Boff keeps the ontological and the economic Trinity closely together—no divine person is ever without the other two. Although each person has his own proper characteristics, Father, Son and Spirit act together and can only be understood in interdependence. According to Boff, this understanding of the Trinity avoids both the danger of falling back into strict monotheism, which overlooks difference and pluriformity, and the danger of tritheism, which observes the persons too independently from one another.[301]

The key concepts of Boff's trinitarian theology are communion and participation.[302] The Trinity is a communion allowing difference. It is characterised by openness: humans are invited to share in the divine life of communion. As a 'sacrament of the Trinity', society[303] and the church[304] should reflect this communal and participatory nature. Not by the absolutist model of the monarch—be he king or pope—but by an egalitarian community in which people and their differences are heard and respected.

For the church, this means that Boff wants concepts like *potestas sacra* to be replaced by the idea of participatory communion. 'The unity of the church does not consist in a bureaucratic uniformity, but in a perichoresis among all the faithful, in the service of others (mission).' Boff traces the hierarchical understanding of the church back to a 'pre-trinitarian or a-trinitarian monotheism', which should give way to a trinitarian model that does justice to the whole people of God, all baptised, all charisms. The more the church effectively becomes a communion of equals, accepting each other in difference, the more the church will be a sacrament of the Trinity.[305]

> The main definition of the church is this: the community of the faithful in communion with the Father, through the incarnate Son, in the Holy Spirit, and in communion with each other and with their leaders. [...] In the same way, there are many local churches, but all together make up the one church of God. The catholicity of the church resides in the respect and welcome it affords to the gifts and specialities the Spirit gives to each local church. All the local churches are united through the risen Christ, in the Spirit. Ecclesial communion expresses

301 BOFF, *Trinity and Society*, 134-148 and *passim*.
302 BOFF, *Trinity and Society*, 20. For communion, cf. 128-134 and *passim*. For participation, cf. 168, 186 and *passim*.
303 BOFF, *Trinity and Society*, 13, 24.
304 BOFF, *Trinity and Society*, 22, 237.
305 BOFF, *Trinity and Society*, 22, 106, 152, 237.

> trinitarian communion: each Person is distinct, but accepts the others and surrenders fully to the others.[306]

It is the Spirit who, through a variety of people and charisms, organises both difference and unity. Every local Christian community—Boff calls it 'every local church'—has a variety of gifts for presiding, instructing and giving social concreteness to the faith. Multiformity is enriching, not threatening. The same Spirit who bestows these multiform gifts, also moulds them to serve the unity of the community.[307] Boff acknowledges the eucharist as the recurring expression of this transforming work of the Spirit. What happens through bread and wine happens through the community as well: the Spirit reveals the presence of Christ and makes this presence efficacious. Moreover, the whole Trinity is present in the eucharist: the eucharist is a 'universal recapitulation' of the salvation, liberation and transformation of Father, Son and Holy Spirit.[308]

3.4.8 Conclusion

Probably the most important of Boff's contributions to a liturgical ecclesiology is his love-hate relationship with the centrality of liturgy and the eucharist. This ambivalence reveals a tension not completely absent from the works of the other authors, but more existentially experienced in Boff's writings. Boff is able to give notions like doxology, liturgy, the eucharist and sacramentality a prominent place in his thought, but is at the same time suspicious of their possible a-social, a-historical and inward-looking interpretations. Two pairs of words may summarise this section: non-exclusive sacramentality and liberating communion.

Firstly, Boff approaches the Christian faith, the church and the liturgy from the angle of sacramentality. This places the liturgy and the eucharist in the broader perspective of other signs of God and his kingdom, both in and outside the church. If the eucharist is seen as the centre of ecclesial being, Boff understands this in a non-exclusive way. The eucharist is not central for its own sake, but because it is the sacrament of the divine-human communion which God wants the church and the world to be. A possible fixation on the eucharistic celebration, which could be the danger of a eucharistic ecclesiology, is opened up by Boff through the wider concept of sacramentality, in which, however, the eucharist retains a place of prominence.

Moreover, the theme of sacramentality provides the opportunity to notice the similarities and dissimilarities of eucharistic ecclesiology and church-as-sacrament ecclesiology. Whereas the latter uses the abstract concept of sacramentality to liken it to the church, the former uses the concrete sacrament

306 BOFF, *Trinity and Society*, 153-154; cf. 133, 225-226.
307 BOFF, *Trinity and Society*, 195-196.
308 BOFF, *Trinity and Society*, 103, 132, 209-210.

of the eucharist to affirm that the eucharistic community coincides with the church.

Secondly, the hermeneutic key by which Boff interprets God, the church, the sacraments and the world is 'liberation'. Boff reminds the theologian, the ecclesiologist and the liturgist of God's, the church's and the sacraments' liberating capacity and insists that this capacity should be enhanced if theology, ecclesiology and liturgy want to respond to their vocation and make sense in today's world. A possible inward-looking tendency, which could be the danger of a liturgical ecclesiology, is opened up by Boff through the reminder that the church and the liturgy are 'sacraments' not of itself but of a restored community, a readjusted society, a liberated world.

3.5 JEAN-MARIE TILLARD

3.5.1 Life and Work

Jean-Marie Roger Tillard (1927-2000) was born on St Pierre and Miquelon, French territory south of the Canadian province of Newfoundland, and moved to Canada during the Second World War. Having entered the Dominican Order in 1950, he studied at the *Collège dominicain* (Ottawa), at the *Angelicum* (Rome), where he took a doctorate in philosophy, and at *Le Saulchoir* (Paris), where he was ordained priest in 1955. For the best part of his life, from 1957 onwards, he served as a Professor at the Dominican College of Philosophy and Theology, Ottawa, and as a Visiting Professor in Canada and Europe. He attended the Second Vatican Council as a theological adviser to the Canadian episcopate. Moreover, Tillard's ecumenical involvement was considerable. He was an adviser to the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity, a member of several bilateral dialogue commissions and, from 1978 until his death, vice-president of the Faith and Order Commission of the World Council of Churches.[309]

This section investigates Tillard's ecclesiology from the prespective of 'communion', a term very central throughout Tillard's work.[310] This is already the case in his 1964 study on the ecclesial meaning of the eucharist, *L'Eucharistie. Pâque de l'Eglise*.[311] Communion is also the key to Tillard's understanding of the papacy in the context of the whole church, as presented in

309 Cf. G.-D. MAILHIOT, 'Le professeur', in: G.R. Evans & M. Gourgues (eds.), *Communion et réunion. Mélanges Jean-Marie Roger Tillard* (Louvain: University Press/Peeters, 1995), 21-30; G.-D. MAILHIOT, 'Nécrologie F. Jean-Marie Roger Tillard, O.P. 1927-2000', www.collegedominicain.com/pdf, 3, 5-6, 56-57.

310 For a more comprehensive account of Tillard's ecclesiology, cf. RUDDY, *The Local Church*, 54-122.

311 J.-M. R. TILLARD, *L'Eucharistie. Pâque de l'Eglise* (Paris: Cerf, 1964), 15-58, 244.

L'Evêque de Rome (1982),[312] and of the place of the local church in the universal communion of churches, as presented in *L'Eglise locale* (1995).[313] All these insights—communion ecclesiology and its relationship to the eucharist, the local church and the role of the bishop of Rome—are summarised in the 1987 study, *Eglise d'Eglises*,[314] and its 1992 appendix, *Chair de l'Eglise, chair du Christ*.[315] My presentation will mainly depend on *Eglise d'Eglises*. Incidentally, additional reference will be made to the more detailed studies, where the same thought is elaborated and more historical and systematic evidence is given.

3.5.2 The Ecclesiology of Communion

Tillard's ecclesiology is built around the notion of 'communion'. Although this could also be said of the other three authors discussed in this chapter,[316] it is Tillard who gives his ecclesiology the explicit title 'the ecclesiology of communion' (*l'ecclésiologie de communion*).[317] According to Tillard, communion ecclesiology—'or,' as he says, 'eucharistic ecclesiology, in the broad sense of this term, which does not correspond exactly to the one used by Afanasiev'—corresponds best to the biblical and traditional idea of the church, and is the best way to overcome the confessional differences between the churches of the ecumene.[318] The following eight remarks summarise the numerous directions into which Tillard explores and applies the concept of communion.

First, communion is a key to understand God. It is 'the eternal mystery of communion which brings forth the existence of God himself', namely as the trinitarian God.[319] Human and ecclesial communion (*koinonia*) is always a matter of being in co-communion (*syn-koinonoi*) with God, *koinonia* meaning 'participation with *others* in a *similar* reality'.[320]

312 J.-M. R. TILLARD, *L'Evêque de Rome* (Paris: Cerf, 1982), 155.

313 J.-M. R. TILLARD, *L'Eglise locale. Ecclésiologie de communion et catholicité* (Paris: Cerf, 1995).

314 J.-M. R. TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises. L'ecclésiologie de communion* (Paris: Cerf, 1987).

315 J.-M. R. TILLARD, *Chair de l'Eglise, chair du Christ. Aux sources de l'ecclésiologie de communion* (Paris: Cerf, 1992), 11 ('le tome second de notre *ecclésiologie de communion*'). This 'second volume' was particularly written in order to prove that communion ecclesiology is neither a new invention nor the particular theology of the Eastern church, but rooted in the great tradition of East and West (7-11).

316 Cf. paragraph 3.6.1 (Communion Ecclesiology).

317 Cf. the book titles in the previous notes.

318 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 9 ('l'ecclésiologie de *communion* [ou eucharistique, au sens large de cette expression qui ne correspond pas exactement à celui d'Afanassief]').

319 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 35 ('le mystère éternel de communion qui fait l'existence de Dieu lui-même'), 53, 399.

320 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 35 n. ('participation *avec d'autres* à une *même* réalité'), 36, 72-74, 163, 199-200.

Second, communion is a key to understand the history of salvation—God's dealing with creation and particularly with humanity. Tillard understands salvation as reunification and therefore as the creation or recreation of communion. As the Old Testament *qahal* (gathering) is interpreted by Jewish theology as a revival of creation, characterised by the reunification of humanity into a community, the New Testament *ekklesia* (the Septuagint translation of *qahal*) can likewise be seen as humanity revived, communion re-established. Pentecost is the reversal of Babel, the dispersion of humanity is reversed by its reunion. The *ekklesia* is the eventual realisation of God's purpose with humanity: to unite it into one reconciled fellowship.[321]

The 'human drama' is that humanity has split itself up into 'a collage of individuals', whereas it 'is truly itself only in *communion*'. In Tillard's thought, in which communion is such a pivotal element of humanity, individualism amounts to a state of 'not truly existing'. As opposed to the 'individual' (*l'individu*), 'singularity' (*singularité*)—true human personhood—'is satisfied only in a solidarity that is welcomed and sought after'. Resembling the trinitarian nature, humanity consists both of 'communion (non-division)' and 'singularity (non-absorption)'.[322]

The church is, thus, the firstfruits of a reconciled world.[323] Therefore, the church can also be called a 'sacrament of salvation', because it makes visible and works towards the reconciliation of the world into one communion. Not as if the church is the author of salvation—which is God—but because the reconciled community is called to be, as a consequence of salvation, an effective sign of the kingdom. By receiving reconciliation from God, the church becomes a servant of reconciliation in proclamation and practice. By being called to communion by God, the church becomes 'a mediator for the gathering together of humanity *en Christoi*'. Such is the church's place in the *mysterion* of salvation.[324]

Third, communion is a key to understand ecclesial identity as it is reflected in the New Testament. Overarching the differences between the several New Testament authors is the conviction that one belongs to the community of salvation.[325] As the summaries of ecclesial life in Acts indicate, living in communion was regarded as an essential element of the church's essence and practice.[326] Present *jam ab Abel justo*[327]—from the beginning of God's salvation

321 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 21-29, 31-33.

322 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 23 ('drame humain'), 27 ('l'humanité n'est vraiment elle-même que dans la *communion*'), 33 ('un collage d'individus'; 'ne pas exister en vérité'), 34 ('la quête de singularité ne s'assouvit que dans une solidarité accueillie et recherchée'). Tillard refers to Finkielkraut, Lévinas, Buber and Berdiaeff.

323 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 70, 85-86, 189, 193.

324 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 313 ('l'Eglise se sait pourtant chargée d'intervenir pour le rassemblement de l'humanité *en christô*'); cf. 291-296, 304-314, 317.

325 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 13-14, 166, 192-193.

326 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 18-19, 33, 49, 194, 254, 314.

history—but revealed at Pentecost, the church is a communion held together by the Spirit. Through the Spirit, the work of Christ is activated, interpreted and proclaimed.[328]

Fourth, communion is a key to a deeper understanding of the relationship between Jesus Christ and the church. The Spirit who constitutes Jesus as the Christ and as the resurrected One, also constitutes Christ as communion, 'giving him a community'. The Spirit constitutes the church 'by inserting it into the reality of God's *Christos*. There is no Christ without the church, just as there is no church without Christ'.[329] The church is, Tillard concludes, not just a gathering of friends, not even only the company of those who imitate Christ, not in the first instance a moral or ethical institution, but, 'radically, the community *of* Christ', 'insertion into Christ'.[330] The concept of the body of Christ is the best expression of this relationship. Calling the church the body of Christ is another way of saying that the church is a communion rooted in the Spirit who vivifies Christ's work and being. In turn, the eucharist is the event in which the concept of the body of Christ is best expressed.[331]

Fifth, communion is a key to understand the Christian faith as such. The Christian faith is precisely the corporately experienced belief in God's dealing with humanity and the world towards communion:

> In the strict sense, there is no individual faith. All faith is ecclesial, belonging to communion by its very essence. Its subject is the church in its being as *koinonia*. [...] One believes personally, but one does so only within the church.[332]

Sixth, communion is a key to understand the meaning and function of Scripture and tradition. The canon of Scripture and the tradition of the faith exist in order to enable the churches to remain in communion with one another. Faith is both given and to be interpreted. In the communion of the church—communion expressed by the interaction of *sensus fidelium*, theological

327 'Already from Abel, the righteous one'; cf. TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 31-33, 44, 54, 89-92, 113, 115, 181, 200, 215, 306.

328 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 19-20, 75, 141.

329 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 39 ('en lui donnant une "communauté"'; 'Il ne constitue l'*Eglise de Dieu* qu'en l'enserrant dans la réalité du *Christos* de Dieu. Il n'existe pas de Christ sans Eglise, tout comme il n'existe pas d'Eglise sans Christ'), 297-298.

330 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 44 ('insertion dans le Christ'), 45-46, 47 ('radicalement, la communauté *du* Christ'), 70, 73, 191. Although this amounts to a deep relationship between Christ and the church, Tillard emphasises the remaining difference between the two. The church remains dependent on Christ, it is not the prolongation of his incarnation. Cf. TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 249-250, 305 n. 167; TILLARD, *Chair de l'Eglise, chair du Christ*, 158-159.

331 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 37, 40-42, 298-299.

332 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 166 ('Au sens strict, il n'y a pas de foi individuelle. Toute foi est ecclésiale, communionnelle par essence. Son sujet est l'Eglise en son être de *koinônia*. [...] On croit personnellement mais on ne le fait qu'en Eglise').

magisterium and ordained magisterium in respectful interdependence—the interpretation of God-given Scripture has its natural *milieu*.[333]

Seventh, communion is the key to understand mission. Mission is not a 'zeal for the salvation of individuals'. Rather, mission is the church's surrender to God's zeal for all humanity and the whole universe. Therefore, the mission of the church is to incorporate humanity and society into Christ, into the realm of God's recreational activity.[334]

Finally, communion is the key to understand the task of the church, the action to be taken by the church. Communion is put into practice by accepting 'communion with the misery of humanity', particularly through sustaining the poor and outcast, and through combatting the abuse of power and money.[335] Experiencing communion implies living the new creation, living 'the flesh of salvation', being 'instruments of communion'.[336] Amidst separation and estrangement, hatred and war, dehumanisation and slavery, excessive belief in technical progress and the accumulation of individual pleasure, the vocation of the church is to glorify God and, before God, to co-operate with God's plan of love and peace.[337] In doing so, the church exercises its eschatological role within this world, until everything will be restored to communion.[338]

3.5.3 Eucharistic Communion, Zones of Communion

Tillard does not hesitate to identify the eucharist as the most perfect expression of the identity of the church as communion. 'As the people of God, the church is fully itself in the [eucharistic] synaxis.'[339] 'Church is therefore every local community gathered together by the eucharist', or—when there is more than one eucharist in a diocese—church is 'the totality of these eucharistic communities in communion with this bishop'.[340] In the eucharistic celebration, all Christians—retaining all their singularity—are 'assumed' or 'absorbed' into the body of Christ, 'inserted' into Christ.[341] Sanctified by Christ, through being brought into communion with Christ, 'the Christian community is, in all reality,

333 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 139-186.

334 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 46 ('zèle [...] pour le salut des individus').

335 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 36, 48, 49 ('*communion* à la détresse humaine'), 86-88, 94-100, 130-131, 195-196, 203-209. Tillard uses the expression 'preferential option for the poor' ('l'option préférentielle pour les pauvres'; 209, 241).

336 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 50-51 ('la chair du Salut', 'agents de la *communion*').

337 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 68-71, 93, 131, 134, 194, 201.

338 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 72, 83, 92.

339 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 139 ('Peuple de Dieu, l'Eglise est pleinement elle-même à la synaxe'), 323, 399.

340 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 47 ('C'est toute communauté locale rassemblée par l'Eucharistie qui est ainsi l'Eglise', 'L'Eglise locale devient l'ensemble de ces communautés eucharistiques en communion avec cet évêque').

341 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 41, 44-46, 57. Tillard uses the verbs *assumer*, *insérer* and *saisir*.

the holy church of God in the eucharistic celebration'. The eucharist is 'the central act of the community', because there it is most completely a communion.[342]

As Tillard asserts, referring to the gospel of John, the eucharist makes visible the communion of the Father and the Son, which overflows into their communion with humanity, which in its turn overflows into communion of people among themselves. The eucharist, thus, reveals the source of Christian being. But this source is also its goal. Never fully in harmony and communion, the church should strive at becoming what it is meant to be—communion. So, the eucharist is a celebration of what the church is, and a proclamation—critically *ad intra* and missionary *ad extra*—of what the church should be, and what Christian faith is about. Let the church 'be what it receives, Augustine would say'.[343]

For this central role of the eucharist in ecclesiology, Tillard more than once uses de Lubac's expression, 'the eucharist makes the church'.[344] He even presents his entire book, *L'Eucharistie. Pâque de l'Eglise*, as the exposition of this 'traditional truth in ecclesiology and sacramental theology'.[345] The eucharist makes the church and is the most real expression of the church; 'the church is eucharistic'.[346]

The eucharistic community is the local church, understood as the diocese.[347] By celebrating the eucharist, the local church is the church of God in all its (qualitative) catholicity.[348] It has as its presider the one who is responsible for the unity of the local church and for its unity with the other local churches—the bishop or his deputy.[349] However, the communion which the eucharist conveys, surpasses the local church both diachronically and synchronically. Diachronically, the eucharist connects the present church to the communion of saints, from ancient times to the fulfillment of God's kingdom. The eucharist anticipates the consummation of time by *already* expressing reconciliation,

342 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 50 ('la communauté chrétienne est, en toute réalité, sainte Eglise de Dieu à la synaxe eucharistique'), 220 ('l'acte central de la communauté').

343 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 197-202, 210-214, 283 ('Qu'elle soit ce qu'elle reçoit, dirait Augustin'), 314. Cf. AUGUSTINE, *Sermones ad populum*, sermo 272 (PL 38, 1247-1248): 'Estote quod videtis, et accipite quod estis'.

344 'L'Eucharistie fait l'Eglise': TILLARD, *L'Eucharistie*, 7 (cf. 231: 'L'Eucharistie construit l'Eglise'); TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 42. Surprisingly, Tillard does not mention de Lubac as the author of this phrase (cf. paragraph 3.2.6), and cites de Lubac rarely, anyway.

345 TILLARD, *L'Eucharistie*, 7 ('vérité traditionelle en ecclésiologie et en théologie sacramentaire').

346 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 41, 58 ('l'Eglise est eucharistique').

347 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 47.

348 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 174-175. Tillard calls this the rediscovered link between church and eucharist, confirmed by Vatican II (*Eglise d'Eglises*, 386).

349 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 237, 325, 384; cf. paragraph 3.5.5.

fraternity and social outreach.[350] Synchronically, as will be seen in the next paragraph, the eucharist creates the bond between the local church and the universal church. The eucharistic communion of the local church is at the same time communion with the church in its totality.[351]

When it is impossible for a local Christian community to celebrate the eucharist, Tillard warns against the emergence of an understanding of the church which can do without the eucharist. Non-eucharistic Sunday worship, Tillard says, should not be seen as 'a mass without priests', or as 'a eucharist without the words of consecration and the epicletic prayer', or as a sign that eucharist and ministry are unimportant anyway. It should be seen as non-eucharistic, although 'in a eucharistic reference', that is, having the intention of celebrating the Lord's Day, tending towards the eucharistic remembrance of Christ, and being celebrated in communion with the bishop.[352]

Not all Christians, let alone all humanity, are yet 'in communion' with one another in the fullest possible way as expressed in the eucharistic *koinonia*.[353] According to Tillard, the absence of 'full communion' does not imply, however, the total absence of communion. There are 'zones of communion'.[354] The basis of this broader communion is *baptism* as the seal of the acceptance of the central Christian *kerygma*. Communion is found in common *prayer*—the Lord's Prayer, the Psalms, the same concerns voiced in the intercessions—and in a common concern for *mission*. The highest form of non-eucharistic communion is martyrdom. It is Tillard's conviction that martyrdom for the sake of the Christian faith is always a sign of communion. Churches should exchange each other's lists of martyrs, in order to be united through their remembrance.[355]

Zones of communion also exist outside the community of the baptised. Tillard emphasises that—through Abrahamite faith, through 'the Twelve', through the transformed Passover which is the eucharist, and through the expectation of the Day of the Messiah—a basic 'communion' with Israel is maintained. Being saved by Jesus Christ is being 'saved by his communion with the Promise and the destiny of the authentic Israel of God'. Jesus Christ embodies and consummates Israel, but does not suppress it.[356] There is also a basic form of 'communion' with all humanity as it strives for righteousness. Although Tillard does not follow Rahner's expression 'anonymous

350 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 45, 58, 76-77, 79-86, 91, 134-138; cf. TILLARD, *L'Eglise locale*, 250-271.

351 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 44.

352 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 285 ('une messe sans prêtres', 'une Eucharistie sans les paroles de la consécration et la prière d'épiclèse', 'dans une référence eucharistique').

353 This position is critically evaluated in paragraph 8.4.4.

354 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 60 ('zones de *communion*'), 384 ('niveaux de la *communion*').

355 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 60-66, 203.

356 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 123 ('sauvé par sa *communion* à la Promesse et à la destinée de l'authentique Israël de Dieu'); cf. 114-123, 127, 135-139, 294.

Christians'—for they are voluntarily *not* Christians—he recognises that they may be 'anonymous saved ones' and belong to the communion of salvation.[357]

In other words, Tillard insists that communion is not a matter of 'all or nothing'. There are zones of communion—from all humanity, through Israel, to the baptised. In the eucharistic community, however, communion finds (before the kingdom) its supreme fulfillment and its heart.

3.5.4 Church of Churches, Communion of Communions

The church is a communion on several levels. On the local level, the church is a communion

> of men and women who together, in an osmosis of charisms and functions, under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, welcome, understand, actualise, celebrate, transmit the faith which causes them to be the church.[358]

This description of local communion applies to the parish and to the diocese. In Tillard's understanding, the diocese is 'the totality of [...] eucharistic communities in communion with [the] bishop'. Thus, although Tillard reserves the term 'local church' for the diocese, he acknowledges that the diocese is in itself already a 'communion of communions', a diocesan communion of parochial eucharistic communities.[359]

On the supra-local level, the church is again a 'communion of communions'. This is where the title of Tillard's book, *Eglise d'Eglises* (Church of Churches), comes in. The universal church is a 'church of churches', a 'communion of communions', a church consisting of all local churches, though not simply as their 'sum' (*addition*), but as their communion. Locality and universality are intertwined in the concept of communion: on the one hand, the universal church only exists 'in' (*en*) and 'through' (*par*) the local churches; on the other hand, a local church can only exist because it is a communion in itself and because it is in communion with the other local churches. In Tillard's concept there is, thus, no rivalry between locality and universality, as these are two sides of the same concept of communion.[360] In the light of this concept of

357 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 54, 128, 190 ('sauvés anonymes', not 'chrétiens anonymes').

358 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 113 ('Le Peuple de Dieu est fait d'hommes et de femmes qui ensemble, dans une osmose des charismes et des fonctions, sous la conduite de l'Esprit, accueillent, comprennent, actualisent, célèbrent, transmettent la foi qui les fait être Eglise [...]').

359 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 47 ('l'ensemble de ces communautés eucharistiques en communion avec cet évêque', 'Eglise locale', 'communion de communions').

360 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 30, 47, 48, 78, 101, 173, 179, 217, 283, 325, 400.

the simultaneity of locality and universality, the question whether the local or the universal church should have 'priority' appears to be 'a mistaken one'.[361]

Conceiving the universal church as a 'church of churches' implies *both* the admission of a 'variety of verbal expressions, cultural contexts, religious rootings in the traditions of the peoples, liturgical forms, embodiments in human problems' *and* essential unity, communion.[362] Local churches may be 'different in their customs, their traditions, their problems, their spirit, often even in their organisation', as long as they have, on a deeper level, a common identity in a 'unity of faith, of sacramental life and of mission'.[363]

There are two other senses in which Tillard uses the term 'church of churches'. Referring to the unbreakable link between Israel and the church, he can call the church a 'church of churches' in the sense of a 'church of the *qahal*'.[364] Moreover, Tillard uses the term in the context of ecumenism. The church will only be a real 'church of churches' when every local church will be a communion of all Christians in the same place, and when all local churches will be in communion with all other local churches. Not on the basis of 'reconciled diversity', if this would imply recognising one another while continuing a separate life, but 'in communion': sharing a common life of variety and difference, enriching one another. Until that day, there will be '*some* communities or *some* churches' rather than '*one church of churches*'.[365]

Basing himself upon New Testament and patristic witnesses, Tillard affirms the 'catholicity' of the local church. The 'church of God', the 'whole church', exists in every local church.[366] This is particularly true because every local church celebrates the (same) eucharist in which the body of Christ, and the communion with Christ, are fully present. 'Wherever there is a eucharistic celebration, there is the church of God, as it is in all the communities where the eucharist is celebrated'. Again, there is no rivalry between locality and universality, as long as the local eucharistic celebration is *both* respected as

361 RUDDY, *The Local Church*, 99; cf. 106. Ruddy refers to the Ratzinger-Kasper debate; cf. paragraph 3.3.9.

362 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 179, 213 ('variété des expressions verbales, des contextes culturels, des enracinements religieux dans les traditions des peuples, des formes liturgiques, des incarnations dans les problèmes humains'), 400.

363 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 325 ('diverses dans leurs coutumes, leurs traditions, leurs problèmes, leur âme, souvent même leur organisation'), 327 ('unité de foi, de vie sacramentelle et de mission').

364 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 139 ('*Eglise d'Eglises*, Eglise du *Qâhâl*...'). On the 'zone of communion' between Israel and the church, cf. paragraph 3.5.3.

365 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 202, 283 ('*des* communautés ou *des* Eglises, [...] pas *une Eglise d'Eglises*'), 400 ('diversité réconciliée').

366 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 29-30; cf. 114, 142; worked out in more detail in TILLARD, *L'Eglise locale*, 15-144.

fully realising the church of God in the local church *and* conceived as a celebration in communion with the celebrations in all other local churches.[367]

In practice, this means that all local churches are in communion with one another through the synodal communion of their bishops, who in their turn never act without their presbyterium and their people. The proper character of every local church is respected by the others, as long as the others 'recognise' their catholicity in this local church.[368] This mutual 'reception' is expressed by the exchange of synodal letters, the eucharistic concelebration of ministers, and the fact that every Christian may feel himself or herself 'at home' wherever he or she encounters a Christian community. The exchange between the churches is an exchange of 'communion, witness, service, suffering, martyrdom'.[369]

3.5.5 The Ordained Ministry as a Service to Communion

Tillard emphasises that the whole church (which in his writings often means: the whole *local* church) constitute the priestly people of God. The whole (local) church is 'a royal priesthood' (1 Peter 2:9), offering itself to God as 'a living sacrifice' (Romans 12:1). As a eucharistic community, the church is the gathering of all baptised.[370] Within this church, there are numerous charisms—special gifts of the Spirit for the exercise of 'functions, services, ministries'.[371] The ordained ministry appears within this 'osmosis', this 'symphony', this 'communion' of charisms, as the service which holds these charisms together in communion, and keeps them in contact with the *acta et dicta* of Jesus Christ.[372]

The latter task which Tillard assigns to the ordained ministry—preserving the church's relationship to Jesus Christ—is the ordained ministry's 'apostolic' task. The apostles testified to their experience of Jesus's words, signs and particularly his cross and resurrection. The church is only saved from becoming 'gnostic' when it affirms this concrete relationship to the historic Jesus. It does so through the apostles, who safeguard the 'commemoration' of the church's 'constituing relationship' to Jesus.[373] Without 'communion' with this 'tradition

367 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 44 ('Là où se trouve une synaxe eucharistique, là est l'Eglise de Dieu telle qu'elle est dans toutes les synaxes eucharistiques'), 57-58.

368 In Tillard's thought, catholicity is always primarily *qualitative*, and then—by necessity, because of communion—also *geographical*. Cf. TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 169, 175, 182-183, 194, 214; TILLARD, *L'Eglise locale*, 17-29, 387-394.

369 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 58, 150-151, 172-174, 274 ('échanges de communion, témoignage, service, souffrance, martyre').

370 Tillard underlines that the centrality of the eucharist in his communion ecclesiology implies a centrality of baptism. Cf. TILLARD, *L'Eglise locale*, 149 ('L'Eucharistie est la synaxe des *baptisés*').

371 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 125, 218-220 ('des charismes'; 'des fonctions, des services, des ministères'); cf. TILLARD, *L'Eglise locale*, 302-309.

372 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 151 ('osmose'), 220 ('symphonie', 'communion'), 235, 315.

373 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 226 ('groupe *mémorial* de la "relation constituante" à Jésus').

(*paradosis*)' there can be no Christian faith or church. In practice, this tradition is carried on through the combination of Scripture and the ordained ministry in the context of the community. The ordained minister receives the faith from his local church, but is established as its guardian through the charism of the Spirit conferred by ordination. In its turn, this ordination takes place within, and with the contribution of, the whole local church. There is, therefore, an 'osmosis' between the faith of the local church and the faith to be guarded by the ordained minister.[374] Tillard regards this apostolic task of the ordained ministry as a constitutive element of the church since its beginnings. Not because the bishops are univocally the 'successors' of the apostles, but because the 'deposit' (*dépôt*, *paratheke*) of the apostles is entrusted to the bearers of the ministry. Whatever form the ordained ministry may have taken initially, Tillard concludes from the New Testament that some form of apostolic and post-apostolic ministry has ever been regarded as constitutive for the church's indissoluble connection to Jesus Christ.[375] Because the apostolic task of the ministry connects the church, through the apostolic faith, to Jesus Christ himself, the apostolic function of the ordained ministry leads to the position of the minister in the midst of the congregation as an 'icon of [Christ's] presence' in the midst of today's church.[376]

If the 'apostolic' task of the ordained ministry is not exercised apart from but in communion with the whole local church, this applies even more to the other task which Tillard assigns to the ordained ministry—to serve the communion of all charisms. The ordained ministry is 'to coordinate, but by verifying them' the charisms of the community. That is, the ordained ministry has to grant each charism its place within the apostolic identity of the church, so that every charism will be exercised to the well being of the local church in its adherence to the apostolic faith *and* in its concrete time, place and situation. Particularly the 'non-ordained' ministries can be creatively moulded to answer the needs of concrete situations, as Tillard sees at work in, for example, the Latin American base communities.[377]

This presiding and enabling character of the ordained ministry becomes, according to Tillard, particularly visible in the eucharistic celebration. For 'in the liturgical celebration the minister is only a concelebrant'. The whole people of God, the whole local church, celebrates the eucharist and seals it with its 'Amen'. In the eucharist, 'the community will express and nourish its own reality'. It does so under the presidency of the ordained minister, whose task is to exercise a 'role' within the entire gathering, namely to preside over the celebration of the whole community and to enable all charisms to flourish

374 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 223-236, 240-241.

375 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 230-234. Tillard therefore prefers the use of the word 'vicar' (of the apostles, of Peter), not 'successor'; cf. RUDDY, *The Local Church*, 74, 194 n. 166.

376 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 251 ('Il [the minister] est l'icône de cette [Christ's] présence').

377 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 235 ('coordonner mais en les "vérifiant"'), 270-271, 276-281.

within the whole.[378] In the eucharist, the role of the ordained ministry is 'essential and irreplacable', but as essential and as irreplacable is the celebrating act of the whole congregation. The presider—only in a later layer of tradition called the 'priest' (*hiereus*, *sacerdos*)—enables the congregation 'to exercise *the* priesthood', namely the primary priesthood of the whole people of God.[379] Ordained ministry, understood as the 'service of communion', presides, enables, integrates the whole local church and all its charisms into one communion and serves its being in communion with apostolic tradition.

Thus being 'a ministry of communion', the ordained ministry forms also 'a communion of ministries'.[380] Tillard recalls that, from the outset, the apostles were apostles *as a group*, as 'the Twelve'. Their witness to Jesus, upon which the church is founded, is a common witness. In the New Testament this becomes particularly clear when decisions are at stake which affect the totality of ecclesial life. In such situations, individual apostles, who obviously have a large freedom of initiative, nevertheless do not take the decision on their own, but gather together for mutual counsel and eventually take the decision together. When communion is at stake, the apostles act communally.[381] Tillard sees this principle of the communal exercise of the ministry confirmed by the practice of the Early Church. When problems arise which affect the supra-local level, bishops from the same province gather together and synods send their letters to neighbouring churches. Eventually, this principle and practice led to the ecumenical councils, in which the 'episcopal college' perpetuates the 'collegial responsibility' of the 'apostolic college'.[382] In the present-day Roman Catholic Church, national or regional episcopal conferences, the Synod of Bishops and the Ecumenical Council are expressions of 'episcopal solidarity'. According to Tillard, only the principle of episcopal solidarity is *jure divino*, the expressions—including the ecumenical council—are its 'historical actualisations'.[383]

Apart from episcopal collegiality, ministry as 'a communion of ministries' is also expressed by the fact that, within the local church, there is not one ministry but a variety of ministries. Some of them are 'ordained'—bishop,

[378] TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 220, 221 ('dans la célébration liturgique le ministre n'est ainsi qu'un con-célébrant'), 224 ('l'Eucharistie où la communauté exprimera et nourrira sa propre réalité'), 269 ('rôle').

[379] TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 148 ('rôle essentiel et irremplaçable'), 167, 238, 239 ('exercer *le* sacerdoce'), 266.

[380] TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 218 ('ministère de *communion* et communion de ministères').

[381] TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 254-256.

[382] TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 257 ('"collège" épiscopal', '"collège" apostolique', 'responsabilité "collégiale"'); cf. 256-258.

[383] TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 265 ('actualisation historique', 'solidarité épiscopale'); cf. TILLARD, *L'Eglise locale*, 469-483. In 1982, Tillard stated that, due to a centralising tendency, the episcopal conferences and the Synod of Bishops did not receive the importance they should have according to Vatican II. Cf. TILLARD, *L'Evêque de Rome*, 12, 63-65, 237.

presbyters, deacons—and some are not, but all exercise their vocation and charism in communion. The two major manifestations of this communion are the eucharistic celebration and the synodal gathering. Tillard acknowledges that the putting into practice of this theology of ministry—and this theology of the local church in general—requires the formation of 'dioceses of a more human size'.[384]

3.5.6 The Primacy of the Bishop of Rome as a Service to Communion

One particular form of the 'service of communion' is exercised by the bishop of Rome. Tillard's interpretation of the primacy of the bishop of Rome is based upon a *relecture* (re-reading) of the First Vatican Council in a threefold light—the context of the whole Catholic tradition, the transformative reception of Vatican I by Vatican II and the context of the present ecumenical situation.[385]

In view of an ecumenical liturgical ecclesiology, it is interesting to see how—far from regarding it as alien to an ecclesiology of communion—Tillard acknowledges the primacy of the bishop of Rome as an essential element in the life of the 'church of churches', the 'communion of communions'.[386] Citing from documents of the Second Vatican Council, Tillard says that communion with the see of Rome is not a prerequisite for being 'a true church', as the only prerequisite for this is having a 'true eucharist' presided over by 'a minister truly inserted into the apostolic succession'.[387] Nevertheless, just as every ministry—in particular that of the diocesan bishop—has the task to preside over, to enable, to hold together a variety of charisms in the bond of unity, and just as metropolitans and patriarchs have this task on a regional level, so the bishop of Rome has this task on a universal level. As all bishops have to preside over their local church *and* to serve the communion of all local churches, the universal ministry of the bishop of Rome is a specification of this latter duty.[388]

384 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 270-274; 149 n. 92 ('le retour à des diocèses de taille plus humaine'); cf. TILLARD, *L'Eglise locale*, 196-220.

385 TILLARD, *L'Evêque de Rome*, 28, 55, 70, 237. Cf. RUDDY, *The Local Church*, 125: '*The Bishop of Rome* and Tillard's subsequent reflections on the papacy, are efforts to show how the two councils stand—easily and uneasily—within the great tradition'. In a 1964 lecture, Ratzinger already advocated (literally) a 'relecture' of Vatican I in the light of, particularly, the tradition of the Early Church; cf. RATZINGER, *Das neue Volk Gottes*, 140.

386 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 176.

387 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 242-243 ('Car là où ce célèbre une *vraie* Eucharistie, présidée par un ministre *vraiment* inséré dans la succession apostolique, là existe une vraie Eglise'); cf. TILLARD, *L'Evêque de Rome*, 67. Tillard mentions the Orthodox and the Old Catholic Churches (and he follows the use to call communities of baptised Christians *without* such a eucharist and ministry 'ecclesial communities' rather than 'churches').

388 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 260-261, 328; cf. TILLARD, *L'Eglise locale*, 411-452.

Basing himself upon the teaching of the Second Vatican Council, Tillard emphatically insists that the bishop of Rome is not a bishop *above* the episcopal body, not a 'super-bishop', not a 'universal bishop', but a 'bishop among bishops'.[389]

> The papacy is not a sacrament, not even a degree in the fullness of the sacrament of orders. It is a particular way of putting into operation the episcopal, sacramental, common grace. For a tradition which maintains the absolute priority of the sacramental over all the rest and even affirms that the church has only a sacramental source, this remark is of capital importance.[390]

Therefore, the primacy of the bishop of Rome does not impart the authority of each diocesan bishop in his own diocese. When, on the one hand, a diocesan bishop 'acts in communion' and, on the other hand, the bishop of Rome 'is faithful to not going beyond the specifics of his function', then 'there are not two authorities in the diocese'.[391]

Tillard emphasises that the Pope is Pope because he is the bishop of the local church of Rome. History shows that the primacy belongs to the local *church* of Rome (even when its see is vacant) and *thereby* to its bishop.[392] For Tillard, this primacy belongs to the church of Rome because of its 'most powerful origin':[393] the witness and martyrdom of Peter and, additionally, Paul. As the 'vicar of Peter', the bishop of Rome has to exercise the same function in the midst of the bishops as the function Peter exercised in the midst of the apostles.[394] The Roman primacy is thus, according to Tillard, not primarily derived from its patriarchal status. Tillard does not deny that the bishop of Rome is also an Italian metropolitan and the Western patriarch, but he points to the fact that the organisational power and practice of these roles have been

389 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 260 ('super-évêque'), 262 ('évêque universel'), 324 ('pas un évêque au-dessus [...] mais parmi les évêques'); cf. 341; TILLARD, *L'Evêque de Rome*, 177-186.

390 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 324 ('La papauté n'est pas un sacrement, ni même un degré dans la plénitude du sacrement de l'ordre. Elle est une façon particulière de mettre en oeuvre la grâce épiscopale, sacramentelle, commune. Pour une tradition qui maintient la priorité absolue du sacramentel sur tout le reste et même affirme que l'Eglise n'a de source que sacramentelle, cette remarque est capitale'); cf. TILLARD, *L'Evêque de Rome*, 58.

391 TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 338 ('Là où l'évêque local agit dans la *communion* et en fonction d'elle, et là où l'évêque de Rome est fidèle à ne pas déborder le spécifique de sa fonction, il n'y a pas dans le diocèse (l'Eglise locale) deux autorités'); cf. TILLARD, *L'Evêque de Rome*, 161-177.

392 TILLARD, *L'Evêque de Rome*, 91-100; TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 327, 330; cf. 333, 356.

393 The church of Rome's *potentior principalitas* (Irenaeus): TILLARD, *L'Evêque de Rome*, 102 ('plus puissante origine'); TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 359 ('plus puissante origine'); TILLARD, *L'Eglise locale*, 511 ('origine plus excellente'). Afanasiev translates differently; cf. paragraph 2.2.9.

394 TILLARD, *L'Evêque de Rome*, 100-154; TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 356-383; TILLARD, *L'Eglise locale*, 509-543.

confused too much with the Petrine ministry. For Tillard, centralism is a metropolitan and patriarchal phenomenon, not a necessary characteristic of the exercise of the Petrine primacy in the context of a 'church of churches'. Tillard gives as an example that the bishop of Rome does not need to appoint bishops, but has to 'receive' a locally elected bishop into communion.[395]

Tillard acknowledges the primatial function of the bishop of Rome as an integral part of the church as a communion. Exercised in the spirit of communion, this primacy alone enables the church to be a *fully visible* 'communion of communions'.[396]

3.5.7 Conclusion

Tillard upholds a eucharistic ecclesiology in which the eucharist is seen as the heart of 'communion'. Communion refers to God himself, to God's purpose for creation and humanity, to the church as the first fruits of restored communion, and to the eucharist as the most perfect expression of this communion. Through 'zones of communion', the 'full communion' of the eucharistic gathering is connected to all baptised, Israel and all humanity. The first of Tillard's contributions to a liturgical ecclesiology is, thus, his theological description of the church as communion, with the eucharist in the centre, but in the wider perspective of God and the world.

Tillard's second contribution is his non-competitive description of locality and universality. Affirming the primary status of the local church (the diocese) in his eucharistic ecclesiology of communion, and defending the existence of local expressions of church life, Tillard nevertheless gives the universal church an intrinsic place in his ecclesiology, by emphasising that every local church should be in communion with every other local church, and by acknowledging that the eucharist, always celebrated in a local church, is always the same eucharist celebrated in all local churches. 'Communion' is, thus, the concept which intrinisically connects locality and universality, implying both a common faith and local adaptation.

Finally, Tillard contributes to our quest for an ecumenical liturgical ecclesiology by engrafting the ministry of the bishop of Rome into his ecclesiology of communion. Tillard's *relecture* does not jeopardise the role of the papacy in the tradition of the Roman Catholic Church—a tradition into which the First Vatican Council is embedded—but opens up the role of the bishop of Rome as a service to the 'communion of communions' which the church is: both today's Roman Catholic Church and the reunited church towards which the ecumenical movement is striving. Ministry in general, and the

[395] TILLARD, *L'Evêque de Rome*, 70, 224-225; Tillard, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 338-343. For the same opinion, cf. paragraph 3.3.9 (Ratzinger).

[396] TILLARD, *Eglise d'Eglises*, 377-397; cf. TILLARD, *L'Evêque de Rome*, 204-207.

ministry of the bishop of Rome in particular, are seen by Tillard as presiding over the whole community of the baptised and enabling all charisms to flourish in one communion of communions.

3.6 CONCLUSION

This chapter has brought together four Roman Catholic theologians. This is, of course, a rather meagre representation of the vast Roman Catholic literature on liturgical, eucharistic or communion ecclesiology. Nevertheless, because these four authors stand for different approaches, this chapter gives some impression of the variety within Roman Catholic liturgical ecclesiology. The move beyond neo-scholasticism through a neo-patristic way of theologising is represented by the pioneering work of de Lubac. Subsequently, Ratzinger functions as an influential theologian who designed a thoroughly defined Roman Catholic identity on the basis of a eucharistic ecclesiology. Boff stands for a more critical but no less influential line of thought detectible throughout Roman Catholic ecclesiological and sacramental thought since the Second Vatican Council. Finally, the ecumenical outlook of many Roman Catholic theologians since the Council is personified in Tillard, who also counts as the 'communion' ecclesiologist *par excellence*. In this concluding section, the main lines of this chapter will be brought together.

3.6.1 Communion Ecclesiology

All four authors are in their own ways representatives of 'communion ecclesiology'.[397] Prepared by the nineteenth-century rediscovery of the church as a 'mystical body' and deepened by eucharistic ecclesiology, 'communion ecclesiology' can be regarded as the central Roman Catholic ecclesiology since Vatican II.[398]

Communion ecclesiology is not without its critics. Probably the most challenging critique comes from Nicholas Healy. Two aspects of his criticism are of particular relevance. Firstly, he holds the opinion that communion ecclesiology belongs to what he calls 'blueprint ecclesiologies'—rather abstract theological concepts, which lack sufficient rooting in the empirical reality of the

[397] Cf. D.M. DOYLE, *Communion Ecclesiology: Visions and Versions* (Maryknoll: Orbis, 2000), 56-71 (de Lubac), 103-118 (Ratzinger), 124-136 (Boff), 152-156 (Tillard).

[398] This was affirmed by the 1985 Synod of Bishops (cf. DOYLE, *Communion Ecclesiology*, 2), by Pope John Paul II (cf. DULLES, *Models of the Church*, 221, 240), and by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith under Cardinal Ratzinger (cf. *Communionis notio*, 1, 3). Cf. RUDDY, *The Local Church*, 9-53.

church, so that they are of little 'practical-prophetic' worth, *i.e.*, they lack the power for transformative renewal of the actual church.[399]

Nevertheless, in the light of the ecclesiologies discussed in this chapter, it is clear that taking 'communion' as one's basic ecclesiological category does not necessarily lead to an abstract theory without 'practical-prophetic' relevance. However one might think of, for example, the practical consequences of Ratzinger's and Boff's ecclesiologies, few would say that these ecclesiologies lack awareness of the empirical reality of the church and that they (in their different ways) point to the transformation of this reality. Rather, it would be accurate to characterise the theologians discussed in this chapter as ecclesiologists who manage to combine thorough theological thought with practical and transformative engagement with the actual church: 'although undoubtedly idealistic in its vision of ecclesial communion, [their] thought is equally concrete, practical, and realistic'.[400]

Secondly, Healy regards 'communion' as a concept so vague ('undetermined') that it can be applied in virtually all directions. In an amusing sequence of examples, Healy sums up such different communion ecclesiologists as Roman Catholic and Orthodox 'resourcement theologians', 'liberation', 'feminist', 'liberal Protestant' and 'Free Church' theologians. Healy concludes that it is not the communion model which governs the eventual ecclesiology, but 'the respective imaginative judgements and agendas of the theologians'.[401]

It must be admitted that Healy utters a 'rightful concern for articulating the content of "communion"'.[402] Insofar as different authors draw different conclusions from the same biblical-theological notion (*koinonia*/*communio*), it is true that 'communion ecclesiology' is not the name of one unequivocal type of ecclesiology. In this respect Healy is right that the concept of communion has primarily a 'heuristic function, but what among its findings is accepted or not is determined by the agenda rather than the model itself'.[403] To admit this is, however, not to dismiss the concept of communion as a guiding model for ecclesiology, as the following two comments try to substantiate. First, 'communion' is not a vague concept as long as each communion ecclesiologist makes clear what he or she understands by it. The authors discussed in this chapter do so in unmistakable, though sometimes different, ways. Second, the observation that 'communion ecclesiology' serves as a heading for sometimes quite different ecclesiologies, is only a half-truth. Hardly coincidentallly in the Roman Catholic context, this first half of the truth has primarily to do with the different stance communion ecclesiologies take in view of the universal church

399 N.M. HEALY, *Church, World and the Christian Life: Practical-Prophetic Ecclesiology* (Cambridge: CUP, 2000), 25-51.
400 RUDDY, *The Local Church*, 128 (Ruddy says this about Tillard's thought).
401 HEALY, *Church, World and the Christian Life*, 43-46.
402 RUDDY, *The Local Church*, 129.
403 HEALY, *Church, World and the Christian Life*, 46.

and the exercise of authority in the church. The other half of the truth is, however, that these ecclesiologies have some quite important similarities, over against other possible types of ecclesiology. Dennis Doyle summarises these similarities as follows: (1) 'a retrieval of a vision of the Church presupposed by Christians of the first millennium', (2) an emphasis on the 'spiritual' rather than the 'juridical' aspects of the church, (3) 'a high value on the need for visible unity as symbolically realised through shared participation in the Eucharist', and (4) 'a dynamic and healthy interplay between unity and diversity in the Church, between the Church universal and the local Churches'.[404] It is striking to what extent most of these characteristics apply to the four different authors presented in this chapter.

Additionally, Doyle analyses which ecclesiological traps many communion ecclesiologies want to avoid and by what means. These traps are (1) an individualist approach to Christianity, corrected by using the Trinity as the paradigm of communion, (2) a 'merely human' approach to the church, corrected by regarding the church as the Body of Christ and the Communion of Saints, (3) a juridicist approach to ecclesial structures, corrected by an understanding of the church as a 'Communion of Communions', (4) ecclesiological 'mystification', leaving out of sight the sins of the empirical, and the contingencies of the historical church, corrected by the models of People of God and Pilgrim Church, and (5) an exclusivist understanding of the church, corrected by acknowledging that the church has to be a 'Leaven in the World' to the benefit of humanity and all creation.[405] Again, with different emphases, these themes can be detected throughout this chapter.

One could summarise that 'communion ecclesiology' is the name of a type of ecclesiology with a number of common characteristics as well as a number of possible varieties. To keep the varieties together, it seems important to guard the biblical-theological depth of the concept of *koinonia* as well as the 'multi-dimensionality' of one's ecclesiological vision: the balance between the divine and the human, the mystical and the historical, the sacramental and the social. These are not opposites, but integrating elements of the Christian vision.[406]

3.6.2 The Eucharist as the Centre of Communion

Notwithstanding their differences, all four theologians discussed in this chapter regard the eucharist as the focus of communion. In between, on the one hand, Boff's love-hate relationship with the eucharist[407] and, on the other hand, Ratzinger's exclamation that 'church *is* eucharist',[408] all authors treat the

404 DOYLE, *Communion Ecclesiology*, 13.
405 DOYLE, *Communion Ecclesiology*, 14-16.
406 DOYLE, *Communion Ecclesiology*, 175-178.
407 Cf. paragraph 3.4.3.
408 Cf. paragraph 3.3.8.

eucharist as central in the life and being of the church, because they understand the church as a communion and the eucharist as both the means towards and the expression of this communion.

De Lubac is generally acknowledged as the one who has rediscovered the ecclesial nature of the eucharist and the eucharistic nature of the church as two sides of the same coin. He brought back into Western theological consciousness the awareness that the church is as verily the body of Christ as the eucharist is, and that the two are interrelated. 'The eucharist makes the church': by partaking in the eucharistic body of Christ, the church is time and again reconstituted as the body of Christ. 'The church makes the eucharist': because the church is the body of Christ, it is supremely manifested when it celebrates the eucharistic communion with the body of Christ.

Ratzinger takes up de Lubac's theme and undergirds the centrality of the eucharist by four biblical-theological lines of thought. First, he regards the *pascha* of both Israel (the exodus from Egypt and the giving of the Law) and the church (the death and resurrection of Christ and the giving of the Spirit) as constitutive for them as a 'cultic people' (*Kultvolk*), and the paschal meal of both Israel (*pascha*) and the church (eucharist) as the celebration, and thereby the constant re-affirmation, of their *raison d'être*. Second, he regards the ecclesiological terms 'people of God' and 'body of Christ' as related: the church is the new people of God (without denying that Israel also remains the people of God) because it is incorporated into Christ. Once through Christ's death and resurrection, and continually through the eucharist, Christ makes a non-people the people of God by incorporating them into his body. Third, Ratzinger insists that Jesus Christ did not only fulfill the 'prophetic' line of the Old Testament, but also its 'priestly' line. In Christ, righteousness and cult are reconciled. Therefore, the church is a community of ethics and of liturgy. It is, again, the body of Christ, continually present in the eucharist, which connects these lines—there, Christ's way of life and Christ's priestly offering come together. Finally, God's trinitarian being, as well as the nature of salvation through Christ by participation in him, point to the fundamentally corporate, communal character of the Christian faith and church. This relationality of the church, Ratzinger says, is manifested most clearly in the eucharistic celebration.

For Boff, the eucharist is central because it reflects Jesus Christ's life and work, it unites people into a community, and it anticipates the liberation to be fulfilled in the kingdom of God. However, Boff warns that the eucharist can also become an element of a repressive ecclesial climate, when admission to its presiding ministry is restricted and when this ministry, rather than being committed to the celebrating community, serves as an agent of a 'top down' understanding of the church. Moreover, Boff places the eucharist in the broader context of sacramentality. According to him, Christianity has to learn people to look at the world 'sacramentally': things, persons and situations can either be understood in a one-dimensional sense or in a 'transparent', 'diaphanous' sense:

pointing towards God. The church itself is such a 'sacrament' of Christ and salvation for the world. Finally, Boff roots the social character of the church and of society in the Trinity. 'Perichoresis' is his model for a communion of equals, living in interdependence.

Not surprisingly, Tillard's thorough ecclesiology of communion points time and again to the eucharist as the ecclesial event which most powerfully manifests all aspects of 'communion'—God, the church and a reconciled world. The eucharist serves as the both spiritual and tangible centre of an overarching theology of communion.

3.6.3 The Bishop of Rome in the Service of Communion

In the context of this chapter on Roman Catholic contributions to a liturgical ecclesiology, it is important to highlight the position which the bishop of Rome occupies in the ecclesiologies presented here. De Lubac can be regarded as a representative of those twentieth-century theologians who contributed to a shift in the approach to the church. Instead of treating the church as an hierarchical institution, he approaches the church as a social and historical communion in the wider context of God's desire for all humanity. The thought of Ratzinger, Boff and Tillard builds upon this renewed paradigm.

Ratzinger works it out in a direction that sees the church—both in its theological essence ('ontologically') and in its first historical manifestation in Jerusalem ('historically')—primarily as the universal church, of which the local churches are the subsequent manifestations. For Ratzinger, this universal church is on the one hand a theological idea—the body of Christ, the people of God, bride, city, mother. On the other hand, it is an empirical phenomenon—the 'net of communions' held together by communion with the bishop of Rome. Ratzinger warns, however, not to equate the universal church with the local church of Rome. Neither should the metropolitan, patriarchal role of the bishop of the local church of Rome be used to give the bishop of Rome as many organisational privileges as possible. It is rather the 'Petrine' ministry of the bishop of Rome, that makes him the primate of the universal church. Being in communion with him is the sign of belonging to the true 'net of communions' that is the universal church. Because of the importance of this theological and empirical unity of the one church, Ratzinger holds the opinion that spiritually and visually belonging to this one church—expressed by being in communion with the bishop of Rome—is not an external addition to the identity of the local church, but an essential characteristic 'internal' to each local church. Notwithstanding this strong affirmation of the necessity of communion with the bishop of Rome, the theological basis of Ratzinger's ecclesiology is not 'hierarchical' but rather christocentric, paschal, baptismal, eucharistic and based upon communion (*koinonia*).

Theologically, Boff does not differ from Ratzinger in the theological priority of the universal over the local church,[409] which is a result of the fact that his church-as-sacrament ecclesiology, like his theology of sacramentality, proceeds conceptually from the general to the particular. Practically, however, Boff sees this universal church manifested in a variety of local churches, whose differences he defends on the basis of a trinitarian, perichoretic concept of communion. By focusing on local congregations—particularly the Base Ecclesial Communities—rather than on the 'local church' understood as the diocese, Boff tends to perceive a tension between the local congregation and the 'hierarchy' of the papacy, the episcopate and to a certain extent also the priesthood. In reaction to this tension, Boff advocates, both in church and in society, a communal and participatory attitude instead of *potestas sacra*.

Finally, Tillard is the one who offers the most consistent view on the ministry of the bishop of Rome within an ecclesiology of communion. He understands the universal church as a 'communion of communions', a 'church of churches', in which locality and universality occur simultaneously. It is as essential for the local church to be in communion with the other local churches as it is essential for the universal church that is does not exists but in and through the local churches. This fundamental emphasis on communion characterises Tillard's thought on the bishop of Rome. His role is a specification of the supra-local task of every bishop—every bishop being simultaneously a local diocesan bishop and, thereby, a member of the episcopal college with its responsibility for the well-being of the supra-local, and ultimately the universal, church. In communion with all these local bishops, the bishop of Rome fulfills an indispensable service to the universal 'communion of communions'. Opposing centralism—including the appointment of diocesan bishops by the Vatican—and unilateral intervention in a local diocese, Tillard believes that local bishops and the universal primate are able to 'act in communion' for the well-being of both the local and the universal church.

3.6.4 Communion beyond the Church

De Lubac is one of the Roman Catholic theologians who initiated the twentieth-century opening-up of theology towards the wider world. His interpretation of 'Catholicism' as all-embracing communion has helped to prepare Vatican II's appreciation of other Christians, other religions and all humanity. Throughout this chapter, the theme has recurred that the church is part of a larger design of communion, that begins with the trinitarian God himself and that ends with the consummation of the world as one reconciled community.

For de Lubac, the unity of the human race, rooted in the unity of the Creator, implies the unity of the church and, ultimately, the unity of redeemed

[409] Cf. RUDDY, *The Local Church*, 209 n. 25.

humankind. For Ratzinger, the 'love' (*agape*) of the Christian community, especially as celebrated in the eucharist, is meant to embrace the whole world. Liturgy is 'never just a cult'—Christ, his church and his sacraments have a cultic but also a non-cultic, a priestly but also a prophetic character. For Boff, the perichoresis within the Trinity is the model of a participatory church and society. In accordance with the hermeneutical principle of liberation theology, all Boff's themes—such as trinitarian theology, sacramentality and ecclesiology—have cutting edges which aim at the transformation of ecclesial and societal reality. And for Tillard, the notion of 'communion' is so fundamental that he cannot conceive God and humanity, the church and the world, otherwise than in terms of relationship and reciprocity. Communion is the all-embracing theme that has to become, both theologically and empirically, the characteristic of the church and the whole world.

4 'A UNITY IN A GIVEN PLACE AROUND A BISHOP WITH THE EUCHARIST AS ITS CENTER'

Old Catholic Contributions to a Liturgical Ecclesiology

4.1 INTRODUCTION

4.1.1 A Eucharistic Self-Understanding

In 2001, the International Old Catholic Bishops' Conference added an ecclesiological preamble to its renewed statute. In this preamble, it is formulated that the Old Catholics understand the church to be a

> fellowship and communion of people, which by the reconciliation in Jesus Christ and by the outpouring and the continuous work of the Holy Spirit is constituted as a unity in a given place around a bishop with the eucharist as its center

and that such a church 'in a given place' is to be understood as 'a complete church that carries out its tasks autonomously in that given place'.[1]

This basic ecclesiological statement reflects the intentions of a eucharistic ecclesiology in a particularly consistent way. The church is defined christologically as well as pneumatologically, and the church is fundamentally regarded as local, episcopal and eucharist-centred. The local and eucharistic aspects of this formulation are repeated and placed into a wider context in another part of the preamble, which says:

> Each local church is the Body of Christ in which the members, baptized and confirmed in the name of the Holy Trinity and united in the Eucharist, are called,

[1] U. VON ARX & M. WEYERMANN (eds.), *Statut der Internationalen Altkatholischen Bischofskonferenz (IBK). Offizielle Ausgabe in fünf Sprachen* (Bern: Stämpfli, 2001), 28-29 (preamble 3.1). Both the German and the English text (my citations are from the latter) are 'authentic'. Cf. U. VON ARX, 'Vorwort', in: von Arx & Weyermann (eds.), *Statut*, 3-11, at 11 n. 25.

> authorized, and sanctified by the various gifts of the Holy Spirit to live a multifaceted common life in *martyria*, *leitourgia*, and *diakonia*.[2]

It is the aim of this chapter to investigate the main line of twentieth-century Old Catholic ecclesiology in such a way as to elucidate how the Old Catholic ecclesiological tradition has been continued and perhaps transformed into the eucharistic ecclesiology to which the 2001 preamble witnesses. Before this, I give a short introduction to two central features of the Old Catholic ecclesiological tradition—the question of jurisdiction and the appeal to the Early Church—and to an example of an 'ecclesial liturgy' at a time when a 'liturgical ecclesiology' was not yet formulated.

4.1.2 Ecclesiological Jansenism: Jurisdiction and Mentality

As a catholic but non-Roman church, the Old Catholic Church has always attached importance to ecclesiology as a major component of its theological self-understanding. The ecclesiology of the Old Catholic Church of the Netherlands[3] has its roots in Western catholic movements such as Conciliarism, Gallicanism and Jansenism. Central to Old Catholic ecclesiology were questions about the structure of the church,[4] about the role of the papacy in relation to the role of the episcopate, and about the source of jurisdiction. This focus on discussion with Rome about the constitution of the church, understandable as it is in historical perspective, has not left much room for other ecclesiological focuses, such as the place of the liturgy within ecclesiology. Nevertheless, the jurisdictional focus has its own ecclesiological relevance, as will be shown in

2 VON ARX & WEYERMANN (eds.), *Statut*, 29 (preamble 3.3).

3 Before the end of the nineteenth century, the Old Catholic Church of the Netherlands understood itself as the 'Roman Catholic Church of the Old Episcopal Clergy'. For ease of survey, in the following account the term 'Old Catholic' is used throughout, even when it is anachronistically applied to a period in which that term was not yet in use. On the nomenclature (from 'Old Episcopal Clergy', through 'Old-Episcopal Clergy' and 'Old Catholic', to 'Old Catholic Church') see D.J. SCHOON, 'Oude en nieuwe bisschoppen. De "oud-katholieken" en 1853', in: J. Vis & W. Janse (eds.), *Staf en storm. Het herstel van de bisschoppelijke hiërarchie in Nederland in 1853: actie en reactie* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2002), 166-187, at 186-187; D.J. SCHOON, *Van bisschoppelijke Cleresie tot Oud-Katholieke Kerk. Bijdrage tot de geschiedenis van het katholicisme in Nederland in de 19de eeuw* (Nijmegen: Valkhof Pers, 2004), 71-73.

4 An example of the centrality of ecclesiology within Old Catholic theology, and the centrality of problems of ecclesiastical structure within Old Catholic ecclesiology, is the fact that the extraordinary professorial chair of the Old Catholic Seminary at Utrecht University, established in 1974, was named 'the ancient Catholic structures of the church'. In 1996 the name was enlarged into 'the ancient Catholic structures of the church, including the history and doctrine of the Old Catholic Churches', because the essence of a church is not only represented by its structure, but also by its past and by the theological aspects of its identity. Cf. J.J. HALLEBEEK, *De 'wondere afscheidpreekens' van pater Daneels, Oudewater 1705* (Amersfoort: COKB, 1998), 5.

this paragraph. Beyond canon law, the question where jurisdiction belongs is an ecclesiological question with consequences for the mentality of ecclesial life.

Traces of a distinctively Dutch catholicism, which eventually led to the breach between two catholic groups in the Netherlands around 1700,[5] can already be found in the *Devotio Moderna* of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. Centred on the inner life, not on outward expressions, authors like Geert Groote (1340-1384) and Thomas a Kempis (1379-1471) wanted explicitly to base their understanding of the catholic faith on Scripture and Jesus Christ, and upheld the ideal that all members of the church should be deeply informed about their faith. For centuries, the spirituality of the Dutch secular clergy, as different from the rather Southern-European devotions advocated by the regular and missionary clergy, would maintain this character of what could be called 'learned devotion'.[6] Part of this spirituality was an emphasis on the official liturgy of the church, rather than on para-liturgical or private devotions.[7]

Another reason for the widening abyss between secular and regular clergy, or more generally between two spiritual traditions in the Netherlands, was the Jansenist controversy. In the light of ecclesiology, the aspect of Jansenism called 'ecclesiological Jansenism' is of more immediate relevance than the theological controversy over the Augustinian interpretation of grace,[8] or the spiritual movement associated with Pascal, the Arnaulds and Port Royal.[9] Ecclesiological Jansenism was the movement by which Conciliarist and

5 Since this breach, from the Roman Catholic side called 'the Schism of Utrecht' (1723), the Old Catholic Church of the Netherlands considers itself (at least officially) as the continuation of the Catholic Church which exists in the Netherlands since Willibrord (658-739), the first bishop of Utrecht. Cf. A. RINKEL, 'Die Lehre von der Kirche nach der Auffassung der altkatholischen Kirche', *IKZ* 39 (1949), 1-15, at 2. For the seventeenth-century background of the 'schism', cf. J.E.A. ACKERMANS, *Herders en huurlingen. Bisschoppen en priesters in de Republiek (1663-1705)* (Amsterdam: Prometheus/Bert Bakker, 2003).

6 This term was coined by the Dutch Roman Catholic church historian Theo Clemens. Cf. T.H.J. CLEMENS, *De godsdienstigheid in de Nederlanden in de spiegel van de katholieke kerkboeken 1680-1840* (Tilburg: Tilburg University Press, 1988), vol. I, 92 ('De vroomheid [...] was "geleerd", zowel in de betekenis van "aangeleerd" als "erudiet"'). See also T.H.J. CLEMENS, 'Katholieke vroomheid en het schisma van 1723', *Holland* 25 (1993), 197-220, at 206 ('godvruchtige geleerdheid').

7 Cf. J. VISSER, 'Old Catholic Spirituality', in: G. Huelin (ed.), *Old Catholics and Anglicans 1931-1981: To Commemorate the Fiftieth Anniversary of Intercommunion* (Oxford: OUP, 1983), 96-108, at 99-101; CLEMENS, *De godsdienstigheid*, vol. I, 91-96; Clemens, 'Katholieke vroomheid', 202, 206-207.

8 On the importance of the Augustinian point of view for the Old Catholic understanding of grace, see for example A. RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', stencilled edition 1956, III 23-65, 119-157.

9 Cf. J. VISSER, *Het ideaal van de 'ecclesia primitiva' in het jansenisme en het oud-katholicisme* (Amersfoort: COKB, 1980), who denies the idea that the development from doctrinal, through spiritual, to ecclesiological Jansenism is a downward movement. 'It *had* to lead to questions on jurisdiction and authority' (6: 'Het moest wel tot de vragen van jurisdictie en gezag komen').

Gallican ecclesiological thought was mediated into the Old Catholic Church. Authors of importance to this movement were, among others, the Conciliarist bishop of Avila, Alonso el Tostado (1410-1455), the Parisian theologian, Edmond Richer (1559-1631), and the Louvain canonist, Zegers Bernard van Espen (1646-1728). In these writers one can already find the main thrust of the later international Old Catholic ecclesiological position, which can be summarised under the headings of 'Early Church' (recourse to the patristic period), 'Local Church' (the national church or the diocese as the principal ecclesiological entity) and 'Whole Church' (the church consists of clergy and laity alike).[10]

Against the pretensions of the Roman curia, Tostado upheld the theory that the authority to administer the church (jurisdiction) is essentially the property of the church as a whole. Because Tostado compared 'the entire church' to the 'entire assembly' in the Old Testament, he presumably had in mind both clergy and laity. Taking Numbers 15:32-36 as a clue, Tostado argues that, in principle, the whole people of God has to take decisions, but because this is practically impossible, the people of God leave the decision to Moses and Aaron.[11] Likewise, the whole church—represented by the cardinals—elects a pope, who receives the duty to exercise the jurisdiction which belongs to the whole church. After his death the jurisdiction reverts to the church again. Tostado did not challenge the practice that the pope appointed most of the bishops, so he could write that the bishops receive their jurisdiction from the pope.[12]

Richer and the Paris school differed from Tostado in two respects. Firstly, they were much more occupied with the rights of the priests, the *second ordre*, which led to their view that jurisdiction belongs to the entire church, not in the sense of all faithful, but in the sense of the clergy of all ranks. Secondly, although they regarded—like Tostado, but using different terminology—jurisdiction as *essentialiter* belonging to the church and only *ministerialiter* to the pope and the bishops, they deviated from Tostado as it came to the bestowal of this jurisdiction. According to Tostado, jurisdiction was given by the church to the pope, who mediated it to the bishops. According to the Paris school, including Richer, both forms of jurisdiction (*essentialiter* and *ministerialiter*) were conferred directly and at the same time by God. Because the pope and the bishops receive the same kind of jurisdiction at the same moment, Richer, unlike Tostado, can be regarded as an episcopalist.[13]

10 Cf. M. PLOEGER, 'Catholicity, Apostolicity, the Trinity and the Eucharist in Old Catholic Ecclesiology', in: U. von Arx, P.D.L. Avis, M. Ploeger (eds.), *Towards Further Convergence: Anglican and Old Catholic Ecclesiologies* (Bern: Stämpfli, 2006), 7-27, at 25-26.

11 J.J. HALLEBEEK, *Alonso 'el Tostado' (c. 1410-1455). His doctrine on jurisdiction and its influence in the Church of Utrecht* (Amersfoort: COKB, 1997), 13, 25.

12 HALLEBEEK, *Alonso 'el Tostado'*, 10-11, 15.

13 HALLEBEEK, *Alonso 'el Tostado'*, 19-23.

The later French Jansenists, some of whom became of considerable importance to the Old Catholic Church, upheld a theory which can be seen as a combination of aspects from Tostado and from Richer. They accepted Richer's episcopalism, but adapted his clericalism by interpreting 'the entire church' in the way Tostado did—as a description of all faithful: clergy and laity alike.[14] One of the representatives of this thought was Nicolas LeGros (1675-1751), who taught at the Old Catholic Seminary at Amersfoort.[15] This stance was also taken by van Espen, who was very influential in the Old Catholic Church, because Dutch priests were taught at Louvain and because he was frequently asked for advice by the Chapter of Utrecht. But van Espen and some of his Dutch students carried a second adaptation through, again by introducing an aspect of Tostado's theory into Richerist thought. They maintained Richer's view that jurisdiction was given to pope and bishops alike (and not, as with Tostado, to the pope and by him to the bishops), but they replaced Richer's *direct divine* bestowal of jurisdiction by Tostado's view that jurisdiction was granted by the *church*. This can be explained from the fact that, unlike Tostado who was used to episcopal appointments by the pope, the Dutch catholics were used to the ancient right of the chapters to elect their bishops. Combined with the first adaptation, the result is that the entire church (all faithful and clergy) possesses jurisdiction, which they hand down to the bishops (including the pope).[16]

The question where jurisdiction belongs, and how it is conferred to those who exercise it, has to do with the *mentality* of a church and its members. If the authority to administer the church

> is eventually founded on the approval of the entire community of the faithful, this must have consequences for the way in which the administrative authority is exercised, namely in responsibility towards the confidence which the entire church has put in its ministers.[17]

The task of these ministers is, therefore, not aptly defined as the 'right' to proclaim the gospel in the liturgy or the 'right' to preside at the eucharist—as if it is up to the ministers to decide whether or not they are willing to proclaim or

14 HALLEBEEK, *Alonso 'el Tostado'*, 25-32.

15 Cf. J. VISSER, 'Jansenismus und Konziliarismus: ekklesiologische Anschauungen des Nicolas LeGros (1675-1751)', *IKZ* 73 (1983), 212-224; HALLEBEEK, *Alonso 'el Tostado'*, 26-29.

16 HALLEBEEK, *Alonso 'el Tostado'*, 32-42; J.J. HALLEBEEK, 'Die Autonomie der Ortskirche im Denken von Zeger Bernard van Espen', *IKZ* 92 (2002), 76-99.

17 J.J. HALLEBEEK, *Over de oorsprong van jurisdictie* (Amersfoort: COKB, 1992), 32 ('Als alle niet-sacramenteel handelen uiteindelijk gefundeerd is op de instemming van de gehele gemeenschap van gelovigen moet dit gevolgen hebben voor de wijze waarop leidingsmacht wordt uitgeoefend, namelijk in verantwoordelijkheid tegenover het vertrouwen dat de kerk als geheel in haar ambtsdragers gesteld heeft'); cf. HALLEBEEK, 'Die Autonomie der Ortskirche', 98.

to preside. Theirs is rather 'the task and thereby the obligation to proclaim the Gospel'. In other words, ministry should be approached in terms of *responsibility* and *task* rather than of *right* and *power*.[18]

The traditional emphasis of Old Catholic ecclesiology on questions of jurisdiction, then, expresses the fundamental ecclesiological conviction that the church is not to be identified with the ministry but with the whole people of God, and that the church is not to be regarded primarily as a universal church governed by the pope, but as a local church governed by the bishop in co-operation with clergy and laity.

4.1.3 Neo-Gallican Liturgical Principles: An Ecclesial Liturgy

The preceding paragraph indicated the importance of the Gallican tradition in the field of ecclesiastical structure and jurisdiction. This paragraph tries to show that Gallicanism also included a liturgical practice that reflected its ecclesiological view. Although on a slower pace, the Old Catholic Church has appropriated these liturgical practices as well as the underlying ecclesiological apprehensions.

One of the Neo-Gallican[19] liturgical practices with an immediate link to ecclesiology was the revision of the calendar. Calendars were published in *diocesan* editions of missals and breviaries, so that the choice of saints could be adapted to local customs and preferences. This linked the calendar primarily to the the local church, rather than to the universal church. Another principle witnessing to a critical attitude over against the Roman tradition was the elimination of 'legendary' parts of saints' lifes. A similar movement *ad fontes* was the principle that antiphons and other liturgical texts had to be derived preferably from Scripture.[20]

Another liturgical principle of Neo-Gallicanism was the participation of the laity. In spite of Roman condemnation, French translations of the Mass and other explanations of the liturgy appeared during the seventeenth and eighteenth

[18] K. STALDER, *Die Wirklichkeit Christi erfahren. Ekklesiologische Untersuchungen und ihre Bedeutung für die Existenz von Kirche heute* (Zürich-Köln: Benzinger, 1984), 255 ('die Aufgabe und darum die Verpflichtung, das Evangelium zu verkündigen').

[19] The liturgical equivalent of theological and ecclesiological 'Gallicanism' is called 'Neo-Gallicanism' in order to distinguish it from the early medieval 'Gallican' liturgy. See also J.D. CRICHTON, *Lights in Darkness: Fore-runners of the Liturgical Movement* (Blackrock, Co Dublin: Columba, 1996), 44-51; K.F. PECKLERS, 'The Jansenist Critique and the Liturgical Reforms of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries', *Ecclesia Orans* 20 (2003), 325-338.

[20] K. OUWENS, *Het Stukjesboek. Missen en Gezangen 1745-1803. De basis van het oud-katholieke kerklied in Nederland* (Amersfoort: COKB, 1996), 76. Ouwens (77-79) gives examples of the differences between the Roman Missal and the missals of the dioceses of Paris (1680) and Auxerre (1726). The differences between the Roman Breviary and the breviaries of such dioceses as Vienne (1678), Paris (1680 and 1736) and Rouen (1728), but also of the monastery of Cluny (1686), are even larger (85-88).

centuries. Particularly parts of the *Rituale*, such as the pastoral liturgies for baptisms and funerals, lent themselves to be translated—and sometimes actually performed—in the vernacular.[21] The missals of some dioceses contain indications that the people responded to the priest's prayers, and that communion of the people was a general practice.[22]

In the wake of Gallican ecclesiology, the Old Catholic Church gradually introduced Neo-Gallican liturgical principles. The *Breviarium Ecclesiasticum*, used by the Old Catholic clergy from its appearance in 1744 to at least the first half of the twentieth century, was a Dutch adaptation of the 1736 *Breviarium Parisiense*. Other liturgical and devotional books show a similar tendency towards biblical foundation, catechetical explanation and rubrical simplification.[23] If it is impossible to trace a 'liturgical ecclesiology' back to the early history of the Old Catholic Church, at least there was an attempt at an 'ecclesial liturgy'—a liturgy in which the ecclesiological emphasis on the local church (diocese), and on the importance of all members of the church, is unmistakably reflected.

4.1.4 The Appeal to the Early Church

One of the main characteristics of Old Catholic ecclesiology—and Old Catholic theology in general—is its appeal to the Early Church. This characteristic is an integral part of the Jansenist legacy. Following the Renaissance ideal of returning *ad fontes*, the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Jansenists attempted to go back behind scholasticism—'positive' historical research was preferred to 'speculative' theological method. Although in Old Catholic history the Jansenist appeal to the Early Church has mainly to do with ecclesiastical structure and jurisdiction, it has also influenced Dutch Old Catholicism in a broader sense—liturgical, ethical and doctrinal.[24]

But the appeal to the Early Church has not entered the Old Catholic Churches only through the Old Catholic Church of the Netherlands. Although in a different historical-theological context, the appeal to the Early Church was a dominant feature of the German-speaking Old Catholic Churches as well, which came into existence[25] as the result of their refusal to accept the dogmas of papal

21 OUWENS, *Het Stukjesboek*, 80-85.

22 OUWENS, *Het Stukjesboek*, 100-103. This is particularly the case with Bossuet's missal for the diocese of Meaux (1709), and his nephew's missal for the diocese of Troyes (1736).

23 OUWENS, *Het Stukjesboek*, 89-103.

24 VISSER, *Het ideaal van de 'ecclesia primitiva'*, 4-13. SCHOON, *Van bisschoppelijke Cleresie tot Oud-Katholieke Kerk*, 389-391, 724-726, points out that the Dutch recourse to the Early Church shifted from a defense of the rights of the local church (17th and 18th centuries) to using the Early Church as a model for ecclesial renewal (19th and 20th centuries).

25 Although the German speaking Old Catholic Churches historically came into existence after 1870, they consider themselves to be in continuation with the 'old' or 'ancient' Catholic

infallibility and universal jurisdiction of the First Vatican Council (1869-1870).[26] In 1889 the Dutch church joined the German, Swiss and (one year later) Austrian (including the later Czech and Slovakian) churches, which had emerged in the eighteen seventies, to form the 'Old Catholic Churches' of the 'Union of Utrecht'. In the twentieth century the Union was joined by Old Catholic Churches in the United States of America, Poland and Croatia.[27]

These developments resulted in an Old Catholic identity that originates from three sources—the ecclesiological and spiritual history of the Dutch Old Catholics, the mainly German-speaking background of a breach with Rome over the dogmas of Vatican I, and the twentieth-century desire for autonomous ecclesial existence of ethnic groups. The Swiss Old Catholic theologian Urs von Arx claims that what he calls 'Old Catholic mainstream theology' is mainly determined by the first two groups and is characterised by 'a marked closeness to Anglican and Orthodox ecclesiology'.[28]

That the appeal to the Early Church played a major role in the German-speaking protest against the papal dogmas of the First Vatican Council, is shown by the very name of the protest movement—*altkatholisch* (Old Catholic). By that time, the term *altkatholische Kirche* (Old Catholic Church) was used in the field of church history as a standard term for third-century Christianity.[29] By adopting this term as the name for their movement, the Old Catholics, inspired by the German church historian Ignaz von Döllinger (1799-1890), proclaimed the Early Church as the norm for their strivings at reform in the Catholic Church.[30] But in their appliance of the term 'Early Church' (*Alte Kirche*), they did not limit it to a clear-cut period such as the third century. By the 'Early Church' they understood the rather unarticulated period of 'the first millennium', particularly in order to emphasise the importance of the unity between Eastern and Western Christianity before the schism of 1054.[31] 'The

Church of the early centuries. Cf., e.g., RINKEL, 'Die Lehre von der Kirche nach der Auffassung der altkatholischen Kirche', 2-3.

26 Cf. U. KÜRY, *Die altkatholische Kirche. Ihre Geschichte, ihre Lehre, ihr Anliegen* (Stuttgart: Evangelisches Verlagswerk, 1966), 57-93; A.K.H. BERLIS, *Frauen im Prozess der Kirchwerdung. Eine historisch-theologische Studie zur Anfangsphase des deutschen Altkatholizismus (1850-1890)* (Frankfurt: Lang, 1998), 25-232.

27 Cf. KÜRY, *Die altkatholische Kirche*, 93-96; U. VON ARX, 'The Old Catholic Churches of the Union of Utrecht', in: P.D.L. Avis (ed.), *The Christian Church: An Introduction to the Major Traditions* (London: SPCK, 2002), 157-185, at 158-160.

28 VON ARX, 'The Old Catholic Churches', 160. On von Arx's ecclesiology, cf. section 4.8.

29 Among others, Ritschl used the term in this sense, alongside *frühkatholisch* for the second century and *reichskatholisch* for the post-Constantine era. Cf. C. MARKSCHIES, 'Alte Kirche', in: H.D. Betz *et al.* (eds.), *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Handwörterbuch für Theologie und Religionswissenschaft*, vol. I (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998[4]), 344-360, at 345.

30 C. OEYEN, 'Die Alte Kirche als Norm nach Döllinger und seiner Schule', *IKZ* 86 (1996), 26-44, at 27.

31 OEYEN, 'Die Alte Kirche', 29-30. Cf. M. RING, 'Ad pristinam normam patrum. Anmerkungen zum altkatholischen Reformparadigma', in: A.K.H. Berlis & K.-D. Gerth

first millennium' is the form in which the Early Church entered the 'Declaration of Bishops' (1889), the charter of the Union of Utrecht.[32] In the wake of this formative declaration, the rather vague definition of the Early Church as the first millennium remains influential to the present time.[33]

In recent times, Old Catholic theologians have intensely engaged themselves with the historical and hermeneutical problems of the traditional appeal to the Early Church. What is the Early Church, and how can it be used as a model?[34] The current state of this discussion is probably best described by the Dutch Old Catholic theologian Jan Visser as he concludes that we can use the Early Church only as 'a hermeneutical principle'. According to Visser, both the Jansenist and the German Old Catholic forebears used the Early Church not in order to leave things as they were in times past, but as a means of solving contemporary problems according to the *methods* of the Early Church for finding truth and solving conflicts.[35] The appeal to the Early Church means, Visser explains, 'that when one has to decide upon new questions, one searches for a [hermeneutically interpreted] historical foundation in the Early Church, in order to legitimate what one wants to renew'.[36]

The theological and ecclesiological consequences of the appeal to the Early Church are evaluated differently by contemporary Old Catholic authors. The interpretations vary from an emphasis on the Jesus movement of the first century,[37] through a hermeneutical transformation of the patristic practice of 'conciliarity' into an understanding of the church as being available to the

(eds.), *Christus Spes. Liturgie und Glaube im ökumenischen Kontext. Festschrift für Bischof Sigisbert Kraft* (Frankfurt: Lang, 1994), 255-264, at 258.

32 The text of the Declaration can be found in VON ARX & WEYERMANN (eds.), *Statut*, 25-27 (English translation: 40-42).

33 See for instance two leading Old Catholic theologians in 1966 and 2002, who both refer to the first millennium: KÜRY, *Die altkatholische Kirche*, 126; VON ARX, 'The Old Catholic Churches', 166.

34 An historical problem is the definition of what is actually meant by 'the Early Church' when one acknowledges the pluriformity within the church of the first centuries. A hermeneutical problem is the fact that everyone who appeals to a certain period will emphasise certain aspects of that period and leave out others, according to one's own preoccupations. Cf. RING, 'Ad pristinam normam patrum', 258.

35 J. VISSER, 'Die Alte Kirche als hermeneutisches Prinzip', *IKZ* 86 (1996), 45-64, at 63; J. VISSER, 'The Old Catholic Churches of the Union of Utrecht', *International Journal for the Study of the Christian Church* 3 (2003), 68-84, at 79-84. On Visser's ecclesiology, cf. section 4.6.

36 J. VISSER, 'Von Mäntelchen und dem Wind. Zur Frage einer altkatholischen Theologie', *IKZ* 95 (2005), 73-94, at 82 ('dass man bei neuen Fragen, die zu entscheiden sind, jeweils nach einer historischen Begründung in der Alten Kirche zu suchen hat, zur Legitimierung dessen, was man (er-)neuern will').

37 J.L. WIRIX, 'De *ecclesia primitiva*: een spiegel voor de kerk van nu!', in: J.J. Hallebeek & J.L. Wirix (eds.), *Met het oog op morgen. Ecclesiologische beschouwingen aangeboden aan Jan Visser* (Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum, 1996), 233-241.

others and to the Other,[38] to the classical view that the appeal to the Early Church implies the normativity of actual doctrines and institutions,[39] such as Scripture, the creeds, the seven ecumenical councils (with particular reference to the trinitarian and christological dogmas), the eucharist, episcopal ministry and synodal networks.[40]

What these various interpretations indicate, is that, although originally the jurisdictional aspect played a substantial part in the appeal to the Early Church of both Jansenism and *Altkatholizismus*, the acceptance of the Early Church as a norm influences more levels than only the structural and jurisdictional. Accepting the Early Church as a basis has also consequences in such areas as Scripture, trinitarian faith, the eucharist, ministry, and living together in pluriformity and solidarity.

4.1.5 This Chapter

This introductory section has served to inform the reader about some important aspects of Old Catholic ecclesiology. Moreover, a recent formulation of Old Catholic self-understanding in terms of a eucharistic ecclesiology has been presented. The question is how this recent eucharistic ecclesiology is related to twentieth-century mainstream Old Catholic ecclesiology. The answer is sought in the writings of a number of authors who have contributed to this development.

As in the other chapters of this study, this implies that not all Old Catholic theologians who have contributed to Old Catholic ecclesiology will be discussed in this chapter. A choice had to be made and the criteria for the selection have been twofold. Firstly, a number of authors should be presented who have explicitly contributed to the development of an Old Catholic eucharistic ecclesiology. This applies without doubt to Werner Küppers, Kurt Stalder, Herwig Aldenhoven and Urs von Arx.[41] Secondly, this development towards a consistent eucharistic ecclesiology should be placed in the context of twentieth-century Old Catholic ecclesiological thought. This line of thought is represented here by Andreas Rinkel, Urs Küry and Jan Visser. The result is a

38 J.A.O.L. VERCAMMEN, *Identiteit in beraad. Theorie en praktijk van het parochieel identiteitsberaad in vier oud-katholieke parochies* (Baarn: Gooi & Sticht, 1997), 324.

39 OEYEN, 'Die Alte Kirche', 42.

40 VON ARX, 'The Old Catholic Churches', 165-166.

41 In addition to these systematic theologians, mention should be made of Old Catholic liturgists who through their teaching contributed to a liturgical understanding of ecclesiality and an ecclesial understanding of liturgy; cf. S. KRAFT, 'Grundsätze und Ziele alt-katholischer Liturgiereform', *IKZ* 72 (1982), 82-106; C. TOL, *Concelebratie* (Amersfoort: COKB, 1988). See also the 1999 pastoral letter of the German Old Catholic bishop Joachim Vobbe, 'Denk-Mahl göttlicher Zukunft. Betrachtungen über die Heilige Eucharistie', in: J. VOBBE, *Brot aus dem Steintal. Bischofsbriefe* (Bonn: Alt-Katholischer Bistumsverlag, 2005), 109-169.

selected but representative account, not of Old Catholic theology in general, but of the liturgical-ecclesiological thread within twentieth-century Old Catholicism.

4.2 ANDREAS RINKEL

4.2.1 Life and Work

Starting point of this chapter's research into Old Catholic thought on church and liturgy is the theological position of Andreas Rinkel (1889-1979). After having served two parishes as a parish priest, he was elected archbishop of Utrecht in 1937, a position he held for more than thirty years (he retired in 1970). Prior to and partly in addition to his episcopate, he was Professor of Dogmatics and Ethics at the Old Catholic Seminary (1921-1948) then based at Amersfoort.[42] He also taught liturgy, seemingly on his own initiative, 'as a more or less relaxing appendix' to his systematic-theological lectures.[43]

Rinkel's thought is interesting for at least two reasons. Firstly, Rinkel was the first Dutch Old Catholic theologian who did not regard dogmatic theology as a (neo-) scholastic discipline, understood as deducing conclusions from propositions. In his time and before, Old Catholic theologians had a preference for biblical and patristic studies rather than for dogmatics. Rinkel was the first to combine the Old Catholic preference for a sound biblical foundation and constant recourse to the Fathers of the Church with doing dogmatic theology, not in the rationalistic way of deduction from propositions, but by reaching dogmatic conclusions out of biblical and historical research, with permanent awareness of the concrete ecclesiastical and ecumenical effects of dogmatic positions.[44] In this respect, Rinkel's approach was a fundamental change, as dogmatic theology had been taught for more than a century from Josef Valla's *Institutiones Theologicae* (1784), the content of which was in the Augustinian tradition, but presented in a scholastic way.[45]

42 F. SMIT, 'Andreas Rinkel (1889-1979)', in: F. Smit e.a., *Adjutorio Redemptoris. Dr. Andreas Rinkel, aartsbisschop van Utrecht, 1889-1979* (Amersfoort: COKB, 1987), 3-197, at 33, 123.

43 C. TOL, 'Liturgische notities', in: Smit e.a., *Adjutorio Redemptoris*, 232-238, at 235 ('na drie à vier uur dogmatiek volgde als min of meer ontspannend aanhangsel 's middags een uur liturgiek'). Tol (233, 237) produces evidence that the introduction to the *Liturgisch Handboek* was written by Rinkel. Cf. [A. RINKEL], 'Liturgie', in: *Liturgisch Handboek ten dienste der Oud-Katholieke Kerk van Nederland* (Schiedam: Cor unum et anima una, 1931), 9-20.

44 KÜRY, *Die altkatholische Kirche*, 1966, 39; J. VISSER, 'De dogmatisch theoloog', in: Smit e.a., *Adjutorio Redemptoris*, 207-221, at 208-210.

45 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', I 2-3; cf. F. SMIT, *Batavia Sacra* (Amersfoort: COKB, 1992), 115-116.

Secondly, for Rinkel dogmatic theology was not an abstract subject to be studied in isolation, but thinking about the faith of the church from within the church and with the practice of the church in mind:

> The Old Catholic theologian is convinced of his great responsibility, not in the sense that he allows his personal faith to be dictated and thrusted upon him, but the kind of responsibility which realises that his own thought could not be dissoluted from the church's thought without the danger of erring in self-pride.[46]

An overview of Rinkel's episcopate shows the consistency between his theological thought and his practical decisions as an archbishop.[47]

Rinkel's dogmatic thought can be found in the four volumes of his 'Dogmatische theologie' (Dogmatic Theology), which appeared as a typewritten, stencilled edition in 1956. In the preface, Rinkel mentions with regret the fact that he could not find the time for a complete rewriting of the material that he used for his lectures in the Seminary. For that reason he does not allow this stencilled edition the status of a dogmatic handbook.[48] Nevertheless, the 'Dogmatische theologie' is the principal deposit of Rinkel's thought. It is the result of studying and teaching from his first years as a parish priest (1914) until the end of his professorship at the Seminary (1948).[49] Later articles and addresses are largely consistent with what he developed in those formative years.

This study will, of course, concentrate on Rinkel's writings on the church and the sacraments.[50] Jan Visser, who, two decades after Rinkel, also taught

46 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', I 6 ('De Oud-Katholieke theoloog is overtuigd van zijn grote verantwoordelijkheid, niet zo, dat hij zich zijn persoonlijk geloof laat gebieden en het zich laat opdringen, maar de verantwoordelijkheid, die beseft, dat eigen denken zich nooit zonder gevaar van hoogmoedige verdwaling kan losmaken van het denken der kerk').

47 For example in his attitude towards the ordination of *episcopi vagantes* (SMIT, 'Andreas Rinkel', 183-184 is consistent with RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', IV 168).

48 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', I 10.

49 SMIT, 'Andreas Rinkel', 26. According to RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', 10, the lectures had been rewritten, but not later than ten years prior to the 1956 stencilled edition. Rinkel borrowed the general outline for his dogmatics from the Dutch Reformed theologian Herman Bavinck (1854-1921); cf. P.B.A.J. SMIT, 'De oud-katholieke receptie van Bavincks Gereformeerde Dogmatiek: Rinkels Dogmatische Theologie', in: G. Harinck & G.W. Neven (eds.), *Ontmoetingen met Bavinck* (Barneveld: Vuurbaak, 2006), 87-105.

50 In the 'Dogmatische theologie' these are the sections on the church (III 158-247), on sacraments in general (III 248-295) and on the individual sacraments (IV 7-187). The section on the eucharist (IV 52-109) was, in an elaborated form, published in German as A. RINKEL, 'Die heilige Eucharistie', *IKZ* 37 (1947), 1-30; *IKZ* 40 (1950), 156-177, 260-278; *IKZ* 41 (1951), 3-12, 65-85 (and this *IKZ* version was also published separately). In addition to these sources, reference will be made to Rinkel's articles in the *Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift* and of the *Handboek voor geloofs- en zedeleer*, which was prepared by a commission but actually written by Rinkel; cf. the preface to [A. RINKEL], *Handboek voor geloofs- en zedeleer in de Oud-Katholieke Kerk van Nederland* (Utrecht: Kerkelijk Boekenfonds, [1932]).

dogmatics at the Old Catholic Seminary, has discovered that Rinkel's ecclesiological thought bears the marks of the theology of the Anglican bishop Arthur Headlam (1862-1947), whereas the section on the sacraments is influenced by such Old Catholic theologians as Josef Langen (1837-1901) on sacraments in general, Eugène Michaud (1839-1917) on the eucharist, and Eduard Herzog (1841-1924) on penance.[51] Moreover, questions about the church, its structure, its sacraments and its ministry were to occupy Rinkel more and more, particularly during his episcopate, so that it is clear that we are dealing here with themes which were of central importance to Rinkel's thought and life.[52]

4.2.2 The Church and the Kingdom

It is Rinkel's basic presupposition, that Jesus proclaimed the kingdom of God, or rather, the eschatological reign of God, which in the New Testament is said to have begun with Jesus's ministry *and* is still to be expected. This kingdom is, and will be, a community. Before the eschaton, the kingdom is anticipated by the church, or—as Rinkel interestingly adds—by what Paul calls 'righteousness', or by the already started 'eternal life' of John's gospel.

> The *dikaiosyne*, the *zoe* and the community or *ekklesia* are, all three of them, the forms of the *basileia*; here an imperfect but already present realisation of it, once perfected and consummated in heaven as *basileia tou patros*. [...] The church is the kingdom become visible. But the kingdom is much greater and more glorious, and the church can only reveal it; the church is the imperfect image of the kingdom and therefore also the preparation for its perfect coming.[53]

The church does not do full justice to the kingdom, but the kingdom does not, in this world, come otherwise than through the church.[54] This leads Rinkel to the conclusion that ministry and sacraments, 'although necessary and indispensable for the church', only reach their goal if they serve 'the Christian

51 VISSER, 'De dogmatisch theoloog', 212-213; on Headlam, cf. RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 162; on Langen, cf. A. RINKEL, 'Das Hauptstück: "De Sacramentis in genere"', *IKZ* 6 (1916), 79-91, 215-231, at 79.

52 VISSER, 'De dogmatisch theoloog', 215.

53 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 165-166 ('De "dikaiosunè", de "zooè" en de gemeenschap of "ekklèsia" zijn alle drie de vormen van de "basileia", hier onvolmaakt, maar reeds aanwezig en realisering ervan, eenmaal volmaakt, consummatum in de hemel als "basileia tou patros". [...] De kerk is het zichtbaar geworden koninkrijk, dat echter veel grootser en heerlijker is en in de kerk slechts openbaar wordt; de kerk is het onvolmaakte beeld des koninkrijks en daardoor ook de voorbereiding voor de volmaakte komst ervan').

54 [RINKEL], *Handboek voor geloofs- en zedeleer*, 80; cf. 102; RINKEL, 'Die Lehre von der Kirche nach der Auffassung der altkatholischen Kirche', 7. The Church embodies salvation and is therefore 'more than an eschatological sign-post'; A. RINKEL, 'Interkommunion', *IKZ* 43 (1953), 209-230, at 214 ('mehr als ein eschatologischer Wegweiser'); cf. 217.

ideal' to which the church is subject. 'This ideal is the realisation of the kingdom of God'.[55] Although Rinkel says nothing less than that the Church is 'the *earthly appearance* of the kingdom of God [...], the present Christ, the incorporation of his continued work, the body of Christ', he nevertheless emphasises that 'as the *earthly* form of that kingdom, it is necessarily imperfect'. Both things are true: the gospel is clear about the existence of a church and its fundamentals, and at the same time the church has constantly to be tested by and orientated towards the ideal.[56]

The church is 'the *organism of salvation*, in which the economy of salvation finds its sphere of action'. By using the phrase, 'organism of salvation', Rinkel wants to describe both the church's intrinsic 'essence' (salvation) and its 'visible institution, committed to leadership, forms and discipline' (organism).[57] Those who only occupy themselves with the essence or ideal, undervalue the visible form of the church and run into the danger of an individual, self-righteous superbia. Those who undervalue the essence and ideal, are too much occupied by the visible church, which, says Rinkel, usually leads to the collective superbia of turning the church into a tyranny.[58]

As Rinkel acknowledges, 'Of course, the church has a hidden, mystical and eternal life [...], but that does not make the church invisible'. The church is both invisible—it has a divine origin and belongs not only to this but also to another world—and visible—it is an earthly appearance of the kingdom. Rinkel says that the concept of an invisible church leads to the acceptance of denominationalism and to indifference towards ecclesiastical order. Moreover, it deprives prayer, sacraments and ministry of its reality and sincerity.[59] Nevertheless, Rinkel is not unwilling to use the expression 'invisible church',

55 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 170 ('De kerk wordt geoordeeld naar het christelijk ideaal. Dit ideaal is de verwezenlijking van het koninkrijk Gods. [...] Daartegenover blijven ambt en sacrament, ofschoon noodzakelijk en onmisbaar voor de kerk, [...] nochtans middelen, die alleen aan hun doel beantwoorden, voorzover zij dienstbaar zijn aan de verwezenlijking van het ideaal').

56 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 220 ('Van dat koninkrijk Gods is de kerk de *aardse verschijning*'; 'de praesente Christus, de incorporatie van zijn voortgezet werk, het lichaam van Christus'; 'Als "*aardse*" vorm van dat koninkrijk is zij noodzakelijk onvolmaakt'); A. RINKEL, 'Die Stellung der Altkatholischen Kirche zu den Berichten der Lausanner Konferenz', *IKZ* 18 (1928), 212-225, at 219; A. RINKEL, 'Die Kirche Christi und das Wort Gottes. Grundsätzliches zum zweiten Edinburgh-Thema', *IKZ* 27 (1937), 85-91, at 85-86; A. RINKEL, 'Unsere Probleme im ökumenischen theologischen Gespräch', *IKZ* 38 (1948), 236-250, at 241.

57 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 159 ('het *heilsorganisme*, waarin de heilsoeconomie haar sfeer van werkzaamheid vindt'), 161 ('*wezen*'; 'zichtbaar, aan leiding, vormen en discipline gebonden *instituut*'); cf. RINKEL, 'Das Hauptstück: "De Sacramentis in genere"', 80-81.

58 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 222-223.

59 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 224 ('Natuurlijk heeft de kerk een verborgen, mystiek en eeuwig leven [...], maar dit maakt haar niet onzichtbaar'), cf. 199, 205, 212-214, 224-225.

when the emphasis is on the divine prerogative to decide who ultimately belongs to the kingdom. From the human perspective, however, the church is the form in which we know the kingdom provisionally but really present. As will be seen below in respect to baptism and ministry—*we* are bound to the means of grace God instituted for us, but he is not.[60]

4.2.3 The Church and Faith

Rinkel's ecclesiological outline is determined by three prerequisites. These are: unity of faith, unity of organisation, unity of sacraments.[61] Rinkel's thought on *sacraments* and *organisation* wil be discussed in some length in the next paragraphs. There it will be shown that the sacraments (primarily baptism and the eucharist) and organisation (particularly episcopal ministry) are regarded by Rinkel as necessary expressions of the visibility of the church. His ecclesiological concept is the church as an organism of grace, the church as the body—'body of Christ' not as a metaphor but as a reality[62]—through which its head acts. Such a church, says Rinkel, must necessarily have visible and real means of grace.[63] This leaves us with a short discussion of Rinkel's understanding of the unity of *faith*.

Unity of faith has, according to Rinkel, to be built upon Scripture and upon the one creed which is accepted by virtually all Christians—the *symbolum Nicaeno-Constantinopolitanum*. Anything which cannot be found in Scripture, cannot be made a necessary article of faith. And, the other way round, anything which is in clear contradiction to Scripture cannot be accepted within the church. The Nicene creed is used by Rinkel as the expression of the faith of the church as it developed from the apostles onwards to the Council of Chalcedon, that is, during the formative period of the formulation of Christian faith, including the trinitarian and christological dogmas. The faith as developed in

60 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 224; A. RINKEL, 'Christentum—Kirche—Sakrament', *IKZ* 20 (1930), 103-121, at 110-111; RINKEL, 'Unsere Probleme im ökumenischen theologischen Gespräch', 241.

61 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 219, 221, 231; cf. RINKEL, 'Die Kirche Christi und das Wort Gottes', 87; A. RINKEL, 'Eucharist and Ministry', *IKZ* 48 (1958), 65-74, at 69; A. R[INKEL], 'Lanka und Nord-Indien/Pakistan', *IKZ* 52 (1962), 48-59, at 53. A similar but slightly different set of essentials is: doctine, community of love, sacraments, liturgy, ministry; cf. A. RINKEL, 'Unsere Kirche in Vergangenheit, Gegenwart und Zukunft', *IKZ* 29 (1939), 222-231, at 222-223.

62 RINKEL, 'Die Lehre von der Kirche nach der Auffassung der altkatholischen Kirche', 10 (in this sense, Rinkel allows the Church to be called 'the continuation of the Incarnation'); RINKEL, 'Interkommunion', 214; A. RINKEL, 'Die heutige ökumenische Bewegung und wir', *IKZ* 47 (1957), 214-228, at 222; A. RINKEL, 'Altkatholisch und orthodox', *IKZ* 51 (1961), 257-270, at 268; A. RINKEL, 'Das altkatholische Bekenntnis', *IKZ* 55 (1965), 201-216, at 207-208.

63 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 236-247; cf. RINKEL, 'Die Stellung der Altkatholischen Kirchen', 219.

this period and expressed in the Nicene creed has to be *normative* for all Christians, and is at the same time the *only* expression that could really be regarded as ecumenically normative. All other credal formulations—catechisms, confessions, articles—can have their value in a certain area or period, but can never be imposed with the same normative force as the Nicene creed. Moreover, the acceptance of tradition—by accepting the Nicene creed—implies understanding Scripture within the community of the church. Rinkel rejects an 'individually interpreted Bible' because it 'has always proved to be an insufficient basis for a religious community'.[64] Scripture—at least the New Testament—originates from *within* the church, which means that one could not say that the Bible has authority above the church. But neither has the church authority above the Bible. Both Scripture and the church have come into being by the creative and incarnate Word of God. The Bible directs the church; the church transmits the Bible. This is, says Rinkel, the right interpretation of 'tradition'.[65]

One can conclude that Rinkel's treatment of the faith of the church is designed to be clear on the one hand, and as inclusive as possible on the other. By claiming the Nicene creed as necessary, Rinkel devotes himself to—and regards the Old Catholic Churches as bound to—the traditional thought on Christ and the Trinity as determined by 'the line of faith [*Glaubenslinie*] Nicaea—Constantinople—Chalcedon'.[66] But by claiming nothing other than the Nicene creed, Rinkel tries to overcome Christian division reinforced by denominational confessions. Finally, Rinkel's wish to interpret Scripture within the tradition of the church witnesses to the fundamental role which the church as a community—rather than Christianity as a private way to salvation—plays in his thought.

64 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 233-235 ('een steunen op een individueel geïnterpreteerde Bijbel [...] is altijd onvoldoende basis gebleken voor een religieuse gemeenschap').

65 RINKEL, 'Die Kirche Christi und das Wort Gottes', 88-90; A. RINKEL, 'Wort Gottes und Tradition in der altkatholischen Kirche unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Utrechter Konvention', *IKZ* 29 (1939), 51-61, at 54-57; RINKEL, 'Die Lehre von der Kirche nach der Auffassung der altkatholischen Kirche', 9; RINKEL, 'Interkommunion', 214-215; RINKEL, 'Die heutige ökumenische Bewegung und wir', 223; RINKEL, 'Das altkatholische Bekenntnis', 206-207. Cf. RINKEL, 'Das Hauptstück: "De Sacramentis in genere"', 83-85, where Rinkel argues that doctrinal and practical developments are right if they can be interpreted as grown out of biblical origins (the same in: RINKEL, 'Die Stellung der Altkatholischen Kirchen', 220-221). P.B.A.J. SMIT, 'The Old Catholic View on Scripture and Tradition: A Short Study of a Theological Organism', *IKZ* 97 (2007), 106-123, shows that this approach to revelation, Scripture and tradition is in tune with the Old Catholic 'mainstream' theology of the twentieth century.

66 RINKEL, 'Unsere Probleme im ökumenischen theologischen Gespräch', 238; RINKEL, 'Die heutige ökumenische Bewegung und wir', 221; RINKEL, 'Das altkatholische Bekenntnis', 204.

4.2.4 The Church and the Sacraments

How does Rinkel relate the church to the liturgy and the sacraments? 'As institutions of Christ, [baptism and the eucharist] point to a community that was obviously intended by him.' The first Christians knew baptism as, among other things, the 'instrument of [...] incorporation into the community' and the eucharist as, among other things, 'a community meal', 'food of life for a community' and the visible sign of the community's unity.[67]

> As a principle, the church exists of the baptised Christians. That is why baptism, by whomever administered, has always been regarded as valid. Therefore, one is not baptised into 'a' church, but *eis Christon*. [...] Baptism is the widest boundary of the *one* church.

This does not imply the irrelevance of the membership of a concrete church. 'The fullness of Christian life is more than baptised membership [...], and that fullness is not everywhere in the same amount.' Nevertheless, Rinkel believes that baptism fundamentally implies membership of the one church of Christ.[68]

It is one of the characteristics of Rinkel's way of theologising, that he tries to avoid a confusion of the human perspective with God's perspective. 'Baptism is [...] *from the human side* the *conditio sine qua non*'.[69] This 'necessitas' may not close our eyes for the fact 'that baptism cannot be a limitation of God's saving omnipotence and love'.[70] *We* are bound by the signs he gave us, not he himself.[71] This attitude will be encountered again when it comes to episcopal ministry.

Right at the start of his exposition of eucharistic theology, Rinkel makes the statement:

---

67 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 168 ('Als instellingen van Christus wijzen zij naar een door Hem klaarblijkelijk bedoelde gemeenschap'; 'instrumentum der [...] inlijving in de gemeenschap'), 169 ('een gemeenschapsmaal'; 'levensvoedsel voor een gemeenschap'), 171-172, 179.

68 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 229 ('Principieel bestaat de kerk uit de gedoopte christenen. Daarom heeft de doop altijd als geldig gegolden, door wie ook bediend. Daarom wordt men niet tot lid van "een" kerk gedoopt, maar "eis Christon".' 'De volheid van het christelijk leven is meer dan het dooplidmaatschap [...], en die volheid is niet overal in gelijke mate aanwezig'), 244 ('*De Doop is de wijdste grens der éne kerk*'); RINKEL, 'Christentum—Kirche—Sakrament', 112; [RINKEL], *Handboek voor geloofs- en zedeleer*, 133, 137.

69 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 243 ('De Doop is [...] menselijkerzijds de conditio sine qua non'), emphasis added.

70 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', IV 17 ('dat de Doop geen beperking van Gods reddende almacht en liefde zelf kan zijn').

71 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 180; IV 31; cf. RINKEL, 'Das Hauptstück: "De Sacramentis in genere"', 229; A. RINKEL & A. KÜRY, 'Erklärung zu dem Bericht der zweiten Weltkonferenz für Glauben und Verfassung', *IKZ* 30 (1940), 81-93, at 84; RINKEL, 'Eucharist and Ministry', 72.

> In the corpus of dogmatics, the doctrine of the eucharist plays a subordinate part. In the practice of the church, however, the eucharist is central as a real celebration; ecclesial life has here the leading role.[72]

It sounds as if Rinkel apologises for the fact that, following the conventional outline of a dogmatic handbook, he cannot give the eucharist a more central place than in the final volume, among an account of the other sacraments. This citation, then, witnesses to the fact that the eucharist played a central role in Rinkel's thought on the church, although he found it difficult to translate the centrality of the eucharist in 'ecclesial life' into a centrality of the eucharist in 'the corpus of dogmatics'.[73]

Throughout Rinkel's section on the eucharist there are indications of the importance of the eucharist for ecclesiology. 'Where this sacrament is denied or neglected, the church languishes and the concept of church disappears.'[74] In other words, it is essential for the flourishing of the church and for the ecclesiological understanding of the church, that the eucharist is being celebrated.

> The Early Church [...] has never known or practised another centre of its worship. [...] And so it remains: *the* liturgy of the church is the celebration of the eucharist [...]. It is the constant conviction of the church that the Lord continues his redeeming work in the church by the celebration of the eucharist.[75]

> The eucharistic liturgy was the centre of all ecclesial life, because in the eucharist the church lived with its present Lord and experienced its unity in the highest and most real form as unity in Christ.[76]

72 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', IV 53 ('In het corpus der dogmatiek neemt de leer der Eucharistie een ondergeschikte plaats in, maar in de kerkelijke praktijk is de Eucharistie als werkelijke viering centraal. Het leven der kerk vervult hier de leidende rol'); cf. 69; [RINKEL], *Handboek voor geloofs- en zedeleer*, 143, 146; RINKEL, 'Die heilige Eucharistie', 33-34.

73 TOL, 'Liturgische notities', 232-233, 236, thinks that, for Rinkel, the *lex credendi* determined the *lex orandi*, but adds, also in relation to Rinkel: 'To what extent, though, is praying eventually primary and existentially?' (236: 'In hoeverre is toch bidden uiteindelijk niet primair en existentieel?').

74 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', IV 97 ('Waar dit sacrament ontkend of verwaarloosd wordt, kwijnt de kerk en verdwijnt het kerkbegrip'); cf. RINKEL, 'Eucharist and Ministry', 71.

75 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', IV 97 ('De oude kerk heeft [...] nooit een ander centrum voor haar eredienst [...] gekend of in praktijk gebracht [...]. En zo blijft het: *de* liturgie der kerk is de viering der Eucharistie [...]. De constante overtuiging der kerk is, dat de Heer zijn verlossend werk in de kerk voortzet in de viering der Eucharistie').

76 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 245 ('De eucharistische liturgie was het centrum van alle kerkelijk leven, omdat de kerk daarin leefde met haar presente Heer en haar eenheid in de hoogste, reëelste vorm beleefde als eenheid in Christus').

Another relevant utterance on this subject is Rinkel's conviction that, although he equals '*consecratio* or eucharistic prayer' and '*communio*' as two constitutive factors of the eucharist, the eucharistic rite finds its climax in the communion.[77] The eucharist is essentially a communal event: 'because the eucharist is the *koinonia* of the *polloi* with the *heis artos*, it can only be celebrated in the midst of the congregation'. Because of the fact 'that in the *koinonia* with the Lord, the *koinonia* of all with each other is included', Rinkel calls the eucharistic communion a 'double *koinonia*'.[78]

Nevertheless, it should be noticed that in most instances Rinkel uses the word *koinonia* in the first sense only (*koinonia* with the Lord), which sometimes gives his eucharistic theology an implicit individualist tendency. Rinkel mainly describes the eucharist in terms of its effects on the individual communicant—his or her sharing in the fruits of Christ's sacrifice on the cross,[79] or the fulfillment of personal need for spiritual food[80]—rather than on the celebrating church as a community, although he naturally presupposes the communicant to be a member of the church as the body of Christ.[81]

Much more in line with a eucharistic ecclesiology is Rinkel's emphasis on the fact that the eucharist can never be isolated from the church in general. 'At the heart of the church is its celebration of the Lord's Supper, the eucharist.'[82] The eucharist is not one ecclesial act among many, but the act of Christ within the body of Christ. 'As the church is the body of Christ [...], so he acts immediately and directly and personally in this body, the church, by his sacraments.' More important than the word 'sacrament' and their number is the recognition that it is Christ who acts through these acts of his body, the church.[83] The church has a social character and the experience of grace through the sacraments is both personal and communal.[84] The eucharist binds the living

77 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', IV 104 ('consecratio of eucharistisch gebed'; 'communio').

78 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', IV 107 ('daar de Eucharistie een "koinoonia" is der "polloi" aan het "heis artos", kan de Eucharistie alleen gevierd worden in de kring der gemeente'), 108 ('dat in de "koinoonia" met de Heer ook de "koinoonia" van allen onderling begrepen is'; 'dubbele "koinoonia"'); cf. [RINKEL], 'Liturgie', 10; [RINKEL], *Handboek voor geloofs- en zedeleer*, 151.

79 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', IV 102; cf. RINKEL, 'Das Hauptstück: "De Sacramentis in genere"', 218, 222-223.

80 RINKEL, 'Unsere Kirche in Vergangenheit, Gegenwart und Zukunft', 228.

81 RINKEL, 'Die heilige Eucharistie', 75. The Dutch text lacks the emphasis on the Church in this paragraph (RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', IV 107).

82 RINKEL, 'Das altkatholische Bekenntnis', 210 ('Im Herzen der Kirche steht ihre Feier des Herrenmahles, der Eucharistie').

83 RINKEL, 'Unsere Probleme im ökumenischen theologischen Gespräch', 246 ('Wie die Kirche Christi Leib ist [...], so handelt Er auch, unmittelbar und direkt und persönlich in diesem Leib der Kirche durch Seine Sakramente'); cf. RINKEL, 'Das Hauptstück: "De Sacramentis in genere"', *passim*; RINKEL, 'Die Lehre von der Kirche nach der Auffassung der altkatholischen Kirche', 12-13; RINKEL, 'Interkommunion', 227-228.

84 RINKEL, 'Die Stellung der Altkatholischen Kirchen', 219.

members of the church together with the living and the dead in the communion of saints which is the church.[85]

On these grounds, Rinkel is opposed to 'open communion' and to 'intercommunion' other than full communion based on full recognition in matters of faith and order.[86] According to Rinkel, 'intercommunion' should not be interpreted as relating to the eucharist only; it is not translated adequately as *Abendmahlsgemeinschaft*. Rather, it expresses the mutual recognition of each other's 'catholicity' as churches; 'catholicity' primarily understood as continuity with the undivided church of the first millennium. In Rinkel's view, organisational reunion adds nothing to intercommunion (in the sense of full communion) and is therefore superfluous. 'Intercommunion is not a means to a goal, but the goal itself.' It should be noted, however, that Rinkel thinks here of full communion between churches *in different areas*. The full sense and meaning of intercommunion is, in Rinkel's interpretation, both unity (full recognition of each other as catholic churches) and independence (*Selbständigkeit*; being the local church in one's area).[87]

4.2.5 The Church and the Ordained Ministry

Rinkel's thoughts on ministry are not written in the language of a liturgical or eucharistic ecclesiology. Sometimes, leading and governing seem to be more important ministerial categories than liturgical presiding.[88] This having been said, there are, nevertheless, instances in Rinkel's writings which intimately connect ministry, ecclesiology and liturgy.

First, Rinkel insists on the principle that authority is vested in the (whole) church, which acts through its ministers. Authority is given to the church, not to 'an *ordo* within it, above it, or over against it'.[89] This is why an order is called a 'ministry' (*diakonia*): the ordained one serves the church by exercising the task

85 [RINKEL], *Handboek voor geloofs- en zedeleer*, 234, 240-241; cf. RINKEL, 'Altkatholisch und orthodox', 267.

86 RINKEL, 'Unsere Probleme im ökumenischen theologischen Gespräch', 31, RINKEL & KÜRY, 'Erklärung', 93; RINKEL, 'Die heutige ökumenische Bewegung und wir', 224-225; RINKEL, 'Eucharist and Ministry', 70-71. This position is critically evaluated in paragraph 8.4.4.

87 RINKEL, 'Interkommunion', 210-213, 229-230 (212: 'Interkommunion ist kein Mittel zum Ziel, sondern das Ziel selbst'); cf. R[INKEL], 'Lanka und Nord-Indien/Pakistan', 56: 'The Church of England is not a mere denomination, it is the Church of God in England' (English original).

88 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 172-174, 221-222.

89 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 168 ('opdat vast sta, dat de *kerk* de autoriteit ontvangt en draagt, en *niet* een groep mensen, een ordo in haar, boven haar of tegenover haar'); cf. 176, 192, 196, 201-202, 209, 221-222; IV 157; [RINKEL], *Handboek voor geloofs- en zedeleer*, 89, 96-97, 169; RINKEL, 'Das altkatholische Bekenntnis', 213. This view is consistent with the position of 'ecclesiological Jansenism'; cf. paragraph 4.1.2.

which the church has conferred.[90] On the other hand, the minister has received the ministry from God, Christ, the Spirit. Without this ministry no church can exist. But it is the church which acts through its ministers. Rinkel tries to keep these two aspects in balance. Ordination, he says, is both absolutely 'real' and absolutely 'ministerial'. If, however, there is an imbalance in Rinkel's ministerial thought, it is in the direction of the church which 'creates its ministries' and without which there can be no ministry at all.[91]

The church remains the subject of the ministerial acts. The church is the body of Christ and the place where the Spirit works, so every ecclesial and ministerial act is the act of Christ, of the Spirit and of the whole church.[92] For Rinkel, this is one of the reasons why the church should have a duly instituted ordained ministry. Only if ministerial functions are exercised by duly authorised persons, Christ and his body, the church, remain—and not a charismatic minister becomes—the subject of these actions.[93] Rinkel calls this a 'constitutional' ministry. That is, in this understanding ministry is defined by and dependent on the church. There is no ministry without 'the church's will'.[94]

This theoretical primacy of the church in relation to ministry has a practical consequence—ministers cannot exercise their ministry apart from the consensus of the church. Synodality and the necessity of ecclesial reception of ministerial decisions are the practical consequences of an understanding of ministry which is fundamentally rooted in the whole church.[95]

The *form* this ministry takes, is, according to Rinkel, not yet clear in the New Testament, but becomes clear soon after. Most prominent is (a) the fact that, from New Testament times onwards, there *is* a ministry, and the fact that it is handed down by the laying-on of hands. But equally prominent, Rinkel says, is (b) the fact that the ministry developed organically into the form of episcopate, presbyterate and diaconate.[96] If it is true that the New Testament

90 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 168, 211.

91 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 182-183, 222, 267-269; IV 163; RINKEL, 'Das Hauptstück: "De Sacramentis in genere"', 82, 225-227, 230; RINKEL & KÜRY, 'Erklärung', 89; RINKEL, 'Die Lehre von der Kirche nach der Auffassung der altkatholischen Kirche', 8; RINKEL, 'Interkommunion', 219-221.

92 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 173, 180, 222; IV 156, 163.

93 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 181; IV 163; RINKEL, 'Christentum—Kirche—Sakrament', 117-118.

94 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 195, 238 ('*constitutioneel*'; 'de wil der kerk'), 240; IV 164, 168; [RINKEL], *Handboek voor geloofs- en zedeleer*, 171-172; RINKEL, 'Die Kirche Christi und das Wort Gottes', 86. This also means that there is no room for *episcopi vagantes*—'wandering bishops' without a Church to serve—whose ordinations Rinkel regards as not just illegitimate but invalid; RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 194, 239-240; IV 168; cf. RINKEL & KÜRY, 'Erklärung', 92; RINKEL, 'Die Lehre von der Kirche nach der Auffassung der altkatholischen Kirche', 11-12.

95 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 191.

96 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 170, 172-174, 180-183, 187, 195, 237, 243; [RINKEL], *Handboek voor geloofs- en zedeleer*, 91-92. In ecumenical-theological terminology, one could say that fact (a) refers to '*episkope*' and fact (b) to 'episcopate'.

could point in the direction of either episcopal or presbyterian order, the Early Church has decided undeniably in favour of the former.[97] Episcopal order 'is the form of the *catholica*'. The bishop is both centre and means of unity. Therefore it does not surprise Rinkel that ecumenical rapprochement is often accompanied by a rediscovery of episcopal order. Consistent with what was said before is Rinkel's emphasis on both '*Nullus episcopus sine ecclesia*' and '*Nulla ecclesia sine episcopo*'.[98]

The ministries of bishop, priest and deacon are, according to Rinkel, separate ministries within the one *sacramentum ordinis*. The theory, stemming from Jerome, that the bishop is a priest with enlarged jurisdiction, is denounced by Rinkel with two arguments. Firstly, arguing according to the maxim *lex orandi lex credendi*, Rinkel mentions that the consecration of a bishop is a separate ordination including the laying-on of hands and prayer to the Holy Spirit, which can never be an empty sign. Secondly, according to Rinkel, the Jerome theory depends on the view that sees the sacerdotal offering of the Mass as the centre of the ministry, to which the deacon not yet and the bishop already have been admitted. Rinkel, however, regards the task of the ministry as '*praeesse*' rather than '*offerre*', which could in the context of this study be translated as 'presiding' rather than 'offering'.[99] Like Afanasiev, Rinkel derives the bishop from the prime presbyter, acknowledges that the bishop is not of apostolic origin, but affirms the organic development into a college of presbyters with one bishop as the head of the local church.[100]

As the central figure within the ministry and within the church, the bishop is the personification of the apostolic succession. Rinkel recognises three interpretations of this apostolic succession. The first one is the succession of particular bishops on one and the same see which had been founded by an apostle. This oldest view, recognisable since the second century, regards a bishop as the successor of an apostle in the very concrete sense that he has

97 RINKEL, 'Unsere Probleme im ökumenischen theologischen Gespräch', 244; cf. RINKEL, 'Das Hauptstück: "De Sacramentis in genere"', 83-85; RINKEL, 'Die Lehre von der Kirche nach der Auffassung der altkatholischen Kirche', 11; RINKEL, 'Interkommunion', 216-218; RINKEL, 'Eucharist and Ministry', 66-67. Because of the unanimity of the Early Church, Rinkel dismisses the idea that ecumenism could fundamentally question the status of this threefold ministry; RINKEL, 'Das altkatholische Bekenntnis', 211.

98 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 237 ('De *episcopale vorm* van organisatie is de *vorm der catholica*'), 238; IV 168; RINKEL, 'Christentum—Kirche—Sakrament', 115; RINKEL & KÜRY, 'Erklärung', 91-92; RINKEL, 'Unsere Probleme im ökumenischen theologischen Gespräch', 243.

99 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', IV 163-167; cf. III 239. Only in RINKEL, 'Das altkatholische Bekenntnis', 212, he calls the bishop 'essentially a priest' and 'primus inter pares' among his fellow-priests. This passage, cited by Küry who acclaims the Jerome theory (KÜRY, *Die altkatholische Kirche*, 347; cf. below, paragraph 4.3.5), is not representative for Rinkel's thought on the episcopate as it occurs throughout his writings.

100 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 185, cf. 190. Cf. paragraphs 2.2.7 and 2.2.8 (Afanasiev).

succeeded this apostle as leader of this specific local church.[101] The second interpretation of the apostolic succession is, since the third century, the view that the bishops exercise the same functions as the apostles did. In this sense, the bishops in general are the successors of the apostles in general.[102] Only a third interpretation, again recognisable since the third century, connects the notion of apostolic succession to the 'transmission' of apostolic power through ordination. Rinkel calls this 'the sacerdotal theory' of the 'golden channel'.[103] He particularly resists two aspects of this theory. First, it makes ordination dependent on conditions which did not exist in patristic times and, on the other hand, it allows for ordinations which take place in conditions which the Early Church would never have sanctioned.[104] Second, 'it renders the work of the Holy Spirit, which reveals itself in other churches without this so-called apostolic succession, incomprehensible'.[105] In other words, Rinkel criticises this conception of the apostolic succession as not in accordance with the Early Church and as ecumenically impossible to maintain.

Rinkel rather defines apostolic succession as the expression, through the bishop, of the apostolicity of the *church*. He emphasises the second definition just given—the bishops as the successors of the apostles as regards their function within the church. Apostolic succession, Rinkel says, should not in itself be regarded as a guarantee for truth. It should always be complemented by catholicity, holiness and unity.[106]

101 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 192-193, 240; cf. 202, 205.

102 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 193, 240.

103 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 193, 202 ('de *sacerdotale theorie*'), 241 ('een gouden kanaal').

104 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 241. This is probably another reference to *episcopi vagantes*: laying-on of hands without an electing or consenting church.

105 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 241 ('Bovendien maakt zij het werk des H. Geestes, dat zich elders in kerken zonder deze zg. apostolische successie openbaart, onverklaarbaar'), cf. 229.

106 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 196, 227, 241; RINKEL, 'Unsere Probleme im ökumenischen theologischen Gespräch', 245; RINKEL, 'Die Lehre von der Kirche nach der Auffassung der altkatholischen Kirche', 12; RINKEL, 'Interkommunion', 223-224; RINKEL, 'Eucharist and Ministry', 69-70; RINKEL, 'Das altkatholische Bekenntnis', 208, 214.
In [RINKEL], *Handboek voor geloofs- en zedeleer*, 96, the importance of the historic line is somewhat more emphasised.
In RINKEL, 'Interkommunion', 230, the idea is denounced that Old Catholic participation in Anglican ordinations to the episcopate should 'add' anything to the apostolicity or catholicity of these ordinations. Rather, such participation is the *expression* of a beforehand mutually *acknowledged catholicity* of the *churches* involved.
In the correspondence between Rinkel and Geoffrey Fisher, archbishop of Canterbury, on the status of those ministers within the Church of South India who had been non-episcopally ordained, Rinkel is mildly corrected by Fisher for being somewhat on the extreme side with regard to the apostolic succession, and for considering the question as a matter of individual *ministers* rather than of the catholicity of a *church*; A. RINKEL & G. [FISHER], 'Die Kirche von Südindien. Ein Briefwechsel zwischen dem Erzbischof von Utrecht und dem

Although Rinkel wants to avoid a definition of ministry in such a sense hat the Spirit's work in other churches becomes incomprehensible, he does not easily recognise the apostolic ministry—and particularly the episcopate—in other forms of ministry. In view of the recent ecumenical use of the term *episkope*, it is interesting to read that, according to Rinkel, not all 'administrative and organisational officers' like superintendents and *moderatores* are to be considered bishops in the catholic sense of the word. Rinkel's problem here is their existence 'only on the basis of ecclesiastical rules or statutes' rather than as bearers of a particular ministry, to which prayer and the laying-on of hands have ordained them.[107]

Rinkel's teaching on ministry can be summarised as an effort to do equal justice to both sides of some controversial aspects of traditional theologies of ministry. He tries to balance the church as a whole *and* the particular ministry; ancient variety of ministerial forms *and* the emergence of the threefold ministry of bishop, priest and deacon; criticism of the 'pipeline theory' *and* insistence on the apostolic succession; respect for the Spirit's work in non-episcopal churches *and* faithfulness to the principle of episcopacy. His insistence on the ministry's role within the whole church, and his conviction of ministry as *praeesse*, are important aspects of a liturgical or eucharistic ecclesiology.

4.2.6 The Church Local and Universal

Rinkel gives the assertion that there is only one church, 'and every other use of this word has derivative meaning only'. Local 'churches' bear the name of 'church' if and because they are 'the particular representation of the whole in one place'. According to Rinkel, the church is not a federation of independent entities. Its unity and universality are primary to its local manifestations.[108]

In other passages, Rinkel explains that he does not mean this in a geographical-universal, but in a soteriological-universal sense. Catholicity, he says, has not, or not primarily, to do with locality but with salvation. Everyone is to be saved. Ethnic or geographical boundaries are no more. Every church

Erzbischof von Canterbury', *IKZ* 49 (1959), 1-15, at 9, 12; cf. RINKEL, 'Eucharist and Ministry', 73.

107 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 238 ('Dit sluit uit de zuiver administratieve en organisatorische functionarissen, die alleen krachtens een kerkelijk reglement of statuut bestaan. Superintendenten, visitatores en moderatores hebben hun betekenis op zichzelf, maar zijn geen episcopi in de zin der ecclesia catholica'); IV 161; RINKEL, 'Christentum—Kirche—Sakrament', 115-116; RINKEL, 'Unsere Probleme im ökumenischen theologischen Gespräch', 244-246; RINKEL, 'Interkommunion', 218-219, 225; RINKEL, 'Eucharist and Ministry', 71, 73.

108 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 178 ('Hoofd en hoeksteen is Christus, en daarom is er slechts één kerk, en heeft elk ander gebruik van dit woord slechts afgeleide betekenis'; 'slechts voor zover zij de bizondere representatie van het geheel zijn op een bepaalde plaats'), 179, cf. 182, 213; cf. RINKEL, 'Eucharist and Ministry', 67.

which affirms the whole Christ and offers salvation to all, is catholic or universal—possesses the '*old* [ancient] *catholicity*'[109]—in its soteriological sense.[110] No church possesses this catholicity in its fullness. Rather, every church should be on the way from potential catholicity to full catholicity.[111]

Within this soteriological unity, the church has to be free to express itself in locally adapted forms. Centralisation is the enemy of catholicism. While Rinkel does not allow for what he calls 'pluriformity' as soteriology is concerned, he likewise warns against 'uniformity' as local expression is concerned. Uniformity leads to fossilisation, and disregards the freedom which is the mark of true catholicism.[112] Rinkel's phrase is 'unity without uniformity'.[113]

Unlike Afanasiev, who pleads for an understanding of ministry that is always locally embedded, Rinkel has no problem acknowledging a gradual shift—in the first century—from a universal to a local ministry.[114] The universal, missionary ministries of apostles, prophets and evangelists gave way to the local ministries of bishops, presbyters and deacons. Rinkel acknowledges this as a natural, historical development which has rightly resulted in the threefold apostolic ministry which is primarily a local ministry. By having contact with each other, the local bishops maintained the unity of the church.[115] The growth of the dioceses diminished the importance of the presbyterium while at the same time it elevated the importance of the individual presbyter, but it left the local-and-unifying role of the bishop fundamentally unchanged. Rinkel affirms the fact that the bishop has become the one who provides the link between the local church and the universal church.[116]

109 By 'old' or 'ancient' catholicism (*alter Katholizismus*), which is different from the term 'Old Catholic' in its denominational sense (*Altkatholizismus*), Rinkel means catholicity as it was understood before the breach between East and West and before the deviations of both Reformation and Contra-Reformation. This understanding of catholicity, he says, can be found in the Old Catholic, Orthodox and Anglican Churches, and in parts of the Roman Catholic Church. RINKEL, 'Die heutige ökumenische Bewegung und wir', 226; RINKEL, 'Altkatholisch und orthodox', 260-261.

110 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 178, 221, 227; RINKEL, 'Christentum—Kirche—Sakrament', 112-113; [RINKEL], *Handboek voor geloofs- en zedeleer*, 87; RINKEL, 'Die Kirche Christi und das Wort Gottes', 86; RINKEL, 'Die Lehre von der Kirche nach der Auffassung der altkatholischen Kirche', 8; RINKEL, 'Interkommunion', 212; RINKEL, 'Eucharist and Ministry', 67; RINKEL, 'Das altkatholische Bekenntnis', 208.

111 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 195, cf. 188, 227; RINKEL, 'Das altkatholische Bekenntnis', 209, 214.

112 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 192, 195, 208, 217; RINKEL, 'Interkommunion', 218; cf. RINKEL, 'Altkatholisch und orthodox', 269.

113 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 191 ('*eenheid zonder uniformiteit*').

114 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 173, 236-237; IV 154. On Afanasiev, cf. paragraph 2.2.6.

115 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 184; RINKEL, 'Eucharist and Ministry', 68.

116 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 190, 242.

Contact between bishops received the form of synods and, eventually, councils. In council, all bishops are equal, because all represent their local church. A council does not impose the orthodox faith on the church, but 'brings the corporate awareness of the church to expression'. This is why the process of reception—which was already encountered briefly in the previous paragraph on ministry—is essential for all ministerial decisions, including the episcopal decisions in council, to be accepted as catholic doctrine.[117]

When it comes to the question of the Petrine primacy of the bishop of Rome, Rinkel argues from two of the above mentioned propositions. In the first place, authority is given to the whole church, not to an *ordo* or even one minister within it. The church is the bearer of authority, which it exercises through the apostolic—and later the episcopal—college.[118] In the second place, all bishops are equal. Incidentally, Rinkel roots this in the fact that the bishop represents the (which probably means *his local*) church.[119] In other instances the equality of the bishops is derived from the equality of the apostles, who exercised the same ministry. The fact that Peter initially had a leading role does not, says Rinkel, mean that he had authority over the others, who at times reproached and corrected him.[120] Although Rinkel respects the primacy of honour, since patristic times allowed to the see of Rome, he regards as 'heretical' the presumption of the First Vatican Council that papal definitions are irreformable *ex sese, non autem ex consensu Ecclesiae*.[121] The other Vatican article of faith—the bishop of Rome's universal jurisdiction—is, according to Rinkel, likewise contradictory to the catholic faith of the early centuries. The council is above the pope, and each bishop is autonomous in his own diocese.[122]

It can be concluded that Rinkel emphasises the unity and universality of the church with respect to the doctrine of salvation. At the same time, however, he resists uniformity. Local churches are held together by their common affirmation of salvation, and by the supra-local contacts between the bishops.

Additionally, it should be recognised that there are some scattered phrases in Rinkel's writings where he grants *the eucharist* to be 'the sign of unity, the centrum unitatis', or *the celebration of the eucharist* to be the place at which 'unity in faith, ministry and sacraments is revealed', or *the liturgy* to be the

117 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 187, 191 ('Het concilie ontleent zijn gezag hieraan, dat het het corporatieve bewustzijn der kerk tot uitdrukking brengt'), 192; cf. RINKEL, 'Die Stellung der Altkatholischen Kirchen', 221.

118 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 168, 176; cf. IV 123.

119 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 191; cf. RINKEL, 'Das altkatholische Bekenntnis', 212.

120 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 168, 171, 176; [RINKEL], *Handboek voor geloofs- en zedeleer*, 95. This thought is in line with the Dutch Old Catholic tradition as found in van Espen; cf. HALLEBEEK, 'Die Autonomie der Ortskirche', 84-85.

121 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 204, 211, 216 ('Daarmede [...] is de Roomse kerk ketters geworden'); A. RINKEL & U. KÜRY, 'Der Primat in der Kirche. Erklärung der Altkatholischen Bischöfe zum 18. Juli 1970', *IKZ* 60 (1970), 57-59.

122 [RINKEL], *Handboek voor geloofs- en zedeleer*, 93-94.

means 'by which [the church] is one throughout the whole world and united with the church triumphant above'.[123] The rarity of the occurrence of these phrases underlines the observation that Rinkel's theology is not written in the style of a eucharistic ecclesiology. Nevertheless, the fact that such phrases do occur, confirms Rinkel's fundamental—though sometimes rather implicit—awareness of the centrality of the eucharist in the church.

4.2.7 The Church and Ecumenism

Twentieth-century theology, says Rinkel, 'can hardly separate its ecclesiology from ecumenical dialogue'. The very word 'church' has become questionable, because the word 'church' has in fact become synonymous with 'schism'. Every 'church' has become a denomination, and therefore a schismatic group. '"The" church is the *one* church.'[124] Rinkel wants his theology to be embedded in the ecumenical context. He says that those convictions which among insiders may be termed 'our position', have to be seen as no more than 'our problems' in the ecumenical world. And among ecumenical themes and goals, Rinkel regards the work 'on faith and order' as the most fundamental ecumenical task, to which Old Catholics have both the opportunity and the task to contribute their understanding of catholicity.[125]

As was said above, Rinkel firmly roots his ecclesiology in baptism. 'Baptism is the widest boundary of the *one* church.' But also with respect to the eucharist, Rinkel says that the very fact that the eucharist is celebrated at all, is in itself already 'a monument of unity'. Recognition should not be dependent on rigid formulations, but on a healthy balance between 'a mechanical, materialistic interpretation' and 'an extremely symbolic interpretation' of the eucharist. Between these extremes one should not disavow 'the manifest life of grace' at work in the sacrament in whatever church.[126]

123 RINKEL, 'Eucharist and Ministry', 67 (English original); A. RINKEL, 'Orthodox und altkatholisch', *IKZ* 48 (1958), 2-8, at 7 ('dass sich hier [in der Feier der Hl. Eucharistie] die Einheit offenbarte im Glauben, im Amt und im Sakrament'); RINKEL, 'Altkatholisch und orthodox', 267 ('Es ist die ganze Liturgie der Kirche aller Jahrhunderte [...], in der sie eins ist über den ganzen Erdkreis und eins ist mit der triumphierenden Kirche da oben').

124 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 230 ('*De* kerk is de éne kerk'), 231 ('De theologie [...] kan tegenwoordig haar ecclesiologie bijna niet meer losmaken van het oecumenisch gesprek').

125 RINKEL, 'Unsere Probleme im ökumenischen theologischen Gespräch', 236-237 ('Standpunkt'; 'Problem'); RINKEL, 'Unsere Kirche in Vergangenheit, Gegenwart und Zukunft', 227-228; RINKEL, 'Die heutige ökumenische Bewegung und wir', 220, 225.

126 RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 244 ('*De Doop is de wijdste grens der éne kerk*'), 245-246 ('In het volbrengen van de Avondmaalsviering op zichzelf ligt een monument der eenheid'; 'een mechanische materialistische opvatting'; 'een extreem symbolische opvatting'; 'Daartussen ligt het aperte leven der genade, dat niet geloochend kan of mag worden').

According to Rinkel, it remains an ecumenical problem that church, sacraments and ministry are so closely linked together that all three have to be fully understood before unity can be restored. In Rinkel's view, the catholic order of ministry and sacraments gives the fullest assurance that it is really God who is at work in his church. According to Rinkel, Rome has a too mechanical and the Reformation a too unorderly understanding of the church including its ministries and sacraments.[127]

One can conclude that Rinkel makes the following distinction. On the one hand, he recognises, or at least does not deny, God's grace at work in other churches including their sacraments and ministries. But on the other hand, he regards formal recognition of this ecclesiality, sacramentality and ministry by the Catholic Church (which is in Rinkel's writings *in concreto* the Old Catholic Church) as impossible. The Old Catholic Church, he says, can never trespass the boundaries which are erected by the classic, catholic faith in the church, the sacraments and the ministry.[128]

4.2.8 Conclusion

Throughout his long life, Rinkel firmly believed in the ecclesiological position of the Old Catholic Churches, which he regarded as the ancient Catholic/Orthodox view:

> It will have become clear from what has been said above, that there is an originally catholic view on the church, neither mitigated and evaporated by Reformation thought, nor made rigid and worldly by hierarchical Roman thought.

Rinkel believed that this ancient catholicism could be, should be, and would be the invaluable contribution of the Old Catholic tradition both to the identity of the Old Catholic Churches themselves and to the churches of the ecumene.[129]

[127] RINKEL, 'Dogmatische theologie', III 228-229, IV 170.

[128] RINKEL, 'Unsere Probleme im ökumenischen theologischen Gespräch', 244, 247-248; RINKEL, 'Interkommunion', 225-226; RINKEL, 'Die heutige ökumenische Bewegung und wir', 224; RINKEL, 'Eucharist and Ministry', 71-72. 'One has to keep in mind that to refrain from a verdict [on the sacraments and ministry of other churches] does not yet imply recognition or equation'; RINKEL & KÜRY, 'Erklärung', 90 ('Man soll aber bedenken, dass ein Verzicht auf ein Urteil noch keine Anerkennung einschliesst oder eine Gleichsetzung bedeutet'). However, in the case of ecumenical situations in which Rinkel cannot participate, he nevertheless wants to retain 'the position of a sympathetic and very interested observer' ('der Standpunkt des wohlwollenden und stark interessierten Zuschauers'), because one should never exclude the possibility that God shows a new way where we do not yet see it; RINKEL, 'Die heutige ökumenische Bewegung und wir', 228; cf. RINKEL, 'Eucharist and Ministry', 74.

[129] RINKEL, 'Die Lehre von der Kirche nach der Auffassung der altkatholischen Kirche', 14 ('Denn aus den obigen Zeilen wird deutlich geworden sein, dass es eine ursprünglich katholische Anschauung über die Kirche gibt, welche weder durch reformatorische

Rinkel's thought has been described at some length, because it marks the start of a consistent twentieth-century Old Catholic systematic theology upon which the other authors in this chapter build in their own ways.[130] Moreover, it contributes to our quest for a liturgical ecclesiology such themes as baptism as the most embracing delineation ('widest boundary') of the church, the central role of the eucharist in the life of the church, the both functional and essential role of the ministry amidst the whole people of God, a soteriological rather than geographical understanding of catholicity, the affirmation of (primarily) the universal and (subsequently) the local church in unity without uniformity, and an earnest effort to do justice to the Spirit's work in other churches.

4.3 URS KÜRY

4.3.1 Life and Work

One of Rinkel's best friends[131] was his colleague, Urs Küry (1901-1976), bishop of the Old Catholic Church (*Christkatholische Kirche*) of Switzerland from 1955 to 1972. Son of his predecessor, bishop Adolf Küry, Urs Küry studied theology in Berne, philosophy in Basle, and both subjects in Paris. He became parish priest and, additionally, Professor of Systematic Theology at the Old Catholic theological faculty of the University of Berne. He retained this academic post during nearly the whole period of his episcopate.[132]

The works of Andreas Rinkel showed a tendency to value the eucharist as the centre of the church's life, but at the same time an inability to design a dogmatic concept in which the eucharist's centrality would be adequately reflected. The same is true of Urs Küry's handbook on Old Catholicism, *Die altkatholische Kirche*. Because of Küry's importance within the twentieth-century history of Old Catholic theology, however, this section will briefly sketch Küry's views on some of the recurring themes of this study—the understanding of the church and ecumenism (which, for Küry, is fundamentally linked to his concept of the Early Church), the ministry and the relation between

Gedanken abgeschwächt und verflüchtigt noch durch römisch-hierarchisches Denken erstarrt und verweltlicht ist').

130 This is, of course, not to say that Rinkel was the first Old Catholic systematic theologian. Rather, Rinkel was the first to write a systematic theology at the time (the nineteen twenties) when the several sources of the Old Catholic tradition came together into a Western European 'mainstream Old Catholic theology'; cf. VON ARX, 'The Old Catholic Churches', 160.

131 M.J.IJ.W. ROOSJEN, 'Een kwart eeuw aan de Emmalaan', in: Smit e.a., *Adjutorio Redemptoris*, 256-259, at 258; cf. KÜRY, *Die altkatholische Kirche*, 4.

132 H.A. FREI, 'Ein Leben für die Kirche', in: U. Küry, *Hirtenbriefe* (Allschwil: Christkatholischer Schriften-Verlag, 1978), 1-42.

the local and the universal church. In Küry's own words, Old Catholic theology is mainly occupied with 'the church, its ministry and ecumenism'.[133]

4.3.2 A Catholic Church of the West

Küry regards the Old Catholic Church as 'the Catholic Church of the West'. He does not understand this in an exclusive way, but nevertheless he regards the Old Catholic Church without doubt as the legitimate representation, or one of the legitimate representations, of the Western Catholic Church.[134] More particularly, he understands the Old Catholic Church as the continuation of the Early Church, whereas the Roman Catholics after the First Vatican Council have proven themselves to be 'New Catholics'. In this respect, he can call the Old Catholics the 'Old Believers'.[135] Although Küry, as will be shown, understands catholicity primarily in relation to the Early Church, and although this brings the Old Catholics close to the Orthodox, Küry remains a Westerner. In background, structure, theology and spirituality, the Old Catholic Church 'is and wants to be' a Western Church.[136]

4.3.3 The Early Church

Küry's Western Catholicism is determined by the Early Church. Küry regards the concept of the church as a legal corporation, that arose later in Catholicism and Protestantism, as a fundamental error. Roman Catholicism gradually replaced the 'open system' of the Early Church by the 'closed system' of the papacy. By this, Küry means the fact that the church became more and more to be understood as a *societas perfecta*, a corporation which was grounded in itself rather than in something above it—God, Christ, the Spirit. The crown of this corporative-legal ecclesiology was the pope with his universal jurisdiction and infallibility.[137] Another deviation from the Early Church was the disappearance of the whole people of God from the theological and ecclesiastical scene.[138]

The alternative, for which the Old Catholic Church stands, is a return to the ecclesiological concept of the Early Church. This concept has been carried on through the Middle Ages by the Conciliar movement and its heirs in modern times. It is this wish to return to the principles of the Early Church (*alte Kirche*)

133 KÜRY, *Die altkatholische Kirche*, 223 ('*die Kirche, ihr Amt und die Ökumene*').

134 KÜRY, *Die altkatholische Kirche*, 16 ('die katholische Kirche des Abendlandes'), 37, 39, 66, 70, 76, 112.

135 KÜRY, *Die altkatholische Kirche*, 68, 83 (the term 'Old Believers' originally refers to a schism within the Russian Orthodox Church). Küry is happy to be able to say that the 'Liberalism' (*Liberalismus*) of the beginnings has given way to 'catholic ecclesiogenesis' (*katholische Kirchwerdung*); KÜRY, *Hirtenbriefe*, 230; cf. 291, 294-297.

136 KÜRY, *Die altkatholische Kirche*, 388, 393.

137 KÜRY, *Die altkatholische Kirche*, 25-29, 55, 58.

138 KÜRY, *Die altkatholische Kirche*, 64.

which is, according to Küry, the primary meaning of the term 'Old Catholic' (*altkatholisch*). This does not mean, says Küry, an imitation of particular details of the life of the Early Church, but the affirmation of its principal decisions—Scripture, creed, sacraments, episcopal ministry, synodality.[139] The Old Catholic appeal to the Early Church is, according to Küry, not the wish to revive an ideal period in the past, but the attempt to live here and now in continuity with the principles of the undivided church of the first millennium. Not because this was a static period without change or dispute, which it was not, but because this was the period in which the church was still one and which is therefore the period that can most effectively be regarded as having abided in the truth. A return to the principal decisions of the Early Church means a return to the major issues of Scripture, creed and ministry, rather than remaining within the historic divisions and its many denominational confessions, which date from the second millennium.[140]

4.3.4 Ecumenism

Küry boldly states that the Early Church has its continuation in the Orthodox, Anglican and Old Catholic Churches. These churches have remained within the framework of the Early Church, without distorting it by a legal and hierarchical ecclesiological concept, or by the addition of dogmas.[141] Ecumenical rapprochement, says Küry, is not to be expected from comparing the life and doctrine of contemporary churches with each other, but from the return of every church to the principles of the Early Church. When the churches will have returned to those principles, they will recognise each other as churches on the common ground of the Early Church. Not, again, as a repetition of the patristic period, but as today's churches reaffirming the basic decisions of the Early Church.[142]

This also elucidates the self-understanding of the Old Catholic Churches as thoroughly ecumenical churches. They are not ecumenical in the sense that they strive for a rapid practical re-union of churches, but they understand themselves as ecumenical because they try to be churches in continuity with the Early Church which they see as the only fruitful basis of ecumenical rapprochement. In other words, the Old Catholic Churches are not just ecumenical when it comes to their relations with other churches, but they regard being

139 KÜRY, *Die altkatholische Kirche*, 17-21, 64, 66, 119, 125, 362, 402.

140 KÜRY, *Die altkatholische Kirche*, 126-127, 227; cf. 139. Cf. U. KÜRY, 'Die Wiedervereinigung der christlichen Kirchen und das altkatholische Kirchenideal im Lichte des eucharistischen Wunders', *IKZ* 20 (1930), 146-175, at 173.

141 KÜRY, *Die altkatholische Kirche*, 359, 361, 398; KÜRY, *Hirtenbriefe*, 100-103, 114.

142 KÜRY, *Die altkatholische Kirche*, 402; cf. 64; KÜRY, *Hirtenbriefe*, 231.

ecumenical—trying to be as faithful as possible to the undivided church—as part of their own self-understanding.[143]

4.3.5 The Ordained Ministry

Küry has an understanding of ministry which is centred around the presbyter/priest, rather than around the bishop as is the case in most eucharistic or liturgical ecclesiologies. The bishop, Küry says, is not fundamentally different from the presbyter, because both exercise roughly the same functions—preaching and teaching, administering the sacraments, exercising pastoral care—whereas the bishop exercises these functions at the level of the supra-local church as the representative of the church's unity.[144] Consequently, Küry says that the ordinary presider at the eucharist is the *priest*, and that priests and bishops exercise the same ministry but on different levels—the priests (pastors, *Hirten*) on the level of the 'local congregation' (*Einzelgemeinde*), the bishops (chief pastors, *Oberhirten*) on the level of 'all, or a number of, congregations' (*alle, bzw. mehrere, Gemeinden*).[145]

In Küry's view, the threefold apostolic ministry of bishop, priest and deacon is part of the unnegotiable essentials of the Christian faith. As Rinkel allowed the ministry to have gained shape in patristic times, as an organic development from apostolic times, Küry grounds the threefold ministry even firmer in apostolic times, by saying that the church of apostolic and post-apostolic times still possessed oral tradition next to the written tradition which became Scripture, and that the threefold ministry is part of this oral tradition and therefore has the same status as Scripture. As a result, Küry mentions the ministry of bishops, presbyters and deacons as *apostolische Urtradition* under the heading of 'Scripture', whereas 'Tradition' is for Küry the way in which the (later) church represents and guards this apostolic proto-tradition.[146] It should be added, however, that Küry regards the disappearance of the 'pneumatic' and 'charismatic' offices as a loss which should be restored, alongside the threefold

143 Cf. U. KÜRY, 'Konfession und Ökumene', *IKZ* 43 (1953), 129-145, at 130-131, 133, 142, 145; KÜRY, *Die altkatholische Kirche*, 224, 365-366.

144 KÜRY, *Die altkatholische Kirche*, 318, 326; cf. KÜRY, 'Konfession und Ökumene', 132; U. KÜRY, 'Heiliger Geist, Kirche und Amt', *IKZ* 50 (1960), 107-125, 150-157, at 154-155; KÜRY, *Hirtenbriefe*, 167, 235. Küry can even describe ordination as the 'commissioning to perform the eucharistic sacrifice' ('Bevollmächtigung zum Vollzug des eucharistischen Opfers'; KÜRY, *Die altkatholische Kirche*, 217), a view particularly foreign to a eucharistic ecclesiology.

145 KÜRY, *Die altkatholische Kirche*, 197, 295-296. This position is critically evaluated in paragraph 8.5.5.

146 U. KÜRY, 'Der canon fidei der alten Kirche und wir', *IKZ* 52 (1962), 86-99, at 87; KÜRY, *Die altkatholische Kirche*, 132-133; cf. 301-302, 304, 306, 317; U. KÜRY, 'Von der Katholizität der Kirche', *IKZ* 58 (1969), 1-18, at 11.

apostolic ministry, in order to regain the ministerial variety and pluriformity of the Early Church.[147]

Like Rinkel, Küry emphasises the interdependence of ministry and laity. He describes the position of the ministry within the church as a position not 'above' (*übergeordnet*) but 'before' (*vorgeordnet*) the laity. By this, Küry means that the ministers do not occupy a position which makes them different from their co-members of the church, but that they have to take the lead at the head of their co-members. The particular task of the ministry is to represent Christ before the community in teaching, celebrating and caring.[148]

4.3.6 Local and Universal

Küry's ecclesiology is rooted in the local congregation. Consistent with the above mentioned tendency to equate bishop and priest except for the level of their activity, Küry calls every local congregation—every parish (*Einzelgemeinde*)—'a complete representation or manifestation of the one and whole church, which in its qualitative wholeness is present and effective in every local congregation'.[149] The life (contents of the faith) and the order (sacraments, ministry) of the whole church are in Küry's view none other than the life and the order of every parish, except for the scope of their administration. The bishop functions as the *trait d'union* between the parish and the universal church. The bishop's task is to make sure that the parish does not alienate itself from the church as a whole, and *vice versa* that the church as a whole does not neglect the life of each parish. The local parish *is* not the whole church—that would be, says Küry, independentism—but *represents* it.[150]

It may be concluded that, remarkably, the diocese has no particular place in Küry's ecclesiology. His main categories are the parish and the universal church.[151] The bishop functions as the intermediary between the parishes and the presbyters on the one hand and the universal church represented by all bishops on the other. Küry literally states that the presbyters are assigned to the parishes and the bishops to the church as a whole.[152] The difference between this view and the general opinion of those who uphold a eucharistic

147 KÜRY, *Die altkatholische Kirche*, 308; KÜRY, 'Von der Katholizität der Kirche', 18; KÜRY, *Hirtenbriefe*, 234, 330.

148 KÜRY, *Die altkatholische Kirche*, 211, 243, 284, 291, 293.

149 KÜRY, *Die altkatholische Kirche*, 295 ('dass jede Einzelgemeinde eine vollgültige Repräsentation, eine Vertretung oder Darstellung der Einen und ganzen Kirche ist, während diese in ihrer qualitativen Ganzheit in jeder Einzelgemeinde gegenwärtig und wirksam ist'); cf. KÜRY, 'Konfession und Ökumene', 132.

150 KÜRY, *Die altkatholische Kirche*, 295, 319.

151 Cf. KÜRY, *Hirtenbriefe*, 236.

152 KÜRY, *Die altkatholische Kirche*, 319, 326 ('... Ordnung, nach welcher die ersteren [the bishops] der ganzen Kirche, die letzteren [the priests] der Einzelgemeinde zugeordnet sind').

ecclesiology is that in a eucharistic ecclesiology the bishop *and* the presbyters are fundamentally assigned to the local church, understood as the diocese. One could say that Küry's parish—as the fundamental ecclesiological community lead by a presbyter—resembles a eucharistic-ecclesiological diocese, but the difference is, firstly, that in Küry's model the bishop becomes a supra-local official instead of the local eucharistic presider and, secondly, that the basic ecclesiological entity (the parish) is left with a priest (and perhaps a deacon) rather than with the full unity of the ministries of bishop, presbyters and deacons. On the other hand, Küry is in favour of relatively small dioceses, so that the bishop is actually able to fulfill his role as intermediary between the local congregation and the whole church, and the parishes have a chance of really knowing who their bishop is and how he administers his ministry of unity.[153]

The church as a whole has its *centrum unitatis* in the bishop of Rome. Küry affirms the ancient Pentarchy tradition, with the bishop of Rome as its *primus inter pares*.[154] He firmly resists, however, the development of the church in the direction of a corporative-legal entity with the pope at its head, and in particular the papal dogma's of the First Vatican Council. Regarding Old Catholicism as an heir of Conciliarism, Gallicanism, Jansenism, Febronianism, Josefinism and J.H. Wessenberg's nineteenth-century reforms in Constance, Küry advocates the independence of each diocese or province.[155] But if the churches should return to the organic ecclesiology of the Early Church, Küry finds it natural to acknowledge the role of the bishop of Rome as the centre of unity and as a service to unity.[156]

4.3.7 Conclusion

It has become clear that Urs Küry's thought—important as it is within twentieth-century Old Catholic theology—cannot be regarded as a contribution to a liturgical or eucharistic ecclesiology. Interestingly, this is not only shown by the more or less complete absence of concepts which reflect such a liturgical or eucharistic ecclesiology (such as, for example, the idea that the common eucharist incorporates the partakers into one celebrating community), but also—circumstantially, one could say—by the presence of concepts which are hardly compatible with a liturgical or eucharistic ecclesiology (such as the centrality of

153 KÜRY, *Die altkatholische Kirche*, 346.

154 KÜRY, *Die altkatholische Kirche*, 330-331; KÜRY, *Hirtenbriefe*, 243, 248-249, 253.

155 KÜRY, *Die altkatholische Kirche*, 27-56. However, as S. SUDMANN, 'Abgrenzung oder Nachahmung. Das Basler Konzil und die alt-katholische Kirche' in: A.K.H. Berlis & M. Ring (eds.), *Im Himmel Anker werfen. Vermutungen über Kirche in der Zukunft. Festschrift für Bischof Joachim Vobbe* (Bonn: Alt-Katholischer Bistumsverlag, 2007), 289-301, points out, historical investigation into the Council of Basle (1431-1449) shows that Conciliarism was not at all positive about lay participation and diocesan self-regulation.

156 KÜRY, *Hirtenbriefe*, 249.

the priest and of the local congregation). If only for this reason, it has been worthwile to mention some of Küry's views, because it helps to delineate the concept which is under observation in this study.

The positive evaluation of Küry has to do with his concept of Old Catholic theology and ecclesiology as rooted in patristic concepts of the Christian faith and church. This approach gives shape not only to Old Catholic self-understanding, but also to the Old Catholic approach to ecumenism. In Küry's view, the Old Catholic Church is the Catholic Church of the West, continuing the ecclesial reality of the Early Church and wishing to recognise all other churches as identical Catholic Churches on the same basis.

4.4 WERNER KÜPPERS

4.4.1 Life and Work

Werner Küppers (1905-1980) was born in the East Prussian city of Königsberg as the son of an Old Catholic parish priest. He studied theology at the Old Catholic theological faculty in Berne (Switzerland), where he subsequently lectured in Old Testament theology. In 1938 he moved to Bonn (Germany), where he became Professor of Old Catholic Theology. Both in Berne and in Bonn he combined his academic work with being a parish priest (in Biel and Bonn respectively).[157] From 1935 Küppers was a member of the NSDAP. After the Second World War, he was suspended but after two years rehabilitated by the German and British authorities, as a result of which he resumed his professorship. Küppers played a major role in restoring the Old Catholic Seminary to an accepted place within the University of Bonn. He was also engaged in ecumenical contacts, primarily with the Orthodox.[158] This section will present his thoughts on ecclesiology in relation to the liturgical celebration.

4.4.2 The Liturgy

With Küppers we enter the period in Old Catholic theology which continues to the present day and is marked by a growing awareness of the paradigmatic place of the liturgical celebration within ecclesiology.[159] In a short monography on the

[157] H.A. FREI, 'Zum Gedenken an Professor Dr. theol. Werner Küppers (1905-1980) sel., Tübingen—Bern', *IKZ* 70 (1980), 137-138.

[158] M. RING, 'Eine neue Periode. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Alt-Katholischen Seminars der Universität Bonn', in: G. Esser & M. Ring (eds.), *Zwischen Freiheit und Gebundenheit. Festschrift zum 100jährigen Bestehen des Alt-Katholischen Seminars der Universität Bonn (1902-2002)* (Bonn: Alt-Katholischer Bistumsverlag, 2002), 112-177, at 164-172.

[159] Küppers himself uses the terminology 'a eucharistic-local ecclesiology': W. KÜPPERS, 'Die Altkatholische Position heute im Rückblick auf Vatikanum I', *IKZ* 60 (1970), 124-167, at

faith (*Symbolik*) of the Old Catholic Church(es), Küppers—unlike Rinkel and Küry, who in such cases would remain within the paths of a systematic exposition of Old Catholic theology, or of the Old Catholic understanding of systematic issues such as catholicity, ministry, or the appeal to the Early Church—takes the celebration of the liturgy as his paradigm.

He refers to Old Catholic scholars from the previous period to indicate that liturgy has regularly been understood and taught in a more or less rationalistic, at least verbal way—liturgy as text, the theological meaning of which text had to be explained to and understood by the celebrating people.[160] In Küppers's opinion, this way of interpreting liturgy is more about 'the "thoughts" of the liturgy' than about the liturgical celebration itself. Instead, Küppers chooses to look at the liturgy as a communal ritual, that is, not only as a text but as the corporate act of the church. Liturgy is

> a cultic symbolic act in the Christian Church, [understood] as the act of the congregation in connection to Christ as the head, within the *corpus mysticum*.[161]

Liturgy is neither the external expression of an inward spiritual devotion, nor the formal performance of divinely instituted rites. Liturgy is, says Küppers, the

> expression of a double event: because the church, as the body of Christ, is a divine-human unity, in its cult happens in a sacramental way the 'coinciding', the 'symballein' in the full sense of the word, of divine and human action. The members and organs of the body in their own way perform acts which are at the same time acts of the head, because they happen within one and the same body.[162]

In other words, liturgy is presented here as the central activity of the church as the body of Christ, in which the members of the body and the head of the body act inseparably.

166 ('eucharistisch-lokale Ekklesiologie'); cf. W. KÜPPERS, 'Alt-katholische Kirchengemeinschaft der Utrechter Union', in: F. Heyer, *Konfessionskunde* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1977), 554-574, at 562 ('eucharistisch-ortskirchliche Ekklesiologie').

160 W. KÜPPERS, 'Symbolik der Alt-Katholischen Kirche', in: W. Küppers, P. Hauptmann, F. Baser, *Symbolik der kleineren Kirchen, Freikirchen und Sekten des Westens* (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1964), 1-27, at 16.

161 KÜPPERS, 'Symbolik der Alt-Katholischen Kirche', 17 ('... der kultischen Symbolhandlung in der christlichen Kirche als des Handelns der Gemeinde in der Verbinding mit Christus als dem Haupt im Corpus Mysticum').

162 KÜPPERS, 'Symbolik der Alt-Katholischen Kirche', 20 ('... Ausdruck eines doppelten Geschehens: Indem die Kirche als der Leib Christi eine gottmenschliche Einheit ist, ereignet sich in ihrem Kult das "Zusammenfallen", das "symballein" im Vollsinn des Wortes, von göttlichem und menschlichem Handeln in der Weise des Sakramentes. Die Glieder und Organe des Leibes vollziehen in ihrer Weise Handlungen, die zugleich, da sie ja im einen und gleichen Leibe geschehen, auch Handlungen des Hauptes sind').

Küppers acknowledges the Old Catholic liturgist Adolf Thürlings (1844-1915) as the inspirer of this thought and the Roman Catholic liturgical theologian Odo Casel (1886-1948) as the one who first thought these principles through in full theological depth. It is the Liturgical Movement which, according to Küppers, rediscovered the full, patristic meaning of the liturgy, and it is his conviction that the Old Catholic Church should re-interpret itself along these lines.[163] Later in his life, Küppers acted as co-secretary of the Orthodox—Old Catholic dialogue commission. It was particularly the thought of Orthodox scholars such as Afanasiev and Schmemann, which gave further shape to his 'local and eucharistic ecclesiology'.[164]

4.4.3 The Ordained Ministry

Küppers's thoughts on ministry are as much in line with a liturgical or eucharistic ecclesiology as his views on liturgy. 'The bishop is the central figure in the ordering of every Old Catholic community.' The bishop is, says Küppers, not only the senior pastor (*oberster Hirt*) of the diocese, but also and moreover the spiritual leader (*geistlicher Leiter*) of every parish within the diocese, and therefore also the primary liturgical celebrant.[165] Not essentially because he has more 'rights' or (sacramental or jurisdictional) 'power', but because his ministry is 'inclusive' in such a way that he represents the whole church over which he presides (the diocese).[166] The bishop symbolises the unity of the church in three ways. When he stands at the altar, he occupies the uniting place of Christ before the congregation. When he gathers with his colleagues, he represents his diocese (both clergy and laity). And, again, when he stands at the altar, he represents his diocese (again both clergy and laity) before God.[167] The bishop is, then, both the guardian and the sign of the local church's *koinonia* in apostolicity and catholicity. As such, he is in constant synodal interaction with clergy and laity.[168] Küppers regards this uniting and representing office of the bishop best depicted in the semicircle of the apse—bishop with presbyterium

163 KÜPPERS, 'Symbolik der Alt-Katholischen Kirche', 18-20.

164 W. KÜPPERS, 'Stand und Perspektiven des altkatholisch-orthodoxen Dialogs', *IKZ* 62 (1972), 87-114, at 113 ('örtliche[] und eucharistische[] Ekklesiologie'); cf. KÜPPERS, 'Alt-katholische Kirchengemeinschaft', 562.

165 KÜPPERS, 'Symbolik der Alt-Katholischen Kirche', 23. In a strictly liturgical or eucharistic ecclesiology, one would prefer to say that the bishop is the liturgical presider and *therefore* the spiritual leader of the diocese, rather than the other way round, but in the context of Küppers's views this difference is of relatively little importance.

166 W. KÜPPERS, '"Das Amt der Einheit". Theologische Erwägungen zum Bischofsamt', *IKZ* 61 (1971), 243-256, at 247.

167 KÜPPERS, 'Symbolik der Alt-Katholischen Kirche', 23. Ministry has always both sides—representation of the community *and* personal witness, given by Christ, towards the community; KÜPPERS, '"Das Amt der Einheit"', 255-256.

168 KÜPPERS, '"Das Amt der Einheit"', 248-249.

and deacons—completed into a circle by the concelebrating congregation, with the Christ representing altar in their midst. Therefore, his practical advice is to order the liturgical space in such a way that 'the full episcopal liturgy' is a real possibility in every parish of the diocese.[169]

For Küppers, the episcopate is the pivotal ministry. 'Priests and deacons are the representatives of the bishop.'[170] Not the sacerdotal priest with his 'power' to consecrate and to absolve—together with an understanding of the episcopate reduced to the 'power' to confirm and ordain—but the bishop as the genuine communitarian and collegial presider over his laity and clergy stands in the centre of Küppers's view on church and ministry.[171]

The ministry of bishops, priests and deacons is of a highly symbolic nature, that is, of a sacramental nature. Sacramental, in turn, means christocentric, pneumatic and eschatological. This is another instance of the importance of Küppers's thought for a liturgical ecclesiology. Ministry is not primarily seen in functional, but in symbolic terms. The various ministerial functions derive from their symbolic, liturgical, sacramental role. How far the work of a minister or the deliberations of a synod may seem to be alienated from liturgical celebration, in essence they all refer to the organic liturgical gathering of the people of God in unity with their bishop.[172]

Furthermore, the bishop is in Küppers's view always a *local* minister, that is, a minister who owes his existence to the concrete, local (diocesan) community by which he is elected and within which and for which he is ordained. So, Küppers says, the bishop does not derive his ministry from being received into the universal episcopal college under the leadership of the bishop of Rome—as, according to Küppers, in the Roman Catholic view since the Second Vatican Council—but from being the presider of his local church.[173]

4.4.4 The Early Church

The advantage of such an ecclesiology, says Küppers, is that it makes the ecclesiology of the Early Church tangible and visible. For Küppers, as for Küry, the basic decisions of the Early Church are the only foundation of Old Catholic theology, liturgy and ministry, and the only fruitful way into ecumenism.[174] Old

169 KÜPPERS, 'Symbolik der Alt-Katholischen Kirche', 23. Cf. paragraph 1.1.1.

170 KÜPPERS, 'Symbolik der Alt-Katholischen Kirche', 24.

171 KÜPPERS, '"Das Amt der Einheit"', 250-251.

172 KÜPPERS, 'Symbolik der Alt-Katholischen Kirche', 24.

173 W. KÜPPERS, 'De leer over de kerk van Vaticanum II van oud-katholiek standpunt', in: G. Baraúna (ed.), *De kerk van Vaticanum II. Commentaren op de Concilieconstitutie Over de kerk* (Bilthoven: Nelissen, 1966), vol. II, 586-605, at 604; KÜPPERS, '"Das Amt der Einheit"', 246, 250.

174 Cf. KÜPPERS, 'Die Altkatholische Position heute', 159, 161. In the ecumenical context the Old Catholics have always emphasised the issue of reunion by growing towards common faith and order; KÜPPERS, 'De leer over de kerk van Vaticanum II', 588, 593.

Catholic theology will always try to guard the *depositum fidei* of the first millennium, without losing it, but also without adding to it. Again like Küry, Küppers emphasises that he regards the appeal to the Early Church not so much in an 'historic-statutory' way (*historisch-statutarisch*) as in a way which tries to do justice to the organic meaning of the patristic decisions in context (*organisch-sinngemäss*).[175]

4.4.5 The Eucharist

Corresponding to the emphases in Küppers's ecclesiology are those in his eucharistic theology. More poignantly than Rinkel and Küry, Küppers stresses the fact that the eucharist unites the individual believer not only with Christ, but also with his or her fellow Christians in the body of Christ.[176] As strong as Rinkel, Küppers emphasises the eschatological character of both church and eucharist. 'The eucharist is the heart of ancient Christianity, and the key to this is its eschatology.' The common meal represents the eschatological unity of the many in the one body.[177]

The celebration of the eucharist is the central moment of the church as *communio* or *koinonia*. That is not to say, Küppers adds, that the communal life of the church is restricted to the liturgical celebration. What becomes manifest in the eucharist has to be lived in daily life—living in community, self-giving for others. *Communio*, celebrated in the eucharist and continued in daily life, is 'taking part in, being part of, and giving part to others'.[178]

4.4.6 Conclusion

After the foundation of Old Catholic ecclesiology has been encountered in the works of Andreas Rinkel and Urs Küry, those of Werner Küppers represent the first full appearance of a liturgical or eucharistic ecclesiology within Old Catholic theology. The church as a liturgical *communio* from which all other aspects of the life of the *communio* flow, liturgy as the work of the body of Christ in which head and body act simultaneously, the eucharist as uniting people eschatologically into one body, the bishop as the local church's presider and as the link between the local and the wider church—all these issues are highly important aspects of a fully liturgical or eucharistic ecclesiology.

175 KÜPPERS, 'Symbolik der Alt-Katholischen Kirche', 8, 27; cf. 3-9.

176 KÜPPERS, 'Symbolik der Alt-Katholischen Kirche', 26.

177 W. KÜPPERS, 'Eucharistie und Eschatologie', *IKZ* 48 (1958), 79-83, at 81 ('In der Eucharistie schlägt das Herz der ältesten Christenheit, und der Schlüssel dazu ist ihre Eschatologie').

178 W. KÜPPERS, 'Leben in Gemeinschaft', *IKZ* 65 (1975), 50-59, at 56 ('Teilnahme, ja Teilhabe und Teilgabe am anderen und an den anderen').

4.5 KURT STALDER

4.5.1 Life and Work

Kurt Stalder (1912-1996) was born into a Swiss Old Catholic family. He studied at the Old Catholic theological faculty of the University of Berne, and became a parish priest. His doctoral dissertation on justification and sanctification in the Pauline writings (1959) was a first sign of a way of theologising that would become his characteristic—combining exegesis and systematic theology. From 1960 to 1982 Stalder was Professor of New Testament Exegesis, Homiletics and Religious Education at the Old Catholic faculty in Berne. He was also active in Swiss ecumenism and in the worldwide commission on Faith and Order. His personal preference in ecumenism was with the Eastern Orthodox Churches.[179]

4.5.2 Salvation as the Restoration of Communion

At the end of his career, Stalder described a gradual change which occurred throughout his theological life. He started as deeply influenced by the thought of Karl Barth. This, he says, resulted in a continuous unease with regard to the tradition of the Old Catholic Church into which he had been baptised. For example, he did not recognise much of the ecclesiological relevance in many New Testament texts. Then, as a New Testament scholar, he became thoroughly involved in the study of such themes as justification, sanctification and freedom. The more Stalder discovered the interrelatedness of redemption, unity, community and the church, the more he rediscovered the value of the Old Catholic tradition. He even became convinced that these central Christian issues find their fullest expression in the Old Catholic ecclesiological position.[180] The thought presented in this section is the result of this later phase of Stalder's theological development.

Central to this discovery, and to his view of the Christian faith and church in general, is his conviction that Christian soteriology consists in the restoration of the unity between God and humanity and between humans themselves. Contrarily, the basic characteristic of sin is separation from God and struggle between humans. Christ has redeemed the world, which means, says Stalder, that he restored communion with God and with each other.[181] There is not such

[179] U. VON ARX, 'Kurt Stalder (1912-1996). Ansprache beim Trauergottesdienst am 6. Januar 1997 zu St. Peter und Paul in Bern', in: K. Stalder, *Sprache und Erkenntnis der Wirklichkeit Gottes. Texte zu einigen wissenschaftstheoretischen und systematischen Voraussetzungen für die exegetische und homiletische Arbeit*, herausgegeben von U. von Arx (Freiburg CH: Universitätsverlag, 2000), 435-442.

[180] STALDER, *Die Wirklichkeit Christi erfahren*, 7, 87.

[181] STALDER, *Die Wirklichkeit Christi erfahren*, 8, 89, 110-111, 202, 245, 265, 298.

a thing as individual salvation.[182] The natural effect of this view is that salvation implies—or even *is*—communion and therefore implies a community. This community is the church, and being a community in unity should be the church's main characteristic.[183]

4.5.3 The Church as 'Proof' of the Reality of Salvation

Stalder is insistent on the fact that there *must* be such a community if salvation has to be true and real. 'If such a community does not exist in the world, one has to say that the mission of the Son of God has not reached its goal, that it has been in vain, that reconciliation and restoration do not exist.'[184] The existence of the church—the existence of a community in which God and humans are reconciled, brought into communion—is for Stalder, as it were, the 'proof' of the reality of salvation. 'Therefore, the church as the community of God and humans is of Christ's work the decisive "result" which is already visible in this "aeon".'[185]

For Stalder, the church is not an institution which administers means of grace to the people, but the community of God and people which comes in this world closest as possible to the reality of salvation, the reality of redeemed life-in-communion. 'Thus, the church is the fundamental soteriological, pneumatological, eschatological, anthropological reality in this world, created in Christ.'[186]

4.5.4 Participation in the Trinitarian Life

Reconciliation between God and humanity means, according to Stalder, more than just some contact between the two. Life-in-communion—between God and humanity, and between humans themselves—means full participation in each other. Therefore, Stalder can say that salvation makes humans partakers of the divine trinitarian life. He refers to John 17:22 where this participation is expressed: 'That Jesus gives his [disciples] the "doxa" which he himself has received from the Father, is the highest expression of the goal and fulfillment of

182 STALDER, *Die Wirklichkeit Christi erfahren*, 103, 111, 287.

183 STALDER, *Die Wirklichkeit Christi erfahren*, 84-85, 129, 241, 264.

184 STALDER, *Die Wirklichkeit Christi erfahren*, 241 ('Gibt es solche Gemeinschaft nicht in der Welt, so muss man sagen, dass die Sendung des Sohnes Gottes nicht zum Ziel gekommen, ergebnislos verlaufen sei, dass es Versöhnung und Wiederherstellung nicht gebe'); cf. 173.

185 STALDER, *Die Wirklichkeit Christi erfahren*, 265 ('Die Kirche als die Gemeinschaft von Gott und Menschen ist also das entscheidende "Ergebnis" des Christusereignisses, das schon in diesem "Aion" sichtbar ist'); cf. 8.

186 STALDER, *Die Wirklichkeit Christi erfahren*, 266 ('Die Kirche ist somit die in Jesus Christus geschaffene soteriologische, pneumatologische, eschatologische, anthropologische Grundrealität in dieser Welt').

his mission.'[187] Moreover, the goal of this participation in the Trinity's divine life is that the disciples may be one. Being one, being in communion, being a community, is therefore, according to Stalder, the fulfillment of salvation.[188]

In the meantime it should be noted that, for Stalder, this does not apply to the church only. The church is a 'paradigm for humanity and life'.[189] Every sphere of human—and not even only human—life is filled by God's trinitarian presence; every aspect of the world is in some sense redeemed and restored to communion. Created and redeemed life is an image of God and therefore trinitarian in constitution, that is, aiming for communion. Anthropologically speaking—a human being is, according to Stalder, firstly a member of humanity, and only secondarily, *as* a member of humanity, a being of its own. Sociologically and psychologically speaking, humans are neither collective nor individual, but 'intersubjective' creatures.[190]

4.5.5 Community Shaped by 'Over Against' (Gegenüber)

Community, says Stalder, implies exchange, including tensions. Otherwise it would not be a community but a group subject to tyranny. Father, Son and Spirit are each other's counterparts, each other's 'over against' (*Gegenüber*).[191] A human community which reflects the trinitarian life should, therefore, have a bipolar character as well. In the church, this 'over against' is given shape by the distinction (not separation) between clergy and laity. The clergy—the bishop, the presbyters and the deacons—experience the 'over against' relationship internally, too. Nevertheless, Stalder wants to consider the interaction between clergy and laity as the primary 'over against' relationship. He is aware of the danger of clericalism within this view. Therefore, he emphasises that the ministry is fundamentally grounded in the community of the church as a whole.[192]

According to Stalder, the clergy mainly represent Christ, whereas the laity mainly represent the Spirit. Stalder sees this in a mutual way—the laity should accept the clergy as representatives of Christ, while at the same time and in the same amount the clergy should accept the laity as the temple of the Holy Spirit, that is, as the group of people through which the voice of the Spirit is to be

187 STALDER, *Die Wirklichkeit Christi erfahren*, 83 ('Dass Jesus den Seinen die "doxa" gibt, die er selber vom Vater bekommen hatte, ist höchster Ausdruck für Ziel und Erfüllung seiner Sendung').

188 STALDER, *Die Wirklichkeit Christi erfahren*, 84-85; cf. 106, 111, 166, 179-180.

189 STALDER, *Die Wirklichkeit Christi erfahren*, 280 ('Paradigma für Menschheit und Leben').

190 STALDER, *Die Wirklichkeit Christi erfahren*, 179-180; cf. 184, 279-281, 304.

191 Being one another's *Gegenüber* does not just mean standing 'in opposition to' one another; it rather refers to a mutual complementarity of non-identical persons. It is difficult to find an English equivalent.

192 STALDER, *Die Wirklichkeit Christi erfahren*, 100, 111, 179, 241-242.

heard.[193] Stalder relativises this distinction by pointing to the fact that every Christian is a representative of Christ, and that every ministry can only be fulfilled in the power of the Spirit. Nevertheless, for Stalder, the ministers are primarily sent by Christ to represent him, whereas the laity are primarily gathered by the Spirit and, therefore, primarily represent the Spirit.[194]

4.5.6 Conciliarity

Stalder attributes a constitutive role to the interrelation of clergy and laity. Thus, in his view, it is not the clergy who make the church. The ultimate goal of Christ's work was not the commissioning of the apostles, but the recreation of communion between God and humanity, and within humanity. Therefore, it is the whole church, including laity and clergy, which is the subject of Stalder's ecclesiology. Moreover, Stalder says that the value of any theology of the ministry is dependent on the underlying ecclesiology.[195]

The task of the whole people of God is not 'delegated' (*delegiert*) to the ministers. As long as a man or woman belongs to the church, he or she has the full responsibility to take part in the process of being church. The 'over against' of the clergy only functions if it is complemented by the 'over against' of the laity.[196] All of them have their own responsibility. Finding the truth and making decisions is a process in which every member of the church has a part to play. It is precisely this process, that the ministry—the bishop bearing the main responsibility—has to enable and serve.[197] This process includes, at a late stage, an episcopal decision. But this is neither the last word nor a guarantee for truth. Every member of the church has to define his or her position with regard to the episcopal decision. This final stage of the process is called 'reception' (*Rezeption*).[198]

Stalder calls this process 'conciliarity' (*Konziliarität*). As has become clear from Stalder's emphasis on the mutual 'over against' of clergy and laity, he does not understand conciliarity as random pluralism. Rather, every member of the church must have the opportunity to contribute 'his' or 'her' gospel to the

193 STALDER, *Die Wirklichkeit Christi erfahren*, 18, 96, 100, 103, 112, 202, 266-267.

194 STALDER, *Die Wirklichkeit Christi erfahren*, 131. This position is critically evaluated in paragraph 8.5.3.

195 STALDER, *Die Wirklichkeit Christi erfahren*, 94, 265.

196 STALDER, *Die Wirklichkeit Christi erfahren*, 18, 37, 123, 131-132, 224. For this reason, there can be no bishop without a church. There can be no 'isolated sacramental individualism' ('isolierte Sakramentsindividualismus'). Stalder takes the International Old Catholic Bishops' Conference as an example of good legislation in view of this principle—in this conference only those who actually serve as diocesan bishops have voting rights (STALDER, *Die Wirklichkeit Christi erfahren*, 219-220, 224, 262). Since 2001 they are even the only formal members of the conference; cf. VON ARX, 'Vorwort', 10 n. 24.

197 STALDER, *Die Wirklichkeit Christi erfahren*, 107, 210, 267.

198 STALDER, *Die Wirklichkeit Christi erfahren*, 216, 221, 244.

general process of finding the truth of the gospel. The goal of the process is to reach consensus. The highest form of such a consensus is a council's decision including its reception by the entire church. Not because a council is automatically infallible, but because such a consensus reflects a high amount of 'intersubjective' (*intersubjektiv*) or 'ecclesial' (*ekklesial*) truth and has therefore a 'pneumatological preponderance' (*pneumatologisches Übergewicht*).[199]

4.5.7 Apostolic Succession

In Stalder's thought, another word for the conciliar process is 'apostolic succession'.[200] For Stalder, apostolic succession is the continuity and identity of the message, handed down in every local church from generation to generation by the leaders of each church, but without a formal guarantee—apostolic succession is a process which, led by the Spirit, has to be repeated in every time and place.[201] Thus, according to Stalder, apostolic succession is not a status but a process, that is, the same process as has been described above under the heading of 'conciliarity'. The bishops and the presbyters have the task to enable and lead this process of discerning the truth, a process in which all members of the church participate. 'The apostolic succession has its meaning and reality in the fact that it is the actual carrying-out of the cohesion of the multifaceted ecclesial tasks.'[202] In other words, apostolic succession is a term to describe the whole church in action.

The core of this process is that the church in every time and place bears witness to its continuity with Jesus and the apostles. This continuity is personalised in the bishop and comes most prominently to the fore in the election and ordination of a bishop, the communal act in which the church expresses its wish to continue being church.[203] Personalisation of the principle of the apostolic succession is important, says Stalder, because the church is not an abstract intellectual idea, but a human community living from being sent into the world since the—and as the—apostles.[204] The bishop, however, is not the one who decides on his own, but the one who enables and leads the process of working towards consensus, a process in which every member of the church, gifted by the Spirit, has his or her own place.

199 STALDER, *Die Wirklichkeit Christi erfahren*, 183, 268; cf. 52, 108, 216, 243.
200 STALDER, *Die Wirklichkeit Christi erfahren*, 66.
201 STALDER, *Die Wirklichkeit Christi erfahren*, 53, 97.
202 STALDER, *Die Wirklichkeit Christi erfahren*, 71 ('Die apostolische Sukzession hat ihre Bedeutung und ihre Wirklichkeit darin, dass sie der faktische Vollzug des Zusammenhangs der allseitigen ekklesialen Verpflichtungen ist'); cf. 66-67, 98, 101, 120, 133, 135, 210, 242.
203 STALDER, *Die Wirklichkeit Christi erfahren*, 97, 267.
204 STALDER, *Die Wirklichkeit Christi erfahren*, 54, 243.

4.5.8 The Local Church

All these aspects of Stalder's thought come together in what he calls a *Lokalkirchenekklesiologie* (ecclesiology of the local church).[205] When salvation in Christ becomes a reality in a group of people-in-communion, this group is the church and the whole church. As we have seen, this being-in-communion is, for Stalder, participation in the divine trinitarian life, and therefore includes the 'over against' of the laity and the clergy headed by the bishop.[206] The local church is, therefore, the diocese. In order to give a real chance to the conciliar process of being church in 'over against' relationships, a local church—a diocese—cannot be too large. Stalder proposes one city or one small region as both minimum and maximum size.[207]

A major problem of an ecclesiology of the local church which Stalder recognises is the fact that in practice the one local church does not exist. In one place there is a multitude of denominations. In Stalder's vision, the ecclesiological goal of ecumenism should be *one* church in *one* place. As long as this is not the case, an Old Catholic diocese should regard itself (conceptually) as the one church in one place. Stalder does not believe in the practice of, for example, a common eucharistic celebration in one place as long as full communion between the denominations has not been reached.[208]

Stalder thinks the local church should not be equated with the 'one man parish' (*Einmannpfarramt*), the parish lead by one priest. Being church requires as many ministries—lay as well as ordained—as possible. Such a 'team' of various ministries, says Stalder, is the best way to enable the whole people of God to take part in the conciliar process of being church, that is, the process of realising the apostolic succession.[209]

As much as the local church is the whole church, all other local churches are the whole church as well. Therefore, Stalder's ecclesiology of the local church does not imply the isolation of the local church. Every local church has the task to be in communion with the other local churches, to sustain them, and to make their unity visible.[210] This mutual co-responsibility is most clearly expressed in the contacts between the bishops. The bishops are co-responsible for the other churches. This becomes visible, for example, during an episcopal ordination, but also in a synod or council of a smaller or larger territorial range.[211] According to Stalder it is only a good thing that metropolitans on a

205 STALDER, *Die Wirklichkeit Christi erfahren*, 263.
206 STALDER, *Die Wirklichkeit Christi erfahren*, 110-111, 241-242.
207 STALDER, *Die Wirklichkeit Christi erfahren*, 116; cf. 100, 190, 257, 267.
208 STALDER, *Die Wirklichkeit Christi erfahren*, 119, 121, 124, 205. This position is critically evaluated in paragraph 8.4.4.
209 STALDER, *Die Wirklichkeit Christi erfahren*, 100-101, 115; cf. 126-141.
210 STALDER, *Die Wirklichkeit Christi erfahren*, 107, 112-113, 117, 203, 206, 241-242.
211 STALDER, *Die Wirklichkeit Christi erfahren*, 214, 220-221, 223-224.

provincial and the bishop of Rome on a universal level should preside over such gatherings, as long as they do not take the decisions on their own, but enable and lead the conciliar process of finding the truth.[212]

4.5.9 The Eucharist

At the heart of every local church is the eucharist. In Stalder's view of the apostolic, post-apostolic and Early Church—which is the background for his ecclesiology of the local church—the eucharist is central to the life of the church. As the church is, for Stalder, primarily described in terms of being restored by Christ to communion with God and each other, the eucharist is the paramount expression of this unity both with each other as members of Christ's body, and with Christ as the head of this body.[213]

Presider at the eucharist is the bishop, or a presbyter as one of the bishop's co-ministers. The necessity of such a presider is not grounded in questions of 'validity', but in the ecclesiological embedding of the eucharist. A eucharist without the community—and therefore, a eucharist without a link with the presider of the community—is not the eucharist because in that case it is not an ecclesial event. 'By the presence of the bishop or his deputy, the ecclesial place and character of the eucharist as *communio* is retained.'[214] Bishops and priests are no 'masters of the eucharist' (*Herren der Eucharistie*). They do not have the 'right' to celebrate, or the *potestas consecrandi*. They do have the task—the obligation—to celebrate the eucharist with the people.[215]

The eucharist is the place where everything has to take place which has constitutive and ordering meaning for the community, because the eucharist itself is constitutive and ordering for the church. 'Thus, the community of the church is constitutive for the eucharist and the eucharist is constitutive for the community of the church; one cannot have one without the other.'[216] Participating in the eucharistic celebration is, and requires, partaking in the whole communal life of the church.[217]

212 STALDER, *Die Wirklichkeit Christi erfahren*, 109, 117. Old Catholics acknowledge 'the church of the city of Rome, according to the order of the Early Church, as the first among the local churches, and its bishop as the first among the bishops'; K. STALDER & H. ALDENHOVEN, 'Rom, Küng und die Zukunft der Ökumene in christkatholischer Sicht', *IKZ* 70 (1980), 71-76, at 74 ('die Kirche der Stadt Rom nach altkirchlicher Ordnung als die rangerste unter den Ortskirchen und ihren Bischof als ersten unter den Bischöfen').

213 STALDER, *Die Wirklichkeit Christi erfahren*, 35, 68-69.

214 STALDER, *Die Wirklichkeit Christi erfahren*, 75 ('Durch die Anwesenheit des Bischofs oder seines Beauftragten wird der ekklesiale Ort und Charakter der Eucharistie als communio festgehalten'); cf. 69, 76, 103-104, 267.

215 STALDER, *Die Wirklichkeit Christi erfahren*, 75, 255.

216 STALDER, *Die Wirklichkeit Christi erfahren*, 103 ('Die Gemeinschaft der Kirche ist darum für die Eucharistie und die Eucharistie für die Gemeinschaft der Kirche konstitutiv; man kann keines ohne das andere haben'); cf. 89, 97, 132.

217 STALDER, *Die Wirklichkeit Christi erfahren*, 103.

There is still another sense in which Stalder brings the eucharist in connection to his ecclesiology of the local church. The local church is the whole church, he says, because the whole Christ is present in the eucharist. Everywhere where the eucharist is celebrated, the whole Christ and the whole church become present.[218]

Stalder warns for a reduced understanding of the church. Church should be about every part of every human's life. Therefore, church is not only the liturgical celebration. However, the liturgy is the main expression of the ultimate meaning of salvation—living in communion with God and one another.[219]

4.5.10 Conclusion

All the aspects which have been discussed above, are interrelated in Stalder's thought. He therefore deplores the fact that this interdependence is so often neglected. Particularly the interdependence of church, eucharist and ministry can, says Stalder, rescue the church from becoming individualist, clerical and in the end trivial.[220] Stalder presents a coherent view of the Christian faith in which such elements as the Trinity, salvation, communion, the church, the eucharist and ministry are mutually dependent and explain each other.

The theological change he has described in hindsight and which was mentioned in the opening of this section on Stalder, can be interpreted as a gradual change towards thinking along the lines of a liturgical ecclesiology. Communion as the heart of salvation and the church, the eucharist as the centre of the church's life, the interplay between laity and clergy, together forming the local church which is the whole church, are all particularly strong elements of a liturgical or eucharistic ecclesiology.

4.6 JAN VISSER

4.6.1 Life and Work

In the chorus of Old Catholic ecclesiologists, Jan Visser (born 1931) is the first who thoroughly combines Systematic Theology with Practical Theology. After his theological studies and training for the ministry at the Old Catholic Seminary, then based at Amersfoort (the Netherlands), and his doctorate on

218 STALDER, *Die Wirklichkeit Christi erfahren*, 202, 266.
219 STALDER, *Die Wirklichkeit Christi erfahren*, 111; cf. 295, 303-306.
220 STALDER, *Die Wirklichkeit Christi erfahren*, 102, 115, 119.

seventeenth-century Dutch (Old) Catholic spirituality,[221] which he received from the Old Catholic faculty of the University of Berne, Visser developed an interest in pastoral psychology. After having served two parishes, he worked as a pastoral theologian at the Universities of Nijmegen and Utrecht. When the Old Catholic Seminary closed its doors as a residential college and became an institution affiliated to the theological faculty of Utrecht University, Jan Visser became the first to hold the extraordinary chair of the Old Catholic Seminary at Utrecht University (1976-1996). During nearly all of this period, he combined his pastoral-psychological work in the theological faculty with his professorship and with his responsibility as Principal of the Old Catholic Seminary.[222] Not surprisingly, his ecclesiological thought is deeply influenced by insights from the Social Sciences and, more particularly, from Practical Theology.[223]

4.6.2 A Hermeneutical Approach

Already in his first article in the Old Catholic academic journal—the *Internationale Kirchliche Zeitschrift*—Visser hints at what would become his main interest: to connect the (Old Catholic) tradition in its fullest sense with contemporary thought and culture in its fullest sense. A seamingly technical article on the doctrine of grace in Jansenism becomes a plea for an understanding of the Christian faith in such a way that it can be experienced as relevant by contemporary people. In this article, the necessity of a hermeneutical approach is already indicated.[224]

Hermeneutics refer, for Visser, to the handing-on of tradition from one culturally determined form (of the past) into another culturally determined form (of the present). Inculturation, he says, is not the adaptation into contemporary terms of something which previously had been absolute and objective, but the adaptation into contemporary terms of something which previously had been adapted into the contemporary terms of another era.[225] Like the mannah in the desert, the 'costly bread of tradition' cannot be kept overnight.[226]

221 J. VISSER, *Rovenius und seine Werke. Beitrag zur Geschichte der nordniederländischen katholischen Frömmigkeit in der ersten Hälfte des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Assen: Van Gorcum/Prakke, 1966).

222 J.J. HALLEBEEK & J.L. WIRIX, 'Ten geleide', in: Hallebeek & Wirix (eds.), *Met het oog op morgen*, VII-IX.

223 For other insights from Practical Theology, cf. section 6.6 (Albert Ploeger & Joke Ploeger-Grotegoed).

224 J. VISSER, 'Zur Erlösungs- und Gnadenlehre', *IKZ* 59 (1969), 278-293 (especially 279-280, 286, 291-292). In this article, hermeneutics refer to the understanding of Jansenius and his opponents in their time and situation, but also to the necessity of explaining grace in such a way that it will be understandable for people in our own time.

225 J. VISSER, 'Kirchenstruktur und Glaubensvermittlung', *IKZ* 79 (1989), 174-191, at 186.

226 J. VISSER, 'Zusammenfassung und Zukunftsvision', *IKZ* 85 (1995), 61-69, at 65.

The ecclesiologically most important aspect of the contemporary context is its individualism. The time of the *Volkskirche* is over. Every church has to choose between being either a counter-world of its own (a *societas perfecta* in its nineteenth-century sense) or a 'denomination'—a religious body within and as part of society. The members of such a church will only partially identify themselves with their church. The Old Catholic Churches—particularly in Western Europe—have chosen the denominational model. This means that these churches find themselves in the situation of contributing to people's lives inasmuch those people invite the church to do so. According to Visser, it is the task of such a church, not to regard itself as the opponent of modern culture, but to strive to become a place where genuine community can be found with respect for everybody's individual biography, while at the same time expressing solidarity with the 'poor' within society.[227] Visser thinks the other choice—becoming a closed anti-cultural world of its own—is no longer a real possibility. Such a romantic *Gemeinschaft*, if understood as closed to the world outside, is not an option, as the decline of ecclesiastical organisations prove. The other extreme, however, is also dismissed by Visser. The church cannot reduce itself to serving random individual needs and wishes. Visser pleads for an intersubjective dealing with the Christian tradition—on the one hand, everybody's individuality is to be respected, while, on the other hand, the discovery of the transcendent and the search for orientation and spirituality is, from the point of view of the Christian tradition, to be explored not individually but by means of (small) communities. The church should make it possible for people to come together in small circles to grow spiritually by learning from each other.[228] In a personal address to an international Old Catholic Congress, Visser says, 'I do not hope to be saved alone, but in Christ I will find the consummation of my personal life in the new community of the body of Christ'. The church should be a community in between coerced uniformity on the one and non-commitment on the other hand.[229]

4.6.3 The Church

Visser is prepared to regard the church as auxiliary to 'the Message, the Gospel'. Nevertheless, even if the church is only auxiliary, it is still

227 J. VISSER, 'Ökumene—Welt—Utrechter Union: Die Aufgabe der altkatholischen Kirche', *IKZ* 84 (1994), 92-113, at 104-107; cf. VISSER, 'Old Catholic Spirituality', 96-108, at 108.

228 J. VISSER, 'Ik en de ander of de ander en ik', in: C. Bakker & R.R. Ganzevoort (eds.), *Omgaan met de ander. Afscheidscolleges van Jan Visser en Piet Steegman* (Utrecht: Faculteit der Godgeleerdheid van de Universiteit Utrecht, 1994), 21-41, at 39-40.

229 VISSER, 'Zusammenfassung und Zukunftsvision', 64, 66 ('Ich hoffe nicht, dass nur ich gerettet werden soll, aber in Christo werde ich die Erfüllung meines persönlichen Lebens finden in der neuen Gemeinschaft des Leibes Christi'). In the introductory section of this chapter, another example of Visser's hermeneutical approach has been mentioned: the Early Church as a hermeneutical principle; cf. paragraph 4.1.4.

indispensable to promote the gospel. The church is not the 'light', but the 'lampstand'. Still, the light has to be placed upon the lampstand and not under the basket.[230] In one of his earlier writings, Visser could even say that the doctrine of the church is at the heart of being Old Catholic.[231]

As an Old Catholic, Visser stands in the tradition of an ecclesiology of the local church.[232] Visser distinguishes between two basic types of ecclesiology. On the one hand, there is a concept of the church as a legal corporation, an entity closed in itself (*societas perfecta*, 'a counter-world of its own'),[233] ultimately leading to the absolutist, universalist church of the First Vatican Council. Visser explains the emergence of this type against the background of the French Revolution and the rise of autonomous national states, as well as against the background of the increasing insecurity in matters of faith, stemming from the Enlightenment. In the latter sense, the declaration of an infallible spiritual leader can, says Visser, be regarded as an unfortunate result of the understandable effort to meet a pastoral need.[234] Even since the Second Vatican Council, this Roman Catholic tendency to approach ecclesiological problems in a primarily legal way has not disappeared.[235] Moreover, the pontificate of Pope John Paul II has, according to Visser, reinforced this first ecclesiological concept as the paramount concept within the leading circles of the Roman Catholic Church.[236]

On the other hand, there is a concept of the church as a communion (*communio*) or community (*gemeenschap*). According to Visser, this concept

230 J. VISSER, *De kandelaar van het licht. Over het probleem van de kerkstructuren* (Amersfoort: COKB, 1976), 3; cf. J. VISSER, 'De geloofsleer [1]', in: P.J. Maan *et al.*, *De Oud-Katholieke Kerk van Nederland. Leer en leven* (Hilversum: Gooi & Sticht, 1979), 91-115, at 114-115; J. VISSER, 'De geloofsleer [2]', in: A.K.H. Berlis *et al.*, *De Oud-Katholieke Kerk van Nederland. Leer en leven* (Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum, 2000), 163-191, at 189-190.

231 VISSER, 'De geloofsleer [1]', 102 ('Men kan zelfs zeggen dat de leer over de kerk het hartstuk vormt van het oud-katholiek zijn'). In the revised edition, this bold statement has disappeared; cf. VISSER, 'De geloofsleer [2]', 175.

232 Cf. paragraph 4.5.8 (The Local Church).

233 VISSER, 'Kirchenstruktur und Glaubensvermittlung', 176 ('eine eigene Gegenwelt').

234 J. VISSER, 'Überlegungen zu Hans Küngs Buch "Unfehlbar?"', *IKZ* 61 (1971), 272-287, at 276; VISSER, *De kandelaar van het licht*, 6-14; J. VISSER, 'De oud katholieken en het Petrusambt', in: J. van der Lans *et al.*, *Petrusambt: tot uw dienst* (Nijmegen: Theologische Faculteit van de Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen, 1985), 47-54, at 48-49; VISSER, 'Kirchenstruktur und Glaubensvermittlung', 178-179; J. VISSER, 'Het licht onder de korenmaat?', in: J. Visser *et al.*, *Staat de kerk haar eigen boodschap in de weg?* (Amersfoort: COKB, 1998), 37-55, at 43-44; J. VISSER, 'Tradition, Unfehlbarkeit und Primat', in: Berlis & Ring (eds.), *Im Himmel Anker werfen*, 355-368, at 355-358.

235 J. VISSER, 'Die Beziehungen zwischen dem Vatikan und der Utrechter Union aus altkatholischer Sicht', in: H. Gerny, H. Rein, M. Weyermann (eds.), *Die Wurzel aller Theologie: Sentire cum Ecclesia. Festschrift zum 60. Geburtstag von Urs von Arx* (Bern: Stämpfli, 2003), 309-325, at 323-324.

236 VISSER, 'Kirchenstruktur und Glaubensvermittlung', 183 n. 17.

stems from Schleiermacher, who considered the church to be the 'ideal community' (*ideale Gemeinschaft*), a community of freedom, not constituted by external pressure, but flowing from religious conviction. In this type of ecclesiology, says Visser, liturgy occupies a central position, because in the liturgy the church is most clearly a religious organism, a true communion of people who open themselves to the divine. In the wake of Schleiermacher, Roman Catholics like Möhler have applied similar principles to Catholic ecclesiology. In this concept, the church is primarily a *communio* of the baptised, the body of Christ, in which all charisms—of clergy and laity alike—are mutually complementary. As Visser says, the German Old Catholic initiator Ignaz von Döllinger stands in this Schleiermacher-Möhler tradition. Döllinger's ecclesiology is determined by the same parameters: church as communion; eucharist as constitutive for the church as the body of Christ; freedom and co-responsibility of all baptised. For both Möhler and Döllinger, the Early Church, understood in a more or less romantic way, was the leading idea.[237]

It is Visser's conviction that the church should stand in the tradition of the second model. Visser regards the church as a communion of local communities. The supra-local means by which this communion is hold together should be organised in a conciliar way, that is, in such a way that the aims of each local community are respected within the whole.[238]

The foundation of this ecclesiology finds Visser in the Trinity:

> Father, Son and Spirit are distinguished, each of them perfectly himself, and nevertheless united in an indissoluble unity. This mystery is the essence of the church: manifesting unity in pluriformity, letting everyone be himself or herself in relation to the other.[239]

Therefore, anthropology and ecclesiology are complementary: 'The destination of man and therefore his deepest fulfillment of life is to be found in the encounter and bond with the other—with God and in him with his fellow humans.'[240] Likewise, christology and pneumatology are complementary. The

237 VISSER, *De kandelaar van het licht*, 15-17, 20.

238 VISSER, 'Kirchenstruktur und Glaubensvermittlung', 190; VISSER, 'The Old Catholic Churches', 82.

239 J. VISSER, 'Episcopus oecumenicus', in: C. van Kasteel, P.J. Maan, M.F.G. Parmentier (eds.), *Kracht in zwakheid van een kleine wereldkerk. De oud-katholieke Unie van Utrecht* (Amersfoort: COKB, 1982), 89-100, at 95 ('Vader, Zoon en Geest zijn onderscheiden, ieder volmaakt zichzelf én toch in een onlosmakelijke eenheid met elkaar verbonden. Dit geheim is het wezen van de kerk: eenheid in verscheidenheid te manifesteren, ieder zichzelf te doen zijn in verbondenheid met de ander'); cf. VISSER, 'Het licht onder de korenmaat?', 50.

240 VISSER, 'De geloofsleer [2]', 172 ('Zijn bestemming en daarmee zijn diepste levensvervulling vindt de mens in de ontmoeting en de band met de ander, met God en in hem met zijn medemens'); cf. 175, 189; J. VISSER, 'Systematisch theologische beschouwing over "De vrouw in het ambt"', in: J. Visser *et al.*, *De Haagse teksten. Referaten en*

church is not only the product of the incarnated Son of God, but also of the Holy Spirit, who gives each member of the church his or her own charism. Unity-in-pluriformity is the work of the Spirit. The Spirit brings all the redeemed together into one new community determined by love.[241]

4.6.4 The Eucharist

Visser traces this interaction between individuality and community back to a seventeenth-century tradition within Dutch Catholicism. A serious personal piety with individualist tendencies was counterbalanced by an emphasis on participation in the official liturgy of the church—Mass and Vespers. Personal inner devotion was nourished by public liturgy.[242]

Standing in this tradition, Visser finds the ecclesiastical phenomenon *par excellence* in the liturgical celebration: 'in that which is specifically ecclesial—the liturgy'. Visser pleads for a simple, transparent liturgy which should never loose its transcendental character. Transcending everyday reality in hope of God's future is, according to Visser, one of the main goals of the liturgical celebration. Not verbalisation or moralisation, but transcending the *status quo* is the power of liturgy.[243] The liturgy opens up God's future. It is 'a window, through which we see the salvation of humankind in the kingdom of God'. Therefore, the liturgy is 'the unique feature of the church, which none other societal institution can replace'. In the centre of the church, says Visser, is the celebration of the eucharist.[244] The sacraments—particularly baptism and the eucharist—are 'acts which constitute new fellowship and in which a foretaste of the consummated kingdom of God can be found.'[245]

Although Visser, as a practical theologican, regards it as very important that the church becomes more aware of the insights of the social sciences for its

beschouwingen op de studiedagen 'Vrouw en kerkelijk ambt' 18-20 januari 1994 (Amersfoort: COKB, 1995), 35-48, at 38-40.

241 VISSER, 'De geloofsleer [2]', 174-175.

242 VISSER, 'Old Catholic Spirituality', 99-101; cf. 104, 106, 107. Cf. the characteristics of the Neo-Gallican liturgy described in paragraph 4.1.3. In his doctoral dissertation on the seventeenth-century bishop Rovenius, Visser stresses rather the one-sidedness of this spirituality, in which even the common liturgy primarily served the spiritual needs of the individual; VISSER, *Rovenius und seine Werke*, 151-153; cf. 43, 96.

243 VISSER, 'Kirchenstruktur und Glaubensvermittlung', 190 ('in dem, was spezifisch kirchlich ist, nämlich in der Liturgie'); cf. VISSER, 'Ik en de ander of de ander en ik', 40.

244 VISSER, 'Zusammenfassung und Zukunftsvision', 65 ('Die Liturgie ist wie ein Fenster, durch das wir das Heil der Menschen im Reiche Gottes sehen, das in der Lebenswelt des Alltags nicht gegenwärtig ist. Das ist das Einzigartige der Kirche, das keine andere gesellschaftliche Institution ersetzen kann. So ist gesagt: Im Zentrum steht die Feier des Herrenmahls').

245 VISSER, 'De geloofsleer [2]', 177 ('daden die nieuwe gemeenschap stichten en waarin een voorproef ligt van het voltooide koninkrijk van God'); cf. VISSER, 'Systematisch theologische beschouwingen', 41.

community building, he underlines that the unique manifestation of the church is and remains the eucharist.[246] By the Spirit, Christ is present in the eucharist, and because all share in the same gifts, all are united into one fellowship.[247] According to Visser, this eucharistic-ecclesiological line of thought has relatively recently become dominant within Old Catholic ecclesiology by mediation of Orthodox theologians.[248]

4.6.5 The Bishop

Visser regards the bishop as the principal eucharistic presider. This is the case, because the eucharist is for Visser the paramount manifestation of the church's unity-in-diversity, and the bishop the paramount guarantor of this unity.[249]

Visser does not believe in the theory that regards the bishop as no more than a priest with enlarged jurisdiction. Moreover, he rejects the whole attitude of describing a ministry in terms of jurisdiction. Comparing the bishop to the priest is, according to Visser, based on the centrality of sacrificial, sacerdotal priesthood, which is not the original understanding of the presbyter. Rather, he says, the priest should be compared to the bishop. As a member of the presbyterial college, 'the priest is of assistance to the bishop'.[250] *Episkope* is exercised by the bishop and his presbyterium, in the context of the whole church with its many ministries. In this context, the bishop has the primary task to symbolically represent *and* actively maintain or regain unity.[251]

In Visser's words, 'the aim of tradition [...] is the building up of community'. Therefore, it is the bishop's task to strive for *koinonia* in every concrete situation. The community of faith is not only built up by the transmission of the *depositum fidei*, but also by the creative, communicative presentation of tradition so that it is experienced as relevant by new communities in every time and place.[252]

Visser draws two conclusions from this. In the first place, the bishop, having been a theologian in the Early Church and an administrator in the Middle Ages, should in modern times primarily be 'a successful communicator', a '*pontifex*, or builder of bridges'. Christianity's core is not a dogmatic formulation but a person—Jesus Christ—and therefore Christianity is

246 VISSER, 'Episcopus oecumenicus', 95.
247 VISSER, 'De geloofsleer [1]', 102; cf. 105, 108, 113-114.
248 VISSER, 'The Old Catholic Churches', 78-79. Visser mentions the Orthodox Zizioulas and the Old Catholics Stalder, Aldenhoven and von Arx.
249 J. VISSER, 'Episcopacy Today: An Old Catholic View', in: P. Moore (ed.), *Bishops: But What Kind? Reflections on Episcopacy* (London: SPCK, 1982), 41-50, at 49; VISSER, 'Episcopus oecumenicus', 91.
250 VISSER, 'De geloofsleer [2]', 178 ('de priester staat de bisschop bij').
251 VISSER, 'Episcopus oecumenicus', 90-91; VISSER, 'De geloofsleer [2]', 188.
252 VISSER, 'Episcopacy Today', 43-46.

best represented by a communicative person—the bishop—fostering personal relationships that form the community of the church.[253]

In the second place, in the context of a church broken into many denominations, maintaining or regaining unity implies that the bishop has a thoroughly ecumenical task. Visser does not make it a secret that he regards the ministry of the bishop as essential for the church. But *how* does he see this essential ministry? Not as a 'monarchical episcopate' which enforces its decisions upon its people, but as a presiding ministry in collegiality with presbyters, deacons and the ministries of all the members of the church. Not as a bishop who is firstly a member of the universal episcopal college, but as a bishop who is firstly the bishop of his diocese, which he represents within the universal church. His task is, therefore, to foster unity within the geographical area of his diocese. Rather than asking a non-episcopal church to 'restore' episcopacy, Visser asks the bishop of an episcopal church to be a champion of unity in such a sense 'that he takes initiatives to relativise those [denominational] boundaries and, if necessary, cross them creatively and progressively, in order to restore the unity of the Christians within the territory of his diocese'.[254]

The same is true on the universal level. Some kind of primacy is needed in order to express unity and universality. Such a primate should not be the one who takes the decisions on his own, but the one who enables the process of 'finding the truth' by all members of the church. Therefore, says Visser, Old Catholics insist on the embedding of primacy in the episcopal and synodal structures of the church.[255] Consequently, Visser on the one hand maintains that the current definition and exercise of the Roman primacy is not acceptable to Old Catholics. On the other hand, he welcomes Roman Catholic communion ecclesiology insofar as it re-reads and re-receives Vatican I into a more collegial and dialogical direction.[256]

4.6.6 Conclusion

In his valedictory lecture, Jan Visser confessed that the many areas of his working life sometimes led him to the brink of a disintegrated personality.[257] There is, nevertheless, a consistent line throughout his various tasks in theology,

253 VISSER, 'Episcopacy Today', 47-49.

254 VISSER, 'Episcopus oecumenicus', 98 ('dat hij initiatieven nam om die grenzen te relativeren, en zonodig op creatieve en progressieve wijze te overschrijden om binnen het gebied van zijn bisdom de eenheid der christenen te herstellen'); cf. 91, 96, 100 n. 13; VISSER, 'Episcopacy Today', 49-50; VISSER, 'Het licht onder de korenmaat?', 53-54.

255 J. VISSER, 'De oorzaken van 1723', in: J. Visser, F. Smit, P.J. Maan, *Onafhankelijk van Rome, toch katholiek. 250 jaar oud-katholieke geschiedenis* (Hilversum: Gooi & Sticht, 1973), 12-22, at 21; VISSER, 'De oud katholieken en het Petrusambt', 52.

256 VISSER, 'Tradition, Unfehlbarkeit und Primat', 364-365.

257 VISSER, 'Het licht onder de korenmaat?', 54.

psychology and the church. Visser has remained faithful to at least two basic convictions—firstly, the priceless worth of the Old Catholic theological and ecclesiological tradition in view of the religious need of people and in view of the ecumenical rapprochement of the churches, and secondly, the indispensable need of a hermeneutic, open and trustful way of dealing with this tradition within (post-) modern secularised society. What Visser intends is to be fully immersed into tradition and (post-) modernity at the same time.

Apart from his understanding of the Early Church as a hermeneutical principle, which was encountered in the introductory section of this chapter,[258] the following aspects of Visser's thought are important to be kept in mind during our quest for a liturgical or eucharistic ecclesiology. Firstly, there is his conviction that the search for new forms and interpretations does not necessarily mean a departure from tradition. Secondly, this is given concrete form, for example, in his plea for an understanding of episcopal ministry in such a way that it is not ecumenically devisive but—'creatively and progressively'—uniting. Thirdly, it is remarkable that even within his (post-) modern view of church and society the eucharist can still be—and still is—the central symbol or metaphor[259] of the church, its fellowship and its foretasted future. Finally, Visser shows how the trinitarian and *lokalkirchliche* ecclesiological concepts of the Old Catholic tradition can serve an open, non-authoritarian, conciliar understanding of the Christian church in a (post-) modern world.

4.7 HERWIG ALDENHOVEN

4.7.1 Life and Work

Born in Vienna, Herwig Aldenhoven (1933-2002) studied theology at the Old Catholic theological faculty of the University of Berne, where he excelled in languages and systematic thinking. After a pastorate in the Swiss Old Catholic Church, Aldenhoven became Professor of Systematic Theology and Liturgics in the same faculty at the age of 38. He retained this chair until his retirement in 2000. Notwithstanding the systematic and sometimes technical character of his academic work, Aldenhoven has had a large influence on the development of Old Catholic ecclesiological and liturgical self-understanding. It is the aim of this section to enfold something of this.

[258] Cf. paragraph 4.1.4.
[259] Cf. VISSER, 'Systematisch theologische beschouwingen', 43.

4.7.2 A Trinitarian Ecclesiology

In contemporary Old Catholic ecclesiology, Aldenhoven's 1980 article 'Das ekklesiologische Selbstverständnis der Altkatholischen Kirchen' (The Ecclesiological Self-Understanding of the Old Catholic Churches) has gained a kind of canonical status.[260] It seems, therefore, appropriate to take this article as a starting point for these reflections on Aldenhoven's thought.

The article begins with the proposition that Old Catholic self-understanding is determined by ecclesiology. Being Old Catholic is laying emphasis on the ecclesiological tradition which can be traced from the Early Church, through the Conciliar movement of the Middle Ages and the non-papalist movements within the post-Tridentine church, to the protests against the decisions of the First Vatican Council. This is not to say, Aldenhoven adds, that Old Catholics are only occupied with their own internal ecclesiastical affairs. Ecclesiology, he asserts, has to do with the position of the church in all its aspects, including its relationship to the world.[261]

Basing himself on the writings of Rinkel, Küry, Stalder and Küppers, Aldenhoven starts his ecclesiology at its heart—at the trinitarian life of communion, in which God calls people to participate. Being redeemed means being drawn into communion with God, each other and the whole creation. Being called by the one Lord and having received the one Spirit makes us into 'one We'. The church is the concrete realisation of this communion, which consists in community with each other, readiness to reconciliation with each other, and mutual love. Even if this is not fully realised in the empirical church, it should be the church's aim and goal. It is its *raison d'être*.[262]

In the wake of this fundamental ecclesiology, Aldenhoven recalls the concept of personhood which was encountered in this chapter primarily in the thought of Stalder. A 'person' is not an 'individual'. Personhood—at least personhood as understood in trinitarian theology and Christian anthropology—can only exist in the mutuality of community, as much as community can only exist because of free, responsible persons.[263]

An aspect which Aldenhoven explicitly adds, is the fact that the kingdom of God is not yet consummated. If the church shows signs of community,

260 Cf., e.g., VON ARX, 'The Old Catholic Churches', 182-185.

261 H. ALDENHOVEN, 'Das ekklesiologische Selbstverständnis der Altkatholischen Kirchen', *Österreichisches Archiv für Kirchenrecht* 31 (1980), 401-430, at 401-403.

262 ALDENHOVEN, 'Das ekklesiologische Selbstverständnis', 405; H. ALDENHOVEN, 'Der Zusammenhang der Frage des Ausgangs des Heiligen Geistes mit dem Leben der Kirche', in: L. Vischer (ed.), *Geist Gottes—Geist Christi. Ökumenische Überlegungen zur Filioque-Kontroverse* (Frankfurt: Lembeck, 1981), 134-143, at 140; cf. H. ALDENHOVEN, 'Einheit und Verschiedenheit von Bischofs- und Priesteramt im Licht eines trinitarischen Kirchenverständnisses', *IKZ* 72 (1982), 145-151; H. ALDENHOVEN, 'Trinitarische Analogien und Ortskirchenekklesiologie', *IKZ* 92 (2002), 65-75.

263 ALDENHOVEN, 'Das ekklesiologische Selbstverständnis', 407. Cf. paragraph 4.5.4.

reconciliation and love, these are signs of the coming kingdom, but the full coming of this kingdom is still to be expected from God. Part of this eschatological reserve is the fact that God's salvation is destined to embrace all people and the whole creation, so that the divine-human communion which is the church, has still to be widened until the whole of creation will be part of with this communion. The whole earth, Aldenhoven adds, includes the ecology of this earth. As the church confesses the redemption of the whole earth, and celebrates the highest value of earthly elements—water, bread, wine—in its sacraments, the church should also realise its responsibility towards this very earth.[264]

4.7.3 An Ecclesiology of the Local Church

Aldenhoven sketches a short history of the ecclesiology of the local church insofar as it can be found in the thought of Old Catholic theologians. He takes the first bishop of the German Old Catholics, Joseph Hubert Reinkens (1821-1896), as his starting point. For Reinkens, the local church—in what Aldenhoven calls 'the theologically strictest sense of the word, that is, the diocesan [church]'—is the catholic church. Full catholicity is present in each local church. This line of thought, says Aldenhoven, has been worked out systematically by the Berne Professors Ernst Gaugler (1891-1963) and Kurt Stalder. Since then, reinforced by the contacts with the Orthodox—Aldenhoven mentions Afanasiev and Zizioulas—this ecclesiology of the local church has become mainstream Old Catholic ecclesiology.[265]

According to Aldenhoven, it is in the agreed statements of the Orthodox—Old Catholic dialogue, that this ecclesiology of the local church was formulated for the first time in such a way that one can speak of a eucharistic ecclesiology.[266] This dialogue took place from 1975 to 1987—of the authors mentioned in this chapter, Küppers, Stalder, Aldenhoven and von Arx were members of the dialogue commission—and reached full theological consensus, which is unique in the bilateral dialogues of the Orthodox with any church.[267] In

264 ALDENHOVEN, 'Das ekklesiologische Selbstverständnis', 407-408, 429; ALDENHOVEN, 'Trinitarische Analogien und Ortskirchenekklesiologie', 66-67.

265 ALDENHOVEN, 'Das ekklesiologische Selbstverständnis', 410-411; cf. H. ALDENHOVEN, 'Orthodoxes und altkatholisches Kirchenverständnis', in: *Hundert Jahre Christkatholisch-theologische Fakultät der Universität Bern* (Bern: Stämpfli, 1974), 41-55 (*passim*; esp. 55).

266 Cf. section 7.8 (Orthodox—Old Catholic dialogue).

267 U. VON ARX, 'Kurze Einführung in die Geschichte des orthodox-altkatholischen Dialogs', in: U. von Arx (ed.), *Koinonia auf altchristlischer Basis. Deutsche Gesamtausgabe der gemeinsamen Texte des orthodox-altkatholischen Dialogs 1975-1987 mit französischer und englischer Übersetzung* (Bern: Stämpfli, 1989), 11-26, at 20, 23. Cf. the statement of the Swiss Metropolitan Damaskinos, 'Thus we have proved that there is no essential opposition between East and West within Christianity'. D. PAPANDREOU, 'Die gegenseitige ekklesiologische Anerkennung', in: Gerny, Rein, Weyermann (eds.), *Die Wurzel aller*

the ecclesiological part of the document, the following formulation is to be found, which is cited by Aldenhoven: 'The one Church on earth exists in the many local Churches whose life is centred on the celebration of Holy Eucharist in the communion with the lawful bishop and his priests'.[268]

Aldenhoven continues with the warning that no local church should regard itself as independent from the other local churches. Exactly because every local church possesses the same full catholicity, the local churches should be in communion with each other. Each local church is, as it were, a 'corporate personality' that 'loves' the other corporate personalities. This communion of love between all local churches is most effectively expressed by councils, synods or bishops' conferences, not as institutions above the local churches, but as articulations of the mind of the church. Therefore, conciliar decisions can only be said to express the mind of the church if there are accepted in a process of reception.[269] Aldenhoven says 'that the universal church does not ontologically precede the local churches, but *exists as* local churches'.[270]

Ecumenism is seen in the same perspective. According to Aldenhoven, ecumenical agreement exists when two or more local churches mutually acknowledge that they are essentially identical. This view is in line with Küry's, who likewise said that ecumenism is not to be reached by negotiating, but by assessing that one's church is essentially identical with another church. Following Orthodox ecclesiology, Aldenhoven affirms the principle that every local church is the whole church, and that communion between the local churches is established when a local church recognises another as having the same fullness as it has itself.[271]

Theologie, 285-291, at 285 ('So haben wir unter Beweis gestellt, dass es keinen wesentlichen Ost-West-Gegensatz innerhalb der Christenheit gibt').

268 ALDENHOVEN, 'Das ekklesiologische Selbstverständnis', 412; the text is cited from the English translation in VON ARX (ed.), *Koinonia auf altchristlicher Basis*, 190.

269 ALDENHOVEN, 'Das ekklesiologische Selbstverständnis', 412-415. Aldenhoven recalls here the difference between the Roman Catholic interpretation of episcopal collegiality (bishops—diocesan or titular—are members of the universal episcopal college lead by the Pope, by virtue of their episcopal ordination rather than by virtue of their being bishops of their local churches) and the Old Catholic, Orthodox and Anglican interpretation (bishops are primarily local diocesan bishops, who come together in the episcopal college). On the mutual 'love' of the local churches as 'corporate personalities': ALDENHOVEN, 'Trinitarische Analogien und Ortskirchenekklesiologie', 69-70.

270 ALDENHOVEN, 'Trinitarische Analogien und Ortskirchenekklesiologie', 74 ('dass die Universalkirche nicht ontologisch den Ortskirchen vorausgeht, sondern vielmehr als Ortskirchen existiert'), emphasis added.

271 ALDENHOVEN, 'Orthodoxes und altkatholisches Kirchenverständnis', 52-54; on Küry see paragraph 4.3.4.

4.7.4 The Eucharist

The community of the church and the communion of the eucharist are closely related in Aldenhoven's thought. The word *koinonia*, he says, refers to both the ecclesial community and the eucharistic communion. Moreover, it indicates that either aspect of community/communion is only effected by 'common participation' (*gemeinsame Anteilhabe*) in something external. That is, the community of the church is not rooted—at least not rooted only or primarily—in the human wish to create community. Rather, both eucharistic communion and ecclesial community are rooted in the common participation in Christ. This is, according to Aldenhoven, why eucharistic and ecclesial communion are complementary and in a sense identical. *Koinonia* is (eucharistic) communion with Christ and thereby (ecclesial) communion with each other. 'Those who celebrate the eucharist together, thereby form the church, the body of Christ in the "place" [...] where they celebrate.'[272] Referring to Rinkel, Küry, Küppers and the German Old Catholic bishop Josef Brinkhues (1913-1995), Aldenhoven concludes that it is Old Catholic teaching that 'eucharistic communion is essentially ecclesial communion'.[273]

In this context, the ecumenical problem *par excellence* is, according to Aldenhoven, not the difference in theological thought about the eucharist, important though it is,[274] but the bare *fact* that the church—and, particularly painfully, the local church in one place—is devided into denominationally separated groups. Even given the fact that the Old Catholic Churches do not refuse communion to baptised members of other churches who earnestly want to receive, this remains—according to Aldenhoven—an anomaly, because it suggests that eucharistic communion can exist without ecclesial communion, which is in Aldenhoven's pattern of thought a *contradictio in terminis*.

Aldenhoven pleads for retaining the tension between the pastoral practice of not refusing communion to anybody on the one hand and the strict theological identification of ecclesial and eucharistic communion on the other. This tension, he says, is given by the fact that the churches are still

272 H. ALDENHOVEN, 'Einladung zur Eucharistie—Eucharistiegemeinschaft—Kirchengemeinschaft', *IKZ* 77 (1987), 257-265, at 257-258 ('Diejenigen, die miteinander Eucharistie feiern, bilden also dadurch die Kirche, den Leib Christi an dem "Ort" [...] wo sie feiern').

273 ALDENHOVEN, 'Einladung zur Eucharistie—Eucharistiegemeinschaft—Kirchengemeinschaft', 259 ('Dass Eucharistiegemeinschaft ihrem Wesen nach Kirchengemeinschaft ist').

274 That eucharistic theology is important in itself can be concluded from, e.g., the Dutch Old Catholic provision that those members of other churches who receive communion in the Old Catholic Church should have faith in the eucharistic presence of the risen Christ. Cf. 'Richtlijnen voor het deelnemen aan de communie bij nog niet gerealiseerde kerkelijke gemeenschap', in: *Vademecum bij Adresboekje en Statuut* (Amersfoort: Bisschoppelijk Bureau van de Oud-Katholieke Kerk van Nederland, 2002), at 'Communie 1.2'.

denominationally separated but at the same time engaged in a process of rapprochement towards reunion. The tension is, therefore, theologically correct. Solution of the tension either way—that is, by refusing communion or by officially sanctioning 'intercommunion' in a situation of continuing separation—is in Aldenhoven's view to be avoided. Pastoral openness in an ecumenical context and theological integrity in view of the identity between eucharistic and ecclesial communion are, according to Aldenhoven, two equally necessary attitudes, as long as the denominational separation of the churches continues.[275]

Finally, the celebration of the eucharist is for Aldenhoven not only strongly linked to the church, but also to Christian life and the life of the world. As the eucharist is founded upon Christ's work and upon his commission to continue it by the power of the Spirit in the community of the church, Christian life finds its source in Christ's work and in his mandate to sanctify the whole world by the power of the Spirit in the community of the human race.[276]

4.7.5 The Ordained Ministry

All Christians represent Christ. As women and men represent Christ in a general way as baptised Christians, it is Aldenhoven's line of thought that women and men also represent Christ in a particular way as ordained ministers.[277] What, then, is the particular task of the ministry? According to Aldenhoven, the ministerial task is not to act in an 'immediate' way *in persona Christi*, concentrated in the recitation of Christ's words of institution at the eucharist. Rather, the ministerial task is to preside over the eucharistic gathering of the whole congregation. This presidency is not a delegation by the congregation, it is a commission by Christ—not in the sense of an immediate act *in persona Christi*, but as an act of presiding over the assembly of the church, which assembly—as the community in Christ and communion with Christ—is the subject of the eucharistic celebration.[278]

275 ALDENHOVEN, 'Einladung zur Eucharistie—Eucharistiegemeinschaft—Kirchengemeinschaft', 263-265.

276 H. ALDENHOVEN, 'Die spirituell-theologischen Konzequenzen der Struktur des Eucharistiegebetes', *IKZ* 70 (1980), 212-225, at 219.

277 H. ALDENHOVEN, 'Der Vorsitz bei der Eucharistie im Kontext der Bildtheologie. Fragen zur ekklesialen Christusrepräsentation durch das Priestertum', *IKZ* 88 (1998), 301-311, at 302, 307 [in English: H. ALDENHOVEN, 'Presidency at the Eucharist in the Context of the Theology of Icons: Questions about the Ecclesial Representation of Christ by the Priesthood', *Anglican Theological Review* 84 (2002), 703-712, at 706, 709]. Aldenhoven' argument in favour of the ordination of women is rooted in the incarnation, of which he regards neither Jesus's being a circumcised Jew nor his manhood as essential characteristics, but his becoming human, a humanity which is shared by women and men alike and which therefore can be iconically represented by women as well as men (309; English: 710-711). This concurs with Rowan Williams's view; cf. paragraph 5.6.8.

278 ALDENHOVEN, 'Die spirituell-theologischen Konzequenzen', 220-221.

Aldenhoven explicitly criticises Küry for rooting the special function of the bishop in the fact that the bishop works in the sphere of the universal church and the priest in the sphere of the parish. A distinction between parish and diocese, Aldenhoven says, 'does definitely not belong to the essence of the church'.[279] A diocese made up of several parishes should in principle and in practice try to understand itself as one church.[280] Priests who preside over a parish do not, according to Aldenhoven, exercise a 'genuinely presbyteral' function, but a 'delegated episcopal function'. It is the function of the bishop to represent the unity and 'oneness' of the local church (the diocese, either consisting of one community or of a group of communities), as well as the unity and 'oneness' of God and Christ. It is the function of the presbyterium to represent the communal character of the church, reflected in the collegiality of the ministry. Both are indispensable aspects of the ministry of the church. The one is not placed hierarchically above the others, they rather find themselves in a relationship of mutuality. Both ministries *together* represent 'unity and community'.[281]

Aldenhoven regards it as essential that the ministry of each complete church—each 'local church'—should include both the bishop and the college of presbyters. In other words, the bishop is not someone who works on another, more 'universal' level than the priests. All belong essentially to one and the same church, the local church, 'which in its concrete place is the manifestation of the whole essence of the church'.[282]

Like other Old Catholic authors already encountered, Aldenhoven presents as Old Catholic teaching that the apostolic succession is not some kind of sacramental power transmitted from bishop to bishop by their ordination, but the gift of continuity which is given to and exercised by the whole church. The laying-on of hands in a line of succession is an important element of this

279 ALDENHOVEN, 'Das ekklesiologische Selbstverständnis', 421 ('sicher nicht zum Wesen der Kirche gehört'); ALDENHOVEN, 'Einheit und Verschiedenheit von Bischofs- und Priesteramt', 145-146. On Küry see paragraph 4.3.5. Aldenhoven's criticism of Küry is not related to Küry's conclusion that the church needs the episcopate as well as the presbyterate, which Aldenhoven affirms, but to the argument used by Küry. This internal Old Catholic discussion can be seen as a sign that the eucharistic ecclesiology of the later generations not only continues but also carries forward the mainstream Old Catholic theology of the earlier generations. Cf. paragraph 4.9.3.

280 ALDENHOVEN, 'Einladung zur Eucharistie—Eucharistiegemeinschaft—Kirchengemeinschaft', 258.

281 ALDENHOVEN, 'Das ekklesiologische Selbstverständnis', 422 ('eine delegierte bischöfliche Funktion [...] keine eigentlich presbyterale'); ALDENHOVEN, 'Einheit und Verschiedenheit von Bischofs- und Priesteramt', 147 ('Einheit und Gemeinschaft'); cf. 147-151.

282 ALDENHOVEN, 'Einheit und Verschiedenheit von Bischofs- und Priesteramt', 148 ('die ja am konkreten Ort das ganze Wesen der Kirche vergegenwärtigt').

succession—Aldenhoven says, 'particularly important as a sign'—but not the most important one.[283]

Stalder's emphasis on the 'over against' relationship between clergy and laity is reiterated by Aldenhoven. Moreover, the latter roots this relationship in the intra-trinitarian relationship of Son and Spirit, which is characterised by reciprocity and not, as the Western *filioque* suggests, by a dependence of the Spirit on the Son. If Son and Spirit are not in an hierarchical, but in an equal and mutually interdependent relationship to each other, the same must be true of clergy and laity.[284]

4.7.6 Primacy

Aldenhoven acknowledges the fact that Old Catholic theologians have largely neglected the issue of universal primacy during the period between the First and the Second Vatican Council. The obvious absence of a chance to realise a kind of primacy which would be acceptable to Old Catholics, kept them from addressing the issue. Since the Second Vatican Council, however, a climate has come into existence in which the question of primacy can be discussed anew. The Old Catholic view on a universal primacy sees such a primate as someone who helps churches in finding their unity by taking initiatives to let the church make up its mind, not by taking the decisions himself.[285] That it will be the bishop of Rome who has to exercise this primacy, is for Aldenhoven a matter of course. With Stalder, he regards 'the church of the city of Rome, according to the order of the Early Church, as the first among the local churches, and its bishop as the first among the bishops'.[286] It is noteworthy that this formulation keeps the notion of primacy within an ecclesiology in which priority is given not to the ministry but to the church, and not to the universal but to the local church.

4.7.7 Conclusion

One can conclude that Aldenhoven presents a very consistent eucharistic ecclesiology. Anthropology and soteriology are thoroughly embedded in the notion of communion, which in turn is rooted in the Trinity. The church is

283 ALDENHOVEN, 'Das ekklesiologische Selbstverständnis', 423-424, 427 ('ein wichtiges—besonders zeichenhaft wichtiges—, aber nicht das wichtigste Element').

284 ALDENHOVEN, 'Das ekklesiologische Selbstverständnis', 424; ALDENHOVEN, 'Der Zusammenhang', 140-141.

285 ALDENHOVEN, 'Das ekklesiologische Selbstverständnis', 425.

286 STALDER & ALDENHOVEN, 'Rom, Küng und die Zukunft der Ökumene', 74 ('Dabei erkennen wir grundsätzlich die Kirche der Stadt Rom nach altkirchlicher Ordnung als die rangerste unter den Ortskirchen und ihren Bischof als ersten unter den Bischöfen'); ALDENHOVEN, 'Trinitarische Analogien und Ortskirchenekklesiologie', 74.

primarily the local church (diocese), and this local church is the catholic church. The local churches 'love' one another and thereby form the worldwide communion of churches. This communion is expressed by the conciliarity of its bishops.

The eucharist is the central expression of the communion of the church. Therefore, eucharistic and ecclesial communion (*koinonia*) are identical. The practice of not refusing communion to members of other denominations has to be continued in an indissoluble tension with the principle of the identity between eucharistic and ecclesial communion, a tension created by the ecclesiologically 'impossible' fact of denominational separation, particularly within one local area.

Ministry is not primarily acting *in persona Christi*, but of—commissioned by Christ—presiding over the gathering of the whole church as the body of Christ. This presiding is done in a continuous 'over against' relationship with the community, and even the ministers themselves are embedded in a relationship, as ministry expresses both unity (bishop) and community (presbyterium). All ministries belong to the local church, and all local churches are equal, because each local church *is* the church. Nevertheless, one local church and its bishop exercise a primacy, and it belongs, according to Aldenhoven, to Old Catholic ecclesiology to help shaping this primacy in such a way that it will serve the unity of all local churches.

Aldenhoven explicitly places his eucharistic ecclesiology in the context of the Old Catholic ecclesiological tradition. By doing so, Aldenhoven has contributed to a process of growing systematic consistency within the Old Catholic tradition of an ecclesiology of the local church.

4.8 URS VON ARX

4.8.1 Life and Work

One of the most recent theologians who interpret Old Catholic ecclesiology along the lines of a eucharistic ecclesiology is Urs von Arx. He was born in 1943 into a Swiss Old Catholic family, studied theology in Berne, Paris and Oxford, was parish priest between 1971 and 1986, and currently works at the Old Catholic Theological Faculty (recently re-structured as the Old Catholic Department within the Old Catholic and Protestant Theological Faculty) of the University of Berne. Since 1986 he is Professor of New Testament and Homiletics, and since 1994 also of the History of Old Catholicism.

As a continuum in the work of the Old Catholic faculty of Berne, von Arx identifies 'the questions of the structure of the ecclesial community' and questions of freedom and authority. In other words, ecclesiology in its widest sense has, according to von Arx, determined Old Catholic theology in one of its

main academic centres. The first generation approached Old Catholic ecclesiology from a rather apologetic angle. A later generation was mainly engaged with the Old Catholic heritage in discussion with the theology of Karl Barth, the paramount theme in this period being tradition and its presuppositions (traces of this approach were encountered above in the thought of Urs Küry and Kurt Stalder). The work of the present generation is characterised by von Arx as the exploration of not yet unfolded themes from the Early Church, put into systematic coherence, with the aim of helping contemporary people in their search for God and the meaning of life.[287] This exploration includes the development of trinitarian theology into a thoroughly Christian view on anthropology and community, which was encountered in the thought of Stalder and Aldenhoven, as well as the eucharistic ecclesiology of the local church, which flows from the trinitarian anthropological and ecclesiological concept. This section will discuss von Arx's contribution to this ecclesiological school within Old Catholic theology.

4.8.2 'Old Catholic Mainstream Theology'

As indicated in the introduction to this chapter, von Arx is convinced of the existence of what he 'would call the Old Catholic mainstream theology'.[288] This theology, he says, stems from the pioneers of the German-speaking Old Catholic Churches (around 1870), and was gradually accepted by the (older) Old Catholic Church of the Netherlands. Its centres are Berne, Utrecht (previously Amersfoort) and Bonn. Its literature is largely written in German and to a lesser extent in Dutch, which is one of the reasons why—still according to von Arx—this theology did not gain wide reception within the Polish and particularly the American-Polish member churches of the Old Catholic Union of Utrecht.[289]

How does von Arx define this 'Old Catholic mainstream theology'? It is a 'comparatively progressive and ecumenically minded position', characterised by a 'marked closeness to Anglican and Orthodox ecclesiology'. It is a contemporary, hermeneutical, systematic theology.[290] The local, episcopal, eucharist-centred ecclesiology which was, for example, encountered at the

287 U. VON ARX, 'Ein Porträt der christkatholischen Lehranstalt der Universität Bern', in: Esser & Ring (eds.), *Zwischen Freiheit und Gebundenheit*, 209-237, at 221 ('Fragen der Struktur der kirchlichen Gemeinschaft').

288 VON ARX, 'The Old Catholic Churches', 160; cf. paragraph 4.1.4.

289 VON ARX, 'The Old Catholic Churches', 160-161. The fact that the American-Polish Church (the Polish National Catholic Church in the USA) is no longer a member of the Union of Utrecht is not unrelated to this analysis. The analysis can be refined by pointing at the debates about ecclesiastical renewal which were, in the nineteenth century, also going on in the *Dutch* church; cf. SCHOON, *Van bisschoppelijke Cleresie tot Oud-Katholieke Kerk*, 617-666.

290 VON ARX, 'The Old Catholic Churches', 160-161.

beginning of this chapter in the recent statute's preamble, is claimed by von Arx to represent this mainstream theology as it has emerged out of a century's theological reflection within the Union of Utrecht.[291]

Von Arx acknowledges that this is a vulnerable theological position. Vulnerable on the one hand, because it is based on more than a vague religious intuition—it is based on faith in the trinitarian God who calls people into communion with himself and with one another. In a time of secularisation, this is not always a popular theological position. Especially the ecclesiological position of Old Catholic theology—'a constituted church with contours and even a goal, related to the ecclesial being of people in a communion transcending the local community'—is not the first thing people think about when it comes to religious feelings or thoughts.[292] Vulnerable on the other hand, because it asks for a conscious, distinctive way of Old Catholic theologising. As many clergy and laity in the contemporary Old Catholic Churches come from other churches, particularly from the Roman Catholic Church, it is not easy to maintain a distinctive Old Catholic theology.[293] The main lines of this theology as it is represented by Urs von Arx will now be investigated.

4.8.3 Ecclesiological Credentials

Already in one of his first publications, a contribution to the book marking the centennial (1978) of his hometown parish in Solothurn, von Arx presents his ecclesiological credentials. Like Stalder, von Arx defines the Christian faith as 'faith in God and being-in-communion-with-others'. Both belong together, and both together form the church. Church is being-in-communion with God the Trinity, who is communion in himself, and being-in-communion with our brothers and sisters. Again like Stalder, von Arx is bold to say that the church is proof of the reality of faith. Faith is only real when it manifests itself in something more tangible than an ideal or an opinion.[294]

In the second place, the church does not start at zero. For example, it does not start with Scripture—fundamental, though, as the biblical testimony is—but it has an historic continuity, which makes the Early Church of great importance for Old Catholics. Von Arx acknowledges that 'the undivided church of the first

291 VON ARX, 'Vorwort', 8.

292 U. VON ARX, 'Was wird bleiben? Ein Rückblick auf ein Grundanliegen von Eduard Herzog', *IKZ* 82 (1992), 206-232, at 218 ('eine verfasste Kirche mit Konturen und gar mit einer Zielsetzung, die auf das Kirchesein von Menschen in einer übergemeindlichen Gemeinschaft bezogen ist').

293 VON ARX, 'The Old Catholic Churches', 161.

294 U. VON ARX, 'Reflexionen über Weg und Zukunft der christkatholischen Kirche', in: W. Flückiger & C. Jenzer (eds.), *Christkatholisch. Die Christkatholische Kirche der Schweiz in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Zum 100-Jahr-Jubiläum der Christkatholischen Kirchgemeinde Solothurn* (Zürich: Benziger, 1978), 207-219, at 212-213 ('Glaube an Gott und Mit-andern-in-Gemeinschaft-stehen').

millennium' is often regarded as an historical myth, but nevertheless he claims that the Early Church retains its meaning as a period in which the structures were given for a concretisation of salvation in Christ in the community of faith. The Old Catholic, says Von Arx, is not impressed by the exegetical or historical opinion that modern denominational pluralism is justified by the pluriformity of the New Testament or the Early Church. Rather, according to von Arx, the Early Church possessed and practised structures of thought which precede the later confessional—individualist and rationalist—divisions, so that a return to patristic approaches of theology, ecclesiology, liturgy and ministry would be promising for the reunion of the churches.[295]

These patristic structures, serving the concretisation of salvation-in-community, are, according to von Arx, the liturgy and the ministry. One could as well say, the local church and its liturgy. Or, the two 'sacramental principles of unity and order': the eucharist and the bishop.[296] For von Arx, the patristic concept of the church is not a centralistic super-church, but the local church in conciliar communion with all other local churches. 'Local church' is understood as the community around a bishop, regardless whether this community covers a city, a region, or even a whole country. This local church gathers in the liturgy, which is the expression of the God-given communion, and which overflows in daily life and particularly in *diakonia*.[297] It is, in other words, von Arx's conviction that the Early Church determines the ecclesiological standard characterised by the local church, around the bishop, gathered in the liturgy, continued in *diakonia*.[298]

The ecumenical position of the Old Catholic Churches is sketched by von Arx as twofold. Firstly, these churches take wholeheartedly part in the ecumenical movement from its beginnings. Secondly, however, the proper Old Catholic attitude to ecumenism does not much come to the fore in this wide movement. This attitude is determined by the conviction that reunion between churches is only possible as a common return to the principles of the Early Church. Von Arx refers to Küry, who holds—as was indicated above—the same opinion about the Old Catholic attitude towards ecumenism. This attitude has become manifest in the bilateral dialogues of the Old Catholic Churches with the Anglican and Orthodox Churches. On the practical level, Old Catholic ecclesiology implies that rapprochement and reunion are primarily a matter of the local, not the universal church.[299]

295 VON ARX, 'Reflexionen über Weg und Zukunft', 212-214.

296 VON ARX, 'Reflexionen über Weg und Zukunft', 209 ('sakramentalen Einheits- und Ordnungsprinzipien').

297 VON ARX, 'Reflexionen über Weg und Zukunft', 213-214.

298 One should notice the continuity of this view (of 1978) with the 2001 preamble to the International Bishops' Conference's statute, of which von Arx was one of the key authors; cf. paragraph 4.1.1. Cf. also VON ARX, 'The Old Catholic Churches', 169.

299 VON ARX, 'Reflexionen über Weg und Zukunft', 210-211, 214-215, 219 n. 6 and 11. On Küry, cf. paragraph 4.3.4.

Finally, von Arx emphasises that a living church can never do without a living faith. An ecclesiology of salvation-in-communion will only have a chance when people's faith consists of more than 'some theological and moral banalities'.[300] Deepening the spiritual life and enriching the knowledge about the Christian faith and church are therefore continuous concerns of von Arx besides his academic work. Building upon the foundation laid in the article just discussed, the following recurring themes can be detected throughout von Arx's writings.

4.8.4 Ecclesiology of the Local Church

Central in von Arx's thought about the church is his concept of *Ortskirchenekklesiologie* (ecclesiology of the local church). It is von Arx's thesis, that an ecclesiology of the local church has implicitly been the leading concept from the beginning of the Old Catholic movement, although it has only gradually been developed and systematised explicitly.[301] The growing awareness that Old Catholic ecclesiology is indeed based upon an ecclesiology of the local church has, according to von Arx, been stimulated by the contacts with the Orthodox and, to a lesser extent, with Anglicans, Lutherans, Roman Catholics of the communion ecclesiology school, and the Faith & Order movement.[302] In this light, von Arx states that this gradual enfolding of a consistent local, episcopal and eucharistic *Ortskirchenekklesiologie* has to be evaluated as the right interpretation of the Old Catholic ethos from the beginning.[303]

Characteristic for this ecclesiology is the thesis that every local church—understood as a diocese united in *martyria*, *leitourgia* and *diakonia*—is the catholic church, and that, because every local church is the catholic church, all local churches are in communion with each other, forming not a higher entity—a higher entity than the local church is impossible—but a communion of dioceses. All local churches are 'theologically identical', but not identical in

300 VON ARX, 'Reflexionen über Weg und Zukunft', 216 ('ein paar theologische und moralische Banalitäten').

301 U. VON ARX, 'Der ekklesiologische Charakter der Utrechter Union', *IKZ* 84 (1994), 20-61, at 32 n. 19; U. VON ARX, 'Katholizismus und Demokratie. Überlegungen eines Christkatholiken im Blick auf seine Kirche', *IKZ* 86 (1996), 80-104, at 93 n. 24; U. VON ARX, 'Strukturreform der Utrechter Union—verschiedene Denkmodelle', *IKZ* 87 (1997), 87-115, at 103; U. VON ARX, 'Was macht die Kirche katholisch? Perspektiven einer christkatholischen Antwort', in: W.W. Müller (ed.), *Katholizität—Eine ökumenische Chance* (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 2006), 147-186, at 155-170.

302 VON ARX, 'Katholizismus und Demokratie', 97-99; VON ARX, 'The Old Catholic Churches', 170.

303 VON ARX, 'Strukturreform', 103; 'beginning' meaning here the emergence of a common Old Catholic identity since the merging of different churches into the Union of Utrecht (1889).

terms of culture, sociology and the like. This understanding of identity and variety, or unity-in-diversity, is at the basis of von Arx's ecclesiological vision.[304]

In this light, ecumenism is understood as the communion between the local churches. In von Arx's thought, 'catholicity' (*Katholizität*) is primarily seen as theological, qualitative or vertical catholicity (the intrinsic catholicity of every local church), whereas geographic or horizontal catholicity is described as 'ecumenicity' (*Ökumenizität*). Every local church should be in communion with every other local church. How fits ecumenism—as generally understood—into this? In a certain sense, it does not. Our situation, in which the Christian church in one place is rather a group of denominations in more or less the same place, is an anomaly for an ecclesiology of the local church. Therefore, the rapprochement between the churches should, according to von Arx, start at the level of the local church, with the aim of creating the basic entity of an ecclesiology of the local church: one church in one place. Von Arx interprets the full communion with the Anglicans and the quest for full communion with the Orthodox in this sense—that Anglicans, Orthodox and Old Catholics recognise each other as *the* church in one place, not as mutually recognised denominations in one and the same place with 'overlapping jurisdictions'.[305]

Another ecclesiological theme which von Arx places in the context of his ecclesiology of the local church is the question of primacy. Primacy, says von Arx, is a phenomenon on many levels. Already in the Early Church, it was usual for dioceses to group into provinces, for provinces to group into patriarchates, and for the patriarchs to recognise the patriarch of Rome as their *primus inter pares*. Important to von Arx's concept is the fact that every ministry has always a personal and a collegial aspect. This is as much true of the local church—the bishop in close connection to the presbyterium—as of the supra-local structures—the metropolitan, patriarch or pope acting as primate *and* as a member of the synod of bishops. In this light, von Arx criticises the classical Old Catholic view that the pope is 'under' the council. Rather, von Arx says, the personal and the collegial always go *together*. Another critical remark which von Arx makes is that the Old Catholic recognition of the bishop of Rome's primacy has largely been without real contents. If the Old Catholic Church recognises this primacy—as it does—then, von Arx says, it has to have a real

304 VON ARX, 'Der ekklesiologische Charakter der Utrechter Union', 33; U. VON ARX, 'Identität und Differenz. Elemente einer christkatholischen Ekklesiologie und Einheitsvision', in: H. Hoping (ed.), *Konfessionelle Identität und Kirchengemeinschaft. Mit einem bibliographischen Anhang zu 'Dominus Iesus'* (Münster-Hamburg-London: LIT, 2000), 109-136; U. VON ARX, 'Ein "Petrusamt" in der Communio der Kirchen. Erwägungen aus altkatholischer Perspektive', *IKZ* 93 (2003), 1-42, at 7-9; VON ARX, 'Was macht die Kirche katholisch?', 169.

305 VON ARX, 'Der ekklesiologische Charakter', 34; VON ARX, 'Identität und Differenz', 134-136; VON ARX, 'The Old Catholic Churches', 180-181; VON ARX, 'Was macht die Kirche katholisch?', 152-155.

meaning. Von Arx sees this meaning embedded in the synodical process of all local churches, represented by their bishops. The task of a primate—on a provincial, patriarchal or universal level—should be to enable and further the synodical process of finding the truth.[306]

4.8.5 Ecclesial and Eucharistic Communion

What is the place of the liturgy within von Arx's ecclesiology of the local church? The most fundamental answer to this question is the fact that, for von Arx, ecclesial communion and eucharistic communion are identical. The common sharing (communion, *koinonia*) of the body and blood of Christ is 'the highest expression and the deepest ground for ecclesial communion'.[307] An important definition of such ecclesial communion is, 'entering into the relationship with Christ and remaining in it'.[308]

Therefore—although he does not oppose the acceptance of other Christians at communion on a basis of *non-refusal*—von Arx opposes formal *agreements of intercommunion* without full ecclesial communion. In such formal cases of 'intercommunion', he says, the criterion for the (not yet reached) full ecclesial communion is the recognition of the ordained *ministry* rather than the common faith in and celebration of the *eucharist*. This is an inversion of priorities which, still according to von Arx, endorses the clericalisation and bureaucratisation of ecclesiology and ecumenism.[309]

In von Arx's thought, the eucharist is not merely 'one sacrament among others', but the ecclesial act *par excellence* which expresses that being church is being in communion with the trinitarian God and with each other. The eucharist expresses that being church is being in *koinonia*: being 'constituted through a

306 VON ARX, 'Identität und Differenz', 121-122, 125; VON ARX, 'The Old Catholic Churches', 175-176, 184 n. 24; VON ARX, 'Ein "Petrusamt"', 9, 11-15, 42. Von Arx's observation refers to twentieth-century Old Catholic ecclesiology and practice. Before 1870, however, the Dutch Old Catholics repeatedly tried to do justice to the primacy of the bishop of Rome, considering themselves a part of the Roman Catholic Church. This was especially the case at the Provincial Council of 1763; cf. B.A. VAN KLEEF, 'Das Utrechter Provinzialkonzil vom Jahre 1763', *IKZ* 49 (1959), 197-228; 50 (1960), 65-92, 194-224, esp. at 78. For the nineteenth century, cf. SCHOON, *Van bisschoppelijke Cleresie tot Oud-Katholieke Kerk*, 29, 67, 713-716 and *passim*.

307 U. VON ARX, 'Der orthodox-altkatholische Dialog. Anmerkungen zu einer schwierigen Rezeption', *IKZ* 87 (1997), 184-224, at 220 n. 56 ('der höchste Ausdruck und tiefste Grund von Kirchengemeinschaft').

308 VON ARX, 'Identität und Differenz', 130 ('das Eintreten in die Christus-Beziehung und das Bleiben in ihr').

309 VON ARX, 'Der orthodox-altkatholische Dialog', 219 n. 54, 221 n. 56; cf. U. VON ARX, 'Zwischen Krise und Stabilität. Bericht über die Anglikanisch-Altkatholischen Theologenkonferenzen in Toronto 1987 und Morschach 1990', *IKZ* 81 (1991), 1-40, at 3; VON ARX, 'Der ekklesiologische Charakter', 33; VON ARX, 'Identität und Differenz', 117; VON ARX, 'The Old Catholic Churches', 179; VON ARX, 'Ein "Petrusamt"', 7-8, 10 n. 13.

common participation in an entity that the members of the communion are not themselves'. The eucharistic community, presided over by the bishop, *is* the church.[310]

4.8.6 Advocating the Old Catholic Proprium

Throughout his career, von Arx expresses a certain unease when it comes to the continuation of what he himself has coined 'the Old Catholic mainstream theology'. Von Arx claims to stand within this tradition,[311] which can be understood as a claim that his presentation of Old Catholic ecclesiology is—perhaps more than the presentation by others—in line with the historic Old Catholic ethos. At the same time, he expresses the fear that with the demise (in the nineteen seventies) of such theologians as Rinkel, Küry and Küppers, this tradition of Old Catholic mainstream theology has lost its strength.[312] He already dates the period of Old Catholic mainstream theology 'between approximately 1925-1975'.[313]

As a possible reason for the decline of this type of theology, von Arx mentions the fact that the importance of ecclesiological problems was stronger recognised by the theologically informed priests and bishops of the past than by the laity and the rather pastorally oriented priests and bishops of recent times. Therefore, 'a lot of encouragement (and instruction) is needed to bring the members of the church to live this "high" ecclesiology'.[314] Von Arx also points to the fact that the general process of individualisation has driven the classical Old Catholic ecclesiological concept in the background, giving way to ecological, feminist and interreligious themes. The potential of the church—and therefore of ecclesiology—to be formative in the constitution of identity has been significantly weakened.[315]

Von Arx identifies three contemporary Old Catholic ecclesiological approaches. The first approach is in accordance with 'his' mainstream theology. It sees the Old Catholic Church first and foremost in the perspective of the Early Church, understood in terms of a local, episcopal and eucharistic communion. Ecumenical partners for this first group are primarily the Orthodox and the Anglicans. The authors discussed in this chapter follow this approach. The second approach sees, in von Arx's characterisation, the Old Catholic Church mainly as an alternative for the contemporary Roman Catholic Church. It

310 VON ARX, 'The Old Catholic Churches', 168, 170; cf. VON ARX, 'Strukturreform', 115.
311 Explicitly so, e.g., in VON ARX, 'Ein "Petrusamt"', 7.
312 VON ARX, 'Strukturreform', 90, 106 n. 75, 115; VON ARX, 'Der orthodox-altkatholische Dialog', 187-188, 209 n. 17, 210 n. 21; VON ARX, 'The Old Catholic Churches', 161.
313 VON ARX, 'Zwischen Krise und Stabilität', 32 n. 35.
314 VON ARX, 'The Old Catholic Churches', 174; cf. VON ARX, 'Strukturreform', 112; VON ARX, 'Der orthodox-altkatholische Dialog', 192.
315 VON ARX, 'Der orthodox-altkatholische Dialog', 211 n. 26.

identifies largely with the latter's progressive wing. Its ecumenical scope concentrates on Anglicans and Protestants. A third approach, which regards Old Catholicism as traditional, conservative catholicism without a thorough reception of the Old Catholic theological perspective, is identified by von Arx with the Polish National Catholic Church in the United States of America and Canada, which does no longer belong to the Union of Utrecht now.[316] This leaves us, in von Arx's analysis, with two main 'wings' within European Old Catholicism. Von Arx is committed to convincing Old Catholics and others of the lasting importance of the classical Old Catholic theological *proprium*, which will be summarised in the following conclusion.

4.8.7 Conclusion

Von Arx's theology provides a summary of the 'mainstream' Old Catholic ecclesiology that was underlying the ecclesiological positions presented in this chapter. Ecclesiology is rooted in a theology and anthropology of communion. From there, the church is interpreted in eucharistic terms. It is fundamentally seen as the local church around the bishop, which is at the same time in relation with all other local churches, giving primacy to archbishops and patriarchs, among whom the bishop of Rome is the *primus inter pares*. For von Arx, Old Catholic ecclesiology is close to its Orthodox and Anglican counterparts, for these are likewise based upon the fundamentals of the Early Church—Scripture and creed, the eucharist and the bishop.

4.9 CONCLUSION

4.9.1 The Emergence of a Eucharistic Ecclesiology

This chapter started with a recent formulation of Old Catholic ecclesiological self-description that could be interpreted as a full manifestation of a eucharistic ecclesiology—christological, pneumatological, local, episcopal and eucharist-centred. The question then posed was whether this ecclesiological self-understanding could be seen as reflecting the twentieth-century Old Catholic ecclesiological tradition. To answer this question, a number of Old Catholic theologians have been discussed in relation to their thought on ecclesiology, particularly as they relate it to the eucharist and to other constitutive elements of a eucharistic ecclesiology. As in the other chapters of this study, the focus on

316 VON ARX, 'Strukturreform', 114-115; cf. VON ARX, 'Zwischen Krise und Stabilität', 39-40; VON ARX, 'Der orthodox-altkatholische Dialog', 193-194; VON ARX, 'The Old Catholic Churches', 179-180.

eucharistic ecclesiology necessarily implied a restriction to those authors who contributed to this particular school of ecclesiology.

The answer to the question appears to be that the eucharistic ecclesiology of recent generations is both a continuation and a transformation of the Old Catholic ecclesiological tradition. Recent Old Catholic eucharistic ecclesiology (or ecclesiology of the local church) certainly continues the aims of the earlier Old Catholic ecclesiologists, but is at the same time a more systematic concept—based on a more unified theological approach and demanding stricter consistency as a model—than the ecclesiological thought of previous generations.

4.9.2 Elements of Continuity

The continuity is to be found in the emphasis on the local church. From the outset to the present, Old Catholic ecclesiologists have understood themselves as standing in the tradition of those who, appealing to the Early Church, see the church as a communion of local churches rather than as a universal, centralist church. Also continuous is the fact that the themes of church, ministry and ecumenism are identified as the Old Catholic theological *proprium*.

4.9.3 Elements of Transformation

Transformation is to be found in the more conscious place of the eucharist within the ecclesiological concept. Recent Old Catholic ecclesiologists no longer treat the eucharist as one sacrament among many, but regard it as the gathering and expression of the church *par excellence*. This can be called a transformation or gradual development—not a discontinuity—because the importance of the eucharist and its relation to the church has always been part of eucharistic theology in the Old Catholic tradition. That this is a transformed continuity rather than a discontinuity has in this chapter become particularly clear in comparison to the thought of Andreas Rinkel.

Another transformation can be traced in relation to the position of the bishop and the diocese. Although the Old Catholic mainstream theology has always emphasised the importance of the threefold apostolic ministry, the more recent Old Catholic ecclesiologists—in this chapter: from Werner Küppers onwards—give more weight to the interrelated coherence not only of the church and the ministry (this has always been emphasised), but also of the bishop, the eucharist and the church. This transformation—mediated by Orthodox ecclesiology—can be seen as a somewhat belated consequence of the Old Catholic appeal to the Early Church, in such a way that the medieval concentration on the centrality of the priest has given way to the patristic concentration on the centrality of the bishop, not as a monarch, but as a local minister in communion with presbyterium, deacons and people.

In relation to the introductory paragraph on jurisdiction, a third transformation has to be mentioned. In eucharistic ecclesiology, jurisdiction as such has no constitutive place. Nevertheless, as the introductory section has showed, earlier thought on jurisdiction can—especially in the Old Catholic tradition which regards jurisdiction as originating from the whole people of God—be reappropriated in terms of service and task rather than right and power. In this light, the recent Old Catholic eucharistic ecclesiology of the local church is not foreign to the (particularly Dutch) Old Catholic tradition of maintaining the 'rights' of the local church (diocese or province) and the 'jurisdiction' of the whole people of God, exercised by the local diocesan bishop.

4.9.4 Conclusion

Old Catholic ecclesiology—with its appeal to the Early Church, its emphasis on the local church, its threefold apostolic ministry which is seen as both functional and essential, and its ecumenical interest based on theological conviction—is particularly apt for the development of a fully eucharistic ecclesiology. The twentieth-century development of the main school of Old Catholic ecclesiology shows both continuity and transformation in its journey towards the recent eucharistic-ecclesiological self-understanding of the Old Catholic Church as 'a unity in a given place around a bishop with the eucharist as its center'.

5 PARTICIPATION AND TRANSFORMATION

Anglican Contributions to a Liturgical Ecclesiology

5.1 INTRODUCTION

5.1.1 Sources of Anglican Theology

Anglican theology has its roots in virtually all angles of the Christian theological tradition. This is not only a matter of the many wings within Anglicanism—although they play their part—but it is true of Anglican theology in general. Faithfulness to the Anglican theological tradition may include reference to a number of very different periods and movements in the history of Christian theology. To the history of Anglicanism belong the Reformation and the Oxford Movement which 'may be seen as the Church of England's deferred Counter-Reformation'.[1] This opens up a broad theological spectrum, so that to be an Anglican is to legitimately draw inspiration from the Early Church, the Middle Ages, the Reformation and the modern period. One can hardly find a better witness to this breadth of sources of inspiration than today's liturgical calendar of the Church of England. If Ignatius of Antioch and Augustine of Hippo, Thomas Aquinas and Ignatius of Loyola, Martin Luther and Thomas Cranmer, William Laud and John Bunyan, Dietrich Bonhoeffer and Oscar Romero are to be commemorated in Anglican liturgies, who would prevent them from being read by Anglican theologians?[2]

5.1.2 An Anglican Theological Method?

As the Anglican theologian, now archbishop of Canterbury, Rowan Williams (born 1950) says, 'British theologians are a good deal more inclined [than Germans] to begin haphazardly and let the methodology look after itself'.[3]

1 P.D.L. AVIS, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church: Theological Resources in Historical Perspective*, Revised and Expanded Edition (London-New York: T&T Clark, 2002), xix.

2 Cf. *Common Worship: Services and Prayers for the Church of England* (London: Church House Publishing, 2000), 5-16. A similar kind of list could be drawn up from, e.g., the calendar of the Episcopal Church in the USA; cf. *The Book of Common Prayer* (New York: The Church Hymnal Corporation, 1979), 19-30.

3 R.D. WILLIAMS, *On Christian Theology* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000), xii.

Rather than objectifying the subject, so that it becomes an object that can be analysed with methodological precision,[4] these authors are—as Rowan Williams describes his own theological method—'always beginning in the middle of things. There is a practice of common life and language already there'. The theologian is not isolated behind the study desk, but is part of a community of faith. Theological meaning is not only discovered conceptually, but rather 'by watching what this community does [...] when it is acting, educating or "inducting", imagining and worshipping'. Therefore, every Christian is in his or her way a 'theologian', and the professional theologian is only needed when conflicts arise. *Then* there is need 'to tidy up an [up to that point] unsystematized speech'. This tidying up is the task—and the risk—of a theologian, but the theologian should never forget that his or her work is practically and historically rooted 'in the informal theologizing of the community as it develops'.[5]

This theological method could be described as a fundamental immersion of theology into the church. As a result, much of Anglican theology has implicit or explicit references to ecclesiology, without always formally presenting itself as ecclesiology. Interesting for a liturgical ecclesiology are particularly those authors who link their writing to the church as a worshipping community, as do the authors who will be encountered in this chapter. They do so as members of a church which is generally respected for its 'commitment to an excellence and beauty of worship' and which—although this principle is challenged increasingly and dramatically—recognises not primarily doctrine but 'common practices of prayer as constitutive of its communion'.[6] As this chapter makes clear, Anglicans do not necessarily perceive such liturgical commitment as 'a retreat into pietism', but as a generator of 'disturbing and uncomfortable presence', rooted in the conviction that 'devotion and action [...] cannot but be complementary aims'.[7]

4 The fundamental difference between the traditional English style of philosophising ('probability'; philosophical scepticism; preference for analogy and metaphor instead of logic) as opposed to and nearly incomprehensible by the continental, analytical methodology (particularly in its scholastic, syllogistic form) is described by W.O. CHADWICK, *From Bossuet to Newman* (Cambridge: CUP, 1987[2] [1957[1]]), 48, 124-126, 166-167, 176-177, 190. Chadwick traces this way of thinking and writing back to the prevailing influence of David Hume upon English culture.

5 WILLIAMS, *On Christian Theology*, xii-xiii. For more on Williams's theological method, cf. paragraph 5.6.2.

6 A.W.M. RITCHIE, 'After Christendom: Benedict, MacIntyre and the Future of Anglicanism', *One in Christ* 40 (2005), nr. 1, 73-77, at 74.

7 RITCHIE, 'After Christendom', 76-77.

5.1.3 The Anglican Catholic Context

The thought presented in this chapter is, to a higher or lesser degree, to be understood in the context of Anglican Catholicism.[8] At the beginning of the period on which this study focuses—the twentieth century—the 'Catholic' wing of Anglicanism had already gone through three phases of its history. As both a continuation and a considerable adaptation of the 'High Church' tradition present in Anglicanism from the outset, Anglican Catholicism started in the eighteen thirties with the 'Oxford Movement' of the academic and theological 'Tractarians', led by John Keble (1792-1866), Edward Bouverie Pusey (1800-1882) and John Henry Newman (1801-1890).[9] It was left to the second generation to transform Tractarianism into 'Ritualism'. As a result of Ritualism's changes in the externals of worship—texts and rituals, vestments and incense, music and architecture—'Catholic' principles became more widespread and popularised.[10] A third phase was inaugurated by the 1889 publication of *Lux Mundi*, a book of essays by Anglo-Catholics, edited by the later Anglo-Catholic leader and bishop, Charles Gore (1853-1932). *Lux Mundi* was the start of Anglican Catholicism's 'liberal' wing, which continues to combine the Anglican Catholic emphasis on tradition, incarnation, church, sacraments and ministry with openness to contemporary knowledge, culture and living.[11]

It is this dynamic context of Anglican Catholicism in which the present chapter is situated. In the nineteen thirties, where this chapter starts, Anglo-Catholicism celebrated its heyday. At the beginning of the twenty-first century,

8 For a general overview of Anglican Catholicism, cf. K. HYLSON-SMITH, *High Churchmanship in the Church of England: From the Sixteenth Century to the late Twentieth Century* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993).

9 For continuity and discontinuity between classic High Churchmanship and the innovative Oxford Movement, cf. P.B. NOCKLES, *The Oxford Movement in Context: Anglican High Churchmanship, 1760-1857* (Cambridge: CUP, 1994); W.O. CHADWICK, *The Spirit of the Oxford Movement: Tractarian Essays* (Cambridge: CUP, 1999), 4-21. For the same question, with a comparison of some basic systematic-theological themes, cf. M. PLOEGER, *High Church Varieties: Three Essays on Continuity and Discontinuity in Nineteenth-Century Anglican Catholic Thought* (Amersfoort: COKB; Sliedrecht: Merweboek, 2001), 11-44 (also available through 'Project Canterbury' at www.anglicanhistory.org/academic, 5-22). See also paragraph 5.5.3.

10 On Ritualism, cf. J.F. WHITE, *The Cambridge Movement: The Ecclesiologists and the Gothic Revival* (Cambridge: CUP, 1962). I have investigated the relationship between the initial Oxford Movement and later Ritualism in PLOEGER, *High Church Varieties*, 45-71 (online 22-35).

11 On Gore, cf. P.D.L. AVIS, *Gore: Construction and Conflict: Published to Mark the Centenary of the Appearance of LUX MUNDI* (Worthing: Churchman, 1988); C.E. SMIT, *Reasonable and Reverent: The Critical Orthodoxy of Charles Gore and Lux Mundi* (Amersfoort: COKB; Sliedrecht: Merweboek, 2006). I have offered four examples of Anglican 'Liberal Catholicism' from *Lux Mundi* to the present in PLOEGER, *High Church Varieties*, 73-105 (online 35-52).

where this chapter ends, it is rather in decline, although one of its objectives may be said to have 'moved into the Anglican mainstream', because it 'established the eucharist as the main Sunday service in probably the majority of [Anglican] churches'.[12] In an age, however, in which 'it has become fashionable' to question 'whether the Eucharist ought to continue to be the central act of Sunday parish worship',[13] it seems appropriate to re-examine the theological, ecclesiological and liturgical rationale of those Anglicans who thought and think that liturgy and particularly the eucharist are at the heart of the life of the church and the world.

5.1.4 This Chapter

Searching for Anglican contributions to a liturgical ecclesiology, this chapter will first discuss a movement—the Parish Communion movement, led by Gabriel Hebert (1886-1963)—and in more detail one of its members, Gregory Dix (1901-1952). This movement, and Dix's writings in particular, have been of pivotal importance for the Anglican understanding of the relation between the church and the liturgy, both in theological theory and in parish practice. Subsequently, attention is drawn to the contribution to ecclesiology made by Michael Ramsey (1904-1988), which is both a liturgical ecclesiology *pur sang* and an attempt to integrate Evangelical and Catholic emphases into a coherent Anglican self-understanding. Although others have been writing from a similar perspective—most notably Charles Gore (1853-1932), Evelyn Underhill (1875-1941) and Lionel Thornton (1884-1960)[14]—the Parish Communion movement, Dix and Ramsey are influential examples of the rediscovery of an Anglican ethos of corporate liturgy as part of an understanding of the church as the body of Christ.

The second part of this chapter is devoted to three contemporary authors, who in their own ways continue this Anglican ethos of eucharistic or liturgical ecclesiology. Paul Avis (born 1947) is outstanding among those who are engaged in a reassessment of Anglican ecclesiology in general. It will be interesting to study whether his reorientation has implications for an Anglican liturgical ecclesiology. Aspects of Rowan Williams's thought are represented here not particularly because he became the archbishop of Canterbury at the time these lines were written, but because of his stature as one of today's

12 M.D. CHAPMAN, *Anglicanism: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: OUP, 2006), 88; cf. 93.

13 C. IRVINE, *Worship, Church and Society: An exposition of the work of Arthur Gabriel Hebert to mark the centenary of the Society of the Sacred Mission (Kelham) of which he was a member* (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 1993), xv; P. HINCHLIFF, 'Epilogue', in: Irvine, *Worship, Church and Society*, 149-154, at 152.

14 Cf. C. GORE, *The Body of Christ: An Enquiry into the Institution and Doctrine of Holy Communion* (London: John Murray, 1901); E. UNDERHILL, *Worship* (London: Nisbet, 1936); L.S. THORNTON, *The Common Life in the Body of Christ* (Westminster: Dacre Press, [1941]).

leading Anglican theologians. Moreover, as an Anglican Catholic he stands explicitly and implicitly in a liturgical-ecclesiological tradition—a tradition which receives his wholehearted, though transformatively critical, support. Eventually, reference is made to Catherine Pickstock (born 1970) as an example of another contemporary Anglican theologian who in her own way continues and reinvigorates the concept of liturgical ecclesiology. Her work is a postmodern example of the same Anglican Catholic tradition in which the church and the liturgy are intimately linked.

That the Parish Communion movement is taken as this chapter's starting point, reflects the importance of the nineteen twenties and thirties as the pivotal period for the development of the theological, ecclesiological and liturgical ideas prominent throughout this study. Across many countries and denominations, these decades saw a lively interest in seeking inspiration in the patristic era, rediscovering the church as the body of Christ, deepening the awareness of the liturgy—particularly the eucharist—as the heart of the church and of liturgical texts and rites as containing the meaning of the Christian faith. In other words, in many respects the foundations for twentieth-century thought about liturgical or eucharistic ecclesiology were laid in this period.[15] This chapter has not, however, the aim of presenting the Parish Communion movement as the foundation of Anglican liturgical-ecclesiological thought, any more than claiming Catherine Pickstock's thought as its consummation. Every section is meant to present, in its own right, an instant of liturgical-ecclesiological theology rather than indicating a linear development.[16]

5.2 GABRIEL HEBERT AND THE PARISH COMMUNION MOVEMENT

The Parish Communion movement interpreted itself primarily as an ecclesiological movement. Although its members advocated a particular type of Sunday service, they opposed the view that this was merely a matter of liturgical shape. What they really meant it to be, was a liturgical expression of a particular ecclesiology.[17] This places the Parish Communion movement in the context of this study's quest for a liturgical ecclesiology.

15 Cf. paragraphs 2.1.6 (The Call for a Neo-Patristic Synthesis), 3.1.2 (Theological Reassessment) and 3.1.3 (The Liturgical Movement).

16 In view of the worldwide character of Anglicanism, I must make the words of not the least of Anglican ecclesiologists my own, that 'it is my own limited knowledge [...] that restricts me to discussing *British*—mainly English—theologians' (AVIS, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church*, 304).

17 A.G. HEBERT, 'Preface', in: A.G. Hebert (ed.), *The Parish Communion: A Book of Essays* (London: SPCK, 1937), v-ix, at v-vii; D. GRAY, *Earth and Altar: The Evolution of the*

The type of service indicated by the term 'Parish Communion' emerged in the 1890s, received its name in 1919, and was most prominently advocated in the 1930s by the works of A.G. Hebert.[18] Although the Parish Communion has now become widely accepted by most wings of Anglicanism, it originates from an Anglo-Catholic, and more particularly from a 'Christian Socialist' background.

5.2.1 The Background

In Victorian times, the usual pattern of Sunday worship consisted of an early said celebration of Holy Communion (7.30 or 8 am), Mattins, Litany and Sermon as the main service of the day (10.30 or 11 am), and Evensong.[19] In Anglo-Catholic parishes, the 11 o'clock main service was not Mattins but a solemn High Mass.[20] At this High Mass, however, apart from the celebrating priest hardly anyone communicated. This was the result of the ancient rule of fasting before communion, which was revived by the Anglo-Catholics of the 1850s.[21] The consequence of this rule was that the early (said) celebration was meant for communion and the main (solemn) celebration for 'worship'. Many people attended Mass twice—after the said Mass, at which they communicated, they had breakfast and subsequently returned to church to attend the same Mass in its choral form, at which they did not communicate.[22]

Moreover, the spiritual attitude with regard to communion was highly individualistic. The Anglo-Catholic expression 'making my communion' is telling. Communion was mainly about receiving Jesus into your heart, and was surrounded by individual devotions of preparation (including fasting) and thanksgiving. On the Evangelical side, eucharistic spirituality was clothed in different, but no less individualistic forms.[23]

5.2.2 Christian Socialist Influence

It is not coincidental, that many of the Anglo-Catholics who challenged this individualist attitude towards communion, and this separation of 'communion' and 'worship', came from groups called 'Christian Socialist'. All these groups recognised their indebtedness to the thought of Frederick Denison Maurice

Parish Communion in the Church of England to 1945 (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 1986), 3, 228; IRVINE, *Worship, Church and Society*, 124.

18 GRAY, *Earth and Altar*, 159, 164, 184, 196-208. For more on Hebert, cf. paragraph 5.2.4.

19 GRAY, *Earth and Altar*, 160.

20 A.G. HEBERT, 'The Parish Communion in its Spiritual Aspect', in: Hebert (ed.), *The Parish Communion*, 1-29, at 5.

21 Not by the early generation of the 1830s and 1840s. GRAY, *Earth and Altar*, 15-17.

22 GRAY, *Earth and Altar*, 16.

23 GRAY, *Earth and Altar*, 111, 223-225.

(1805-1872), who, although not a typical Anglo-Catholic himself, inspired Anglo-Catholics to work out their incarnational and sacramental beliefs into a social and critical direction. These Anglo-Catholic theologians interpreted the incarnation as a relationship not only between the divine and the human, but also between the sacred and the secular. This interpretation of the incarnation led, for example, to Gore's 'kenotic christology', with its emphasis on the fact that God's self-emptying by becoming a servant implies for the Christian in society an attitude of solidarity with the suffering.[24]

Part of the Christian Socialists were no socialists at all in the proper sense of the word, but Anglo-Catholics who combined their incarnational theology and their ritualist liturgy with a large amount of social awareness, not least by serving working-class parishes in industrial areas. Others, however, did have socialist views, and could summon the partakers of Holy Communion to become 'Holy Communists'.[25] In their view, the church 'was not merely a preacher of social justice—it was an experiment in community in which liturgy, life and beauty were all united'.[26]

5.2.3 The Parish Communion

Anglo-Catholics who in some way or another adhered to Christian Socialist beliefs, started to relate their theological and social views to their interpretation of the eucharist. In the wake of Maurice, such socially aware Anglo-Catholics as Gore, Henry Scott Holland (1847-1918), Stuart Headlam (1847-1924), Percy Dearmer (1867-1936) and Conrad Noel (1869-1942) were not satisfied with the devotional, liturgical, sacramental aspects of the eucharist, but started to stress the communal character of the eucharist and particularly of the sharing of communion.[27] In the context of Anglo-Catholicism, their criticism was mainly levelled at the fact that the people who wanted to communicate did this at early celebrations, because the main service of the Sunday was a non-communicating Mass, with the result that there was no gathering of the whole congregation into an act of corporate worship which included a general communion. By several

24 J.N. MORRIS, 'A "Fluffy-Minded Prayer Book Fundamentalist"? F.D. Maurice and the Anglican Liturgy', in: R.N. Swanson (ed.), *Continuity and Change in Christian Worship* (Woodbridge UK, Rochester NY: Boydell, 1999), 345-360; IRVINE, *Worship, Church and Society*, 9, 60, 108-109; HYLSON-SMITH, *High Churchmanship*, 187-188, 203-204; WILLIAMS, *On Christian Theology*, 226-227.

25 HYLSON-SMITH, *High Churchmanship*, 223-227; GRAY, *Earth and Altar*, 131.

26 M.D. CHAPMAN, *Liturgy, Socialism and Life: The Legacy of Conrad Noel* (London: DLT & Affirming Catholicism, 2001), 45; cf. *passim*.

27 GRAY, *Earth and Altar*, 111, 220; H. DAVIES, *Worship and Theology in England*, vol. V: *The Ecumenical Century, 1900-1965* (Princeton: Princeton University Press; Oxford: OUP, 1965), 199. Cf. GORE, *The Body of Christ*, 40-46.

stages from the 1890s to the 1930s they developed an ideal which became known as the 'Parish Communion'.[28]

Central to the concept of the Parish Communion are the following characteristics. Firstly, the Parish Communion should be—either ideally or effectively—the *only* celebration of the eucharist on a Sunday. 'Because Christians are one in Christ, they ought to have an outward and visible expression of their unity in the church service.' Secondly, the Parish Communion should be celebrated at an hour at which the whole congregation was able to assemble. Because of the fast before communion—which was part of the concept of the Parish Communion—the usual hour of 11 o'clock was too late. On the other hand, the people—and particular those from the working classes—should have their rest on Sunday morning, so that the other usual time, 8 o'clock, was too early. Therefore, the Parish Communion was usually understood as a service starting at about 9 or 9.30 am. Thirdly, the Parish Communion should neither be a said liturgy, nor a Choral Eucharist in which most of the singing was done by the choir, but a Sung Eucharist with hymns and a simple Mass setting, in order to make full participation of the congregation possible. Besides these main characteristics, the Parish Communion could be followed by a Parish Breakfast—serving a practical purpose because fasting before communion was encouraged, but also expressing the continuing fellowship of those who are the people of God and the body of Christ—and people could participate in parts of the service which were usually reserved for the priest.[29]

What can be seen at work here, is a reformation of Anglo-Catholic liturgical principles from within.[30] The promotors of the Parish Communion did not compromise their Anglo-Catholic sacramental convictions, but put them into the broader perspective of the church (ecclesiology) and the world (social responsibility).

Already in the nineteen thirties the aim was to influence not only the Anglo-Catholic party, but wider circles of the Anglican Church as well.[31] After the Second World War, the Parish Communion movement was broadened by being incorporated into the 'Parish and People Movement'. This group originated from a Christian Socialist background, and had both an ecclesiastically and a politically focused wing. As a result of this less strictly Anglo-Catholic approach, by the nineteen sixties the idea of the Parish Communion had its influence in Evangelical and other wings of the Anglican

28 GRAY, 109-149. Cf. GORE, *The Body of Christ*, 270-280.

29 A.G. HEBERT, *Liturgy and Society: The Function of the Church in the Modern World* (London: Faber & Faber, 1935), 207-214; HEBERT, 'The Parish Communion in its Spiritual Aspect', 4-5, 17, 19; GRAY, *Earth and Altar*, 5, 182-183.

30 The Anglo-Catholics were 'changing their liturgical focus'; HYLSON-SMITH, 275.

31 HEBERT, 'Preface', viii; HEBERT, 'The Parish Communion in its Spiritual Aspect', 20-21.

Church.[32] The order for Holy Communion in the 1980 *Alternative Service Book* can be interpreted as the final acceptance of the principle of the Parish Communion throughout the Church of England.[33]

5.2.4 The Ecclesiology of Hebert's 'Liturgy and Society'

In this paragraph and the next, the ecclesiological thoughts of members of the Parish Communion movement will be studied by turning to the book *Liturgy and Society*, and the volume of articles *The Parish Communion*. The former was written and the latter was edited by the Anglican priest Arthur Gabriel Hebert (1886-1963), 'the pioneer of the Liturgical Movement in England'.[34] A member of the Society of the Sacred Mission, Hebert taught theology at Kelham in England and worked on the translation and adaptation of the liturgy in South Africa. A visit to Sweden brought him into contact with the Swedish Lutheran Liturgical Movement led by the liturgical scholar, later archbishop of Uppsala, Yngve Brilioth (1889-1959). Later in his life Hebert worked in Australia, mainly in the field of ecumenics. Hebert is remembered for his work as a biblical scholar, but most of all for his insistence on the centrality of worship, particularly the eucharist, in the life of the church, based upon the conviction that it is in the worshipping assembly that the church is most clearly itself.[35]

In his book, *Liturgy and Society* (1935), which has been characterised as a 'liturgical theology' and a 'eucharistic ecclesiology',[36] Hebert acknowledges his indebtedness to the continental Roman Catholic Liturgical Movement,[37] of which he emphasises the aspect of giving the liturgy back to the laity. The social character of Christianity and its liturgy, however, leads him beyond the liturgy towards society. The answer to the question 'What has the church to give to the modern world?' is the church's social life, which it should offer to restore fellowship in European civilisation, endangered as it is by individualisation and economisation.[38] In other words, to Hebert the *fellowship* of the church is a

32 GRAY, *Earth and Altar*, 145-149.
33 GRAY, *Earth and Altar*, 3-4, 222-223.
34 DAVIES, *Worship and Theology in England*, xix, cf. 38-39.
35 C. IRVINE, 'A.G. Hebert', in: C. Irvine (ed.), *They Shaped our Worship: Essays on Anglican Liturgists* (London: SPCK, 1998), 64-70, at 64-67; DAVIES, *Worship and Theology in England*, 183. For a fuller account of Hebert's life and work, especially focussing on the link with Scandinavia, ecumenism, liturgy and biblical theology, cf. IRVINE, *Worship, Church and Society*.
36 IRVINE, *Worship, Church and Society*, 109, 124.
37 HEBERT, *Liturgy and Society*, 7. This is underlined by references to Beauduin, Cabrol, Guardini, Guéranger, Pius X, and most of all Herwegen. Gray, however, produces evidence that Hebert already held his opinions before he was influenced by the Liturgical Movement; GRAY, *Earth and Altar*, 196, 200. On the 'continental' Liturgical Movement, cf. IRVINE, *Worship, Church and Society*, 99-108, and above, paragraph 3.1.3 (The Liturgical Movement).
38 HEBERT, *Liturgy and Society*, 8, 14, 28-30.

major part of the church's identity and of what the church has to offer to the world.

The main aim of his book is, therefore, to indicate that the church is the body of Christ: not a collection of individuals, but 'a society with an organic life', of which the common eucharist is the utmost expression.[39] Not surprisingly, Hebert's exposition of Christian liturgy—both in practice and in meaning—focuses on its communal character expressed by the participation of all who are present at the service. The ideas which shortly afterwards would become well known through the work of Gregory Dix,[40] are already present in Hebert's book. Referring to Roman Catholic authors such as the Maria Laach abbot Ildefons Herwegen (1874-1946), but also to members of the Protestant Liturgical Movement such as Brilioth, Hebert draws the contrast between the communal character of church and liturgy in the Early Church, and the individualist, clericalist approach of church and liturgy in the Middle Ages.[41] Also foreshadowing Dix's thesis is Hebert's remark that the Reformers did not—and perhaps historically could not—change this medieval attitude, although the restoration of general communion, particularly in the Lutheran Churches, was a step in the right direction. However, not before the Liturgical Movement in the twentieth century was the corporate character of the church and its liturgy fully rediscovered.[42] According to Hebert, the misunderstandings about the church and the liturgy can be summarised by referring to the words 'congregation' and 'service'. The church is not, as Hebert thinks it is usually seen, a congregation of more or less coincidentally gathered individuals. Rather, the church is the people of God, like the people of Israel gathered together by God and represented in local churches. Likewise, the liturgy is not 'a service' which can be 'a nice service' or 'a dull service', but 'the celebration and the application of Redemption'. In the liturgy, the people of God celebrate all that they are as the redeemed body of Christ.[43]

Another line through Hebert's book is his fight against liberalism, which he regards as not critical enough and not modern enough. 'The way out from Liberalism is not backwards but forwards.' The problem of liberal theology is that it reacts against an alleged orthodoxy which is not orthodox Christian tradition but 'a static system of doctrines', mistaken for orthodoxy by Anglo-Catholics because the Oxford Movement treated orthodoxy in this static way. Hence the fact that the only alternatives seem to be fundamentalism and liberalism.[44] Referring to Maurice, however, Hebert interprets orthodoxy as a relationship to God rather than as a formal subscription to the existence of

39 HEBERT, *Liturgy and Society*, 13.
40 Cf. section 5.3 (Dix).
41 HEBERT, *Liturgy and Society*, 64-84, 115-121.
42 HEBERT, *Liturgy and Society*, 122-138.
43 HEBERT, *Liturgy and Society*, 205-207.
44 HEBERT, *Liturgy and Society*, 34-36, 105, 108.

God.[45] And the centre of orthodox faith is the incarnation. From the incarnation flow the sacraments as the hallowing of body and soul, but from the incarnation flows as much the hallowing of common life in society.[46]

Here Hebert's theology is linked with his social concern. The incarnation implies that not only the body is sanctified, but also 'the life lived in the body'—society, economy, politics. 'The method of the Incarnation means that the separation of "sacred" and "secular" is broken down.' In modern society the workman has become a slave, labour has become mechanised. Has the Christian, in order to pursuit a more Christian social order, to be a Communist? Or should he adhere to 'the great national movement' of Nazi Germany?[47] No, says Hebert, the church should contribute to society in a 'theological' way. It should never consider a human being as a 'case', or a group of people as a mass, but as persons. It should not yield to the temptation of erecting an earthly kingdom, which would fail because it would be built upon a too optimistic view on human nature. But although the church should not throw in its lot with one particular political programme, it would be untrue to the incarnation if it stood completely aside. Fights against poverty and housing problems, against excessive wealth and class distinction, are nothing but 'the corollaries of the Incarnation'.[48]

Hebert's book can be summarised as a plea for a renewed understanding of the church as a fellowship, with immediate consequences for both its liturgy and its relation to society. The liturgy should express and strengthen the corporate character of the church as the body of Christ. The church's attitude to society should originate from the awareness that the incarnation means a hallowing of all human life, including its physical and secular aspects, and should be based on the conviction that the church as a fellowship is the best model for a renewal of fellowship in society.

5.2.5 The Ecclesiology of 'The Parish Communion'

In 1937 Hebert edited the volume *The Parish Communion*. The essays collected in this book were written by fifteen Anglo-Catholic priests, of whom—apart from Hebert himself—Henry de Candole (1895-1971), later bishop of Knaresborough, and the liturgical scholars Gregory Dix (1901-1952) and Austin Farrer (1904-1968) are the most famous names.[49]

45 HEBERT, *Liturgy and Society*, 108-109, 185, 256.

46 HEBERT, *Liturgy and Society*, 92, 142, 144. Hebert's age saw a general return to orthodox faith; cf. DAVIES, *Worship and Theology in England*, 182-183. See also footnote 119.

47 HEBERT, *Liturgy and Society*, 191, 195-197. As if he senses the future, Hebert warns the reader that his cautious but not dismissive comments on Nazism are written (not later than) in October 1934; cf. HEBERT, *Liturgy and Society*, 189.

48 HEBERT, *Liturgy and Society*, 203, cf. 197, 201-202.

49 In order to avoid a labyrinth of references, the separate articles in *The Parish Communion* will only be distinguished by author, not by full bibliographical references. Exceptions

The Parish Communion movement had a strong ecclesiological foundation. The recurring theme of *The Parish Communion* is the assertion that the church is not just an organisation, but the body of Christ, and that the church as the body of Christ is built up by receiving the body of Christ in the eucharist. First of all, the book fights against the individualism which, it asserts, characterises much of contemporary church life. The authors have a predilection for the word 'family' to describe the church, and to liken the eucharist to a family meal, or even—once—to a birthday cake.[50] The corporate character of the eucharist should be reflected by its interpretation and its outward form. The people join the priest in praising God, in hearing God's word, and in 'the act of consecration'.[51] In practice, this means that the eucharist should not be celebrated in a multitude of 'early celebrations' or 'Low Masses', but that there should be one Sung Eucharist on a Sunday.[52] Moreover, the congregation should know that their part in the service is important, not only theologically, but also practically in the form of responses and 'Amens'.[53]

The article by Gregory Dix is particularly revealing on this issue. He shows that the liturgy of the Early Church was a happening in which '*the whole Church* in its hierarchical unity' had its indispensable role,[54] and that this included the view on the whole congregation as a royal priesthood. Not the bishop was seen as a 'celebrant', but all the people celebrated the liturgy.[55] The Middle Ages, however, saw a clericalisation, stemming particularly from

occur when more detailed consideration is given to particular articles by Hebert, Dix and Farrer.

50 HEBERT (ed.), *The Parish Communion*, 3 (A.G. Hebert), 175, 181 (J.F.L. Southam), 187, 190 (E.D. Tyndall), 214 (M.R. Newbolt), 235, 239, 248 (H. de Candole), 258 (F.R. Fairbarn & F.M. Downton). Birthday cake: 5 (where Hebert quotes from hearsay). Michael Ramsey (cf. section 5.4), although generally positive about the aims of the Parish Communion movement, criticised it for tending towards an understanding of 'fellowship' more in line with 'bonhomie' than with the full meaning of *koinonia*; cf. IRVINE, *Worship, Church and Society*, 126. In the concept of the Parish Communion, Ramsey welcomed the centrality of the eucharist, but feared a certain superficiality towards the 'awe and mystery' of the sacrament; cf. D. DALES, *Glory: The Spiritual Theology of Michael Ramsey* (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2003), 91.

51 HEBERT (ed.), *The Parish Communion*, 12 (A.G. Hebert), cf. 247 (H. de Candole).

52 HEBERT (ed.), *The Parish Communion*, *passim*. There are two remarkable exceptions in the volume. The first is the personal remark by Gregory Dix that he says a private Mass every day (which he explains as a *monastic* devotion and not as something which is recommendable in a *parish*; the inconsequence is similar to Afanasiev's nearly private celebrations in *Saint-Serge*, cf. paragraph 2.2.4); G. DIX, 'The Idea of "The Church" in the Primitive Liturgies', in: Hebert (ed.), *The Parish Communion*, 95-143, at 134. The other exception is the assertion by J.F. Briscoe that 'Sheep must not be over-driven', for which reason there should remain early celebrations for communion and late celebrations for worship and sermon; this article gives the impression to be somewhat out of place in the volume; HEBERT (ed.), *The Parish Communion*, 202-203.

53 HEBERT (ed.), *The Parish Communion*, 99 (G. Dix), 105 (G. Dix), 246 (H. de Candole).

54 DIX, 'The Idea of "The Church" in the Primitive Liturgies', 105.

55 DIX, 'The Idea of "The Church" in the Primitive Liturgies', 118, 122, 125.

Gaul.[56] Dix says that this gradual clericalisation has not left many traces in the wording of the liturgy or in the dogmatic definition of the sacraments, but that it nevertheless was 'by far the most momentous change in the whole history of the rite': 'a vast unconscious revolution has silently taken place'. The eucharist was no longer interpreted as 'the action of the Body of Christ' but as 'something done *by* the clergy *for* the laity'.[57] Dix sees a connection between this liturgical clericalisation and the decline of the view on the church as the body of Christ.[58] The Reformation did not—and historically could not—do more than restore the communion of the people. It did not restore the ancient ecclesial spirit of the liturgy, nor did it restore the corporately celebrated eucharist to its central position. In spite of the alleged dichotomy between Protestantism and Catholicism, the Reformation liturgy stood, together with the Catholic liturgy, on the medieval side. It was a liturgy *by* the clergy *for* the laity. Reformation spirituality as well as Counter-Reformation spirituality were largely individualist. According to Dix, a real renewal can only come when the eucharist will be seen again as the corporate act of the body of Christ, as it was in the Early Church.[59]

For the authors of *The Parish Communion*, the centrality of the eucharist in the life of the church is based upon the fact that the eucharist expresses the meaning of the church.[60] The eucharist makes manifest the reconciliation of humanity to God.[61] It is by the eucharist—by partaking in the body and blood of Christ—that the church as the body of Christ is built up.[62] So the eucharist is not only an *expression* of the meaning of the church, it is also the *mediation* between salvation history and the church in the present. The 'Mystical Body' (the church) is *created* by partaking in the 'Glorified Body'.[63] 'The Eucharist is *not* [...] the "expression" of the Church's unity. [...] It is its *cause*.'[64]

The ecclesiological consequence of the emergence of the church out of the sacramental body of Christ is that Christ and the church become essentially one. The church is 'in Christ', as the Pauline phrase says. The fact that the church is the body of Christ, and that Christ is the head, unites Christ and the church in a most intimate way. From this point of view, the centrality of the eucharist is obvious: 'If the Eucharist is the presence of Christ, it cannot be an aspect or department of our religion, but the whole of it'.[65]

56 DIX, 'The Idea of "The Church" in the Primitive Liturgies', 115, 133-135.
57 DIX, 'The Idea of "The Church" in the Primitive Liturgies', 132.
58 DIX, 'The Idea of "The Church" in the Primitive Liturgies', 135.
59 DIX, 'The Idea of "The Church" in the Primitive Liturgies', 137-140.
60 HEBERT (ed.), *The Parish Communion*, 13 (A.G. Hebert), 235, 239 (H. de Candole).
61 HEBERT (ed.), *The Parish Communion*, 23 (A.G. Hebert).
62 HEBERT (ed.), *The Parish Communion*, 71 (J.O. Cobham), 175 (J.F.L. Southam), 304 (C.H. Smyth).
63 HEBERT (ed.), *The Parish Communion*, 75, 83 (A.M. Farrer).
64 HEBERT (ed.), *The Parish Communion*, 122 (G. Dix).
65 HEBERT (ed.), *The Parish Communion*, 93-94 (A.M. Farrer).

This is true as much for the corporate life of the church as for each individual member of the church—the eucharist is the centre of the life of the church both on earth and in heaven, and it is the centre of parish life, but it is also the centre of personal devotion, social action and missionary zeal.[66] The *koinonia* starts at the altar, but has to be lived out in the life of '*koinonia*-bearers'.[67] This means that receiving communion is not only a private devotion, but also and primarily a communal act which unites the communicants into the body of Christ and which equips them for living a Christian life in the church and in the world.[68]

Although not as a main theme, this volume reflects something of the social and critical awareness that was mentioned above as part of the background of the Parish Communion movement. Most of the authors express in some way their concern that the sense of communion advocated by them should not be limited to either the liturgy or the fellowship of the church, but should be lived out into the everyday world. Theologically, this is grounded on Paul's summons 'to present your bodies a living sacrifice [...] which is your reasonable service' (Romans 12:1).[69] Liturgically, reference is made to the offertory, which the Parish Communion movement—according to the example of the Early Church—wants to see as the actual bringing of bread, wine and other supplies to the altar by all members of the congregation, interpreted as an offering of one's work, one's possessions and most of all one's self to the service of God.[70] Practically, this sometimes takes the rather *bourgeois* form of 'kindness, gentleness, patience and long-suffering',[71] but in other cases there is real social concern. One author emphasises the 'bread and wineness'—that is, the physical, earthly, ordinary character—of daily life in one's own environment.[72] Others sum up teaching, healing, caring for unemployed and overworked, and attention to the problems of bad housing, payment and industrial working conditions, as practical effects of a life inspired by the eucharist.[73] The divisions between races, sexes and social classes should be abolished on the grounds of the church's unity in the eucharist.[74] Also is the idea expressed that society will regain the Christian attitude of *agape* if the corporate interpretation of the

66 HEBERT (ed.), *The Parish Communion*, 155 (C.P. Hankey), 173, 178-179 (J.F.L. Southam), 195 (E.D. Tyndall).
67 HEBERT (ed.), *The Parish Communion*, 187-188 (E.D. Tyndall).
68 HEBERT (ed.), *The Parish Communion*, 195 (E.D. Tyndall), 212 (M.R. Newbolt).
69 HEBERT (ed.), *The Parish Communion*, 63 (J.O. Cobham), 153 (C.P. Hankey), 186 (E.D. Tyndall).
70 HEBERT (ed.), *The Parish Communion*, 11 (A.G. Hebert), 100-101, 114 (G. Dix), 217-218 (M.R. Newbolt), 245 (H. de Candole).
71 HEBERT (ed.), *The Parish Communion*, 189 (E.D. Tyndall).
72 HEBERT (ed.), *The Parish Communion*, 153 (C.P. Hankey).
73 HEBERT (ed.), *The Parish Communion*, 178 (J.F.L. Southam), 190, 194 (E.D. Tyndall).
74 HEBERT (ed.), *The Parish Communion*, 188 (E.D. Tyndall), 215 (M.R. Newbolt).

eucharist is restored first.[75] Just as the eucharist does not point to itself but to the redemption of humanity which it sacramentally proclaims, so the church does not point to itself but to the redemption of all humanity.[76]

As to the relation of church and state, there is some tendency towards disestablishment in this book. The church should regard itself as the body of Christ in a secularised world, and not as part of a post-Christian empire. The state should care for the temporal and physical affairs of its people, without denying that people are spiritual beings as well; the church should care for the eternal and spiritual without forgetting that people are physical creatures as well.[77]

The contributors to *The Parish Communion* also have a view on the relationship between the local church—which is, in their understanding, the parish—and the universal church. Gabriel Hebert and Austin Farrer are the ones who are responsible for most of the statements on this issue. According to Hebert, priority should be given to the universal church, of which the parish is 'the local unit'.[78] Yet 'the whole is present in the part, and the unity of the whole Body is present and is expressed in the worship of the local community'.[79] That is possible, because it is the eucharist which unites the local congregations with each other. 'Every Eucharist is a Eucharist of the whole Church.' Even separated Christians in other denominations take part in the same eucharist because they are united to the same heavenly altar.[80] Farrer seems to view the local and the universal (which he calls the 'fellowship' and the 'universality' respectively) as somewhat more united. The local congregations are 'incarnations' of the universal church.[81] The church is present ('incarnate') in the local congregation, because the local congregation is a eucharistic congregation and 'the many sacramental presences of Christ' are 'strictly analogous and complementary' to 'the many "presences" of the Church'.[82] Nevertheless, Farrer denies that it is 'the whole Church' which is present in every local congregation. The universal church cannot be regarded simply as the sum of all local congregations, because 'the Apostolic ministry must bind together the many congregations'.[83] Here Farrer means the bishop, which indicates that his discussion of local and universal suffers from the fact that he

75 HEBERT (ed.), *The Parish Communion*, 176 (J.F.L. Southam).
76 HEBERT (ed.), *The Parish Communion*, 306-307 (C.H. Smyth).
77 HEBERT (ed.), *The Parish Communion*, 140-142 (G. Dix), 301 (C.H. Smyth).
78 HEBERT, 'The Parish Communion in its Spiritual Aspect', 4, 8; cf. HEBERT (ed.), *The Parish Communion*, 213 (M.R. Newbolt).
79 HEBERT, 'The Parish Communion in its Spiritual Aspect', 9; cf. HEBERT (ed.), *The Parish Communion*, 214 (M.R. Newbolt), 304 (C.H. Smyth).
80 HEBERT, 'The Parish Communion in its Spiritual Aspect', 18-19.
81 A.M. FARRER, 'Eucharist and Church in the New Testament', in: Hebert (ed.), *The Parish Communion*, 73-94, at 84.
82 FARRER, 'Eucharist and Church in the New Testament', 86.
83 FARRER, 'Eucharist and Church in the New Testament', 87.

treats the *parish* as the local church and not the *diocese*. Probably he would have allowed 'the whole church' to be present in the local church if the local church had not been the parish but the diocese.

5.2.6 Conclusion

If the Anglican Church is 'essentially a liturgical Church' and if 'one could almost describe it as the Anglican instinct' that the celebration of the liturgy is 'the definite activity of the Church',[84] this certainly applies to Hebert and the Parish Communion movement. Accustomed as they were to the 'grave and dignified (and strongly sacramental) worship' of Anglo-Catholicism, they discovered 'that ritual or, worse still, ritualism divorced from an understanding of "Church" was superficial and did not get to the roots of the matter'.[85]

Their ecclesiological thought can be summarised as a focus on the collectivity of the whole body of Christ, as the conviction that it is the eucharist which shapes the (ecclesial) body of Christ by partaking in the (sacramental) body of Christ, and as an emphasis on the need to live out socially the life which has been imbibed eucharistically. What is presented here is a eucharistic ecclesiology, with an emphasis on the corporate aspect of the church and its liturgy, and having an open eye for the consequences concerning the social order outside the church.[86]

5.3 GREGORY DIX

5.3.1 The Shape of the Liturgy

Dom Gregory Dix (1901-1952) was a monk of the Anglican Benedictine abbey at Nashdom from 1936 until his death. After his contribution to the volume, *The Parish Communion*, he worked out his theory in his book, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (1945).[87] In and outside the Anglican Communion this book has become

84 IRVINE, *Worship, Church and Society*, 77-78.

85 J.D. CRICHTON, *Lights in Darkness: Fore-runners of the Liturgical Movement* (Blackrock, Co Dublin: Columba, 1996), 90; cf. 87-94.

86 Several aspects of this ecclesiology are similar to the Orthodox ecclesiology encountered in chapter 2. Not surprisingly, *Liturgy and Society* refers to Khomiakov (147-148), and *The Parish Communion* contains references to Khomiakov (151, 294) and 'the exiled Russians' (142).

87 '*The Shape of the Liturgy* was largely developed from an earlier essay which Dix had written [...] for a symposium *The Parish Communion* edited by Gabriel Hebert in 1937'; R.C.D. JASPER, *The Development of the Anglican Liturgy 1662-1980* (London: SPCK, 1989), 180. Although this is true according to the contents of Dix's article and book, Dix himself mentions another link, namely a lecture before the Anglican religious order of the

seminal in spreading the 'vision of what Christian liturgy should be: the action of the whole people of God under the presidency of its bishop and clergy'.[88]

Both in his article in *The Parish Communion* and in his book, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, Dix launches his theory of the fourfold shape of the eucharistic action. At the Last Supper, Christ *took* bread, *gave thanks* ('made eucharist'), *broke* the bread, *gave* the bread to his disciples, *took* the cup, *gave thanks*, and *gave* the cup to his disciples. Dix's contribution to liturgical studies and practice is the insight that the core of all eucharistic liturgies—how varied they may have become in the course of time by geographical or denominational separation—consists of nothing else than these seven actions comprised to four: taking (the offertory), thanksgiving (the eucharistic prayer), breaking (the breaking of the bread before communion) and giving (communion). This pattern according to which the eucharistic service unfolds itself, and which was given to it at the Last Supper by Christ himself, is what Dix calls the 'shape of the liturgy'.[89]

Although increasingly disputed by contemporary liturgists,[90] Dix's exposition of the 'shape' has proven a major contribution to liturgical scholarship.[91] In the context of this study, however, it is of more immediate interest that *The Shape of the Liturgy* also contains important contributions to ecclesiology. Although the title suggests that the book is primarily on the liturgical theme of the 'shape', the book is full of references to the ecclesiology underlying the liturgy of the Early Church. In fact, all ideas presented in Dix's article in *The Parish Communion*—to which reference was made in the previous section—return in the book.[92]

Cowley Fathers in 1941; G. DIX, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (London: A&C Black, 1945[2] [1945[1]]), viii.

88 P.F. BRADSHAW, 'Gregory Dix', in: Irvine (ed.), *They Shaped our Worship*, 111-117, at 116.

89 DIX, 'The Idea of "The Church" in the Primitive Liturgies', 100-104; DIX, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, 2, 48-50, 78-81, 101, 127, 215, 232, 303, 744.

90 Cf. P.F. BRADSHAW, 'Continuity and Change in Early Eucharistic Practice: Shifting Scholarly Perspectives', in: Swanson (ed.), *Continuity and Change in Christian Worship*, 1-17.

91 BRADSHAW, 'Gregory Dix', 114. Another important contribution to liturgiology was Dix's promotion of (what was believed to be) Hippolytus's then recently rediscovered *Apostolic Tradition*, which has had enormous influence on twentieth-century liturgical revision throughout the churches; cf. BRADSHAW, 'Gregory Dix', 111-112.

92 It should also be noted that, as was seen above, Dix's main theses—as far as ecclesiology is concerned—were already established by Hebert in his *Liturgy and Society*. Cf. DAVIES, *Worship and Theology in England*, 40-42.

5.3.2 Middle Ages, Reformation, Counter-Reformation: Three of a Kind

In view of this chapter, which tries to spell out Anglican contributions towards a liturgical ecclesiology, Dix's approach to the identity of the Church of England is highly interesting. Throughout the book, Dix treats the Anglican liturgy simply as one of the stages in the unbroken history of Christian liturgy, and the Anglican Church as one of the stages in the unbroken history of Christianity in England. The liturgiological aim of the book is to set out the continuities and discontinuities of the eucharistic liturgy throughout the world and throughout the ages. The underlying theological conviction is that all those various liturgies express the same basic truth—they are celebrations of the same sacrament. Of course the theological explanations and, moreover, the spiritual experiences have changed. But the eucharist of the apostles, the eucharist of the ante-Nicene church, the eucharist of the fourth century (in which Dix locates much of the changes which eventually led to the medieval liturgical concepts), the eucharist of the Middle Ages, the eucharist of post-Reformation England, and the eucharist of the twentieth century are all representations of the same eucharist:

> In so far as the christian Syrian and Byzantine and Copt and Englishman and Frenchman and Roman are all christians and so partakers in the one eucharistic action and experience of the one Body of Christ, the Shape of the Liturgy by which that action is performed is bound to be the same in all essentials for them all.[93]

Dix knows of no deliberate breakaway at the English Reformation. Although Dix describes Cranmer as a consistent Zwinglian, he considers this as an exception in the whole history of Anglicanism. Ironically, Dix says, Anglicanism is saddled with a liturgy compiled by a Zwinglian, a liturgy which Anglicanism has always reinterpreted—and in later editions slightly altered—in order to make it compatible with a non-Zwinglian eucharistic theology, be it Calvinist or Catholic.[94]

What happened at the Reformation was, according to Dix, not a radical re-orientation of the church and its liturgy, but a reaction against certain excesses in medieval theology, liturgy and practice, without changing the general medieval liturgical attitude. As Dix already pointed out in his article in *The Parish Communion*, the Reformation liturgy was as clericalist and as individualist as the medieval Mass.[95] Moreover, the medieval emphasis of human unworthiness to approach the altar of God and especially to receive

[93] Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, 433, cf. 744-745.
[94] Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, 656-657, 670, 672, 677, 691, 693, 706, 715, 717, 731.
[95] Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, 45, 303, 484. The Anglican liturgy was based on the principles of the medieval Low Mass (599, 602).

communion, and the medieval isolation of the death of Christ as by far the most important aspect of salvation history, were unhesitatingly taken over by the Reformation.[96]

It is, however, not Dix's aim to claim the catholicity of Anglicanism on the ground of its continuity with the medieval church. Rather, Dix dismisses the medieval, Reformation and Counter-Reformation liturgy and ecclesiology alike, because of their deviation from the primitive understanding of the church and the liturgy. It is the liturgical ethos of the ante-Nicene church, which—Dix thinks—is the only desirable goal of liturgical and ecclesiological renewal and the only solution to ecumenical controversy.[97]

5.3.3 The Eschatological Christ and the Church

It is Dix's hope that, like in the ante-Nicene church, the contemporary church will learn again to understand salvation as a corporate affair. By baptism people are incorporated into Christ, which means that the church is *in* Christ and that the church *is* Christ. The church is the body of Christ in the most literal sense.[98] As a consequence, the liturgy is the act of Christ as much as the act of the church. Christ is the agent of the liturgy and not its passive object.[99]

> The Eucharist, then, manifests the true being of the church as the Body of Christ and of the christian as the member of Christ, because it manifests the being of Christ as the Redeemer—the Redeemer by the sacrifice of Himself. It is the act of Christ in His Body the church, transferring all who are 'in Him' into the eternal Kingdom of God beyond time.[100]

This quotation also marks Dix's eschatological approach to the liturgy. In the liturgy the *anamnesis* takes place, which does not mean a remembrance of the past, not even a representation of a past event in the present, but the presence of redemption in its entirety, as it will only be revealed at the end of time.[101] Dix is eager to emphasise that this does not mean that the object of the liturgical *anamnesis* is a series of events, of which some lie in the past (incarnation, death, resurrection) and some in the future (second coming, judgement). This

96 DIX, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, 526, 600, 615-616, 639.

97 DIX, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, 752. For a similar evaluation by Catherine Pickstock, cf. paragraph 5.7.5.

98 DIX, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, 246, 339-340.

99 DIX, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, 117, 251, 254, 265, 301. Dix is critical of the Eastern understanding of the epiclesis, in which—according to Dix—Christ is reduced to being the object of the Spirit's activity. According to Dix, the primitive understanding of 'Spirit' referred rather to the Second Person of the Trinity than to the Third. DIX, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, 137, 183-184, 202, 276-278, 292; cf. IRVINE, *Worship, Church and Society*, 93-97.

100 DIX, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, 268.

101 DIX, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, 185-186, 242-243, 247, 255-256, 263.

would mean that 'eschatological' merely refers to something which still has to take place, but which, when it will have happened in the end, will be at the same level as the 'historical' events which have already taken place. This—says Dix—is not an eschatological approach, but the termination of primitive eschatology by bringing everything on the historical level. Rather, Dix regards *all* elements of salvation history as eschatological. Christ's first coming, death, resurrection, ascension, second coming, judgement—they all are one eschatological event, which could be summarised as the coming of the kingdom of God through Christ.[102]

In the period of the ante-Nicene Church—Dix's liturgical and ecclesiological ideal—the liturgy was perceived as an eschatological act of the eschatological Christ, or—which is the same—of the eschatological body of Christ, the church. Each ecclesiastical 'order' had its own indispensable role in this act. The order of the laity as well as the orders of ordained ministers had their own 'special liturgies'.[103] It is not primarily a matter of 'validity' whether or not a eucharist may take place without the bishop or his deputy, it is a matter of order, a matter of the unity of the body of Christ which is not whole when one of the 'special liturgies' is not there.[104] In the Early Church, the special liturgy of the laity consisted particularly in the offering of bread and wine at the offertory, in saying 'Amen' to the eucharistic prayer, and in receiving communion. Dix emphasises the people's role at the offertory, because it is a good example of the people's *active* role which *culminates* in communion, rather than only a *passive* role which is limited to *receiving* communion.[105] More generally, the fact of taking part in the corporate act of the worship of the

[102] DIX, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, 265, *cf.* 139, 305, 314, 336-338, 349, 359, 393, 621-622, 670. Dix criticises the Eastern eucharistic prayers for summing up past and future elements of salvation history in one *anamnesis* paragraph (*The Shape of the Liturgy*, 264). It should be noticed that, although Zizioulas refers positively to these *anamnesis* paragraphs, both Dix and Zizioulas have the same concept of eschatology. For both, the eucharistic *anamnesis* is not a representation of something in the past and something in the present, but the representation of the *whole* salvation event which is *as a whole* eschatological. Cf. J.D. ZIZIOULAS, *Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church* (Crestwood NY: SVSP, 1985, 130, 180, and above, paragraph 2.3.4. Dix places the transition from an eschatological into an historical approach of the liturgy in the fourth century (*The Shape of the Liturgy*, 394).

[103] An interesting statement is that, according to Dix, having a 'special ministry' also means that this ministry has regularly to be carried out, which leads Dix to the conviction that a priest should preside regularly at the eucharist, and not just sit in a pew where he 'usurps [the function] of a layman' (*The Shape of the Liturgy*, 484, cf. 593). In chapter 6 will be given a similar (van der Leeuw; cf. paragraph 6.2.9) and a different (Lathrop; cf. paragraph 6.5.7) opinion on the same question. The various positions will be evaluated in paragraph 8.5.2.

[104] DIX, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, 99, 594.

[105] DIX, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, 117, 128-129, 436, 442-443, 480, 598.

body of Christ is, for Dix, the act *par excellence* by which a Christian exercises his or her order within the church.[106]

5.3.4 Conclusion

One can conclude that for Dix the liturgical gathering *is* the church. It is during the liturgy that the church becomes what it is. To be a Christian is to be a partaker in the corporate act of worship. Illustrative is the place Dix gives to two other important aspects of being a Christian: *faith* and the Christian *life*. Faith is the prerequisite for taking part in the liturgy, and Christian living is the hoped-for result of taking part in the liturgy. But never are the Christian and the church more themselves than during the corporate celebration of the liturgy, when they become that which they eschatologically already are.[107]

5.4 MICHAEL RAMSEY

5.4.1 Excursus: Evangelical and Catholic Anglicans

Not surprisingly, most Anglican authors who stand for a liturgical ecclesiology are to be found at the Catholic side of Anglican comprehensiveness. Liturgical ecclesiology, with its emphasis on the communal character of salvation, does not sit happily together with an Evangelical perspective which tends to stress the individual relationship between the believer and his or her Redeemer. The Evangelical ecclesiologist Tim Bradshaw, for example, affirms the simultaneity of coming to faith and becoming a member of the church, but formulates this in a way which proceeds from the relationship between Christ and the individual towards the relationship between the individual and the church: 'Individual Christians then, in belonging to Christ, belong inseparably to the church'.[108] It is the order which matters here. Because individuals 'receive Christ', they become members of the church. This church is primarily the universal church and even the invisible church.[109] Although Evangelicals emphasise the local community

[106] DIX, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, 153-154. The fact that the Christians in the ante-Nicene church risked the persecutions which threatened all who took part in the act of Christian worship is a recurring 'proof' of the centrality of corporate worship throughout *The Shape of the Liturgy* (e.g. 26, 140-151). The argument runs: something for which they risked so much, must have been central to their existence; but also: both to the pagan persecutors and to the church itself, the ultimate test of being a Christian was whether or not one partook in the corporate liturgy.

[107] DIX, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, 267, 391-392, cf. 602, 734.

[108] T. BRADSHAW, *The Olive Branch: An Evangelical Anglican Doctrine of the Church* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1992), 8, 10.

[109] BRADSHAW, *The Olive Branch*, 8, 10, 12.

of faith in their daily religious life, theologically their ecclesiology is a universal one. Outward structures—including specific churches—are secondary to the fact that every faithful is part of the one (invisible, universal) church of Jesus Christ.

Another element of Evangelical teaching which makes it unlikely for an Evangelical to uphold a liturgical ecclesiology, is its emphasis on the 'Word'. Catholic teaching could be said to uphold the Word as well, but the Evangelical tends to interpret the term 'Word' in a more restricted sense than the Catholic who, through the incarnation and its continuation in the church as the body of Christ, is used to a wider interpretation of the term 'Word', that also includes the church and the sacraments. The Evangelical abides by the Word as the verbally proclaimed Word. Bradshaw sums up that the Word can mean Christ, the gospel proclaiming Christ, and the Scriptures. The Word comes from God to the individual (prophet, apostle) who has to proclaim it to the church. Thus, in an Evangelical understanding, the Word does not—as in Catholic teaching—come from God to the church, or from God to the individual through the church, but the church hears the Word from individuals whom God has commissioned to proclaim it.[110] The fact that proclamation is primarily seen as a verbal affair is another difference between an Evangelical and a Catholic who would say that proclamation takes place as much in the sacraments as in verbal preaching. As far as an Evangelical acknowledges this, another difference is that an Evangelical would subsume the sacraments under the heading of proclamation from God to the individual, whereas a Catholic views the sacraments as participation of the church in the proclaimed salvation and as a union between Christ and the church rather than as one way traffic from God to the church.[111]

The term 'participation' leads to the probably most fundamental difference between an Evangelical and a Catholic approach to the church. Whereas for Catholic Anglicans—as is particularly the case with Michael Ramsey's thought to be presented in this section—the church is no less than the participation of the faithful in Christ and of Christ in the faithful, Evangelical Anglicans emphasise the distance that remains between Christ and the church. Christ and the church, according to Bradshaw, relate to each other not by means of identity but by means of a 'covenant relationship'. Rather than the church in Christ, Christ is, by the Spirit, in the church. 'The church is not so much a form of Christ as the people of Christ, in covenant with him.' In Anglican Evangelical thought, the church is not seen as a corporate personality which includes Christ and all members of the church. Rather, Christ is seen as the head and the church as the body—more emphasis is laid on their difference than on their intimate relationship.[112]

[110] BRADSHAW, *The Olive Branch*, 148-151.
[111] BRADSHAW, *The Olive Branch*, 152, 180, 193.
[112] BRADSHAW, *The Olive Branch*, 15, 138, 140.

This ecclesiological difference makes it understandable that Bradshaw does not really come to terms with the concept of eucharistic ecclesiology. He calls it 'a narrowly defined, cultically determined idea of the visible church'.[113] And he is right, as far as his Evangelical understanding of both the church and the eucharist is concerned. If the eucharist is not the *participation* in the salvation by the death and resurrection of Christ, but a *celebration* of his death and resurrection which—not through the celebration, but *by themselves*, through (individual) faith—lead to salvation,[114] then the eucharist can indeed not be a focus of ecclesiology. If the eucharist is not the focal point of identity between Christ and his people, the event from which Christian life flows, Bradshaw is right in asserting that eucharistic ecclesiology is rather 'static and passive'. 'No doubt the sacraments play a part [in fostering real relations with Christ], but living faith in the heart is how we feed on Christ'.[115] Here the Evangelical position is made clear, as is the fact that a thoroughly liturgical ecclesiology is unlikely to be found among Evangelical divines.

Nevertheless, one warning of Bradshaw's should be taken to heart by those who uphold a liturgical ecclesiology. The life of the church is more than Sunday worship. Even if the liturgy is taken as the ecclesiological focus, it should be remembered that Christian life, ethics and eschatology cannot be limited to 'awaiting the next eucharistic event'.[116]

This introductory excursus sketched some of the classic distinctions between the Evangelical and the Catholic wings of Anglicanism.[117] Nevertheless, the author who is to be considered now, Michael Ramsey, has contributed much to the awareness that the Gospel is no Evangelical prerogative, as the church and its order are not exclusively Catholic features.

5.4.2 The Gospel and the Church

Arthur Michael Ramsey (1904-1988) was one of the most prominent Anglo-Catholic theologians and church leaders of the twentieth century. His theological career included professorships of Divinity at Durham (1939) and Cambridge (1950), after which he became bishop of Durham (1952), archbishop of York (1956), and archbishop of Canterbury (1961-1974).[118] His lasting contribution to ecclesiology is his book *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*

113 BRADSHAW, *The Olive Branch*, xii. This has evoked Avis's criticism that Bradshaw, although he works with the concept of *koinonia*, neglects baptism as constitutive of *koinonia* and the eucharist as expressing and sustaining *koinonia* (AVIS, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church*, 325).

114 BRADSHAW, *The Olive Branch*, 76-77.

115 BRADSHAW, *The Olive Branch*, 244, 257-258.

116 BRADSHAW, *The Olive Branch*, 253.

117 Cf. also section 6.2 (Noordmans & van der Leeuw) and paragraph 7.7.3 (Excursus: The Nature of Salvation and Participation).

118 HYLSON-SMITH, *High Churchmanship*, 315-322.

(1936). Because it appeared in a context dominated by theological liberalism, it made, with its emphasis on the cross, resurrection and judgement, an impression not unlike Barth's theology in his context.[119] Although only the first of many books, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church* is regarded as seminal for the subsequent unfolding of Ramsey's ideas, and therefore as a good introduction to his thought.[120]

The title's reference to the 'Gospel'—the gospel of salvation by Christ's death and resurrection—stands for an emphasis usually associated with an Evangelical approach to Christianity. The 'Catholic Church' stands for those aspects of the church which are usually associated with the Catholic branch of Christianity: liturgy and church order, in particular episcopacy. Written from an Anglo-Catholic perspective, Ramsey's book can be understood as both a vindication and a correction of his own tradition. A vindication, because it tries to establish church order, episcopacy and liturgy not as secondary additions to, but as constitutive elements of the gospel of Jesus Christ. A correction, because it tries to rediscover the gospel of Jesus Christ, and especially the *theologia crucis*, as central to any ecclesiology, that is, also to Anglo-Catholic ecclesiology. The book aims at demonstrating that the Evangelical emphasis on the gospel of Christ's death and resurrection and the Catholic emphasis on ministry and liturgy in fact belong together. Therefore, Ramsey says, Anglican 'comprehensiveness' should not mean that an Evangelical and a Catholic wing both receive permission to be part of the same church, but that Anglicanism consists of both Evangelical and Catholic truths, because only in combination they form the Christian faith.[121]

5.4.3 The Church Shares in Christ

Characteristic of a liturgical ecclesiology is the word 'sharing'. A Christian is someone who not only *believes* in the death and resurrection of Christ, but who also *shares* in them, or rather who becomes part of the *body* which shares in them. The liturgy is the act in which this sharing takes place most prominently. This is why the verb 'to share', and its equivalents such as 'partake', 'make their own', 'join', 'identify', 'apply', 'unite', 'draw into', 'fellowship', 'part of',

[119] P. SEDGWICK, 'Anglican Theology', in: D.F. Ford with R. Muers (eds.), *The Modern Theologians: An Introduction to Christian Theology since 1918*, Third Edition (Oxford: Blackwell, 2005), 178-193, at 178-184. Interesting are also Sedgwick's observation of ebb and flow between forms of liberalism (until the 1920s and from the 1960s) and forms of orthodoxy (from the 1930s and from the 1980s), and his recognition of 'the continuity in Anglican theology over the last seventy years, as it sought to respond to modernity in an attitude of "critical solidarity"' (191).

[120] Cf. DALES, *Glory*, xiv and *passim*.

[121] A.M. RAMSEY, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church* (London: SPCK, 1990 [reprint of 1956[2]], 1936[1]), 208-209.

'indwelling' and 'within' appear frequently throughout Ramsey's book. Christianity is a religion of participation.[122]

For Ramsey, the identification between Christ and the church is as intimate as for other authors already encountered in this chapter. 'The fact of Christ includes the fact of the Church.' The life of the church is, as it were, the biography of Christ.[123] This has an immediate impact on Ramsey's view on worship. Worship is the activity of Christ, in which the church shares. Ramsey connects this to his *theologia crucis* by saying that Christ's activity is primarily his high-priestly offering of himself, of which his death is the ultimate expression. As Christ is the high priest, his body is a priestly body, and the worship of the body—which is the activity of Christ—a priestly (sacrificial) liturgy.[124] As a result, every Christian prayer is 'liturgical' because it is participation of the church (or a member of the church) in Christ's sacrifice and heavenly intercession. And because the liturgy is the act whereby the church takes part most intimately in the work of Christ, the church can be said to be 'gathered around the Liturgy [...] of which the Eucharist is the centre'.[125]

The identification of Christ and the church, in combination with Ramsey's *theologia crucis*, leads to the assertion that the imperfect character of the contemporary church, including its lack of unity, is not a coincidental historical fact, but part of the church's sharing in Christ's death. The imperfectness of the church, and the suffering it brings with it, should not just be lamented or tried to be ignored, but should be experienced in the awareness that it is part of the church's unity with the crucified Lord.[126] Moreover, the concept of participation in Christ, juxtaposed to Ramsey's emphasis on Christ's self-sacrifice, leads to a deep awareness of human suffering as participation in Christ's suffering and, therefore, to a fundamentally 'kenotic' form of Christian spirituality.[127] This prevents Ramsey's insistence on the church's participation in Christ from becoming either cheap or triumphalistic.

The fact that a Christian only can become a Christian by entering the body, does not exclude the importance of every individual member of the body. By entering the body, individualism ceases and 'the individual finds himself'.

[122] Cf. RAMSEY, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*, vi, 6, 19, 25, 27-34, 36, 39-40, 43-44, 48-50, 60-61, 65-66, 93-94, 101, 104, 105, 108, 114, 117, 118.

[123] RAMSEY, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*, 34, 36; cf. 146, 157.

[124] RAMSEY, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*, 93, 114-115. The fact that the church is a priestly body, implies the 'priesthood of all believers', but Ramsey fears that the Reformers understood this term in the 'politicised' and 'individualized' sense of 'the independent rights of the laity' rather than as 'describing the share of the people in the priesthood of the one body' (188, cf. 115). On the other hand, Ramsey warns against a clericalist approach of the ordained ministry. Although the ministry is 'an indelible order', it should not be seen otherwise than as an organ within the body (117).

[125] RAMSEY, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*, 89, 94, 118-119.

[126] RAMSEY, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*, 7, 139, 174, 220, 224.

[127] Cf. DALES, *Glory*, *passim*.

Individuals become 'whole' ('Catholic') when they operate no longer on their own, but become part of the 'whole' (Catholic) church. Therefore, Ramsey regards corporate and individual language about salvation as equally legitimate, as long as the order is recognised: the individual Christian only exists because he or she has entered the body.[128] An example of this relation between the individual and the body is the veneration of saints. Ramsey recommends what he sees as the Eastern view on saints: they are not to be venerated as isolated individuals of high standard, but as members of the body in whom the sanctity of the body is manifested. This is, says Ramsey, particularly true of Mary, who represents the goal of all members of the body of Christ, because she is 'humanity indwelt by God' and 'first-fruits of the Church'.[129]

5.4.4 The Eucharist

'The Eucharist was at the heart of Bishop Michael's spiritual life and teaching'.[130] He emphasises the identity of the eucharistic and the ecclesial body of Christ, citing Augustine's famous phrase from *Sermo* 272, 'the mystery of yourselves is laid upon the table of the Lord; the mystery of yourselves ye receive. To that which you are, answer "Amen"'.[131] But he asserts that the Western church has largely forgotten this connection, so that one has to turn to the Eastern church in order to rediscover the rich meaning of *soma Christou*, which is not adequately retained in the Western understanding of the term *corpus Christi*.[132] The church should again be seen as an organic body rather than an institution. Part of the organic conception is the unity of all members of the body, clerical and lay. Another aspect is the fact that 'body of Christ' should not primarily refer to Christ's presence in bread and wine in an individualist, pietistic sense, but to the whole act of the eucharist and to the church. The eucharist is the act of Christ through his body the church.[133]

Ramsey asserts that the eucharist is not a mere repetition or imitation of the events which took place at the Last Supper. The eucharist does not refer to a specific moment in Jesus's life, but to his whole person and work. The eucharist shows forth the death and resurrection of Christ, and all other aspects of his

128 RAMSEY, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*, 38. 'In this approach, Bishop Michael took on the centrifugal tendencies in the Church as well as in society at large. He swam against this tide throughout his life, standing for a deeper and more organic view of reality, and of the ultimate unity and spiritual meaning of all human relationships' (DALES, *Glory*, 13).

129 RAMSEY, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*, 147.

130 DALES, *Glory*, 86; cf. 28, 54, 56, 70, 84-92, 108, 127, 153.

131 RAMSEY, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*, 112, 158. Cf. AUGUSTINE, *Sermones ad populum*, sermo 272 (PL 38, 1247): 'Si ergo vos estis corpus Christi et membra, mysterium vestrum in mensa Dominica positum est: mysterium vestrum accipitis. Ad id quod estis, Amen respondetis, et respondendo subscribitis.'

132 RAMSEY, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*, 165, 179.

133 RAMSEY, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*, 166-168, 171-173, 223.

Messiahship. So the words and rituals of the eucharist do not have to conform precisely to certain words or rituals in the New Testament, but they have to reflect the New Testament as a whole. The eucharist betokens everything Jesus was and did—it is his sacrifice; it sets forth the new covenant in his death; it creates his people, his new nation, the church; it makes his people partakers of his death; and it foreshadows his banquet in God's kingdom.[134] This means that the eucharist is inseparable from the church. The eucharist incorporates the church into the benefits of Christ. The eucharist is not an addition to the gospel, it is formed by the gospel itself and bears all the marks of it.[135]

5.4.5 Episcopacy

Ramsey describes the early development of the church as resulting into 'an organism of Sacraments, Episcopacy, Scriptures and Creeds'. This organic structure, developed in the Early Church, is not important because it represents a 'golden age', but because it is the way in which the gospel found expression in the church.[136] The four elements summed up by Ramsey are identical with those of the *Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral* (1886/1888), which gave as minimum requirements for ecclesial unity: Scripture, the Creed, baptism and the eucharist, and the 'Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples'.[137]

Ramsey emphasises the interrelation of these four marks of the church. Treated in isolation, the meaning of each of them is distorted. Creeds apart from Scripture run the risk of becoming scholastic, turning dogma into a fossile. Likewise, Scripture and Creeds must not be separated from their context, the worshipping church, the unity of which is expressed by the bishop. Scripture is not an isolated book, but is part of the witness of the church. The context of the Early Church with its bishops and liturgy is the 'true context' of the Bible.[138] In its turn, episcopacy has no existence outside the context of the church. Episcopacy is not a channel of grace which operates above or even apart from the church. Here Ramsey seems to distantiate himself from the so-called *episcopi vagantes*, persons who acquire episcopal ordination without having a church to serve. The isolated pipeline theory 'glories in the name of Catholic but [...] severs the doctrine of orders from the doctrine of the Body of Christ'.[139] Ramsey also distantiated himself from the 'branch theory', the old High Church

134 RAMSEY, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*, 96, 99-101, 118.
135 RAMSEY, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*, 105, 108.
136 RAMSEY, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*, 57, 140.
137 'Text of The Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral 1886/1888', in: J.R. Wright (ed.), *Quadrilateral at One Hundred: Essays on the Centenary of the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral 1886/88-1986/88* (Cincinnati OH: Forward Movement Publications; London-Oxford: Mowbray, 1988), vii-ix.
138 RAMSEY, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*, 62-63, 130-131, 181, 205.
139 RAMSEY, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*, 154.

Anglican view on the one Catholic church consisting of three branches—Eastern (Orthodox), Western (Roman Catholic) and British (Anglican).[140] According to Ramsey, this theory is a perfect alibi for acquiescing in schism. One cannot say that the Catholic church consists of several branches while at the same time accepting that these branches are not in communion with each other. Episcopacy *alone* cannot be the mark of the Catholic church.[141]

Ramsey does not believe that deep insight into the gospel will lead to indifference to ecclesial order. Neither does he believe that liberal Christianity's relativist attitude towards dogma and order will bring unity. Unity can only be found in the gospel, which centres around the death and resurrection of Christ and which implies—so Ramsey believes—the church and its order. This is the context in which Ramsey discusses episcopacy—as part of those elements of the church which express the gospel of Christ.[142]

The essence of the episcopate is, for Ramsey, to unite the body of Christ. The doctrine of episcopacy is an expression of the gospel of Christ because the doctrine of the body of Christ is incomplete without a ministry which *unites* this body. This means that Ramsey sees the episcopate as a continuation of the apostolate, which was not a 'local' ministry—like the presbyter-bishops and the deacons—but a 'general' ministry, 'not attached to local churches but controlling local churches on behalf of the general Church'. The task of the apostles was to secure both the link between the churches and Jesus Christ (continuity) and the link between the churches themselves (unity). The apostles were not enabled to this task by a special channel of grace, but by their place within the structure of the body of Christ in which every organ has its function. After the apostolic period, there was even more need of continuity and unity, and therefore of an apostolic ministry. The continuity of the gospel and the unity of the body of Christ asked for a continuation of the apostolate, which found its form in the episcopate.[143] Although Ramsey acknowledges that the bishop became a local figure while his view on the apostolate is universal, he emphasises the universal role of the bishop, namely to provide the unity between the local congregation and the general church.[144]

In Ramsey's thought, episcopacy belongs to the *esse* of the church. He does not 'unchurch' non-episcopal churches, but regards them as missing one of the ecclesiological essentials, as much as other churches may lack one or more

140 Forms of the branch theory are detectable from John Ussher (1581-1656) through William Laud (1573-1645) to the Tractarians (1833 and after). Unlike the earlier Anglicans, the Tractarians restricted the branches to churches with bishops in the apostolic succession. It is this form of the branch theory which Ramsey has in mind. Cf. AVIS, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church*, 69, 135, 241, 254, 345, 352.

141 RAMSEY, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*, 217-218.

142 RAMSEY, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*, 57, 66-67, 201-202.

143 RAMSEY, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*, 60, 68-69, 73-77.

144 RAMSEY, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*, 80, 84-85.

of the other ecclesiological essentials.[145] Notwithstanding his—to Anglo-Catholic standards uncharacteristically positive—allegiance to the Reformation tradition of gospel, faith and *theologia crucis*, Ramsey remains a characteristic Anglo-Catholic in his insistence on episcopal ministry. Aware that 'the Reformers' notion of the *unum necessarium* did not include episcopacy' (Avis),[146] In this respect, Ramsey not only refers to the Reformation, or even in the last instance to the post-Reformation tradition of the Church of England which, he claims, 'did not always perceive the meaning of its own order in its deepest relation to the Gospel and the universal Church', but to Scripture as received within the ecclesial reality of the Early Church.[147]

5.4.6 The Church Local and Universal

There is some unclarity as to the question whether Ramsey regards the bishop as a local or as a supra-local minister.[148] The meaning he attaches to the episcopate—preservation of unity—emphasises its supra-local character. This is consistent with Ramsey's derivation of the bishop from the apostle.[149] But the point of contact between the local and the universal function of the bishop is the eucharist. The bishop is the liturgical presider of the local church. Because the eucharist connects the local church to the whole body of Christ, its presider should not only have a local function, but should be the one who relates the local church to the whole people of God.[150] So, the eucharist is the focal point of identity between the local and the universal church. The bishop's function is most evidently expressed in the eucharistic celebration, which is the act of the universal church as represented in one place.[151]

145 RAMSEY, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*, 84, 219, 222-223.

146 AVIS, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church*, 352.

147 RAMSEY, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*, 205.

148 Perhaps the unclarity is partly due to the historically misleading assertion that—after (*a*) Jesus and the apostles, (*b*) the Pauline epistles, and (*c*) the pastoral epistles—the episcopate as described by Ignatius of Antioch is '(*d*) the final development' (RAMSEY, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*, 69). It would be historically more correct to add as stage (*e*) the change of the local model of the bishop and the presbyterium into the medieval model of the bishop as a provincial governor and the individualised priest as the local minister. Doing—like Ramsey—as if (*e*) is the same as (*d*) blurs the historical evidence and hinders the ecumenical discussion on episcopacy.

149 As indicated in chapter 2, Afanasiev does not believe in any other ministry than a local ministry. Even the apostles were members of a local church that sent them out on missions. Historically, Afanasiev deduces the bishop from the presbyter (episcopacy as the leadership of the presbyterate evolving into a ministry of its own) and not from the apostle, that is, not from the apostle as a supra-local overseer. The Evangelical Anglican tradition sides with Afanasiev—the bishop as the senior presbyter rather than as the bearer of an apostolic ministry of its own—but obviously with other consequences than Afanasiev (BRADSHAW, *The Olive Branch*, 174-179).

150 RAMSEY, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*, 60, 77, 113.

151 RAMSEY, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*, 79-80, 82, 95-96, 223.

There is unmistakably a priority of the universal over the local church in Ramsey's book. 'The one race exists first, precedes the local ecclesia and is represented by it.'[152] In Ramsey's thought the fact that the eucharist is central to the church does not lead to a particular emphasis on the local church. Rather, both eucharist and episcopate are seen as the organs which prevent the local community from regarding itself as self-sufficient.

Here exactly lies Ramsey's criticism of the continental Reformation. According to Ramsey, the Reformation neglected the necessity of a ministry that could secure the unity of the whole body of Christ. Luther's notion of the invisible church made him fail to recognise the importance of church order, not for order's sake but for the gospel's sake. Ramsey says that in Lutheranism individual groups of Christians are insufficiently linked to the whole people of God. This opened the way to individualism and subjectivism. Calvin, on the other hand, was eager to organise the visible church, but like Luther he neglected the relationship between the local community and the church as a whole. His conviction that the apostolate was a once-for-all order missed the point that it united the local churches into the one body of Christ, and that this function should be continued in the post-apostolic period. Ramsey acknowledges his indebtedness to the Reformers because they rediscovered the gospel and, by so doing, revitalised the church. Nevertheless, he regards their reforming work incomplete without the apostolic ministry.[153]

On the other hand, Rome has distorted the meaning of the episcopate by turning bishops into delegates of the Pope. In Ramsey's exegesis, all apostles and therefore all bishops share in the same apostolic office. Ramsey refers to Cyprian as he says, *episcopatus unus est*, and to the Conciliar Movement and Gallicanism as they tried to restore the balance between Pope and bishops.[154] But because the goal of episcopacy is to secure and express unity, Ramsey can imagine a form of primacy which serves this same goal of unity. Such a primacy should respect that the body of Christ has an 'organic' and not an 'institutional' character. It should reflect Peter's place as *primus inter pares* of the apostles. It should not be technically developed by discussing the concept of primacy in isolation, but it should naturally emerge from a better understanding

[152] RAMSEY, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*, 47, *cf.* 48, 60, 75, 84, 135. DALES, *Glory*, 109, even suggests that Ramsey's thought on the priority of the universal over the local church 'proved prescient of the vision enshrined in the statement of Vatican II, *Lumen Gentium*, about the nature of the Church', with its view that a bishop is primarily a member of the universal college of bishops and only secondarily (and not even necessarily) a diocesan bishop. This view is critically evaluated in paragraph 8.6.4.

[153] RAMSEY, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*, 181, 192-193, 196-197, 201.

[154] RAMSEY, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*, 71, 150, 169, 172. Cf. Cyprianus, *De ecclesiae catholicae unitate* 5, in: *Corpus Christianorum*, Series Latina, vol. III: *Sancti Cypriani Episcopi Opera*, pars I (Turnhout: Brepols, 1972), 252.

of the whole body of Christ with all the marks that continue the gospel message. In such an understanding of the church, 'Peter will find his due place'.[155]

5.4.7 Conclusion

Ramsey's *The Gospel and the Catholic Church* is still acclaimed as a seminal work for Anglican ecclesiology, both by Catholics and Evangelicals.[156] It invites Anglicans to rediscover the true meaning of both Catholic and Evangelical Christianity. Because Anglicans have much freedom, they are in a position in which they—easier than Roman Catholics—can emphasise that Catholicism is not a particular legal or devotional system, but 'the organic, corporate idea of the Body in life and worship'. As sources of inspiration, Ramsey refers to the Liturgical Movement of Mont-César and Maria Laach in Roman Catholicism,[157] but also to the Parish Communion movement in Anglicanism.[158] All churches have to 'return to their roots in the Liturgy and in the Word'. Anglicanism should be able to lead the way, because Anglicanism maintains by nature a healthy balance of gospel and church.[159] No aspect of Christianity should be considered in isolation. Scripture, creeds, sacraments and ministry receive their meaning in the context of the whole. And this context is the baptismal and eucharistic life of the church, based on the gospel of Christ's death and resurrection and the church's participation in it.[160]

5.5 PAUL AVIS

The previous three sections dealt with Anglican liturgical-ecclesiological thought that dated from the first half of the twentieth century. In the remainder of this chapter, attention is drawn to three contemporary Anglican theologians: Paul Avis, Rowan Williams and Catherine Pickstock. All three are, in their own

155 RAMSEY, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*, 64-65, 71, 163, 172, 227-228. Cf. section 7.7 (Anglican—Roman Catholic Dialogue) for an example of treating the theme of the primacy of the bishop of Rome within a wider ecclesiological framework.

156 The Anglo-Catholic Geoffrey Rowell calls it 'a profound expression of that reformed Catholicism to which Anglicanism at its best has borne witness'; D.G. ROWELL, 'Foreword', in: Ramsey, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*, i-v, at v. The other way round, the Evangelical Tim Bradshaw says the same: 'Ramsey can claim to represent a catholic evangelicalism'; BRADSHAW, *The Olive Branch*, 48.

157 Cf. paragraph 3.1.3 (The Liturgical Movement).

158 IRVINE, *Worship, Church and Society*, 73, points to the fact that Ramsey wrote his book while being sub-warden of Lincoln Theological College, not far from Kelham, where Hebert (cf. section 5.2) taught at that time, with whom Ramsey was continuously in contact during the writing.

159 RAMSEY, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*, 175-177, 203, 220.

160 RAMSEY, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*, 62-63, 127, 131.

way, influential in present Anglican self-understanding—Paul Avis mainly as an historical and ecumenical theologian who devotes much of his attention to ecclesiology, Rowan Williams as a leading systematic theologian and now, of course, also as archbishop of Canterbury, and Catherine Pickstock as the most 'liturgically' oriented member of the 'Radical Orthodoxy' circle which stirs up theological minds since the last decade.

5.5.1 The Quest for a Distinctive Anglican Ecclesiology

'Is the faith, practice and spirit of the churches of the Anglican Communion merely a product of the accidents of history', 'the decadent legacy of unprincipled Anglo-Saxon imperialism', or 'possibly the embodiment of some genuine ecclesiological truth or principle'?[161] And can a description of Anglicanism take any form, depending on whether you speak to a Catholic, Evangelical or Liberal Anglican, or is there a specifically *Anglican* understanding of the church?[162]

The quest for a distinctive Anglican ecclesial identity[163] is a main focus in the work of the historian and ecumenical theologian Paul Avis (born 1947). After having served as a parish priest, and as a member of doctrinal and ecumenical committees of the Church of England, he is General Secretary of the Council for Christian Unity of the Church of England, and Director of the Centre for the Study of the Christian Church in Exeter, where he is also Prebendary and Sub-Dean of the Cathedral and Research Fellow in the University's theological department.

This section first investigates Avis's reading of Anglican ecclesiology in general. As a tool to interpret Anglicanism in history and in the present, Avis has developed three paradigms or models of Anglican self-understanding. The Erastian and the apostolic paradigms are historical models. As the basis of a modern ecumenical Anglican ecclesiology, Avis offers the baptismal paradigm, in which some elements of the other paradigms are retained. Subsequently, particular attention is given to Avis's thought on the sacraments, ministry, ecumenism and mission in relation to his concept of Anglican ecclesiology. Finally, the question is asked to what extent this leading contemporary Anglican ecclesiologist upholds a liturgical or eucharistic ecclesiology.

161 P.D.L. AVIS, 'What is "Anglicanism"?', in: S.W. Sykes, J.E. Booty, J. Knight (eds.), *The Study of Anglicanism*, Revised Edition (London: SPCK; Minneapolis MN: Fortress, 1998), 459-476, at 459.

162 P.D.L. AVIS, 'The Churches of the Anglican Communion', in: P.D.L. Avis (ed.), *The Christian Church: An Introduction to the Major Traditions* (London: SPCK, 2002), 132-156, at 132.

163 A theme first taken up by S.W. SYKES, *The Integrity of Anglicanism* (London: Mowbrays, 1978); cf. S.W. SYKES, *Unashamed Anglicanism* (London: DLT, 1995). These books are reviewed in AVIS, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church*, 321-322, 328-330.

This section on Avis is no exception to the other presentations of writers throughout this study in that it focuses only on one aspect of the author's work. Under observation in this section is Avis's construction of a distinctive Anglican ecclesiology. Therefore, the systematic-theological[164] and practical-theological[165] sides of Avis's work remain somewhat concealed. The discourse here is largely historical, ecclesiological and ecumenical.

5.5.2 The 'Erastian Paradigm'

The English Reformers and the other sixteenth-century Anglican theologians worked on the basis of what Avis calls the 'nation-as-church model'. This model acclaims 'the citizen as Anglican'. For men like Thomas Cranmer (1489-1556) and Richard Hooker (c. 1554-1600), it was self-evident that church and society formed one Christian commonwealth. Another term Avis uses for this model is the 'Erastian paradigm'. Although the term 'Erastianism' has undertones of undue state interference in ecclesiastical matters, Avis uses it as a catchphrase to describe the pre- and post-Reformation situation in which church and state acted in constant relation to each other. In the Erastian paradigm, the monarch is the sacred symbol of the church. He or she stands for the integrity of both state and church.[166]

Avis's historical research demonstrates that the Anglican theologians of this period, like the continental Reformers, distinguished between things necessary to salvation and things indifferent (*adiaphora*) or accessory. The visible church is marked by faith in the one Lord and initiation by the one baptism. Matters of church order are of secondary importance. This does not mean, however, that episcopacy can be abolished at will. It should be preserved if possible—and it was possible in the English context. But it should be abolished if the bishops should prove unreformable—which was the situation on the continent.[167]

During this period, 'the royalism and the anti-Romanism went hand in hand' in the self-understanding of the English church: the church that had done away with papal supremacy was upheld by royal supremacy. Nevertheless, Avis emphasises the heuristic, not exhaustive, character of this paradigm: the church

[164] See especially P.D.L. AVIS, *God and the Creative Imagination: Metaphor, Symbol and Myth in Religion and Theology* (London-New York: Routledge, 1999).

[165] See especially P.D.L. AVIS, *A Church Drawing Near: Spirituality and Mission in a Post-Christian Culture* (London-New York: T&T Clark, 2003); but see paragraph 5.5.9.

[166] AVIS, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church*, xiv, 344-345; P.D.L. AVIS, *The Anglican Understanding of the Church: An Introduction* (London: SPCK, 2000), 15-16. The term 'Erastianism' is derived from the name of the Swiss theologian Thomas Erastus (1524-1583), who taught that in a territory with one religion, the state had both civil and ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The meaning of the term was broadened to include the modern state's legislation concerning the Established Church.

[167] AVIS, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church*, 35, 46-48.

of the English Reformation cannot be reduced to its Erastian aspect. It was a church in which the word was preached, the sacraments were administered, pastoral care was exercised.[168]

5.5.3 The 'Apostolic Paradigm' and the 'Anglican Consensus'

Within the continuing context of a strong relationship between church and state, the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries saw the emergence of another paradigm. In the seventeenth century two drastic changes took place. The Civil War and the Commonwealth resulted in the parting of a number of people from the Church of England, who could not accept the non-monarchical, non-episcopal, protestantised form it took at that time. But after the Restoration of monarchy, episcopacy and liturgy, another wing left the Church of England to become the 'non-conformists'. They did not differ so much from the Church of England in matters of faith, as in matters of ecclesiastical order and liturgy (which were not regarded as matters of faith, at least not decisively so).[169]

Strictly speaking, from then on one could no longer think in terms of the 'nation-as-church model', because a substantial part of the nation was no longer part of the Church of England. Although the connection with the monarchy and the state remained tense, the church could no longer consider the state and the monarch as its rationale. Out of the Commonwealth and the Restoration grew a self-confident Anglican identity, of which the episcopate was the mark. Avis calls this the 'apostolic paradigm' or 'episcopal succession model', summarised in the phrase, 'Bishops are essential'.[170]

The first period in which this paradigm was prominent, dates from the Restoration (1660) to just before the beginning of the Oxford Movement (1833). It is Avis's thesis that during this period an 'Anglican consensus' was formed. This consensus included a view on the Anglican Church as both Catholic and Reformed, or the other way round, as different from both the Roman Catholic and the continental Protestant Churches. Episcopacy and monarchy were regarded as *de jure divino*. Nevertheless, episcopacy was not regarded as necessary to salvation, or to being a true church. There was interchange of communicants and ministers between the Church of England and the continental Lutheran and Calvinist churches. Even High Churchmen like William Laud (1573-1645) and the other Caroline divines were critical of non-episcopal ministry but did not deny its validity.[171]

168 AVIS, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church*, 62; cf. xiv; AVIS, 'What is "Anglicanism"?', 460.

169 AVIS, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church*, xiv.

170 AVIS, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church*, xv, 79-80; AVIS, *The Anglican Understanding of the Church*, 19-20.

171 AVIS, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church*, 62, 65-66, 136. The 'Caroline divines', named after Kings Charles I (1603-1625) and Charles II (1660-1685), are the High Church

Between the Restoration and the Oxford Movement there was, nevertheless, a party who saw things in a more restricted way. The view 'that non-episcopal churches were no churches, their ministers were laymen, and their sacraments were no sacraments' was held by those who belonged to the Nonjuring schism. Although canonically outside the Church of England, the Nonjurors were a source of theological, liturgical and spiritual inspiration for High Church Anglicans. They form an ecclesiological and liturgical connection between the earlier High Church tradition and the nineteenth-century developments to be considered now.[172]

The second phase of the apostolic paradigm was initiated by the Oxford or Tractarian Movement.[173] Apart from more moderate Tractarians who represented the 'older' High Church tradition, the leading Tractarians[174] proved remarkably succesful not only in pushing traditional Anglican Catholic or High Church teaching to extremes, but also in making the general Anglican mind think that their interpretation of Anglican Catholicity continued the classical High Church tradition. Only recent historical research—including Avis's work—has put the more extreme 'Catholic' teaching of the Oxford Movement and of the subsequent Anglo-Catholics back into its historical place, that is, not as a seamless continuation of the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century High Church tradition—which operated within the 'Anglican consensus'—but as, for Anglicanism, a relatively new theology, particularly in its insistence on episcopacy in the apostolic succession not only as important but also as a reason for denying the validity of non-episcopal ministry and sacraments. [175]

theologians of the seventeenth century. 'In George Herbert, John Donne, Nicholas Ferrar, Lancelot Andrewes, John Cosin, Thomas Jackson, William Laud, there is an air which is somehow redolent of Catholicism while it is still Reformed'; CHADWICK, *The Spirit of the Oxford Movement*, 8.

172 AVIS, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church*, 78; cf. 82-84, 147-151. The 'Nonjurors' were those bishops (most notably Thomas Ken, 1637-1711), clergy and people who, in 1688, felt unable to accept William and Mary because they regarded themselves bound by their oath of allegiance to the previous King James II and to those whom they regarded as his legitimate successors. The Nonjurors lived a separate ecclesial life from 1688 to the end of the eighteenth century, when their bishops died out, most of their people had become members of the Church of England, and the death of James II's grandson deprived the movement of its original *raison d'être*. Cf. HYLSON-SMITH, *High Churchmanship*, 71-78.

173 Cf. paragraph 5.1.3 (The Anglican Catholic Context).

174 Avis's account of the Tractarians makes a distinction between, first, those representing the older High Church tradition (Rose, Palmer of Worcester, Hook, Gladstone), second, those radicalising the 'Catholic' character of Anglicanism (Froude, Keble, Newman, Manning, Pusey) and, third, 'the extremists, the avowed Romanisers' (Oakeley, Ward); AVIS, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church*, 181. Those whom I here call 'the leading Tractarians' are those who led the apostolic paradigm into its second phase, that is, Avis's second group (which is in this respect not different from the third group).

175 Cf. NOCKLES, *The Oxford Movement in Context*, 310 and *passim*; PLOEGER, *High Church Varieties*, 20-44 (online 10-22).

The difference between the first and the second phase of the apostolic paradigm can be summarised by the fact that the 'Anglican consensus' saw the Church of England as both Catholic and Reformed, whereas the Oxford Movement saw it as a Catholic Church. The Tractarians and their heirs, the Anglo-Catholics, saw (and see) the Anglican Church as a non-Roman, but Catholic Church. The allegiance to the Reformation and to the continental Protestant Churches was, if not completely blot out from, at least reduced in their consciousness—with Michael Ramsey as a notable exception.[176] The ecclesiological and ecumenical effects of this second variety of the apostolic paradigm are obvious. Not only do Anglo-Catholics uphold a (non-Roman but) strictly Catholic approach to their church, more important to Anglican ecumenical involvement is their conviction that episcopacy is not only essential to Anglican identity—this would be agreed by the 'Anglican consensus'—but is also a *conditio sine qua non* for communion with other churches. In this respect, Avis regards the apostolic paradigm as ecumenically too 'sterile' and even 'divisive'.[177]

5.5.4 Evaluation of the 'Erastian' and 'Apostolic' Paradigms

'The Erastian paradigm is dead.' Avis evaluates that since the Restoration it could no longer be the basis of Anglican self-understanding, although the monarch or Parliament kept ruling the Church of England until the beginning of the twentieth century. Moreover, in a post-Christian, multi-cultural society, Erastianism is no longer relevant as an ecclesiological paradigm.[178]

There are, however, aspects of this paradigm which Avis counts worthy to be retained and cherished. The most important of these aspects is the awareness—which Avis says is not limited to the Church of England but is part of the ethos of the whole Anglican Communion—that the church has a mission to the whole community. The Anglican 'ethos is essentially inclusive, not exclusive'.[179] Avis regards as other important aspects of the nation-as-church model—or are they aspects of the Catholic-and-Reformed character of Anglicanism?—the participation of the laity in liturgy and ecclesiastical government, and the right of each regional church to reform its life according to its needs. Avis wants to retain and include this inclusive ethos, this tradition of

176 NOCKLES, *The Oxford Movement in Context*, 146-183; AVIS, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church*, 343.

177 AVIS, *The Anglican Understanding of the Church*, 22; AVIS, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church*, 347.

178 AVIS, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church*, 344, 347.

179 AVIS, *The Anglican Understanding of the Church*, 26. This theme of being an inviting church in (post-) modern culture is worked out theologically and practically in AVIS, *A Church Drawing Near*; cf. paragraph 5.5.9. In the same missionary context, Avis pleads for a national, established and united church: P.D.L. AVIS, *Church, State and Establishment* (London: SPCK, 2001).

lay participation, and this provincial independence in a contemporary Anglican self-understanding.[180]

Likewise, Avis wants to retain something of the 'apostolic' paradigm. But he is most determined to leave one aspect behind—as 'ecumenically divisive', as taking 'one aspect of catholicity for the whole' and as a 'singularly deplorable example of the failure of sound learning, objective scholarship and the capacity for self-criticism'—namely, the anti-Reformation insistence on episcopacy as the *sine qua non* of church, sacraments and ministry.[181] Having said this, it is important not to confuse this with a wish to eliminate episcopacy as an important element of ecclesiology. 'Anglicans are committed to the historic episcopate; they are wedded to it and do not feel at liberty to compromise on it.'[182]

What Avis wants to do is to restore the apostolic paradigm to its pre-Tractarian form. As a result, Avis retains the importance of episcopacy, with the primary function of serving the unity of the church. An ecumenical consensus is growing towards the view that bishops, as signs of unity, will be part of a future united church. But to fulfill this service, episcopacy does not have to be of divine right, and does certainly not imply the view that—before a united church will be realised—non-episcopal ministry should be regarded as invalid. Because Avis sees the ministry of the bishop mainly as a service to the unity of the church, he emphasises the need of being in communion with the bishop. He remarks that, paradoxically, those who uphold a Tractarian view on the apostolic paradigm were in history the ones who most often disregarded the authority of their bishops, and are in the present the ones who most often break communion, look for alternative oversight, or start a 'continuing' church. Avis says that Anglicans should remain in communion with their bishops, exactly because the bishop is the sign of unity in Anglican ecclesiology. Anglicans should become more aware of the fact that the diocese is the church of Christ, the local eucharistic assembly of which the bishop is the presider. Only when the basis of baptismal faith is at stake—something which impairs the Christian belief in the Father, the Son and the Spirit—there is reason for a breach of communion.[183]

180 AVIS, *The Anglican Understanding of the Church*, 19, 26-27; AVIS, 'The Churches of the Anglican Communion', 147-148.

181 AVIS, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church*, 337, 347.

182 AVIS, *The Anglican Understanding of the Church*, 78.

183 AVIS, *The Anglican Understanding of the Church*, 28-29, 63-64, 78-79; P.D.L. AVIS, *Christians in Communion* (London: Geoffrey Chapman Mowbray, 1990), 60-61. Avis works out the example of breaking communion over the issue of the ordination of women, which is, he says, not an issue which impairs baptismal faith, and therefore should be regarded as an illegitimate reason for schism. Solutions without breaking communion include 'parallel jurisdictions' (at which the 'early Fathers would undoubtedly turn in their graves' and which is equal to 'institutional schism') and the provision of 'episcopal visitation' with the approval of the diocesan bishop, which Avis thinks appropriate to cater

5.5.5 The 'Baptismal Paradigm'

Avis's 'Erastian' and 'apostolic' paradigms are tools to interpret the history of Anglican ecclesiology. What he calls the 'baptismal paradigm', or the 'communion-through-baptism model', is his own proposal for a contemporary Anglican ecclesiology. Its catchphrase is, 'Baptism is the basis!' Unlike the historical paradigms, which were explicit models of Anglican ecclesiological self-understanding, the baptismal paradigm is a rather implicit model, which Avis digs out of the Anglican theological and liturgical tradition.[184]

The baptismal paradigm is not in every detail an alternative to the other paradigms. The previous paragraph already summed up some aspects of the 'Erastian' and 'apostolic' paradigms that Avis wants to retain in his 'baptismal' paradigm. The main point of the 'baptismal' paradigm, however, is that those aspects which were central to the other paradigms—the relation to the nation and episcopal order—*are retained but no longer seen as fundamental*, because common baptism—including 'the fundamental trinitarian baptismal faith of the Church'—takes the place of the fundamental principle. Avis's starting point is 'the immense ecclesiological significance of baptism as the instrument of our incorporation in Christ's messianic office'. As an effect, one of Avis's primary ecclesiological statements is that Anglicanism is no less and no more than a *part* of Christianity, together with all other churches which consist of baptised Christians.[185]

These considerations result in Avis's ecumenical Anglican ecclesiology. In the following paragraphs, aspects of this ecclesiology will be investigated that seem particularly relevant for an ecumenical liturgical ecclesiology—the relationship between baptism and the eucharist, the role of the ministry, the approach to ecumenism, and the relevance for mission.

5.5.6 An Ecumenical Anglican Ecclesiology: Baptism and the Eucharist

The fact that Avis calls his alternative paradigm 'baptismal' could lead to a misunderstanding. It means that the basic term of communion is baptism. It

for those who cannot accept a female bishop. The refusal to accept a male bishop who has taken part in the ordination of women, however, is 'to invoke the primitive notion of guilt by association—almost of taboo' and should be condemned as schism. AVIS, *Christians in Communion*, 67.

184 AVIS, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church*, 348-349; AVIS, *The Anglican Understanding of the Church*, 23-24. Historical evidence for an Anglican baptismal paradigm is given throughout AVIS, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church*, and is summarised in AVIS, *Christians in Communion*, 31-35.

185 AVIS, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church*, 346; AVIS, *The Anglican Understanding of the Church*, 24, 30-32, 60; AVIS, 'The Churches of the Anglican Communion', 140-141.

does not mean that Avis's ecclesiology is limited to the importance of baptism. Avis's ecclesiology is a communion (*koinonia*, *communio*) ecclesiology, as are many contemporary ecumenical ecclesiologies.[186] The reason why he calls his paradigm 'baptismal' is that baptism is the one and only incorporation into the communion of the church. This implies that, on the one hand, baptism says it all, but that, on the other, baptism is only the beginning.

Baptism says it all, because it is our incorporation into 'the great divine-human drama of redemption, from incarnation to glorification, in which God incorporated our humanity into his own divine life'. As a consequence, everyone who is baptised is baptised into the body of Christ—that is, into Christ and into the church. Through baptism, one becomes part of Christ in his fulness, and part of the church and all that it stands for.[187]

Baptism is only the beginning, because having been baptised into the body of Christ means having become a member of the body of Christ with its christological, ecclesiological and sacramental aspects. Avis is convinced that, sooner or later, the churches will understand that recognition of baptism has far-reaching consequences, because in the end it cannot mean anything else than recognition of each other's belonging to the church and all that it stands for.[188]

What, then, is the centre of the church and all that it stands for? This is the eucharist. Avis agrees with Orthodox eucharistic ecclesiology that 'the *koinonia* enjoyed by the local church as it celebrates the eucharist is the heart of our ecumenical understanding of the Church'.[189] Avis's historical and ecclesiological work culminates in a plea for intercommunion on the ground of baptismal recognition. As soon as churches recognise each other's baptism, they should also recognise each other's membership of the one eucharistic community which is the church. 'It is in our common participation in the eucharist that we come closest to realizing our Lord's prayer [...] that his disciples may be one as he is one with the Father.' And, referring to Paul's phrase about being one body *because* we partake of the one bread (1 Corinthians 10:17), Avis affirms: 'The eucharist builds up the body of Christ'. The eucharist is the best expression of what the church is: the eucharist is 'the paradigm of *koinonia*'. In the eucharistic celebration, communion with Christ and communion with all baptised fellow Christians are inseparable. For Avis, a common eucharist is neither the final point after full agreement has been reached on all issues of doctrine and order, nor a pragmatic anticipation of a not yet existing unity, but the best expression of the fundamental unity which

[186] AVIS, *Christians in Communion*, vii, 48.
[187] AVIS, *Christians in Communion*, 28.
[188] AVIS, *Christians in Communion*, vii, 21.
[189] AVIS, *Christians in Communion*, 49.

already exists between all who, by their baptism, participate in (have *koinonia* with) Christ and one another.[190]

5.5.7 An Ecumenical Anglican Ecclesiology: Episcopacy and Ministry

The baptismal paradigm, then, implies that churches accept one another's baptism and therefore one another's existence as Christians. 'We seek to be in communion with those who are already in communion with our Lord'.[191] The things necessary for ecclesial communion should, in Avis's view, be none other than the things necessary for salvation.[192]

For ecclesial communion, Avis takes the four pillars of the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral as 'indispensable features of visible unity'. Scripture, the creeds, the dominical sacraments and episcopacy are 'non-negotiable commitments'. Episcopacy is, thus, one of these commitments, though not in the sense of the later phase of the apostolic paradigm, which excludes the ecclesial identity of non-episcopal churches, but as the generally recognised ministry of a future united church.[193] A kind of primacy is not unthinkable within the limits of the Quadrilateral, as long as the primate remains a *primus inter pares*: a member of, not someone above, the episcopate.[194]

Although Avis accepts the validity of non-episcopal ministries and sacraments, he thinks Anglicans are 'not at liberty to compromise' on episcopacy. 'It is extremely unlikely that any Anglican church could be a serious partner in a scheme of visible unity that did not involve all participating churches eventually sharing in the historic episcopate.' According to Avis,

190 AVIS, *Christians in Communion*, 56; *cf.* vii, 7, 40, 43-44, 49, 54-55; P.D.L. AVIS, *Ecumenical Theology and the Elusiveness of Doctrine* (London: SPCK, 1986), 129; AVIS, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church*, 348; AVIS, *The Anglican Understanding of the Church*, 74. This position is critically evaluated in paragraph 8.4.4.

191 AVIS, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church*, 348; AVIS, *Christians in Communion*, vii, 59.

192 The Tractarians, indeed, thought differently. As Keble wrote, '"Necessary to Salvation," and "Necessary to Church Communion," are not to be used as convertible terms'. That is, Keble did not want to declare that members of non-episcopal churches were not saved, although he did not accept ecclesial communion with them. Cf. PLOEGER, *High Church Varieties*, 32 (online 16).

193 Compared to J.R. WRIGHT, 'Heritage and Vision: The Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral', in: J.R. Wright (ed.), *Quadrilateral at One Hundred: Essays on the Centenary of the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral 1886/88-1986/88* (Cincinnati OH: Forward Movement Publications; London-Oxford: Mowbray, 1988), 8-46, Avis's view seems to be in line with the original intent.
It is, however, hard to understand how Avis can uphold the identity of (a) things necessary to salvation and (b) things necessary to ecclesial communion. If he takes the Quadrilateral as a requirement for (b), but does not regard non-episcopal churches as missing (a), there appears to be a difference between (a) and (b) after all.

194 AVIS, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church*, 350; AVIS, *The Anglican Understanding of the Church*, 70, 80.

Anglicanism should not be criticised for this on the ground that episcopacy comes only to us through tradition, because the canon of Scripture and the ancient creeds come to us through tradition as much as episcopacy. It is important to notice, however, that Avis does not interpret episcopacy in the sense of the later apostolic paradigm, that is, not in the sense that only by accepting episcopal ordination the other ministries will be validated. In Avis's ecclesiology episcopacy is indispensable not as the channel for validity but as the effective symbol of unity. Avis's position regarding episcopacy can be summarised as necessary for structural union but unnecessary for the recognition of other churches' ecclesiality, sacraments and ministries.[195]

Avis claims that the recognition of the ministries in other (including non-episcopal) churches can be grounded in the baptismal paradigm. Moreover, he holds the opinion that recognition of baptism will at the end of the day inevitably lead to the recognition of ministries. His argument runs as follows. There is no other access to Christ than through his body, the church. Likewise, there is no other access to his body than through baptism. Ministry is no exception to this. Ministry exists within the church, not apart from it or above it:

> A grasp of the significance of baptism, whereby the believer is invested with Christ's priestly office, would suggest that, since the fullness of priesthood dwells in the whole priestly body of the Church, the ordained ministry must indeed derive its priesthood from this source—i.e. from Christ through his body the Church—for there is no 'other realm' outside the body of Christ to which it might belong.[196]

On the one hand, Avis is clear in asserting that the minister acts *in persona Christi*. On the other hand, he combats a dualism between Christ and his body, the church. Because Christ and his body are intimately linked in a *koinonia* ecclesiology (and Avis says *koinonia* is best translated by 'participation'), Christ and the church, and also the ministry and the church, belong together and cannot be placed over against each other. The whole church acts *in persona Christi*. Suggesting that the ministry derives its priesthood from Christ in a way different from the baptismal priesthood of the whole church is, Avis claims, turning the identity between Christ and his body into a mere metaphor. A *koinonia* ecclesiology should not allow this to happen. It affirms the participation, founded in baptism, of the whole church in Christ—in his body, in his priesthood, in his fullness (*pleroma*). The ministry—to which ordination is not a 'democratic' kind of 'delegation', but the real, effective, sacramental commissioning and bestowal in the name both of Christ and of his body—is 'an *economy* internal to the life of the Church'. Any ministry is 'the reflection,

[195] AVIS, *Christians in Communion*, 59; AVIS, *The Anglican Understanding of the Church*, 72, 78-79.

[196] AVIS, *Christians in Communion*, 11, 76.

expression and public manifestation of the *koinonia*—based on baptismal incorporation into Christ—of any given ecclesial body'.[197]

In short: for Avis, the church as a whole is the starting point of ecclesiological reflection. The church as a whole is *koinonia* with (participation in) Christ. Every aspect of the church, including its ministry, cannot be grounded in anything else than in the *koinonia* which is the whole church and into which baptism is the one and only incorporation. With baptismal recognition (recognition of being in *koinonia*) goes recognition of ministry (an ordered ministry within the *koinonia*). Therefore, although episcopacy is needed for full visible unity, it is not a requirement for the recognition of other churches' ecclesiality and 'valid' ministry.

5.5.8 An Ecumenical Anglican Ecclesiology: Comprehensiveness as Ecumenical Model

One of Avis's typically Anglican contributions to an ecumenical ecclesiology is his thought on comprehensiveness. In the face of the pluriformity which exists in all major Christian churches, Avis regards it as an impossible task to strive for ecumenical consensus on all matters of doctrine or ethics. Moreover, in the light of the postmodern condition, with its simultaneous emphasis on globalisation and particularity, he warns that

> [a]n undifferentiated totality, an ecumenical soup, would be even more ideologically suspect than the present plurality of distinct communions with their patently defensive boundaries of identity. There must be another way of discovering our solidarity in Christ without sacrificing the identity constituted by our tradition, our time-tested way of being Christians together in a particular community.[198]

Avis offers Anglican comprehensiveness as a model for a future united church—comprehensiveness not as a weakness but as a strength. Necessary for this view is Avis's distinction between essentials and *adiaphora*. 'Anglican comprehensiveness permits a latitude of belief and practice on inessentials within a common discipline of worship and pastoral structure in the parish system.'[199] Avis urges his fellow Anglicans, to remain in communion with their bishops and not to start a breakaway church or to seek alternative oversight. Comprehensiveness is held together by common worship and the episcopate.

[197] AVIS, *Christians in Communion*, 15, 79-80, 92-93, 96; AVIS, *The Anglican Understanding of the Church*, 67-69; AVIS, 'The Churches of the Anglican Communion', 143-144; P.D.L. AVIS, *A Ministry Shaped by Mission* (London-New York: T&T Clark, 2005), 72-76, 94-103, 114-117.

[198] AVIS, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church*, 347. Cf. paragraph 7.1.4.

[199] AVIS, *Ecumenical Theology*, 80.

Avis challenges the Roman Catholic Church to develop a similar kind of rationale for its own incurable pluriformity, as a contribution towards a comprehensive united church of the future.[200]

Before comprehensiveness can be offered as an ecumenical model, however, the very meaning of the concept of comprehensiveness has to be clarified. Within Anglicanism, Avis discovers three interpretations of this concept. The first is to regard comprehensiveness as a mere juxtaposition of irreconcilable opinions. Although Avis knows of no theological justification of this view, he assumes that this is the most popular view on Anglican comprehensiveness, both from within and from outside. Each wing of the church takes its own churchmanship for the right one, but accepts that there are other wings with completely different ideas. The second interpretation of comprehensiveness is that the Anglican position consists in the middle way between the extremes which exist within the comprehensive church. According to this view, Anglican identity is seen as a *via media* between Rome and the Reformation. Thirdly, comprehensiveness can be used as a justification for an eclectic theology. This interpretation upholds that Anglican theologians can draw their inspiration from all corners of the Christian tradition, according to their fancy.[201]

It is Avis's conviction that comprehensiveness as an ecumenical concept cannot in the last resort be built upon one of these three interpretations—juxtaposition, compromise or eclecticism. It should fundamentally be built upon the rather 'tacit' conviction that we all 'share the same hope, participate in the same salvation and follow the same Lord'. This implicit intuition is, says Avis, the essential upon which many Christians base their faith. It should not be the task of theologians to make their fellow Christians aware of the theological differences which separate them from Christians in other churches. It should rather be the task of (ecumenical) theologians to develop a comprehensiveness which is based on this basic intuition. Here again, Avis's thought is built upon the notion of 'essentials'—the essentials shared by all Christians on the basis of their common baptism.[202]

5.5.9 An Ecumenical Anglican Ecclesiology: Mission through Word, Sacraments and Pastoral Care

One of the cutting edges of Avis's ecclesiology is the way in which he incorporates the concept of mission. It is no secret that the centrality of 'mission' in contemporary Anglican thought, speech and practice does not stem

200 AVIS, *Ecumenical Theology*, 115; AVIS, 'What is "Anglicanism"?', 474-475; AVIS, *The Anglican Understanding of the Church*, 44-49.
201 AVIS, *Ecumenical Theology*, 118-122; cf. AVIS, *Christians in Communion*, 52.
202 AVIS, *Ecumenical Theology*, 125-131.

from 'Catholic' or 'Liberal' Anglicanism, but from its 'Evangelical' wing.[203] Avis's approach to mission can be read as an invitation to 'central' or 'higher' Anglicanism to integrate the concept of mission into its own self-understanding.

What, then, does mission mean in an understanding of Anglicanism that is in the first instance affirmative (though corrective), rather than suspicious, of the innate inclinations of contemporary people?[204] What does mission mean in an understanding of the Christian faith in which the church, the sacraments and the ministry are not just seen as matters of ecclesiastical practice but as fundamental theological loci?[205] Even, what does mission mean in the context of an ecclesiology in which the eucharist is allowed to be the central paradigm?[206] Avis's approach to mission starts with the acknowledgement of *God's* mission, the *missio Dei*. It regards the church as a part of God's mission. More specifically, it sees the church as centred around the word and the sacraments and as served by an ordained ministry that gives priority to 'the pastoral'.

In expounding the nature of mission as rooted in the *missio Dei*, Avis offers a biblical-theological 'wholeness paradigm' that is close to the soteriology of *koinonia* expounded elsewhere throughout this study. It is, Avis says, God's aim to make people 'whole' and 'well', to 'heal' people in body, mind and spirit. This is something deeply resonant with the needs and desires of contemporary people.

> What does militate against the spirit of the age is my stress on the public, communal application of this paradigm. I stoutly resist the reduction of wholeness, healing and fulfilment to individualistic, self-centred, subjective experience. I insist that God is concerned with communities, as they exist structured in societies. For that reason, the Christian mission is ineradicably ecclesiological, for the Christian Church is itself just such a structured, ordered community or society. It is to that community that the mandate of mission is given.[207]

According to Avis, God's redeeming work takes the form of 'the healing of human identity'.[208] Identity—personhood—is given in relationship (*koinonia*). Therefore, 'redemption is not only about the salvation of the individual. It is

[203] Cf. R. HOLLOWAY, 'Introduction', in: J. John (ed.), *Living Evangelism: Affirming Catholicism and Sharing the Faith* (London: DLT, 1996), 1-8.

[204] Cf. AVIS, *A Church Drawing Near*, 99-130 and *passim*. Here Avis presents his understanding of 'common religion': the innate 'sense of the sacred' in people (even people in contemporary culture), which the church has first to accept and then, if appropriate, cautiously to correct.

[205] Cf. AVIS, *A Church Drawing Near*, vii, 50 and *passim*.

[206] Cf. AVIS, *A Church Drawing Near*, 37, 122, 143, 148, 181, 200; AVIS, *A Ministry Shaped by Mission*, 16, 19, 118.

[207] AVIS, *A Church Drawing Near*, 23; cf. 19-27, 90.

[208] AVIS, *A Church Drawing Near*, 37.

about the life of communion in the body of Christ, the personal integration that comes from social integration.' Mission is, then, 'essentially ecclesial'.[209]

If this theological and ecclesiological foundation is taken as a starting point, mission cannot be defined in terms of the 'evangelistic industry' that offers the gospel to individuals as an instant remedy—'a capitulation to the consumerist ethic if ever there was one'.[210] Mission is wider than evangelisation—it does not only include *kerygma*, but also *leitourgia*, *diakonia* and *koinonia*. 'A holistic understanding of mission not only affirms the priority of evangelization, but relates it to the life of the Church.'[211] Mission, then, appears to be the patient (but actively present) living of ecclesial life in its modes of *word*, *sacraments* and *pastoral care*. Mission is then, first and foremost, the acceptance of people in their search for meaning and healing, even if their presuppositions seem inadequate to Christian theological or liturgical standards.

In such situations, the ministry of the *word*, as a missionary asset, takes the form of a dialogue with the thoughts and experiences of contemporary people.[212] Only through such an attitude may the church hope to correct patiently what might be false in contemporary people's understanding of Christianity. These fallacies, Avis suggests, stem from a too strict attitude of the church in the past; the outmoded, stereotyped perception (reinforced by the media) of Christian doctrine, particularly concerning the reading of Scripture, as if that can only be done in a fundamentalist way; and 'the disastrous combination of divine providence (understood in a rather mechanical sense) and the *lex talionis*', which should be countered by proclaiming that Christians believe in a 'suffering God'.[213]

In this missionary understanding, the *sacraments* mainly take the form of the 'rites of passage', the 'occasional offices'—especially baptisms, weddings and funerals—through which the church is, to a certain extent, able to meet people's desires and where it has the opportunity, if prudently taken, to try to correct some of people's prior assumptions in the light of the Christian faith.

> Part of our pastoral role is to understand and to interpret the genuine but inarticulate spiritual instincts of individuals who do not have the received Christian vocabulary on the tip of their tongue.[214]

[209] AVIS, *A Church Drawing Near*, 44; cf. 28, 39-44, 94, 129, 155-179, 185.
[210] AVIS, *A Church Drawing Near*, 87.
[211] AVIS, *A Ministry Shaped by Mission*, 18; cf. 14-21. Cf. paragraphs 7.5.4 and 7.6.2.
[212] AVIS, *A Ministry Shaped by Mission*, 26-28.
[213] AVIS, *A Church Drawing Near*, 114-121.
[214] AVIS, *A Church Drawing Near*, 142; cf. 131-142.

Of course, this missionary-through-pastoral ministry of the sacraments does not make the sacraments shine forth in all their theological and ecclesiological splendour:

> The sacraments of the Church cannot be tailor-made for a particular individual. On any given occasion, only a few facets of a stupendous reality will shine out. Pastoral skill lies in drawing out what speaks most directly to the candidate's spiritual condition.[215]

Interestingly, Avis's plea for a pastoral, missionary application of the sacraments, mainly the rites of passage, does not stand in opposition to a sacramental concept in which the eucharist is central. Avis regards the eucharist as the most fundamental sacrament of the church, and calls 'sacramental initiation' through baptism, confirmation and first communion 'the central task of evangelization',[216] but at the same time he respects the empirical fact that the regular Sunday celebration of the eucharist is not the main missionary tool in the church's sacramental kit. The community centred around the eucharist—constitutive though it is for the church—should look beyond the eucharistic centre.[217] Thus, affirming the eucharist as 'crucial to ecclesial identity' and as 'paradigmatic for our understanding of all Christian symbolism',[218] Avis applies this sacramental symbolism to all sacraments and the whole liturgy. As a missionary asset, the liturgy has to make most of its '[v]ivid metaphors' that speak louder to people than any sermon.[219] For that reason, not only the rites of passage but also the metaphoric contents and aesthetic imagination of all Christian liturgy has an unmistakable missionary power.[220]

After the word and the sacraments, *pastoral care* is the third component in Avis's understanding of mission. He even gives it, as a missionary mode, priority over the first two: 'Personal, practical, loving care and support in the name of Christ, extended to individuals, households, institutions and communities, opens the way for the ministry of word and sacrament.'[221] For Avis, the *ordained ministry* is important for the church's pastoral strategy, because, although all baptised share in the *missio Dei*, an effective missionary position of the church in society requires the visibility and accessability of the

215 AVIS, *A Church Drawing Near*, 141.
216 AVIS, *A Ministry Shaped by Mission*, 30; cf. 34.
217 AVIS, *A Church Drawing Near*, 181, 186.
218 AVIS, *A Church Drawing Near*, 148, 181.
219 AVIS, *A Church Drawing Near*, 146, 150; AVIS, *A Ministry Shaped by Mission*, 29-30.
220 AVIS, *A Church Drawing Near*, 143-154; cf. AVIS, *God and the Creative Imagination*, 83-89 and *passim*.
221 AVIS, *A Church Drawing Near*, 180.

church's 'official representatives', the clergy.[222] Making contact, creating points of access, is the main missionary task Avis assigns to them. Making most of the remnants of 'common religion', the church should make itself findable for those who seek meaning, community, belonging.[223] Such a ministry of presence requires the art of taking time. It is Avis's conviction that not the quick conversion but the gradual growing from alienation to belonging creates a sustained community.[224] 'So let us hear no more of pastoral care as mere "maintenance" of the status quo, contrasted unfavourably with mission.'[225]

5.5.10 Conclusion: A Liturgical Ecclesiology?

Avis's ecumenical Anglican ecclesiology is not explicitly a 'liturgical ecclesiology'. Implicitly, though, it does not differ much from a liturgical or eucharistic ecclesiology, in the sense (wider than the liturgical or eucharistic event on its own) in which this study investigates it. It is an ecclesiology of communion (*koinonia*), understood as an ecclesiology of participation. At its heart is the conviction that Christ and his body, the church, are essentially one, and that this unity is accomplished by sacramental incorporation. Of this *koinonia* baptism is the starting point (and the only necessary starting point) and the eucharist the pivotal expression.

As already encountered in the work of the founding father of eucharistic ecclesiology, Afanasiev, it is hard to draw a line between a eucharistic ecclesiology, which emphasises the priestly character of the whole celebrating body of Christ, and a baptismal ecclesiology, which emphasises the act by which one is initiated into this celebrating body of Christ.[226] Eucharistic ecclesiology presupposes baptism, because it is by baptism that people enter the celebrating community. Baptismal ecclesiology leads to the eucharist, because the once-for-all immersion of the baptised into Christ and into the fellowship of the church is time and again reinforced by the celebration of the eucharist. Baptism and the eucharist are celebrations of, and convey participation in, the same Paschal mystery of Christ, which is the essence of all that the church is about. For this reason one can take Avis's ecclesiology—particularly his views on baptism, intercommunion, ministry, comprehensiveness and mission—as a fundamental Anglican contribution to the concept of a liturgical ecclesiology.

Moreover, in a recent article Avis explicitly asks himself the question whether his perception of Anglican self-identity can be understood as a

222 AVIS, *A Church Drawing Near*, 169. 'Representation' is a key concept in Avis's theology of ministry; cf. AVIS, *A Ministry Shaped by Mission*, 69-76, 81-82, 98-100, 118 (for a sensitive distinction between lay and ordained ministries: 114-117).

223 AVIS, *A Church Drawing Near*, 180-200.

224 AVIS, *A Church Drawing Near*, 86, 140, 198.

225 AVIS, *A Ministry Shaped by Mission*, 42.

226 Cf. paragraph 2.2.2.

'eucharistic ecclesiology'.[227] Understandable in the context of his wish to represent a 'mainstream' Anglicanism,[228] he shows a certain reluctance to subsume his thought under the denominator of one particular school (which 'eucharistic ecclesiology' used to be, at least in its initial phase within Orthodoxy). He nevertheless sees important twentieth-century Anglican divines 'moving along the same lines'—Avis numbers Gore, Ramsey and Thornton among those who 'were on a trajectory that pointed towards a full eucharistic ecclesiology'—and Avis himself calls eucharistic ecclesiology 'one of the most creative developments in Christian theology in the last half-century'.[229]

Avis proposes some elements to modify—or perhaps just complement or articulate—eucharistic ecclesiology along the lines of his ecumenical Anglican ecclesiology. Not surprisingly,[230] the first is his wish to make the relationship between the eucharist and *baptism* more explicit. 'The significance of the truth that the Eucharist presupposes baptism and that baptism contains a theological dynamic and momentum that leads to the Eucharist needs to be developed.' The second proposal is a stronger articulation of the proclaimed Word within ecclesiology. Avis 'would have a more *kerygmatic eucharistic ecclesiology*'. The final element Avis wants to emphasise is a *missionary*, 'outward looking' thrust:

> I would see baptism and Eucharist both as *instruments* of mission, as they set forth God's redemptive action in Christ, and as *goals* of mission, because evangelisation must necessarily be geared towards, and lead to, initiation into Christ, into the Church as the Body of Christ. [...] I would be giving eucharistic ecclesiology more of a cutting edge.[231]

Rather than running the danger of 'turning [eucharistic ecclesiology] into something rather different',[232] Avis's articulations seem undoubtedly compatible to, and often deeply consistent with, the emphases laid in the liturgical or eucharistic ecclesiologies of the various other theologians discussed in this and other chapters. Avis's own contribution is twofold. Firstly, he presents an Anglican ecclesiological self-understanding that is both historically undergirded and contemporarily relevant. Secondly, he puts this Anglican identity in the perspective of the ecumenical quest for a shared ecclesiology. Such a shared approach to the nature and purpose of the church is necessary for

227 P.D.L. AVIS, 'Anglicanism and Eucharistic Ecclesiology', in: U. von Arx, P.D.L. Avis, M. Ploeger (eds.), *Towards Further Convergence: Anglican and Old Catholic Ecclesiologies* (Bern: Stämpfli, 2006), 28-45.

228 Cf. AVIS, *Anglicanism and the Christian Church*, 302.

229 AVIS, 'Anglicanism and Eucharistic Ecclesiology', 42-43. Avis mentions John Hind and Rowan Williams as contemporary examples.

230 Cf. paragraph 5.5.6.

231 AVIS, 'Anglicanism and Eucharistic Ecclesiology', 43-44.

232 AVIS, 'Anglicanism and Eucharistic Ecclesiology', 44.

the unity of the Christian church and for its mission—or rather, its part in God's mission—in the world.

5.6 ROWAN WILLIAMS

5.6.1 Life and Work

Rowan Williams (born 1950) is currently the archbishop of Canterbury. In this study, however, he is mentioned primarily as a leading Anglican theologian. He began his theological career as a lecturer at Mirfield theological college (1975). A period at Cambridge followed, where he was chaplain and tutor at Westcott House theological college (1977), University lecturer (1980), and Fellow and Dean of Clare College (1984). In 1986 he changed to Oxford where he succeeded the Anglo-Catholic theologian John Macquarrie as Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity. Before becoming archbishop of Canterbury in 2002, he was bishop of Monmouth from 1992 and, additionally, archbishop of Wales from 2000.[233]

The influences upon his spiritual and theological life[234] include his firm though non-conservative allegiance to Anglo-Catholicism with its sacramental theology and its social character,[235] his ambiguous relationship to the liberal theology of the twentieth century,[236] his indebtedness to theologians critical of liberalism, notably Karl Barth (1886-1968) and Donald MacKinnon (1913-1994),[237] and his special congeniality with Eastern Orthodoxy.[238] As a result of these influences, Williams circumscribes (his version of) Anglican theology as

233 R. SHORTT, *Rowan Williams: An Introduction* (London: DLT, 2003), 31, 37-38, 48, 52, 64.

234 Cf. the interview with Williams in: R. SHORTT, *God's Advocates: Christian Thinkers in Conversation* (London: DLT; Grand Rapids MI: Eerdmans, 2005), 1-23.

235 T. HOBSON, *Anarchy, Church and Utopia: Rowan Williams on Church* (London: DLT, 2005), 7-10; cf. paragraph 5.2.2.

236 HOBSON, *Anarchy, Church and Utopia*, 10-12. Cf. R.D. WILLIAMS, *Anglican Identities* (London: DLT, 2004), 85-86: 'I am pleading for a recognition on all sides that the word "liberalism" is complex and slippery, and that, despite the angry polemic of the right, there is no single "liberal agenda" to be written off as apostasy. But on the other side, I want to pose some questions to an ecclesial left that can collude with the conservative caricature by assuming that there is indeed a self-evident emancipatory agenda, in which all issues can be decided by appeal to a particular definition of rights [..., which] avoids the labour of working through why a new perspective on some questions remains part of one continuing conversation, part of a common work with the writers of the Bible or the creeds'. Williams pleads for an Anglican theology and spirituality of 'patience' in 'an age dramatically impatient and intolerant of many sorts of learning' (7).

237 SHORTT, *Rowan Williams*, 18-19; HOBSON, *Anarchy, Church and Utopia*, 12-16.

238 HOBSON, *Anarchy, Church and Utopia*, 16-20. 'This is the most distinctive of the various influences on Williams, the only one that a bright Anglican theologian might have avoided' (16).

> the sort of Reformed Christian thinking [...] content to settle with a church order grounded in the historic ministry of bishops, priest and deacons, and with the classical early Christian formulations of doctrine about God and Jesus Christ—the Nicene Creed and the Definition of Chalcedon. It is certainly *Reformed* thinking [...]: it assumes the governing authority of the Bible [...] and repudiates the necessity of a central executive authority in the Church's hierarchy. It is committed to a radical criticism of any theology that sanctions the hope that human activity can contribute to the winning of God's favour, and so is suspicious [...] of a theology of the sacraments which appears to bind God too closely to material transactions (as opposed to seeing the free activity of God sustaining and transforming certain human actions done in Christ's name).[239]

In the nineteen seventies, Williams was a co-founder of the so-called 'Jubilee Group'. Convened by Kenneth Leech (born 1939), an East London parish priest and theologian in the Anglo-Catholic Christian Socialist tradition, the Jubilee Group fought a tendency within Anglo-Catholicism to confine itself to ritual and conservatism. The aim was to revive the social—including the political—consciousness of Anglican Catholicism on the basis of a trinitarian theology and a sacramental ecclesiology.[240] Williams was also one of the initiators of 'Affirming Catholicism', a movement within the Anglican Communion which exists since 1990. It unites Anglo-Catholics who distantiate themselves from the rather conservative attitude of traditional Anglo-Catholicism, mainly connected with the issues of the ordination of women and the acceptance of practising homosexuals both lay and ordained. Affirming Catholicism claims to be the contemporary phase of the Catholic movement within Anglicanism.[241] Finally, Williams was instrumental in the emergence of the 'Radical Orthodoxy' movement, to which he not explicitly belongs, but the formation of which, foremost by his pupil John Milbank (born 1952), is hardly conceivable without his influence.[242]

Williams is probably best described as a 'radical traditionalist'. Radical in his political, economic and social views. Traditional in his orthodox—though rather creative than conservative—Catholic theology.[243] Something of this

239 WILLIAMS, *Anglican Identities*, 2-3.

240 SHORTT, *Rowan Williams*, 28-29; HOBSON, *Anarchy, Church and Utopia*, 31.

241 HYLSON-SMITH, *High Churchmanship*, 361-366; PLOEGER, *High Church Varieties*, 98-107 (online 49-54); S. CONWAY (ed.), *Living the Eucharist: Affirming Catholicism and the Liturgy* (London: DLT, 2001), 140; HOBSON, *Anarchy, Church and Utopia*, 62-64.

242 SHORTT, *Rowan Williams*, 35; HOBSON, *Anarchy, Church and Utopia*, 67-69, 72-75; cf. paragraph 5.7.1 (Radical Orthodoxy).

243 SHORTT, *Rowan Williams*, 2-6; M.D. CHAPMAN, 'On Being a Radical Traditionalist: An Overview and Discussion of the Theology of Michael Ramsey', *Affirming Catholicism Journal* 21 (Winter 1996), 17-27. Cf. paragraph 5.6.8.

radical traditionalism may be detected in the following account of selected themes that seem to have particular relevance for a liturgical ecclesiology.[244]

5.6.2 A Methodology of Celebration

In the introduction to this chapter the fundamental relation of Williams's theology to the mind of the church was already briefly encountered.[245] Moreover, Williams's methodology is not only linked to the church in general, but also, more particularly, to the church as a worshipping community. Williams identifies a 'celebratory', a 'communicative' and a 'critical' way of doing theology, which ideally should be in constant connection to each other. What he calls the *celebratory* is a kind of theology that keeps as close as possible to the primary event from which all theology flows—songs and sermons, poetry and iconography. Celebratory theology is 'less to argue than to evoke'. The *communicative* way of doing theology is an attempt to connect a religious tradition of the past to the culture, imagery and language of contemporary society. In all periods of Christianity such translations have been made—examples range from Greek philosophy in patristic times to Marxist categories in twentieth century liberation theology. The communicative not only serves to translate ancient categories into contemporary language, it has the opposite effect as well: 'the unfamiliar idiom may uncover aspects of the deposit of belief hitherto unexamined'. Finally, the *critical* category of theology is the method of 'conceptual clarity', the method most often associated with academic theology. It challenges and tests the language of believers, be it in the celebratory or in the communicative mode. The critical is needed to question those religious presumptions which are otherwise too easily taken for granted. But, however necessary, the critical is neither the goal nor the end of the theological enterprise. According to Williams, a consequent pursuit of the critical way of theologising either ends in agnosticism, or leads back to the celebratory.[246]

244 As the references reveal, this account of Williams's ecclesiology is mainly based upon his major collection of theological essays, *On Christian Theology*, with additional reference to his major collection of sermons: R.D. WILLIAMS, *Open to Judgement: Sermons and Addresses* (London: DLT, 1994) and a limited number of other publications. See also the chapter 'God in Company' in: R.D. WILLIAMS, *Tokens of Trust: An Introduction to Christian Belief* (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2007), 105-133, which can be read as an accessible summary of Williams's eucharistic ecclesiology.

245 Cf. paragraph 5.1.2.

246 WILLIAMS, *On Christian Theology*, xiv-xvi. Williams acknowledges that his threefold typology is adapted from Friedrich Schleiermacher's 'poetic', 'rhetorical' and 'scientific'. Cf. F.D.E. SCHLEIERMACHER, *Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, vol. VII: *Der christliche Glaube nach den Grundsätzen der evangelischen Kirche im Zusammenhange dargestellt (1821/22)* (Berlin-New York: de Gruyter, 1980), I 10 ('dichterisch', 'rednerisch', 'wissenschaftlich').

Williams's point is that these three paradigms of theology have the same status, particularly if each of them is constantly nurtured by the other ones. The choice of one of the paradigms is mainly influenced by the 'public' one has to address.[247] For the theme of the present study it is important that Williams gives the celebratory a central place in his theological methodology—theology both starts and ends there. Theology's subject matter is 'people who pray'. Language about God can never become independent of language to God or before God.[248]

5.6.3 An Anthropology of Relation

Fundamental for Williams's world view is his conviction that human beings do not exist separately but in relation to each other and as members of communities. This could be called an anthropology of relation. The identity of the self is only discovered in relation to—and therefore dependent on—the other. Identity is only received as a gift, in 'conversation'. But because this conversation is also 'negotiation', the discovery of one's identity always runs the risk of being imposed by the more powerful other. As a result, the formation of identity may include a period of resistance to those 'others' who have determined one's identity. Therefore, everyone needs a 'non-competitive other' on whom to rely for the formation of identity, without being forced into an identity which serves the other rather than one's authentic identity. According to Williams, God is this non-competitive other. As creator and as giver of grace, his action always precedes our action, and his action is not influenced by our action. In relation to God, human identity can grow because it has neither to be created nor to be defended.[249]

What Jesus did was revealing this God of grace and forming a community in which this non-competitive relationship should be normative. Consequently, there can be no 'good' in the church if it is good for me alone. Salvation is a 'common good' which God assigns not to this or that individual, but to all. The sacraments are there to 'reconstruct or radicalize' our common identity. Baptism and the eucharist are passages 'into new solidarities'. To describe this solidarity, Williams uses the words 'belonging' and 'gift'. Even our most 'individual' identity is received in reciprocity from each other as a 'gift'.

247 WILLIAMS, *On Christian Theology*, xvi, 9. Williams borrows the concept of the 'publics' Church (celebratory), Society (communicative) and Academy (critical) from D. TRACY, *The Analogical Imagination: Christian Theology and the Culture of Pluralism* (London: SCM, 1981), 3-31.

248 WILLIAMS, *On Christian Theology*, 7, 13, 27, 84, 86, 143, 185, 284. HOBSON, *Anarchy, Church and Utopia*, 25-29, 49-50, traces this conviction back to the influence of the later Wittgenstein on Williams's thought: 'Christianity is not a doctrine but a description of something that actually happens' (26); the Christian faith is to be found in its language, prayer, worship.

249 WILLIAMS, *On Christian Theology*, 70-71, 239-250; cf. WILLIAMS, *Open to Judgement*, 243-244.

Therefore, people are not autonomous individuals, but 'belong' to each other.[250] David Ford summarises an understanding of personhood attributed to, among others, Williams as follows:

> the self, or soul, that is shaped before the face of Jesus Christ is 'eucharistic'. He or she participates with and for others in the abundance of blessing [...] and takes responsibility with and for others [...].[251]

Thus, both the person and the church are defined by a basic understanding of—as Zizioulas called it—'being as communion'. Like Zizioulas, Williams grounds his anthropology and ecclesiology in the Trinity. God as Trinity is 'intrinsic self-love and self-gift'. His creation, including the creation of humanity, is a 'giving away' of himself. The doctrine of the Trinity is not a theological abstraction, but a specific view on God which implies a specific view on the human world. In the light of the Trinity the world is transformed into 'a comprehensive human community'.[252]

5.6.4 The Church as the Start of a New Humanity

The church, according to Williams, is the group in which the new human community is prefigured. It is the community in which the ultimate aim of the Christian faith—the transformation of the world—has started. In Williams's writings, this is never interpreted in a narrow, ecclesiastical sense—as if sooner or later everyone should belong to the church in order to be saved. The picture Williams decribes is rather the other way round—he prefers speaking of 'the new humanity' or 'the new community' as terms which in principle refer to the entire world. Everything that can be said of the church, should in principle be said of all humanity.[253]

In the meantime, the church is not a perfect institution. Although it is meant to be a place where the new humanity is practised, it remains as much part of the old humanity. On the one hand, the church 'signifies (means, points to) the humanity that could be'. This is most clearly visible in prayer and sacraments, because growing into the likeness of Christ and towards the Father are most poignantly seen in the church's sacramental life. But on the other hand,

250 WILLIAMS, *On Christian Theology*, 24, 209, 212-214, 248-252, 262, 269, 286.

251 D.F. FORD, 'Holy Spirit and Christian Spirituality', in: K.J. Vanhoozer (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Postmodern Theology* (Cambridge: CUP, 2003), 269-290, at 284; cf. M. PLOEGER, 'Een zingend wezen. Liturgie en muziek, mens en gemeenschap in het werk van David F. Ford en andere hedendaagse anglicaanse denkers', in: M.J.M. Hoondert *et al.* (eds.), *Door mensen gezongen. Liturgische muziek in portretten* (Kampen: Gooi & Sticht, 2005), 272-285.

252 WILLIAMS, *On Christian Theology*, 74, 179; WILLIAMS, *Open to Judgement*, 245. On Zizioulas, cf. paragraph 2.3.5.

253 WILLIAMS, *On Christian Theology*, 31, 120, 177, 238, 285, 287.

the church cannot claim 'finality', because it is not yet the new humanity to which it points. The church is a 'sign of the Spirit rather than its domicile'. The church has not yet reached its goal, since it is engaged in an ongoing process of becoming Christ-like in every new situation. For Williams, the presence of Christ in the church is indicated rather by the fact that the church remains asking questions in every new situation, than by presuming that history is consummated in the church's once-for-all answers.[254]

Consequently, Williams emphasises the distinction between Christ and the church rather than their identity. He affirms that Christ gives what he has to give to human beings 'in significant part through the mediation of the common life, which is itself his "body"', but he is eager to add that the church 'does not exhaust his identity or activity'.[255] Williams wants to retain a critical distance between Christ and the church—the fact that Christ is active in the church means in Williams's theology first and foremost that Christ remains the church's *judge*. The Christian life should be characterised by an awareness of 'repentance, provisionality, openness to judgement, the acknowledgement of failure'. In short, the church itself is still 'in process of formation' as long as it is 'an historical human community'.[256]

What, then, are the characteristics of the new humanity to which the church points? As Williams's relational anthropology suggests, humanity should be determined by *community*. Moreover, its should be determined by *unrestricted* community. The church should beware of every attempt at restricting community—'the Christian begins with a non-negotiable commitment to basic egalitarianism'. Williams is clear in his conviction that the gospel of Jesus's life, death and resurrection has social and political implications.[257] The new humanity will know no 'racial or sexual exclusivity'. Christians should be involved in 'resistance to consumer pluralism'. The church should take seriously the issues of women, sexuality, death and suffering. Liberation and humanisation are 'Christ-like events'. '[I]n theological terms, human history is the story of the discovery or realization of Jesus Christ in the faces of all woman and men'. 'Christlike humanity' will be no longer subject to any kind of

254 WILLIAMS, *On Christian Theology*, 101, 124, 143-144, 146; cf. WILLIAMS, *Open to Judgement*, 221-223, 277-278. The dialectic in Williams's ecclesiology between the church's high calling and the church's empirical reality is the main theme in HOBSON, *Anarchy, Church and Utopia*; cf. paragraph 5.6.8.

255 WILLIAMS, *On Christian Theology*, 189; cf. 188, 192, 194.

256 WILLIAMS, *On Christian Theology*, 132, 192, 252, 271-272. This awareness of the church's historical, not-yet-fulfilled and often sinful existence is a main distinction between Williams and the Radical Orthodoxy school of thought (cf. paragraph 5.7.1), with its tendency to an ecclesiological 'triumphalism' through its strong identification of Christ and the church, and its lurking 'fundamentalism' through its all-pervasive anti-liberalism. Cf. HOBSON, *Anarchy, Church and Utopia*, 74-75.

257 WILLIAMS, *On Christian Theology*, 262, cf. 40, 42, 76, 162, 164, 172, 179, 220, 233, 263; WILLIAMS, *Open to Judgement*, 54-55, 83, 258.

slavery. The story of Christ offers to the world 'a kind of critical human norm', according to which a new humanity can be built up. The characteristics of this new humanity are summarised in the term 'transfigured persons'.[258]

In Williams's ecclesiology, the church prefigures this new humanity not by all kinds of rules and not even primarily by what it has to *say*, but mainly by simply being what it *is*: a community of people performing transformative acts. This, he writes, is

> the vision of the Church as 'epiphany': what matters about the Church is not a system of ideas as such (though doctrine and dogma have their place) nor the structure of an organisation competent to deliver authoritative judgements and to require obedience (though order is important in its proper context), but what the bare fact of the Church *shows*. [... T]he Church *is* the message. [...] It is first and foremost the epiphany of God's action, especially God's action in the paschal events, and so too of God's nature. It exists to radiate the glory of God. This can only be seriously maintained, of course, if we allow that the Church is what it is visibly and tangibly in one context—the Eucharist.[259]

This quotation leads to the next paragraph. Imperfect as the church is, the prefect image of God and his kingdom is anticipated and celebrated in the eucharist:

> [A]gainst [...] distortions, moralist and pietist, the Catholic tradition affirms that the life of God and God's Kingdom is real and concrete here, not in our achievement but in the sacraments. *There* is the steady course run by divine reality in our midst, the life and death and resurrection of Jesus, into which our lives are invited.[260]

5.6.5 The Sacraments as Defining Christian Identity

Williams deliberately refrains from a definition in which the church is set apart from the rest of humanity. The church is part of all humanity and practises or rehearses the new life which is meant for the whole world. And as the words just quoted indicate, whoever wants to define this practicing and rehearsing of the new life, is referred by Williams to the sacraments, particularly the eucharist.

Sacraments are those signs and symbols by which the community defines itself, just as all human beings use signs—including language—to define their identity. Like Israel celebrates its festivals in order 'to *become again*' the people

258 WILLIAMS, *On Christian Theology*, 24, 37, 39, 143, 173, 177, 174-175, 195; cf. 208.

259 WILLIAMS, *Anglican Identities*, 91-93. Williams is describing here an aspect of Ramsey's thought, but the formulation is his own and is representative of his own vision.

260 R.D. WILLIAMS, 'Postscript: Talk of the Devil', in: J. John (ed.), *Living Evangelism: Affirming Catholicism and Sharing the Faith* (London: DLT, 1996), 97-102, at 101.

whom God chooses, liberates and sustains, so the church celebrates certain acts which define the church as that which it most intimately is—a communion incorporated into the Paschal event of Jesus Christ. Williams calls the sacraments 'characteristic (i.e. self-identifying) acts of the Church'. In the sacraments the church 'makes sense' of itself.[261]

Baptism and the eucharist celebrate 'those events that are understood as forming the particular historical difference of the tradition'. In other words, in celebrating Christ's death and resurrection, the sacraments celebrate the events which make Christianity what it is. Although it is important for Williams—as became clear in the preceding paragraphs—to emphasise that the church is more than 'a cultic institution', the sacraments are nevertheless pivotal in the church's existence, because they focus precisely on the events (death and resurrection) which characterise the church's identity and, moreover, they are powerful means of humanity's 'immersion' into and 'participation' in these foundational events. The sacraments lead humanity to 'a new self-identification, a new self-description'. Participation in the sacraments brings about a 'ritual change of identity' which is, importantly, 'not confined to the ritual context, but continues in the practical interactions of the common life'.[262]

Notwithstanding Williams's thorough engagement with Scripture, it is in his theology not Scripture as such—Scripture as a corpus of texts—which defines Christian identity. The unity of what Scripture has to say, is to be discovered 'in a community that says and does identifiable and distinctive things'. Through the ages it has been baptism and the eucharist which most clearly show how this community identifies itself, namely as a community identified with the death and resurrection of Christ. The church 'reads' Scripture from that which forms the church's centre. And the church's centre can be 'read' out of baptism and the eucharist. So, the sacraments teach that the Paschal event is central to the understanding of both the church and Scripture.[263]

Although Williams, as an Anglo-Catholic, accepts the eucharistic doctrine and practice of the consecration of bread and wine, and the adoration of Christ in the consecrated bread, his emphasis is not on the priest and the elements but on the act of the community, not on a change of the elements but on a change—a transformation—of the people into a new humanity with new solidarities. Baptism implies a transition from natural bonds to the new context of the community. The eucharist implies a transition from uncertainty and betrayal to unrestricted community and solidarity.[264]

But does the empirical reality of the church in history and at present 'allow us to speak so serenely about what is made manifest in the eucharistic

261 WILLIAMS, *On Christian Theology*, 200-205, 209, 273.
262 WILLIAMS, *On Christian Theology*, 10, 27, 32, 141, 189, 211.
263 WILLIAMS, *On Christian Theology*, 55-59, 185.
264 WILLIAMS, *On Christian Theology*, 206-221.

assembly?'[265] It is typical for Williams that the way in which the sacraments define Christian identity is presented by him as profoundly *critical*. 'It is madness to wear ladies' straw hats and velvet hats to church; we should all be wearing crash helmets'.[266] The fact that baptism and the eucharist point to Christ's death and resurrection implies that the church's identity does not rest on a 'safe' basis, but on the critique of Christ's cross and vindication—as will be elaborated in the next paragraph. The sacramental life of the church is 'committed to the preservation [...] of its own questionability'.[267]

> The Church may be perfectly the Church at the Eucharist, but its life is not exhausted in the Eucharist: there is a life that is always struggling to realise outside the 'assembly' what the assembly shows forth.[268]

5.6.6 Incarnation and Judgement

Williams's theology, particularly his view on the church and the sacraments, includes a reassessment of what he calls the 'incarnationalist consensus' in Anglican theology. It is interesting to study Williams's thought on the incarnation, especially as the incarnation was already encountered as an important issue in the theology of the Parish Communion movement and will be encountered again in Catherine Pickstock's thought.[269]

Like Ramsey, Williams insists that not the incarnation but Christ's death and resurrection are the founding events of the church. There can be no talk about the incarnation without talking about Christ's life, death and resurrection.[270] The problem Williams has with the incarnational trend in Anglican theology is that it runs the risk of interpreting the incarnation as an end in itself, as 'the fusion of heaven and earth', leading to a deeply static and secure view on the church and the sacraments, but also on the secular life. In Williams's words, this interpretation of the incarnation is 'ideological', by which he means that it affirms the (ecclesial, social, political, cultural) *status quo* rather than that it questions it.[271]

Williams is afraid that the Anglican 'incarnationalist consensus'—with founding fathers like Maurice, Gore and Hebert—tended towards using the incarnation in such a sense. According to Williams, their reference to the incarnation served a *hallowing* of the human condition by the fact that God became human, without sufficient emphasis on the *critical* words and deeds of

265 WILLIAMS, *Anglican Identities*, 98; cf. 95, 99-101.
266 WILLIAMS, *Open to Judgement*, 117; cf. 55, 109.
267 WILLIAMS, *On Christian Theology*, 100.
268 WILLIAMS, *Anglican Identities*, 100; cf. WILLIAMS, *Open to Judgement*, 256.
269 Cf. paragraphs 5.2.2, 5.2.4 (Parish Communion movement), 5.7.7 and 5.7.8 (Pickstock).
270 Cf. RAMSEY, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church*, 5-7; WILLIAMS, *On Christian Theology*, 82, 89.
271 WILLIAMS, *On Christian Theology*, 85, 99, 206.

Jesus Christ. For example, the catchword of the 'incarnationalist consensus', *kenosis*—God's self-emptying—was primarily understood as the process of God becoming human, whereas Williams sees *kenosis* exemplified not in the general fact of God becoming human but in the particular life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. Jesus's historical life tells of *kenosis*, and the *ordo cognoscendi* of revelation is that we first have Jesus's kenotic life from which we can learn how God is, and that incarnational theology is secondary to this experience of Jesus's kenotic life. Referring to the Christian Socialist elaboration of incarnational theology, Williams says that the social vision (based on Christ's life) shapes the incarnational doctrine, not *vice versa*.[272] In short, it is *the Paschal event* that characterises God's incarnation in Christ and therefore his will for the world.[273]

In the more imaginative language of a sermon, Williams compares the meaning of the incarnation to the birth of a child—an event which does not lead to stability and cosiness, but to 'broken nights, hungry mouths', incomprehensible crying and laughter. Babies 'make their presence felt, they alter lives'. So is the incarnation of God in Jesus—'he confronts us with the alarming, mysterious, shattering strangeness of God'.[274]

The incarnation of God in Jesus Christ is, for Williams, not primarily a hallowing of creation, and certainly not a hallowing of existing structures, but a *judgement* of creation and humanity. First and foremost, Christ's life has been a judgement of all forms of community. 'Christology exists because of the reconstruction of community'. In Christ, every exclusion—ritual, racial, national, sexual, economical, political—has become inacceptable.[275] By telling the story of Jesus Christ, the church judges both the world and itself. Not only secular communities are placed under judgement, also the church itself is asked whether it is determined by ideology rather than faith, how its power is used, whether it is a restricted or an open community. Jesus's story asks the question of how we are related to his story. When we relate Jesus's ministry, death and resurrection to our own lives, Jesus's story will judge ours.[276]

Moreover, the church continuously places itself under the 'judgement of baptism, preaching and Eucharist'. Because the Paschal event—present in the church's preaching and sacraments—is constitutive of the church, it is the same event by which the church is continuously judged. By celebrating the sacraments, the church is always reminded of its essence, and always called back to live up to its essence: 'the sacraments faithfully performed hold up a mirror to other forms of sociality and say that these are at risk and under

272 WILLIAMS, *On Christian Theology*, 92, 161, 225-227, 231, 234; WILLIAMS, *Anglican Identities*, 90-91; cf. SHORTT, *Rowan Williams*, 111.
273 WILLIAMS, *On Christian Theology*, 89-92, 105, 156, 229-230.
274 WILLIAMS, *Open to Judgement*, 35-36; cf. 64-65, 122.
275 WILLIAMS, *On Christian Theology*, 99, 189, 228-230, 233, 286.
276 WILLIAMS, *On Christian Theology*, 31, 91, 104, 162.

judgement'. Finally, when the church is open to 'repentance and judgement', it will discover that these are not negative terms, but prerequisites for 'conversion and transformation'.[277]

5.6.7 Being Transformed

In Williams's theological environment it has become rather fashionable to speak of 'transforming' or 'transfiguring'.[278] Williams himself uses terms like 'transformation', 'transfiguration' and 'transition' as comprehensive descriptions of the goal of the Christian faith.[279] Proceeding from a general to a specific use of the term, the following nuances can be detected. In the most general sense, faith transforms one's understanding and interpretation of the human condition.[280] More specifically, the Christian faith aims at a transformation of people into the likeness of Christ through the Spirit,[281] and a transformation of the world into the kingdom of God.[282] Here transformation becomes related to conversion, in the sense in which this concept was encountered in relation to judgement and repentance in the previous paragraph.

Most specifically, the sacraments are signs of and means towards this transformation of human existence and the world at large. The sacramental action includes a transition, a transformation, from one situation to another. The rite gives the partakers a new identity. A sacrament understood as a corporately performed action, shows best how a sacrament aims at transforming the participants from a 'pre-sacramental' to a 'sacramental' state. Sacraments are there to incorporate the partakers into the central event of the Christian faith—Christ's transition, transformation or transfiguration from death to glorified life. The transition from self-centred individuals to Christ-like members of his

277 WILLIAMS, *On Christian Theology*, 58, 83, 164, 220. With M.A. HIGTON, *Difficult Gospel: The Theology of Rowan Williams* (London: SCM, 2004), 35-36, one could ask whether Williams's 'focus falls too consistently on the "No" of the cross rather than on its encompassing "Yes". [...] I suspect that the tenor or atmosphere of his writing is too unrelentingly *agonized*—too aware of the possibilities of self-deceit, too aware of the dangers of cheap consolation, ever to relax in the Sabbath rest of God's love, feasting at table with the Son, despite all the dangers that attend such relaxation'. Not questioning the validity of this objection, one must however point at the rather deficient account of Williams's eucharistic theology given by Higton (61, 72-75) and, perhaps as a result, the very limited place the eucharist receives in Higton's exposition of Williams's theology. A reading of Williams's theology that grants the eucharist a more pervasive role could possibly provide the balance for which Higton asks.

278 Cf., e.g., D.F. FORD, *Self and Salvation: Being Transformed* (Cambridge: CUP, 1999), 9, 85 (where Paul Ricoeur is the origin); D. STANCLIFFE, 'Evangelism and Worship', in: John (ed.), *Living Evangelism*, 25-42 (esp. 36-41).

279 WILLIAMS, *On Christian Theology*, 40, 45, 50, 101, 172, 207, 210, 233, 248, 253, 288.

280 WILLIAMS, *On Christian Theology*, 14, 39, 41, 161, 162, 197-198, 253.

281 WILLIAMS, *On Christian Theology*, 28, 38, 41, 83, 116, 120, 123, 143, 195, 264, 266, 270.

282 WILLIAMS, *On Christian Theology*, 31, 33, 37, 39, 42, 104, 164-165, 192, 272.

community is 'realized in these actions'. The 'end-point' of the sacraments is the creation of communion.[283]

Baptism and the eucharist speak of God's act that draws people into communion. Therefore, the sacraments are also signs of hope. They show not only how the world is to be interpreted but, moreover, how the world can and will be transfigured.[284] People have to come again and again to the sacraments, to be 'broken open' into an attitude of hospitality and worship. Both the social attitude of compassion and charity and the liturgical attitude of joy, beauty and worship are 'the overflowing of response' to God's transforming power.[285]

5.6.8 A Radical Traditionalist

Commentators characterise Williams's work as 'difficult'—not just because of 'academic jargon, involved argument, abstruse references and subtle distinctions', but most of all because of 'the searching, disarranging, devastating difficulty of the Gospel' as Williams expounds and explains it.[286] His work is deeply marked by nuance, sometimes amounting to ambiguity, but more often opening new perspectives. He is perceived as 'both orthodox and liberal', 'a radical traditionalist', 'keen to do justice to all sides of an argument [...] simultaneously rather than sequentially', adhering to a 'nuanced orthodoxy'. He is able to surprise friend and foe by 'his inference that one may arrive at fresh conclusions via orthodox paths'.[287] As one observer notices, however, 'Whether contemporary Anglicanism has much space for such subtlety remains an open question'.[288]

An example is Williams's reasoning in favour of the ordination of women. Rather than, as he calls it, 'raiding the Egyptian storehouses of sociology', he argues along the path of the theology of the incarnation. Rupert Shortt recounts:

> Patristic teaching on Jesus' attributes had been grounded in the claim that 'the unassumed is unhealed'—and what Christ 'assumed' was representative humanity, not only maleness. This argument would blow away the defence of a single-sex priesthood on the grounds that the apostles were men, Williams thought. They

283 WILLIAMS, *On Christian Theology*, 209-210, 214, 216-217.
284 WILLIAMS, *On Christian Theology*, 207-208.
285 WILLIAMS, *Open to Judgement*, 30-31. In David Ford's account, God's transforming power results into 'a hospitable self', 'a non-idolatrous self', 'a worshipping self', 'a singing self' and 'a eucharistic self' (FORD, *Self and Salvation*, *passim*).
286 HIGTON, *Difficult Gospel*, 3; cf. 2-10.
287 SHORTT, *Rowan Williams*, 1-2, 5, 8, 40.
288 CHAPMAN, *Anglicanism*, 93. This doubt stems mainly from Chapman's observation that a sometimes 'belligerent' Evangelicalism is in the ascendant (74, 143).

> were also Jews; but no one had ever seriously claimed that Gentiles were thereby unfit to stand at the altar *in persona Christi*.[289]

Another example is 'the manner in which Williams derives his allegiance to socialism from doctrinal premisses'. As already indicated, his trinitarian ontology leads to an anthropology and sociology of communion. The political edge of this thinking in terms of communion shows itself in Williams's critique of the globalised free market economy which, he claims, is governed by a fundamental individualism and is socially divisive.[290] Characteristically, such a view springs forth from a deeply rooted theology. 'If the church understands itself rightly, it *already* has this agenda'.[291] In Williams's own words, 'the bare fact of the Church is our social programme'.[292]

The complex nuance in Williams's thought is intimately connected to his approach to the spiritual life. Commenting on John of the Cross, Williams ponders how God, in the 'dark night of the soul', 'sweeps all human religious constructions—conservative, radical or whatever—away'. Williams himself writes: 'In the middle of all our religious constructs—if we have the honesty to look at it—is an emptiness. The Dark Night is God's attack on religion'.[293]

One commentator, Theo Hobson, analyses Williams's radical traditionalism—especially in view of ecclesiology—so thoroughly that he is left with the question whether the conventional concept of the church can survive Williams's vision.

> Church in [Williams's] full sense is not an institution but an anarchic movement. Yet Williams wants to insist that this vision is compatible with the 'conservative' face of catholicity: the affirmation of church as the body of Christ. Williams is therefore promoting a disruptive and a conservative account of catholicity *at the same time*.[294]

Hobson questions the possibility of this combination. He thinks that the core of Williams's Christian vision—renewed community—points beyond rather than to the church. He reads in Williams's work an impossible ecclesiology.[295]

Hobson's investigation shows, nevertheless, why this ambiguity between the Christian vision (including the ecclesiological vision) and muddled ecclesial reality does, for Williams, not amount to a separation. The reason is that, for

289 SHORTT, *Rowan Williams*, 36-37. This concurs with Herwig Aldenhoven's view; cf. paragraph 4.7.5.

290 SHORTT, *Rowan Williams*, 95, 107-125, including a discussion of some criticisms of Williams's political views.

291 HOBSON, *Anarchy, Church and Utopia*, 31.

292 WILLIAMS, *Open to Judgement*, 258.

293 Cited in SHORTT, *Rowan Williams*, 100-101.

294 HOBSON, *Anarchy, Church and Utopia*, 44.

295 HOBSON, *Anarchy, Church and Utopia*, xiii, 15, 23, 35, 40, 44-46, 53-54, 57, 59-60, 64, 67, 69, 78-79, 82, 87, 93, 99-101.

Williams, Christianity is inconceivable without its concrete embodiment in a community—however dreary a community it may be—and, most of all, in the sacramental acts of that community. The church must always more faithfully become what it *should be* and, moreover, what it sacramentally already *is*. Therefore it is in Williams's thought the eucharist that makes the church.[296] In the eucharistic celebration, the church becomes 'epiphanic': it shows Christ to the world (and to itself!), which it too often fails to do outside the liturgy.[297]

Williams's critical ecclesiology is, therefore, still an ecclesiology. Not a triumphalistic, but a kenotic and eucharistic ecclesiology. Irrespective of the amount in which the church succeeds or fails in giving the Christian vision empirical shape, there is one occasion in which the visionary and the empirical meet: the liturgical celebration. Hobson's reading of Williams is, therefore, a radical version of a liturgical ecclesiology:

> [T]he key to his ecclesiology is the fact that he really believes in the Eucharist. The ritual representation of Jesus' passion and resurrection is the engine of the Christian vision: this ritual is utopian, in the sense that it offers a glimpse of a healed world—and a first step towards it (a first step that is always the only possible step). And at the same time the Eucharist is the justification of the cultural burden we call church. [...] Because there must be Eucharist, there must be church. Without the Eucharist, Christianity is abstract idealism, prey to every passing fashion. Riteless it's rootless. Because it has the Eucharist at its heart, the church can be forgiven—for turning the vision of total peace into something all too human. [...] The fact that the church stages this primal rite about Jesus is what justifies it.[298]

5.6.9 Conclusion

Although most of Rowan Williams's publications are not explicitly about ecclesiology, there is hardly an article or book in which he does not make connections to ecclesiology, and to a 'liturgical ecclesiology' for that matter. Williams stands in the Anglo-Catholic tradition, as his view on the Christian faith as a religion of communion and his insistance on the sacraments as the markers of this communion show. One finds, however, in Williams not a

296 HOBSON, *Anarchy, Church and Utopia*, xii, 5, 7, 19-20, 28-29, 38-40, 42-43, 47-48 ('When the Eucharist is faithfully performed, the negative aspect of the institutional church drops away'), 53-54, 66-67 ('It often seems as if Williams wants the church to be nothing but the company that puts on the Eucharist'), 70, 78, 80-81 ('We cannot know what the church ought to be, except through experiencing what, in the Eucharist, it is'), 83, 99, 101.

297 HOBSON, *Anarchy, Church and Utopia*, 19, 67, 84, 94. Cf. the citations at the end of paragraphs 5.6.4 and 5.6.5 above.

298 HOBSON, *Anarchy, Church and Utopia*, 100. Nevertheless, Hobson questions whether this actually *does* justify the church, suggesting that Williams is only one step from leaving the church at all (perhaps underestimating the fact that Christianity is, for Williams, *per definitionem* embodied in community, how imperfect the community effectively may be).

'churchy' vision of the church, and not a narrowly 'liturgical' vision of the sacraments. The church is, in his thought, not an area separated from the world, but nothing more and nothing less than the group and the place where the 'new humanity' is experimented and, hopefully, experienced. Within the church, the sacraments are not a 'liturgical' area separated from other realms of ecclesial life, but the actions of the whole church by which the church is constituted and defined—and judged. The church continually stands under judgement—the need to conversion and transformation—which is at the heart of the gospel. Jesus's ministry, death and resurrection—of which the incarnation teaches that it is God who is revealed by these events—are foundational to the church and central to the sacraments. The sacraments constitute the community, but also continuously call the community back to its identity of being a transformed and transforming community of charity and joy.

5.7 CATHERINE PICKSTOCK

5.7.1 Radical Orthodoxy

A third example of a contemporary Anglican theologian who links her ecclesiology fundamentally to the liturgy of the church, is Catherine Pickstock. If Paul Avis wrote primarily from an *historical*, and Rowan Williams from a *theological* point of view, Catherine Pickstock is primarily a *philosophical* theologian. An Anglican lay theologian, Pickstock (born 1970) is a Fellow of Emmanuel College, Cambridge, and a Lecturer in Philosophy of Religion in the University of Cambridge.

Pickstock belongs to the 'Radical Orthodoxy' movement,[299] which originated in Cambridge in the last decade of the twentieth century. Together with two other theologians then based at Cambridge—her teacher John Milbank and Graham Ward—she edited the 1999 volume *Radical Orthodoxy: A New Theology*, which was the first explicit manifesto of this movement.[300] As a 'post-secular' and an intensified 'post-liberal' theology,[301] Radical Orthodoxy combines postmodern philosophy, traditional systematic theology (Plato,

[299] Instead of 'movement', some of its adherents prefer 'theological sensibility' (Ward), or 'spirit', 'tendency', 'task', 'a hermeneutic disposition and a style of metaphysical vision' (Pickstock); Milbank is less afraid of spreaking of a 'movement' with a 'program'; J.K.A. SMITH, *Introducing Radical Orthodoxy: Mapping a Post-secular Theology* (Grand Rapids MI: Baker Academic; Milton Keynes UK: Paternoster, 2004), 66-67.

[300] The first implicit manifesto was J. MILBANK, *Theology and Social Theory: Beyond Secular Reason* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1990).

[301] Cf. SMITH, *Introducing Radical Orthodoxy*, 31-61; J. FODOR, 'Postliberal Theology', in: Ford with Muers (eds.), *The Modern Theologians*, 229-248, at 229.

Augustine, Aquinas), and left wing collectivist politics into a distinctive approach of contemporary theology.[302]

Not wanting to beg the question of this section on Pickstock, it may nevertheless be helpful to mention some characteristics of the movement of which she is a major representative.[303] Radical Orthodoxy's main thesis is the non-existence of 'the secular'. Refusing to approach theology through the categories of modernity, it wants to interpret, conversely, the world by the categories of the Christian faith. Given the faith in God as the Creator—not *being* itself but the *donating cause* of being—the world cannot be 'secular' but *participates* in its Creator.[304] This basic view on reality leads Radical Orthodoxy to criticise 'modern' accounts of reason and living. There is not one all-embracing 'neutral' rationality over against the supposedly non-neutral rationalities of, for instance, faith. There is not one all-embracing 'neutral' political and economical model over against supposedly non-neutral visions such as the Christian concept of communion. As an outstanding commentator, James Smith, summarises,

> In short, *there is no secular*, if by 'secular' we mean 'neutral' or 'uncommitted'; instead, the supposedly neutral public spaces that we inhabit—in the academy or politics—are temples of other gods that cannot be served alongside Christ.[305]

Radical Orthodoxy, then, reacts against *modernity*, especially the kind of liberalism (theological and political) that accommodates itself to modernity's misleading claim of neutrality and universality. It does not, however, unconditionally accept *postmodernity* as modernity's alternative, because it views postmodernity's nihilism[306] as an intensification of modernity. As Pickstock explains,

302 C.J.C. PICKSTOCK, 'Is Orthodoxy Radical?', in: J.N. Morris (ed.), *Faith and Freedom: Exploring Radical Orthodoxy* (= *Third Millennium* 6, September 2003), 5-16.

303 For an overview of main characteristics, cf. SMITH, *Introducing Radical Orthodoxy*, 70-80. See also the interview with John Milbank and Simon Oliver in: SHORTT, *God's Advocates*, 103-125.

304 Cf. paragraph 5.7.4.

305 SMITH, *Introducing Radical Orthodoxy*, 42.

306 Against the objection that postmodernity cannot be called nihilistic, because postmodern philosophers are deeply concerned with ethics, Smith explains that 'nihilism, for RO, does not signal a mere abandonment of morality for an anything-goes mentality; rather, nihilism has a distinct *metaphysical* meaning' (SMITH, *Introducing Radical Orthodoxy*, 43). Radical Orthodoxy would say that postmodern nihilism is helpful, and even true, as far as it shows that, *immanently*, there is no (neutral, universal) ratio that keeps differences together, but that it is just the extrapolation of modernity, and therefore false, as far as it does not regard *God* as the one who keeps his creation together by participation in him. See also the quotation from Pickstock below.

> radical orthodoxy argues that postmodernity only witnesses to the negative failure of modernity. The postmodern stance towards the local traditions it recommends is an avowedly ironic one. And, in fact, it assumes that because universal reason is an illusion, differences are bound to be in conflict [...]. Now, radical orthodoxy believes [...] that God created the world in such a way that its differences exist in harmony, even if this order has been interrupted by the disorder of the Fall. [...] Thus, one is not faced with the alternative, either graspable universal reason or else anarchic chaos of variety. We insist upon an understanding of local differences in their integrity as partial strivings towards something greater. [...] Postmodernism, by contrast, takes a more nihilistic stance: there is nothing beneath the drift of signs. Radical orthodoxy seeks to reposition this nihilism: the flux of signs is only not nothing because it reflects God who is everything. Thus, there is no secular escape from anarchy, the indeterminacy of meaning. But there is a theological escape: everything participates in God [...]. The 'nothing' from which we are all created is not the void of postmodernism but the inexhaustible plenitude of God, dark only by excess of light.[307]

Radical Orthodoxy's post-secular philosophical position leads not only to a severe criticism of theological and political liberalism, but also—through the concept of participation—to a fundamental affirmation of the centrality of doxology, liturgy and particularly the eucharist in the Christian world view. Although other adherents of the movement also explore this theme, Radical Orthodoxy's 'liturgical turn'[308] is 'most fully developed' by Catherine Pickstock,[309] in the book that will be the focus of this section: *After Writing: On the Liturgical Consummation of Philosophy* (1998).[310] As the title suggests, and as will be investigated below, Radical Orthodoxy does not conceive nihilism, the void, as the final outcome of humanity's philosophical (and theological and societal) history, but doxological, liturgical, eucharistic, ecclesial participation in God.

That the notion of participation has not only a 'vertical' (participation in God) but also a 'horizontal' (communal) meaning, is given by Radical Orthodoxy's societal (political, economical) stance, but also by its repeated emphasis on the church as the exemplary locus of participation. As in Williams,[311] this 'church' is sometimes the empirical church, sometimes the notion of redeemed community more generally.[312] For Radical Orthodoxy as

307 PICKSTOCK, 'Is Orthodoxy Radical?', 9-10.

308 J. MILBANK, 'The Programme of Radical Orthodoxy', in: L.P. Hemming (ed.), *Radical Orthodoxy?—A Catholic Enquiry* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000), 33-45, at 43; J. MILBANK, 'Foreword', in: Smith, *Introducing Radical Orthodoxy*, 11-20, at 17.

309 SMITH, *Introducing Radical Orthodoxy*, 77.

310 C.J.C. PICKSTOCK, *After Writing: On the Liturgical Consummation of Philosophy* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1998).

311 Cf. paragraphs 5.6.4 and 5.6.8.

312 SMITH, *Introducing Radical Orthodoxy*, 231-259, seems to equate this ambivalence with a blurring of the boundaries of the church, which he approaches 'with some needless worry' (MILBANK, 'Foreword', 18-19). When Smith seems to encounter a same sort of blurring in

well as for one of its inspirers, Williams, 'the church does not *have* a cultural critique; it *is* a cultural critique. Its politics is an ecclesiology'.[313]

Two remarks remain to be made. First, Radical Orthodoxy is not an anti-modern movement in the sense of a nostalgic repristination of pre-modernity. It celebrates modernity's achievements through human creativity in arts and sciences, but refuses to interpret this creativity and its achievements in a 'secular' light, which (Radical Orthodoxy thinks) leads to abstraction, individualism and the absolutisation of knowledge and power. It rather claims to represent a minority tradition within modernity (Pickstock refers to Cusanus 'and many Augustinian humanists') which interprets the achievements of modernity 'as a participation in the Father's creative utterance of the Logos', so that 'human productive understanding remains conjectural and approximative' and makes 'more manifest divine revelation'.[314]

Second, although some of the contributors to the volume *Radical Orthodoxy* are Roman Catholics, and the movement has adherents in other churches as well, the three 'leaders' of Radical Orthodoxy are Anglicans of the Anglo-Catholic persuasion. They stand in the tradition of Anglican Catholicism, more particularly Anglo-Catholic socialism, and they see their movement as part of the classically Anglican quest for an integration of faith and reason.[315] Similar to most of the other authors discussed in this chapter,[316] their position as Anglicans does not mean that they limit themselves to theological developments after the English Reformation. They belong to 'those who are formally "protestant", yet whose theory and practice essentially accords with the catholic vision of the Patristic period through to the high Middle Ages'.[317] Moreover, they envisage their movement as a trespassing of confessional boundaries. It is their aim to transcend both 'Protestant biblicism and post-tridentine Catholic positivist authoritarianism' by 'affirming a richer and more coherent Christianity', of which they find traces in the Early Church and the Middle Ages.[318] Behind this ecumenical outlook, there is, however, something deeply

RO's use of the word 'theology' (168-178), he defends this by distinguishing between 'theology[1]' (the Christian faith and wordview) and 'theology[2]' (theology proper, as a specialised subject). Perhaps his exposition of RO's ecclesiology could have benefited from a similar distinction between 'church[1]' (God's will for humanity, as exemplified in, but flowing over from, the church into society, and only fulfilled eschatologically) and 'church[2]' (the church proper, as a distinctive empirical community).

313 SMITH, *Introducing Radical Orthodoxy*, 80; cf. 232, 253.

314 PICKSTOCK, 'Is Orthodoxy Radical?', 11-12; cf. J. MILBANK, *Theology and Social Theory: Beyond Secular Reason*, Second Edition (Oxford: Blackwell, 2006), XIV-XV (= 'Preface to the Second Edition').

315 PICKSTOCK, 'Is Orthodoxy Radical?', 6, 13.

316 Cf. paragraph 5.1.1.

317 MILBANK, 'The Programme of Radical Orthodoxy', 36.

318 J. MILBANK, G. WARD, C.J.C. PICKSTOCK, 'Introduction: Suspending the Material: The Turn of Radical Orthodoxy', in: J. Milbank, C.J.C. Pickstock, G. Ward (eds.), *Radical Orthodoxy: A New Theology* (London-New York: Routledge, 1999), 1-20, at 2.

'Anglican Catholic' in Radical Orthodoxy's position, particularly in its multi-faceted, equivocal character.[319] It is, therefore, an intriguing question to what extent radically orthodox thought can be translated into, say, Protestant or Roman Catholic theological discourse and ecclesial practice.[320] This second remark confirms, anyway, the inclusion of Radical Orthodoxy, and especially Catherine Pickstock's doxological emphasis, among this chapter's examples of Anglican—and, for that matter, Anglican Catholic—contributions towards a liturgical ecclesiology.

[319] Some Roman Catholic observers find Radical Orthodoxy's wide use of theological resources and its broad concept of ecclesiality somewhat ungraspable and bewildering, and therefore require that it should commit itself unequivocally to one ecclesial tradition (cf. L.P. HEMMING, 'Introduction: Radical Orthodoxy's Appeal to Catholic Scholarship', in: Hemming [ed.], *Radical Orthodoxy?*, 3-19). This equivocity is, however, exactly an element of Radical Orthodoxy's rootedness in Anglo-Catholic sensibility (cf. W.S.F. PICKERING, *Anglo-Catholicism: A Study in Religious Ambiguity* [London-New York: Routledge, 1989]) and cannot be done away with, without pinning down Radical Orthodoxy onto fixed positions it wants rather to improvise around than to stick upon. Whether this is the movement's methodical strenght or weakness remains a matter of theological and personal appreciation.
In the meantime, the very fact that the authors *are* engaged in tangible (namely, Anglican) ecclesial life implies that they do not operate in an ecclesial vacuum, that is, they do not operate 'un-self-referentially' (as Hemming claims). Cf. Williams's not dissimilar ambivalence (not dichotomy) between ecclesiology and ecclesiality in paragraph 5.6.8. One has to keep in mind that Anglican (and other non-Roman) interpretations of theological positions do not necessarily include a whole 'political agenda', a whole 'package which is powerfully conservative', as the effect may be in the Roman Catholic Church; cf. the interview with Rowan Williams in SHORTT, *God's Advocates*, 18.
Finally, is it not a gross instance of 'post-tridentine [Roman] Catholic positivist authoritarianism' to claim much of Christianity's tradition—including Augustine, Anselm and Aquinas—as *Roman Catholic* theology, and subsequently to declare that 'to re-perform [Roman] Catholic dogma *from without* [...] in a context (ecclesial or academic) *which cannot receive it*, cannot [...] really produce the effects that are desired' (HEMMING, 'Introduction', 17, emphasis added)?

[320] Of an application into Calvinist Protestantism, SMITH, *Introducing Radical Orthodoxy*, is an impressive example. The effect is, on the one hand, a reinvention of the 'Reformed Catholicism' of Calvinism (as opposed to Zwinglianism). On the other hand, however, the questionable suggestion is made that Radical Orthodoxy's main line of thought can be taken in while leaving aside the cutting edges of its ecclesiological and eucharistic convictions (cf. 34, 223, 262, where Smith seems to regard liturgy and the eucharist as *expressions* of, rather than as *constitutive* of the Christian life; although he points to the latter at 238, 253-254), which is probably not unrelated to Smith's questioning of RO's participatory ontology (204-222; cf. MILBANK, 'Foreword', 14-15).
On the Roman Catholic side, it is questionable to what extent Radical Orthodoxy's line of thought is taken in by those rather reactionary circles who, the other way round, celebrate some of its ecclesiological and liturgical positions, not least Pickstock's defense of the Tridentine Mass, often quite isolated from Radical Orthodoxy's overall vision.

5.7.2 A Doxological Ontology

Starting with an interpretation of Plato's *Phaedrus*, Pickstock dismisses the idea that Western civilisation is built upon rationalist and non-corporeal presuppositions. Contrarily, she claims that Plato's original concept of language differs radically from the modern and postmodern concept of language as dividing, rationalising and commercialising. Pickstock attributes to Plato a linguistic concept which is characterised by its uniting and holistic power—language as *doxology*.[321]

Doxology is not the same as the observation that something or someone is praise-worthy. Doxology transcends the constative. Language as doxology transcends language as a tool for dividing objects into rationally graspable categories. Unlike the *observation* that something or someone is praise-worthy, doxology implies *participation* in the thing which, or in the one who is being praised. Doxology requests the totality of the person. It is a way of life. The doxological mode of life is 'ontologically constitutive of the person'. Someone who offers praise is acting with his or her complete person. As a form of loving, it requires full commitment. Therefore, doxology leads a person to his or her very self. Doxology is 'the gift of humanity itself'. The doxological identity of the person cannot be laid down in constative or contractual rules. Again like loving, it is a complete identity which takes a lifetime to be lived out fully.[322]

As a consequence, liturgy is 'the highest form of language'.[323] In the liturgy, language is no longer estranged from itself, it is no longer manipulated for other goals than the most fundamental one: loving and praising with body and soul. Liturgy—song and dance—is the expression of the doxological person. Likewise, doxology is the highest form of *ethics*. Instead of being internally divided because of a variety of interests, doxological language and a doxological person are fully themselves and fully whole, because of their total commitment to praise.[324]

5.7.3 Spatialisation

It is Pickstock's conviction that the 'modern' view on reality deviated from the doxological foundations of Western philosophy. As an alternative to a lost

321 PICKSTOCK, *After Writing*, 4, 42, 44, 48.

322 PICKSTOCK, *After Writing*, 39-40, 45.

323 PICKSTOCK, *After Writing*, 40. Modern philosophy's 'linguistic turn' becomes a 'liturgical turn'; cf. D.S. LONG, 'Radical Orthodoxy', in: Vanhoozer (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Postmodern Theology*, 126-145, at 135-136.

324 PICKSTOCK, *After Writing*, 45-46. See also FORD, *Self and Salvation*, 268-271: in a Christian perspective, feasting and sharing (liturgy and ethics) are not just juxtaposed, but integrated, so that feasting becomes sharing and sharing becomes feasting (cf. PLOEGER, 'Een zingend wezen', 277).

religious eternity, through which time became a meaningless flux, modernity sought objectivity in space, thus creating an immanent pseudo-eternity. Pickstock calls this development 'spatialisation', by which she means that the blocked road to eternity found a surrogate in the pseudo-security and pseudo-objectivity of an identically repeated space.[325] Examples include the identical repetition of writing—and especially printing—rather than the non-identical repetition of speech;[326] the methodical shift from knowledge as 'embodiment of the good' to knowledge as 'formal consistency';[327] the architectonic shift from the 'open' space of a gothic building to the in itself 'closed' system of baroque architecture;[328] and the spatial division of reality into 'areas', of which the division of the human person into a mind and a body is an important example.[329] According to Pickstock, modernity sees reality as a graspable, objectified and classified 'given', whereas in the classical and medieval periods reality was not seen as a 'given' but as a 'gift', that is, not as impersonal and objective, but as relational and transcendent.[330] In what follows, a few aspects of spatialisation are further investigated.

The interactive 'reading' of statues or images, which demands interpretation from the beholder, changed into an allegedly passive reading of an allegedly objective text. A written text was believed to contain universally accessible 'given' information, free from the influence of time and personal interpretation. The corresponding style of language is constative and expository. Significantly, in this period interpunction ceased to serve primarily the *declamation* of the text, and became an aid in structuring the grammatical *logic* of the text.[331]

This modern attempt at objectifying and depersonalising is reflected by a language which makes excessive use of nouns. Instead of composing a sentence with a subject, an object and a verb, modernity uses a nominalisation which turns the personal sentence into a reified noun. For example, instead of saying that 'X has alleged against Y that Y has done A', one says, rather impersonally, that 'allegation' has taken place. Political use of words like 'inflation' or 'recession', Pickstock argues, disguises the personal effects on people, and is a linguistic means of withdrawing from the responsibility for these effects. The

[325] The difference between 'identical repetition' and 'non-identical repetition' is a central concern in Pickstock's thought. For 'non-identical repetition' Pickstock can also say 'analogical repetition' or 'asymmetrical reciprocity' (PICKSTOCK, *After Writing*, 18, 35). For an exposition of non-identical repetition in relation to doxology and the eucharist, cf. FORD, *Self and Salvation*, 5, 10, 123-124 (where he refers to Williams), 139 (where he acknowledges his indebtedness to Pickstock), 152-157, 164, 215.

[326] PICKSTOCK, *After Writing*, 48-50, 56.

[327] PICKSTOCK, *After Writing*, 58-59.

[328] PICKSTOCK, *After Writing*, 81-88.

[329] PICKSTOCK, *After Writing*, 61.

[330] PICKSTOCK, *After Writing*, 54, 56, 62, 64.

[331] PICKSTOCK, *After Writing*, 48-50, 53-56.

use of nouns instead of transitive clauses suggests objectivity and inevitability. Because a noun, unlike a verb, has no relation to time, it has the appearance of being beyond human influence. A noun has no beginning and no end; it is simply there in a universalist way. This, says Pickstock, reflects a system of power. Power is best preserved when its roots remain hidden. The use of nouns in modern language serves the interest of those in power, because it disguises the real responsibility, the personal effects, and the origins of power.[332]

Another linguistic feature of modernity is asyndeton—the use of main clauses after each other, without the use of subordinate clauses, or coordinating and subordinating conjunctions. This results in a style which is supposed to reflect scientific clarity, graspability of reality, and an economic view of transmitting 'information'. The underlying epistemology sees reality as static, and as mastered by the knowing subject. According to Pickstock, it is the capitalist economy which profits from this view of reality. If behind every linguistic object there is an object in reality which can be mastered, every linguistic phrase of information will awake the desire to possess this object. The interpersonal character of Plato's desire (*eros*) is changed into an interpretion of desire as 'not having one's needs satisfied'.[333]

The ultimate spatialisation takes places in modernity's separation of life and death. Pickstock shows that this separation, seemingly stemming from necrophobia, in fact implies necrophilia. The attempt to free life from all traces of death in the end hands life over to death. For if life is an objectified 'given' in itself, life has no other future or destiny than to vanish into death. Here, as elsewhere, Pickstock sees a link with capitalist economy—the handing over of life to death brings about a fundamental insecurity, which cries out for 'security', a security offered by capitalist economy in the form of accumulation of products and investment of capital. This necrophobia which paradoxically turns everything into death, is called by Pickstock 'a non-eucharistic sacrifice'. Everyone has to offer this sacrifice, because modern capitalist society keeps alive this separation of life and death, and therefore this invented need for security.[334]

What Pickstock offers instead, is a view on death as something 'as much constitutive of our life as other from it'. Life and death are not separated by a strict division. Living is also dying, and dying leads also to 'greater living towards eternity'. Life and death belong together, 'since it is death's perpetual entry into life which constitutes our temporality and alone allows one to be a subject'. In Pickstock's opinion, even postmodernist philosophers argue from an underlying necrophobia. When they say that one's death is the only thing which is really one's *own* (Heidegger, Derrida), or that the death of the *other* supersedes the importance of my own death (Levinas), it is not death connected

[332] PICKSTOCK, *After Writing*, 93-94.
[333] PICKSTOCK, *After Writing*, 93, 95-98.
[334] PICKSTOCK, *After Writing*, 104-105.

to life, but the 'modern' view on death as a separate entity, which is underlying their thought. As will be seen below, Pickstock's alternative is a view on life and death as gifts and not as possessions.[335]

5.7.4 Aquinas and Scotus

For Pickstock, as for others in the Radical Orthodoxy movement,[336] it is the Franciscan John Duns Scotus (c. 1265-1308) who initiated these 'modern' views on God and humanity. In a pious attempt to secure God's greatness and supremacy, Scotus regarded God as the supreme Being, thus placing God and humans on the same scale of Being (albeit on different stages) and suppressing the ontological difference between God and humans as it had been taught by Thomas Aquinas (c. 1225-1274). As a result, Pickstock claims, God and humanity became more separated than ever. In Aquinas's view, God and humanity have a different ontology, which makes it possible to approach each other analogically. The result of Scotus's view, however, is that God and humans share the same ontology ('univocity of Being') but find themselves on very different quantitative levels of the scale of Being. An unbridgeable gulf between the supreme Being (God) and lower Beings (humans) makes it impossible for humans to participate analogically in God. Consequently, the relations between God and humanity take the form of *contractual* relationships rather than of the *participation* of human nature in God's nature, and God becomes primarily regarded as a supreme Will, rather than as a Person.[337]

Pickstock prefers (her reading of) Aquinas's approach, according to which God and creatures do not share the same ontology. God is the only giver of Being, and humans participate more fully in this Being the more they grow towards God and participate in God. Although Aquinas appears to separate God and humans at first sight by denying them the same ontology, eventually it is only this difference which makes possible *analogia entis* and participation of the human into the divine. In Scotus's view, God and humans will never reach each other, although they share the same ontology. In Aquinas's view, although—or precisely because—God and humans do not share the same ontology, they have the opportunity to meet analogically.[338]

335 PICKSTOCK, *After Writing*, 107, 110-112, 114. Cf. paragraph 5.7.7.

336 For an overview of Radical Orthodoxy's perception of philosophical-theological history, cf. SMITH, *Introducing Radical Orthodoxy*, 87-122 (= 'Radical Orthodoxy's "Story" of Philosophy: From Plato to Scotus and Back').

337 PICKSTOCK, *After Writing*, 122-123; MILBANK, WARD, PICKSTOCK, 'Introduction', 5-6; see also John Milbank's (23), John Montag's (51), and Phillip Blond's (233) contributions to MILBANK, PICKSTOCK, WARD (eds.), *Radical Orthodoxy*.

338 PICKSTOCK, *After Writing*, 128-129. For the application of such an 'analogical imagination' (cf. TRACY, *The Analogical Imagination*) to a 'Catholic' religious sensibility and wordview in daily life, cf. A.M. GREELEY, *The Catholic Imagination* (Berkeley-Los Angeles-London: University of California Press, 2000). For its grounding in a participatory ontology cf. 1-10,

This difference between Aquinas and Scotus is reflected in their eucharistic theology. For Aquinas, Christ is present in the eucharist because the substance, not the quantity, of bread and wine is changed into the substance, not the quantity, of Christ's body and blood. Moreover, the *whole* Christ is present in individual parts of bread and wine as much as in all of it. For Scotus, however, it is not so much the whole Christ, but particularly the *body* of Christ, separated from his soul, which is present in the host, not in a substantial but in a dimensional way. Pickstock calls Aquinas's view 'holistic'—the whole original event is non-identically repeated in the sacramental action—whereas she dismisses Scotus's view as only a 'miracle', which divides aspects which should belong together (such as body and soul) and which eventually leads to the conclusion that Christ is present only in the form of a corpse. According to Pickstock, all this is due to Scotus's 'extreme *pietism*, his too purist theology'. Trying to uphold God's holiness and sovereignty, Scotus separates everything which should be connected.[339]

Pickstock rather wants to recover a view on the eucharist (current from the *patres* to Aquinas) 'as an essential *action*' in an '*ecclesial* and *relational* context'. Beyond Protestant ('a matter of non-essential, *illustrative* signification which relies upon a non-participatory similitude between the bread and the Body') and Catholic ('in dissociation from the realization of the Church, an extrinsicist miracle which stresses the alienness of bread from Body') caricatures, Pickstock defends transubstantiation as the view that respects the co-existence of presence and absence. In such an understanding, the eucharist reminds 'never to assume, nor to claim to know securely, that the way a thing appears is the way it substantially and exhaustively is'. Not because there is ultimately only nothingness, but because 'any substance is what it is only through its participation in divine being'. Therefore, 'transubstantiation is only an extreme case of what, for Aquinas, always applies': the fact that, in the eucharist, the 'accidents' only receive their real 'substance' from God reflects the fact that, always, every 'essence' (*essentia*) only receives its real 'existence' (*esse*) by participation in 'God who exists of His very nature'.[340] In this manner, Pickstock is able to present the eucharist as the paradigm for all being.

5.7.5 Modern Society and Modern Liturgy

Pickstock sees a connection between the emergence of Scotist concepts and the rise of modern society and economy. She parallels the distinctions between soul

184-186. An Anglican example is D.F. FORD, *The Shape of Living: Spiritual Directions for Everyday Life* (Grand Rapids MI: Baker, 2004[2] [London: HarperCollins, 1997[1]]), where 'overwhelming' (17-31, 50-53) and 'overflowing' (198) indicate the participatory basis. (This reference does not mean to claim Greeley and Ford for Radical Orthodoxy.)

339 PICKSTOCK, *After Writing*, 133-135, 160.

340 PICKSTOCK, *After Writing*, 253-266.

and body, between metaphysics and physics, and between religion and politics. The growing emphasis on the sovereign will of God is reflected in the rise of the absolutist monarch. The will becomes detached from the pursuit of the good. That is, the will no longer serves the common good, but has become synonymous with the power of the sovereign. The separation between religion and politics leads to an immanent quasi-eschatology: a 'futurity of accumulation'—banking, capital, interest. The liturgical ordering of society gives way to a new order, which does not know the liturgical return, the liturgical gift, so that society only strives forward in a linear movement—an 'order with no Sunday'. In short, the incorporation of the individual into a liturgically ordered society gave way to an individualist society which is only ordered by the will of the powerful and the laws of economy. Participation by celebration gave way to impersonal contractual relations.[341]

This separation between the liturgical order and the ordering of society not only affected society. It also had its effects on the liturgy. The liturgy became a world of its own, clericalised by a priesthood which regarded the liturgy as its own sphere of influence. Instead of the unifying rite in which all strata of society—of both church and world—were ordered into one body, the eucharist became privatised and interiorised. The increasing emphasis on the miraculous presence of Christ in the eucharist resulted in both the sacralisation of the liturgy and the secularisation of everything outside the liturgy. This separation of the sacred and the secular took also place *inside* the church. The eucharist was no longer seen as the act which constituted the church, but as a sacralised sacrament without organic relations to the 'secularised' aspects of the church. One of those secularised aspects was episcopacy. The bishop was no longer seen as the primary eucharistic celebrant, but as an ecclesiastical monarch with jurisdictional power. Even the theological kernel *par excellence*, the mystery of Christ, was no longer seen as a unity—from the incarnation, through the Pascal events, to eschatology—but was increasingly reduced to one of its aspects: the crucifixion. Reconciliation became a private, 'contractual', 'juridical' affair between God and the believer, whereas reconciliation had previously been achieved not by a private divine-human transaction, but by incorporation of the believer into the body of Christ. Pickstock recalls de Lubac's conclusion that the meaning of 'body', originally referring to both the church and the eucharist, became increasingly separated. The reality of the church as the body of Christ gave way to the reality of the host as the body of Christ, leaving the church as a *less real* manifestation of Christ's body.[342]

341 PICKSTOCK, *After Writing*, 136, 138-139, 142-144, 152-154.

342 PICKSTOCK, *After Writing*, 145, 147, 149-150, 157, 161-162. On de Lubac, cf. paragraph 3.2.5. For Dix's similar evaluation of late medieval developments, continued in the Reformation and Counter-Reformation period, cf. paragraph 5.3.2.

5.7.6 A Liturgical Vision

The final part of Pickstock's book is devoted to her liturgical vision of anthropology, society and the church. To explain her pre-modern or radically postmodern views, Pickstock uses the text of what she calls the Roman Rite, which is the eucharistic liturgy in its Tridentine form (1570). Firstly, she dismisses the usual criticisms of this liturgy, and the subsequent liturgical revisions, as '*not radical enough*'. As will be seen, in her opinion the many repetitions and the many confessions of unworthiness, which are characteristic of this liturgy, are not to be criticised as medieval accretions which have obscured the basic shape of the rite, but are to be valued as important in their own right. Rather, according to Pickstock, the post-Vatican II clearing of the rite—the principles of which can also be found in the new liturgies of other churches, including those of the Anglican Communion—has to be criticised, because it implicitly introduced modern, anti-liturgical presuppositions into the rite itself and into its language. What is needed is not a revision of the rite within a modern context, but 'a revolutionary re-invention of language and practice which would challenge the structures of our modern world'. Liturgy, Pickstock argues, has again to be understood as central to all aspects of human life, so that everyday life can again become thoroughly liturgical. We 'need to pray that we again begin to live, to speak, to associate, in a liturgical, which is to say truly human and creaturely fashion'.[343]

The Roman Rite is characterised by constant re-beginnings. Something which seems to be accomplished by one prayer, is shortly afterwards again prayed for in another prayer. To the modern mind, which thinks in linear movements, economically moving from A to B, these re-beginnings seem redundant. In the liturgy as interpreted by Pickstock, however, they point towards an important characteristic of the liturgical journey—the 'impossibility of liturgy', or, 'the hope that there might be a liturgy'. As was seen above, in the paragraph on Pickstock's doxological ontology, it is her conviction that 'the human subject is constituted (or fully central to itself) only in the dispossessing act of praise'. Fallen humanity, however, is not able to live this doxological life, if not Christ's resurrection 'ensures that our difficult liturgy is not hopeless'. Liturgy, then, is a constant prayer that there might be a liturgy. Likewise, the altar at which the liturgy is celebrated, is 'an infinitely receding place, always vertically beyond'. Paradoxically, one can only celebrate the liturgy if one has *arrived* at the altar of God, and at the same time the whole liturgy is an infinite journey *towards* this altar. The same applies to the many utterances of unworthiness, which constantly reoccur throughout the Rite. According to Pickstock, they are not primarily expressions of sin and guilt, but of the awareness that liturgy requires purification, and that purification is an infinite

[343] PICKSTOCK, *After Writing*, 169-176.

and lifelong task. Liturgy remains a manifold attempt that there might be a liturgy.[344]

The liturgical counterpart of the modern nominalisation of language is *apostrophe*—the linguistic form in which a totally other person, idea, or object is invoked. Many of those apostrophic utterances start with the vocative 'O!'. Contrarily to nominalisation—which objectifies something present into something more or less absent—apostrophe makes, by invocation, present what seems to be absent. Apostrophe is the language of desire, a desire which is consummated by the very act of invoking the desired object or person. The one who cries apostrophically is not the same as the modern subject that masters its objects. The one who cries out to God is aware that his or her true subjectivity can only be given by the One who is being invoked. So the crying subject has no priority over the 'object' for which he or she cries, 'because God alone makes the cry both possible and audible, such that to call upon God is always already to have entered into Him'. This means that the subject-object dichotomy is transcended in the liturgy.[345]

Not only the relation of the celebrating 'subject' to the celebrated 'object' is transcended: the liturgy also transforms the 'subject' (the worshipper) and the 'object' (God) *themselves* during the course of the liturgy. Unlike the Homeric heroes, who remain static characters throughout the poem, the worshipper and God are identified in a number of ways during the liturgical act. God is apostrophically identified as Lord, King, God, Father, and the epithet 'Lord' is in the *Gloria* attributed first to God the Father and immediately after that to Jesus Christ. By naming God in these ways, his multi-sided existence is revealed. It is 'epiphanic naming'. Likewise, the worshippers occur in several identities. Sometimes they are praising, another time they identify themselves with the angels who are praising, and through the act of praising the worshippers enter into the One whom they praise, participating in the God whom they praise. In short, the liturgy transcends the 'modern' separations between the human and the divine, between immanence and transcendence.[346]

Another characteristic of a liturgical way of life is the experience of *time*. Liturgical time, says Pickstock, is not the identical repetition of a cherished past, nor is it a period which terminates at a graspable arrival. In liturgical time, the past is non-identically repeated, and the future is anticipated although it is not yet definitely reached. The past is recalled as the 'memorial which remembers that which still remains'. When Christ said, 'As often as you do this', he instituted an event which only becomes what it is by being done over and over again. And as to the future—liturgical time is only consummated in

344 PICKSTOCK, *After Writing*, 176-177, 183-187.

345 PICKSTOCK, *After Writing*, 193-194, 196-197.

346 PICKSTOCK, *After Writing*, 204, 208-209, 211. A not dissimilar principle was encountered in Williams: a sacrament as a transition which transforms the participants during the liturgical action; cf. paragraph 5.6.5.

eschatology. The image Pickstock uses to indicate this, is the image of the 'evening'. Liturgical time is always, figuratively speaking, the time of the evening before an important day. Liturgy is celebrated at the threshold of the eschatological consummation.[347]

In contrast to modernity with its spatialisation, Pickstock says that liturgy is characterised by temporalisation. So, she interprets liturgical *space* primarily as liturgical *time*, as a liturgical journey. The space towards which the worshipper travels, is the place where God is, and that place is God himself. This journey of the worshipper towards God is counterbalanced by God's journey into the worshipper. The liturgical life is a pilgrimage not *through* space, but *of* space: it is a pilgrimage in which 'space' is becoming more and more itself. That is, the worshipper's space (his or her situation) and God's space (God himself) are growing nearer and nearer towards each other. In a liturgical context the question, 'Where am I?' is not related to topography, but to the liturgy: wherever the worshipper is, the liturgy places him or her in a relationship to God. This is what Pickstock calls the liturgical 'chronotope': the *topos* is actually a matter of *chronos*—the place is in fact a position within the liturgical journey.[348]

5.7.7 The Liturgical Gift

Pickstock's liturgical vision culminates in her thought about the liturgical gift. In the first place, all gifts depend on the incarnation as the supreme gift and as the event which consecrated all created things. '[A]ll creation is a non-identical instance of the supreme gift.' But if Christ is the supreme gift, all human gifts seem to be impossible compared to God's great gift of himself in Christ. This would, indeed, be the case if 'gift' is equated with 'given'. In that case, a gift would be nothing but the identical exchange of some object. In the liturgy, however, a gift is something else than an objectified given, and giving is something else than exchanging an object identically. The Christian perception of gift is relational: everything we have, we have received; and everything we have received, we have received in order to pass it on. Thus, liturgical giving is giving to the One who gave us first. This relationality of the gift implies that the liturgical gift incorporates the worshipper into the inner giving of God himself, into the inner love of the Trinity. Everything we have to give, is a non-identical repetition of the supreme gift God gave us in creation and particularly in the consecration of creation by the incarnation. Even our life and death are part of this liturgical mutuality. We have received our being from God, we offer

347 PICKSTOCK, *After Writing*, 221-223.
348 PICKSTOCK, *After Writing*, 228, 230-232, 234-235.

ourselves to God, and we receive ourselves back again from God in the liturgical 'economy of resurrection'.[349]

All this means that in Pickstock's perception the liturgical gift cannot be analysed into stages. There is not a moment in the eucharistic liturgy in which we offer something to God (the offertory, for instance) and another moment in which God offers something to us (for example in the consecration). There is only *one* gift, 'forever repeated differently'. There is no giving without receiving and no receiving without giving. The offering of worship stems from 'the *desire* to give', and in the liturgical process of giving there is no loss in the donor, only a gain in both donor and donee, namely the gain of mutual participation, the gain of transformation into God. This is why the prayers in the Roman Rite are able to pray for acceptance of the offering even *after*—what has become known as—the 'concecration'. Because the liturgical gift is not a linear movement in which an objectified given is 'offered' and another objectified given is 'returned', but the whole liturgy is 'a prayer that there might be a gift'—not a gift from us to God and a gift from God to us, but participation in the supreme gift: God's *kenosis* towards us.[350]

5.7.8 Conclusion

Radical Orthodoxy is neither radical nor orthodox in an unqualified way. Its radicality differs from other brands of radicality by its recalling of traditional theologies and liturgies. Its orthodoxy, on the other hand, differs from mere conservatism or antiquarianism by its re-evaluation of ontology and its affirmation of the extra-ecclesial consequences of its thought on, for example, the body and politics.

Radical Orthodoxy can be seen as standing in the twentieth-century Anglo-Catholic tradition. More precisely, it stands in the tradition of those Anglo-Catholics who combined a thoroughly incarnational and liturgical theology with an amount of (sometimes politically left-wing) critical social awareness. Therefore, in its own philosophical way, Radical Orthodoxy continues the aims of the members of the Parish Communion movement and of the other theologians encountered in this chapter.

Catherine Pickstock shows how all classical elements of a liturgical ecclesiology still can determine a radically postmodern view on the church and the world. Fundamental among these elements is the principle of participation or incorporation. As for the other theologians referred to in this chapter, for Pickstock the main ecclesiological category is the body of Christ. Her philosophical expression—the body of the church as a 'non-identical repetition'

[349] PICKSTOCK, *After Writing*, 240-242, 250-252.
[350] PICKSTOCK, *After Writing*, 241-247.

of the body of Jesus Christ—has a similar ecclesiological meaning as the deep connection between Christ and the church that was found in earlier authors.

The eucharist means participation in Christ's body. In accordance with all who stand in the tradition of the Liturgical Movement or of liturgical ecclesiology, Pickstock interprets this eucharistic participation in Christ's body neither individualistic nor narrowly focused on the elements, but in the sense of a corporate, social act in which the whole Christ (not only his body, and not only his sacrifice on the cross) is present. The church—and, for Pickstock, also society at large—should be seen from the perspective of the eucharist. Consequently, she does not want the eucharist to be regarded as a clericalised liturgical sphere apart from the world that became as much secularised as the liturgy became sacralised. Even the church becomes secularised if it is regarded as an institution which can be defined otherwise than liturgically—an example of which is jurisdictional power rather than eucharistic presidency as the bishop's rationale. Instead, liturgy should be seen as the focal point of personal, ecclesial and societal life. To secularist, capitalist society, Pickstock offers community and participation as alternatives for individualism and competition.

Participation in Christ means incorporation into his body both glorious and humiliated. Pickstock emphasises that participation in Christ's body implies a kenotic view on life—death and suffering are as much part of life as are resurrection and glory. Like the Parish Communion movement and Williams, Pickstock underlines the social and political relevance of 'a Eucharistic ethic'.[351] Moreover, Pickstock widens the view by opening up this eucharistic ecclesiology into a doxological anthropology. In the liturgy a person becomes what he or she really is—not an autonomous individual, but a doxological person, that is, someone who is totally devoted to love, both religiously and ethically.

Due to the Fall, the realisation of doxological personhood is a lifelong task and is only consummated in eschatology. Likewise, liturgy in its fullest sense can only be an eschatological reality. In this world, liturgy remains forever a constant prayer that there might be a liturgy. Here again, a postmodern concept meets fundamental liturgical instincts—the fragmentary character of this world coincides with the principle that liturgy is a manifestation of the eschatological in the present. Liturgy is not a sacramental grasp of the divine object by the human subject. Neither is it, the other way round, humanity passively infused by divine grace. Liturgy is the eschatological participation of the divine in the human and the human in the divine. Eschatologically, liturgy transcends the subject-object relationship and the abyss between immanence and transcendence.

[351] Pickstock in: R. KOHN, 'Rejecting Modernity: Radical Orthodoxy', radio interview in 'The Spirit of Things' (Radio National, Australia) with members and opponents of Radical Orthodoxy, 7 November 1999, transcript published at www.abc.net.au/rn/spiritofthings.

It does not surprise that—as an Anglican, and as an Anglo-Catholic for that matter—Pickstock roots her views on Christ, the church, society and the person in the incarnation. Although she has a wider apprehension of christology, Pickstock reflects the Anglican and particularly Anglo-Catholic devotion to the incarnation as not only constitutive of christology but also of ecclesiology, anthropology and a world view in general. In the incarnation God not only became human in Jesus Christ, but also hallowed creation—bodily, material existence—by entering it. And because the incarnation does not just refer to the moment of Christ's birth, but to the whole *mysterium Christi* including his life, death and resurrection, the incarnation is also the model of *kenosis*: God emptied himself, taking the form of a human being and, moreover, taking the form of a servant. Incarnation is the basis for everything described so far: mutual participation between the human and the divine, incorporation into the glorious and humiliated body of Christ, living a (politically interpreted) kenotic life-style.

Finally, the programme of Pickstock and Radical Orthodoxy is of ecumenical importance. It claims to work on overcoming the confessional boundaries of Protestant biblicism and Roman Catholic papalism, by referring to patristic and medieval sources which underline a corporate, non-clericalised understanding of the church, which takes the liturgy as its focus—not liturgy as a separate 'liturgical' area, but liturgy as a perspective from which to interpret both church and society. The eucharist, then, not only makes the church, it also makes humanity and society.

5.8 CONCLUSION

The fact that this chapter ends with Catherine Pickstock is not to suggest that the Anglican contributions towards a liturgical ecclesiology necessarily culminate in the Radical Orthodoxy movement. Groundwork for an Anglican liturgical ecclesiology was done in the volume *The Parish Communion*. Gregory Dix unfolded it from the liturgist's, Michael Ramsey from the theologian's point of view. Three quarters of a century later, the same tradition, but in a different historical, theological and philosophical climate is reflected by authors of whom Paul Avis, Rowan Williams and Catherine Pickstock were taken as examples. This concluding section summarises some insights which this tradition has to offer to a liturgical ecclesiology.

5.8.1 Christ and the Church

Firstly, most of these Anglican authors—and Dix with particular poignancy—emphasise the identity between Christ and his body, the church. It is important, however, to keep Williams's warning in mind, that this ecclesiological and

liturgical identification of Christ and the church must not immunise the church for the continuous judgement by Christ's words and actions, death and resurrection. The sacraments effect incorporation into Christ, but do not suppress the fact that Christ also remains the church's judge.

5.8.2 Incarnation

A second element of the Anglican contributions towards a liturgical ecclesiology is the incarnation as a recurring theme in Anglican theological thought. Some Anglican authors regard the incarnation—interpreted as the self-emptying (*kenosis*) of God by becoming human and, moreover, by becoming a servant—as exemplary for all Christ stands for. As a consequence, they see the incarnation as exemplary for all the church and the sacraments stand for: divine-human participation, the hallowing of created matter (exemplified by the sacramental elements) and human community (exemplified by the church).

Other authors—in this chapter represented by Ramsey and Williams—are critical of the 'hallowing' power of the incarnation. They regard the incarnation as secondary to the primary importance of Jesus's whole ministry, culminating in the Paschal event (death and ressurrection). It seems advisable to keep in mind their warning that incarnational theology can debase into a mere affirmation of the natural or societal *status quo*. Therefore, the concept of incarnation should neither be abstracted from the particular person of Jesus Christ, nor reduced to the moment of his birth, but should be seen as the embodiment of God in the whole Christ event, including his life, death, resurrection, the sending of the Spirit and the continuing relationship between Christ the head and his body the church.

5.8.3 Episcopacy and Primacy

Thirdly, the Anglican tradition has insights to offer regarding episcopacy and primacy. Although Anglicans—including those referred to in this chapter—do not agree on the precise theological and ecumenical implications of episcopacy, they do have bishops and they do have a concept of primacy. In this chapter particularly Ramsey and Avis contribute to thoughts on an ecumenical understanding of episcopacy. Pickstock's 'all-liturgical' concept of self, church and society includes a reference to a liturgical rather than jurisdictional understanding of episcopacy, much like the concept encountered in the Orthodox chapter above.

When it comes to the relation between the local and the universal church, there is a tendency among these authors (explicit in Hebert and Ramsey) to prioritise the universal church. This is, however, the universal church in the sense of all Christians, all baptised, not in the sense of a universal, centralised organisation. Avis is probably right that the 'baptismal paradigm' is inherent in

much that the Anglican tradition has to say about the church. This leads to a view on the church which includes all Christians, but does not exclude the conviction that the church is most visible in its sacramental worship. According to the authors referred to in this chapter, it is precisely eucharistic worship by which the church of all baptised is continuously re-constituted.

5.8.4 The Corporate Character of the Liturgy and the Sacraments

Fourthly, all authors in this chapter interpret the sacraments—above all (baptism and) the eucharist—as corporate, constitutive and defining actions rather than individual or isolated means of grace. An historical scholar such as Dix elaborates this by placing the corporate, celebrating and eschatological concept of the Early Church over against the individual and isolated concepts of the later Middle Ages, the Reformation and the Counter-Reformation. More recent theologians such as Williams and Pickstock use the corporate, constitutive, defining and celebratory understanding of the sacraments to make them exemplary of their whole understanding of Christianity, humanity and all the world. For all authors the corporate character of the sacraments serves an ecclesiology of incorporation, participation and transformation.

5.8.5 Ecclesiology beyond the Church

Finally, some authors—most obviously those of the Parish Communion movement, Williams and Pickstock—show a tendency of making their ecclesiological thought less 'churchy' by applying it not only to the life of the church but also to the life of humanity and society. Avis relates such a broadening of ecclesiology to the 'established' background of Anglicanism: 'Anglican faith is personal but not private and Anglicans are normally committed to involvement in the local community and in civil society at large', an ethos that is not restricted to the Established Church of England, but has spread also to the other provinces of the Anglican Communion. 'Anglican spirituality is generally world-affirming, though at its best in a prophetically dialectical manner.' Avis also mentions the Anglican theological emphasis on the incarnation as a possible background for this opening-up of ecclesiology: the integration of spirit and body, the individual and the community, time and eternity is facilitated by 'the incarnational, sacramental spirit of Anglican spirituality'.[352] Pickstock likewise argues from the incarnation, when she comments on the meaning of the Christian faith beyond the boundaries of the church:

[352] AVIS, 'The Churches of the Anglican Communion', 147-149.

> Since every Eucharist is an essential repetition of the incarnation [...] our attempt to 'return' to our divine origin is not so much a journey towards God, as a journey towards God's entry into our body [...]. Thus, with Christianity, the optimum of meaningfulness and the optimum of living subjectively coincide *within* the world—with all its temporality, space, and embodiment.[353]

In this study's quest for a liturgical ecclesiology we should keep in mind this broader view, in which a liturgical ecclesiology overspills into a liturgical worldview. Such an approach does not blur the boundaries of the church, but emphasises the church's relevance beyond itself. Moreover, it reminds the church that, in God's plan of salvation for the world, the church is no less, but neither more, than one element.

[353] PICKSTOCK, *After Writing*, 273.

6 THE BREAKING OF SYMBOLS

Protestant Contributions to a Liturgical Ecclesiology

6.1 INTRODUCTION

Protestantism is perhaps not the part of Christianity to which one would turn first in search of a liturgical or eucharistic ecclesiology. For many Protestants, a focus on eucharistic liturgy, let alone a eucharistic focus on ecclesiology, appears 'totally irrelevant', because they see 'Protestant worship [as] the "non-sacramental alternative"'.[1] On the other hand, however, the biblical, patristic, liturgical and ecumenical movements of the twentieth century have not left Protestantism unaffected.[2] Numerous new service books and, moreover, a change in the theological and spiritual appreciation of the liturgy, including the eucharist, witness to that fact. This chapter presents some of the fruits of this development.

The chapter could be read as a triptych. The first section, a side panel, serves as an introduction to the tension within Protestantism when it comes to the centrality of the liturgy. The debate between the Dutch Reformed theologians Oepke Noordmans and Gerardus van der Leeuw can be regarded as a classic in liturgical theology. Is there something like a Protestant concept of liturgy? And if so, how is 'centrality of the liturgy' to be perceived?

The other side panel, the final section, deals with two authors, who, like Noordmans and van der Leeuw, belong to the Netherlands Reformed Church (now merged into the Protestant Church in the Netherlands). Within the contemporary international discipline of Practical Theology, Albert Ploeger and Joke Ploeger-Grotegoed belong to the few Protestants who develop a theological ecclesiology in which the liturgy plays a constitutive role. They see *leitourgia* and *diakonia* as the two complementary foci of their ecclesiological ellipse.

The middle and main panel of the triptych consists of an encounter with three widely acclaimed contributors to international and ecumenical thought on liturgy and ecclesiology—the Swiss Reformed Jean-Jacques von Allmen, the

1 J.F. WHITE, *Protestant Worship: Traditions in Transition* (Louisville KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1989), 13-14.

2 Cf. WHITE, *Protestant Worship*, 32-35.

British Methodist Geoffrey Wainwright and the American Lutheran Gordon Lathrop. They can be regarded as leading liturgical theologians who contribute to the ecumenical perspective from their Protestant background.

In short, the main panel presents exemplary representatives not only of three important strands within Protestantism—Reformed, Methodist and Lutheran—but also of the distinctive contribution of Protestants to the development of an ecumenically converging view on the liturgy, the eucharist and the church. Additionally, the authors presented on the side panels contribute exemplary insights into the intra-Protestant debate on the identity of Protestant liturgy (Noordmans and van der Leeuw) and into the possible liturgical and ecclesiological lines of thought as explored in Protestant Practical Theology (Ploeger and Ploeger-Grotegoed).

Notwithstanding the fact that some sections of Protestantism remain unfamiliar with an ecumenical approach to liturgy, the eucharist and the church, Protestantism as a whole fully participates in liturgical-ecclesiological discourse. Therefore, as in all preceding chapters, the selection of authors in this chapter is far from exhaustive. Particular attention should be drawn to the interesting fact that, in addition to the *liturgical* and *ecumenical* theologians depicted on the main panel of this chapter's triptych, there is also an increasing number of *systematic* theologians who have started the 'reception' of eucharistic-ecclesiological thought into Protestant theological self-understanding. The names of Wolfhart Pannenberg[3] in the German-speaking world and Robert Jenson[4] in the English-speaking world can stand for this relatively recent tendency,[5] for which liturgical and ecumenical theologians, such as those presented in this chapter, have undoubtedly paved the way.

3 Cf. W. PANNENBERG, *Systematische Theologie*, vol. III (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993), 117-128 (not only positively referring to Luther but also to, among others, Afanasiev, Congar, Kasper, Rahner and Ratzinger), 314-369. On Pannenberg, cf. C. SCHWÖBEL, 'Wolfhart Pannenberg', in: D.F. Ford with R. Muers (eds.), *The Modern Theologians: An Introduction to Christian Theology since 1918*, Third Edition (Oxford: Blackwell, 2005), 129-146, at 140-143.

4 Cf. R.W. JENSON, *Systematic Theology*, vol. II: *The Works of God* (New York-Oxford: OUP, 1999), 183-188, 211-227 (particularly endorsing Zizioulas), 232, 253. On Jenson, cf. J. WEBSTER, 'Systematic Theology after Barth: Jüngel, Jenson, and Gunton', in: Ford with Muers (eds.), *The Modern Theologians*, 249-264, at 255-258.

5 Cardinal Kasper (Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity) recognises Pannenberg and Jenson as Protestant theologians who interpret the ecclesiological tradition of Protestantism as potentially converging with Catholic ecclesiology rather than as determined by a fundamental dissensus. Cf. W. KASPER, *Wege der Einheit. Perspektiven für die Ökumene* (Freiburg-Basel-Wien: Herder, 2005), 41.

6.2 OEPKE NOORDMANS & GERARDUS VAN DER LEEUW

6.2.1 A Theological Debate

Is it possible for a Protestant to define the liturgy as the central act by which the church is constituted? And if so—what, then, is the centre of Protestant worship, around which the assembly gathers and around which the church is constituted? On these and similar questions a debate developed between two Dutch Reformed theologians in the nineteen thirties. The two of them knew each other, because both were active in the *ethische richting*, a wing of their church which was neither conservative nor modernist and was subsequently to become the central wing of the Netherlands Reformed Church.[6]

Oepke Noordmans (1871-1956) was a parish minister in this church during his whole working life. He made himself a name by the publication of many books and articles, which exercised a large influence and for which he received an honorary doctorate from Groningen University. Gerardus van der Leeuw (1890-1950) had for a short time been a parish minister in the same church, but at a young age became Professor of Phenomenology of Religion at Groningen University. In the first post-war cabinet, he was Minister of Arts and Sciences. Next, but not unrelated, to his professorship he acted as the leader of the liturgical movement in his church during the second quarter of the twentieth century.[7]

This is not the place to introduce Noordmans's theology or van der Leeuw's phenomenology of religion, or to sketch the liturgical movement in the Netherlands Reformed Church between the two World Wars, of which van der Leeuw was the leading personality. Rather, this section will concentrate on the theological debate between these two theologians regarding the identity of Reformed worship.

The debate was opened when Noordmans published his book *Liturgie* (1939).[8] This book was a reaction against some tendencies which—he thought—were underlying the theory and practice of the Dutch Reformed liturgical movement which had come into being in the 1920s under the leadership of van der Leeuw.[9] Noordmans particularly reacted against the

6 For the so-called 'ethical school' (*ethische richting*), cf. A.J. RASKER, *De Nederlandse Hervormde Kerk vanaf 1795. Geschiedenis, theologische ontwikkelingen en de verhouding tot haar zusterkerken in de negentiende en twintigste eeuw* (Kampen: Kok, 1986[3]), 125-153, 233-252.

7 RASKER, *De Nederlandse Hervormde Kerk*, 238-247.

8 O. NOORDMANS, *Liturgie* (Amsterdam: Holland, 1939). References are to the annotated edition in: O. NOORDMANS, *Verzamelde werken*, vol. VI: *De kerk en het leven* (Kampen: Kok, 1986), 45-164.

9 NOORDMANS, *Liturgie*, 50. The 'Liturgische Kring' (Liturgical Circle) was established in 1922 under van der Leeuw's presidency; the larger 'Liturgische Vereeniging' (Liturgical Society) followed in 1935. This 'institutionalised' and 'theological' period was preceded by

liturgical handbook which was published by the *Liturgische Kring* (Liturgical Circle) in 1934.[10] After the publication of Noordmans's book, van der Leeuw wrote an article giving some answers and reactions. This article was followed by a reply from Noordmans and a polemic between Noordmans and W.H. van de Pol (1897-1988), one of van der Leeuw's co-members of the Protestant liturgical movement.[11] All articles were subsequently published under the title *Liturgie in de crisis* (Liturgy in Crisis, 1939).[12] Noordmans's *Liturgie* and the compilation *Liturgie in de crisis* remain the primary sources for the Noordmans-van der Leeuw debate.[13]

6.2.2 Mystery

Noordmans's main problem with the liturgy of the liturgical movement is the very concept of 'liturgy' itself. According to Noordmans, the term 'liturgy' (*liturgie*) stands for a coherent totality of ceremonies. In the Roman Catholic mass—Noordmans writes in the 1930s—this totality serves the concept of the sacrifice of the mass. The Reformation, however, cut out this sacrificial core

a century of theoretical calls for liturgical renewal (1816-1910) and a decade of practical liturgical experiments (1911-1921); it was followed by World War II and a decade in which the liturgical renewal became focused on ecclesiological and primarily ministerial questions (apostolic succession; episcopate; 1945-1955), which led to the dissolution of this movement. Cf. E. VAN DER SCHOOT, *Hervormde eredienst. De liturgische ontwikkeling van de Ned. Herv. Kerk* ('s-Gravenhage: Boekencentrum, 1950), 115-215; J.F. LESCRAUWAET, *De liturgische beweging onder de Nederlandse hervormden in oecumenisch perspectief. Een fenomenologische en kritische studie* (Hilversum: Brand, 1957); P. STAPLES, *The Liturgical Movement in the Netherlands Reformed Church 1911-1955: With Special Reference to the Anglican Dimension* (Utrecht: IIMO, 1983), 12-18; J. KRONENBURG, *Episcopus Oecumenicus. Bouwstenen voor een theologie van het bisschopsambt in een verenigde reformatorische kerk* (Zoetermeer: Meinema, 2003), 83-167. Contemporary to this dissolution, a new liturgical movement started, with an emphasis not on the dogmatic-theological backgrounds of the liturgy, but on hymnody and biblical theology. This 'second' liturgical movement is still alive in what is now called the Protestant Church in the Netherlands. Cf. W.G. OVERBOSCH, *Zo gezegd. Gebundelde overwegingen* (Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum, 1998), 139-152.

10 *Handboek voor den Eeredienst in de Nederlandsche Hervormde Kerk*, samengesteld door den Liturgischen Kring (Rotterdam: Bredée, 1934).

11 In 1919, van de Pol left the Netherlands Reformed Church to become an Anglican (in Holy Trinity, Utrecht, the Netherlands). At the time of the Noordmans—van der Leeuw controversy, van de Pol was an Anglican (which meant, in his view, a Protestant). He converted to Roman Catholicism in 1940 and became a Professor at the Roman Catholic University of Nijmegen. Cf. KRONENBURG, *Episcopus Oecumenicus*, 84-85.

12 G. VAN DER LEEUW, O. NOORDMANS, W.H. VAN DE POL, *Liturgie in de crisis* (Nijkerk: Callenbach, 1939). References are to the annotated edition in: NOORDMANS, *Verzamelde werken* VI, 165-243.

13 For references to the *Handboek* of the 'Liturgische Kring' and to 'non-theological' aspects of the discussion, cf. M. PLOEGER, '"Geen spelletje". Noordmans' *Liturgie* (1939) en het *Handboek* van de Liturgische Kring' (unpublished MA thesis, Leiden University, 1995).

and, consistently, removed the liturgical ceremonies. Those Reformation churches which retained some of the ceremonial, such as the Lutheran churches, did, according to Noordmans, not regard the ceremonial as essential but as accessory (*adiaphoron*). But now, Noordmans claims, the liturgical movement wants to reintroduce the ceremonies without reintroducing the eucharistic sacrifice. In other words, they want to introduce the coherent totality of ceremonies without the sacrificial centre on which the ceremonies were focused. As a result, this liturgy will have nothing else to centre around than the *numen praesens*, the presence of the divine mystery. This liturgy—says Noordmans, transcending popular suspicion—will take us not to Rome but to Byzantium[14] or to High Church Anglicanism.[15]

In his reaction, van der Leeuw admits that the liturgical movement regards the liturgy as one coherent ritual. The centre of this ritual is, however, not a *numen praesens*, but Jesus Christ. His incarnation and his sacrifice on the cross are central in van der Leeuw's thought. Moreover, the incarnation already implies the sacrifice, because the incarnation was not an incarnation *per se*, but God's incarnation in the Servant, the broken One, the crucified One, the One who reigns from the cross. Liturgy is, thus, not a form without a contents, the vacuum being filled by a *numen praesens*, but a form because of the form which was given in the incarnation: the form of Jesus Christ, crucified and risen.[16]

6.2.3 Fragmentary Liturgy

Instead of a liturgy in which every part is intimately linked to the other parts, a liturgy that could, therefore, be subsumed under a single term—the liturgy-as-a-whole called 'sacramental' or 'prayer' or 'proclamation'—Noordmans proposes the thesis that Reformed liturgy has a fundamentally 'fragmentary' character.[17] In Noordmans's view, the Reformed churches do not possess a 'liturgy' in the sense of one coherent ritual sequence. They only possess 'liturgy in the negative sense', a kind of *antiliturgie*, a bundle of liturgical formularies for the

[14] It must be mentioned that Noordmans's sketch of Orthodoxy (particularly the idea that it has a necessarily 'closed' liturgy which turns away from society and ethics) is a serious misrepresentation of Orthodoxy, especially in view of its ethical, societal, missionary, pneumatological and eschatological potential. Cf. F. HAARSMA, *Geest en kerk. Een pastoraal-oecumenische studie over de ecclesiologie van dr. O. Noordmans* (Utrecht: Ambo; Baarn: Bosch & Keuning, 1967), 338-339, 342.

[15] NOORDMANS, *Liturgie*, 54-55, 60, 62, 89, 104, 116, 119 and *passim*; NOORDMANS in *Liturgie in de crisis*, 188, 222-223. Noordmans's insight that Reformation and Counter-Reformation can be placed over against the insights of the liturgical movement and Orthodoxy, has to do with the former's (later) medieval and the latter's (neo-) patristic background. Cf. paragraphs 2.1.6 (The Call for a Neo-Patristic Synthesis), 3.2.2 (Theological Reassessment) and 3.2.3 (The Liturgical Movement).

[16] VAN DER LEEUW in *Liturgie in de crisis*, 173, 175, 179.

[17] NOORDMANS, *Liturgie*, 60, 79 ('fragmentarisch').

administration of sacraments and other liturgical acts.[18] These formularies are not held together by an overarching 'liturgy'. Reformed worship is the fragmentary combination of essentially different elements such as preaching, sacraments, prayer, psalms. These elements are decreed by God—Bible reading, preaching, praying, baptising, keeping the Lord's Supper are all done by divine institution—but nothing else is decreed by God, particularly not a 'liturgy' which smoothly fuses all elements into one, by calling it all by one name or by integrating it musically or ritually into one liturgical drama. According to Noordmans, the church should confine itself to the divinely instituted liturgical elements and should not try to integrate them in a not divinely instituted liturgy—'what God has left open, we do not close.'[19]

Noordmans's battle is thus fought against something like an 'essence of the liturgy' or a 'spirit of the liturgy', by which the liturgy could be summarised as one coherent set of ceremonies.[20] It is true that the liturgical movement tried to catch the liturgy in one term, for example 'proclamation' (van der Leeuw), 'priestly ministry' (W.Th. Boissevain), or 'prayer' (P. Blaauw).[21] Van der Leeuw admits this in his reaction, but he rejects the accusation that this 'spirit of the liturgy'—'the spectre which haunts every page of Noordmans's book'[22]—leads to a 'closed' (*gesloten*) concept of liturgy. God's presence remains God's concern. But this does not imply that the liturgy is only a bundle of unrelated formularies. The liturgy has an order with a focus—'and about this focus we do not agree'.[23]

Another objection made by van der Leeuw to Noordmans's use of the term 'fragmentary liturgy' is that it creates the possibility that slovenly liturgy, untidy speech, bad music will be justified with a noble argument. A bad form is still a form. Van der Leeuw acknowledges that Noordmans is right in asserting that the mutual coherence of liturgical elements cannot and may not be humanly designed. But, he claims, God himself has given the liturgy a centre.[24]

18 NOORDMANS, *Liturgie*, 61. Liturgy 'in negatieve zin' (in the negative sense) is Noordmans's expression; the term '*antiliturgie*' is mine. See also Lathrop's use of Mönnich's title *Antiliturgica* (cf. paragraph 6.5.5).

19 NOORDMANS, *Liturgie*, 58-59 ('wat God opengelaten heeft sluiten wij niet toe').

20 NOORDMANS, *Liturgie*, 56. Noordmans implicitly refers here to two publications from within the liturgical movement—*Het wezen van den Eeredienst* (The Essence of the Liturgy), a 1933 report by a commission largerly consisting of members of the liturgical movement in Dutch Protestantism, and *Vom Geist der Liturgie* (On the Spirit of the Liturgy), the 1918 book by Romano Guardini.

21 *Handboek voor den Eeredienst*, 117-124, 38-60, 125-142; cf. PLOEGER, '"Geen spelletje"', 16-20 ('verkondiging', 'priesterlijke bediening', 'gebed').

22 VAN DER LEEUW in *Liturgie in de crisis*, 176 ('het spook, dat door alle bladzijden van Noordmans' boek rondwaart').

23 VAN DER LEEUW in *Liturgie in de crisis*, 171 ('de orde heeft een middelpunt, een brandpunt. En over dit brandpunt zijn wij het niet eens').

24 VAN DER LEEUW in *Liturgie in de crisis*, 169-171; G. VAN DER LEEUW, *Liturgiek* (Nijkerk: Callenbach, 1940), 92. For the debate about this centre, cf. paragraph 6.2.8.

6.2.4 The Holy Spirit

Underlying Noordmans's view is his fear that a unitary concept of liturgy will deny three of his basic theological convictions: the importance of the Holy Spirit, the brokenness of the world and of its Saviour and the eschatological character of the Christian faith. In the liturgical movement's concept he sees a 'magic realism' which closes the liturgy to the free operation of the Holy Spirit.[25] Word and sacrament are two different things, not to be subsumed under one heading, and they both need the Spirit to mean anything at all.[26] Moreover, a 'closed' liturgy denies the freedom of the Spirit to decide to be absent or present. 'Therefore we cannot say [...] that God goes to church when we do.' Liturgy makes God's presence mystical or ontological, which is, according to Noordmans, an impossibility.[27] Liturgy reckons with the presence of a 'liturgical spirit',[28] while it should reckon with the Holy Spirit, who is only present by God's grace if God is willing, not automatically by the regulations of a liturgical system.[29]

The liturgical expression of this dependence on the Spirit is the epiclesis. According to Noordmans, the epiclesis was central in the Early Church, but was replaced in the Roman Catholic Church by the consecration and in the Orthodox Church by 'the spirit of the liturgy'. The Reformation has restored the utter dependence on the Spirit, which means the end of the liturgy as an institution in itself.[30]

6.2.5 Brokenness

Noordmans's theology is a *theologia crucis*, not a *theologia gloriae*.[31] For him, Christian theology is about brokenness—the brokenness of human life due to the Fall, the brokenness of the crucified Christ, the brokenness of world history, particularly in the twentieth century.[32] This theological outlook brings him in

25 NOORDMANS, *Liturgie*, 64, 71 ('magisch realisme').

26 NOORDMANS, *Liturgie*, 67-68, 73; NOORDMANS in *Liturgie in de crisis*, 191-192.

27 NOORDMANS, *Liturgie*, 77 ('Daarom kunnen wij niet zeggen [...] dat God ook naar de kerk gaat als wij er naar toe gaan'); cf. NOORDMANS in *Liturgie in de crisis*, 193-194, 198. The kind of presence meant here is not God's general 'omnipresence', but his specific presence in the liturgy, for example through the preaching of the Word or through the sacraments.

28 Noordmans plays with the Dutch word for 'spirit' (*geest*), which, like the English 'ghost', can mean 'spectre' as well as 'spirit' or 'Spirit'.

29 NOORDMANS, *Liturgie*, 78, 80, 114, 121.

30 NOORDMANS, *Liturgie*, 80-81, 125.

31 Cf. A. VAN DER KOOI & G.W. NEVEN, 'Liturgie bij dr. O. Noordmans. De viering van de dood van Christus als het centrale moment van een levende liturgie', in: G.W. Neven (ed.), *Oecumenische ontdekkingen in het werk van O. Noordmans* (Kampen: Kok, 1990), 88-123.

32 Noordmans was one of the first Dutch Reformed theologians to introduce Karl Barth's dialectical theology. Cf. RASKER, *De Nederlandse Hervormde Kerk*, 242-243.

constant collision with the liturgical movement and especially with van der Leeuw, who did not primarily theologise from the cross but from the incarnation.[33] Here is the core of the conflict between the Calvin- and Barth-oriented theologian Noordmans and the phenomenologist and sacramental theologian van der Leeuw. Many of their differences have something to do with the difference between analysing (Noordmans) and synthesising (van der Leeuw).[34]

Noordmans notices that the representatives of the liturgical movement often use terms like 'form', 'body' and 'life'. Noordmans concludes that they argue from creation or consummation, not from the fallen state in between, in which we live.[35] The hallowing of creation by the incarnation is the centre of their thought.[36] This leads them to the liturgy as a coherent ceremony—something which Noordmans can only imagine in the pure state of creation or consummation. This is one of the reasons why he classifies the liturgical movement not with Rome but with Byzantium—the liturgical movement's liturgy is the unbroken liturgy of heaven.[37]

The incarnationalist theology of the liturgical movement is fiercely resisted by Noordmans. 'On Calvary, all figures and forms perish.'[38] The crucified Christ and the work of the Holy Spirit are critical forces. They do not *create*

33 Cf. O. NOORDMANS, 'Mysterie of boodschap', *Eltheto* 89 (1935), 131-140. Annotated edition in: O. NOORDMANS, *Verzamelde werken*, vol. IV: *Ontmoetingen. De actualiteit der historie* (Kampen: Kok, 1988), 180-190. The article is a recension of W.J. AALDERS, *De incarnatie* (Groningen-Den Haag-Batavia: Wolters, 1933). According to Noordmans, Aalders's 'incarnationalism' is the same as van der Leeuw's, with the difference that van der Leeuw does not shrink from the consequences of such an incarnationalist theology (189). This evaluation is taken up again, this time directly referring to van der Leeuw, in O. NOORDMANS, *Gestalte en Geest* (Amsterdam: Holland, 1955), 354-374 (= 'Figuur en Woord. Kritiek op de sacramentstheologie van prof. dr. G. van der Leeuw'). Annotated edition in: O. NOORDMANS, *Verzamelde werken*, vol. VIII: *Meditaties* (Kampen: Kok, 1980), 179-478 (at 452-467).

34 Cf. M. BARNARD, *De dans kan niet sterven. Gerardus van der Leeuw (1890-1950) herlezen. Essay over religie en cultuur* (Zoetermeer: Meinema, 2004), 104, cf. 47-50, 55, 75, 108; PLOEGER, '"Geen spelletje"', 32-33.

35 NOORDMANS, *Liturgie*, 69-70 ('vorm', 'lichaam', 'leven').

36 NOORDMANS, *Liturgie*, 71, 109-110, 112, 116-117; NOORDMANS in *Liturgie in de crisis*, 194, 233.

37 NOORDMANS, *Liturgie*, 52-54, 57, 73, 116 and *passim*.

38 NOORDMANS, *Liturgie*, 94 ('Op Golgotha vergaan alle gestalten en alle vormen'), cf. 133. Cf. O. NOORDMANS, *Herschepping. Beknopte dogmatische handleiding voor godsdienstige toespraken en besprekingen* (Zeist: NCSV, 1934). Annotated edition in: O. NOORDMANS, *Verzamelde werken*, vol. II: *Dogmatische peilingen. Rondom Schrift en Belijdenis* (Kampen: Kok, 1979), 214-322, at 251-252, cf. 229, 245-246, 275-276, 299-300, 317. *Herschepping* is regarded as Noordmans's comprised dogmatics (cf. K.H. Miskotte's introduction to the second edition: 318). On *Herschepping*, cf. G.W. NEVEN, *In de speelruimte van de Geest. Studies over de theologie van dr. O. Noordmans II* (Kampen: Kok, 1980).

'form', they *criticise* it.[39] The incarnation has come to an end when Christ ascended; otherwise, the Spirit could not have come.[40] A sober and fragmentary liturgy reflects the broken form of human existence and of Christian theology.[41]

In reaction to these assertions, van der Leeuw says that it is as if he hears the passion narrative without the gospel of the resurrection, as if Noordmans proclaims 'a gospel of a narrow escape [...], instead of the life and the abundance which are promised to us'.[42] Form is not impossible in Christianity. The Spirit is both the creator and the critic of all forms. According to Noordmans, the Spirit can only be one of the two—creator or critic. Van der Leeuw advocates a more dialectical understanding of the Spirit. Creation and incarnation are the theological basis of liturgical (and all other) forms, while the Fall and the crucified Christ are the theological basis of the criticism of the same forms. Throughout salvation history, God's work is always both creation and judgement.[43] 'Creation is, as Noordmans says, criticism, distinction. [...] But it is also, which Noordmans forgets, formation.'[44] Van der Leeuw, then, wants to take seriously the tension between the 'already' (creation, incarnation, presence of Christ, liturgical forms) and the 'not yet' (Fall, cross, 'Come, Lord Jesus', liturgical criticism), rather than to solve the tension by focusing on the 'not yet', as Noordmans does, or on the 'already', for which Noordmans blames van der Leeuw.

6.2.6 Eschatology

We saw that Noordmans bids the liturgical movement to think less from creation and more from the Fall, less from the incarnation and more from the cross. He regards a 'closed', ceremonial liturgy as too much belonging to unbroken or restored creation. In Noordmans's theology, this will only be possible in the eschaton. He blames the liturgical movement for anticipating the final consummation, or, the other way round, for depreciating the eschatological character of the Christian faith. Something of Noordmans's eschatology was already encountered in the paragraph on the Holy Spirit. During the 'not yet',

39 NOORDMANS, *Liturgie*, 94. Cf. O. NOORDMANS, 'De zon, het orgel en de preek', *Weekblad der Nederlandsche Hervormde Kerk* 31 (1947), 4th issue. Annotated edition in: NOORDMANS, *Verzamelde werken* VI, 300-303.

40 NOORDMANS, *Liturgie*, 118-119.

41 NOORDMANS, *Liturgie*, 94 and *passim*.

42 VAN DER LEEUW in *Liturgie in de crisis*, 173 ('een evangelie van een narrow escape [...], in plaats van het leven en de overvloed, die ons zijn beloofd'), cf. 186.

43 NOORDMANS, *Liturgie*, 94; VAN DER LEEUW in *Liturgie in de crisis*, 179.

44 G. VAN DER LEEUW, *Inleiding tot de theologie* (Amsterdam: H.J. Paris, 1935), 119 ('Schepping is, zooals Noordmans zegt, critiek, scheiding. [...] Maar zij is ook—en dat vergeet Noordmans—vorming, formatie'). Creation asks for both *distrust*, because of sin and the need of judgement, and *trust*, because of the sanctity of creation and incarnation (119-120).

communication between God and humans can only take place through the Holy Spirit and at the Spirit's wish, not at our wish or according to our liturgical schemes. Rather than by the ontological presence of the divine, the liturgy should be determined by the cry, 'Come, Lord Jesus'. That God's presence in the liturgy is not self-evident, is an eschatological fact.[45]

Eschatology has, in Noordmans's vocabulary, not only to do with the end of time, but also with the not yet fulfilled way in which the gospel of Christ is proclaimed throughout the world and throughout history. That is why he calls preaching more eschatological than the sacraments—preaching goes out to the ends of the world, while the sacraments belong, so to speak, to the domestic existence of the church in a certain place. The preaching of the gospel throughout the world is, in Noordmans's line of thought, an eschatological act. The sermon should not be made part of the liturgical mystery; rather, the liturgy should be 'unmystericised' by the worldwide, eschatological act of mission and preaching.[46] Although Noordmans grants the sacraments an eschatological character, he prefers to emphasise the *eschatological* character of mission and preaching and the *pastoral* character of the sacraments. The sacraments serve the formation of the local church. They represent the 'static' (*statische*) side of the church. But the Word (preaching) represents its 'dynamic' (*dynamische*) side. Sometimes it finds its rest in the congregation, together with the sacraments, but it may never forget its missionary, eschatological origin. The Word may never be subsumed under the sacraments. Rather, the sacraments have to be understood according to the Word.[47]

Eschatology, then, serves Noordmans's plea for a fragmentary liturgy. Firstly because the church is not yet in heaven and the liturgy should reflect this 'not yet'. Secondly because the eschatological character of the Word implies its missionary and its critical function, which forbids an enclosure of the Word in a sacramental liturgy.

In Noordmans's thought, the sacraments represent something of the rest and the consolation of the eschaton.[48] Paradoxically, Noordmans does not call this 'eschatological', because in his terminology 'eschatological' refers primarily to the 'not yet'. This becomes interestingly clear when he protests against the (Roman Catholic) phenomenon of the procession with the Blessed Sacrament. Protestantism, he says, knows its evangelisation campains on the streets. But these are no more than appeals. The people in the street can take their own decision to ignore the appeal or to respond to it. With a procession of the Sacrament it is different. The decision has already been taken—here is Christ brought out into the street, the street becomes a church. The non-believer

45 NOORDMANS, *Liturgie*, 86.
46 NOORDMANS, *Liturgie*, 87, 122 ('ontmysteriseren').
47 NOORDMANS, *Liturgie*, 74, 126-127, 130, 134-135, 138; NOORDMANS in *Liturgie in de crisis*, 188-191.
48 NOORDMANS, *Liturgie*, 135, cf. 127.

can only go away; there is no possibility of staying without either assenting or offending.[49] This is an illumining example of Noordmans's view of preaching as missionary and eschatological—an appeal, not a realisation—and of the sacraments as parts of the pastoral constitution of the local church, the 'resting' and 'realised' character of which should be constantly corrected by the eschatological 'not yet' of preaching. In the liturgical movement he sees exactly the opposite—due to an incarnational rather than an eschatological and missionary theology, preaching is subsumed under the 'realised' and 'static' character of the sacraments.[50]

6.2.7 The Participant

One of the effects of a 'closed' liturgy is, says Noordmans, the fact that it locks out the brokenness of the world with its problems and questions. The 'closed' liturgical concept which Noordmans combats, can become an escape from the world, a 'moral holiday'.[51] If the liturgy is the sphere where contact between God and humans takes place, daily life becomes secondary, 'real life' takes only place in the liturgy. Being a participant in the liturgy becomes more important, more 'real', than living the Christian life. Participating in a given structure becomes more important than deciding whether one wants to participate or not. The liturgy reckons with a 'yes-sayer' and has no place for a 'no-sayer'.[52] Liturgical life is, says Noordmans, 'participating' life, 'communicative' life. Daily life, he fears, will be influenced by this affirming attitude, at the cost of a good deal of the Puritan tradition of 'saying no'. Noordmans wants to turn this tide, by retaining the plain Dutch Reformed liturgy in which the ethical attitude

49 O. NOORDMANS, *Memorandum aangaande de processie* (a text written for the Netherlands Reformed Church in 1949). Annotated edition in: NOORDMANS, *Verzamelde werken* VI, 560-562.

50 Compared to other authors in this chapter, Noordmans stands alone when he calls preaching rather than the eucharist 'eschatological'. The other authors regard the eucharist as eschatological, not because they start from the incarnation rather than from eschatology, but because they use the word 'eschatological' not to refer to the 'not yet' (as Noordmans does), but to the proleptic realisation of the 'already'. It is largely a matter of definition of the word 'eschatological', which Noordmans emphatically wants to apply to the 'not yet', while the other authors apply it to the foretaste of the 'already'. Cf. paragraphs 6.3.5 (von Allmen), 6.4.4 (Wainwright) and 6.6.4 (Ploeger & Ploeger-Grotegoed). HAARSMA, *Geest en kerk*, 351-352, points to the fact that Noordmans's non-eschatological interpretation of the sacraments, ironically, makes the sacraments precisely what he does not allow the liturgy to be: a rather static, inward-looking affair.

51 NOORDMANS, *Liturgie*, 91. Noordmans borrows the term 'moral holiday' from the American philosopher and psychologist William James (1842-1910).

52 NOORDMANS, *Liturgie*, 94-95 ('ja-zegger', 'neen-zegger'), 103, 118, 132. This position is critically evaluated in paragraph 8.7.4.

of 'saying no' is reflected by liturgical sobriety.[53] For the same reason, Noordmans prefers to speak of a 'service' rather than a 'celebration'.[54]

Van der Leeuw is disappointed by Noordmans's suggestion that participating in the liturgy will lead to a diminishing of 'saying no' in moral life. He even regards this criticism as below the high level of the discussion.[55] The liturgical movement does not want anything else than that the liturgical service is continued in daily service, and that daily life should be in accordance with liturgical life. Both liturgy and ethics are impossible without God's grace. But this, adds van der Leeuw, is not the same as to say that they are impossible at all. A unity of liturgical and ethical life is possible if God enables us in Christ by his Spirit.[56]

6.2.8 The Centre of Protestant Liturgy

Noordmans is not a spiritualist. He does not deny that the liturgy, including Protestant liturgy, implies a real encounter with God (although not automatically through the liturgy, but only God willing).[57] Noordmans affirms that there is a 'place' (*plaats*) of God's presence in the liturgy. Appealing to Luther, Noordmans locates this place in the proclamation of the Word of God, more particularly in preaching about Christ. The church is where the Holy Spirit is. The Spirit constitutes the church. And the Spirit is where Christ is proclaimed. 'Where the Word is, there emerges the church'. 'The Word of God constitutes the church'.[58]

Thus, Noordmans interprets the place of God's presence in the liturgy not as a literal place but as—what he calls—an 'eschatological' place. The encounter with God takes place outside ourselves, in the proclamation of the Word, 'particularly the vocal Word', the sermon.[59] So it is the Word—which Noordmans explicitly concentrates in the sermon—which is the centre of Protestant liturgy.

53 NOORDMANS, *Liturgie*, 96-97 ('dit liturgische, [...] deelnemende, communicatieve leven').

54 NOORDMANS, *Liturgie*, 108 ('dienst' versus 'feest-vieren'), 127-128 ('dienst' versus 'viering').

55 The Noordmans-van der Leeuw debate was seen by both parties as a dignified and high level discussion; cf. VAN DER LEEUW in *Liturgie in de crisis*, 165-166; NOORDMANS in *Liturgie in de crisis*, 192; the editor's foreword to *Liturgie in de crisis*, 237; O. NOORDMANS, 'Een oude koe', *Weekblad der Nederlandsche Hervormde Kerk* 33 (1949), 172; annotated edition in: NOORDMANS, *Verzamelde werken* VI, 340-341.

56 VAN DER LEEUW in *Liturgie in de crisis*, 177-180.

57 VAN DER KOOI & NEVEN, 'Liturgie bij dr. O. Noordmans', 99, formulate that Noordmans wants the liturgy not only to be 'demythologised' (against Orthodox liturgy) but also to be 'depsychologised' (against Protestant idealism).

58 NOORDMANS, *Liturgie*, 82-87 (86: 'Waar het Woord is, daar ontstaat de kerk'; 87: 'Het Woord van God constitueert de gemeente').

59 NOORDMANS, *Liturgie*, 85-86 ('het vocale Woord'). This position is critically evaluated in paragraph 8.4.6.

This centre of the liturgy is something else than the 'essence' or 'spirit' of the liturgy. We have seen that Noordmans refuses to determine the latter, because he does not believe that Protestant liturgy could be summarised under one heading. Liturgy is made up of several separate elements.[60] Among those elements, however, a central element can be singled out, and this is the sermon ('the Word'). The paragraph on eschatology showed that the Word is, in Noordmans's understanding, the most far-reaching of all liturgical elements. Instead of incapsulating the Word in the safe, coherent structure of the liturgy, the liturgy (prayer, sacraments, hymnody) should be determined and criticised by the Word.

But there is another reason why the sermon is central. That is because in the sermon the sacrifice of Christ becomes present. Noordmans allows two Christian meanings of the term 'sacrifice' (*offer*). It could mean the sacrifice of Christ on the cross, according to Noordmans the central fact of the Christian faith. And it could mean the daily task, the self-surrendering attitude of Christians in daily life (cf. Romans 12:1). The latter sacrifice is not a liturgical but an ethical matter. But how is the former sacrifice—Christ's—present in the liturgy? Is it present, as the liturgical movement says, in the eucharist, or in the liturgy as a whole? No, Noordmans says, 'The sacrifice comes to us in the sermon, like grace'. '[The sermon] and not the eucharist takes the place of the cultic sacrifice'.[61]

Van der Leeuw's main objection to Noordmans's view is not the absence of the sacrament, but the absence of the Word. 'Word' in the biblical sense, says van der Leeuw, is both word and deed. It is God's creative Word and God's incarnate Word. Noordmans's 'vocal Word' is, according to van der Leeuw, merely the humanists' word or the idealists' word. Van der Leeuw proposes a much more 'sacramental' understanding of the 'Word'. Sermon and sacrament are both 'Word' in the theological sense, and at the same time they are both 'sacramental' in the sense that they are, God willing, the vehicles of God's coming towards humans.[62]

Moreover, van der Leeuw has a fundamentally different view as to the question in which form the sacrifice of Christ is present in the liturgy. He agrees with Noordmans that 'the sacrifice of Christ, in which we, being his, may share' is the centre of the liturgy. He does not, however, agree that this sacrifice is predominantly present in the sermon. 'Everything which is in its essence related

60 NOORDMANS, *Liturgie*, 120.

61 NOORDMANS, *Liturgie*, 100-105, 120-135 (123: 'De offerande komt in de prediking naar ons toe, zoals de genade'; 134-135: 'Zij [de prediking] en niet het Avondmaal staat in de plaats van het cultisch offer').

62 VAN DER LEEUW in *Liturgie in de crisis*, 175. Van der Leeuw has elaborated this understanding of sacramentality—including the Word—in his *Liturgiek* and in G. VAN DER LEEUW, *Sacramentstheologie* (Nijkerk: Callenbach, 1949). Cf. PLOEGER, '"Geen spelletje"', 20-21, 27. According to HAARSMA, *Geest en kerk*, 353, Noordmans's contrast between Word and sacrament is 'an inadequate distinction' ('geen adequaat onderscheid').

to [Christ's sacrifice], is sacramental.' This is primarily the eucharist, and after that baptism and the proclamation of the Word—in the sermon but also in other forms, such as the absolution. For van der Leeuw, no particular element of the liturgy represents the cultic sacrifice (as Noordmans had argued of the sermon), but every liturgical element is related to Christ's sacrifice in some way or another.[63]

For van der Leeuw, therefore, the centre of the liturgy is not the sermon but the eucharist, which has the most intimate relation to Christ's incarnation and self-offering. Preaching—not as the 'vocal Word', but as proclamation of 'the Word' which is both word and deed—is also related to Christ's incarnation and self-offering (and therefore sacramental). But the preacher should, in order to say more than just a vocal word, always realise that preaching is not salvation itself, but the message of salvation. Salvation is in Christ, and everything which stands in a relationship to Christ has its sacramental place in the liturgy of the church, beginning with the eucharist.[64]

6.2.9 Can the Liturgy Constitute the Church in Protestant Theology?

Is it possible within Protestant theology to develop a liturgical ecclesiology? Can the liturgy be said to be constitutive of the church? The Noordmans-van der Leeuw debate suggests at least two possible answers to this question.

Both Noordmans and van der Leeuw regard (elements of) the liturgy as constitutive of the church. Noordmans distantiates himself from spiritualist tendencies in Protestantism and proposes two ways of looking at the constitution of the church by events which take place in the liturgy: the sermon and the eucharist. Van der Leeuw is wholeheartedly a liturgical theologian and sees the church primarily as a celebrating community, with the eucharist as 'the actual form of the church'.[65] In one way or another, then, both authors see the liturgy as central to the Protestant understanding of the church. We have, however, to differentiate between Noordmans's and van der Leeuw's views.

A first answer, therefore, is Noordmans's. According to Noordmans, the liturgy as a whole does not exist. Protestant liturgy is made up of independent elements, of which the sermon takes precedence. It is the Word, and particularly

63 VAN DER LEEUW in *Liturgie in de crisis*, 179 ('het offer van Christus, waarin wij als de zijnen mogen delen'), 181 ('het offer des Heren. Alles wat daarmede in wezensbetrekking staat, is sacramenteel'). In his *Liturgiek* (41-42), van der Leeuw takes not Christ's sacrifice but his incarnation as the centre, around which a set of concentrical circles can be drawn. From the centre onwards these circles are the incarnated Christ, the eucharist, baptism, the proclamation of the gospel (pre-eminently in the sermon and in the rite of absolution), the *sacramentalia* and the liturgy as a whole. See also VAN DER LEEUW, *Sacramentstheologie*, 252-253.

64 VAN DER LEEUW in *Liturgie in de crisis*, 185-186.

65 VAN DER LEEUW, *Sacramentstheologie*, 298 ('de eigenlijke vorm van de kerk').

the vocal preaching of the Word, which constitutes the church. Preaching takes place both within and outside the liturgy. But if we take one aspect of preaching—the sermon within the liturgy—we could say that Noordmans regards the liturgy—with the sermon at its centre—as constitutive of the church. Moreover, Noordmans is prepared to describe parish liturgy as an ellipse with two focuses: the sermon—dynamic, free, missionary, eschatological—and the eucharist—static, giving rest and stability to the local congregation.[66] However, it remains Noordmans's view that the eschatological, missionary, dynamic, universal character of preaching should, in the end, determine the character of the church. The pastoral, static character—in some sense the 'realised eschatology'—of the sacraments form the local church but have always to be woken up by the message of the Word.[67]

A second answer to the question whether Protestant theology can produce a liturgical ecclesiology is van der Leeuw's. Van der Leeuw has a broader view on Protestantism than Noordmans, and blames the latter for identifying Protestantism with Puritanism.[68] Moreover, van der Leeuw is not afraid of 'a new Reformation' if it proves necessary. Particularly when it comes to the sacraments and the liturgy, van der Leeuw regards a recourse to the Reformers' views as not satisfactory for contemporary theology. Van der Leeuw wants to be seen as a theologian of the Reformed church, which means that he views himself as neither Eastern Orthodox nor Roman Catholic, but *not* that he views himself as being bound to follow all decisions taken by the sixteenth-century Reformers.[69] In van der Leeuw's view, the church is a liturgical community. One is a member of the church throughout all his or her days, but this becomes visible when all members are called (*ekklesia*) to the liturgical gathering. The creative and liberating Word of God constitutes the liturgy and the church, by calling sinners to the liturgical community. So, the creation of the liturgy is at the same time the creation of the church. Through baptism, all are called (*ekklesia*) to be bearers of the ministerial priesthood. All belong to the people of God (*laos*) and all exercise a task (*kleros*) within the body of Christ. Ministry in the strict sense is a specialisation—conferred by the grace of God and always exercised communally—of the ministry of the whole people of God. The 'ministry of all believers' is not a diminishing but a heightening of the priestly

66 NOORDMANS in *Liturgie in de crisis*, 197.

67 NOORDMANS in *Liturgie in de crisis*, 190, 197, 199. On Noordmans's use of the concept of eschatology, cf. paragraph 6.2.6.

68 VAN DER LEEUW in *Liturgie in de crisis*, 167, 184. Noordmans refutes this accusation in *Liturgie in de crisis*, 224-227, 234-235.

69 VAN DER LEEUW in *Liturgie in de crisis*, 166, 174, 182-184 ('een nieuwe hervorming'). Noordmans is not prepared to go back behind the decisions of the Reformers, cf. *Liturgie in de crisis*, 196, 200.

character of the (whole) church, which is best expressed in the eucharistic liturgy.[70]

6.2.10 Conclusion

The other authors to be discussed in this chapter will probably recognise themselves rather in van der Leeuw's than in Noordmans's approach to the identity of the Protestant churches, as twentieth-century 'ecumenical' Protestantism resembles rather van der Leeuw's broader view than Noordmans's more restricted view. It should be noticed, however, that Noordmans's self-identity as a Protestant in direct rapport with the Reformers remains an important strand within Protestantism.[71]

Something similar could be said of Noordmans's place in the whole of this study. Although the thought presented throughout this study, including my own choices in the final chapter, is more congenial to van der Leeuw than to Noordmans, the latter's emphases remain valid as warnings against misconceptions of Christian liturgy. It may, then, be interesting to summarise Noordmans's criticisms and compare them to the insights of the other Protestant theologians whose thought on the church and the liturgy will be presented in the following sections.

Firstly, Noordmans is critical of liturgy as a closed system. Liturgy should always be broken open by the criticism of the Spirit and of Christ crucified. Secondly, God is present in the church by Word and Spirit, not by an extension of the incarnation in liturgical, sacramental or ministerial forms. The incarnation has to be interpreted as message not mystery.[72] Thirdly, the first two criticisms could be summarised as the necessary breaking of forms. This breaking serves an ecclesiology which is both pneumatological—the freedom of the Spirit transcends our forms—and eschatological—unbroken forms will only be trustworthy at the end of time.[73] Fourthly, a sober, broken liturgy reflects a sober ethics which is not characterised by 'participation' but by 'saying no'. There must be a direct relationship between liturgy and life.

70 VAN DER LEEUW, *Liturgiek*, 53-54, 56-57. Like Dix (cf. paragraph 5.3.3), but unlike Lathrop (cf. paragraph 6.5.7), van der Leeuw thinks it a sign of a healthy non-clericalist view when a non-presiding minister does not sit in the pews but assists his or her colleague, 'so that one can no longer ask one another: Whose service did you attend?'; *Liturgiek*, 58 ('zoodat men elkander niet meer kan vragen: bij wien heb jij gekerkt?'). The various positions will be evaluated in paragraph 8.5.2.

71 Cf. WHITE, *Protestant Worship*, 35, 211-212. See also paragraphs 5.4.1 (Excursus: Anglicans Evangelical and Catholic) and 7.7.3 (Excursus: The Nature of Salvation and Participation).

72 Cf. NOORDMANS, 'Mysterie of boodschap'.

73 The breaking of language and symbols is further explored, in a more ecumenical context but stemming from a similar critical Protestant tradition, by Lathrop (cf. paragraph 6.5.4).

As van der Leeuw's responses indicate, not all of Noordmans's criticisms are accurate in the light of the liturgical movement's theological self-understanding. They are, however, relevant warnings against a self-sufficient, 'closed' liturgical concept. To detect the possibility of such a liturgical-theological debasement is the genius of Noordmans's contribution to the formation of an ecumenical liturgical ecclesiology.

6.3 JEAN-JACQUES VON ALLMEN

6.3.1 Life and Work

The attention now turns to the central 'panel' of this chapter's 'triptych', on which three internationally and ecumenically respected authors are depicted. The previous 'side panel' tried to indicate that within twentieth-century Protestantism quite a variety of theological opinions is possible when it comes to the approach of Scripture, the church, the sacraments and the liturgy, and therefore also to the evaluation of the sixteenth-century Reformation. Compared to the different views of Noordmans and van der Leeuw, the three authors presented on this central 'panel' continue rather van der Leeuw's than Noordmans's line of thought. As stated at the beginning of this chapter, many contemporary Protestants will recognise themselves rather in Noordmans's views, and may therefore prefer ecclesiological approaches less congenial to a liturgical or eucharistic ecclesiology. Nevertheless, the theological, liturgical and ecumenical movements of the first half of the twentieth century have not left Protestantism untouched. The three authors encountered here represent 'ecumenical Protestantism'—a *relecture* of the sources and principles of Protestantism in the context of the ecumenical movement.

The first of them is the Swiss Reformed pastor and professor Jean-Jacques von Allmen (1917-1994). Having studied theology in Lausanne, Basel and Neuchâtel, von Allmen was ordained to the ministry. A church historian by training, he became a respected biblical scholar and ecumenist as well. From 1958 until his retirement, von Allmen was Professor of Practical Theology at the Protestant Theological Faculty of the University of Neuchâtel, interrupted from 1971 to 1974 by his directorate of the Tantur Ecumenical Institute near Jerusalem.[74]

In the context of this study, von Allmen is acknowledged as a liturgical theologian who, combining his Reformed background with his ecumenical interest and expertise, offers insights into a liturgical ecclesiology. Out of his

[74] Cf. A.D. DUBA, 'Jean-Jacques von Allmen: Christian Worship: A Reformed Perspective', in: D.W. Vogel (ed.), *Primary Sources of Liturgical Theology: A Reader* (Collegeville MN: TLP, 2000), 126-127.

numerous books and articles on biblical, historical, theological, liturgical and pastoral themes,[75] three publications are of particular interest—the ecclesiological and liturgical essays in *Prophétisme sacramentel* (1964);[76] the *Essai sur le repas du Seigneur* (1966), a concise but thorough eucharistic theology and ecclesiology;[77] and the synthesis *Célébrer le salut* (1984),[78] which is the belated (and revised) French edition of a lecture course which was given at Neuchâtel in 1960-1961[79] and published in English as *Worship: Its Theology and Practice* (1965),[80] the book for which von Allmen is best known in the English-speaking world.[81]

6.3.2 Protestantism and Ecumenism, Prophetism and Sacramentality

One of von Allmen's important contributions to ecumenical discourse is his both self-conscious and self-critical interpretation of Reformed Protestantism. Von Allmen regards Protestantism as orthodox and catholic. The aim of the Reformers—in the case of the Reformed churches particularly Calvin—was to restore the catholic church in the orthodox faith. Likewise, in the contemporary ecumenical situation, every church has—according to von Allmen—to uphold the orthodox faith and has to strive at being a part of the catholic church. Von Allmen considers, therefore, the liberalism of eighteenth- and nineteenth-century Enlightenment Protestantism as a painful element in Protestant history, as it strayed from orthodoxy and did no longer wish to be catholic.[82]

Von Allmen's key to the interpretation of Protestant self-identity is to read the Reformers in the light of their theological and patristic knowledge rather than in the light of later Protestant doctrine marked by Pietism and the Enlightenment. The latter has become the regular way of interpreting the Reformers, whereas, von Allmen claims, the former does more justice to the Reformers' intentions. Thus, von Allmen believes that there is more continuity between Scripture, the Fathers, the Reformers and the contemporary church

75 Cf. 'Bibliographie J.J. von Allmen 1939-1981', in: B. Bobrinskoy *et al.*, *Communio sanctorum. Mélanges offerts à Jean-Jacques von Allmen* (Genève: Labor et Fides, 1982), 1-17.

76 J.-J. VON ALLMEN, *Prophétisme sacramentel. Neuf études pour le renouveau et l'unité de l'Eglise* (Neuchâtel: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1964).

77 J.-J. VON ALLMEN, *Essai sur le repas du Seigneur* (Neuchâtel: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1966).

78 J.-J. VON ALLMEN, *Célébrer le salut. Doctrine et pratique du culte chrétien* (Genève: Labor et Fides; Paris: Cerf, 1984).

79 The French original existed in stencilled form only; cf. 'Bibliographie', 1-2.

80 J.-J. VON ALLMEN, *Worship: Its Theology and Practice* (London: Lutterworth; New York: OUP, 1965).

81 Cf. DUBA, 'Jean-Jacques von Allmen', 127.

82 VON ALLMEN, *Prophétisme sacramentel*, 17 n. 25, 65, 67, 254, 271, 273.

than he usually finds in the writings of Reformed theologians.[83] For von Allmen, there can be no church which does not *reform* itself in the light of Scripture and the Early Church. Neither can there be a church which does not *recatholisise* itself in the same light. Therefore, von Allmen remarks, he is seen from different sides as very 'Reformed' (*réformé*) and very 'catholisising' (*catholicisant*).[84]

His own term in which these aspects are united is 'sacramental prophetism' (*prophétisme sacramentel*). Sacraments are prophetic because they imply both a judgement and a promise. Baptism, for example, judges natural humanity and the natural world by placing a man or a woman sacramentally in the new world. The other way round, prophecy—for example as concreticised in preaching—is sacramental, because it makes present what it proclaims. According to von Allmen, word and sacrament, prophetism and sacramentality, are complementary not opposite to each other.[85] This double movement—judgement and promise, criticism of this world and prefiguration of the next, the need of going through a 'baptismal' purification before one enters the realm of the kingdom—is characteristic of von Allmen's thought.[86]

Two recurring themes in von Allmen's writings are constitutive for the interdepence of prophetism and sacramentality—pneumatology and eschatology. It is *by the Spirit* that both word and sacrament receive their efficacy. And the Spirit does so *through judging this aeon by revealing the new aeon*. The Spirit makes present the past and the future. The realm of this effective remembrance of the past and foretaste of the future is the church and specifically the liturgy.[87]

6.3.3 The Church, the World and the Kingdom

Von Allmen regards the church as the realm in which God's future—God's kingdom—is already made present by the Spirit. The kingdom 'installs' itself (*s'installe*) provisorily in this world by the church, through which the world is both questioned and turned towards God's future. The double movement of the 'sacramental prophetism' is, thus, a characteristic of the church. The church is both critical and affirmative towards this world—critical because this world has to be judged, affirmative because through being judged and purified this world will enter God's future. The church proclaims and signifies both the 'end' (*fin*) and the 'future' (*avenir*) of this world (*l'éon présent*).[88]

83 VON ALLMEN, *Prophétisme sacramentel*, 109-110. Cf. paragraph 6.3.6.
84 VON ALLMEN, *Prophétisme sacramentel*, 77.
85 VON ALLMEN, *Prophétisme sacramentel*, 10, 19, 26, 28 n. 43, 39, 49.
86 Cf. VON ALLMEN, *Célébrer le salut*, 283-290.
87 VON ALLMEN, *Prophétisme sacramentel*, 16, 52-53, 288-310.
88 VON ALLMEN, *Prophétisme sacramentel*, 21-23, 26.

Baptism functions in von Allmen's writings as the sacrament which most clearly indicates this double character of salvation and of the church which embodies salvation. Being baptised is renouncing the powers of this passing world and being placed into the realm of God's power and future. A baptised person—as well as the church consisting of all baptised—is a walking sign to everyone in this world that one has to be judged, purified, turned away from living for oneself, *and* that one has the opportunity to do so, to be transformed, to participate in salvation.[89] Not surprisingly, a word like 'transformation' has a significant place in von Allmen's writings. For him, salvation is the transformation of this world into God's kingdom. The church, consisting of all those who have gone through the baptismal transformation, is the realm in which the transformation of the whole world is temporarily prefigured.[90]

As a consequence, there is high tension in von Allmen's thought about 'the world'. The church, distinct from but not separated from the world, knows both a *dégagement* from and an *engagement* with the world.[91] On the one hand, von Allmen does not for a moment relativise the need of judgement to which the world—not just some political wing of the world,[92] but unredeemed creation in general—is subject. In this sense, the church has no engagement with the world other than to convert it. The church is different from the world and the deciding difference is baptism—the judgement and death of the 'old man' living for himself, and the resurrection and recreation of the 'new man' living for God.[93] On the other hand, the church has no other goal than to prefigure what the whole world will become—transformed humanity, renewed creation, kingdom of God. In this sense, von Allmen is not defeatist about the world. Once gone through judgement and repentance, the world will eventually be transformed into God's kingdom.[94] Therefore, von Allmen does not refrain from saying that the church, and every baptised person, is both a 'threat' (*menace*) and a 'promise' (*promesse*) to the world.[95] The church's task is to restore the world to its real meaning and destination.[96] To express this both critical and affirmative attitute towards the world, von Allmen suggests the terms 'visited' (*visité*) and

89 VON ALLMEN, *Prophétisme sacramentel*, 19, 21, 25, 29, 31, 37; VON ALLMEN, *Célébrer le salut*, 42, 69, 93, 284.

90 *Transformation*, *transformer*, *transfigurer*, *métamorphose*, *métamorphoser*, *renouveler*, *réorienter*; cf. VON ALLMEN, *Prophétisme sacramentel*, 15, 65, 264; VON ALLMEN, *Essai sur le repas du Seigneur*, 85, 90; VON ALLMEN, *Célébrer le salut*, 43, 62, 68, 74, 96, 108, 251, 284. Cf. also paragraph 5.6.7 (Williams).

91 VON ALLMEN, *Célébrer le salut*, 74; cf. 93; VON ALLMEN, *Essai sur le repas du Seigneur*, 113.

92 VON ALLMEN, *Célébrer le salut*, 82 n. 28.

93 VON ALLMEN, *Prophétisme sacramentel*, 19-20, 34, 38-39; VON ALLMEN, *Essai sur le repas du Seigneur*, 60, 107, 109; VON ALLMEN, *Célébrer le salut*, 66.

94 VON ALLMEN, *Prophétisme sacramentel*, 21-23, 35.

95 VON ALLMEN, *Prophétisme sacramentel*, 19-26; VON ALLMEN, *Célébrer le salut*, 79-80, 90.

96 VON ALLMEN, *Prophétisme sacramentel*, 32-35; VON ALLMEN, *Essai sur le repas du Seigneur*, 54, 107; VON ALLMEN, *Célébrer le salut*, 92.

'(yet) to be visited' (*visitable*) instead of the words 'sacred' (*sacré*) and 'profane' (*profane*)—the world is not irredeemably profane, but is yet to be visited by the grace of God.[97]

Compared to the world, the church belongs rather to the realm of God's kingdom. Compared to the kingdom, however, the church still belongs to the world. This is the eschatological tension so characteristic for von Allmen's ecclesiology. '[W]hether one likes it or not, the church has no sense outside the world',[98] because it is exactly the church's essence to be the kingdom's prefiguration *in this world*. This is why von Allmen's ecclesiology is a 'high' ecclesiology without becoming triumphalistic. The exalted vocation of the church—being the kingdom's sacrament—is exercised nowhere else than in and in view of the world. The eventual recapitulation of the whole world under Christ will be God's work at the end of time.[99] In the meantime, the church is—says von Allmen, modernising the ancient comparison between the church and Noah's Ark—no less and no more than a zoo, containing 'specimens' (*spécimens*) of the world, until God regains the whole world for Himself.[100]

The church being a prefiguration of the kingdom by containing specimens of the world, means also that von Allmen's ecclesiology knows a tension between the universal and the local. For as specimens of this world are represented in the church as firstfruits of the kingdom, the church has to be a genuine representation of the (many) varieties of the world, while at the same time being a prefiguration of the (one) kingdom. The latter is reflected in von Allmen's writings by a certain predilection for the universal, cosmic church—the church on earth and in heaven, the church of all times and places. This universal church, consisting of all baptised, is Christ's body and bride and prefigures the kingdom. A 'local' (*locale*) or 'particular' (*particulière*) church is 'not the catholic church in its fullness, but the localisation [...] of it',[101] the 'epiphany, here and now, of the holy church of God'.[102] The other side of the coin is that 'the catholic church in its fullness' is nowhere else to be found than in the local churches. 'One is a Christian in a parish [...] or one is not a Christian'.[103] Being a manifestation of the universal church, every local church shares in its fullness and catholicity. According to von Allmen, this becomes

97 VON ALLMEN, *Célébrer le salut*, 72-74.

98 VON ALLMEN, *Prophétisme sacramentel*, 26 n. 41 ('que cela lui plaise ou non, l'Eglise n'a pas de sens hors du monde').

99 VON ALLMEN, *Prophétisme sacramentel*, 25, 27, 137; VON ALLMEN, *Essai sur le repas du Seigneur*, 94; VON ALLMEN, *Célébrer le salut*, 29-30.

100 VON ALLMEN, *Prophétisme sacramentel*, 28-29; cf. VON ALLMEN, *Célébrer le salut*, 51-52.

101 VON ALLMEN, *Prophétisme sacramentel*, 136 ('ce n'était pas l'Eglise catholique dans sa plénitude, mais une localisation [...] de cette Eglise'); cf. 29 n. 45, 114.

102 VON ALLMEN, *Essai sur le repas du Seigneur*, 39 ('l'Eglise locale, épiphanie *hic et nunc* de la sainte Eglise de Dieu'); cf. VON ALLMEN, *Célébrer le salut*, 238.

103 VON ALLMEN, *Prophétisme sacramentel*, 61 ('On est chrétien dans une paroisse [...] ou on n'est pas chrétien'); cf. VON ALLMEN, *Célébrer le salut*, 39, 224.

most fundamentally true when the eucharist is celebrated: 'When [the eucharist] is celebrated, through Jesus Christ being present, his whole church is present also'.[104] The fullness of the church becomes, thus, present in every local eucharistic community—every local church—however small it may be. Therefore, the local churches need structures and practices of mutual recognition, celebration and solidarity, respecting variety and expressing unity.[105] But no local church has, according to von Allmen, the right to place itself above rather than among the other local churches, as, in his view, the church of Rome has done. Every local church, including the church of Rome, has to check itself critically against other local churches and the whole church, in order not to stray away in self-sufficiency and self-pride, making itself the criterion for ecclesiality.[106]

6.3.4 The Liturgy

The church (*ekklesia*, *qahal*) is, according to von Allmen, primarily an assembly (*assemblée*). '[T]he church is the people gathered by God before God'.[107] One is baptised in order to become a member of the celebrating community.[108] The liturgy is, therefore, the manifestation of the church.[109]

Because the church—as we saw above—consists of 'specimens' of this world as the firstfruits of the kingdom, the liturgy is also the manifestation of that which the world will become. Becoming a liturgical community, acquiring a doxological attitude, is the true destination of the world. The true role of humans is 'a liturgical role', their true place 'a liturgical place': 'Indeed, man is, according to the first chapter of Genesis, created for conducting a cosmic liturgy'.[110] In the liturgy, the world is re-orientated eschatologically—humans, water, bread, wine, wood, stone, light, sound, time and place are given their true role of adoration and intercession. The primary identity of creation is

104 VON ALLMEN, *Essai sur le repas du Seigneur*, 51 ('Quand elle est célébrée, parce que Jésus-Christ est présent, toute son Eglise est présente elle aussi'); cf. 40, 45, 114; VON ALLMEN, *Célébrer le salut*, 40, 51.

105 VON ALLMEN, *Essai sur le repas du Seigneur*, 51-52; cf. VON ALLMEN, *Célébrer le salut*, 220-221, 274-276.

106 VON ALLMEN, *Prophétisme sacramentel*, 138; cf. J.-J. VON ALLMEN, *La primauté de l'Eglise de Pierre et de Paul. Remarques d'un protestant* (Fribourg CH: Editions universitaires; Paris: Cerf, 1977), 104-107: the primacy of Rome is the primacy of the local church of Rome among (and, thus, respecting) the other local churches.

107 VON ALLMEN, *Célébrer le salut*, 38 ('l'Eglise, c'est le peuple assemblée par Dieu devant Dieu'); cf. 276.

108 VON ALLMEN, *Célébrer le salut*, 225.

109 Cf. VON ALLMEN, *Célébrer le salut*, 37-60 (a chapter called 'Le culte, manifestation de l'Eglise').

110 VON ALLMEN, *Prophétisme sacramentel*, 290 ('un rôle liturgique'; 'C'est en effet pour conduire une liturgie cosmique que l'homme, d'après le premier chapitre de la Genèse, a été créé'), 298 ('une place liturgique'); cf. 32-33.

doxological and the liturgy invites creation back into this identity. This is the substitutive, vicarious character of the Christian liturgy: that it celebrates in limited and temporary forms what the whole world will become.[111] '[L]ife is fundamentally a liturgical affair'.[112]

In the kingdom of God, says von Allmen, there will be no distinction between the liturgy of the church and the life of the world, because everything will be restored to its doxological identity.[113] But before the final breakthrough of the kingdom, life—even the life of the baptised, the life of the church—does not consist of liturgy only. There is still a dialectic between liturgy and life, between Sunday and the weekdays. Von Allmen is convinced that, next to the Sunday as the liturgical day, the weekdays should not be imitations of the Sunday, because they have their own character. Flowing from and leading back to the Sunday liturgy is the week's task of witness (*témoignage*) and service (*diaconie*).[114] Von Allmen compares the liturgy with the beating heart—it is central and crucial, but it also knows the movement of systole and diastole, that is, the movement of gathering and sending out.[115] As a consequence, von Allmen distinguishes between the church's liturgy and the church's mission outside the liturgy. Although the Sunday liturgy prepares for mission and service during the week, it is not missionary itself. The liturgy is the celebration of the baptised, the encounter between God and his people, between Christ and his body and bride. Therefore, von Allmen thinks it would be wrong to transform the Sunday liturgy into a missionary activity, as easily accessible as possible. In his view, liturgy is origin and goal of mission, not mission itself.[116]

Another dialectic is the both local and universal character of the liturgy. The liturgy reflects what already has been said about the local and universal character of the church—the liturgy of the local church manifests its catholicity, but does also justice to its local character. Baptism pardons and sanctifies the world—also the local cultural world—but does not suppress it. As it was in the Early Church, local churches had, and still have, different liturgical traditions, which do not endanger mutual recognition. As local elements von Allmen acknowledges for example the liturgical language and the choice of prayers and hymns.[117] But although von Allmen emphasises that unity does not imply

111 VON ALLMEN, *Prophétisme sacramentel*, 297-298; VON ALLMEN, *Essai sur le repas du Seigneur*, 53-54; VON ALLMEN, *Célébrer le salut*, 92, 94-96, 133-134, 197, 251, 287-288.

112 VON ALLMEN, *Célébrer le salut*, 278 ('la vie est dans le fond une affaire liturgique').

113 VON ALLMEN, *Célébrer le salut*, 251.

114 VON ALLMEN, *Célébrer le salut*, 44, 52, 62, 102, 134, 269-270; cf. VON ALLMEN, *Prophétisme sacramentel*, 49-50; VON ALLMEN, *Essai sur le repas du Seigneur*, 107. On the Sunday as the day of the eucharist, see the next paragraph.

115 VON ALLMEN, *Célébrer le salut*, 58-59.

116 VON ALLMEN, *Essai sur le repas du Seigneur*, 113, 115; VON ALLMEN, *Célébrer le salut*, 52-55, 102-103.

117 VON ALLMEN, *Prophétisme sacramentel*, 309-310; VON ALLMEN, *Essai sur le repas du Seigneur*, 14-15; VON ALLMEN, *Célébrer le salut*, 44, 98, 123, 125, 275.

uniformity, he is aware that there is a potential tension here, because on the other hand every local liturgy must clearly manifest its Christian character, its belonging to the unity of the whole church.[118]

6.3.5 The Eucharist

Perhaps not surprising in contemporary ecumenical liturgical theology, but still remarkable in von Allmen's Reformed context, is his insistence on the fact that the central Christian liturgy is the eucharistic liturgy (including, of course, the liturgy of the Word).[119] Jesus Christ himself has instructed the church to celebrate the eucharist,[120] and the life of the Early Church was centred around it.[121] But von Allmen's most important argument is that the eucharist is the celebration of the central event of salvation history, the true 'liturgy' in which all liturgy culminates: the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. The eucharist gives those who celebrate the eucharist a share in Christ's 'liturgy'.[122]

The eucharist is communion *with* Christ and communion *in* Christ. In the eucharist, the church is made one with Christ and, being one in Christ, the members of the church are one with each other.[123] This communion with and in Christ leads von Allmen to acknowledge the 'constitutive' character of the eucharist,[124] and to say that there can be no church without the eucharist, because it is in the eucharist that the church is most deeply itself.[125] By instituting the eucharist, Christ instituted the church.[126] The eucharist 'incorporates', 'integrates' the members of the church into Christ,[127] makes them part of his body,[128] part of himself: part of *totus Christus*—head and body.[129] This catena of references shows how deeply von Allmen's thought is immersed into eucharistic ecclesiology. The eucharist is constitutive of the church and therefore the central liturgy of the church. Through the eucharist, the church is built up by being connected to Christ.

118 VON ALLMEN, *Essai sur le repas du Seigneur*, 40.

119 VON ALLMEN, *Célébrer le salut*, 13, 32, 34, 53, 54, 56, 84, 89, 126, 137, 158, 162-168, 273. Von Allmen sees the liturgy of the Word, including the sermon, as necessary because the Kingdom has *not yet* come and is still to be proclaimed, and the liturgy of the eucharist as necessary because the firstfruits of the Kingdom have *already* come (150, 165).

120 VON ALLMEN, *Essai sur le repas du Seigneur*, 23; VON ALLMEN, *Célébrer le salut*, 13, 32, 163-164.

121 VON ALLMEN, *Prophétisme sacramentel*, 31 n. 48.

122 VON ALLMEN, *Prophétisme sacramentel*, 46, 299 n. 37; VON ALLMEN, *Essai sur le repas du Seigneur*, 98; VON ALLMEN, *Célébrer le salut*, 16-17, 23, 60-61, 90, 164-165, 273.

123 VON ALLMEN, *Essai sur le repas du Seigneur*, 56.

124 VON ALLMEN, *Essai sur le repas du Seigneur*, 37, 91, 108, 115.

125 VON ALLMEN, *Essai sur le repas du Seigneur*, 19, 62, 75.

126 VON ALLMEN, *Essai sur le repas du Seigneur*, 12, 31.

127 VON ALLMEN, *Essai sur le repas du Seigneur*, 57, 88.

128 VON ALLMEN, *Essai sur le repas du Seigneur*, 31-32, 62, 91, 98.

129 VON ALLMEN, *Essai sur le repas du Seigneur*, 51, 57.

To describe this connection between Christ and the church, von Allmen not only applies 'body of Christ' terminology. He has also a predilection for nuptial imagery—Christ as groom and the church as bride, the kingdom (and its prefiguration in the eucharist) as a wedding banquet. Von Allmen says that nuptial imagery is not very popular in a time in which the church relativises its otherness opposite the world and does not take seriously the eucharistic consequence of baptism. Nevertheless, the church is related to Christ as intimately as lovers are. Precisely the eucharist is the moment in which these lovers meet each other, show that they exist for each other, give themselves to each other, and unite themselves to each other. Moreover, the nuptial theme gives a deep layer of hope, joy and beauty to even the simplest eucharistic celebration.[130]

This close connection between Christ, the church and the eucharist has a consequence for von Allmen's opinion about intercommunion. He argues that the usual question—whether Christians of different denominations can take part in one another's eucharist—is the wrong question. According to von Allmen, the 'right' answer to this 'wrong' question can only be that intercommunion is inadmissible, because intercommunion endorses separation, either by regarding the division of the churches as incurable, which makes intercommunion the only 'solution', or by not taking the division of the churches seriously, so that intercommunion is possible because the churches are not 'really' divided (because our union in Christ surmounts differences, or because differences are theological or clerical barriers rather than real differences, or because external, visible unity does not matter). So, von Allmen's answer to the 'wrong' question (the acceptance of intercommunion in a state of denominational division) is that only restored *communion*, not intercommunion, is the solution to the separation of the churches. A 'corrected' question, he says, would be whether the restoration of communion between the churches could be encouraged by—not accepted but exceptional—forms of intercommunion. To this corrected question he gives four answers. First, each church should purify its own eucharistic practice. Second, churches with a similar background—for example, Protestant churches of different denominations—should accept visiting members of each other's churches in a form of limited communion.[131] Third, the same kind of limited communion could be practised at ecumenical conferences. Fourth, trans-confessional intercommunion could be experimented *in a given place*—all Christian churches of that place practising intercommunion towards each other—for a limited time. Von Allmen feels that exceptions such as these would both retain the principle of communion rather than intercommunion and

[130] VON ALLMEN, *Prophétisme sacramentel*, 304-305; VON ALLMEN, *Essai sur le repas du Seigneur*, 59-60; VON ALLMEN, *Célébrer le salut*, 45-48, 104, 112, 123, 127.

[131] In *Célébrer le salut* (241) this form of communion seems to have progressed from a limited and exceptional to a full and normal status.

encourage the churches to grow in mutual acceptance.[132] In the meantime, it is clear that von Allmen personally thinks that the time for this mutual acceptance has come.[133]

Because von Allmen regards the eucharist as the full Christian liturgy, he also wants that all celebrants of this liturgy—all baptised—are given the opportunity to take part in the full eucharistic liturgy. To be baptised is to be made part of the eucharistic community. Therefore, von Allmen opposes a situation in which baptism is required and administered much more easily than participation in the eucharist. Both belong together. There is a border (namely the border between *profane* and *sacré*) between belonging to 'the world' and being baptised, not between being baptised and taking part in the eucharistic communion. The paschal experience of baptism, once for all, is renewed by the paschal experience of the eucharist on the weekly Easter morning.[134] Neither is the celebration of the eucharist limited to the presider. The ordained minister presides at the con-celebration of all baptised, not making the celebration 'his' service, but enabling the congregation to celebrate. His liturgical role is to represent Christ to his people and to conduct (*diriger*) the celebration of the whole people.[135]

The strong link between baptism and the eucharist leads von Allmen to two recurring criticisms—a criticism against Roman Catholicism for not letting the whole congregation receive communion (and receive communion under both species) in every eucharist, and a criticism against Protestantism for not celebrating the eucharist every Sunday. Either way, the baptised are deprived of their (full participation in the) weekly eucharist and, thus, treated as catechumens.[136] In view of the Reformation, von Allmen acknowledges that the fact that 'for the first time one dared to disjoin the Lord's Day from the Lord's Supper' had its root in the situation that, in late medieval times, the people were not used to a more frequent communion than once a year, around Easter. The correct 'theological' view that the eucharist implies general communion conflicted with the 'pastoral' situation in which the baptised only communicated annually.[137] Thus, compared to daily Mass, the Reformers' practice—four Sundays a year and on the principal feasts—occurs as a dramatic *decrease* of

[132] VON ALLMEN, *Essai sur le repas du Seigneur*, 70-77; VON ALLMEN, *Célébrer le salut*, 240-245.

[133] VON ALLMEN, *Essai sur le repas du Seigneur*, 91; VON ALLMEN, *Célébrer le salut*, 243.

[134] VON ALLMEN, *Essai sur le repas du Seigneur*, 38, 64-65, 88 (cf. n. 37), 98, 109, 119; VON ALLMEN, *Célébrer le salut*, 42-43, 69 (cf. n. 14), 79 n. 23, 89, 167-168, 204, 224-227, 232, 235. Consistently, von Allmen says that the baptism of children should imply their receiving communion (*Célébrer le salut*, 227).

[135] VON ALLMEN, *Célébrer le salut*, 122, 129-130, 217-218, 229-231. Cf. paragraph 6.3.6.

[136] VON ALLMEN, *Essai sur le repas du Seigneur*, 17-18, 64-65, 91; VON ALLMEN, *Célébrer le salut*, 54, 226 (catechumens: 168, 226).

[137] VON ALLMEN, *Essai sur le repas du Seigneur*, 17-18 ('pour la première fois on a osé disjoindre jour du Seigneur et repas du Seigneur'), 64-65.

eucharistic celebrations, but compared to Easter communion only, the Reformed Church *increased* eucharistic participation.[138] However, von Allmen's defence of Reformed practice is confined to this historical contextualisation. It is his conviction that a less-than-weekly celebration of the eucharist was a temporary pastoral measure, and that the Reformers' intention was to restore, eventually, the weekly Sunday eucharist with full congregational participation. The fact that this restoration did, generally speaking, not take place 'has undoubtedly divided the church more deeply than any preceding schism', because, according to von Allmen, it is at the root of the distinction between the 'Catholic' and 'Protestant' types of Christianity. Not from its theological origins, but in its subsequent '*sentire ecclesiam*' and its 'religious sociology', Protestantism became a form of Christianity 'in the margin of sacramental life'.[139]

The Sunday is the day of the eucharist. Von Allmen argues that Scripture, patristic practice, Reformation thought, and the reality of the majority of Christian churches, show that the eucharist belongs to the Sunday because of the paschal ('first day') and eschatological ('eighth day') character of both the Sunday and the eucharist. So there should be no celebration of the Sunday without a celebration of the eucharist (including the liturgy of the Word).[140] But the other side of the coin is, according to von Allmen, that there should be no more than one eucharist on a Sunday, and no more eucharists during the week than the Sunday eucharist. The eucharist is the one celebration of the one church on the day of the anamnesis of creation, of Christ's death and resurrection, and of the coming of the Spirit, as well as of the anticipation of the parousia. Improvising on the names of the days of the week, von Allmen says that, because the kingdom has not yet come in full vigour, the life of the church knows not only a day of the Lord (*dimanche*), but also days still under the influence of the powers of this world—the moon (*lundi*), Mars (*mardi*), Mercury (*mercredi*), etcetera. Like liturgy in general, the eucharist in particular is subject to the dialectic of 'systole and diastole', the dialectic between the celebration of Christ and his kingdom and the work and toil of daily life, witness and service. The fact that the eucharist (*eucharistie*) prepares for mission (*messe*), implies that not every day is a day of the eucharist, but that every working day—and its liturgy of prayers—revolves around the 'sun' of the eucharist.[141]

Finally, like the liturgy in general, the eucharist in particular is related to the dialectic between the locality and the universality of the church. On the one

138 VON ALLMEN, *Célébrer le salut*, 159-160.

139 VON ALLMEN, *Essai sur le repas du Seigneur*, 18 ('a sans doute partagé l'Eglise plus profondément qu'aucun des schismes précédents', 'sentire ecclesiam', 'sociologie religieuse', 'en marge de la vie sacramentelle'); cf. 74.

140 VON ALLMEN, *Essai sur le repas du Seigneur*, 82, 109, 116; VON ALLMEN, *Célébrer le salut*, 24, 157-158, 226, 253-262.

141 VON ALLMEN, *Essai sur le repas du Seigneur*, 64 n. 39, 105, 115; VON ALLMEN, *Célébrer le salut*, 52, 102-103, 134, 269-270, 281.

hand, in the eucharist the church is fully local, because there is no celebration otherwise than by a local church. On the other hand, in the eucharist the local church is fully connected to all other local churches, because all celebrate the same eucharist in which the same Christ is present: '*every* local church, gathered into a eucharistic assembly and constituted through that eucharist, is on the same ground the same sacrament of the same kingdom because it celebrates the same eucharist'. The celebration of the eucharist connects the local church with the church of all times and places.[142]

6.3.6 The Ordained Ministry

This section started with the acknowledgement that von Allmen offers a both self-conscious and self-critical understanding of Reformed Protestantism.[143] This is especially the case in view of his interpretation of the ministry in the Reformed churches. First, von Allmen states that those strands of Protestantism were wrong which considered the structure of the church as an *adiaphoron*, that is, as belonging to the category of 'ceremonies' external to the essence of the faith and the church. The church's ministerial structure belongs to its being (*être*) and contributes to the exercise of its mission.[144]

Second, von Allmen distinguishes fundamentally between the priestly and the ministerial roles in the church. The priestly, sacerdotal role is attributed to all baptised. The ministerial role is not a specification of the priesthood of all baptised, attributed by the baptised to one of them, but a particular ministry, attributed by Christ to the minister through ordination.[145] The role of the minister is to represent Christ to his people. As the eucharistic assembly reveals the church, the reciprocity between the minister and the people reveals the relationship between Christ and the church—shepherd and flock, father and family, groom and bride, the one who visits and those who are visited, a witness of Christ and those who are Christ's body. Both sides of this polarity are necessary for being church—no church without a ministry, no ministry without a church—and no side of the polarity is first or second.[146]

142 VON ALLMEN, *Essai sur le repas du Seigneur*, 51 ('*chaque* Eglise locale rassemblée en congrégation eucharistique et constituée par cette eucharistie est, au même titre, le même sacrement du même Royaume parce qu'elle célèbre la même eucharistie'); cf. 45; VON ALLMEN, *Célébrer le salut*, 238, 275-276.

143 Cf. paragraph 6.3.2.

144 VON ALLMEN, *Prophétisme sacramentel*, 39-40, 127, 130.

145 VON ALLMEN, *Prophétisme sacramentel*, 88; VON ALLMEN, *Célébrer le salut*, 93 (cf. n. 38 and 39).

146 VON ALLMEN, *Essai sur le repas du Seigneur*, 45-50. For a number of reasons, not least the iconic and the ecumenical, von Allmen opposes the ordination of women; cf. VON ALLMEN, *Prophétisme sacramentel*, 97 n. 39, 247-283. This position is critically evaluated in paragraph 8.5.3.

Third, because the eucharist is the heart of the church and reveals the church's very essence, the eucharistic gathering is normative for the functioning of the ministry in the church. All 'elements of ecclesiastical structure and organisation' (*éléments de structure et d'organisation ecclésiastiques*) must have a relationship to the eucharistic gathering. A consequence drawn by von Allmen is that *one* community can only have *one* bishop-pastor. If the size of the parish or the amount of work require assistance, this can be provided by deacons and presbyters. The diaconate is 'assistance to the shepherd' (*aide du berger*), including the particular liturgical role of the deacon. The presbyterium is a 'collegial representation of the congregation to advise the pastor and, the other way round, to represent him when needed' (*représentation collégiale de l'assemblée pour conseiller le pasteur et, en retour, pour le représenter au besoin*). The presbyters can help the bishop-pastor either by assisting him in his pastoral care for the whole flock or by taking care, by delegation, of a part of the flock. In the first instance, as assistant to the local bishop-pastor, the presbyter has a liturgical 'place' (*place*) in the presbyterium rather than a liturgical 'function' (*fonction*) in the course of the celebration. In the second instance, as pastor-delegate of the bishop, the ministry of the presbyter is 'episcopalised' as he presides over the parish eucharist in the name—and in the place—of the bishop.[147] Here it is clear that von Allmen thinks of the ministerial structure of the Early Church, in which the bishop was the local pastor, assisted by presbyters and deacons. It is, indeed, von Allmen's conviction that the Reformed structure of the ministry—pastors (*pasteurs*), elders (*anciens*) and deacons (*diacres*)—reflects an attempt at restoring the ministerial structure of the Early Church—bishops (*évêques*), presbyters (*prebytres*) and deacons (*diacres*).[148]

Fourth, however, the fact that Reformed elders and deacons are not ordained for life and therefore, according to von Allmen, cannot be—and generally are not—regarded as part of the ordained ministry in the same way as the pastor is, keeps von Allmen from continuing this comparison (pastor/bishop, elder/presbyter, deacon/deacon) and leads him to understand the pastor as the only ordained minister in the Reformed churches.[149] Following the ancient school of thought which does not distinguish ontologically between a bishop and a presbyter, the Reformers conceived of their pastors as 'a pastor-bishop of the parish' (*un pasteur-évêque de paroisse*). Parish ministry was, therefore, 'episcopalised', but the parish was not interpreted as a diocese, that is, a complete church—the complete church being served by synods rather than by a

147 VON ALLMEN, *Essai sur le repas du Seigneur*, 46-50; VON ALLMEN, *Célébrer le salut*, 232-234.

148 VON ALLMEN, *Prophétisme sacramentel*, 85. The Reformed institution of a separate 'doctoral' ministry is acknowledged by von Allmen but does not play a part in his discussion of the ministry.

149 VON ALLMEN, *Prophétisme sacramentel*, 85, 96, 103-104.

particular minister.[150] As a consequence, the Reformed churches—which have, according to von Allmen, 'theologically' continued the episcopate in the parish pastor—do not 'sociologically' possess a bishop in the sense of a supra-parochial minister. This not 'theological' but 'sociological' lack of a bishop, together with a lack of interest in the theology of ministry and the Roman Catholic claim that the Reformed churches abandoned episcopacy, led the Reformed churches to believe that they have no episcopate. This Reformed self-understanding as having no bishops is doubly wrong, says von Allmen, when one realises that the bishop in the Early Church looked more like a (Protestant) parish pastor than like a (Roman Catholic) *gouverneur diocésain*. Von Allmen, therefore, calls his own church to take its own ministry more seriously as the first necessary step in ecumenical dialogue.[151] Of course, von Allmen says, it is possible that some pastors have a supra-local responsibility, 'like archbishops' (*des sortes d'archevêques*). This would, however, not destroy the fundamental equality of all pastors.[152] Recalling Afanasiev's distinction, von Allmen emphasises that the Protestant churches have a 'eucharistic' rather than a 'universal' ecclesiology. The latter will always be alien to them.[153]

Fifth, von Allmen acknowledges the apostolic succession as the normal form of continuity in the church. However, he subdivides the apostolic succession into a 'pastoral succession' (*succession pastorale*) and a 'doctrinal succession' (*succession doctrinale*). The former is what is generally understood as the 'apostolic succession': the continuity of ministers. The latter is what nowadays would be called 'apostolic tradition': the continuity of the contents of apostolic teaching and living. According to von Allmen, the combination of these two successions is the normal way in which the church lives its continuity throughout the ages. However, at the Reformation the church had *temporarily* to give up the 'pastoral succession' in order to rescue the 'doctrinal succession' and with no other aim than to *restore* the 'pastoral succession'. Those who revived the 'doctrinal succession' without being part of the 'pastoral succession' are called by von Allmen 'extraordinary ministers' (*ministres extraordinaires*) who should have given way to the 'ordinary ministry' (*ministère ordinaire*) as soon as the situation was stabilised. This, however, never happened—the lost apostolic succession (*succession pastorale*) was never rejoined with the preserved apostolic tradition (*succession doctrinale*). Von Allmen complains, therefore, that the Reformed churches have overlooked the extraordinary character of a ministry outside the 'pastoral succession', thereby 'installing the

150 VON ALLMEN, *Prophétisme sacramentel*, 85-86, 103 n. 56.

151 VON ALLMEN, *Prophétisme sacramentel*, 131-133, 250; cf. VON ALLMEN, *Essai sur le repas du Seigneur*, 71.

152 VON ALLMEN, *Prophétisme sacramentel*, 103.

153 VON ALLMEN, *La primauté de l'Eglise de Pierre et de Paul*, 111 ('ecclésiologie "eucharistique"', 'ecclésiologie "universelle"'; von Allmen himself does not mention Afanasiev here). Cf. paragraph 2.2.9.

church in the extraordinary' (*installer l'Eglise dans l'extraordinaire*) instead of 'leading it back into the ordinary' (*la ramener à l'ordinaire*).[154]

6.3.7 Conclusion

Von Allmen's contribution to a liturgical ecclesiology is considerable. Not only does he present an understanding of the church which finds its beating heart and its full manifestation in the liturgy, particularly the eucharist. He also connects this understanding to other ecclesiological themes, such as the church's relation to the world and to the kingdom of God, and to the place of the ministry within the church.

According to von Allmen, the church is the temporary form in which the Spirit already reveals the coming kingdom of God in this world, before the whole world will be transformed into God's kingdom. This gives a both critical and optimist flavour to von Allmen's discussions of the church and the world. The church is—through baptism—*different from* the world, but also the *firstfruits of* the whole world on its way to the kingdom. The eschatological awareness of both judgement and promise pervades his thought.

In the liturgy, and above all in the eucharist, the kingdom is 'already' experienced amidst the 'not yet' of this world. 'Liturgical' life—doxology—is the world's ultimate destination. 'Eucharistic' life—being restored under one head, being 'wed' to Christ—reflects what the church is already and what the world will become. But because the breakthrough of the kingdom is still awaited, the church has not only the liturgy and the eucharist—the Sunday—to celebrate, but also a mission and a service—weekdays—to fulfill. Flowing from and leading to the eucharist is the task of the church and its members in this world.

Von Allmen's eucharistic ecclesiology is both universal and local. Theologically—in terms of the church as Christ's body and bride—it is primarily universal, practically—in terms of regional adaptation and translation—it is primarily local. The eucharist itself is the link between the local and the universal: always being celebrated locally, the eucharist establishes the local celebrating congregation as part of Christ's universal church.

In view of an ecumenical theology and practice of ministry, von Allmen offers an interesting interpretation of Reformed ministry as—at least intentionally—in tune with patristic and Catholic understandings of ministry. As appropriate in a liturgical ecclesiology, von Allmen's understanding of ministry finds its focus in the local eucharistic gathering. There, the minister serves the church by representing Christ to the congregation and by presiding over the

[154] VON ALLMEN, *Prophétisme sacramentel*, 109-138, 257-258; cf. VON ALLMEN, *Célébrer le salut*, 56.

communal celebration. Flowing from this liturgical focus are the other ministerial responsibilities, including supra-local—and eventually universal—oversight, in respectful communion with all local churches and their ministers.

6.4 GEOFFREY WAINWRIGHT

6.4.1 Life and Work

Geoffrey Wainwright was born in Britain in 1939, but has lived and worked outside his home country for the most part of his life. He studied in Cambridge, Geneva and Rome, served as a Methodist minister in Liverpool and as Professor of Systematic Theology at the Protestant faculty of Yaoundé, Cameroon, at Queen's College, Birmingham, and at Union Theological Seminary, New York. He is currently Professor Emeritus of Duke University.[155] Next to these academic responsibilities, Wainwright has been involved intensively in the work of the World Council of Churches' Commission on Faith and Order. His most prominent activity in this area was probably his involvement in the discussions about and the final formulation of the Faith and Order document *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* (Lima 1982). He also co-chairs the international Methodist / Roman Catholic dialogue commission.[156]

Wainwright describes himself as 'a (Methodist) systematic theologian who holds that Christian faith begins and ends in worship, which is therefore a constant reference-point for theology'.[157] In this spirit he has written a systematic theology entirely based on the interdependence of liturgy and dogma. This 1980 work *Doxology* has since remained a classic exposition of the *lex orandi lex credendi* principle.[158] As for his own tradition, Wainwright is convinced that Methodism is able to lead people into 'catholic Christianity'. It is his wish that all traditions should develop their tendencies into an ecumenically understood 'Catholicism'.[159] In this section, we will encounter Wainwright's attitude towards central aspects of a liturgical ecclesiology.

155 G. WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology: The Praise of God in Worship, Doctrine and Life: A Systematic Theology* (London: Epworth, 1980), 10-11; G. WAINWRIGHT, *The Ecumenical Moment: Crisis and Opportunity for the Church* (Grand Rapids MI: Eerdmans, 1983), vii; G. WAINWRIGHT, *Worship with One Accord: Where Liturgy and Ecumenism Embrace* (New York-Oxford: OUP, 1997), 85.

156 WAINWRIGHT, *The Ecumenical Moment*, vii, 5, 37, 212; WAINWRIGHT, *Worship with One Accord*, viii, 18 n. 33, 273. On *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, cf. section 7.2.

157 WAINWRIGHT, *Worship with One Accord*, 230.

158 Cf. G.W. LATHROP, *Holy Things: A Liturgical Theology* (Minneapolis MN: Fortress, 1993), 9 n. 11; WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology*, 161. Cf. paragraph 6.4.3.

159 WAINWRIGHT, *The Ecumenical Moment*, 17.

6.4.2 Ecumenism

For Wainwright, ecumenism is not merely a field of church politics, or a pastime for specialists. Ecumenism is at the heart of the Christian faith. It has to do with everything the church, the liturgy and the sacraments stand for. Particularly when a theological view is bound up so closely with ecclesiology and liturgy, one's whole theology is in a certain way jeopardised by the disunity of the Christians. Unity among Christians has to do with 'every Christian's finding his full identity'.[160]

Wainwright is devoted to what he calls 'classic ecumenism'. With this term he describes an approach of ecumenism which is based on 'the apostolic canon of faith'—Scripture, trinitarian faith as found in the patristic creeds—and which aims at visible, structural, organic unity between the churches.[161] In order to indicate what is central in his understanding of ecumenism, Wainwright repeatedly refers to the phrase from the World Council of Churches' constitution, which says that the WCC strives for 'visible unity in one faith and in one eucharistic fellowship'.[162] Wainwright also uses his phrase 'classic ecumenism' to express his reservations about what he calls 'the ecumenically correct'. This latter term refers to a certain religious pluralism which he sees at work in the WCC from the nineteen nineties.[163] For Wainwright, ecumenism is a Christian task, which can only be undertaken on a trinitarian basis and with ecclesiology at its heart. 'The alternative to visible unity is not spiritual unity but visible disunity'.[164]

One of Wainwright's convictions regarding ecumenism is based on the fact that the celebration of the liturgy reveals many resemblances between the churches. Wainwright suggests that the churches should take this fact more seriously. Instead of referring to their dogmatical-theological statements, they should refer to the contents of their liturgical celebrations. Then they will discover that, particularly since the liturgical revisions of the twentieth century, they celebrate largely the same (*lex orandi*), which is a sign of the fact that they believe largely the same (*lex credendi*). The Nicene creed and the contents of

[160] G. WAINWRIGHT, *Eucharist and Eschatology* (London: Epworth, 1971), 140-141; WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology*, 190; WAINWRIGHT, *The Ecumenical Moment*, 61.

[161] WAINWRIGHT, *The Ecumenical Moment*, 10, 15; WAINWRIGHT, *Worship with One Accord*, 85, 273.

[162] WAINWRIGHT, *The Ecumenical Moment*, 2, 138; WAINWRIGHT, *Worship with One Accord*, 81.

[163] WAINWRIGHT, *Worship with One Accord*, 253, 272, cf. 251-273; WAINWRIGHT, *The Ecumenical Moment*, 26. Telling is the anecdote that Wainwright and a colleague walked along the banners of the WCC assemblies of 1954 ('Jesus Christ the Hope of the World'), 1961 ('Jesus Christ the Light of the World'), 1975 ('Jesus Christ Frees and Unites') and 1983 ('Jesus Christ the Life of the World'), after which his colleague said, 'That's the last time we'll see *his* name on a banner.' WAINWRIGHT, *Worship with One Accord*, 257.

[164] WAINWRIGHT, *The Ecumenical Moment*, 190, 199.

the liturgy can and should suffice to establish unity among the churches. The liturgy expresses that something like a provisional unity already exists between the churches. Moreover, the liturgy—by its '(notoriously) conservative character'—will provide a more stable basis for unity than ever-changing theological fashions.[165]

Wainwright's ecumenical vision is a church built up from the level of small local 'dioceses'. In his view, every such 'diocese' should consist of all Christians in one place, in communion with each other but gathering in a number of '"congregations" in various liturgical, spiritual and cultural styles'. Wainwright hopes that the solution of the 'scandal' of division will come from local congregations gathering into such an ecumenical 'diocese'.[166]

Finally, Wainwright admits that it is an anomaly that divided churches do things—social outreach, but also eucharistic celebration—together. But the major anomaly is the churches' division itself. On our way to unity, 'we should choose the minor anomaly' of doing things together in a not yet fully established communion.[167]

6.4.3 Lex Orandi Lex Credendi

Wainwright regards himself primarily as a systematic theologian. His method, however, is liturgical. His 'vision of faith' is shaped by the liturgy of the church. His is a 'liturgical way of doing theology'. 'Worship is a locus for the reception and transmission of the vision'. Because, Wainwright says, the primary attitude of humans towards God is doxological, the practice of worship is a reliable source of the Christian view on humanity, God and their relationships.[168] Primary theological language is, therefore, the *liturgical* language. Consequently, theological *reflection* is not only secondary, but should also remain aware of its relation to the primary, the liturgy. Proper secondary theological reflection should remain doxological in essence. A creed is primarily a doxology; orthodoxy is 'right worship'.[169]

[165] WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology*, 280-282, 292-294, 303, 306, 308, 315, 442; WAINWRIGHT, *The Ecumenical Moment*, 5.

[166] WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology*, 320; WAINWRIGHT, *The Ecumenical Moment*, 10, 12, 215. For this unity emerging from below he refers to the principle of 'subsidiarity'.

[167] WAINWRIGHT, *The Ecumenical Moment*, 93-94.

[168] WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology*, 1, 9, 16; cf. 281; WAINWRIGHT, *The Ecumenical Moment*, 133. 'Liturgy *constitutes* the Tradition. Or even more boldly: Liturgy *is* the Tradition, and (more boldly yet) the Tradition *is* Liturgy'; WAINWRIGHT, *Worship with One Accord*, 45, cf. 56-57, 197.

[169] WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology*, 21, 187-188, 280, 369; WAINWRIGHT, *The Ecumenical Moment*, 3; WAINWRIGHT, *Worship with One Accord*, 11-12. A not dissimilar methodology (celebratory, communicative, critical; with primacy to the celebratory) was found in Rowan Williams; cf. paragraph 5.6.2.

The relation between *lex orandi* and *lex credendi* leads Wainwright to criticise a view on liturgy as mere poetry, disconnected from critical theological reflection. The whole of Wainwright's theological approach is dependent on 'a consistency, if not an identity' between worship and theology.[170] This consistency may take the form of changing the liturgy according to one's theological conviction—with the risk of shaping a liturgy which is outdated soon[171]—or, the other way round, of letting the liturgy act 'correctively' upon one's theological conviction, or, as in the twentieth century liturgical and ecumenical movements, of a simultaneous process of doctrinal and liturgical re-interpretation.[172] Historically, Wainwright presumes, Catholicism has primarily dwelt on the use of liturgical traditions as proof for theological convictions, whereas Protestantism has a larger record of reshaping liturgy from a doctrinal point of view. Wainwright's own interpretation of *lex orandi lex credendi* is certainly not one-way traffic in either of these directions. Although he grants the liturgy a primacy, he is aware of the critical force which theology (Scripture, tradition, hermeneutics) may have to exercise upon liturgical traditions. What he tries to do is to balance the principle *lex orandi lex credendi* in such a way that both the primary doxological and the secondary theological aspect receive their legitimate places in interdependence.[173] In the meantime, Wainwright's eschatological emphasis—which will be treated below—makes him recognise that both liturgy and theology will always be liable to *error*, as long as we live in 'the present incompleteness'.[174]

From the liturgy, Wainwright has learned to consider Christian views on liturgy, church, the human and the divine as 'open systems', with emphasis on both words. Liturgy presents a picture of unity and diversity, both within one church and between the churches, both synchronically and diachronically. This liturgical unity and diversity is, to Wainwright, a hint at on the one hand a 'core substance' of Christian faith and identity—a system—and on the other an amount of 'challenge and enrichment'—openness to a variety of ecclesial and cultural situations. Ultimately, all Christian systems should remain open to God and to the eschaton.[175]

6.4.4 Eschatology

Eschatology is a constant current in Wainwright's writings. Already in an early book, he examined the eschatological character of the eucharist. But also in his

170 One cannot be 'a trinitarian within the charmed circle of the liturgy and a unitarian in the academic study'; WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology*, 57.
171 WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology*, 341, 344.
172 WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology*, 58.
173 WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology*, 150, 158-159, 161, 218-219, 241, 246-247, 250-252, 293-294.
174 WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology*, 283, cf. 440.
175 WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology*, 435-438, 442.

later work, eschatology plays a part, not just as an afterthought, but as a fundamental aspect of liturgy, theology and ecumenism. Characteristic for Wainwright's thought is the emphasis on the *tension* between the 'already' (Christ's presence, the beginnings of the kingdom) and the 'not yet' (sin, imperfection). This corresponds to his option for an 'inaugurated' eschatology. Both an only 'futurist' and a too much 'realised' eschatology suggest the solution of the tension. Only an eschatology in which the kingdom has already been inaugurated but not yet fulfilled does justice to the reality of faith and hope in which the church lives.[176]

The church lives with what is already at hand since it is achieved in salvation history, and with what still has to come when salvation history will be consummated in God's kingdom. Worship is the place *par excellence* where the 'already' and the 'not yet' are celebrated. The very activity of 'praise' is, as the Apocalypse shows, an eschatological activity. The same is true of the 'banquet' and of the '*koinonia*' with Christ and with all the saints. Even those aspects of the liturgy which will have ceased in the eschaton—such as preaching and baptising—can be interpreted as this-worldly 'preparations' for the world to come. Thus, liturgy is the most eschatological activity of the church. It prepares for worship in the kingdom of God, and it is partly already a participation in this worship. Wainwright marks the eschatological character of the liturgy with the words 'anamnetic, epicletic, and proleptic'. These words refer to the past (remembrance), the present (representation) and the future (anticipation), but also to their interconnection in the liturgical celebration.[177]

In Wainwright's writings, there is a relation between eschatology and unity. As we saw, Wainwright has strong ecumenical convictions, but he is also aware of the fact that full unity between Christians—although it should be humanly *sought*—is ultimately a divine *gift*. Disunity between the churches is an instance of the imperfect, broken state in which we live before the eschaton. This means, on the one hand, that churches should not act as if they are already united. Working and praying for unity remains a task, and it is a task with eschatological dimensions—denying this would suggest an already 'realised' eschatology. But it means, on the other hand, that churches should not act as if there were no connection between the eschatological future and the present—this would imply an only 'futurist' eschatology. The gift of unity which still has to be perfected is already there in partial form. As will be seen in the paragraph on the eucharist, it is in Wainwright's view primarily the eucharist which bears an eschatological character and is, therefore, able to not only express but also

[176] WAINWRIGHT, *Eucharist and Eschatology*, 147; WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology*, 170, 395-396; WAINWRIGHT, *The Ecumenical Moment*, 130.

[177] WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology*, 120, 282, 405, 408, 412, 437, 457; WAINWRIGHT, *Worship with One Accord*, 20-26, 31, 40.

create unity. The eschatological foretaste, which the eucharist effects, includes the foretaste of eschatological unity.[178]

6.4.5 The Liturgy

Liturgy,[179] we saw, is for Wainwright of primary importance for theology, for the church's identity, and for the way in which the church perceives its eschatological character. As we give a closer look at the way Wainwright describes the liturgy, we come across phrases like 'the point of concentration at which the whole of the Christian life comes to ritual focus', 'the symbolic focus of the life of the church and (potentially) of humanity', 'the gift and opportunity of new life in anticipation of the final kingdom', 'the privileged place for the enactment and continuation, in words and gestures, of the realities of redemption', and 'a hermeneutical continuum [...] for the formative story'.[180] Liturgy is focal, because it recounts Christianity's foundational story and helps to form a response in worship, ethics and mission.[181] In the liturgy the reciprocal personal relationships between God and humanity take place.[182] In a more abstract way, Wainwright can describe liturgy as defining and maintaining group identity. In a more concrete way, he can describe Christian liturgy as—especially since the twentieth century liturgical and ecumenical movements—'celebration of the paschal mystery'.[183]

These definitions of liturgy bear ecclesiological importance in at least two respects. Firstly, the centrality of the liturgy in the life of the church cannot leave the definition of church untouched. If liturgy is the 'focus' of all that the Christian is and of all that the church is, liturgy must be at the heart of ecclesiology. Secondly, some of the definitions explicitly include the notions of the constitution of a group or the formation of a common identity. It is Wainwright's conviction that the liturgy is not only central to what the church is, but can also be the means to rescue the church from becoming scattered into 'doctrinally, morally, and institutionally unrecognizable forms'.[184] In short,

[178] WAINWRIGHT, *Eucharist and Eschatology*, 142-143; WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology*, 292, 310, 318; WAINWRIGHT, *The Ecumenical Moment*, 79, 89-90, 113.

[179] Wainwright insists that 'liturgy' should in this context not be interpreted as '"read" as opposed to "extemporary" prayers' or as such a thing as 'dressing up in garments'. Every kind of corporate worship is 'liturgy' in the systematic sense in which he discusses it. Cf. WAINWRIGHT, *Worship with One Accord*, 32 n. 5.

[180] WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology*, 8 (cf. 362, 408), 135, 406; WAINWRIGHT, *Worship with One Accord*, 42-43.

[181] WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology*, 153, cf. 352, 361; WAINWRIGHT, *The Ecumenical Moment*, 134, 148.

[182] WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology*, 82, 443, 462, cf. 37-44; WAINWRIGHT, *Worship with One Accord*, 129.

[183] WAINWRIGHT, *Worship with One Accord*, 4-5, 128, 137.

[184] WAINWRIGHT, *Worship with One Accord*, 139, cf. 106.

liturgy is simultaneously the place where everything the church is, is *brought together*, and the place where everything the church is, is *rediscovered and reappropriated.*

6.4.6 The Church

The church is, for Wainwright, an eschatological community, characterised by the relations between the Christians and the Father, the Son and the Spirit.[185] The church should not abandon this trinitarian, in a sense limited pattern, in order to gain relevance to the world. As the paragraph on ecumenism showed, it is Wainwright's conviction that the church needs its own identity. Only as a fully *Christian* church, the church can be part of a transforming process in society.[186] It is probably this choice between the adaptation or the maintenance of the church's identity which makes Wainwright speak of a *kairos*, including a *krisis*, for the church in the context of ecumenism and the whole world.[187] Moreover, only by knowing what the church is—that is, only with a minimum of ecclesiological awareness—the church can fulfill its task of the 'preaching and living of the gospel'.[188]

Christianity is a religion of communion. 'Christianity glories in the fact, the strict matter of fact, that reality can be known only by participation.' In the liturgy, and particularly in the celebration of the eucharist, this communion and participation (with the Trinity, with each other) becomes most apparent.[189] Baptism is the beginning of one's relationship—in the church—with the Father, the Son and the Spirit, and the eucharist is the continuation of and growth in this relationship.[190] Wainwright refers to Orthodox theology and to the liturgical movement, which contributed to a deeper understanding of the liturgy—and particularly the eucharist—as celebrations of the whole church, and thereby contributed to a deepening of ecclesiology as well.[191]

As will be substantiated in the following paragraphs on baptism and the eucharist, Wainwright's ecclesiology is 'broadly sacramental'. In the sacraments, the church's character occurs as both divine gift and human response.[192] The whole church becomes manifest in the local assembly gathering for the eucharist and 'repeatedly returning to its sphere of everyday witness'. In its *leitourgia* (worship) the church anticipates the kingdom. Besides

185 WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology*, 43, 84, 118.
186 WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology*, 146, 395.
187 WAINWRIGHT, *The Ecumenical Moment*, vii, 1.
188 WAINWRIGHT, *The Ecumenical Moment*, 190.
189 WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology*, 43, 84, 118, 142, 362.
190 WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology*, 84, 443, 455.
191 WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology*, 143, 248; WAINWRIGHT, *Worship with One Accord*, 136. Reference is made to Afanasiev and to the liturgical constitution of the Second Vatican Council.
192 WAINWRIGHT, *The Ecumenical Moment*, 14, 21.

its worship it prepares for the kingdom in *martyria* (mission) and *diakonia* (service). This alternately gathering and dispersing is, says Wainwright, characteristic of the church.[193] The liturgy can hold this central ecclesiological place, because it is not merely a human fellowship, but a participation (*koinonia*) in the divine reality. In the liturgy, the church becomes what it is and grows towards Christ. The church with the sacraments is Christ's 'visible people in the world'.[194]

Although Wainwright's Methodist tradition has a tendency to universalism—John Wesley regarded 'the whole world as [his] parish'—Wainwright's own ecclesiology is, being a liturgical ecclesiology, primarily local. The local church which gathers in the liturgy—and disperses from the liturgy—is the church. Wainwright fundamentally links the local churches by the very fact that every local church celebrates the same eucharist.[195]

Wainwright's eschatological emphasis does not lead him to say that the church will have ceased in the eschaton. Rather, the eschaton will mean 'the dissolution of the distinction between the sacred and secular or profane'. In the eschaton, everything the church stands for will be fulfilled. The relations between humans, and between humanity and God, will be perfected. The 'communal nature of humanity and salvation' implies that 'none is perfect until all are perfect'. In the end, 'catholicity' will mean that salvation stretches throughout the world. Sacraments will cease, though, because they are—in Wainwright's thought primarily—anticipations of the eschaton.[196]

6.4.7 Baptism

Throughout Wainwright's writings, there is a tendency in favour of adult ('believer's') baptism.[197] Especially because baptism constitutes the church, baptism should be taken seriously as a sign not only of grace but also of faith and conscious membership of the church of Christ. Baptism is the sign of faith, of justification, of incorporation into Christ, of the 'new creation' and of transformation. It is also a *prolepsis* of the last judgement and the kingdom. As an 'effective sign', it both signalises (presupposes) and effects (produces) what

193 WAINWRIGHT, *The Ecumenical Moment*, 62, 92-93; WAINWRIGHT, *Worship with One Accord*, 31-32, 55, cf. 231.

194 WAINWRIGHT, *The Ecumenical Moment*, 105; WAINWRIGHT, *Worship with One Accord*, 24, 79, 88.

195 WAINWRIGHT, *The Ecumenical Moment*, 86, 92-93, 111; cf. WAINWRIGHT, *Worship with One Accord*, 161.

196 WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology*, 406, 461; WAINWRIGHT, *The Ecumenical Moment*, 27, 62, 89, 134; WAINWRIGHT, *Worship with One Accord*, 46.

197 Cf. WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology*, 126, 139-141, 244, 330-331, 403; WAINWRIGHT, *The Ecumenical Moment*, 136, 212; WAINWRIGHT, *Worship with One Accord*, 131, 134.

it means, or at least it *should* do so.[198] In strong liturgical-ecclesiological terminology, Wainwright calls baptism a '*deputatio ad cultum*', an act which 'induct[s] persons into membership of, and particular roles in, the worshiping community'.[199]

Wainwright prefers the 'provisional place' of children as catechumens to the present situation of millions of 'baptised unbelievers'.[200] As far as the 'necessity for salvation' is concerned, Wainwright opts for the church and the sacraments as 'non-exclusive promise'. By this term he means that the sacraments imply the sure working of God's grace in these persons, but not the opposite—God's grace is not limited to those who have received the sacraments. This meaningful yet not exclusive interpretation of the sacraments allows, says Wainwright, the church to discriminate more seriously between who is going to receive sacraments and who is not.[201]

The fact that Wainwright is not entirely favourable of infant baptism—although he respects and recognises it—contributes to his caution regarding a quick presupposition of already existing Christian unity on the basis of 'our common baptism'. Establishing a common understanding of baptism still remains an ecumenical task.[202] On the other hand, Wainwright pleads for the mutual recognition between churches with different baptismal theologies and practices.[203] At the time of writing *Doxology*, Wainwright did not oppose '"second baptism" in difficult cases', but preferred liturgical acts of baptismal remembrance and renewal. Twenty years later he is convinced that baptism should not be repeated, although it should be regularly remembered and renewed.[204] Moreover, in twentieth-century ecumenical and liturgical developments, he recognises and welcomes a movement towards considering adult baptism as primary and infant baptism as a—possible but secondary—derivative.[205]

198 WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology*, 139, 412; WAINWRIGHT, *The Ecumenical Moment*, 21, 38, 103, 125; WAINWRIGHT, *Worship with One Accord*, 185, 187.

199 WAINWRIGHT, *Worship with One Accord*, 53.

200 WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology*, 141, 397; WAINWRIGHT, *The Ecumenical Moment*, 228 n. 17. Wainwright is not happy with the remains of the *corpus christianum* ('Constantinianism'); cf. WAINWRIGHT, *Eucharist and Eschatology*, 131-134; WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology*, 390; WAINWRIGHT, *The Ecumenical Moment*, 210; WAINWRIGHT, *Worship with One Accord*, 135.

201 WAINWRIGHT, *Eucharist and Eschatology*, 206 n. 439; WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology*, 145, 460; WAINWRIGHT, *Worship with One Accord*, 100, 113.

202 WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology*, 308, 311; WAINWRIGHT, *The Ecumenical Moment*, 40, 44, 89.

203 WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology*, 313; WAINWRIGHT, *The Ecumenical Moment*, 31, 108; WAINWRIGHT, *Worship with One Accord*, 172, 188-191.

204 WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology*, 322; WAINWRIGHT, *Worship with One Accord*, 114, 146-147.

205 WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology*, 337; WAINWRIGHT, *The Ecumenical Moment*, 36-37; WAINWRIGHT, *Worship with One Accord*, 4, 131.

6.4.8 The Eucharist

The eucharist is central in Wainwright's liturgical ecclesiology. Baptism has incorporated the members into the body, 'and the communal dimension of that incorporation continues to be expressed in the eucharist, where common participation in the one loaf properly keeps the many individual members united in the one body'.[206] The eucharist calls the individual members of the church to come together in one place (*epi to auto*). The one bread, the one cup and the one 'Amen' of the congregation, signify the unity of the church.[207] On the level of the supra-local church, by celebrating the same eucharist all local churches are united. The eucharist is the sacrament of relations, of *koinonia* with the Trinity and with each other, and also of *koinonia* between the churches.[208]

Wainwright's emphasis on eschatology comes to a climax in his thought on the eucharist. The eucharist is the church's eschatological celebration *par excellence*. The church (those who are the Lord's) celebrates, or should celebrate, the eucharist (the Lord's Supper) on every 'eighth day' (the Lord's Day).[209] The eucharist reflects both the 'already' and the 'not yet' of Wainwright's preferred type of eschatology. It is a *pars pro toto* celebration of eventual universal redemption, a periodic foretaste of perpetual joy, an invisible celebration of divine glory which still has to be visibly revealed.[210] In the eucharist, the epicletic presence of Christ comes anamnetically from the past as well as proleptically from the future.[211] Like baptism, the eucharist is, according to Wainwright, a 'non-exclusive promise'—that it is an effective sign of what it means, does not imply that what it means cannot be tasted or achieved outside this sacrament.[212]

One instance of the eschatological character of the eucharist is the ethics it teaches. Eucharistic table-fellowship is a rehearsal of the ethics of the kingdom. This 'eucharistic ethics' is described by Wainwright as 'doxological living'—grateful living as a response to what God has done to us—but also, more concretely, as welcoming (like at the table), peace-seeking (like the peace before the eucharistic liturgy starts), responsible living with the earth's resources, especially food and drink (like the reverence paid to bread and wine),

206 WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology*, 142.
207 WAINWRIGHT, *The Ecumenical Moment*, 57-59, 86; cf. WAINWRIGHT, *Worship with One Accord*, 135-136.
208 WAINWRIGHT, *The Ecumenical Moment*, 86; WAINWRIGHT, *Worship with One Accord*, 24, 161.
209 WAINWRIGHT, *The Ecumenical Moment*, 69, 129.
210 WAINWRIGHT, *Eucharist and Eschatology*, 58, 119-121, 147, 150; cf. WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology*, 41, 65, 109, 121, 340, 343, 418, 438, 543; WAINWRIGHT, *The Ecumenical Moment*, 7, 68, 127, 132; WAINWRIGHT, *Worship with One Accord*, 23, 96-97.
211 WAINWRIGHT, *Eucharist and Eschatology*, 91-92; WAINWRIGHT, *The Ecumenical Moment*, 68; cf. WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology*, 133-134; WAINWRIGHT, *The Ecumenical Moment*, 121-122.
212 WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology*, 460.

and responsible dealing with fellow human beings (like the table-fellowship). The eucharist is a sign of God's eschatological justice, which should be anticipated by the Christians' working for justice. In short, the eucharist is 'a paradigm for social ethics', which, in the context of Wainwright's thought, cannot be separated from the notion that this ethics refer to, and will only be perfected in, the eschaton.[213]

Another instance of the eucharist as foretaste of the eschaton is that it prefigures eschatological unity. In the end, the 'place' where the church gathers for its eschatological and uniting meal will be the whole world. Until that time, the 'place' is the local church. In the local church, gathered for the eucharist, the whole church is present. This implies—as Wainwright's fundamentally ecumenical approach urges him to acknowledge—that many denominational 'eucharists' in one place, many 'local churches' in one locality, are no less than a jeopardy of the eucharist and the church. According to Wainwright, one could even say that '*all* eucharists should cease' until reconciliation into one local church has been achieved. However, this is not Wainwright's position. He rather incorporates, from his eschatology, present imperfection and provisionality into his ecclesiology. Wherever the eucharist is being celebrated, God will be gracious.[214]

In the meantime, the separated churches should realise, says Wainwright, that the eucharist is an 'effective sign'—it is not only a *sign* of existing unity, but it is also a means which *effects* unity. This may lead in incidental cases to admission to communion of those non-baptised who sincerely wish to communicate, after which they should be brought to baptism.[215] But more fundamentally the 'effective' power of the eucharist should be applied to the present ecumenical situation. If it is not only true that 'the church makes the eucharist', but also that 'the eucharist makes the church', intercommunion could be seen—and Wainwright does so—as a means towards Christian unity. It is not only true that already existing unity within (a part of) the church is signified by the eucharist, it is also true that the eucharistic celebration effects unity in a situation of not yet existing unity. Thus, intercommunion is imperative, not as if full unity already existed, but because the eucharist is itself a means of growing towards unity.[216] Another reason why Wainwright pleads for intercommunion is

213 WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology*, 32, 78, 83, 121, 234-235, 343, 418, 422, 427; WAINWRIGHT, *The Ecumenical Moment*, 82, 137, 147-148; WAINWRIGHT, *Worship with One Accord*, 136, 205, 207-208, 210, 212.

214 WAINWRIGHT, *Eucharist and Eschatology*, 140-141; WAINWRIGHT, *The Ecumenical Moment*, 59, 62.

215 WAINWRIGHT, *Eucharist and Eschatology*, 134; WAINWRIGHT, *The Ecumenical Moment*, 141; WAINWRIGHT, *Worship with One Accord*, 116-117.

216 WAINWRIGHT, *Eucharist and Eschatology*, 115-117, 141-143; WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology*, 317-318; WAINWRIGHT, *The Ecumenical Moment*, 61, 63, 90; WAINWRIGHT, *Worship with One Accord*, 79. In this most recent work, however, Wainwright does not envisage intercommunion in an indiscriminate and certainly not in an individual way. As a serious

the fact that as soon as initiation (baptism) is recognised, participation in the eucharist should naturally follow. 'It is in the eucharistic assembly that unity comes to focal expression—or fails to.'[217]

6.4.9 The Ordained Ministry

All Wainwright's thoughts on ministry are qualified by the primacy of the whole church, the community of the baptised. In times when the distinctive character of baptism has been forgotten, and baptism has been administered indiscriminately, the demarcation line came to be drawn between clergy and laity rather than between the church and the world, or between those who are committed Christians and those who are not. Reversely, now the times of the Christian commonwealth are past, the baptised rediscover their identity as committed Christians, as those who are the church, and as a consequence the distinction between clergy and laity becomes less dominant. As may have become clear from the preceding paragraphs, Wainwright welcomes this rediscovery of baptism as fundamental and this diminishing of the abyss between clergy and laity.[218]

Ordination must be understood within the context of the whole church. It places the ordained into an *ordo*—Wainwright says, 'a permanent place and function'—*within* the larger *ordo* of all baptised.[219] In Wainwright's view, the function of the ordained ministry is to 'represent' and bring into 'focus' the various ministries of all baptised. Oversight (*episkope*) could be interpreted as coordinating the various gifts of all members of the community. This view leads him to say that ordained ministry is not 'exclusive' yet 'distinctive'. Moreover, ministry is necessary because of 'orderliness', but should not be understood in an 'hierarchical' way. Ministry implies order not rank.[220]

A typical liturgical-ecclesiological contribution to a theology of ministry is to understand ministry as liturgical presidency. Like baptism, ordination is a '*deputatio ad cultum*'—a liturgical act which places the ordained into a particular role in the worshipping community. The purpose of ordination is the 'building up of this worshiping community'.[221] Neither, of course, in the Tridentine sense of the isolated 'priest at his altar', nor in the traditional Protestant sense of the isolated 'preacher in his pulpit', but as him or her—

means to further unity, he recommends it between churches which are constructively on the way to mutual recognition and unity. WAINWRIGHT, *Worship with One Accord*, 178.

217 WAINWRIGHT, *The Ecumenical Moment*, 31, 75-77, 113.

218 WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology*, 136, 328, cf. 407.

219 WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology*, 116. Wainwright's image of minstry as having a 'place' within the context of the church recalls Afanasiev's 'topological' understanding of ministry; cf. paragraph 2.2.8.

220 WAINWRIGHT, *The Ecumenical Moment*, 99, 102-103, 108-110; WAINWRIGHT, *Worship with One Accord*, 76-77.

221 WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology*, 117; WAINWRIGHT, *Worship with One Accord*, 53, 55.

Wainwright regards the ordination of women as desirable[222]—who presides over the liturgical gathering in all its diversity. This understanding of ministry will lead to a different meaning of authority in the church—it will not take the form of top-down management, but of enabling, stimulating and coordinating a variety of gifts and ministries.[223]

Although Wainwright is a member—and minister—of a non-episcopal church, he follows the Lima report in proposing a personally, collegially and communally interpreted episcopal structure for a future united church. He stresses, with Lima, that a bishop is, thought a 'sign', not a 'guarantee' of either apostolic truth or ecclesiastical unity. He is particularly critical of the 'catholic' insistance on episcopacy as a focus of truth and unity while there are several 'rival' episcopates (Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Anglican) claiming both truth and unity, or while there are 'overlapping jurisdictions' within one episcopally ordered denomination (such as the Orthodox jurisdictions in the Western diaspora).[224]

Wainwright is not prepared to see episcopacy as the only acceptable form of ministry, but he is prepared to see episcopacy and episcopal succession as 'a kind of sacrament', as long as they are understood as a sign not a guarantee. Wainwright's eschatological emphasis contributes to this view. The church is not yet perfect, which implies that its orders must be given the credit of being signs of something—in this case, truth and unity—which they cannot yet fully realise.[225]

6.4.10 Conclusion

It is tempting to dwell longer on Wainwright's writings, as the method *lex ordandi lex credendi* leads him to provide many more insights into the areas of, for example, christology, pneumatology, and baptismal and eucharistic ethics. We must, however, confine ourselves to the main themes of a liturgical ecclesiology. It should only be noticed that these, for Wainwright, stand in the context of pneumatology as constitutive of faith, church, liturgy sacraments, and of ethics as their natural consequence.

Wainwright's ecclesiological views can be summarised as liturgical, ecumenical and eschatological. Paramount in Wainwright's approach is the church as a worshipping—particularly a eucharistic—community. What the church is, can be discovered in the liturgical celebration. And, in turn, the contents of the liturgical celebration reaffirms what the church is or should be. Although Wainwright firmly stands within his own (Methodist) tradition, he wants to theologise in an ecumenical way: he argues from his own tradition, but

222 WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology*, 134; WAINWRIGHT, *The Ecumenical Moment*, 114.
223 WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology*, 143, 247-248; WAINWRIGHT, *The Ecumenical Moment*, 104, 118.
224 WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology*, 319-320; WAINWRIGHT, *The Ecumenical Moment*, 28, 113.
225 WAINWRIGHT, *The Ecumenical Moment*, 13, 113, 116, 213.

does so within the context of the traditions of the whole ecumene. Theologically, he stands in the 'classical' tradition (classical Protestantism, classical ecumenism) and it is his conviction that only the classical Christian tradition is able to overcome ecclesiastical boundaries and to have something to contribute to the world. Finally, Wainwright's awareness of the kingdom of God, which has already begun in Jesus Christ but which still has to be fulfilled in the eschaton, makes the church both eschatological and provisional. The liturgy is the nearest the church can come towards anticipating the consummation of what the church stands for—*koinonia* with the Trinity, and *koinonia* with and *diakonia* towards every other in the world.

6.5 GORDON LATHROP

6.5.1 Life and Work

Gordon W. Lathrop (born 1939) studied theology in the United States and in the Netherlands. Having returned to America, Lathrop became pastor to a Lutheran parish and subsequently a lecturer in liturgy. He is now Professor Emeritus of Liturgy at the Lutheran Theological Seminary in Philadelphia. In addition, Lathrop has occupied positions in the Lutheran World Federation and in the Commission on Faith and Order of the World Council of Churches.

The introductory chapter of this study acknowledged Lathrop as a leading liturgical theologian.[226] The present section will present his main contributions to a liturgical ecclesiology by referring to his liturgical-theological trilogy, *Holy Things: A Liturgical Theology* (1993),[227] *Holy People: A Liturgical Ecclesiology* (1999),[228] and *Holy Ground: A Liturgical Cosmology* (2003).[229]

6.5.2 Ordo

Lathrop pays tribute to Alexander Schmemann, from whom he borrows the term *ordo* as a central concept in both the celebration of and the theological thought on the liturgy.[230] For Schmemann, the *ordo* is in the first place the sum of all liturgical prescriptions. In this sense, however, the *ordo* poses many questions. How are the rubrics of the *ordo* to be observed, even as they sometimes contradict each other due to their development in different times and places?

226 Cf. paragraphs 1.3.3 and 1.4.3.
227 G.W. LATHROP, *Holy Things: A Liturgical Theology* (Minneapolis MN: Fortress, 1993).
228 G.W. LATHROP, *Holy People: A Liturgical Ecclesiology* (Minneapolis MN: Fortress, 1999).
229 G.W. LATHROP, *Holy Ground: A Liturgical Cosmology* (Minneapolis MN: Fortress, 2003). For a reflection on the cohesion of the trilogy, cf. LATHROP, *Holy Ground*, ix-x.
230 LATHROP, *Holy Things*, x.

How is the *ordo* to be revered if it has become a dead, 'rubricist' set of rules? To rediscover the central meaning of the *ordo*, Schmemann proposes to 'find the Ordo behind the "rubrics"'. That is, to find the general outline, the general rule or principle, which lies behind all liturgical prescriptions and, moreover, behind all liturgical celebrations which are expressions of the Christian faith.[231]

Lathrop takes up this idea of *ordo* as the determining principle behind all liturgies and behind all theological thought on the liturgy and the Christian faith. He also calls this *ordo* the 'outline', 'shape', 'structure' or 'pattern' of the liturgy.[232] Reduced to its essentials, most Christian churches share the same basic liturgical pattern (*ordo*) of Scripture ('word'), baptism ('bath') and the eucharist ('meal'). Because every church—in some sense even those churches which reject the pattern, such as the Society of Friends (Quakers)—emphasise one or some aspects of the *ordo*, Lathrop describes liturgical theology as the task to integrate all those emphases into an ecumenical renewal of the *ordo*.[233]

Lathrop acknowledges the fact that his assertion of ecumenical consensus on the basis of the *ordo* is increasingly challenged by the 'revival or frontier *ordo*'. This is the pattern of 'warming up singing' followed by 'practical and pointed preaching, based on only a few verses of Scripture', aiming at 'the conversion of the individual hearer', be it in a classical Evangelical or in a modern therapeutic sense. Stemming from the nineteenth century, this *ordo* is gaining ground with the growth of Evangelical and Pentecostal movements, and of massive, televised worship. According to Lathrop, this *ordo* has a tendency to a spiritualised and sarcophobic, as well as to an individualist understanding of Christianity. It cannot, in Lathrop's view, serve as an alternative to the *ordo* of bath, word and meal.[234]

6.5.3 Juxtaposition

Lathrop's contribution to the understanding of the *lex orandi* and the *lex credendi* is his assertion that the *ordo* is always made up of 'juxtapositions'. That is, the fundamental shape of the Christian liturgy—which expresses the

231 A. SCHMEMANN, *Introduction to Liturgical Theology* (Crestwood NY: SVSP, 1986[3] [1966[1]]), 33-40.

232 LATHROP, *Holy Things*, 2, 33, 35. The *ordo* is, then, not the same as the liturgical prescriptions in the official books, but their underlying structure, cf. LATHROP, *Holy Ground*, 21. Lathrop differs from Dix in his definition of 'the shape of the liturgy'. For Dix (cf. paragraph 5.3.1), the shape is the fourfold eucharistic pattern of taking, thanksgiving, breaking and giving. For Lathrop, 'shape' is a more general term to describe basic patterns such as 'word and meal', or 'beseeching prayer and thanksgiving prayer'. Thus, Dix's four action shape is, together, only one action in Lathrop's description of the shape. This difference does not rest on a fundamental disagreement, but on a different application of the term 'shape'. Cf. LATHROP, *Holy Things*, 47; LATHROP, *Holy People*, 131.

233 LATHROP, *Holy Things*, x, 4, 172, 219, 221; LATHROP, *Holy Ground*, 136-137, 147.

234 LATHROP, *Holy Ground*, 140-141, 190; cf. LATHROP, *Holy People*, 114.

fundamental shape of the Christian faith—is always a combination of existing elements which, combined, create something new. These elements can complement each other, but they can also be opposing elements, resulting in a paradox. Other means by which Lathrop describes the principle of juxtaposition include phrases like 'A set next to B', 'chains of images', 'dualism', 'tensions', 'paradoxical appositions', 'interactions', 'dialectical pairs' and 'one thing against another in order to speak the truth'.[235]

The main juxtaposition of the liturgy is the combination of word and meal, which constitute the regular Sunday worship of the church. Perhaps due to his Lutheran background, Lathrop is less likely than other authors who occurred in this study, to summarise the main kind of Christian worship under the heading 'eucharist', although he sometimes does so. He rather insists on the importance of the juxtaposition of, on the one hand, the reading and explanation of Scripture and, on the other, the thanksgiving over and the sharing of bread and wine.[236] Lathrop refuses to interpret this juxtaposition as if the meal fulfills the word, or any other view in which one part of the juxtaposition dominates the other. The *ordo*—that is, the basic pattern which both regulates Christian worship and determines Christian meaning—*is* the juxtaposition. Word without meal, or meal without word, would distort the meaning of both.[237]

The second important juxtapostion is the interaction between the week and the Sunday. From the Early Church onwards, coming together on the 'eighth day' has been constitutive of the Christian community and its faith.[238] Three other juxtapositions are also reckoned by Lathrop to contribute to Christian identity: praise set next to beseeching prayer, teaching set next to baptism, and Easter set next to the year.[239] In his cosmology, the juxtaposition of 'the grace of the triune God, known in word and sacrament, to our place and time on the earth' is central.[240] In more detail, Lathrop can call every aspect of the liturgy a juxtaposition. The liturgy is a pattern in which such things as a book, water, bread, wine, a table, fire, oil, clothing, a chair, images and musical instruments are juxtaposed in such a way as to create new meanings. Last but not least, the liturgy is all this, juxtaposed to an assembly.[241]

Lathrop asserts that this principle of juxtaposing elements is constitutive of the Christian faith. By combining complementary or conflicting elements,

235 LATHROP, *Holy Things*, 23, 24, 35, 60, 79, 82, 166, 179 and *passim*; cf. LATHROP, *Holy People*, 14-18, 38, 47, 113, 124-126, 151, 204; LATHROP, *Holy Ground*, 47, 66, 69, 112, 127, 173, 194, 196.

236 Hence his use of the term 'liturgical ecclesiology' rather than 'eucharistic ecclesiology'; cf. paragraph 1.4.3.

237 LATHROP, *Holy Things*, 1-2, 40, 47, 49-52 and *passim*.

238 LATHROP, *Holy Things*, 38-39, 42, 53, 55.

239 LATHROP, *Holy Things*, 55.

240 LATHROP, *Holy Ground*, 171.

241 LATHROP, *Holy Things*, 10.

Christians form their world view: 'meaning is proposed by juxtaposition'.[242] Christian faith cannot be expressed in univocal statements. About God we can only speak 'with two words', unless we reduce God according to our fancy. God is not only for daytime, but also for the troublesome night; not only for speech, but also for taste; not only for men, but also for women; not only for here, but also for there. Lathrop adds that God *is* not these juxtapositions, not yin and yang, but *our* perception of God has to be balanced by these juxtapositions in order to make us encounter this God and not the god of our own choice or preference. Reflecting on the juxtapositions of the liturgy is discovering the meaning of Christianity.[243]

The principle of juxtaposition gives, says Lathrop, the church 'both a centre and a method'. The centre is bath, word and meal. Without this, no Christian assembly can exist. But it is also important to see the principle of juxtaposition as a method. In every new situation—another time, another place, another culture—the church can accept new ways of expressing the same *ordo*, by welcoming new elements and setting them next to the existing pattern of bath, word and meal.[244]

6.5.4 Breaking

In order to convey Christian meaning, however, the original elements of each juxtaposition have to be 'broken'. Lathrop borrows this term from Paul Tillich, who speaks of 'broken myth' to indicate language which retains its original evocative power whilst being used in a different, sometimes opposite context. The 'breaking' of language is using 'the wrong words' to express something which could not adequately be expressed otherwise. Broken language is language used in a non-univocal way.[245] Not surprisingly for a Lutheran, Lathrop's main example of broken language is the Christian use of sacrificial terminology like 'sacrifice', 'offering', 'priest' and 'altar'. Although they are 'the wrong words'—in the literal ancient sense of the word, Christ's death was not a sacrifice and Christian liturgy is not sacrificial—they express deep layers of meaning about Christ and Christian liturgy.[246]

The principle of juxtaposition serves the breaking of language and of symbols. By setting one aspect next to another, each of the original aspects is corrected ('broken') by the other.[247] Lathrop calls the result of this breaking

242 LATHROP, *Holy Things*, 65, cf. 54, 204.
243 LATHROP, *Holy Things*, 66, 126, 162, 220. Lathrop borrows the expression 'with two words' from Adolf Köberle (1898-1990): LATHROP, *Holy Things*, 121; LATHROP, *Holy People*, 127, 204; cf. LATHROP, *Holy Ground*, 66.
244 LATHROP, *Holy People*, 196-197; cf. LATHROP, *Holy Ground*, 78.
245 LATHROP, *Holy Things*, 27; LATHROP, *Holy People*, 69, 177; LATHROP, *Holy Ground*, 34.
246 LATHROP, *Holy Things*, 139-158.
247 LATHROP, *Holy Things*, 80.

process 'transformation', and the liturgy with its juxtapostition of words and symbols is full of such transformations. The contents of the Christian faith is the result of this breaking of already existing elements so that they are transformed into Christian meaning.[248] The opposite is also true—if the words and symbols are not 'broken', they will convey meaning but we run the risk that this will not be Christian meaning.[249] Lathrop summarises his interpretation of 'breaking' as 'turned to the purposes of the *ordo*'. That is, only when the several elements are brought into the *ordo*—the system of juxtapositions which forms the liturgy and the meaning of Christian faith—they can serve Christian purposes.[250]

Examples of 'broken' words and signs include the following. Sacrificial language will only express Christian meaning if it is broken, that is, if it is not taken in the univocally cultic sense in which it was used in the religions from which it came. If sacrifice is not juxtaposed to—for example—grace, it will function in an unbroken sense, which means that it will imply the principle of *do ut des* (I give so that Thou might give). Unbroken cultic language can serve to reinforce the *status quo* of the relations between God and humans, priest and people. Only in its broken form it can function in the context of Jesus Christ and of the Christian liturgy.[251] Another example is the fact that thanksgiving should be broken by being juxtaposed to beseeching prayer. Especially in a wealthy context, thanksgiving without beseeching can be the expression of a self-convinced and self-sufficient group rather than the prayer of praise *and* beseeching which characterises a Christian congregration aware of its own needs and of the needs of the world.[252] The symbolic meaning of the ministry, to give yet another example, should be broken by being juxtaposed to the assembly. Unbroken ritual leadership turns the church into either the bishop's court or the preacher's lecture room.[253] Likewise should the beauty of ritual be set next to the suffering of everyday life. In the liturgy, none of them has the last word; the liturgy is neither about sheer beauty nor about sheer suffering. Both must be broken by being combined, before they can convey Christian meaning. Their breaking takes place in the liturgy, where both aspects come together.[254] In relation to the cosmos, our view of sun, moon, stars and earth should be broken by the trust that they are all created by God and rest in his mercy.

248 LATHROP, *Holy Things*, 100-101, 222-223; LATHROP, *Holy People*, 41, 69-70, 197, 212 and *passim*; LATHROP, *Holy Ground*, 13-15, 43, 51, 56, 62, 69, 135, 146-147, 163 and *passim*.

249 LATHROP, *Holy Things*, 112, 114, 124.

250 LATHROP, *Holy Things*, 114.

251 LATHROP, *Holy Things*, 155.

252 LATHROP, *Holy Things*, 164. Of course, one could also invert the argument in order to advocate the same principle. Beseeching prayer without praise looks like asking for gifts rather than realising that only in the context of praiseful remembrance of salvation history our petitions have their legitimate place.

253 LATHROP, *Holy Things*, 192-193.

254 LATHROP, *Holy Things*, 163.

Humans should neither abuse nor fear or deify them. The breaking of cosmos and world view makes a 'hole' in the otherwise closed systems.[255]

Lathrop summarises his principle of broken language and broken symbols in the term 'catholic iconoclasm'. Catholic, because it serves the general Christian faith. Iconoclasm, because all sacred images, structures and persons have to be 'broken' in order not to reflect the religious or societal *status quo* but the meanings of Christianity. The *ordo* has, therefore, a critical meaning. Things or persons introduced into the *ordo* do not function any longer in their own way, but are transformed by being brought into dialogue with the many-sided meanings of the Christian faith as expressed in the liturgy.[256]

6.5.5 Antiliturgica

Liturgy, then, serves a critical transformation of existing meaning into Christian meaning. Christian liturgy implies the criticism of liturgy, ritual, cult. In a sense, Lathrop says, Christian liturgy could be called 'antiliturgy', Christian stories 'antinarrative', Christian spirituality 'antispirituality'.[257] Lathrop borrows the term 'antiliturgy' from the Dutch Lutheran Professor C.W. Mönnich (1915-1994), who proposed an understanding of Christian liturgy similar to Ionesco's *antithéâtre*: theatre without theatricality, nobody is audience, everybody is participant.[258] Mönnich's—and Lathrop's—liturgical view is opposed to clericalism and ritualism and tries to regain the corporate and celebrative character of the gathering.[259] Liturgy should, says Lathrop, be particularly critical of a heaven-oriented, 'sarcophobic' spirituality, which denies our existence in this life, in this culture, and on this ground.[260] It should also be critical of closed narratives.[261]

Liturgy should also be critical of *itself*, resisting its tendency to fall back into closed ritualism. On this ground, Lathrop allows for exceptions to ecumenically agreed liturgical and theological principles, in order to illustrate the facts, firstly, that nothing in the Christian faith and church is unequivocal—Lathrop's concepts of juxtaposition and breaking—and, secondly, that liturgy

255 LATHROP, *Holy Ground*, 17-19, 31, 33-39, 44, 47-48, 50, 59, 65, 68-70, 74-75, 81, 87, 111-112, 116, 118-119, 149, 161-163, 179, 185, 190-192, 222-223 and *passim*.

256 LATHROP, *Holy Things*, 157-158, 164, 175, 212.

257 LATHROP, *Holy Ground*, 17, 70, 182; cf. 74, 89, 119.

258 C.W. MÖNNICH, *Antiliturgica. Enige aantekeningen bij de viering van de kerkelijke feesten* (Amsterdam: Ten Have, 1966), 5; cf. BARNARD, *De dans kan niet sterven*, 45.

259 MÖNNICH, *Antiliturgica*, 9-28, 75-94 and *passim*; LATHROP, *Holy Ground*, 180-182, 195.

260 LATHROP, *Holy Ground*, 58-59, 131, 134, 142, 144.

261 With postmodernism Lathrop shares a distrust of all-embracing narratives, cosmologies, dominant cultures and worldviews. However, he does not want to replace them by an ultimate 'despair', 'confusion and inaction'. He offers his view of Christian liturgy as a widely needed set of 'symbols to hold and orient', as long as the symbols remain open and multi-faceted. LATHROP, *Holy Ground*, 9-13, 44, 68, 154.

should be intrinsically critical, even of itself. He calls these healthy deviations from general rule 'catholic exceptions'—although they are exceptions, they serve the true catholicity of the rule to which they are a correcting exception. The mainstream churches with their rules need these exceptions in order to be made aware that no rule is absolute, static, unequivocal. However, the practitioners of these exceptions—such as the Quakers with their different approach to worship, African Christians using local staple food and drink at their eucharist, Evangelicals who may use alternative worship styles—need the wider church and its principles. According to Lathrop, the exceptions cannot exist purely on their own, but should be interpreted as corrective reminders 'in critical dialogue with' the general church.[262]

6.5.6 The Church

So far, we have seen that Lathrop borrows Schmemann's concept of the *ordo* and interprets it as a set of juxtapositions in which the original elements are broken or transformed into Christian meaning. We have also seen that Lathrop draws the conclusion that the liturgy (classically expressed as the *lex orandi*) is the central act in which Christian meaning—the meaning of the church and its faith (the *lex credendi*)—is formed. Now we will study in more detail the relationship between the liturgy and the church in Lathrop's thought.

It is Lathrop's conviction that people who want to know what Christian *faith* has to say in our current world, should participate in Christian *liturgy*. There they will find the meaning of Christianity in the form of words and symbols.[263] Likewise, it is Lathrop's conviction that people who want to know what the Christian *church* is, should attend the liturgical assembly. The primary meaning of 'church' is—Lathrop says—liturgical assembly.[264] In order to substantiate this, Lathrop refers to the fact that all elements which play crucial roles in the Christian faith and church, are originally meant as elements of the liturgy. The people who form the church are originally a group gathered for worship. The Bible is originally a 'list of books' authorised for public reading during worship. The church's ministers are originally those who preside over communal worship.[265]

It is, then, the liturgy which makes the church.[266] In the liturgy a group of people is constituted as church by doing the things of the *ordo*. And also, in

[262] LATHROP, *Holy Things*, 157-158, 221; LATHROP, *Holy People*, 106-107, 114, 130, 147-148; LATHROP, *Holy Ground*, 225-226. Lathrop borrows this concept of 'catholic exceptions' from Wainwright, who calls them 'critical exceptions', cf. WAINWRIGHT, *Doxology*, 244, 249. The concept is critically evaluated in paragraph 8.5.2.

[263] LATHROP, *Holy Things*, 8, 52, 54, 65, 80-81, 162, 164, 212.

[264] LATHROP, *Holy Things*, 9, 113-116, 184, 212; LATHROP, *Holy People*, *passim*.

[265] LATHROP, *Holy Things*, 9-10 and *passim*; LATHROP, *Holy People*, 6, 24, 38, 43, 45, 55, 79, 80-81, 89, 188.

[266] Cf. LATHROP, *Holy People*, 8-9, 16-17, 48-49, 79, 82, 86, 110-111, 123, 167.

another sense, the church is constituted in the liturgy because in the liturgy its *meaning* is established. Baptism, juxtaposed to teaching, is the entrance into this celebrating community.[267] But the community does more than celebrate. What is celebrated is an *ordo* of transformed aspects of history, society, arts, life, cosmos. The church as celebrating community is, therefore, also the new community, the community of the new age in which the religious, social, economic, ecological *status quo* should be transcended. In the church the absent are present, the ritually unclean participate, the sufferers are consoled. Liturgy proposes an ordered world, but it is a re-ordered world.[268] The principal re-ordering acts of the liturgy are baptism with its re-ordering of social relationships, and the eucharist with its re-ordering of economy and ecology.[269]

In Lathrop's ecclesiology, the critical 'breaking' of symbols has two major effects on the re-ordered character of the church. Firstly, although the church can be compared to other communities, the church has to be a fundamentally open and welcoming community, in which the usual conventions of club membership, social or economical class-related forms of community, and traditional understandings of ritual purity should be overcome or 'broken'.[270] A liturgical ecclesiology should always beware of the risk of interpreting the church as only *this* community of insiders—the 'closed-circle distortion' of a liturgical ecclesiology. In Lathrop's words, the centre has to be strong—that is, the *ordo* has to be celebrated with confidence and clarity—but the door has to remain open.[271]

Secondly, the diversity of the world's cultures has to be both welcomed and 'broken', which is an approach of 'yes and no'. Every culture is apt to give expression to the Christian faith, but at the same time every culture has aspects which should be criticised by the Christian faith. As Western civilisation is concerned, Lathrop is particularly critical of the international consumer culture and of the tendency to mistake personal intimacy and cosyness for real community centred around the central things of the *ordo*.[272]

267 Cf. LATHROP, *Holy Things*, 42, 77, 87, 168, 184; LATHROP, *Holy People*, 36, 146, 177, 179; LATHROP, *Holy Ground*, 118.

268 LATHROP, *Holy Things*, 168, 207-208, 217; LATHROP, *Holy People*, 11, 116, 191, 195; LATHROP, *Holy Ground*, *passim*.

269 LATHROP, *Holy Ground*, 116, 149.

270 LATHROP, *Holy People*, 46, 69, 156, 162, 180-182, 185, 191, 193-194.

271 LATHROP, *Holy Ground*, 118, 188-192. The door should also be open to everyone for the reception of the sacraments: LATHROP, *Holy Ground*, 195. One could ask, however, if this is not an instance of 'unbroken hospitality'.

272 LATHROP, *Holy Things*, 118; LATHROP, *Holy People*, 45, 47, 197-201; LATHROP, *Holy Ground*, 11, 14, 16-17, 89, 121, 125, 148-149, 179, 200, 223.

6.5.7 The Ordained Ministry

Lathrop also sketches some of liturgical ecclesiology's consequences for the church's ministry. The central thesis is that ministry has its origin and its primary meaning in liturgical leadership. This thesis has at least two important consequences.

First, ministry understood as liturgical leadership implies the fundamental embedding of the ministry into the assembly. The condition for this is, of course, that the minister understands his or her liturgical role as nothing less or more than presiding over the communal celebration according to the *ordo*. In order to function within a liturgical ecclesiology, liturgical leadership cannot be understood as hosting a talk-show, delivering a lecture, entertaining a public, or—for that matter—offering a sacrifice *for* the people rather than celebrate *with* the people. A liturgical-ecclesiological view of the ministry presupposes a liturgy which is a communal celebration according to the central things of the *ordo*, and a ministry which understands itself as serving this communal celebration by a both strong and modest way of presiding over the central acts around which the people are assembled. '[T]he order of leaders is thoroughly subordinated to the *ordo* of the meeting.'[273]

A second consequence of ministry understood as liturgical leadership is the fact that every other area of ministerial work will have some relationship to the liturgical gathering. Lathrop even calls all extra-liturgical ministerial work 'an extension of the assembly'. This is not only true of the deacon's part in distributing the collected money and goods to those who need them, and of the presider's task of bringing bread and wine to the sick and absent or to reconcile a sinner to the assembly, but also, says Lathrop, of pastoral care as an extention of speaking the Word in the assembly, and of a recognisable priest walking along an inner city street as a visual reminder of the hope, grace and peace which are at the centre of the assembly.[274]

These considerations result in some practical thought on ministry. First and foremost, ministers should not be seen as a separate caste, but as members of the assembly (the church), who fulfill certain symbolic roles as part of all the other symbols of the liturgy.[275] Lathrop fiercely attacks the 'hierarchical

[273] LATHROP, *Holy Things*, 190; cf. 87, 114, 129, 155-156, 167-168, 180, 192-193; LATHROP, *Holy People*, 23, 45, 79, 96. Cf. MÖNNICH, *Antiliturgica*, 89, 93: 'Why a ministry at all, then? Because the rhythm of the liturgical flow requires it' and because 'the Messiah [...] requires a spokesman, a dancing-master, a presider at dinner' ('Maar waarom dan nog een ambt? Omdat het ritme van de liturgische gang erom vraagt'; 'de Messias [...] vraagt een woordvoerder, een dansmeester, een tafelpraeses').

[274] LATHROP, *Holy People*, 188-189; notwithstanding Lathrop's later critique of the clerical collar as nineteenth-century gentleman's clothing (*Holy People*, 202).

[275] LATHROP, *Holy Things*, 192. Interestingly, from a similar understanding of ministry as an order within the *ordo*, Lathrop on the one hand, and Dix and van der Leeuw on the other, draw opposite conclusions regarding the place of non-presiding ministers during the

distortion' which is the pitfall of a liturgical ecclesiology if it mistakes the distinctive liturgical roles of presiders and people for an 'hierarchical' divide.[276] The power of leadership should be 'broken' before it can function within a Christian context. As we saw before, the primary way of 'breaking' is by the juxtapositions of the *ordo*. By being a leader of Christian worship according to the *ordo*, the minister's power will be 'broken'. The minister will not act on behalf of himself or herself, and will not act as a minister if his or her service is not needed. 'The power of ritual leadership is used by [and limited to] the discipline of the *ordo*.'[277]

Another conclusion is, however, that the church cannot do without this kind of ministry. Pretending an assembly could do without leadership roles would be concealing the hidden creation of alternative power structures. Given the need of leadership, the Christian churches should—according to Lathrop—place its ministry in the context of the liturgical *ordo*, have many liturgical leaders together with the presider, confer ministry to people—women and men—according to their charisms, understand it as a lifelong task, and strive for ministerial forms which will be as ecumenically recognisable as possible.[278]

6.5.8 Local and Universal

Lathrop hopes that such a liturgical understanding of ministry will prove useful to overcome the contemporary 'dead end' in ecumenical thought on ministry.[279] He proposes an understanding of bishops, presbyters and deacons which is fundamentally local, because it is rooted in the local liturgical assembly. Bishops will again regard themselves as local liturgical presiders and preachers, frequently and liturgically visiting their parishes. Likewise, all ministries will see themselves as rooted in the local liturgical gathering and their other work as extentions of their liturgical role. This will contribute to a symbolic rather than an ontological, and a local rather than a universal understanding of ministry.[280]

celebration. According to Dix (cf. paragraph 5.3.3) they should not 'usurp [... the function] of a layman' by sitting in the pews, but they should, liturgically dressed, occupy their place in the sanctuary. Van der Leeuw (cf. paragraph 6.2.9) advocates the same from a similar non-clericalist point of view. However, according to Lathrop (*Holy Things*, 199; cf. *Holy Ground*, 186-187) they should sit in the pews, because the 'brokenness' of their symbolic leadership implies that they are first and foremost members of the baptised community and no separate caste apart from their presiding role. The various positions will be evaluated in paragraph 8.5.2.

276 LATHROP, *Holy Ground*, 182-188.

277 LATHROP, *Holy Things*, 193. Lathrop has a similar 'topological' understanding of ministry ('"office" is nothing other than a place to stand and a task to do in the assembly'; *Holy Things*, 185) as Afanasiev (cf. paragraph 2.2.8).

278 LATHROP, *Holy Things*, 195, 198-199; LATHROP, *Holy People*, 95; LATHROP, *Holy Ground*, 194.

279 LATHROP, *Holy Things*, 203.

280 LATHROP, *Holy Things*, 182-187, 195, 200; LATHROP, *Holy People*, 62, 97.

In one place, the bishops of all denominations will form a council of bishops in their common territory and elect one of them as 'the principal local pastor or the "metropolitan" in a newly emerging local Christian church'.[281] The bishop of Rome should be elected by the (ecumenical) clergy and people of Rome, in order to be not a leader without a church, but the bishop *of Rome*—not primarily a universal officer, but a local bishop. 'In the matter of the Petrine office, less would be very, very much more.' With such a really local church of Rome, 'the world will seek to maintain signs of communion'.[282]

But, apart from the bishops, there is another, more fundamental connection between the local and the universal church. The local assembly—correctly understood, says Lathrop, as the diocese, but most of the time receiving concrete form in the parishes[283]—exercises things with universal meaning: the things of the *ordo*. The *ordo* itself is 'the trans-local connection each meeting needs as a balance to locality'.[284] So, although 'church' is always primarily a local liturgical gathering, it is at the same time, by its very gathering around the central juxtapositions of the *ordo*, a gathering with universal meaning and universal connections. Even if formal communion has not been established, the churches experience a real sense of communion by doing the same central things—bath, word and meal—and even by using some common forms for those central things—for example, lectionaries, hymns, making intercession for each other. However, not liturgical uniformity, but liturgical communion by the centrality of the *ordo* of bath, word and meal is constitutive of Christian unity.[285]

Moreover, for Lathrop, the relationship between 'local' and 'universal' is not only a matter of ecclesiastical organisation. It is also a matter of culture and of nature. The liturgy is always both profoundly local *and* connecting us to other parts of the world. The water of baptism comes from the mountains, the bread of the eucharist comes from the earth, the *ordo* is universal but is celebrated in the contexts of local cultures, at this very place in the universe, and at this very moment in time. For Lathrop, the 'ecumenical' search for a balance between the local and the universal has primarily to do with a liturgical, ecclesiological, cultural and cosmological balance between inculturation and uniformity, or between here and there.[286]

Both locality and universality are, in themselves, dangerous. Lathrop wants locality and universality to be set in juxtaposition, in order to be 'broken', as he wants for all elements and aspects of Christian liturgy and faith. Liturgy is

281 LATHROP, *Holy Things*, 200; cf. LATHROP, *Holy People*, 63.
282 LATHROP, *Holy Things*, 200-201; LATHROP, *Holy People*, 97.
283 LATHROP, *Holy People*, 62.
284 LATHROP, *Holy Things*, 207, 221.
285 LATHROP, *Holy People*, 49, 52-54, 56-60, 64, 71, 114, 120-122, 130, 136, 156; LATHROP, *Holy Ground*, 148.
286 LATHROP, *Holy Things*, 109; LATHROP, *Holy People*, 165, 167; LATHROP, *Holy Ground*, 106, 126, 159, 164, 171.

always made up of 'locative' and 'liberative' elements. The locative element alone runs the risk of making the church and its liturgy local *only*, repetitive, supporting the *status quo*. It should be balanced by a liberative openness to the stranger and the wider world. The other way round, the liberative element alone runs the risk of making the church and its liturgy an escape from this very place, this earth, this situation, these neighbours. It should be balanced by the locative insistence on the 'here and now'.[287]

6.5.9 Conclusion

Lathrop's contribution to a liturgical ecclesiology is first of all his concept of the *ordo* as the basic pattern of Christian liturgy and Christian meaning. This concept transcends the precise liturgical forms which the churches use. It focuses on the main pattern of bath, word and meal. Moreover, Lathrop points to the fact that both *lex orandi* and *lex credendi* are built up of juxtapositions. Christian truth cannot be spoken univocally. One element has always to be balanced by another. This balancing by juxtaposition is an act of 'breaking' language and symbols. Christian language and symbols run the risk of being dangerously one-sided when they are not corrected ('broken') by complementary or opposing language and symbols.

The liturgy, with its juxtapositions, is the area where this breaking of language and symbols takes place most prominently. For this reason, Christian liturgy could be called 'antiliturgy'—it is, while being liturgy, also the critique and correction of liturgy. Moreover, by its juxtapositions, it serves the 'breaking' of a number of aspects of Christian faith and church, such as different images of God, the differences between the local and the universal, the contemporary and the traditional, the ministers and all members of the church. The liturgy serves a 'Catholic iconoclasm'—any aspect of the church which threatens to become dominant should be 'broken' by being juxtaposed to another aspect within the juxtapositions of the *ordo* of the liturgy. Even the church as a community should be a 'broken symbol'—although it is constituted by teaching and bath, and by celebrating word and meal, it should be a fundamentally hospitable community, which extends in Lathrop's view to the participation in the sacraments by all who desire to do so.

In the area of ministry, Lathrop's theory has the effect that the minister is seen as no less and no more than one of the liturgical 'symbols'. His or her other work should be seen as extentions of the liturgical assembly. Unity should be given expression on the diocesan or regional level, where the ministers elect one of them as 'metropolitan'. All regional Christian communities will seek for

[287] LATHROP, *Holy People*, 127; LATHROP, *Holy Ground*, 100, 104, 106-108, 110-111, 115-116, 179.

communion with each other and with the (likewise ecumenically organised) church of Rome.

Probably most important in Lathrop's theology is the interwoven concept of *ordo*, juxtaposition and breaking. The need of the breaking of symbols—not in order to destroy them, but in order to balance them—is a 'Protestant' element of great relevance to ecumenical theology.

6.6 ALBERT PLOEGER & JOKE PLOEGER-GROTEGOED

6.6.1 Practical Theology

After the main panel—depicting von Allmen, Wainwright and Lathrop—the 'triptych' of this chapter now concludes with another side panel. Like the first side panel—on Noordmans and van der Leeuw—this panel is devoted to two theologians from the Netherlands Reformed Church (now merged into the Protestant Church in the Netherlands). Albert K. Ploeger (born 1937), having been parish minister and lecturer in Religious Education, is now Professor Emeritus of Practical Theology and Religious Education at Groningen University. Joke J. Ploeger-Grotegoed (born 1941) is a pastor emeritus after having served several parishes. The couple are both practical theologians.

Practical Theology has long been regarded as an ancillory discipline, mediating between theology and the church, particularly in the context of training for the ministry. In recent decades, though, Practical Theology has been emancipated into a discipline with its own method. Modern practical theologians understand their discipline either as empirical-hermeneutical—as the interaction between the social sciences and theological insights[288]—or as hermeneutical-empirical—as the theological theory about the relationship between the context of Scripture and tradition and the context of contemporary people in (post-) modern culture.[289] Both strands of Practical Theology have in common that they are theological, theoretical disciplines, that they engage with the practical, pastoral and empirical reality of the context in which theology is done, and that both theology and the social sciences—albeit with different emphases—are the main contributors to their methodology.

In this section,[290] insights from the angle of Practical Theology—understood as the particular theological discipline just described—will be connected to our quest for a liturgical ecclesiology by referring to the Ploegers'

288 Cf. J.A. VAN DER VEN, *Ecclesiologie in context* (Kampen: Kok, 1993), 7, 9-10.

289 Cf. A.K. PLOEGER & J.J. PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen. Van praktische theologie naar de geloofspraktijk van gemeenteleden* (Kampen: Kok, 2001), 94-95, 102-106, 141, cf. 144-169.

290 For other insights from Practical Theology, cf. section 4.6 (Jan Visser).

book, *De gemeente en haar verlangen* (The Congregation and its Longing).[291] The Ploegers' ecclesiology is chosen because *De gemeente en haar verlangen* presents a Protestant practical-theological ecclesiology fundamentally rooted in *leitourgia* and *diakonia* as two equally important ways in which the church lives its eschatological hope. This section will study the insights which such a liturgio-diaconal or diacono-liturgical approach has to offer to the concept of a liturgical ecclesiology.

6.6.2 Longing

Central in the Ploegers' understanding of the Christian faith and therefore in their ecclesiology is the concept of 'longing' or 'desire' (*verlangen*). Christian faith is a longing, evoked by the Holy Spirit, for enjoying life and enduring suffering and loss, together with other people in our culture, in the expectation of the recreation of the world.[292] More generally, it is a 'longing for the righteous and good life'.[293]

This longing is not specifically Christian. It is a general anthropological possibility. As longing for a humane society, it is the general Western, post-Enlightenment concept of good and righteous living together.[294] Christians interpret this longing according to their specific tradition. They regard it as evoked by the Holy Spirit and as exemplified in God's ways with Israel and Jesus Christ. Moreover, they know this longing to be the hope for and anticipation of the kingdom of God. As longing for the kingdom of God, this human longing is also God's longing.[295]

6.6.3 The Church

The church is, according to Ploeger and Ploeger-Grotegoed, one of the realms in which the Spirit evokes the longing for the good and righteous life. In addition to humanity in general, and to Israel, the church is one of the Spirit's three ways which lead people to the consummation of their longing. The church helps people to reach the fulfillment of their deepest longing: the realisation of the

[291] See note 289. A revised and considerably abridged edition was published as A.K. PLOEGER & J.J. PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *Morgen... in de verte. Een kerk van mensen* (Kampen: Kok, 2007).

[292] PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 24.

[293] A.K. PLOEGER, *Dare we Observe? The Importance of Art Works for Consciousness of Diakonia in (Post-) modern Church* (Louvain: Peeters, 2002), 30.

[294] PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 44-45, 78, 206, 269, 278-279, 530. Cf. PLOEGER, *Dare we Observe?*, 30, 54.

[295] PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 228, cf. 27-28, 39, 41, 43, 46, 49-61, 230, 264, 286, 291 and *passim*. Cf. PLOEGER, *Dare we Observe?*, 136.

good and righteous life.[296] As the church is not the only way by which people can live a life of longing for goodness and righteousness, the church should view itself as one of several possible ways to give expression to this longing.[297] Because this longing will be reached in the eschaton, the church is only needed before the eschaton and is, thus, provisional.[298]

6.6.4 Leitourgia, Diakonia, Martyria, Koinonia

How is the longing for the good and righteous life given expression in the life of the church? The Ploegers recognise four ecclesiological functions which serve the longing: *leitourgia*, *diakonia*, *martyria* and *koinonia*.[299] Among these and other aspects of the church's life, *leitourgia* (worship and prayer in the broadest sense) and *diakonia* (diaconate, the serving of others, again understood in the broadest sense, as social concern and outreach) are outstanding. The combination of *leitourgia* and *diakonia* on an equal level is the characteristic of the Ploegers' ecclesiology. For this principle, they take as a *Leitmotiv* Bonhoeffer's phrase, 'Our being a Christian shall now consist in two things only: praying and doing good among people'.[300] In the Ploegers' understanding, a church will only be a real *koinonia* (communion) if *leitourgia* and *diakonia* are practised together.[301]

The function of *martyria* (witness, the testimony of Scripture and tradition) is continually present where the church does not forget its identity and consequently practises *leitourgia* and *diakonia*. It is the Ploegers' conviction that the contents of biblical faith (*martyria*) leads to the primacy of *leitourgia* and *diakonia.* An 'intrinsic' believer of the Christian faith will realise that *leitourgia* and *diakonia* together should be the centre of his or her life.[302] As an example, they refer to Jesus's 'summary of the law': loving God (*leitourgia*) and loving your neighbour as yourself (*diakonia*).[303] They summarise this understanding in what they call their 'diaconal thesis':

296 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 215, 217, 237, 277, 713.

297 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 286, 293, 301, 713-714.

298 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 192.

299 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 240, 282, 285.

300 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 15, 17, 80-82, 220, 264, 303, 484. 'Unser Christsein wird heute nur in zweierlei bestehen: im Beten und im Tun des Gerechten unter den Menschen', D. BONHOEFFER, *Widerstand und Ergebung* (Gütersloh: Kaiser, 1998), 435.

301 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 225, 291, cf. 720. Cf. PLOEGER, *Dare we Observe?*, xiii, 77.

302 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 135, 195, 286, 290-291, 488, 490, 717.

303 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 67, 516; cf. Mark 12:29-31.

> the interwovenness of *leitourgia* and *diakonia* determines whether one has really understood the *martyria*—the witness of the gospel of Jesus Christ—and, therefore, may call oneself *koinonia*, community of Christ.[304]

Although the authors stand for the equality of *leitourgia* and *diakonia*, once in their book they force themselves to choose between the two. Then, they give priority to *diakonia*, for *diakonia* is what the church has to do before the eschaton, while *leitourgia* will only be perfect in the eschaton, when all *diakonia* will have been done.[305]

6.6.5 The Church between Martyria and (Post-) Modern Culture

As practical theologians, Ploeger and Ploeger-Grotegoed try to do equal justice to the church's tradition and to the experience of people in (post-) modern culture. This does not mean, however, that they relativise the church's foundation upon the *martyria* of Scripture and tradition. They do not encourage a transition from Christian tradition to general religiosity. According to the Ploegers, accepting God as no more than a higher power, as many people in our society do, would be the end of the biblical tradition of Christianity.[306] Members of the church should learn to accept that they live amidst all kinds of religious and other world views, about which they have to reserve their judgement without loosing their own identity. The stronger their own identity is, the better they will be able to respect the position of others. Empirically, churches with a clear identity have more possibilities to flourish than churches which lack confidence in their identity.[307]

But a 'closed' congregation is not what the Ploegers want to promote. They stand for an 'open' congregation which has a clear basic identity, but which is open to people who think differently. In the Ploegers' concept, it is the Spirit who leads people to believe in different ways, according to their biographies and contexts. There can be no church without a normative gospel, but neither can there be a church without (post-) modern people who live and believe 'in the Spirit'. In practice, this requires a balance between isolation and assimilation. The people's belief should be 'corrected' by tradition (Bible, liturgy), but likewise tradition will always be reformed by the beliefs of contemporary people and cultures.[308]

304 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *Morgen... in de verte*, 38 ('Volgens onze diakonale these bepaalt de verwevenheid van leitourgia en diakonia of men werkelijk het marturia—het getuigenis van het Evangelie van Jezus Christus—heeft verstaan en zich daarom koinonia, gemeenschap van Christus mag noemen'); cf. 107, 266, 272.

305 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 583.

306 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 78, 190, 486, 499, 506.

307 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 78, 193, 292.

308 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 193, 231, 276, 524.

6.6.6 Anamnesis and Epiclesis

The Holy Spirit plays a major role in the Ploegers' understanding of the Christian faith and church. The Spirit evokes in people the longing for the good and righteous life. The Spirit leads people to believe in different ways. The Spirit is at work in Israel, in the church and in all humanity.

These authors understand their emphasis on the Spirit as a correction of the usual christological monotony of Christian theology. Although they see Jesus as the Son of God, the Christ, the clearest sign of the living God, and the guarantor of the coming of God's kingdom, they emphasise the context in which Jesus acted, which is the context of God's work through the Spirit from creation to kingdom. They want to understand Christian theology as fundamentally trinitarian, but it is important to mention that by 'trinitarian' they mean not only the *interdependence* between, but also a certain amount of *independence* of Father, Son and Spirit. 'Christology and pneumatology are equal and relatively independent of each other.'[309] In Jesus, God has incarnated himself by the Spirit. Likewise, the Spirit's eschatological goal is to transform all humans to the likeness of God. Thus, incarnation was only possible by the Spirit, and our remembrance of the incarnated Christ (*anamnesis*) will only be relevant if we combine this by the invocation of the Spirit (*epiclesis*) to transform ourselves to the likeness of God as shown in Christ. In other words, *anamnesis* (remembrance of Christ) in itself leads to an impasse, which can only be opened up by the *epiclesis* (invocation of the Spirit).[310]

Ecclesiologically the Ploegers express this by saying that the church lives both 'in Christ' and 'by the Spirit'.[311] As we have seen, this implies that the church's anamnetic foundation is always transformed by the church's epicletic character. The members of the church live on the basis of salvation history (*anamnesis*), but understand and experience this salvation history according to how the Spirit speaks it into their cultural situation (*epiclesis*).[312] Doing this, the Spirit 'soils her hands'. Every concretisation of the eschatological longing, worked in humans by the Spirit, is at the same time a reduction. In every time and place, the church experiences the eschatological longing of the Spirit only in fragmentary ways, according to contemporary culture and situation. Therefore, the *epiclesis* remains an ongoing task, in order to continually correct the understanding of the *anamnesis* of Scripture and tradition. In other words, the hermeneutical process has to go on epicletically. There is no such thing as a

309 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 42 ('Christologie en pneumatologie zijn evenwaardig en relatief zelfstandig ten opzichte van elkaar'), cf. 27-28, 44, 492. This position is critically evaluated in paragraph 8.3.3.

310 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 500-501, cf. 742.

311 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 192 ('in Christus', 'door de Geest'), 277.

312 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 41, 44, 84, 533.

fixed situation in which the church has understood the ultimate meaning of the traditional in relation to the contemporary.[313]

6.6.7 The Individual and the Community

An important contribution of Practical Theology to ecclesiology is undoubtedly its insistance on the relevance of the empirical faith of individual members of the church in relation to an alleged 'faith of the church'. We saw that the Ploegers ground this relevance theologically in the fact that it is the Holy Spirit who evokes faith ('longing') in the believer. For them, the variety of expressions of the Christian faith is not a deplorable fact which has theologically to be corrected, but an empirical fact which has theologically to be interpreted as the work of the Spirit. Moreover, ecclesiology has to reckon with diversity not only because the members of the church have different interpretations and experiences of the Christian faith, but also because, more than ever before, individualism and personal experience play their parts in the *Erlebnisgesellschaft* (experience society) of twenty-first-century Western culture. A contemporarily relevant form of Christianity should reckon with individual experience rather than only criticise it.[314] The fortunate aspect of 'individualisation' (*individualisering*) is 'individuation' (*individuering*): self-development, the free formation of one's personality.[315]

For the church, this context means that people do not belong to it because of family bonds, local tradition, geographical belonging, but—*if* they choose to belong to the church at all—because of personal choice, style, experience.[316] The church has, more than ever, become a community of individuals. This leads Ploeger and Ploeger-Grotegoed to an ecclesiology rooted in a 'to a certain extent intersubjectively shared' *personal* faith.[317] This personal faith may be formed by indoctrination or by free choice, but in every case it is a personal faith. The Ploegers root this individual understanding of faith in what they perceive as 'the Reformational tradition': 'the Holy Spirit grants faith to the individual'. Ultimately, the Ploegers say, Christian faith is about the

313 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 53, 55-56, 549, 735 ('dat de Geest [...] vuile handen moet maken').

314 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 16, 44, 72, 94, 238, 267, 281, 290, 357, 511; PLOEGER, *Dare we Observe?*, 1-3. The term *Erlebnisgesellschaft* is borrowed from the German sociologist G. Schulze.

315 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 204.

316 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 72, 207.

317 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 192 ('het—tot op zekere hoogte intersubjectief gedeelde—verlangen'), 265.

relationship between God and the individual. It is from this personal faith that people act together in the church.[318]

At the same time, however, the church is a community. Religious meaning, religious language, and religious symbolism only exist if there is a community to cultivate and to hand over this tradition. If the contents of the Christian faith wants to survive, it needs 'some sort of community around rituals, service and doctrine'.[319] As an effect, the community—church, parish, congregation—becomes important. Being called to faith by the Spirit means also being called by the Spirit to be a member of the community. In (post-) modern culture, churches should try to be attractive, inspiring communities of the faith.[320]

Additionally, the community is necessary as a basis for those people who are more or less interested in the church, but do not belong to its core community. In the Ploegers' view the church should be present for all who long for the good and righteous life. Those who seek for occasional, short-term or longer-term help along their journey of longing, should find a welcoming community. Those seekers, Ploeger and Ploeger-Grotegoed affirm, belong to the church as well, although they only show occasional interest.[321]

6.6.8 Liturgy and the Formation of Identity

One could summarise that in this practical-theological approach to ecclesiology there is a tension between the individual and the community. Justice should be done to both, with—in the Ploegers' concept—some priority to the individual, due to both (post-) modern culture and the, in their view, Protestant emphasis on personal faith. Notwithstanding this priority of the individual, the community gains nearly equal importance, because it is indispensable for the formation and experience of faith. What Christians need together, the Ploegers say, is a 'partially communal identity'. In the lives of (post-) modern people, the church is no longer a 'primary group', but the intersubjective character of the Christian faith requires that people 'partially identify' themselves with the identity of their congregation.[322]

Interesting in the context of our quest for a liturgical ecclesiology is the fact that the Ploegers regard the liturgy as the main means to construct this partially communal identity. The strength of ritual is, they say, that it is

318 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 196 ('de reformatorische traditie', 'de heilige Geest schenkt het geloof aan de enkeling'), 212, 252-253, 256, 262-263, 270, 281, 285, 545, 717.

319 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 205-207 (206: 'een vorm van gemeenschap rond rituelen, dienst en leer'), 242, 290, 295.

320 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 207, 241, 264, 277.

321 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 205, 285.

322 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 210 ('partieel gemeenschappelijke identiteit'), 242 ('primaire groep', 'partieel [...] identificeren'), 250; cf. 257, 294.

simultaneously experienced individually and communally. Ritual—as long as it remains ritual and is not verbally nailed down—is multi-layered. Every partaker interprets the ritual in his or her own way. At the same time, the ritual is experienced together by the celebrating community, and the personal experiences are balanced by the intersubjectivity of the communal act. In other words, the strength of ritual is that it offers something personal and something communal. Ritual serves the construction of both personal and communal identity. To reach this goal, liturgy should be on the one hand understandable and on the other hand multi-layered. Liturgy should not be so multi-layered that it is nothing more than a 'mystery', but neither should it be so unequivocal that it is nothing else than a 'sermon in action'. This requires an amount of modesty from the side of the presider. Liturgy is not celebrated before an audience but by a congregation.[323]

In short, liturgy is important for the formation of the Christians' personal identity and the church's partially communal identity. In this context the Ploegers can even summarise the church under the following two headings. At the personal side, the church is a 'community of individuals'. At the communal side, it is a 'liturgical community'.[324]

6.6.9 Liturgy and Longing

As practical theologians, the Ploegers recognise the empirical fact that the liturgy is, and is seen as, the most central and representative aspect of the life of most congregations.[325] 'Church' is a building where people assemble for the liturgy. The church becomes visible where the congregation assembles. Active participation in the church's life is largely determined by participation in the liturgy. Even those who participate in *other* areas of ecclesial life, are mainly the regular churchgoers. The character of a congregation can be most easily detected from the style of its worship.[326]

The Ploegers do not combat this situation, but they make an appeal for 'opening up the liturgical space'. Liturgy should be interpreted in a broader sense than Sunday morning worship only. Particularly in (post-) modern, individualist culture, a congregation should cultivate personal, more intimate forms of prayer and spirituality to cater for the diversity of the people's spiritual preferences. The goal of this broader liturgy should be that every member of the

323 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 516, 519, 522-523 ('preek-handelingen'), 526, 534, 547, 684. Cf. PLOEGER, *Dare we Observe?*, 39.

324 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 285 ('de kerk als gemeenschap van individuen', 'de kerk als liturgische gemeenschap').

325 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 271, 734.

326 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 197, 199-201, 246, 485.

congregation may experience his or her life with God as integrated in everyday life.[327]

As we have seen, Ploeger and Ploeger-Grotegoed give equal importance to *leitourgia* and *diakonia*.[328] They do so in the overall context of the eschatological longing for the good and righteous life. Now we can try and formulate how both liturgy and diaconate have their place in the congregation and its longing. The longing is central. It stems from Scripture and tradition (*martyria*), it is evoked by the Spirit, and it is eschatological—it will only be fulfilled in the kingdom of God and in the meantime it strives towards this kingdom.

Liturgy and diaconate are the two means by which the church both experiences its longing and anticipates the fulfillment of its longing. Liturgy is crying out for goodness and righteousness, but it is also foretasting goodness and righteousness. It is longing for God as well as loving God and living with God. In the same way, diaconate is the experience that the good and righteous life has not yet begun, but it is also the relief of suffering as prefiguration of the good and righteous life. In this sense, both liturgy and diaconate have the capacity to express both the *iam* (already) and the *nondum* (not yet).[329]

In another sense, the liturgy is the expression of the *iam* and the diaconate of the *nondum*. Understood in this way, liturgy is the anticipation of *frui Deo* (enjoying God), while diaconate is working hard before the world will have come to full fruition. In this sense, liturgy and diaconate complement each other—liturgy keeps the vision alive and diaconate realises something of the vision in everyday life. When understood in this way, liturgy should always awaken the diaconal awareness of the congregation. Here again, we meet the necessity of *epiclesis* next to *anamnesis*. The aim of the *epiclesis* is to transform the vision, which is celebrated by the *anamnesis*, into a life according to the vision.[330]

6.6.10 The Church as the Body of Christ

Which 'models of the church' are fitting for this practical-theological ecclesiology? In the context of our quest for a liturgical ecclesiology, we pass by the Ploegers' models of the church as the covenant people of God, the

327 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 47-48, 360, 485 ('het "open gooien" van de liturgische ruimte'), 538, 550.

328 Again, the Greek words are used to indicate that liturgy should be understood as worship and prayer in the broadest sense, including references to 'diaconal' outreach, and that diaconate should be understood as social concern and outreach in the broadest sense, including elements of praise and prayer.

329 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, *passim* (e.g., 43, 47, 291-292).

330 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 507-508, 522, 528, 532-535, 545, 591, 650 and *passim*.

church as communion of those who are sanctified by the Spirit, the church as a servant, the church as 'salt of the earth' or 'light of the world', and the church as a community of disciples,[331] to dwell on the model of the church as the body of Christ. We are able to do so, because the Ploegers—although they recognise that every model needs to be corrected by being set next to other models—consider the body of Christ as their main ecclesiological model. They do so in the awareness that the body of Christ is the main model in many, and very different, ecclesiologies.[332]

Ploeger and Ploeger-Grotegoed sketch a difference between a Protestant and a Roman Catholic use of the model 'body of Christ'. In Roman Catholic ecclesiology, they argue, this model is indissolubly connected to the sacramental understanding of the church which is built up by the eucharist. In Protestant ecclesiology, however, the model is mainly used to present the church as a unity in diversity—one body with many different members, who are all equally important to the body. The danger of the Roman Catholic use is, according to the Ploegers, that the unity in diversity of all members of the church is swallowed by the sacramental unity of which the clergy are the dispensers.[333]

The way in which the Ploegers understand the model 'body of Christ' is in the first place baptismal and in the second place eucharistic. In baptism, Christians have—*individually*, the Ploegers say—died in Christ's death. Because all have gone through this baptismal experience, all belong together as one body. The relationship between the corporeal body of Christ and the church as the body of Christ is intimate: 'Through baptism Christ incorporates the believer into his body as a member of that body. In the eucharist, Christ and the Spirit create a community in which the communal interdependence is expressed between God and the members in relation to one another.' In the wake of Augustine, mediated by Karl Barth, the Ploegers say that Christ and his people together are *totus Christus* (the whole Christ). According to the Ploegers, the question 'Where is the body of Christ?' can no longer be answered by referring to the cosmology of antiquity ('Christ has gone up'), but should be answered by saying, 'the body of Christ is in the Eucharist and in the congregation gathered for the eucharist. [...] The eucharistic bread and the congregation are the risen body of Christ'.[334]

331 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 211-231, 244-249, 275-287.

332 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 213, 223, 225-226.

333 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 216, 224. This view is evaluated in paragraph 8.3.4.

334 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 223-227 (223: 'Door de doop neemt Christus de gelovige mens op in zijn lichaam als lid van dat lichaam. In het avondmaal wordt er door Christus en de Geest een gemeenschap geschapen, waarin de gezamenlijke afhankelijkheid van God en van de leden onder elkaar gestalte krijgt'; 226: 'het [lichaam van Christus] is in de eucharistie en in de gemeente, verzameld rond de

The fundamental truth communicated by the model 'body of Christ' is that the church consists of members who are, with all their variety, equally important to the existence of the church as a whole. This ecclesiastical unity in diversity culminates in the liturgical celebration. And although Ploeger and Ploeger-Grotegoed regard this model to be central, it should always be supplemented by the model of the church as a community of the Spirit. It is the Spirit who makes us share in Christ and his body.[335]

6.6.11 The Local Congregation and the Supra-Local Church

As the title of their book suggests, for the Ploegers the church is mainly the local congregation. 'The congregation is the church of Christ in that particular place.' And 'the local congregation is exemplary for the church of Christ'.[336] In the context of this study, the question arises whether there is, in the Ploegers' concept, any need for congregations to be in communion with each other, and if so, how such a communion is expressed. Moreover, the question is whether the local congregation and the supra-local church have anything to benefit from each other.

At first sight, it seems that for Ploeger and Ploeger-Grotegoed a supra-local church is only a burden. Building upon their concept of individuality related to a partially communal identity, they insist that in many cases only the local congregation knows how to relate the Christian tradition to the concrete context of its people. Not theologians or spiritual leaders and not the church as a whole, but the local congregation knows how its people live and how they long for the good and righteous life. Even the type of church may vary according to the context of the local congregation. The Ploegers warn that supra-local structures often limit this freedom of the local congregations to adapt Scripture and tradition to the needs of their people.[337]

Nevertheless, they say, even this local ecclesiology needs the supra-local church for several reasons. The first reason is comparable to the reason why the individual Christian needs a local congregation—in order to correct subjectivity into intersubjectivity, or in other words, to necessarily complement individual identity by a partially communal identity. In the same way in which the individual needs the congregation, the congregation needs the supra-local church, in order to avoid becoming a sect.[338]

eucharistie. [...] zowel het brood van de eucharistie als de gemeente zelf [zijn] het verrezen lichaam van Christus', for which proposition reference is made to Robert Jenson), cf. 277.

335 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 224-225, 277.

336 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 193 ('De gemeente is de kerk van Christus ter plaatse', 'dat naar onze mening de plaatselijke gemeente exemplarisch staat voor de kerk van Christus').

337 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 56, 248, 284.

338 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 357, 534.

Another reason why the local congregation needs the wider church is because of the solving of conflicts and the avoidance of irreversible patterns of power which could emerge within a local congregation. The Ploegers call this 'mild forms of discipline and supervision'. In current ecumenical jargon this could be called 'mild forms of *episkope*'. According to the Ploegers, this *episkope* should not be exercised within an episcopal-synodal model—they regard an episcopal system as a threat to the freedom of the local congregations—but within a presbyterian-congregational, or—as is the case in their own church—a presbyterian-synodal model.[339]

Finally, the local congregation can benefit from a supra-local church in the following matters. The wider church can offer resources for lay education and training on a regional or national level. The wider church can maintain a system of monetary redistribution between richer and poorer congregations. The wider church can sustain a common presentation of the Christian church to the world.[340]

These authors' view on the relationship between the local and the supra-local church can be summarised as follows. Firstly, they advocate a strong emphasis on the local congregation and its freedom to inculturate the Christian tradition in the context of its people. Nevertheless, they regard the bond between the congregations as both necessary and useful. It is useful, because the wider church can provide resources from which the local congregations may benefit. It is necessary, because a single congregation runs the risk of becoming a sect. The Christian faith should be shared in intersubjectivity, not only between individuals but also between congregations. The bond between the congregations is also necessary in the case of situations where *episkope* is needed, although these authors do not wish to hand over *episkope* to one person (a bishop); it should be exercised communally in a presbyterian mode. In more systematic terms, the supra-local church is needed to preserve the confession and the order of the church.

6.6.12 The Ordained Ministry

The Ploegers' view on the church requires a form of leadership which should on the one hand be deeply informed by Scripture and tradition while on the other hand it should be deeply aware of the different situations in which the members of the congregation live. Clearly, this ecclesiological model requires a competent ministry. This does not mean that the local minister has to do everything. The priesthood of all believers should be respected also in the sense that the members of the congregation can bear responsibility for parts of the

339 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 284 ('milde vormen van tucht en opzicht'), cf. 244, 357, 717.

340 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 284.

church's life. All members of the congregation are representatives of Christ. Moreover, all are gifted by the Spirit.[341] Nevertheless, the interaction between Christian tradition and (post-) modern culture, which pervades the Ploegers' ecclesiology, asks for a minister who is both able to give considerable input from tradition and to translate it hermeneutically into the situation of the people.[342]

As a result, Ploeger and Ploeger-Grotegoed mention mainly the following tasks for the local minister. First, he or she should be the mediator between the individual members and the activities of the congregation. The minister accompanies the members on the journeys of their longing. He or she is their spiritual guide.[343] Second, the Ploegers focus on the minister's liturgical role.[344] This is not surprising, as we have seen that the Ploegers, firstly, prioritise the individual's 'personal identity' and, secondly, give the liturgy the role *par excellence* to form the congregation's 'partially communal identity'. Serving the formation of these identities, the minister will be both a personal spiritual guide and a communal liturgical presider. In the liturgy, the congregation is the celebrant. The minister only serves the congregation by presiding over the communal celebration.[345] Third, the minister is the theologian who takes the lead in the biblical and traditional formation of the members of the congregation. This should, of course, be done in a fundamentally hermeneutical way.[346] In the light of the Ploegers' concept, *leitourgia* and *diakonia* are interwoven in these three ministerial tasks. In liturgy and formation, the diaconal aspect of the church should be present.

6.6.13 Conclusion

One can summarise the main insights from this liturgio-diaconal or diacono-liturgical ecclesiology as follows. Firstly, the Ploegers place liturgy on an equal level, and intertwined, with diaconate. The liturgical foretaste of the kingdom has to be parallelled by diaconal foretastes for those who badly need them. The Ploegers emphasise that a liturgical ecclesiology must never close the church doors, must never become a closed liturgical concept.

Secondly, this practical-theological ecclesiology tries to do justice to, on the one hand, the empirical centrality of the liturgy in the life of many churches and, on the other, the empirical diversity of experiences in the lives of the members of the church. It strives at a balance between the *martyria* of Scripture

341 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 284, 361, 715-716, 727, 742. Cf. PLOEGER, *Dare we Observe?*, 76.
342 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 725.
343 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 358, 724, 743.
344 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 743.
345 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 500.
346 PLOEGER & PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen*, 361, 371.

and tradition and the individual forms of belief in our *Erlebnisgesellschaft*. Pluriformity of belief is not necessarily a theologically deplorable situation, but can be interpreted as the activity of the Spirit in the lives and thoughts of all members of the church. Therefore, liturgy creates not a corporate identity, but simultaneously a 'personal identity' and a 'partially communal identity'.

Thirdly, the criticism of the body of Christ model is to be remembered. Although the Ploegers make use of the baptismal and eucharistic aspects of this model, they caution against a use of this model in such a sacramental sense that not the members of the body, but the clergy appear to be central. The body of Christ model should always be used with the connotation of diversity in unity, the equality and equal necessity of all individuals (the members) in relation to the church as a whole (the body). Moreover, the christocentric character of this model is to be balanced by a pneumatological emphasis.

Fourthly, on the level of ecclesiastical structure and ministry, Ploeger and Ploeger-Grotegoed represent the anxiety of those who are afraid of superstructures which diminish the freedom of the local congregation. Continuing the second insight, the church should always be aware that in (post-) modern culture people have their own experiences and preferences. Only the local congregation knows how to inculturate tradition in the context of its members. Ministry should serve this ongoing hermeneutical process. *Episkope* should be 'mildly' exercised, with respect for local differences and needs. Nevertheless, a congregation is not an island. Its faith needs to be lived in the context of the wider church, to which it sometimes contributes and by which it is sometimes corrected.

6.7 CONCLUSION

This chapter was introduced as a triptych. The two side panels depicted two Dutch contributions to a liturgical ecclesiology, one from classic Calvinist Protestantism, the other from modern Protestant Practical Theology. Both proved to be supportive of liturgy as of primary importance for the church's life and identity, as well as critical of liturgy as a potentially closed system. For Noordmans, the liturgy has always to be open towards the Spirit and the Word. Liturgical and ethical sobriety reflect his view on the Christian faith and church. For Ploeger and Ploeger-Grotegoed, the liturgy is a communal ecclesial act but has always to be open to the experience of the (post-) modern individual, and has to be complemented by social outreach (*diakonia*).

On the main panel were sketched the insights from three international 'ecumenical Protestant' theologians. All three regard the church as, first of all, a liturgical gathering, a celebrating community. All three regard the eucharist—in the context of baptism and the Word—as the central Christian liturgy. All three regard the celebration of the liturgy, particularly the eucharist, as the intrinsic

bond between the local and the universal church. All three regard the ministry as emerging from and subject to the liturgical assembly. All three—and it is probably here that the typically Protestant contribution comes in—acknowledge the possibility of 'extraordinary' (von Allmen), 'critical' (Wainwright), or 'catholic' (Lathrop) exceptions to traditional and ecumenical consensus, in order to emphasise that the church and the liturgy are 'open systems' (Wainwright), pneumatologically and eschatologically open to God's interference, not a 'closed' (Noordmans) system which operates automatically.

The aim of this chapter was to present some examples of Protestant theologians who can be regarded as belonging to the school of liturgical or eucharistic ecclesiology. Moreover, the Protestant background of these authors resulted in some critical insights. The combination of liturgical ecclesiology and its criticism is probably best summarised in Lathrop's phrase, 'the breaking of symbols', which was taken as this chapter's title. The traditional liturgical symbols and language are retained, but they are 'broken'. That is, they are used non-univocally. Their meaning is not absolute but transformed by the primacy of the Spirit, the Word, eschatology and the socio-cultural situation in which the church lives. This *using* and at the same time transformatively *breaking* of symbols could be said to be a typically Protestant contribution to a liturgical ecclesiology.[347]

[347] The fact that theologians in *other* ecclesial traditions *similarly* correct a too massive understanding of symbols by taking a symbol's ambivalence (presence and absence; the pneumatological and eschatological reserve) into their semiotics, confirms the growing ecumenical convergence throughout the twentieth century, to which much of this study witnesses.

7 'VISIBLE UNITY IN ONE FAITH AND ONE EUCHARISTIC FELLOWSHIP'

Contributions to a Liturgical Ecclesiology from Ecumenical Texts

7.1 INTRODUCTION

7.1.1 Common Ground

The liturgical-ecclesiological thought presented in the previous chapters proved to be inextricably interwoven with three—themselves interrelated—currents dating from the first half of the twentieth century: the (neo-) patristic *ressourcement* movement,[1] the liturgical movement[2] and the ecumenical movement. One of the features of the previous chapters is that—although emphases differ, sometimes from church to church, sometimes from author to author irrespective of denominational divides—there appears to be a remarkable amount of common ground among these authors as to how the church is approached (primarily as a liturgical gathering) and as to the fundamental characteristics of the church (such as the constitutive role of the Trinity, baptism, the eucharist, eschatology, the use of the 'body of Christ' model and the place of the ministry). If the theologies of the authors discussed in this study, notwithstanding their obvious differences, seem to be deeply related, this is the result of the explicit and implicit influence of the patristic, liturgical and ecumenical movements upon the theology and self-understanding of the churches in the twentieth century. Before this common ground is further summarised and explored in the concluding chapter, the present chapter seeks to confirm the impression of ecumenical convergence, given by the previous chapters, by referring to ecumenical dialogue texts.[3]

1 Cf. paragraphs 2.1.6 (The Call for a Neo-Patristic Synthesis) and 3.1.2 (Theological Reassessment).

2 Cf. paragraph 3.1.3 (The Liturgical Movement).

3 In order to make the references independent of a particular edition, all documents will be cited according to their paragraph numbers rather than to page numbers.

7.1.2 The Ecumenical Movement

'The' ecumenical movement could be defined in different ways. The best known use of the term refers to the ecumenical work of the *World Council of Churches* (WCC), founded in 1948 out of the 'Life and Work' and the 'Faith and Order' movements which dated from the beginning of the twentieth century, later joined by the International Missionary Council and the World Council of Christian Education. Other definitions of the term 'ecumenical movement' could refer to the *Evangelical co-operation* outside the WCC, or to the *Christian World Communions* in which churches with confessional or denominational affinity are internationally organised (such as the Anglican Communion, the Lutheran World Federation and the World Alliance of Reformed Churches). Very tangible definitions of the term 'ecumenical movement' would be a *concrete process towards (re-) union* between two or more churches resulting in a united church, and the *increasing mutual understanding between local churches and congregations* through ecumenical co-operation at grassroots level.[4]

In the context of this study, the ecumenical movement is probably best characterised as a 'current', detectable in many churches and theologies throughout the twentieth century. After centuries in which the relations between the churches were largely determined by an apologetic defense of the truth of one's own denominational theological, ecclesiological, liturgical and spiritual choices and emphases, the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth centuries saw various factors which contributed to a more 'ecumenical' approach. Among these factors were certainly the experience of the missionary inadequacy of the division of Christianity, the decline of the role of church and religion in Western society, and the increasing acknowledgement of plurality and contingency through historical research.[5]

Out of these and other factors grew a new awareness of the common roots—and therefore fundamentally a common identity—of all Christian churches. These common roots were studied by (neo-) patristic theologians, who discovered that ancient patterns of thought were potentially able to transcend theological and methodical boundaries between the inherited confessional theologies, but also by the pioneers of the liturgical movement,

4 Cf. [A.W.J. HOUTEPEN], 'Oecumene en ecclesiogenese. Over het middelpuntzoekende karakter van de oecumenische beweging', in: L.A. Hoedemaker, A.W.J. Houtepen, J.Th. Witvliet, *Oecumene als leerproces. Inleiding in de oecumenica* (Utrecht-Leiden: IIMO, 1993), 5-27, at 6-8; M. TANNER, 'Ecumenical Theology', in: D.F. Ford with R. Muers (eds.), *The Modern Theologians: An Introduction to Christian Theology since 1918*, Third Edition (Oxford: Blackwell, 2005), 556-571, at 556-557; see also the website of the WCC (www.oikoumene.org).

5 Cf. [HOUTEPEN], 'Oecumene en ecclesiogenese', 5; [A.W.J. HOUTEPEN], 'Eenheid en solidariteit van het verdeelde christendom. De beweging en de Commissie voor "Faith and Order"', in: Hoedemaker, Houtepen, Witvliet, *Oecumene als leerproces*, 187-264, at 196.

who discovered that differences in liturgical meaning and shape were not unbridgeable when related back to their common origins. It is, therefore, impossible to say which movement evoked the other, as the patristic, liturgical and ecumenical elements were so thoroughly interwoven.[6] The previous chapters already *implicitly* indicated the far-reaching ecumenical impact of the (neo-) patristic and liturgical rediscoveries of the twentieth century. This chapter is *explicitly* devoted to the increasing ecumenical convergence regarding the relationship between ecclesiology and the liturgy, particularly the eucharist.

7.1.3 Goal and Method of the Ecumenical Movement

The original goal of the ecumenical movement, at least as represented by the WCC, is the full visible unity of the one church of Christ—both throughout the world and 'in each place'.[7] In achieving this goal, the WCC experiences a certain tension between those who emphasise church unity in practice—in mission or in engagement with the concrete needs of the world—and those who seek the unity of the church by theological conversation, leading to convergence and eventually to consensus.[8]

In the context of this systematic-theological study, it is appropriate to concentrate on the latter strand of ecumenical endeavour. Therefore, this chapter will concentrate on the theological achievements of the WCC's Commission on Faith and Order (F&O), of which the Roman Catholic Church, although not a member of the overarching WCC, is a full member. For a liturgical or eucharistic ecclesiology, already the statutory formulation of F&O's aim is remarkable:

> to proclaim the oneness of the church of Jesus Christ and to call the churches to the goal of visible unity in one faith and one eucharistic fellowship, expressed in worship and in common life in Christ, in order that the world may believe.[9]

This concentration on the theological work of F&O is not to say, however, that theological, ecclesiological ecumenism could be separated from missionary, social, environmental ecumenism. As the previous chapters showed, the church and the eucharist are part of God's ways with humanity and the world. In terms of the WCC's program on 'Justice, Peace, and the Integrity of Creation': the church is also a '"moral community" and unity came to be understood as

6 Cf. [HOUTEPEN], 'Eenheid en solidariteit', 210 n. 27.

7 Cf. M.E. BRINKMAN, *Progress in Unity? Fifty Years of Theology within the World Council of Churches: 1945-1995: A Study Guide* (Louvain: Peeters/Eerdmans, 1995), 7-9; [HOUTEPEN], 'Oecumene en ecclesiogenese', 25.

8 TANNER, 'Ecumenical Theology', 557.

9 BRINKMAN, *Progress in Unity?*, 9.

"costly unity," and commitment together to the gospel, "costly commitment."'[10] *Vice versa*, Christian concern for society and the world is more than a pragmatic matter. It has its roots in 'a tradition of narratives and a hermeneutic of those narratives', in fasts and feasts, visions and rituals.[11] As we will see, the *koinonia* model has the potential to embrace both emphases.[12] Therefore, when this chapter devotes itself to the ecclesiological work of F&O, this happens in the awareness that the church is part of God's dealings with the world.[13]

The way by which F&O began its journey towards Christian unity in 1927 (First World Conference, Lausanne) was the 'comparative' method. Agreements and disagreements were registered and different concepts of unity were considered. In 1952 (Third World Conference, Lund) the method changed into the more active approach of dialogue towards convergence and consensus.[14] This method does not aim at a rather static description of the confessional and denominational *status quo*—indispensable as such an overview probably was at the beginnings of ecumenism—but at the discovery of those elements of faith and living upon which the churches already mutually agree (consensus) or potentially could agree in the future (convergence). Whether an alleged convergence or consensus is real, or still conceals a hidden dissensus, becomes clear in the process of reception. Therefore, reception by the churches involved is an indispensable part of the process of (non-) implementation of the work of ecumenical dialogue commissions.[15]

Reception of ecumenical texts is needed both on the level of church leaders in order to pursue the transformations necessary for communion between the churches, and on the level of the faithful so that growing ecumenical consensus really becomes part of Chistians' faith, worship and life. Otherwise, ecumenical conversations will remain 'the ritual encounter of ecumenical experts, a permanent alibi for lasting division'.[16] If ecumenical agreements will be received on all those levels of the churches, reception becomes what it should be—*relecture* of tradition in view of communion. In such an understanding of how ecumenism works, the 'synchronic or horizontal assent of the churches' is

10 TANNER, 'Ecumenical Theology', 558; cf. [HOUTEPEN], 'Eenheid en solidariteit', 263-264.

11 A.W.J. HOUTEPEN, *Geloven in gerechtigheid. Bijdragen tot een oecumenische sociale ethiek* (Zoetermeer: Meinema, 2005), 74 ('een traditie van verhalen en een hermeneutiek van die verhalen'); cf. [HOUTEPEN], 'Eenheid en solidariteit', 259.

12 [HOUTEPEN], 'Eenheid en solidariteit', 229, 261; cf. paragraph 7.1.5.

13 In particular the inclusion of the report *Church and World* is meant to articulate this awareness; cf. paragraph 7.1.5.

14 [HOUTEPEN], 'Eenheid en solidariteit', 210-212; BRINKMAN, *Progress in Unity?*, 7-10.

15 M. GOSKER, *Het ambt in de oecumenische discussie. De betekenis van de Lima-ambtstekst als onderdeel van het BEM-rapport (Baptism—Eucharist—Ministry) uit 1982 van de Commissie voor Faith and Order van de Wereldraad van Kerken voor de voortgang van de oecumene en de doorwerking in de Nederlandse SoW-kerken* (Delft: Eburon, 2000), 22.

16 A.W.J. HOUTEPEN, 'Reception, Tradition, Communion', in: M. Thurian (ed.), *Ecumenical Perspectives on Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* (Geneva: WCC, 1983), 140-160, at 143; cf. 154-155.

a contemporary expression of their willingness to receive the 'diachronical or vertical consensus' which is 'apostolic tradition'. In other words, the ongoing process of *reception* prevents *tradition* from becoming static.[17] In the ecumenical movement, the goal of this dynamism between tradition and reception (or 'tradition in the form of reception') is *communion*. 'Receiving' an ecumenical agreement is in the end no less than 'receiving' the churches that also receive this agreement. Interpreted as a theological rather than a canonical or strategic category, the 'reception' of ecumenical texts comes close to the 'reception' (into communion) of the other churches involved.[18] In Anton Houtepen's words,

> If 'reception' does not apply to texts alone, but to the living reality of faith itself; if by 'receiving' a dogmatic statement of another church or of the ecumenical dialogue, churches recognize those other churches as faithful to the apostolic tradition; then 'reception' not only expresses a rational 'consensus' or 'mutual understanding'; it also is the beginning of 'acceptance' and of 'homology': common confession, which is an essential condition for communion and unity. Ecumenical reception is not the signature under a contract, but a kiss of peace among sister churches.[19]

7.1.4 Modernity and Postmodernity, Unity and Plurality

Some observers experience a decline of ecumenical vigour over the last decades. Such a feeling of stagnation and resignation is, paradoxically, partly the result of the success of the ecumenical movement. The more the churches have come to know, appreciate and partly recognise one another, the stronger the remaining differences cause impatience or disappointment.[20]

However, a deeper reason why the ecumenical quest for unity meets with less enthusiasm than some decades ago, can be found in a changing attitude towards the idea of 'unity' in contemporary thought and experience. In some important instances, the ecumenical movement can be 'read' as a deeply 'modern' current.[21] The quest for unity then appears as part of a wider 'political-economical (*bourgeois*-capitalist) historical process of global unification'.[22] In reaction, the 'loss of the unity of the "grand narratives" that

17 HOUTEPEN, 'Reception, Tradition, Communion', 145; cf. 146, 150.
18 HOUTEPEN, 'Reception, Tradition, Communion', 149, 151.
19 HOUTEPEN, 'Reception, Tradition, Communion', 153.
20 W. KASPER, *Wege der Einheit. Perspektiven für die Ökumene* (Freiburg-Basel-Wien: Herder, 2005), 27.
21 Cf. M.E. MARTY, 'The Global Context of Ecumenism 1968-2000', in: J. Briggs, M.A. Oduyoye, G. Tsetsis (eds.), *A History of the Ecumenical Movement*, vol. III: *1968-2000* (Geneva: WCC, 2004), 3-22, especially 11-13.
22 [J.TH. WITVLIET], 'De moderne oecumenische beweging en haar historisch-maatschappelijke context', in: Hoedemaker, Houtepen, Witvliet, *Oecumene als leerproces*,

convey meaning [...] is characteristic for contemporary "postmodernist" life experience'.[23] Although it is usual to emphasise the enmity between the Enlightenment and Christianity, the two have in common their geographical and temporary universalism—'salvation' for the whole world at the 'end' of time. But this 'eschatological-teleological perspective' has collapsed in post-modern thought.[24]

As a result, the ecumenical movement has become aware of its limits. Since the nineteen seventies, ecumenical theology became much more complicated through the introduction of questions of racism, sexism, feminist theology and contextual theology from Asia, Africa and Latin America. Rather than being able to continue a linear process of unification, ecumenism meets its limits in the fundamental plurality of cultures and religious traditions. Has not 'unity'—even unity in 'pluriformity'—given way to a 'plurality' that has to be acknowledged and respected?[25]

The answer to such questions is not the suppression of the ecumenical movement or 'the abolition of the goal of "visible unity", but a nuancing and deepening of that concept'.[26] Visible unity will be less understood in terms of institutional union or universalisation of certain expressions of faith, and more in terms of the hermeneutical search for convergence as to the question what it means to be a Christian. In this hermeneutical process, Scripture and tradition, ecumenical theological dialogue, and respect for the inalienability of cultural differences, all have their role to play.[27]

When Christians in postmodernity neither want to end up with utter fragmentarisation, or—through the back door—with a uniform culture directed by media and commerce, nor with counteractions of nationalist xenophobia and delimitated confessionalism, they have to face the question what it means to believe in one God, one Lord and one Spirit in the context of the freedom of every woman and man to be herself or himself.[28] As Walter Kasper says,

29-45, at 31 ('politiek-economisch (burgerlijk-kapitalistisch) historisch proces van mondiale eenwording').

23 [WITVLIET], 'De moderne oecumenische beweging', 33 ('Dit verloren gaan van de zinstichtende eenheid van de "grote verhalen" [...] is kenmerkend voor het huidige "postmodernistische" levensgevoel').

24 [WITVLIET], 'De moderne oecumenische beweging', 34, 36 ('eschatologisch-teleologisch perspectief').

25 [WITVLIET], 'De moderne oecumenische beweging', 37, 43, 44 ('eenheid', 'pluriformiteit', 'pluraliteit').

26 [L.A. HOEDEMAKER], 'Oecumenica als theologische discipline', in: Hoedemaker, Houtepen, Witvliet, *Oecumene als leerproces*, 265-284, at 279 ('niet het afschaffen van het doel van "zichtbare eenheid", maar wel een nuancering en verdieping van dat begrip').

27 [WITVLIET], 'De moderne oecumenische beweging', 44-45; [HOEDEMAKER], 'Oecumenica als theologische discipline', 279-280.

28 KASPER, *Wege der Einheit*, 237-243, 248-251.

befitting the churches, beyond both relativism and fundamentalism, is a 'dialogical and diaconal' role among humanity.[29]

7.1.5 From Unity to Koinonia

This changed attitude towards 'unity' led to an important development in F&O's ecclesiological approach—the shift from unity to *koinonia*.[30] Of course, these terms are not mutually exclusive. On the one hand, unity was always understood as a unity 'in each place'; on the other hand, *koinonia* is not just a recipe for pluriformity. Nevertheless, unity and *koinonia* express different emphases. Terminology like 'organic unity' makes clear that ecumenism does not only aim at 'invisible' spiritual unity but also at structural 'visible' unity, and inspired concrete unions between churches,[31] but it also bears connotations of uniformity which became increasingly difficult to maintain in view of the growing awareness of global variety and the emergence of the post-modern critique of univocal systems. This insight led the WCC's Fifth Assembly (Nairobi, 1975) to adopt the concept of 'conciliar fellowship', and the Seventh Assembly (Canberra, 1991) to undergird this concept by the biblical and theological notion of *koinonia*.

Koinonia is not meant as just another ecclesiological model, but as an overarching concept in which a future united church is not envisaged as a static and uniform entity, but as

> a 'communio' of local churches, being each other's 'sister churches', expressing this bond of communion through conciliar consultation, as often as is necessary for the fulfillment of their common task.[32]

This dynamic and multiform understanding of unity as *koinonia*/communion does not regard the ecumenical endeavour as an either romantic or imperialist

29 KASPER, *Wege der Einheit*, 246 ('dialogisches und diakonisches').

30 Cf. J.K.A. SMITH, *Introducing Radical Orthodoxy: Mapping a Post-secular Theology* (Grand Rapids MI: Baker Academic; Milton Keynes UK: Paternoster, 2004), 235: 'The notion of unity [... seems] to suggest a kind of hegemony or totalizing imposition of "sameness." But this is not the case: The unity here is one of communal difference [...]. The unity is one of *koinonia*, which is the community of those who are different.'

31 G. GASSMANN, 'Montreal 1963—Santiago de Compostela 1993: Report of the Director', in: T.F. Best & G. Gassmann (eds.), *On the Way to Fuller Koinonia: Official Report of the Fifth World Conference on Faith and Order* (Geneva: WCC, 1994), 12-18, at 13.

32 [HOUTEPEN], 'Eenheid en solidariteit', 233 ('eenheid als een "communio" van plaatselijke kerken, die elkaars "zusterkerken" zijn en die deze band van communio tot uitdrukking brengen in conciliair beraad, telkens als dat nodig is voor de realisering van hun gezamenlijke opdracht').

striving after a super-church, but as a journey from a lesser to a fuller communion of communions.[33]

Moreover, the concept of *koinonia* opens up a broader perspective on ecclesiological thought. Rooted in God's trinitarian being, *koinonia* characterises the church as well as God's purpose with the world. Placed in the wider context of *koinonia*, ecumenical ecclesiology rediscovers that church, sacraments and ministry are related to the well-being of humanity and to justice in the world:

> More clearly than unity, koinonia can be seen as an integral element in the wider context of God's saving action for the whole of humanity and of creation, which the church has to serve as sign and instrument.[34]

> The life of communion in the church builds upon and transforms, but never wholly replaces, the koinonia in the order of creation. The visible koinonia of the church is to demonstrate what God intends for the whole of humanity and creation—a foretaste of the kingdom.[35]

Especially when one-sided understandings of the concept of *koinonia*—a horizontal fellowship interpreted sociologically; a romantic *Gemeinschaft* interpreted according to a *Leben Jesu* ideal; an institutional *communio hierarchica* interpreted according to the concept of *societas perfecta*—are clarified and balanced, *koinonia* proves to be a fruitful concept in virtually all ecumenical dialogues.[36]

7.1.6 This Chapter (1): Multilateral Texts

Ecumenical theological dialogue is practised multilaterally, through the work of F&O, and bilaterally, through commissions appointed by two churches which are in conversation with one another. Both forms of dialogue produced liturgical-ecclesiological statements or built upon liturgical-ecclesiological thought.

The greater part of this chapter (sections 7.2 to 7.6) is an investigation into the liturgical-ecclesiological content of relevant F&O documents from 1982 to the present. In 1982, F&O published the best known multilateral ecumenical

33 HOUTEPEN, 'Reception, Tradition, Communion', 153-154; [HOUTEPEN], 'Eenheid en solidariteit', 261-262; TANNER, 'Ecumenical Theology', 564; cf. section 3.5 (Tillard).

34 GASSMANN, 'Montreal 1963—Santiago de Compostela 1993', 14.

35 TANNER, 'Ecumenical Theology', 563; cf. BRINKMAN, *Progress in Unity?*, 17-18; [HOUTEPEN], 'Eenheid en solidariteit', 254-255. Nevertheless, Houtepen says that F&O has largely concentrated on a rather isolated treatment of internal ecclesial themes such as the sacraments and the ministry (238-239), even when Christians are perhaps more deeply divided on themes of Christian life than on themes of Christian faith (243).

36 KASPER, *Wege der Einheit*, 72-78.

text ever, the 'Lima report' on *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* (*BEM*).[37] This convergence text is not only important because it brings together the fruits of the dialogue on church and sacraments since the beginning of the ecumenical movement, but also because it is the most widely shared ecumenical text, with the best organised and documented reception process.[38] The results of the '*BEM* process' include an affirmation of the importance of theological dialogue for the rapprochement between the churches; a deepening of thought on baptism, eucharist and ministry within churches, and among churches, on different levels; liturgical renewal on the basis of *BEM*'s theology and the (inofficial) 'Lima liturgy'; growing awareness of the social-ethical implications of liturgy and the sacraments; and in some cases *BEM* helped to pave the way for mutal sacramental, ministerial or ecclesial recognition.[39]

The responses to *BEM* revealed the need for an explicitation of the implicit ecclesiology behind *BEM*.[40] Therefore, rather than continuing the 'itemized agenda of BEM',[41] F&O launced an ecclesiological study project.[42] Stages of this project are documented by the report *Towards Koinonia in Faith, Life and Witness* (1993)[43] and by a text that aims at becoming a common ecclesiological statement: *The Nature and Mission of the Church* (2005).[44] The most recent document in this respect is the 'Text on Ecclesiology: Called to be the One Church', written by F&O and adopted by the WCC's Ninth Assembly (Porto Alegre, 2006).[45]

37 *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* (Geneva: WCC, 1982).

38 Cf. M. THURIAN (ed.), *Churches Respond to BEM: Official Responses to the 'Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry' Text*, vol. I-VI (Geneva: WCC, 1986-1988); *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry 1982-1990: Report on the Process and Responses* (Geneva: WCC, 1990).

39 *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry 1982-1990*, 11-13.

40 *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry 1982-1990*, 147-148.

41 M. TANNER, 'Ministry in Faith and Order: One Woman's Ecumenical Memory', in: T. Grdzelidze (ed.), *One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic: Ecumenical Reflections on the Church* (Geneva: WCC, 2005), 169-179, at 176. Cf. A.W.J. HOUTEPEN, 'Lima—20 Jahre später', *IKZ* 92 (2002), 179-209, at 185, 188-190, 201-202, 209. In Tanner's and Houtepen's opinion a disadvantage of this change from the particular themes of *BEM* towards the more general theme of ecclesiology was that the urgency for the churches to 'receive' *BEM* retired into the background. Houtepen (190-192) adds that, by this change of approach, the concentration on the biblical and patristic *contents of* communion has given way to philosophical, canonical, psychological and linguistic *discourses on* the theme of communion.

42 Cf. G. WAINWRIGHT, 'Church', in: N. Lossky *et al.* (eds.), *Dictionary of the Ecumenical Movement* (Geneva: WCC, 2002), 176-186, at 184-185; A.D. FALCONER, 'Introduction', in: Grdzelidze (ed.), *One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic*, 1-13.

43 *Towards Koinonia in Faith, Life and Witness: A Discussion Paper* (Geneva: WCC, 1993).

44 *The Nature and Mission of the Church: A Stage on the Way to a Common Statement* (Geneva: WCC, 2005).

45 'Text on Ecclesiology: Called to be the One Church: An Invitation to the Churches to Renew their Commitment to the Search for Unity and to Deepen their Dialogue', at www.oikoumene.org/en/resources/documents.

The ecclesiological thought of F&O is, however, not only to be found in F&O's ecclesiological project. The project that investigates the relationship between the theological thought of F&O and the ecumenical movement's concern for witness and service in the world produced the document *Church and World* (1990),[46] and the project towards a common presentation of the Christian faith included an ecclesiological section in its report *Confessing the One Faith* (1991).[47] As relevant articulations of F&O's ecclesiology in a wider context, these documents will also be referred to in this chapter.

7.1.7 This Chapter (2): Bilateral Texts

The study of multilateral texts will be complemented by an investigation into two bilateral documents (sections 7.7 and 7.8). Taking Oliver Schuegraf's extensive study on 'ecclesiology in the documents of bilateral consensus ecumenism' as a guide,[48] the following bilateral relationships can be distinguished.

Anglican—Old Catholic relations date from the 1870s and were already in 1931 sealed by the Bonn Agreement that brought these churches into full communion with each other. In its extreme brevity, the text of the Bonn Agreement does not contribute to a liturgical ecclesiology.[49] In subsequent theological encounters, however, Anglicans and Old Catholics have come to experience a converging ecclesiological view on the basis of a communion ecclesiology with a eucharistic focus.[50]

Anglican—Lutheran dialogues, going on in several countries, concentrate on the issue of *episkope* and episcopacy.[51] Anglican insistence on the 'historic episcopate' seems to be the only reason why, for example, the English-German *Meissen Common Statement* (1988) has not yet reached the stage of full communion.[52] This is even more obviously the case in the British-Irish-Nordic-Baltic *Porvoo Common Statement* (1992)[53] and the American full communion agreement *Called to Common Mission* (2001)[54] with their separate chapters on

46 *Church and World: The Unity of the Church and the Renewal of Human Community: A Faith and Order Study Document* (Geneva: WCC, 1990).

47 *Confessing the One Faith: An Ecumenical Explication of the Apostolic Faith as it is Confessed in the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed (381)* (Geneva: WCC, 1991).

48 O. SCHUEGRAF, *Der einen Kirche Gestalt geben. Ekklesiologie in den Dokumenten der bilateralen Konsensökumene* (Münster: Aschendorff, 2001). See also WAINWRIGHT, 'Church', 179-184.

49 Cf. SCHUEGRAF, *Der einen Kirche Gestalt geben*, 66-73.

50 Cf. U. VON ARX, P.D.L. AVIS, M. PLOEGER (eds.), *Towards Further Convergence: Anglican and Old Catholic Ecclesiologies* (Bern: Stämpfli, 2006).

51 SCHUEGRAF, *Der einen Kirche Gestalt geben*, 76; cf. 76-92.

52 *The Meissen Agreement: Texts* (London: Council for Christian Unity, 1992).

53 *The Porvoo Common Statement* (London: Council for Christian Unity, 1993).

54 Text and official commentary: *Commentary on 'Called to Common Mission'* (Chicago IL: Evangelical Lutheran Church in America; New York NY: The Episcopal Church, 2002).

episcopal ministry—the largest chapters of the documents. Although all three texts represent elements of a communion ecclesiology,[55] sometimes with eucharistic overtones,[56] they cannot be said to be built upon a liturgical or eucharistic ecclesiology. This is especially confirmed by the fact that the approach to *episkope* in these documents includes, of course, presidency at the liturgical gathering as one element of the task of the ordained ministry, but only as one of many and not as the constitutive element which marks the character of the ministry.[57]

A similar concentration on the problem of (episcopal) ministry is found in the Anglican—Methodist and, to a lesser degree, in the Anglican—Reformed and Lutheran—Roman Catholic conversations.[58] Not surprisingly, a eucharistic-ecclesiological foundation is neither encountered in most of the inner-Protestant dialogues.[59] Interestingly, however, a number of conversations in which Protestant partners are involved, cautiously explore a *koinonia* ecclesiology,[60] sometimes including a eucharistic focus.[61]

Full use of eucharistic ecclesiology is encountered in the Anglican—Orthodox, Anglican—Roman Catholic, Old Catholic—Orthodox, Orthodox—Roman Catholic and Oriental Orthodox—Roman Catholic dialogues and to some extent also in the Orthodox—Lutheran dialogue.[62] Out of these, this

55 Cf. *Meissen*, 4-5, 7-8; *Porvoo*, 5, 14-28; *Called to Common Mission*, 5.

56 Cf. *Porvoo*, 17, 24, 31 (f, g, h), 41.

57 Cf. *Meissen*, 15 (ix), 16, 17 (iv); *Porvoo*, 5, 25, 31 (k), 42-45; *Called to Common Mission*, 10.

58 Cf. SCHUEGRAF, *Der einen Kirche Gestalt geben*, 93-101 (Anglican—Methodist), 110-115 (Anglican—Reformed), 255-287 (Lutheran—Roman Catholic).

59 Cf. SCHUEGRAF, *Der einen Kirche Gestalt geben*, 161-169 (Baptist—Lutheran), 170-171 (Baptist—Mennonite), 172-177 (Baptist—Reformed), 216-222 (Lutheran—Mennonite), 240-254 (Lutheran—Reformed), 288-289 (Methodist—Reformed). The same is true of the Reformed—Roman Catholic dialogue (346-355).

60 Cf. SCHUEGRAF, *Der einen Kirche Gestalt geben*, 178-182 (Baptist—Roman Catholic), 183-188 (Disciples of Christ—Reformed), 189-200 (Disciples of Christ—Roman Catholic), 306-308 (Orthodox—Reformed), 336-345 (Pentecostal—Roman Catholic).

61 Cf. SCHUEGRAF, *Der einen Kirche Gestalt geben*, 204-215 (Lutheran—Methodist), 290-300 (Methodist—Roman Catholic).

62 Cf. SCHUEGRAF, *Der einen Kirche Gestalt geben*, 102-109 (Anglican—Orthodox), 116-136 (Anglican—Roman Catholic), 144-152 (Old Catholic—Orthodox), 236 (Lutheran—Orthodox), 309-326 (Orthodox-Roman Catholic), 327-335 (Oriental Orthodox—Roman Catholic). The same is true of the Swiss dialogue between Old Catholics and Roman Catholics (155-157), but not of the German intercommunion agreement between Old Catholics and Lutherans (137-143). The International Roman Catholic—Old Catholic Dialogue Commission (since 2004) has not yet produced an official document. Cf. J. VISSER, 'Die Beziehungen zwischen dem Vatikan und der Utrechter Union aus altkatholischer Sicht', in: H. Gerny, H. Rein, M. Weyermann (eds.), *Die Wurzel aller Theologie: Sentire cum Ecclesia. Festschrift zum 60. Geburtstag von Urs von Arx* (Bern: Stämpfli, 2003), 309-325; H.J.F. REINHARDT, 'Kanonische Aspekte des ökumenischen Dialogs, vor allem im Hinblick auf die Altkatholiken', *Archiv für katholisches Kirchenrecht* 174 (2005), 3-18.

chapter chooses the Anglican—Roman Catholic and the Old Catholic—Orthodox dialogue texts as examples of eucharistic ecclesiology in bilateral ecumenical documents.

The former is the work of the Anglican—Roman Catholic International Commission (ARCIC). The first phase of the dialogue (ARCIC I) was concluded by the publication of the *Final Report* (1981) on eucharist, ministry and authority.[63] The second phase (ARCIC II) produced documents on 'Salvation and the Church' (1986), 'Church as Communion' (1990) and 'Life in Christ: Morals, Communion and the Church' (1993),[64] as well as another document on authority, 'The Gift of Authority' (1998)[65] and a text on mariology, 'Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ' (2005).[66]

The latter is the work of the Joint Orthodox—Old Catholic Theological Commission.[67] Between 1975 and 1987 this commission produced a number of common agreed statements on theology, christology, ecclesiology, soteriology, sacramentology and eschatology, which were subsequently published under the title *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis* (*Koinonia* on the basis of the Early Church).[68] It is the only East-West dialogue that has resulted in full theological consensus. In the words of an Orthodox member of the commission, 'Thus we have proved that there is no essential East-West antithesis within Christianity'.[69]

63 Text in: H. MEYER & L. VISCHER (eds.), *Growth in Agreement: Reports and Agreed Statements of Ecumenical Conversations on a World Level* (Ramsey NJ: Paulist; Geneva: WCC, 1984), 61-129.

64 Texts in: J. GROS, H. MEYER, W.G. RUSCH (eds.), *Growth in Agreement II: Reports and Agreed Statements of Ecumenical Conversations on a World Level, 1982-1998* (Geneva: WCC; Grand Rapids MI: Eerdmans, 2000), 311-372.

65 *The Gift of Authority (Authority in the Church III)* (London: Catholic Truth Society; Toronto: Anglican Book Center; New York: Church Publishing, 1999).

66 D. BOLEN & G. CAMERON (eds.), *Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ: The Text with Commentaries and Study Guide* (London-New York: Continuum, 2005).

67 Cf. H. REIN, *Kirchengemeinschaft. Die anglikanisch-altkatholisch-orthodoxen Beziehungen von 1870 bis 1990 und ihre ökumenische Relevanz* (Bern: Lang, 1993 & 1994 [2 volumes]).

68 The Greek and German texts are authentic. German text and English translation in: U. VON ARX (ed.), *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis. Deutsche Gesamtausgabe der gemeinsamen Texte des orthodox-altkatholischen Dialogs 1975-1987 mit französischer und englischer Übersetzung* (Bern: Stämpfli, 1989). An earlier translation is to be found in: MEYER & VISCHER (eds.), *Growth in Agreement*, 389-419; GROS, MEYER, RUSCH (eds.), *Growth in Agreement II*, 248-268.

69 D. PAPANDREOU, 'Die gegenseitige ekklesiologische Anerkennung', in: Gerny, Rein, Weyermann (eds.), *Die Wurzel aller Theologie*, 285-291, at 285 ('So haben wir unter Beweis gestellt, dass es keinen wesentlichen Ost-West-Gegensatz innerhalb der Christenheit gibt'). Cf. H. ALDENHOVEN, 'Charakter, Bedeutung und Ziel der Dialogtexte', in: von Arx (ed.), *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, 27-44, at 42: 'Die Bedeutung der Dialogtexte liegt darin, dass es nach einer praktisch 1000jährigen verschiedenen und zum Teil entgegengesetzten Entwicklung in Ost und West überhaupt möglich war, gemeinsame Texte in diesem Umfang abzufassen und zu verabschieden. Das ist bisher noch nirgends anderswo geschehen'.

The theological consensus has, however, not yet been translated into ecclesial communion.[70]

As in all chapters of this study, what follows below is not a full treatment of the texts, but an analysis of their liturgical-ecclesiological content. As always, reference will be made to basic theological thought on the relationship between the church and the liturgy, especially the eucharist. Other issues—particularly those on ministry and on the local and universal character of the church—are taken into consideration when they flow from liturgical-ecclesiological basic convictions.

7.2 *BAPTISM, EUCHARIST AND MINISTRY*

7.2.1 A Eucharistic-Ecclesiological Centre

Literally at the heart of *BEM*[71] is a section on the ecclesiological meaning of the eucharist.[72] The section is called 'The Eucharist as Communion of the Faithful' and particularly its first paragraph is worth citing as a concise description of eucharistic ecclesiology.

> [a] The eucharistic communion with Christ who nourishes the life of the Church is at the same time communion within the body of Christ which is the Church.
> [b] The sharing in one bread and the common cup in a given place demonstrates and effects the oneness of the sharers with Christ and with their fellow sharers in all times and places.
> [c] It is in the eucharist that the community of God's people is fully manifested.
> [d] Eucharistic celebrations always have to do with the whole Church, and the whole Church is involved in each local eucharistic celebration.
> [e] In so far as a church claims to be a manifestation of the whole Church, it will take care to order its own life in ways which take seriously the interests and concerns of other churches.[73]

Close reading of these lines reveals the rich meaning of this dense text. The first phrase (a) functions *structurally* as a bridge between the previous christological

70 Cf. REIN, *Kirchengemeinschaft*, II 75-79, 168-202, 514-531; U. VON ARX, 'Der orthodox-altkatholische Dialog. Anmerkungen zu einer schwierigen Rezeption', *IKZ* 87 (1997), 184-224. For a critical review of the dialogue text by an Old Catholic member of the commission, see C. OEYEN, 'Ekklesiologische Fragen in den orthodox-altkatholischen Kommissionstexten', *IKZ* 79 (1989), 237-265; cf. REIN, *Kirchengemeinschaft*, 171-172, 175, 188 n. 257.

71 On *BEM* see paragraph 7.1.6.

72 *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, E 19-21. This section is more or less in the middle of *BEM*'s part on the eucharist (E 1-33), which is in its turn the middle part of the *BEM* report.

73 *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, E 19. Subdivisions (a, b, c, d, e) are added by the present author to facilitate the following exploration of the text.

and pneumatological sections and this ecclesiological section. But it makes also the *theological* connection between communion with and in Christ and communion with one another in the church. The ecclesiological meaning of the eucharist is not alternative but complementary to approaches to the eucharist which concentrate on the real presence or on the spiritual union with Christ. The eucharist can only *have* an ecclesiological meaning because it is *Christ* to whom the partakers are united, and because it is *Christ's* body which is both eucharistically received and ecclesially built up. In other words, the ecclesial aspect of the eucharist flows from the christocentric aspect, and both are made possible by the pneumatological aspect.

The general contents of the second phrase (b) reminds of the, as it were, foundational scriptural text of eucharistic ecclesiology, 'Because there is one bread, we who are many are one body, for we all partake of the one bread' (1 Corinthians 10:17). But next to this general contents, the second phrase contains some important thought only expressed by a few words. Firstly, the words 'in a given place' emphasise the 'local' character of a eucharistic ecclesiology. When talking about the eucharist, one does not talk about a general idea, but about a concrete phenomenon: the enacted celebration of a given group in a given place. The 'oneness with Christ and with their fellow sharers in all times and places' is celebrated by a given, local community. That is, the unity with Christ and with the 'universal' church (both synchronically of 'all places' and diachronically of 'all times') is present in the eucharistic celebration of the 'local' church. Secondly, the expression 'demonstrates and effects' is *BEM*'s rendering of the eucharistic-ecclesiological catchwords 'the church makes the eucharist' and 'the eucharist makes the church'.[74] 'The church makes the eucharist' means that the eucharist 'demonstrates' the (already given) oneness of the church with Christ, and the oneness of the universal church with the local churches. The eucharist is a demonstration, manifestation, of the church. In the eucharist, the church becomes tangibly present. The other catchword, 'the eucharist makes the church', means that the (given, concrete, local) celebration of the eucharist 'effects'—brings about, creates, establishes—the church. By celebrating the eucharist, this local gathering is (re-) constituted as the church, that is, connected to Christ and all other churches. In these two words, 'demonstrates and effects', *BEM* thus summarises the whole dynamic of eucharistic ecclesiology: the mutual interdependence of the church and the eucharist.

Phrases (c) and (d) are straightforward recognitions of two principles already encountered in the previous phrase. The local eucharist is the full manifestation of the church (c). The celebration of the eucharist connects the local church to all other churches and brings the communion of all churches into the celebration of the local church (d).

[74] These phrases originate from Henri de Lubac; cf. paragraph 3.2.6.

The final phrase (e) draws an important practical and ecumenical conclusion from the systematic-theological thought of the previous phrases. If the eucharist implies such a fundamental bond between any local eucharistic community and the whole church, every local church should be anxious to abide and grow in this communion *also* by ordering its own life in such a way that the mutual communion between the churches is strengthened rather than endangered.[75]

The other paragraphs of the eucharistic-ecclesiological section 'The Eucharist as Communion of the Faithful' interestingly open up the ecclesiological theme towards 'all aspects of life'.[76] The fact that 'the eucharist makes the church' is translated into a wider reconciliatory meaning of the eucharist. Celebrating the eucharist not only means being drawn into communion with Christ and the other members of Christ's body, but also implies the willingness to live according to this uniting, reconciling, communion-shaping character of the eucharist. This is true both in and outside the church:

> The eucharistic celebration demands reconciliation and sharing among all those regarded as brothers and sisters in the one family of God and is a constant challenge in the search for appropriate relationships in social, economic and political life [...]. All kinds of injustice, racism, separation and lack of freedom are radically challenged when we share in the body and blood of Christ. [...] As participants in the eucharist, therefore, we prove inconsistent if we are not actively participating in this ongoing restoration of the world's situation and the human condition.[77]

It is important to notice that *BEM* presents this thought not as a practical, social or diaconal 'appendix' to eucharistic theology and ecclesiology, but at the heart of the ecclesial meaning of the eucharist. Being drawn into communion with Christ and one another implies social responsibility both within the community of the church and in the wider world. The liturgy is acknowledged as a place where this social meaning, these 'manifestations of love', are enacted

> in the mutual forgiveness of sins; the sign of peace; intercession for all; the eating and drinking together; the taking of the elements to the sick and those in prison or the celebration of the eucharist with them.[78]

[75] This conclusion probably refers to the shape of the eucharistic celebration, to which section III of *BEM*'s eucharistic part is devoted (cf. E 28, advocating liturgical convergence without uniformity), and of the ministry presiding at the eucharist, which is of course discussed in *BEM*'s part on ministry.

[76] *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, E 20.

[77] *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, E 20; cf. E 4.

[78] *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, E 21.

The connection between liturgy and life is called a testimony 'to the redeeming presence of Christ in the world'.[79] It also functions as a bridge to the next section, which treats the eucharist as a prefiguration of the kingdom of God.[80]

We can conclude that this 'centre' of the *BEM* document represents a full eucharistic ecclesiology. Both directions are recognised: the eucharist as the manifestation (demonstration) of the church, and the church as the result (effect) of the eucharistic celebration. Also two important themes related to eucharistic ecclesiology are mentioned: the mutual indwelling of the local and the universal church, and the need to 'order' the church in such a sense that this ecclesiological meaning of the eucharist becomes consistently visible. Finally, *BEM* opens up the eucharistic-ecclesiological theme towards the social and political consequences of communion in and outside the church.

7.2.2 Liturgical Ecclesiology in the Baptism Text

In addition to the explicitly eucharistic-ecclesiological section just discussed, the Lima report contains other traces of an approach consistent with a liturgical or eucharistic ecclesiology.[81] In the text on baptism, the notions of 'participation' and 'incorporation' are prominent.[82] This is important to notice, because these notions are at the heart of a liturgical or eucharistic ecclesiology. Liturgical ecclesiology is at one with *BEM* in considering baptism to be not just about coming to faith, but about being *united* with Christ, *participating* in Christ; not just about the individual relationship between Christ and the believer, but about being *incorporated* into Christ, that is, being inserted into his *corpus*, his body, the church. Examples from the text: baptism makes a person 'one with' Christ, 'participating in the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ' and 'brought into union with Christ, with each other and with the Church of every time and place'.[83]

79 *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, E 21.

80 Cf. *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, E 22 ('The eucharist is the feast at which the Church [...] celebrates and anticipates the coming of the Kingdom'), E 23 ('The world, to which renewal is promised, is present in the whole eucharistic celebration'), E 24 ('Reconciled in the eucharist, the members of the body of Christ are called to be servants of reconciliation among men and women'), E 25 ('The very celebration of the eucharist is an instance of the Church's participation in God's mission to the world').

81 Max Thurian gives the eucharist a prominent place even in a very general summary of *BEM*'s ecclesiology; cf. M. THURIAN, 'The Lima Document on "Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry": The Event and its Consequences', in: Thurian (ed.), *Churches Respond to BEM*, vol. I, 1-27, at 7-8; cf. 13, 16, 22.

82 The text begins with the phrase, 'Christian baptism is rooted in the ministry of Jesus of Nazareth, in his death and resurrection. It is incorporation into Christ'; *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, B 1.

83 *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, B 3, 6; cf. B 4, 9, 10, 14, 18, 21.

> Baptism is the sign of new life through Jesus Christ. It unites the one baptized with Christ and with his people. [...] It gives participation in the community of the Holy Spirit.[84]

It is clear that *BEM* grants baptism a strong ecclesiological meaning[85] and, moreover, puts this ecclesiological meaning in terms of incorporation and participation.[86] The eucharistic-ecclesiological 'conclusion' that, therefore, baptism is incorporation into the eucharistic community, is suggested in a commentary in the margin of the main text:

> *[...] baptism, as incorporation into the body of Christ, points by its very nature to the eucharistic sharing of Christ's body and blood [...]. Baptism needs to be constantly reaffirmed. The most obvious form of such reaffirmation is the celebration of the eucharist.*[87]

Here, the eucharist is considered as the natural context of baptism. This is reaffirmed by the main text, when it says that '[s]ome churches' understand initiation into the Christian community as a combination of baptism, confirmation and communion.[88] Moreover,

> Since baptism is intimately connected with the corporate life and worship of the Church, it should normally be administered during public worship[89]

and given the fact that *BEM* considers the eucharist as the main act of Sunday worship,[90] it may be concluded that here is another indication of the strong link between baptism and the eucharist, or more precisely, between baptism being the incorporation into the Christian community, and this community being the eucharistic gathering.

These systematic-theological considerations lead to two challenges to the churches. *BEM* suggests that if baptism is regarded as incorporation into the eucharistic community, it seems inconsistent to recognise the baptism of other

84 *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, B 2, 7.

85 Cf. *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry 1982-1990*, 109 (cf. 146-148), where it is concluded from the responses by the churches that 'many churches' regard the relationship between baptism and the eucharist as very 'intrinsic' and that 'some churches' wish the ecclesiological meaning of baptism to be expressed even more explicitly.

86 Cf. *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry 1982-1990*, 110-111, where, in response to the criticism that *BEM* seems to have a 'mechanical' understanding of baptism, it is explained that 'the Triune God is the principal agent in baptism'. The act of God happens, however, through a sacrament, which 'does not simply point towards, but actually participates in, the reality which it effectively conveys' (cf. 114).

87 *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, Commentary at B 14.

88 *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, B 20.

89 *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, B 23.

90 Cf. *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, E 30-31.

churches but not to allow those baptised Christians to take part in the eucharistic communion.[91] The other challenge is that, again, if baptism is taken seriously as the incorporation into the eucharistic community, it seems inconsistent to have some baptised members receiving communion and other baptised members (the text thinks in particular of children) not.[92]

7.2.3 Liturgical Ecclesiology in the Eucharist Text

The eucharistic[93] part of *BEM* reveals traces of eucharistic ecclesiology not only in the paragraphs 19-21 which were studied in paragraph 7.2.1, but also in the rest of the text. The attentive reader finds, for example, a phrase like, 'As it becomes one people, sharing the meal of the one Lord, the eucharistic assembly must ...'.[94] Such seemingly accidental phrases witness to a deep eucharistic-ecclesiological understanding behind the text. *En passant*, the church is described here as becoming one through sharing the one bread, that is, becoming church through celebrating the eucharist. A similar fragment: 'In the celebration of the eucharist, Christ gathers, teaches and nourishes the Church.'[95]

Recalling the institution of the eucharist, the document states,

> Christ commanded his disciples thus to remember and encounter him in this sacramental meal, *as the continuing people of God*, until his return. [...] Its celebration continues as *the central act of the Church's worship*.[96]

Again, this ecclesial aspect of the eucharist is opened up towards the whole world, this time not only in a social and diaconal, but also in an eschatological and doxological perspective:

91 Cf. *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, Commentary at E 19.

92 *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, Commentary at B 14.

93 In the responses by the churches, the request was made to use not only the word 'eucharist', but also, for example, 'Lord's supper' and 'holy communion'. F&O has taken this request to heart: 'Granted that the eucharist [...] has several "aspects" [...], it would have been wise—and it remains appropriate—to make fuller use of the variety of scriptural and traditional names in order to suggest the richness of its meaning' (*Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry 1982-1990*, 112-113). In the course of this chapter, quotations from ecumenical texts after *BEM* will prove this more varied use of names for the eucharist (especially 'the Lord's Supper').

94 *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, E 26.

95 *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, E 29.

96 *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, E 1. Emphasis added by the present author, to underline the relationship between the eucharist and the church. In reaction to the responses by the churches, F&O explains the centrality of the eucharist, expressed in E 1, as including both word and meal. It also mentions a growing awareness in churches of all denominations that Sunday worship should, in principle, include word and meal, and it adds that both word and meal are expressions of the Word in its fullest theological sense (*Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry 1982-1990*, 113-114).

> The eucharist thus signifies what the world is to become: an offering and hymn of praise to the Creator, a universal communion in the body of Christ, a kingdom of justice, love and peace in the Holy Spirit. [...] [In the eucharist, through the Spirit] the Church receives the life of the new creation. [...] The world, to which renewal is promised, is present in the whole eucharistic celebration.[97]

This eschatological character of the eucharist can also be found in the assertion that the eucharist renews the unity with Christ and the 'communion with all the saints and martyrs'.[98]

Another element of liturgical-ecclesiological thought often encountered in the previous chapters and also found in *BEM*, is its trinitarian basis. Although not linked to the church as partaker of trinitarian life through the eucharist, the eucharist itself is described as a trinitarian event:

> it is the Father who is the primary origin and final fulfillment of the eucharistic event. The incarnate Son of God by and in whom it is accomplished is its living centre. The Holy Spirit is the immeasurable strength of love which makes it possible and continues to make it effective. The bond between the eucharistic celebration and the mystery of the Triune God reveals the role of the Holy Spirit as that of the one who makes the historical words of Jesus present and alive.[99]

As a possible corrective to the emphasis on incorporation and participation elaborated in the paragraph above, mention should be made of *BEM*'s nuance that Christ's 'incarnation, life, death, resurrection and ascension' are 'neither repeated nor prolonged'. Rather, the church lives 'in communion with Christ'.[100] Notwithstanding the intimate relationship between Christ and the church, expressed in terms like incorporation and participation, the church is not a prolongation of the incarnation, the church is not the present shape of Christ—there remains a difference between Christ and the church although they live 'in communion'.

7.2.4 Liturgical Ecclesiology in the Ministry Text

The use of eucharistic-ecclesiological categories, thus far discovered in *BEM*'s texts on baptism and the eucharist, is continued in the text on the ordained ministry.[101] Firstly, there are general references to communion ecclesiology.

97 *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, E 4, 18, 23.

98 *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, E 11.

99 *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, E 14. One would like to add (with Zizioulas, cf. paragraph 2.3.4) that the Spirit also makes the *eschatological* Christ present and alive.

100 *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, E 8.

101 The longer term 'ordained ministry' is used because *BEM* distinguises between 'ministry' as 'the service to which the whole people of God is called' and the 'ordained ministry' as the particular 'charism' which is exercised after being appointed by the church 'by ordination through the invocation of the Spirit and the laying on of hands' (*Baptism,*

Not surprisingly, most of these are found in the initial section, 'The Calling of the Whole People of God', which sets the tone for the ministry document.[102] More particularly, there are two instances in which this document's thought on the ordained ministry reflects a eucharistic-ecclesiological approach. These instances are the *task* and the *form* of the ordained ministry.

The *BEM* ministry text seems to approach the task or function[103] of the ordained ministry in two ways. The first approach is rather formal—the ordained ministry serves the connection between the contemporary church and the origins of the church (Jesus and the apostles), and serves the unity of the community of the church:

> In order to fulfill its mission, the Church needs persons who are publicly and continually responsible for pointing to its fundamental dependence on Jesus Christ, and thereby provide, within a multiplicity of gifts, a focus of its unity.[104]

This strand of the document emphasises the role of the ordained ministers as 'heralds', 'ambassadors', 'representatives of Jesus Christ to the community', 'leaders', 'teachers' and 'pastors'.[105] The second approach is rather practical. When it comes to the way in which the ordained ministry exercises its traditory and unifying role, the document contains a fully eucharistic-ecclesiological passage:

> 13. The chief responsibility of the ordained ministry is to assemble and build up the body of Christ by proclaiming and teaching the Word of God, by celebrating the sacraments, and by guiding the life of the community in its worship, its mission and its caring ministry.

Eucharist and Ministry, M 7); it is the latter form of ministry to which the *BEM* ministry text is devoted.

102 *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, M 1 (the 'new community' [the church] is 'built up continually by the good news of the Gospel and the gifts of the sacraments'; 'Belonging to the Church means living in communion with God through Jesus Christ in the Holy Spirit'), 4 ('Living in this communion with God [...]'), 14 ('the deep and all-embracing communion between Christ and the members of his body'). To these general references also belongs the recommendation that ordination and the eventual recognition of one another's ministries should take place during the celebration of the eucharist; cf. *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, M 41, 55.

103 *BEM*'s understanding of the ordained ministry is not 'just functionalist'; cf. *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, M 8: 'The ministry of such persons, who since very early times have been ordained, is constitutive for the life and witness of the Church.' 'Constitutive' means here essential, necessary, indispensable (cf. the explanation in *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry 1982-1990*, 121).

104 *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, M 8; cf. 12, Commentary at 21.

105 *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, M 11.

> 14. It is especially in the eucharistic celebration that the ordained ministry is the visible focus of the deep and all-embracing communion between Christ and the members of his body. [...][106]

Paragraph 13, which could in itself be understood as referring to 'the sacraments' as just something among other things, is given a fully eucharistic-ecclesiological interpretation by paragraph 14, which grants the eucharist its prominent place as 'especially [...] the visible focus' of the church.[107]

The second instance in which the *BEM* ministry text reflects eucharistic-ecclesiological thought, is its section on the *form* of the ordained ministry. Although the document acknowledges that '[t]he New Testament does not describe a single pattern of ministry',[108] it makes the proposal to the churches that 'nevertheless the threefold ministry of bishop, presbyter and deacon may serve today as an expression of the unity we seek and also as a means for achieving it'.[109] This suggestion is not made on the grounds of biblical or historical claims—although the text emphasises that the threefold ministry came up early and is accepted by many churches[110]—but as a proposal to the churches, so that every church may review its ordained ministry according to an ecumenical understanding of the threefold pattern. 'The traditional threefold pattern thus raises questions for all the churches.'[111] Perhaps this way of pleading for the threefold ministry may be seen as an application of the quest for a 'neo-patristic synthesis'[112]—the ministerial structure of the Early Church is proposed to the churches not in an historicising way, but as a contemporary, contextual reaffirmation of patristic witness, serving Christian unity today.[113]

106 *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, M 13-14.

107 The eucharistic-ecclesiological interpretation is endorsed by the elucidations in reaction to the responses by the churches. Discussing the way in which the ordained ministers could be understood as representing Christ, the elucidation says, 'Not these persons in their own right, but precisely their public function (presidency) in the proclamation of the word and at the table of the Lord is an effective sign of the presence of Christ in the community. In this way they express the *koinonia* of all the baptized with the one body of Christ of all times and places, in which Christ himself is the one who presides at the eucharist. [... I]t is the ordained minister who, in presiding at the Lord's supper, publicly represents the divine initiative and the *koinonia* with the church of all times and places.' The responses by the churches also affirm the notion that the nature of baptism and the eucharist define the nature of the ordained ministry, not the reverse (*Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry 1982-1990*, 87, 123).

108 *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, M 19; cf. 22.

109 *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, M 22.

110 Cf. *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, M 19, 22.

111 *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, M 25; cf. 24.

112 Cf. paragraph 2.1.6 (The Call for a Neo-Patristic Synthesis).

113 The criticism that *BEM* introduces the threefold ministry without enough convincing biblical and patristic arguments (cf., e.g., GOSKER, *Het ambt in de oecumenische discussie*, 53-74, 142-143) misses the point that *BEM*, *acknowledging* that there is not enough historical basis, *proposes* an ecumenically *revised* form of the threefold ministry as a potentially fruitful contribution to the unity of the churches (using Clement and Ignatius not

The eucharistic-ecclesiological thought comes in where the historic origin of the threefold ministerial pattern is discussed. *BEM* emphasises the 'considerable changes' which the threefold ministry has undergone in the history of the Early Church:[114]

> 20. [...] In the earliest instances, where threefold ministry is mentioned, the reference is to the local eucharistic community. The bishop was the leader of the community. He was ordained and installed to proclaim the Word and preside over the celebration of the eucharist. He was surrounded by a college of presbyters and by deacons who assisted in his tasks. [...]
> 21. Soon, however, the functions were modified. Bishops began increasingly to exercise *episkopé* over several local communities at the same time. [...] They provide a focus for unity in life and witness within areas comprising several eucharistic communities. As a consequence, presbyters and deacons are assigned new roles. The presbyters become the leaders of the local eucharistic community [...].[115]

It is the latter (paragraph 21) rather than the former (paragraph 20) situation, which is taken up by *BEM* as a proposal to the churches. In other words, the threefold ministry is not regarded as a 'local' ministry—the bishop being the local eucharistic presider, surrounded by presbyters and deacons—but as serving both 'the local eucharistic community' (presbyters and deacons) and 'the regional level' (bishop).[116] Consequently, the parish is called 'the local eucharistic community', the diocese the 'area' of the bishop, and 'the Church' refers to the universal church.[117]

Although this description of the ordained ministry, by repeatedly calling the church a eucharistic community, reflects a eucharistic-ecclesiological background, the transition between paragraphs 20 and 21 is nevertheless problematic from the point of view of a eucharistic ecclesiology. As Zizioulas has pointed out, it is perfectly possible to interpret the later stage—in which a diocese started to comprise more than one eucharistic congregation, and in which, therefore, the bishop assigned to (some of) his presbyters the task to preside at the eucharist of such a part of his flock, deputising for him and in communion with him—as a kind of extension of the former situation.[118] The

as historical proof but as *typoi* of two ministerial models). Only repeating the exegetical consensus that there is insufficient historical basis for any ministerial order, is not a constructive option in the context of ecumenical theology and practice.

114 *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, M 19; cf. 20.

115 *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, M 20-21.

116 *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, M 27.

117 *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, M 20-21, 27, 29-31.

118 Cf. paragraph 2.3.7. The preparatory consultation, *Episkopé and Episcopate in Ecumenical Perspective* (Geneva: WCC, 1980), chose a reconciliatory position: 'The model witnessed to by the Ignatian letter retains its significance for the life of the local church. There is need, in each local eucharistic community, for a bishop providing the focus of unity in life and

conceptual advantages of such an interpretation are: (1) the episcopate, presbyterate and diaconate remain fundamentally 'local' and 'collegial' ministries, without being separated into a 'local' and a 'regional' ministry; (2) the diocese is not degraded into a regional 'area' with many eucharistic communities, but retains its character as the one eucharistic community; (3) the bishop is not abstracted from the local eucharistic community but, as its presider, fully part of one community; (4) the presbyter is not isolated from the bishop and the colleagues in the presbyterium to become 'the leader [...] of the local eucharistic community', but remains one with the bishop, the rest of the presbyterium and the deacons. When dioceses are not too large, such a threefold ministry is very well able to understand itself as the local ministry serving the local church.[119]

Moreover, this fundamentally local—although in practice probably regional—understanding of the threefold ministry could possibly be an answer to those Reformed critiques which fear a supra-local bishop and which rebuke *BEM* for not doing justice to local ministries such as the elders.[120] *BEM*'s emphasis on the need for oversight and unity on a regional level[121]—and, one would like to add, on the universal level[122]—is not incompatible with such a local understanding of the threefold ministry, as local bishops can exercise a primacy on several levels.[123] From the point of view of a eucharistic ecclesiology, the regional and universal church is not served by a ministry of its own, but by the communion of (local) churches and their (local) ministers, some

witness by proclaiming the Gospel and presiding over the eucharist. [...] On the other hand, there is an obvious need for *episkopé* over an area comprising several local churches. The development which resulted in ascribing to the bishop a new [*i.e.*, supra-local] kind of *episkopé* is therefore not simply illegitimate. [...] The bishop's basic function remains to assemble the community and to strengthen its witness by proclaiming the Gospel and presiding over the liturgical and sacramental life of the eucharistic community. *Episkopé* at the level of an area is an extension of this function' (8).

119 Cf. H.-J. SCHULZ, *Ökumenische Glaubenseinheit aus eucharistischer Überlieferung* (Paderborn: Bonifacius, 1976), 113-122; SCHUEGRAF, *Der einen Kirche Gestalt geben*, 394-396.

120 Cf. E.A.J.G. VAN DER BORCHT, *Het ambt her-dacht. De gereformeerde ambtstheologie in het licht van het rapport* Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry *(Lima, 1982) van de theologische commissie* Faith and Order *van de Wereldraad van Kerken* (Zoetermeer: Meinema, 2000), 325-331, 354-357, 401, 463-464. GOSKER, *Het ambt in de oecumenische discussie*, 107, 147-148, asks, the other way round, whether perhaps the ministry of the elder is omitted from *BEM* because of a failing theology of the ministry of the elder in the Reformed Churches themselves, for example regarding the question whether or not the elders and deacons belong to the 'ordained ministry'. The same comment is made by F&O's reaction to the responses by the churches; cf. *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry 1982-1990*, 125-126.

121 *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, M 27, 29.

122 *BEM* does not touch the question of primacy.

123 In a communion ecclesiology, the locality of the church is not incompatible with its universality; cf., e.g., Tillard's thought in paragraphs 3.5.5 and 3.5.6. Cf. von Allmen in paragraph 6.3.6, who talks about a supra-local primacy '*des sortes d'archevêques*', because he regards the Protestant minister as the continuation of (not the presbyter but) the bishop.

of whom preside over this regional and universal communion. In short, *BEM* happily suggests a contemporary reappropriation of the patristic threefold ministry, not without its eucharistic connotations, but unhappily does not take as its model the original situation, in which the threefold ministry appears most consistently as a local, communal, collegial and personal ministry.

With the words 'personal, collegial and communal' reference is made to a fortuitous emphasis in *BEM*. The document proposes to overcome a possible one-sidedness in the ordained ministry—vested in a potentially authoritarian way in individuals, or depersonalised by egalitarian collegial structures—through the combination of the personal, the collegial and the communal in the exercise of any ministry. The evolution of the meaning of these three words is interesting: at F&O's First World Conference (Lausanne, 1927) they served as descriptions of three different ecclesiological models: episcopalism (personal), presbyterianism (collegial) and congregationalism (communal).[124] In *BEM*, they refer to the way in which any ministry should be exercised: on every level of the church there is need for a recognisable and responsible *person*, acting *collegially* with fellow ordained ministers and doing justice to all charisms and (non-ordained) ministries of the *whole community*.[125] This balance between personality, collegiality and communality fits particularly well into a communion ecclesiology.

7.2.5 Conclusion

The Lima report, result of decades of ecumenical convergence, reflects eucharistic ecclesiology in a number of ways. At its heart is an explicit section on the ecclesiological meaning of the eucharist. Here the eucharist is seen as both constituting and manifesting the church. The celebration of the eucharist is regarded as the central event of each local church, which connects the local and the universal church to each other. The meaning of the eucharist transcends the borders of the church: the emergence of reconciled community celebrated in the eucharist has social and societal consequences.

Moreover, throughout the document there are indications of an ecclesiology behind the text. This underlying ecclesiology is based upon incorporation, participation and communion. It regards baptism as the entry into the eucharistic community, the eucharist as the central expression of the church, and—at least in one layer of the text—the ministry as emerging from the eucharistic celebration.

[124] Cf. *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, Commentary at M 26.

[125] *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, M 26-27, 32. Cf. *Episkopé and Episcopate in Ecumenical Perspective*, 6-7.

From the point of view of a liturgical ecclesiology it is remarkable to what an extent its convictions and aims are reflected in what is perhaps the most pivotal document of twentieth century ecumenical theological dialogue.

7.3 *CHURCH AND WORLD*

What is the relationship between the ecumenical commitment to visible ecclesial unity and the ecumenical commitment to witness and service in the world? The F&O document *Church and World* explores this connection. The result is a treatise in which a soteriology of communion is presented as the basis for reflection on both the church and the world. In this reflection, the eucharist receives a place of honour as the occasion at which both the being of the church and the renewal of the world are enacted.

7.3.1 A Soteriology of Communion

Church and World calls the church 'a sign and bearer of the Triune God's work towards the salvation and renewal of all humankind'.[126] The church and all humanity and all creation are to be renewed, that is, to 'transcend the limitations, ambiguities and destructive divisions of a world which is, theologically speaking, fallen'.[127] Humanity is 'created in the image of God, who has been revealed as a communion of love of the Father, of the Son and of the Holy Spirit. Men and women as images of the triune God are, therefore, intrinsically relational'.[128] However, 'God's judgment in the garden of Eden discloses a disruption in the relationships between humanity and the created order'.[129] Consequently, salvation must be the restoration of these relationships between God, humans and creation.[130] Both church and world are, thus, seen in the perspective of 'common origin' (creation in the image of God) and 'common goal' (the renewal of creation).[131]

The consummation of this renewal is the kingdom of God. As the Old Testament already proclaims, a 'restored community will come into being and peace, justice and harmony will be experienced'.[132] In the New Testament, the 'reality of the kingdom is embodied in the person and work of Jesus Christ, crucified and risen'.[133] Christ both 'embodies and exemplifies what he taught',

126 *Church and World*, I.7.
127 *Church and World*, I.9.
128 *Church and World*, V.34.
129 *Church and World*, II.30.
130 *Church and World*, II.27.
131 *Church and World*, III.1.
132 *Church and World*, II.4.
133 *Church and World*, II.6.

namely that the kingdom of God is at hand.[134] The proper reaction to this embodied and exemplified proclamation of the kingdom is willingness to repent and converse 'from a sinful, self-centered life to a life in community in accordance with God's will'.[135] God's kingdom will be 'the gift of radical newness and of all-embracing community'.[136] 'God's salvation is realized as love which essentially expresses itself in new community'.[137] Not incidentally, Scripture depicts the kingdom in communal images like a 'holy city', the 'new Jerusalem', a 'new heaven and a new earth'.[138]

In other words, the purpose God has in mind for the world is interpreted in terms of communion. The fallen, broken state of creation will be restored to a state of communion. The prospect of this restoration gives hope to those who are 'without power, sufficient material means, a voice in society'.[139] Communion, thus, implies the restoration of 'justice', 'peace' and 'joy'. These fundamental characteristics of the kingdom are, in this document, also expressed in terms of communion. Justice overcomes 'broken relationships, shattered dreams and personal guilt'.[140] Peace 'is not merely an absence of conflict, but a state of well-being and harmony in which all relationships are rightly ordered between God, humankind and creation'.[141] Joy is the ultimate promise of God. 'The church is a community of joy' and the breakthrough of God's kingdom will be the breakthrough of feasting.[142]

7.3.2 The Church

Church and World describes the church, the body of Christ, in terms of '*koinonia* (embracing the themes of community, communion, participation)'.[143] The church is the communion which participates in the trinitarian life of God and particularly, through the Spirit, in the paschal mystery of Jesus Christ.[144] As such, the church is a 'mystery' in the world and a 'sign' to the world.[145] A mystery, because the church is the communion of divine-human participation (*koinonia*). A sign, because this *koinonia*, proleptically experienced in the

134 *Church and World*, II.9.
135 *Church and World*, II.18.
136 *Church and World*, II.21.
137 *Church and World*, V.1; cf. 33.
138 *Church and World*, VII.5.
139 *Church and World*, II.21.
140 *Church and World*, II.24. The document particularly investigates the issue of justice related to the position of women in church and society (V) and the potentially oppressive use of language and of power (VI).
141 *Church and World*, II.27.
142 *Church and World*, II.33-35.
143 *Church and World*, III.44.
144 *Church and World*, III.2-6; cf. V.31; VI.1.
145 *Church and World*, I.7 and *passim*.

church as the 'firstfruits of the renewed human community', is ultimately meant to overflow into all humanity and all creation.[146]

If seen in this light, there is no competition between the need for visible ecclesial unity and the need for witness and service in the world. Both are part of the same movement from brokenness to communion.[147] In a communion ecclesiology, the nature of the church (being a communion) and the mission of the church (striving at communion) are integrated.[148] The renewal of the church, including its growth towards unity, is at the same time a contribution and witness to the renewal and unity of humanity at large.[149] The other way round, the church's service to the world—the struggle 'alongside those who suffer', the 'sharing of God's love'—leads the church to a deeper understanding of its own mystery of participation in the divine love.[150]

As a consequence, *Church and World* emphasises that ecclesial unity is imperfect as long as united churches remain divided over issues of social, political or sexual justice. 'Visible unity and the struggle for justice are closely related'.[151] Again, the document interprets justice not so much in individual terms ('giving each person his or her due'), but above all in terms of the right relationships between God and humans and between humans with one another (in the Bible '[j]ustice came to mean goodness as right relationships').[152] Respecting the divine initiative in the breakthrough of the kingdom, *Church and World* acknowledges that, 'in this broken and sinful world, "signs" of justice are ultimately all that Christians can expect'.[153] It is, nevertheless, the church's calling to 'live' (the church as a sign) its essence of being a reconciled community (the church as a mystery). In living such a life of reconciliation and communion, service to the world and proclamation of the gospel to the world will merge.[154] This begins, of course, within the church itself. The concrete living together of the sometimes very different members of the Christian community 'must be an expression of the new life in Christ and of his justice, thereby becoming a source of renewal of the human community'.[155]

7.3.3 The Eucharist

Throughout *Church and World* one focus recurs as an image of both ecclesial and wordwide communion: the eucharist. The eucharist is a foretaste of the

146 *Church and World*, III.5-6, 8, 10; cf. 16-42; IV.1.
147 *Church and World*, I.10.
148 *Church and World*, I.11; III.49.
149 *Church and World*, III.37, 42.
150 *Church and World*, III.38.
151 *Church and World*, IV.5; cf. 32.
152 *Church and World*, IV.7-8.
153 *Church and World*, IV.11; cf. VII.4.
154 *Church and World*, IV.20.
155 *Church and World*, IV.26-27; cf. V.8; VI.17, 23.

kingdom.[156] It makes present the hidden beginnings of the kingdom in the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ,[157] and it anticipates the kingdom's joy,[158] peace and justice.[159] The latter is particularly emphasised by this document: the eucharist, as common celebration and meal, is—or should be—a challenge to all forms of injustice.[160]

Church and World relates the eucharist especially to its main eschatological category: restored communion. Through Word and sacraments, the church is 'a community or communion (*koinonia*)' which 'participates in the communion of the Holy Trinity'.[161] The fact that the church is a eucharistic community has a bearing on both the church and humanity: the eucharistic identity of the church should encourage the churches to seek visible unity, and the communal character of the eucharist should encourage the churches to bann all forms of ecclesial and societal inequality and injustice. 'In its eucharistic communion Christ is the source and goal of the unity of the church and of the renewal of human community'.[162] The document takes the sacramental principle—'taking elements from creation and celebrating their being used and sanctified by God'—as an image of the 'restored relation between God and the cosmos as the new creation in Christ'.[163]

Citing a phrase from the WCC's Sixth Assembly (Vancouver, 1983), *Church and World* speaks of 'a eucharistic vision', embracing 'heaven and earth, God and world, spiritual and secular'.[164] This 'eucharistic vision', which corresponds to the trias 'worship—witness—service',[165] is thus summarised,

> In and through the eucharist the Christian community becomes a communion, a fellowship of hope in which, by the power of the Holy Spirit, renewal is experienced as reconciliation, peace and justice, which are to be realised in the community and its witness to the world.[166]

7.3.4 Conclusion

Church and World witnesses to the potential of communion and eucharistic ecclesiologies. In its effort to show the coherence and consistency between the

156 *Church and World*, III.7.
157 *Church and World*, V.4.
158 *Church and World*, II.34.
159 *Church and World*, VII.12.
160 *Church and World*, I.4; IV.31.
161 *Church and World*, III.44.
162 *Church and World*, III.47; cf. 50; IV.29, 31; VI.25.
163 *Church and World*, III.46.
164 *Church and World*, IV.31. This theme goes back to an address by Vitaly Borovoy at the Sixth Assembly; cf. D. GILL, *Gathered for Life: Official Report: VI Assembly World Council of Churches* (Geneva: WCC; Grand Rapids MI: Eerdmans, 1983), 25-26, 44-45.
165 *Church and World*, III.2, 51-56; cf. VII.14.
166 *Church and World*, VII.12.

two ecumenical emphases of visible ecclesial unity on the one hand, and witness and service in the world on the other, it applies a soteriology of communion as an overarching model. In this model, the eucharist serves as a focus both of ecclesial communion and of anticipation of the kingdom characterised by restored communion. Rooted in the trinitarian communion, and in communion with the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, the church and the world are destined to represent and become a fully restored communion of justice, peace and joy. The document summarises this as 'a eucharistic vision'.

7.4 *CONFESSING THE ONE FAITH*

The document *Confessing the One Faith* is a stage in F&O's study project 'Towards the Common Expression of the Apostolic Faith today'. Launced at Lima in 1982, the project is an aspect of F&O's work towards visible unity between the churches, for 'Christians cannot be truly united unless they recognize in each other the same apostolic faith, which is witnessed in word and in life'.[167] After two provisional documents, *Confessing the One Faith* is this project's first text officially presented to the churches. According to its sub-title, it is *An Ecumenical Explication of the Apostolic Faith as it is Confessed in the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed (381)*. In the context of this study only its chapter on the 'One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church' will be investigated.[168]

7.4.1 The Body of Christ: Eucharistic and Ecclesial

The document concentrates on the 'body of Christ' model, because, among the 'several images' used by the New Testament, '[p]articular attention [...] has been given' to this model.[169] The church as the body of Christ

> is more than an image because the term refers to the fundamental reality of the participation in the body of Christ in the eucharist as constitutive, through the Spirit, of the communion (koinonia) among all those who partake in the Lord's supper.[170]

167 J.-M.R. TILLARD, 'Introduction', in: *Confessing the One Faith*, vii-viii, at viii.

168 *Confessing the One Faith*, III.216-241.

169 *Confessing the One Faith*, III.221. The reference is probably to the centrality of this model in the history of ecclesiology.

170 *Confessing the One Faith*, III.221. Reference is made to 1 Corinthians 10:16-17 and 11:23-30. The quotation continues: 'Wherever in the Pauline literature the expression *Body of Christ* occurs, this profound association is implied', with reference to Romans 12:4-5, 1 Corinthians 12:12-27 and Ephesians 1:22-23.

Needless to say that this short ecumenical ecclesiological text is deeply rooted in communion—particularly eucharistic—ecclesiology. The church, built upon Jesus Christ's proclamation of the kingdom and his death and resurrection, and empowered by the Spirit at Pentecost, 'became manifest in the meals Jesus celebrated, especially in his last supper'.[171] '[T]hrough faith in Christ and the one baptism' one enters into 'communion with Christ and, through him, with one another', in order to live 'a life nourished by the word of God and the eucharist'.[172] 'The life and unity of the Church are grounded in the communion of the Trinity',[173] and this communion/community 'finds its full manifestation wherever people are gathered together by word and sacrament'.[174]

According to this document, the 'body of Christ' model 'underlines the basic importance of his incarnation, passion and resurrection (his bodiliness) for the salvation of the world'. The text immediately connects this importance of Christ's bodiliness for the process of salvation to 'the constitutive role of the sacraments'. Baptism 'integrates human beings into the body of Christ' and the eucharist 'constantly renews the life of believers within the Body of Christ'. But not only the communion of the church, also the restored communion throughout humanity and creation is connected to the eucharist (or perhaps to the church, understood eucharistically):

> The veritable fruit of salvation, *communion*, renewed and re-established between God and humankind, between humans and the world of creation, is brought about and is manifested by the holy mystery of the Body of Christ.[175]

7.4.2 Leitourgia and Diakonia

The world-wide meaning of church and eucharist is furthered by the affirmation of 'the inter-relatedness and unity of "leitourgia" and "diakonia"'.[176] The common 'partaking of the same divine gift',[177] namely the communion with and in Christ, should lead to the sharing of this gift. The church as 'prefiguration of the kingdom', which is 'expresse[d] most vigorously in its liturgy',[178] should lead to mission and service. 'In proclaiming the word of God and celebrating the sacraments, the Church does not only exist for itself, but also for the world God desires'.[179]

171 *Confessing the One Faith*, III.222.
172 *Confessing the One Faith*, III.224.
173 *Confessing the One Faith*, III.225.
174 *Confessing the One Faith*, III.226.
175 *Confessing the One Faith*, III.227.
176 *Confessing the One Faith*, III.230.
177 *Confessing the One Faith*, III.231.
178 *Confessing the One Faith*, III.233.
179 *Confessing the One Faith*, III.236.

For this connection between *leitourgia* and *diakonia*, the document borrows the terms 'mystery' and 'prophetic sign' from *Church and World*, the publication discussed above.[180] The document also relates this connection to the church's 'holiness' mentioned by the creed. The church is 'holy because of the holy words it proclaims and the holy acts it performs'. This is, again, not a holiness for its own sake, but a holiness to be spread throughout the world through witness and service.[181] As one paragraph summarises:

> The Church is the community of those whom Christ receives at his table and who give thanks to the Triune God in worship and service. It receives the Word of God and celebrates the sacraments, especially the eucharist (Lord's Supper) which was instituted by Jesus Christ himself. It is called to praise God for all his creation, to worship and pray on behalf of itself and the world. It is called to serve all people in the name of Jesus.[182]

7.4.3 The Local Church

Notwithstanding its brevity, the ecclesiological section of *Confessing the One Faith* also contains some lapidary thought on the relation between the local and the universal church. Through the eucharistic emphasis, the church is presented as a local church in communion with all other local churches.

> Each local church is authentically the Church of God, when all it preaches, celebrates and does is in communion with all that the churches in communion with the apostles preached, celebrated and did, and with all that the churches here and now are preaching, celebrating and doing in communion with the apostles and under the apostolic gospel. In this way the universal Church consists in the communion of local churches.[183]

The document insists on the reciprocity of locality and universality, or rather, locality and communion. 'In each local church the fullness of grace and truth is present', but this statement is immediatly qualified by the remark that this 'requires the communion of all local churches'. In other words, the local church can only be regarded as the catholic church if it is in communion with the other local churches. The text explicitly says that this communion with the other local churches 'pertains to the identity of each local church' and that it 'constitutes an essential quality of their communion together'.[184] This can be regarded as a balanced ecclesiology of the local church, because, although the

180 *Confessing the One Faith*, III.236; commentary at III.216.
181 *Confessing the One Faith*, III.239.
182 *Confessing the One Faith*, III.229. Reference is made to Matthew 25:31ff.
183 *Confessing the One Faith*, III.226; cf. 228.
184 *Confessing the One Faith*, 240.

local (not the universal) church is taken as the primary ecclesiological unit,[185] the communion between the local churches is interpreted as of intrinsic relevance to the identity of each local church.

7.4.4 Conclusion

The ecclesiological thought in *Confessing the One Faith* proves to be consistent with F&O's ecclesiological project. It is deeply rooted in communion ecclesiology and has a strong eucharistic focus. At the same time, it takes up *Church and World*'s emphasis on the interdependence of worship, witness and service. Finally, it contains a balanced view on the relationship between the fundamentally local character of the church and the—intrinsically necessary—communion between the local churches.

7.5 *TOWARDS KOINONIA IN FAITH, LIFE AND WITNESS*

7.5.1 Koinonia

The text *Towards Koinonia in Faith, Life and Witness* was presented as a 'discussion paper' to F&O's Fifth World Conference (Santiago de Compostela, 1993). As the preface says,

> In this paper we have summarized the fruits of past Faith and Order work, insights of bilateral dialogues, results from other areas of work in the World Council as well as our experiences of a growing life together.[186]

The three documents to which the preface refers as providing the context for this paper, are the three documents presented above: *BEM*, *Church and World* and *Confessing the One Faith*. Thus, *Towards Koinonia in Faith, Life and Witness* can be regarded as the next step in the sequence of ecclesiologically relevant F&O texts.

Towards Koinonia in Faith, Life and Witness elaborates the thought which was expressed two years before in the 'Canberra Statement', a short text called *The Unity of the Church as Koinonia: Gift and Calling*, in which the WCC's Seventh Assembly (Canberra, 1991) pronounced its common understanding of

[185] The document does not specify which unit (e.g. diocesan or parochial) is meant by the 'local church'. Neither does it specify the kind of ministry it envisages when it speaks of ministry under the heading of 'apostolicity'. It does, however, consider the 'apostolic succession of ministry' as 'a part and sign' of the 'apostolic tradition' (*Confessing the One Faith*, commentary at III.241).

[186] *Towards Koinonia in Faith, Life and Witness*, Preface.

unity in terms of *koinonia*.[187] *Towards Koinonia in Faith, Life and Witness* can, therefore, be read as a compilation of everything F&O understands by the term *koinonia*. It applies the term to the fields already encountered in the previous documents—a biblical and theological soteriology (part I), 'faith' (part II), 'life' in the church (part III) and 'witness' through *diakonia* and mission (part IV).[188]

7.5.2 Faith

The document explains why the notion of *koinonia* is so helpful for ecumenical and intra-denominational agreement on the understanding of the church. The reason is, it says, that the whole Christian faith—the whole Christian view on soteriology—is best described in terms of *koinonia*. *Koinonia*—comprising the meanings of 'participation, partaking, sharing, fellowship, community'—refers to God's own trinitarian being, to the reconciliation between God and humanity in Christ, and to the relationships of humans among each other and of humans with creation.[189]

The Christian faith is intimately connected to the concept of *koinonia*. 'For faith in the biblical sense does not only mean a certain content as is entailed in the Creed, but it means an existential act of the human person: living in communion with God'.[190] The history of salvation in the Old and New Testaments and in the church can be interpreted as God's desire to restore '*shalom*', 'harmony', 'love', 'unity', 'common life', that is, *koinonia*.[191]

7.5.3 Life

'The Church is the foretaste of this communion with God and with one another.'[192] Although the document does not deny the presence of Christ outside the church, it emphasises that the church is the realm in which 'the Holy Spirit realizes this communion (koinonia)'.[193] The church's communion with God and one another, including its 'commitment to humanity and creation', is the concrete way in which *koinonia* is—though provisionally—already lived, experienced and shared.[194] Taking up the terms 'mystery' and 'prophetic sign',

187 Cf. 'The Unity of the Church as Koinonia: Gift and Calling', in: M. Kinnamon (ed.), *Signs of the Spirit: Official Report of the Seventh Assembly of the World Council of Churches* (Geneva: WCC; Grand Rapids MI: Eerdmans, 1991), 172-174. Integrally incorporated into *Towards Koinonia in Faith, Life and Witness* as para 18.

188 Cf. *Towards Koinonia in Faith, Life and Witness*, 19-20.

189 *Towards Koinonia in Faith, Life and Witness*, 21; cf. 28, 30, 45, 47, 64.

190 *Towards Koinonia in Faith, Life and Witness*, 22.

191 *Towards Koinonia in Faith, Life and Witness*, 21-36.

192 *Towards Koinonia in Faith, Life and Witness*, 18 (= 'The Unity of the Church as Koinonia: Gift and Calling').

193 *Towards Koinonia in Faith, Life and Witness*, 34.

194 *Towards Koinonia in Faith, Life and Witness*, 37.

this document says *both* that the church (as mystery) already participates in the salvific *koinonia* with Christ and the Trinity—it 'announces and anticipates the Kingdom already present in Christ'—*and* that the church (as prophetic sign) points beyond its provisional self towards the kingdom, so that both church and world are 'judged by the values of the Kingdom'.[195] The eschatological *koinonia* is, thus, on the one hand already *lived* by and through the church, while it is on the other hand still to be *proclaimed* by and to the church.[196]

This document links the term *koinonia* to the term 'body of Christ', because, it says, the *koinonia* between Christ and his people is intimately expressed by the notion of incorporation into Christ.

> Those who are *baptized* into Christ become one with him and with one another. Hearing the *word* of God together in faith and partaking in the *Lord's Supper*, they share in him and receive the gift of koinonia; they become one body in him.[197]

The church's *koinonia* is 'manifested and sustained by the eucharist'.[198] This is the case, the document says, because the essence of a sacrament is not only to make Christ *present*, but also to make possible our '*participation* in the reality which is a transforming power for the journey of God's people'.[199] The document welcomes the growing ecumenical convergence as to the centrality of baptism and the eucharist in the life of the church.[200] At the same time, it deplores the seemingly unbridgeable gulf between those who regard eucharistic communion as the expression of 'full agreement and communion in faith and life' and those who regard it as 'a legitimate expression of the partial communion we already share'.[201] The document understands this dissensus as

195 *Towards Koinonia in Faith, Life and Witness*, 83-84.

196 Cf. *Towards Koinonia in Faith, Life and Witness*, 64, 82.

197 *Towards Koinonia in Faith, Life and Witness*, 31, with reference to Romans 6:4-11 and 1 Corinthians 10:16-17; 11:17-26; 12:13.

198 *Towards Koinonia in Faith, Life and Witness*, 34.

199 *Towards Koinonia in Faith, Life and Witness*, 65, emphasis added.

200 *Towards Koinonia in Faith, Life and Witness*, 66. In para 69, the document summarises the ecumenical convergence on eucharistic theology as follows, 'It is acknowledged by all that in the Lord's Supper we celebrate the death and resurrection of Christ present in our midst, we are united to Christ, we proclaim the word, we offer thanksgiving to God for creation, redemption and sanctification, we pray for the gift of the Holy Spirit, we receive forgiveness of sins, invoke the Holy Spirit, are brought together as a reconciled and reconciling community and celebrate this meal in the expectation of a new heaven and a new earth.' The remaining disagreements relate to the sacrificial character of the eucharist, for which the solution should be sought in the relationship between *anamnesis* and *epiclesis* (69), and the still dividing issue of the ordained ministry (71), for which—interestingly in the context of this study—the solution should be sought in 'the relation between presidency of the eucharist and ordained ministry' (72).

201 *Towards Koinonia in Faith, Life and Witness*, 67.

an encouragement to continue with full vigour the work for visible ecclesial unity.[202]

7.5.4 Witness

The *koinonia* of the Christian faith, proleptically lived in the *koinonia* of the church, is to be shared with humanity and all creation. 'The calling of the Church is to proclaim reconciliation and provide healing, to overcome divisions based on race, gender, age, culture, colour and to bring all people in communion with God.'[203] The themes of *diakona* already encountered in *Church and World*—justice, peace, compassion, 'sharing in one another's joys, sorrows and sufferings', the 'care for the poor, needy and marginalized', the 'struggle for truth', 'responsible stewardship of creation'—are recalled here as elements of *koinonia*.[204] The document explicitly denies an individualistic interpretation of salvation: 'communion with God' is not only a 'personal relation with God', it rather implies community, humanity and creation.[205]

In addition to *diakonia*, the sharing of *koinonia* also includes *martyria*. The church has to 'witness' and to 'embody' what the kingdom is about. This is a process of conversion from sin, a process of transformation towards renewal—in personal life, in the church and in society.[206] The document mentions some ecumenical disagreement as to the balance between 'service' and 'mission'. Although the text itself has a tendency towards serving the world in view of the coming kingdom—a tendency not inconsistent with an emphasis on *koinonia*—it nevertheless invites the churches to balance this service by attention to personal conversion:

> There are those who see the task of mission in terms of transforming society so that it increasingly reflects the will of God for humanity. Those who take such a view are urged not to ignore the transformation of individuals through personal conversion. Others, however, see the primary task as the proclamation of God's love in Christ for the salvation of individuals. Those who take such a view are urged not to ignore inhuman conditions and unjust social structures.[207]

The text continues with its emphasis on the transformation of society in terms of *koinonia*. In this context, the document is realistic enough to address the fact that Christians often take different ethical and political views. It

202 *Towards Koinonia in Faith, Life and Witness*, 68.
203 *Towards Koinonia in Faith, Life and Witness*, 18 (= 'The Unity of the Church as Koinonia: Gift and Calling').
204 *Towards Koinonia in Faith, Life and Witness*, 33; cf. 48, 50.
205 *Towards Koinonia in Faith, Life and Witness*, 41; cf. 107.
206 *Towards Koinonia in Faith, Life and Witness*, 82-87.
207 *Towards Koinonia in Faith, Life and Witness*, 89.

welcomes 'tolerable' 'ethical diversity',[208] but it nevertheless gives some guidelines which, the document claims, emerge from its fundamental principle of *koinonia*:

> While Christians, both individually and as churches do not always reach the same solutions to some of the ethical problems facing human communities, they do have values, the values of the Kingdom, to guide them. These include for example: the sanctity of life; the dignity and equality of all human beings created in God's image and redeemed by Christ; the responsibility to create and develop patterns of life in which justice, peace and respect for all creation can flourish. These values have their origin in our understanding of God's love and express aspects of the authentic communion between God and humanity.[209]

7.5.5 Conclusion

Towards Koinonia in Faith, Life and Witness brings together many themes already encountered throughout this study and in this chapter, and incorporates them in the overarching concept of *koinonia*. In this 'holistic' approach, the church and the eucharist have their natural place.

The document takes a realistic stance as to some divergences among Christians, concerning the relationship between service and mission, and concerning their sometimes different ethical views. It tries to balance these differences within the concept of *koinonia*, giving priority to the communal aspects and societal consequences of the Christian faith.

The document summarises its view on faith, the church, the sacraments, humanity and creation as follows—

> The unity of the Church to which we are called is a koinonia given and expressed in the common confession of apostolic faith; a common sacramental life entered by the one baptism and celebrated together in one eucharistic fellowship; a common life in which members and ministries are mutually recognized and reconciled; and a common mission witnessing to all people to the Gospel of God's grace and serving the whole of creation.[210]

7.6 *THE NATURE AND MISSION OF THE CHURCH*

The most recent stage of F&O's ecclesiological project[211] is reflected by a text that aims at becoming a common ecclesiological statement: *The Nature and*

208 *Towards Koinonia in Faith, Life and Witness*, 103.
209 *Towards Koinonia in Faith, Life and Witness*, 101.
210 *Towards Koinonia in Faith, Life and Witness*, 18 (= 'The Unity of the Church as Koinonia: Gift and Calling').
211 Cf. paragraph 7.1.8.

Mission of the Church.[212] It consists of four parts. First, a biblical and theological treatise on the church ('The Church of the Triune God', paras 9-47). Second, a confrontation of this biblical-theological ecclesiology with the empirical problems of sin, diversity and broken communion ('The Church in History', paras 48-66). Third, an investigation into the main ecumenical ecclesiological themes—faith, baptism, eucharist and ministry ('The Life of Communion in and for the World', paras 67-108). Fourth, an exposition of the moral and social consequences of a common faith ('In and for the World', paras 109-118).

7.6.1 A Communion Ecclesiology

The document sets out as a treatise on communion ecclesiology. This first part most clearly reflects that, as its introduction indicates, the document is to be read as a next step in the sequence of the documents discussed above—*BEM*, *Church and World*, *Confessing the One Faith* and *Towards Koinonia in Faith, Life and Witness*.[213]

The church is defined as the church of the trinitarian God. It is 'grounded in the Word of God', which is interpreted in a threefold way—first, Jesus Christ, the incarnate Word of God; second, the Word of God spoken through salvation history and 'recorded in the scriptures'; third, the Word of God 'as heard and proclaimed in the preaching, witness and action of the Church', 'in preaching, in Sacraments, and in service'.[214] The church, thus 'called forth by the Word of God' (*creatura verbi*), is simultaneously 'brought about by the action of the Holy Spirit' (*creatura spiritus*). The document presents an integrated understanding of christology and pneumatology: 'the Word and the Spirit are inseparable', because Christ's life and work were wrought by the Spirit and, likewise, the church's embodiment into Christ is the work of the Spirit.[215] This trinitarian foundation of the church leads the document to affirm the basic notion of a communion ecclesiology:

> The Church is not merely the sum of individual believers in communion with God, nor primarily the mutual communion of individual believers among themselves. It is their common partaking in the life of God, who as Trinity, is the source and focus of all communion.[216]

[212] An earlier version was published as *The Nature and Purpose of the Church: A Stage on the Way to a Common Statement* (Geneva: WCC, 1998).
[213] *The Nature and Mission of the Church*, 2-3.
[214] *The Nature and Mission of the Church*, 10.
[215] *The Nature and Mission of the Church*, 11; cf. 21.
[216] *The Nature and Mission of the Church*, 13, with reference to 2 Peter 1:4.

> The Church is one, because God is the one creator and redeemer, who binds the Church to himself by Word and Spirit and makes it a foretaste and instrument for the redemption of all created reality.[217]

Following the trinitarian approach, four biblical terms are chosen as key ecclesiological 'images and insights'—people of God, body of Christ, temple of the Spirit and *koinonia*. In the exploration of these themes, the document continues its understanding of the church in terms of communion. As the covenant people of God, Israel and the church are connected to God in 'a relationship of communion'.[218] As the body of Christ, the church is described in terms of incorporation and participation in Christ through the Spirit.[219] As the temple of the Spirit, the church is the place of the Spirit's 'indwelling'.[220] And, of course, the choice of the very word *koinonia* as an ecclesiological key term witnesses to this document's affinity to communion ecclesiology:

> The biblical notion of koinonia has become central in the quest for a common understanding of the nature of the Church and its visible unity. The term koinonia (communion, participation, fellowship, sharing) is found not only in the New Testament but also in later periods, especially in patristic and Reformation writings which describe the Church. Although in some periods the term largely fell out of use, it is being reclaimed today as a key to understanding the nature and mission of the Church.[221]

Salvation history is described in terms of communion. Regarding creation: 'the whole of creation has its integrity in koinonia with God'. Regarding sin: 'Sin damages the relationship between God, human beings and the created order'. Regarding salvation: 'The dynamic history of God's restoring and increasing koinonia reaches its culmination and fulfilment in the perfect communion of a new heaven and a new earth established by Jesus Christ'. The document claims that most biblical images which could be related to the church, reflect some aspect of 'the relationship of God's people to God, to one another and to the created order', so that one could say that '[t]he term koinonia expresses the reality to which these images refer'.[222]

Consistent with such a communion ecclesiology, baptism ('faith and baptism') and the eucharist have, in this part of the document, a constitutive place:

217 *The Nature and Mission of the Church*, 12, with reference to John 17:11 and Ephesians 4:1-6.
218 *The Nature and Mission of the Church*, 18.
219 *The Nature and Mission of the Church*, 21.
220 *The Nature and Mission of the Church*, 22.
221 *The Nature and Mission of the Church*, 24; cf. 28.
222 *The Nature and Mission of the Church*, 25-27; cf. 29-30.

> The Spirit incorporates human beings into the body of Christ through faith and baptism, enlivens and strengthens them as the body of Christ nourished and sustained in the Lord's Supper, and leads them to the full accomplishment of their vocation.[223]

> It is through faith and baptism that human beings become members of Christ in the Holy Spirit. Through the Lord's Supper their participation in this body is renewed again and again.[224]

7.6.2 Mission: Individual and Societal

Already in this first part of *The Nature and Mission of the Church* there is, however, a tendency towards an understanding of the church which is different from the communion ecclesiology, with its eucharistic overtones, dominant in the previously discussed documents. This tendency is reflected in the difference between the place of the eucharist in the sections just quoted, and the place of the eucharist in other sections of the document. In the sections just quoted, baptism ('faith and baptism') and the eucharist play a constitutive ecclesiological role. In other sections, however, this constitutive role is only attributed to 'faith and baptism', while the eucharist is assigned a secondary place as one of many elements of ecclesial life. An example—

> It is only by virtue of God's gift of grace through Jesus Christ that deep, lasting communion is made possible; *by faith and baptism, persons participate in* the mystery of Christ's death, burial and resurrection. [...] *Visible and tangible signs of the new life of communion* are expressed in [1] receiving and sharing the faith of the apostles; *[2] breaking and sharing the Eucharistic bread;* [3] praying with and for one another and for the needs of the world; [4] serving one another in love; [5] participating in each other's joys and sorrows; [6] giving material aid; [7] proclaiming and witnessing to the good news in mission and working together for justice and peace.[225]

The ecclesiologically constitutive element (the element which makes people to 'participate in') is reduced here to 'faith and baptism', whereas the eucharist is listed among seven aspects of the church's life without a constitutive role (they are signs and expressions).

Moreover, in a section inserted into this version of the document,[226] the 'Mission of the Church' is described in nine paragraphs, without one single reference to the eucharist.[227] Here we encounter an aspect of *The Nature and*

223 *The Nature and Mission of the Church*, 11.
224 *The Nature and Mission of the Church*, 21, with reference to 1 Corinthians 10:16; 12:3-13.
225 *The Nature and Mission of the Church*, 31-32 (emphasis and numbers added); cf. 28.
226 As compared to *The Nature and Purpose of the Church*.
227 *The Nature and Mission of the Church*, 34-42.

Mission of the Church which is described in its introduction and which indicates a deviation from the style and contents of the earlier documents. After an affirmation of the ecumenical *koinonia* ecclesiology of the last decades,[228] the introduction inserts a paragraph on 'mission, which is one of [the] guiding themes of this study'.[229] This theme has been inserted into the document, because many of the responses from the churches to an earlier version of this text—*The Nature and Purpose of the Church*—expressed the wish 'to strengthen the text's emphasis on mission'. This new version—*The Nature and Mission of the Church*—has tried to do so 'both in title and in content'.[230] The way this is done, is by reconciling (aspects of) ecumenical *koinonia* ecclesiology with an understanding of mission that is more directed towards the conversion of individuals than in any of the documents presented above.[231]

The central and constitutive place of the eucharist within F&O's communion ecclesiology seems not to have survived this translation in terms of (this understanding of) mission.[232] Mission in terms of the conversion of individuals to Christ is reconciled by this document, on the one hand, to some aspects of *koinonia* ecclesiology (but not the eucharistic aspect) and, on the other hand, to the ecumenical understanding of mission in more social and societal ways.[233] By this double 'reconciliation', the latter understanding of mission has, in this document, lost its eucharistic overtones,[234] which must be evaluated as a loss for the theology of both *eucharistia* and *diakonia*. The question remains whether the understanding of mission in terms of the conversion of individuals to Christ could, through creative theological thinking, be more fully integrated into the perspective of a eucharistic ecclesiology.

7.6.3 Soteriology: Personal and Corporate

A feature of *The Nature and Mission of the Church* not unrelated to the increased emphasis on an individual understanding of mission is its tendency to

228 *The Nature and Mission of the Church*, 1-3 (a revision of *The Nature and Purpose of the Church*, 1-3).

229 *The Nature and Mission of the Church*, 4 (not in *The Nature and Purpose of the Church*).

230 *The Nature and Mission of the Church*, 7.

231 Cf. *The Nature and Mission of the Church*, 35, 37, 41, 46, 110, and above, paragraph 7.5.4. It is also worthwile to mention the change from 'ethics' to 'morals' in this document (cf. 35, 59, 80, 83, 113, 114, 116).

232 This does not mean that a constitutive understanding of the eucharist has completely disappeared from this document, but that the paragraphs especially devoted to this 'translation' (most explicitly 34-42 and 109-118) do not include the eucharistic-ecclesiological aspect.

233 Cf. *The Nature and Mission of the Church*, 34-42, 57, 85, 109-118.

234 Not only in the section 'The Mission of the Church' (34-42), but also in the chapter 'In and for the World' (109-118), the eucharist is completely absent (if I do not count the rather general reference to 'the Sacraments' in 116). Happily, the other way round, the short section on the eucharist (78-81) has not completely lost its societal overtones (81).

describe Christians and the church in individual (or personal) rather than communal (or corporate) terms.[235] After the fundamentally corporate language of the beginning of the document,[236] the text is interspersed with formulations from a different theological origin. A particularly interesting example of this is the phrase that the church is 'the communion of all believers held in personal relationship with God by God himself'.[237] Apparently, the fundamental soteriology and ecclesiology of communion has to be reconciled with an understanding of soteriology and ecclesiology which is rather centred on the individual relationship between God and the believer. It could be questioned, however, whether a phrase like this helps much to clear the relationship between the personal and corporate aspects of Christian soteriology.[238]

An important aspect of the tension between personal faith and corporate ecclesiality is the document's reference to

> the sometimes widespread discrepancy between membership in the church, on the one hand, and vibrant profession and practice of the Christian faith, on the other. Many of our communities face the challenge that some of their members seem to 'belong without believing', while other individuals opt out of Church membership, claiming that they can, with greater authenticity, 'believe without belonging'.[239]

Interestingly, the document does not work this out in terms of, for example, concentrical circles around the presence of Christ in this world—in eucharistic-ecclesiological terms: concentrical circles around the eucharistic centre—but seems to tend towards an either/or stance when it comes to both 'believing' and 'belonging'.

7.6.4 The Eucharist

The insertion of individual/personal elements into the communal/corporate ecumenical language continues in the sections on baptism and the eucharist.[240]

235 The document itself uses the words 'individual' and 'communal' for instance in para 54.

236 Cf. paragraph 7.6.1.

237 *The Nature and Mission of the Church*, 49; cf. 109. In *The Nature and Purpose of the Church*, this formulation (36) even referred to a similar phrase at the very beginning of the document: 'The Church is the communion of those who live in a personal relationship with God' (10). This latter phrase has disappeared from *The Nature and Mission of the Church.*

238 Cf., e.g., Zizioulas's understanding of the interrelatedness of personal and corporate in paragraph 2.3.5.

239 *The Nature and Mission of the Church*, 51.

240 It should be mentioned that, 23 years after *BEM*, the ecumenical questions in the margin of the sections on baptism and the eucharist are largely the same and perhaps even more pressing through increasing 'Evangelical' influence in worldwide ecumenism. In this light, but not only in this, it is telling that the document speaks of a 're-confessionalism', an 'anti-ecumenical spirit' and of 'non-reception' of ecumenical theology, convergence and consensus (*The Nature and Mission of the Church*, 121).

On the one hand, baptism is a 'celebration' of 'participation' and 'incorporation', an entering 'into the koinonia of Christ's Body' and an 'anticipation' of the eschatological 'participation in the divine nature', by which the baptised are called to 'engagement in the struggle for the dignity of all who suffer';[241] on the other it is a stage in the 'life-long growth into Christ' of 'the believer'.[242]

Regarding the ecclesial character of the eucharist, the document can say, on the one hand, that the eucharist is 'the Sacrament which builds up community' and that it implies a challenge to 'all kinds of injustice, racism, estrangement, and lack of freedom',[243] but on the other it is no more than a 'focus' and 'expression' of the communion established by baptism.[244] These terms could, of course, be read in a eucharistic-ecclesiological sense, but such a reading would hardly be compatible with their context. Compared to earlier documents, the summary of characteristics of the eucharist is rather weak, as is particularly the case in view of the anamnesis: 'a memorial of the death and resurrection of Christ Jesus and what was accomplished once for all on the Cross'.[245] Even a full quotation of 1 Corinthians 10:16-17 does not lead the document beyond the observation that 'Paul highlights the connection between the Lord's Supper and the nature of the Church'.[246]

7.6.5 The Ordained Ministry

The previously discussed document, *Towards Koinonia in Faith, Life and Witness*, pointed to a eucharistic-ecclesiological direction for a future solution out of the ecumenical deadlock regarding the ordained ministry.[247] Nevertheless, *The Nature and Mission of the Church*, although granting ordained ministers 'a special responsibility for the ministry of Word and Sacrament',[248] does not work this out in terms of liturgically presiding over the celebration of the community with all its charisms, but in terms of leadership and guidance.[249] This is especially true of the ministerial function of 'oversight' or 'episkopé', which is called 'a ministry of leadership' and 'a ministry of co-

241 *The Nature and Mission of the Church*, 75, 77 (a revision of *The Nature and Purpose of the Church*, 76-77).
242 *The Nature and Mission of the Church*, 76 (not in *The Nature and Purpose of the Church*).
243 *The Nature and Mission of the Church*, 81.
244 *The Nature and Mission of the Church*, 78 ('Communion established in baptism is focused and brought to expression in the Eucharist').
245 *The Nature and Mission of the Church*, 79.
246 *The Nature and Mission of the Church*, 80.
247 *Towards Koinonia in Faith, Life and Witness*, 72 ('A way to overcome these differences would be to explore at greater theological depth the relation between presidency of the eucharist and ordained ministry').
248 *The Nature and Mission of the Church*, 86.
249 *The Nature and Mission of the Church*, 88.

ordination' and is described in terms of 'leadership, consultation, discernment, and decision-making'.[250]

Could this complete absence of a celebratory, liturgical, eucharistic characterisation of ministry[251] be the result of the abstraction of the *episkopos* into the concept of *episkope*? Ecumenically helpful as it has been to recognise (from *BEM* onwards) the presence of *episkope* in 'episcopal' and 'non-episcopal' churches alike,[252] this document shows a tendency to rely on *episkope* as an abstract principle, of which the 'personal embodiment in the individual bishops' becomes a matter of second importance.[253] While *BEM* offered a more or less concrete type of ministry (an ecumenical *relecture* of bishop, presbyter and deacon) to the churches as a possible means of realising personal, collegial and communal *episkope*,[254] this document returns to a kind of 'comparative ecclesiology' in which it is stated that 'some' have this and 'others' have that kind of ministry.[255]

Finally, *The Nature and Mission of the Church* includes a section on regional and universal primacy. The document interprets such a primacy as a ministry of presiding over gatherings and over decision processes towards consensus. Such a primacy is, thus, 'not opposed to conciliarity'.[256] The text welcomes John Paul II's encyclical *Ut unum sint*, in which he invited to an ecumenical dialogue concerning his primatial office. In this light, *The Nature and Mission of the Church* observes 'an increasing openness to discuss a universal ministry in support of mission and unity of the church and agreement that any such personal ministry would need to be exercised in communal and collegial ways'.[257]

7.6.6 Conclusion

Compared to the documents previously discussed, *The Nature and Mission of the Church* seems a rather ambivalent text. On the one hand, it continues F&O's

250 *The Nature and Mission of the Church*, 90, 97.

251 Other than in general phrases like 'Word and Sacrament', the eucharist is not encountered in the sections on the ordained ministry, *episkope*, conciliarity and primacy (86-104). Twice, baptism is mentioned as the foundation of the church (96, 99). The only exception is the fully eucharistic-ecclesiological phrase, 'In the local Eucharistic community, conciliarity is the profound unity in love and truth between the members among themselves and with their presiding minister' (99). Both in content and in style, this sentence is a complete *Fremdkörper* in the sequence of the paras 86-104 (it is, for example, not connected to para 101 which speaks about the presidency of synods).

252 *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, M 21, 23, 53; Commentary at M 14; the concept was prepared by *Episkopé and Episcopate in Ecumenical Perspective*.

253 *The Nature and Mission of the Church*, 92.

254 Cf. paragraph 7.2.4.

255 Cf. *The Nature and Mission of the Church*, 87, 93.

256 *The Nature and Mission of the Church*, 101-102.

257 *The Nature and Mission of the Church*, 104.

affiliation with communion ecclesiology. The fact that individual emphases on soteriology and mission—probably coming from an Evangelical direction—are included into a communion ecclesiology is to be welcomed, although this has, in this document, not yet led to a coherent merge. From the perspective of a liturgical or eucharistic ecclesiology it must be deplored that *The Nature and Mission of the Church*, so obviously struggling with the incorporation of missionary thrusts and personal (individual) theology into a *koinonia* model, has overlooked, or deliberately laid aside, the eucharistic elements of a *koinonia* ecclesiology. Mere reference to the eucharist or the sacraments is something else than giving the eucharist—in the context of God's ways with the world towards *koinonia* in church, humanity and creation—the central and constitutive place it had in earlier documents.

The WCC's Ninth Assembly (Porto Alegre, 2006) adopted an ecclesiological statement—*Called to be the One Church*—that is largely a summary of *The Nature and Mission of the Church*. In *Called to be the One Church*, the ecumenical movement seems to endorse the emphasis on baptism rather than the eucharist, the openness to an individual concept of salvation and the commitment to mission in terms of the conversion of individuals.[258] May these two documents be seen as an intermediate state in which ecumenically helpful elements of Evangelical Protestantism—personal faith, missionary vigour—still await their consistent integration into the ecumenical movement's communion ecclesiology, including its eucharistic focus?

7.7 THE ANGLICAN—ROMAN CATHOLIC DIALOGUE

As indicated in the introduction to this chapter,[259] the quest for contributions to a liturgical ecclesiology from ecumenical texts is now continued by reference to the results of two bilateral dialogues: Anglican—Roman Catholic and Orthodox—Old Catholic. The latter has resulted in a set of comprised texts, which will be examined in the next section. The former, to which this section is devoted, has resulted in a considerable corpus of documents. The set of shorter documents produced by ARCIC I was published together as the *Final Report* in 1981. Subsequently, ARCIC II has produced a number of longer texts. The following exposition of liturgical ecclesiology in ARCIC's texts builds upon the *Final Report* and adds material from the later documents.

258 'Text on Ecclesiology: Called to be the One Church', *passim* (= paras 1-15).
259 Cf. paragraph 7.1.7.

7.7.1 Communion Ecclesiology

The introduction to the *Final Report* says programmatically, 'Fundamental to all our Statements is the concept of *koinonia* (communion)'. This concept is related to 'the Church's experience as a partaking in the salvation of Christ'; 'the emphasis is upon the relationships among [the Church's] members as well as upon their relationship with Christ the Head'.[260]

In its turn, this ecclesiological *koinonia* is based upon a soteriological *koinonia*: 'Union with God in Christ Jesus through the Spirit is the heart of Christian *koinonia*'. This koinonia is to be understood as 'a relation between persons resulting from their participation in one and the same reality':

> The Son of God has taken to himself our human nature, and he has sent upon us his Spirit, who makes us so truly members of the body of Christ that we too are able to call God 'Abba, Father' [...]. Moreover, sharing in the same Holy Spirit, whereby we become members of the same body of Christ and adopted children of the same Father, we are also bound to one another in a completely new relationship. Koinonia with one another is entailed by our koinonia with God in Christ. This is the mystery of the Church.[261]

The fundamental choice for a soteriology and ecclesiology of communion is confirmed by ARCIC II, for example at the beginning of its document on 'Salvation and the Church' (1986):

> The will of God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, is to reconcile to himself all that he has created and sustains, to set free the creation from its bondage to decay, and to draw all humanity into communion with himself. [...] Through baptism we are united with Christ in his death and resurrection, we are by the power of the Spirit made members of one body, and together we participate in the life of God. This fellowship in one body, sustained through word and sacrament, is in the New Testament called 'koinonia' (communion).[262]

In 1990, ARCIC II published a document entirely devoted to the ecclesiology of communion. Like the previous documents, this text connects the communion of the trinitarian God (a communion that God wants to share with all humanity and all creation) with the (not least eucharistic) communion of the church and with the (partly realised, partly eschatological) communion of all creatures in solidarity and reconciliation.[263] This understanding of theology, soteriology, ecclesiology and eschatology in terms of communion is undergirded by a scriptural analysis of salvation history that shows how '[t]he

260 ARCIC I, *Final Report*, 'Introduction', 4.
261 ARCIC I, *Final Report*, 'Introduction', 5; cf. 7.
262 ARCIC II, 'Salvation and the Church', 1; cf. 29.
263 ARCIC II, 'Church as Communion', 3.

relationship between God and his creation is the fundamental theme of holy scripture'.[264] Salvation is a process from 'alienation' through 'transformation' to 'communion', wrought by God through Christ in the Holy Spirit. The church is an intermediate state in which communion, meant to embrace all creation, is already partially embodied.[265] The church is, therefore, an 'effective sign' of the eschatological communion: it both (already) embodies it and (still) points towards it and offers it to the wider world.[266]

Interestingly, the theme of communion is also fundamental in what claims to be the first ecumenical dialogue text on morals,[267] ARCIC II's 'Life in Christ: Morals, Communion and the Church' (1993). Building upon the notion of Christian life as 'participation in the divine life',[268] the document states:

> The fundamental moral question, therefore, is not 'What ought we to do?', but 'What kind of persons are we called to become?' [...] True personhood has its origins and roots in the life and love of God. The mystery of the divine life cannot be captured by human thought and language, but in speaking of God as Trinity in unity, Father, Son and Holy Spirit, we are affirming that the Being of God is a unity of self-communication and interdependent relationship. Human persons, therefore, made in this image, and called to participate in the life of God, may not exercise a freedom that claims to be independent, wilful and self-seeking. Such a use of freedom is a distortion of their God-given humanity. It is sin. The freedom that is properly theirs is a freedom of responsiveness and interdependence. They are created for communion, and communion involves responsibility in relation to society and nature as well as to God.[269]

In the 2005 mariological document, Mary is presented as the one in whom everything that can be said about the church in terms of communion is already fulfilled. As 'the exemplar of redeemed humanity' she is 'an icon of the Church'.[270]

> [I]t is fitting that the Lord gathered her wholly to himself: in Christ, she is already a new creation in whom 'the old has passed away and the new has come' (2 Corinthians 5:17). Viewed from such an eschatological perspective, Mary may be seen both as a type of the Church, and as a disciple with a special place in the economy of salvation.[271]

264 ARCIC II, 'Church as Communion', 6; cf. 6-15.
265 ARCIC II, 'Church as Communion', 16-17.
266 ARCIC II, 'Church as Communion', 19, 22.
267 Cf. ARCIC II, 'Life in Christ: Morals, Communion and the Church', Preface.
268 Cf. ARCIC II, 'Life in Christ: Morals, Communion and the Church', 3, 4, 19, 44, 92, 97.
269 ARCIC II, 'Life in Christ: Morals, Communion and the Church', 7; cf. 31, 44, 52, 90-93.
270 ARCIC II, 'Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ', 71.
271 ARCIC II, 'Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ', 57.

According to ARCIC II, heaven and earth are united in the church as a communion of solidarity that also takes the form of mutual prayer.

> All such invocation takes place within the communion which is God's being and gift. In the life of prayer we invoke the name of Christ in solidarity with the whole Church, assisted by the prayers of brothers and sisters of every time and place.[272]

In this communion of saints, which the church is, Mary is 'the fullest human example of the life of grace' and 'Christ's foremost disciple'. Therefore, Mary 'holds the pre-eminent place within the communion of saints and embodies the destiny of the Church'.[273]

7.7.2 Eucharistic Ecclesiology

The previous paragraph showed that ARCIC's ecclesiological—and no less its soteriological, ethical and mariological—documents are firmly based upon an understanding of God's ways with humanity and creation in terms of *koinonia*/communion. Within ARCIC's communion ecclesiology, the eucharist[274] has a pivotal place.[275] The eucharist is regarded as the centre of the church, from which the body of Christ is built up:

> [W]e present the eucharist as the effectual sign of *koinonia* [...]. In the Statement *Eucharistic Doctrine* the eucharist is seen as the sacrament of Christ, by which he builds up and nurtures his people in the *koinonia* of his body. By the eucharist all the baptized are brought into communion with the source of *koinonia* [*i.e.* Jesus Christ].[276]

> Christ through the Holy Spirit in the eucharist builds up the life of the church, strengthens its fellowship and furthers its mission. The identity of the church as the body of Christ is both expressed and effectively proclaimed by its being centered in, and partaking of, his body and blood.[277]

272 ARCIC II, 'Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ', 69.

273 ARCIC II, 'Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ', 58, 65.

274 Cf. ARCIC I, *Final Report*, 'Eucharistic Doctrine', 1: '[V]arious names have become customary as descriptions of the eucharist: Lord's supper, liturgy, holy mysteries, synaxis, mass, holy communion. The eucharist has become the most universally accepted term.'

275 The number of citations given here, from ARCIC I's *Final Report*, could be amplified by citations from ARCIC II's documents, in which the church is called the eucharistic community, or in which the church is said to have the eucharist as its centre; cf. particularly 'Church as Communion', 3, 8, 11, 14, 15, 17, 24, 31, 34, 36, 37, 42, 43, 45, 48.

276 ARCIC I, *Final Report*, 'Introduction', 6. Cf. 'Introduction', 8 ('In the New Testament it is clear that the community is established by a baptism inseparable from faith and conversion, that its mission is to proclaim the gospel of God, and that its common life is sustained by the eucharist. This remains the pattern for the Christian Church'); 'Eucharistic Doctrine', 2.

277 ARCIC I, *Final Report*, 'Eucharistic Doctrine', 3; cf. 'Ministry and Ordination', 12. Cf. ARCIC II, 'Salvation and the Church', 16 ('Baptism is the unrepeatable sacrament of

The eucharist is the 'memorial (*anamnesis*) of the totality of God's reconciling action in [Christ]'. *Anamnesis* is more than a 'calling to mind', it is 'the making effective in the present of an event in the past'. And, through the document's fundamental understanding of *koinonia*,[278] the celebrating church itself becomes part of this event. The members of the church 'participate in these benefits [of salvation in Christ] and enter into the movement of [Christ's] self-offering'.[279] In other words, those who participate in the *koinonia* are by the eucharist drawn into the likeness of Christ and into his way of life, including his self-offering.

7.7.3 Excursus: The Nature of Salvation and Participation

It is characteristic for the divide between on the one hand the 'Catholic' (in the broadest sense of the term) and ecumenical, and on the other hand the traditionally 'Protestant' (at present primarily Evangelical) approaches to the Christian faith, that—among other things—this eucharistic consequence of the 'identification' of those who are 'in Christ' with Christ himself is criticised by the international 'Evangelical Fellowship of the Anglican Communion'. In their reaction to ARCIC I's *Final Report*, they express their difficulty with the report's phrase that, although Christ's sacrifice on the cross took place once for all, the members of the church 'participate in these benefits and enter into the movement of his self-offering'. The Evangelical reaction sees here

> two kinds of participation, which seem to be mutually incompatible. We do indeed share in the benefits of Christ's sacrifice [...], and offer ourselves to him in gratitude for it; but we cannot share in the offering of it, or even be drawn up into the movement of it. For we cannot see how the offering of ourselves, being a response to Christ's self-offering, can be simultaneous with it or part of it.[280]

justification and incorporation into Christ [...]. The eucharist is the repeated sacrament by which the life of Christ's body is constituted and renewed').

278 Cf. the previous paragraph. That the argument runs via the document's understanding of *koinonia* is not explicitly mentioned, but is clear from the context of the document as a whole. That the argument does *not* run from the idea that something should be *added to* Christ's sacrifice once for all, is explicitly stated. The church's eucharistic sharing in Christ's sacrifice is purely a result of the church's *participation* (*koinonia*) in Christ. This is also stated in ARCIC I, *Final Report*, 'Elucidation' [on 'Eucharistic Doctrine'], 5-6. Cf. paragraph 7.7.3.

279 ARCIC I, *Final Report*, 'Eucharistic Doctrine', 5.

280 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE EVANGELICAL FELLOWSHIP OF THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION, 'An Extract from an Open Letter to the Anglican Communion' (1988), in: C. Hill & E.J. Yarnold (eds.), *Anglicans and Roman Catholics: The Search for Unity* (London: SPCK & Catholic Truth Society, 1994), 283-297, at 287.

Beyond the particular issue of eucharistic controversy, this difference of opinion, amounting to a sincere inability to understand the other's intention,[281] originates on the one hand from a different approach to salvation in Christ. Is Christ's salvific work more or less exclusively concentrated in his propitiatory death on the cross, or more widely seen as including the whole 'Christ-event': incarnation, words and signs, the 'Paschal mystery' (suffering, death, descent into the realm of the dead, resurrection, ascension, sending of the Spirit), judgement and kingship? On the other hand—of supreme relevance in the context of ecclesiology—this difference of opinion originates from a different approach to the concept of (the members of) the church's participation in Christ. Are the New Testament passages about being 'in Christ', being the 'body of Christ', having 'communion with Christ', growing into the 'likeness of Christ' to be interpreted in terms of a far-reaching mutual indwelling between Christ and the church, who become intimately united, or in terms of a rather modest relationship between Christ and the church, who remain two separate entities?[282]

As the Evangelical response says, here are 'two kinds of participation' at stake. Taking its starting point in a broader christological concept, ARCIC takes the view that the church, intimately united to Christ as his body, participates in the whole Christ-event by growing into his likeness and by being drawn into his way of life, including his self-offering. The combination of a broader view on salvation in Christ[283] *and* a far-reaching interpretation of the New Testament texts on participation[284] brings 'Catholic' and ecumenical theology—as

281 The same applies to the reaction to the *Final Report*'s statements on the real presence; cf. EVANGELICAL FELLOWSHIP, 'Open Letter', 288.

282 This question came already to the fore in chapter 5, see especially the nuances between Dix (5.3), Ramsey (5.4), Williams (5.6) and Pickstock (5.7).

283 ARCIC II ('Salvation and the Church', 13) emphasises that the New Testament describes salvation in 'a wide variety of language. Some terms are of more fundamental importance than others: but there is no controlling term or concept; they complement one another'. Examples of these complementary terms and concepts include: 'reconciliation', 'expiation', 'liberation', 'adoption', 'regeneration', 'sanctification' and 'justification'. Moreover, the reality behind these terms 'comes to each believer as he or she is incorporated into the believing community'.

284 ARCIC II ('Church as Communion', 12-15): 'In the New Testament the word "koinonia" (often translated "communion or "fellowship") ties together a number of basic concepts such as unity, life together, sharing and partaking. The basic verbal form means "to share", "to participate", "to have part in", "to have something in common" or "to act together". The noun can signify fellowship or community. *It usually signifies a relationship based on participation in a shared reality* [...]. This usage is most explicit in the Johannine writings [...]. *This communion is participation in the life of God through Christ in the Holy Spirit,* making Christians one with each other. [...] It is characteristic of the apostle Paul to speak of the relationship of believers to their Lord as being "in Christ" [...] and of Christ being in the believer through the indwelling of the Holy Spirit [...]. This relationship Paul also affirms in his description of the church as the one body of Christ. [...] *This description underlines the intimate, organic relationship which exists between the risen Lord and all those who receive new life through communion with him.* [...] Communion will reach its fulfillment when God will be all in all' (emphasis added).

represented here by ARCIC—to this intimate connection between Christ and the church (which they call 'sacramental') *without* understanding this connection as diminishing in any sense the unique meaning of Christ for the salvation of the world (which they call 'historical').[285] The other way round, the combination of a narrower view on salvation in Christ *and* a more limited interpretation of the Pauline texts on participation, brings Evangelical theology to the view that an intimate connection between Christ and the church must necessarily obscure the unique meaning of Christ for the salvation of the world.

Ecumenical theology prefers to interpret differences between Christian schools of thought as, in the end, pointing towards a *Grundkonsens* (fundamental consensus) rather than to a *Grunddifferenz* (fundamental divergence).[286] If there, nevertheless, is such a thing as an ecclesiological *Grunddifferenz*,[287] it might be this divergence on the interpretation of salvation in Christ and our participation in it. It might, therefore, be helpful to realise that much of the remaining controversy over church, sacraments and ministry has to do with this sometimes hidden divergence as to *how* salvation is wrought by Christ and *to what extent* the church and its members participate in the life of Christ.[288]

285 It should be mentioned that this distinction between 'historical' and 'sacramental' (ARCIC I, *Final Report*, 'Elucidation' [on 'Eucharistic Doctrine'], 5) reflects a certain middle position between those who would rather call both Christ and his church 'eschatological', in which salvation history and sacramentality merge (as Zizioulas has exemplarily done, cf. paragraphs 2.3.4 and 2.3.5), and those who take the Evangelical position indicated here.

286 Cf. A. BIRMELÉ & H. MEYER (eds.), *Grundkonsens—Grunddifferenz. Studie des Strassburger Instituts für Ökumenische Forschung. Ergebnisse und Dokumente* (Frankfurt: Lembeck, 1992).

287 That is, not a divergence related to straightforward theological varieties of opinion on specific themes, but a '"systematic" divergence' caused by the fact 'that key terms, which seem to be held in common, are [nevertheless] composed otherwise within the language of one confessional family than in the language of other confessions. This means that the *rules* of the [theological] language are not the same; the concepts which rule the internal composition of the key terms are different'. R.W. JENSON, 'Robert W. Jenson—USA—lutherisch', in: Birmelé & Meyer (eds.), *Grundkonsens—Grunddifferenz*, 217-224, at 220 ('"systematische" Differenz'; 'dass innerhalb der Rede einer Konfessionsfamilie anscheinend gemeinsame Schlüsselbegriffe auf verschiedene Weise ineinandergreifen als dies in der Rede der anderen Konfessionen der Fall ist. Dies bedeutet, dass die *Regeln* für die Rede nicht dieselben sind, dass die Konzeptionen, die das Ineinandergreifen der Schlüsselbegriffe der Rede bestimmen, verschieden sind').
Such 'meta-dogmatic' (or 'fundamental-theological') *Grunddifferenzen* do not simply occur *between*, but also *within* confessional families. Cf. A. BIRMELÉ, 'Sinn und Gefahr der Rede von einer Grunddifferenz. Bericht und Reflexionen über eine Konsultation und ihr Thema', in: Birmelé & Meyer (eds.), *Grundkonsens—Grunddifferenz*, 181-192.

288 Cf. also paragraphs 5.4.1 (Excursus: Anglicans Evangelical and Catholic) and 6.2 (Noordmans & van der Leeuw); perhaps also 5.7.4 (Thomas and Scotus).

7.7.4 The Ordained Ministry from the Perspective of a Eucharistic Ecclesiology

Already in the introduction to the *Final Report*, the ordained ministry is placed in the context of the *koinonia* of the church with its eucharistic focus:

> *[E]piscope* exists only to serve *koinonia*. The ordained minister presiding at the eucharist is a sign of Christ gathering his people [...]. Through the ministry of word and sacrament the Holy Spirit is given for the building up of the body of Christ.

This thought is taken up in the statement on 'Ministry and Ordination':

> So it is because the eucharist is central in the Church's life that the essential nature of the Christian ministry [...] is most clearly seen in its celebration; for, in the eucharist, thanksgiving is offered to God, the gospel of salvation is proclaimed in word and sacrament, and the community is knit together as one body in Christ.[289]

Because the function of *episkope*, exercised by bishops, priests and deacons,[290] aims at the building up of the body of Christ,[291] and because the eucharist is the central event by which the body of Christ is built up,[292] 'it is right that he who has oversight in the Church and is the focus of its unity should preside at the celebration of the eucharist'.[293]

289 ARCIC I, *Final Report*, 'Ministry and Ordination', 13. The Evangelical response says, 'Instead, the distinctive nature of the ordained ministry, according to the New Testament, is surely pastoral oversight, which is mainly exercised by the ministry of the word, to which the ministry of the sacraments also belongs. The primary movement of ministry is not towards God (in offering) but towards human beings (in proclamation and service), because that is the primary movement of the word and sacraments' (EVANGELICAL FELLOWSHIP, 'Open Letter', 290).

290 'Just as the formation of the canon of the New Testament was a process incomplete until the second half of the second century, so also the full emergence of the threefold ministry of bishop, presbyter, and deacon required a longer period than the apostolic age. Thereafter this threefold structure became universal in the Church' (ARCIC I, *Final Report*, 'Ministry and Ordination', 6). 'Because our task was limited to examining relations between our two communions, we did not enter into the question whether there is any other form in which this episcope can be realized' (ARCIC I, *Final Report*, 'Elucidation' [on 'Ministry and Ordination'], 4).

291 ARCIC I, *Final Report*, 'Ministry and Ordination', 9-11.

292 Cf. paragraph 7.7.2.

293 ARCIC I, *Final Report*, 'Ministry and Ordination', 12.

7.7.5 The Church Local and Universal from the Perspective of a Communion Ecclesiology

From this eucharistic *koinonia* ecclesiology flows ARCIC I's description of the relationship between the local and the universal church.

> The *koinonia* is realized not only in the local Christian communities, but also in the communion of these communities with one another. The unity of local communities under one bishop constitutes what is commonly meant in our two communions by a 'local church' [...]. Faithful to the gospel, celebrating the one eucharist and dedicated to the service of the same Lord, it is the Church of Christ. In spite of diversities each local church recognizes its own essential features in the others and its true identity with them.[294]

The document, thus, regards the local church (diocese) as the basic entity of the church of Christ. Such a local church should be in communion with all other local churches, not because they are all the same—there may be 'diversities' between them—but because they are, on a fundamental level, able to recognise in one another the faith of the gospel, the communion of the eucharist and the dedication to Christ in service. ARCIC II takes up this understanding of the universal church as the communion of local churches. It emphasises, however, that the communion between the local churches is not something that can at liberty be added or not to the catholicity of the local church. 'Communion with other local churches is essential to the integrity of the self-understanding of each local church'. Being part of the communion of local churches is, in other words, not additional but intrinsic to the essence of a local church.[295]

Because '[t]he Church of God is found in each of [the local churches] and in their *koinonia*', those who exercise *episkope* over a local church have also the responsibility 'to maintain it in living awareness and practical service of the other churches'. This common responsibility of all bishops is reflected in their coming together in regional or world-wide synods, possibly together with clergy and laity. It is also reflected by the fact that the bishops of a certain region share an amount of responsibility under the *episkope* of one of them. Such a regional, collegial oversight by the 'bishop of a principal see' has an equivalent on the universal scale: 'It is within the context of this historical development that the see of Rome, whose prominence was associated with the death there of Peter and Paul, eventually became the principal centre in matters concerning the Church universal'. Although the office of the bishop of Rome often failed to reflect its purpose, both in theory and in practice, '[c]ommunion with him is

294 ARCIC I, *Final Report*, 'Authority in the Church I', 8.

295 ARCIC II, 'Church as Communion', 39; cf. 43; ARCIC II, 'The Gift of Authority' (= 'Authority in the Church III'), 37.

intended as a safeguard of the catholicity of each local church, and as a sign of the communion of all the churches'.[296]

The document, thus, proposes an understanding of primacy embedded in an ecclesiology of communion. This embedding implies on the one hand the acceptance of such a primacy as a necessary part of a *koinonia* ecclesiology:

> According to Christian doctrine the unity in truth of the Christian community demands visible expression. We agree that such visible expression is the will of God and that the maintenance of visible unity at the universal level includes the *episcope* of a universal primate.[297]

On the other hand, however, the embedding in an ecclesiology of communion means that this primacy is only acceptable if it is exercised in a qualified way:

> If primacy is to be a genuine expression of *episcope* it will foster the *koinonia* by helping the bishops in their task of apostolic leadership both in their local church and in the Church universal. Primacy fulfils its purpose by helping the churches to listen to one another, to grow in love and unity, and to strive together towards the fullness of Christian life and witness; it repects and promotes Christian freedom and spontaneity; it does not seek uniformity where diversity is legitimate, or centralize administration to the detriment of local churches. A primate exercises his ministry not in isolation but in collegial association with his brother bishops. His intervention in the affairs of a local church should not be made in such as way as to usurp the responsibility of its bishop. [...] The *koinonia* of the churches requires that a proper balance be preserved between [primacy and conciliarity] with the responsible participation of the whole people of God.[298]

It is ARCIC's conviction that the history of separation between Anglicans and Roman Catholics is a particularly telling example of the need of such a 'balance between a primacy serving the unity and a conciliarity maintaining the just diversity of the *koinonia* of all the churches'.[299]

296 ARCIC I, *Final Report*, 'Authority in the Church I', 9-12; cf. 'Authority in the Church II', 17-19; ARCIC II, 'Church as Communion', 45.

297 ARCIC I, *Final Report*, 'Elucidation' [on 'Authority in the Church I'], 8.

298 ARCIC I, *Final Report*, 'Authority in the Church I', 21-22.

299 ARCIC I, *Final Report*, 'Elucidation' [on 'Authority in the Church I'], 8. The response to the *Final Report* by the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, however, seems to insist on the letter of Vatican I; cf. CONGREGATION FOR THE DOCTRINE OF THE FAITH, 'Observations on the Final Report of ARCIC I' (1982), in: Hill & Yarnold (eds.), *Anglicans and Roman Catholics*, 79-91, at 86-88. In a milder way, this also applies to 'The Official Roman Catholic Response to the Final Report of ARCIC I' (1991), in: Hill & Yarnold (eds.), *Anglicans and Roman Catholics*, 156-166, about which the archbishop of Canterbury remarked: 'In the case of the Roman Catholic Response, however, the question to our two Communions appears to have been understood instead as asking: "Is the Final Report [not *consonant* with, but] *identical* with the teachings of the Roman Catholic Church?" [...] If either Communion requires that the other conforms to its own theological formulations,

Throughout ARCIC's three documents on 'Authority in the Church' of 1976, 1981 and 1998 it is made clear that the commission 'agree[s] that a universal primacy will be needed in a reunited Church and should appropriately be the primacy of the bishop of Rome, as we have specified it'.[300] The documents arrive at this common conviction through a *relecture* of the Petrine texts in the New Testament[301] and of the papal dogmas of the First Vatican Council[302] in the light of ecumenical theology, especially communion ecclesiology. Having reached this fundamental agreement, ARCIC asks

> that Anglicans be open to and desire a recovery and re-reception under certain clear conditions of the exercise of universal primacy by the Bishop of Rome; that Roman Catholics be open to and desire a re-reception of the exercise of primacy by the Bishop of Rome and the offering of such a ministry to the whole Church of God.[303]

Finally, it is important to notice that ARCIC admits that the presence of these visible structures of the church does not 'guarantee the constant fidelity of Christians'. Neither is it always the case that 'a community in which [these outwards visible structures] are present expresses them fully in its life'. On the other hand, however, 'it is inadequate to speak only of an invisible spiritual unity as the fulfilment of Christ's will for the church; the profound communion fashioned by the Spirit requires visible expression'. Therefore, the church cannot dispense with visible structural expressions. 'They need to be present in order for one local church to recognize another canonically.'[304]

7.7.6 Conclusion

The documents of ARCIC I and ARCIC II indicate how God is understood as trinitarian communion; humanity as created out of and towards this divine communion; personhood as fundamentally relational; the church as the temporary realisation of and instrument towards reconciled divine-human communion throughout creation; the eucharist as constituing and expressing ecclesial communion and as a foretaste of universal communion; the ordained

further progress will be hazardous'; 'Comments of the Archbishop of Canterbury (George Carey) on the Official Roman Catholic Response' (1991), in: Hill & Yarnold (eds.), *Anglicans and Roman Catholics*, 168-170. The 1988 Lambeth Conference endorsed the *Final Report* as 'consonant in substance with the faith of Anglicans'; 'The 1988 Lambeth Conference: Resolution 8 and Explanatory Note regarding ARCIC I', in: Hill & Yarnold (eds.), *Anglicans and Roman Catholics*, 153-155.

300 ARCIC I, *Final Report*, 'Authority in the Church II', 9.

301 Cf. ARCIC I, *Final Report*, 'Authority in the Church II', 2-9.

302 Cf. ARCIC I, *Final Report*, 'Authority in the Church II', 10-33.

303 ARCIC II, 'The Gift of Authority' (= 'Authority in the Church III'), 62.

304 ARCIC II, 'Church as Communion', 43, 46.

ministry as serving (ecclesial) communion, not least by presiding at the celebration of (eucharistic) communion; the local church (diocese) as the basic entity of ecclesial communion; the universal church as the communion of communions. The work of ARCIC is, therefore, an important example of the consistent application of a theology of communion to virtually all aspects of theology—soteriology, anthropology, moral theology, ecclesiology, eucharist, ministry and primacy.

7.8 THE ORTHODOX—OLD CATHOLIC DIALOGUE

7.8.1 A Soteriology of Communion

The full theological consensus, established by the Orthodox—Old Catholic dialogue texts,[305] is based upon a communion ecclesiology, as is indicated by the very title of the document, *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis* (*Koinonia* on the basis of the Early Church). However, the texts are not written in the 'jargon' of ecumenical communion ecclesiologies, which reflects the fact that a fundamental understanding of *koinonia* was already part of Orthodox and Old Catholic theology before the notion of *koinonia* became predominant in the ecumenical movement.[306]

The document begins with an exposition of the Trinity,[307] and proceeds to salvation history as the movement by which God wants to unite the human race to himself under one head.[308] This process of reunion—which can be understood as this document's rendering of the *koinonia* theme—begins with Christ's hypostatic union,[309] which is 'the foundation and starting point for the salvation of the whole human race'.[310]

305 Cf. paragraph 7.1.7. Unless otherwise indicated, citations are from the English translation in VON ARX (ed.), *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, 173-229. The 'authentic' German text is given in the footnotes, sometimes compared to the (likewise 'authentic') Greek text. The Revd Professor Urs von Arx kindly provided the present author with the sections of the proceedings of the dialogue commission in which the Greek text is included.

306 Cf. above, chapters 2 and 4, and paragraph 7.1.5.

307 *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, I/1; I/3.

308 *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, II/1.1.

309 *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, II/1; II/2.

310 *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, IV/1 ('Durch seine Menschwerdung begann der Herr, das grosse Geheimnis der Erlösung zu vollbringen. In der Person Gottes des Logos geschah die hypostatische Vereinigung der göttlichen und der menschlichen Natur, welche die Grundlage und den Ausgangspunkt für die Rettung des ganzen Menschengeschlechtes bildet').

> [B]ecause of the unity of the human race, [Christ] united all humanity within himself [...], so that we gain in him what we have lost in Adam: the freedom from sin and death and eternal life in fellowship with God.[311]

The document emphasises that salvation, although Christ's sacrificial death on the cross is regarded as a paramount element of it, is wrought by the '*one* organic and unified totality' of Christ's incarnation, baptism, words, signs, example, suffering, death, descent into the realm of the dead, resurrection, ascension, sending of the Spirit, kingship, coming again and judgement, as well as by his continuing presence in the church through the Spirit. As the heart of salvation history, the document identifies Christ's (death and) resurrection.[312]

The church is the place where Christ, through the Spirit, gives humans 'a share in himself'.[313] In the church, through the Spirit, humans are 'brought back into communion with God'.[314] The church is 'the human race united in the God-man'.[315] Not surprisingly, in a bilateral dialogue with Orthodox participation, this restoration of divine-human communion is expressed by the word *theosis*, divinisation,[316] which is explained as participation in the divine light rather than transformation into the divine being.[317]

Since the resurrection of Jesus Christ, and particularly since the eschatological outpouring of the Spirit at Pentecost, the church lives, until Christ's coming again, in a continuous 'eighth day', proleptically experiencing the first fruits of the Spirit. This eschatological understanding of the time in which the church lives, does not lead the document to a world-renouncing attitude, but to an invitation to show God's love to the world, in the expectation of 'greater things'.[318] In accordance with a broad concept of *koinonia* soteriology, and mediated by a traditional Orthodox emphasis, the document understands the final destination of the world not only as Christ's coming again, the resurrection of the dead, the reunion of souls and bodies and the final

311 *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, IV/1 ('wegen der Einheit des Menschengeschlechtes vereinte er in sich die gesamte Menschheit [...], damit wir in ihm gewinnen, was wir in Adam verloren haben: die Freiheit von Sünde und Tod und das ewige Leben in Gemeinschaft [*koinonia*] mit Gott').

312 *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, IV/1 ('*ein* organisches und einheitliches Ganzes'); cf. V/1.3; V/4.4.

313 *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, IV/1, my translation ('an sich selbst Anteil [*koinonos*] gibt').

314 *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, IV/2 ('wieder eingesetzt in die Gemeinschaft [*koinonia*] mit Gott').

315 *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, III/1.I.1 ('die im Gottmenschen geeinte Menschheit').

316 *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, II/1.4.b ('Vergottung' [*theosis*]); IV/2 ('vergottet' [*theountai*]).

317 *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, IV/2, with reference to John of Damascus.

318 *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, VI/1.1.

judgement, but also as 'the renewal of the world': the whole creation will share in the eschatological transformation.[319]

7.8.2 A Eucharistic Ecclesiology

This document's chapter on ecclesiology (III) follows the chapters on the doctrine of God (I) and christology (II) and precedes the chapters on soteriology (IV), the doctrine of the sacraments (V) and eschatology (VI). This order reflects the fact that the ecclesiology presented here is seen as a continuation of the christology and pneumatology of the preceding sections. In other words, the church is seen as the continuation of Christ's and the Spirit's work. 'By its very nature the Church is intimately related to the mystery of the Triune God who reveals himself in Christ and the Holy Spirit'.[320] It is in the church, through the Spirit, that Christ 'continues the redemption of the world'.[321]

In this light it is not surprising that this document takes the 'body of Christ' as its pre-eminent ecclesiological model.[322] The church as the body of Christ is underlined by the concept of *totus Christus*—the 'whole Christ' consists of the head (Christ) and the body (the church), which are inseparable from one another.[323] The centre of this understanding of the church as the body of Christ is the eucharist.

> The Church is the one indivisible Body of Christ in which the believers, as members of this Body, are united with Christ as its Head and with one another. The supreme expression and the perennial source of this unity is the sacrament of the Eucharist.[324]

> The focus of the new life is the Holy Eucharist in which the inner form of the bond between the Body and the Head shows itself.[325]

319 *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, VI/1.3 ('die Erneuerung der Welt').

320 *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, III/1.I.1 ('Die Kirche steht ihrem Wesen nach in enger Zusammenhang mit dem Geheimnis des dreieinigen Gottes, der sich in Christus und dem Heiligen Geist offenbart').

321 *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, IV/1 ('[die Kirche,] in der er durch das Wirken des an Pfingsten gesandten und für immer in ihr bleibenden Heiligen Geistes sein welterlösendes Werk fortsetzt, indem er den Menschen, für die er im Himmel immerdar eintritt (vgl. Hebr 9,24), an sich selbst Anteil gibt').

322 Cf. *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, III; IV/2; V; VI.

323 *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, III/8; cf. III/1.I.3; III/1.II.1.

324 *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, III/2.1 ('Die Kirche ist der eine, unteilbare Leib Christi, in dem die Gläubigen als die Glieder mit Christus als dem Haupt und untereinander vereint sind. Der höchste Ausdruck und zugleich die unversiegliche Quelle dieser Einheit ist das Sakrament der Eucharistie').

325 *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, III/8 ('Mittelpunkt des neuen Lebens ist die heilige Eucharistie, in der sich die innere Gestalt der Verbindung des Leibes mit seinem Haupt zeigt').

> [The Spirit] unites [the faithful] in the celebration of Holy Eucharist to the one Body in the fellowship of the Church.[326]

> The sacrament of Holy Eucharist is the focal point of the entire life of the Church [...]. In this sacrament the faithful receive the Body and Blood of Christ and by it are united with him and through him with one another.[327]

Not only is the eucharist understood as the central sacrament, or rather, the central ecclesial event, also the other sacraments are understood as pointing in some way or another to the eucharist, or to the church as the eucharistic community.

> The sacraments as specific sanctifying actions lead to the new creation and unfolding of life in Christ through the incorporation of the recipients into the Church as the Body of Christ, this being effected by the Holy Spirit.[328]

Baptism is, through the Spirit, the sacrament by which one dies and resurrects with Christ and by which one is connected to Christ and the other Christians in one body.[329] Baptism implies the gift of the Spirit (confirmation/chrismation) and introduces one into the eucharistic community.[330] The sacraments of ordination and matrimony are likewise understood as placing the recipient into a certain *ordo* within the eucharistic community.[331]

This eucharistic-ecclesiological basis is consistently applied to a view on the relationship between the local and the universal church, to a concept of ministry and to an understanding of ecclesial unity. The following three paragraphs will deal with these areas of this document's ecclesiological thought.

326 *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, IV/2 ('[Der Geist] vereint [die Gläubigen] in der Feier der heiligen Eucharistie zu einem Leib in der Gemeinschaft der Kirche').

327 *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, V/4.1 ('Das Sakrament der heiligen Eucharistie ist der Mittelpunkt des ganzen Lebens der Kirche [...]. In diesem Sakrament empfangen die Gläubigen den Leib und das Blut Christi [und] werden dadurch mit ihm und durch ihn miteinander vereint'); cf. V/4.9; VII.2.

328 *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, V/1.5 ('Die Sakramente als spezifische heiligende Handlungen führen zur Neuschaffung und Entfaltung des Lebens in Christus durch die im Heiligen Geist erfolgende Eingliederung der Empfänger in die Kirche als Leib Christi').

329 The unity of the church, based on the oneness of Christ's body, is emphasised by a repeated italicisation of the word *ein* (one) in sections III/1, III/2, V/2, V/4 and VII.

330 *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, V/2; V/3; V/4.8.

331 *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, V/7.5; V/8.3. These *ordines* are not understood as mutually exclusive (V/8.6). Surprisingly, the sacrament of penance (V/5) is not explicitly said to reconcile the recipient with the eucharistic community.

7.8.3 Consequences of a Eucharistic Ecclesiology: The Church Local and Universal

The document states that the church is not just an 'inward' affair, 'an invisible fellowship', for such a view 'destroys the real content of relevation and the historical character of the Church'.[332] The church is rather 'a divine-human organism': on the one hand visible and tangible, on the other hand inward and spiritual.[333]

This organism—this body—is one. 'In this body all the local Churches are united to one another by the unity of faith, worship and order'.[334]

> As a fellowship of believers united around the bishop and the presbyterium, each local Church, being the Body of Christ, is the manifestation of the whole Christ in one particular place. It manifests the sacramental reality of the whole Church in its own locality. For it is in no divided form, that the life, that has been given to the Church by God the Father through the presence of Christ in the Holy Spirit, is given to the local Churches; each local Church, on the contrary, has that life in its fullness. [...] There are not many bodies but the one Body of Christ, undivided and whole, in each place. This unity of life in the local Churches reflects the unity of the Holy Trinity itself.[335]

The many local churches (dioceses) do not destroy the unity of the one church, because all local churches are in communion with one another through their faithfulness to the apostolic tradition.[336] This is what the document calls a 'qualitative' understanding of catholicity. The 'quantitative' meaning of catholicity—the fact that the church 'is predestined to extend to the whole creation'—is not denied, but the 'qualitative' sense predominates in this

[332] *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, III/1.I.4 ('nicht nur etwas Innerliches, eine unsichtbare Gemeinschaft [...]. Eine derartige Auffassung vom Wesen der Kirche [...] zerstört den echten Gehalt der Offenbarung und den geschichtlichen Charakter der Kirche').

[333] *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, III/1.I.3 ('ein gottmenschlicher Organismus: eine beschreibbare und wahrnehmbare Gemeinschaft und zugleich eine innere und geistige Beziehung').

[334] *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, III/1.II.1 ('In diesem Leib sind alle Ortskirchen durch die Einheit des Glaubens, des Gottesdienstes und der Ordnung mit einander verbunden'); cf. III/2.5.

[335] *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, III/2.4, amended translation ('Jede Ortskirche als um den Bischof und das Presbyterium vereinigte Gemeinschaft der Gläubigen ist als Leib Christi die Manifestation des ganzen Christus an einem bestimmten Ort. Sie stellt die sakramentale Wirklichkeit der ganzen Kirche an ihrem Ort dar. Denn das Leben der Kirche, das ihr durch die Gegenwart Christi im Heiligen Geist von Gott, dem Vater, geschenkt wird, ist den einzelnen Ortskirchen nicht geteilt gegeben, sondern eine jede besitzt es in seiner Ganzheit. [...] Es ist nicht eine Vielzahl, sondern der eine Leib Christi, ungeteilt und ganz an jedem Ort. In dieser Einheit des Lebens der Ortskirchen bildet sich die Einheit der heiligen Driefaltigkeit selbst ab').

[336] *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, III/2.3.

document. The church is catholic 'because although it is scattered over the whole earth, it is always and everywhere the same'. The church is catholic because 'it is the orthodox, authentic and true Church'.[337]

The fact that every local church is theologically the same, is explained in eucharistic-ecclesiological terms:

> Every local Church has its centre in the Holy Eucharist. It is Christ who invites to his meal. Therefore it is celebrated by his Church under the direction of the bishop or a priest commissioned by him; and indeed it is the Church as the one Body of Christ which performs this celebration, and all who receive this Eucharist become one body, the Body of Christ.[338]

> The one Church on earth exists in the many local Churches whose life is centred on the celebration of Holy Eucharist in the communion with the lawful bishop and his priests.[339]

The communion between the local churches is, therefore, in the first instance a eucharistic communion.[340] It is primarily the eucharist that makes the local churches intrinsically identical and unites them into the one body of Christ. However, this identity 'in essence' of all local churches does not imply their identity in liturgical forms or ecclesial customs: 'communion does not mean uniformity'.[341]

7.8.4 Consequences of a Eucharistic Ecclesiology: The Ordained Ministry

This document aims at an understanding of ministry based upon the practice of the Early Church. This aim leads the document to endorse an episcopal-synodal

337 *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, III/1.II.3 (quantitativ, 'Es ist ihr vorausbestimmt, dass sie sich über die ganze Schöpfung erstrecke'; qualitativ, 'da sie, obwohl über die ganze Erde verstreut, immer und überall dieselbe ist', 'also "katholisch" in dem Sinn, dass sie die rechtgläubige, authentische und wahre Kirche ist').

338 *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, VII.2 ('Jede Ortskirche hat ihre Mitte in der heiligen Eucharistie. Es ist Christus, der zu diesem seinem Mahl einlädt. Deshalb wird es von seiner Kirche unter der Leitung des Bischofs oder eines von ihm beauftragten Priesters gefeiert; und zwar ist es die Kirche als der eine Leib Christi, die diese Feier vollzieht, und alle, welche die Eucharistie empfangen, werden *ein* Leib, der Leib Christi'), with reference to 1 Corinthians 10:17 and its explanation by Augustine and John Chrysostom.

339 *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, III/2.2 ('Die eine Kirche auf Erden existiert in den vielen Ortskirchen, deren Leben seinen Mittelpunkt in der Feier der heiligen Eucharistie hat, die in Verbindung mit dem rechtmässigen Bischof und seinem Presbyterium geschieht'), with reference to Ignatius of Antioch.

340 Cf. *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, III/2.6.

341 *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, III/2.4 ('seinem Wesen nach'); VII.8, my translation ('Gemeinschaft bedeutet keine Uniformität').

ecclesial structure.[342] The church is presented as a communion of local churches centred around the eucharist under the presidency of—or in communion with—the bishop.[343] The bishop is called the one who 'presides over the local church',[344] and this episcopal presidency is particularly manifested when a bishop is 'presiding over the eucharistic and synodical assembly'.[345] The first task of the bishops is, therefore, to be 'the presiders of the church',[346] both at the eucharist and in synod. The document says that, within the church as a whole, the ministry has the task of

> gathering and building up the congregation time and again through the preaching of the Word of God and presiding over the liturgical and sacramental life, especially at the celebration of Holy Eucharist.[347]

This task of building up of the community is not understood as successing the *apostles*, who had a unique ministry, but nevertheless as a continuation of the apostolic *commission* to proclaim and preside, to gather and build up the church.[348] And although this document interprets apostolic succession in the wider sense of apostolic tradition,[349] it regards the historic continuity of the apostolic succession as an element within the apostolic tradition which is both 'the teaching of the Church Fathers in general' and a 'necessity' 'whenever the question of restoring Christian unity arises'.[350]

Within the church as the body of Christ, the ministers—especially the bishops—have the particular ministry of representing Christ. Again, this aspect of the ministry originates from the bishop's presiding role at the eucharist:

342 *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, III/6; cf. III/1.II.1; V/7.3 ('Das Amt als besondere geistliche Funktion erscheint schon in ältester Zeit, trotz einer gewissen Undeutlichkeit im Gebrauch der Termini, in der Gestalt des Bischofs, des Priesters (Presbyters) und des Diakons'). Cf. ALDENHOVEN, 'Charakter, Bedeutung und Ziel der Dialogtexte', 33: 'Ausgangspunkt der gemeinsamen Texte war—das wurde von Anfang an grundsätzlich festgehalten—der Glaube der alten Kirche, die sich in einer gemeinsamen Tradition in westlicher und östlicher Ausprägung findet'.

343 *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, III/2.2; III/2.4.

344 *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, III/4.III.1 ('Der Bischof, der [...] der Ortskirche vorsteht').

345 *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, III/6 ('die Bischöfe, die [...] der eucharistischen und synodalen Versammlung vorstehen').

346 *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, V/6.3, my translation ('die Vorsteher [*presbyteroi*] der Kirche, also Bischof [*episkopos*] und Priester [*hiereis*]').

347 *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, III/7.2 ('durch die Verkündigung des Wortes Gottes und den Vorsitz im liturgischen und sakramentalen Leben, besonders bei der Feier der heiligen Eucharistie, die Gemeinde immer wieder zu sammeln und aufzubauen'); cf. IV/2.

348 *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, III/7.2; cf. III/8; V/7.2.

349 Cf. *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, III/4.

350 *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, III/7.4 ('allgemeine Lehre der Kirchenväter'); III/7.5 ('bei jeder Bemühung zur Wiederherstellung der christlichen Einheit', 'Notwendigkeit'); cf. III/4.III.1.

> The bishop who celebrates the Eucharist presides in the place of Christ and [...] represents Christ as the Head of the Church assembled around him in whose name he celebrates.[351]

This presiding task of the minister is embedded in the liturgical assembly, exactly as the head (Christ) is inseparably connected to his body (the church). The necessity of ordained ministers for the celebration of the liturgy[352] does, therefore, not suppress the conviction that the whole church is the celebrating community:

> The whole eucharistic community, clergy and people, has an organic part in the performance of the eucharistic celebration. The liturgists of the sacrament are bishop and priest.[353]

As a result of their eucharistic and synodical presidency in the local church, the bishops are also the ones who gather together in 'representative gatherings of the bishops of the local Churches', namely supra-local synods and ultimately the ecumenical council.[354] In this supra-local context, all bishops enjoy the same rank:

> According to divine law, the bishops among themselves are of the same rank because they all have received the same episcopal grace by the lawful sacramental laying on of hands and stand in the apostolic succession. They take part in the same way without quantitative or qualitative difference in one and the same episcopal authority. They are bishops among bishops, servants of Christ and the Church.[355]

Notwithstanding this important principle, the document affirms the historical development of primates or presidents of honour: 'bishops of certain local Churches, who had gained greater authority for various reasons'. Among these honorary primacies or presidencies, the bishop of Rome takes the first place.

351 *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, III/8 ('Der die Eucharistie feiernde Bischof hat an Christi Stelle den Vorsitz inne, und [...] stellt [...] Christus als das Haupt der um ihn versammelten Kirche dar, in deren Namen er zelebriert'); cf. III/6.

352 Cf. *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, V/1.10.

353 *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, V/4.5 ('Die ganze eucharistische Versammlung, Klerus und Volk, hat in organischer Weise am Vollzug der eucharistischen Feier teil; Liturgen des Sakramentes sind Bischof und Priester'); cf. V/5.3; V/6.3.

354 *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, III/6 ('bei den repräsentativen Zusammenkünften der Bischöfe der Ortskirchen'); cf. III/5; III/4.III.2.

355 *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, III/8 ('Nach göttlichem Recht sind die Bischöfe untereinander gleichen Ranges, weil sie alle durch die rechtmässige sakramentale Handauflegung dieselbe bischöfliche Gnade empfangen haben und in der apostolischen Sukzession stehen. Sie haben in gleicher Weise ohne quantitativen oder qualitativen Unterschied Anteil an ein und derselben bischöflichen Vollmacht. Sie sind Bischöfe unter Bischöfen, Diener Christi und der Kirche').

'So the Bishop of Rome possesses the presidency of honour in the Church'. The document ascertains, however, that this primacy does not give the bishop of Rome more jurisdiction or infallibility than any other primate of honour and any other bishop.[356]

7.8.5 Consequences of a Eucharistic Ecclesiology: Ecclesial Unity as Eucharistic Communion

As one of the Old Catholic members of the dialogue commission remarked,

> The character of these texts is determined by their goal, and the goal of the dialogue is the communion and unity of the Orthodox and Old Catholic Church. In this context, *communion and unity are not two different things, but one and the same thing,* because unity is understood by us as full communion and not as a central united organisation.[357]

These words summarise this document's understanding of unity. As we have already seen, the church is understood as the body of Christ, fully existing in every local church that is in communion with the other local churches. Neither uniformity in liturgy or custom, nor centralisation in organisation are needed for ecclesial unity. What is needed is that two churches mutually recognise that they are both a part of the one body of Christ.

'In this body all the local Churches are united to one another by the unity of faith, worship and order'.[358] Therefore, mutual recognition depends upon sharing a common faith, celebrating the same liturgy (not in form but in essence), and having the same ecclesial ordering, namely 'a conciliarily constituted episcopacy'.[359] The mutual official recognition of this 'unity of faith, worship and order' is identical with the establishment of communion, that is, unity.

356 *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, III/8 ('Ehrenvorrang' [*presbeia times*], 'Ehrenvorsitz' [*timetike prokathedria*]; 'Bischöfe bestimmter Ortskirchen, die aus verschiedenen Gründen grössere Autorität gewonnen hatten'; 'Der Bischof von Rom besitzt also den Ehrenvorrang in der Kirche').

357 ALDENHOVEN, 'Charakter, Bedeutung und Ziel der Dialogtexte', 27, emphasis added ('Der Charakter dieser Texte ist vom Ziel bestimmt, und das Ziel des Dialogs ist die Gemeinschaft und Einheit der orthodoxen und altkatholischen Kirche. Gemeinschaft und Einheit sind dabei nicht zwei verschiedene Dinge, sondern ein und dasselbe, denn die Einheit wird von uns verstanden als volle Gemeinschaft, und nicht als eine zentrale Einheits-Organisation').

358 *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, III/1.II.1 ('In diesem Leib sind alle Ortskirchen durch die Einheit des Glaubens, des Gottesdienstes und der Ordnung mit einander verbunden'); cf. III/2.5; III/3.3.

359 *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, III/1.II.1, my translation ('den Episkopat, der konziliär verfasst ist').

To underline this principle, the document concludes with a text on 'Ecclesial Communion: Presuppositions and Consequences'.[360] This short text adds nothing to the ecclesiological statements already made throughout the document, it rather summarises them, focusing on their consequences for eucharistic communion and ecclesial unity.[361] Their aim is to assure that eucharistic communion and ecclesial unity are one and the same. This assurance is given by a eucharistic-ecclesiological exposition based on 1 Corinthians 10:17, in which the word 'one' is repeatedly italicised in order to show the indissoluble bond between Jesus Christ and the church (the *one* body of Christ), between the eucharist and the church (*one* bread and *one* body) and between the fact that the eucharist unites the faithful to Christ and the fact that the eucharist unites the faithful to one another (*koinonia* as participating in Christ and, thereby, being united to one another).[362]

The consequence of this consistent eucharistic-ecclesiological principle is that there is nothing between being in communion with one another and *not* being in communion with one another.[363] It is generally acknowledged that this final text was added to the document because this understanding of unity and/as communion, although it is maintained in principle by most Old Catholic ecclesiologists,[364] is not generally practised by the Old Catholic Churches. For example, from this perspective the 1931 Bonn Agreement, which established full communion between the Anglican and Old Catholic Churches, lacks a detailed exposition of its theological basis as well as clarity about the relationship between full communion and ecclesial unity. Moreover, in the case of the mutual invitation to eucharistic communion between the *Evangelische Kirche Deutschlands* and the German Old Catholic Church, adopted by these churches in the nineteen eighties, it is clear that establishing ecclesial unity and sharing eucharistic communion are not regarded as equivalents. Finally, there are unilateral statements in which some of the Old Catholic Churches, although not formally adopting an 'open communion', officially allow the administration of communion to baptised members of other churches. Although the Orthodox Churches know, of course, the practice of *oikonomia*, they do not endorse official statements which suggest that there can be such a thing as 'interim communion' prior to the 'communion' of ecclesial unity. This discrepancy between the full theological consensus in the Orthodox—Old Catholic dialogue texts and the actual Old Catholic position within ecumenism is a reason why the

360 *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, VII ('Kirchengemeinschaft: Voraussetzungen und Folgen').
361 Cf. REIN, *Kirchengemeinschaft*, II 189.
362 *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, VII.2.
363 This position is critically evaluated in paragraph 8.4.4.
364 Cf. above, chapter 4.

theological consensus has not yet been followed by the establishment of ecclesial unity.[365]

One can conclude that this document presents an understanding of unity in the form of a strictly consistent eucharistic ecclesiology. It is questionable whether the less strict Old Catholic practice could be accepted by Orthodoxy as a matter of *oikonomia*,[366] not only because for Orthodoxy the relationship between eucharistic communion and ecclesial unity is quite a central issue, but also because some Old Catholic theologians and churches do not regard their ecumenical attitude as a matter of *oikonomia*, but rather as an element of their ecclesiological self-understanding. Not only the identity between eucharistic and ecclesial *koinonia*, but also the recognition of (perhaps partial) truth in other churches has to be taken into account.[367] As far as this document is concerned, the question how a eucharistic ecclesiology can be consistently reconciled with a constructive ecumenical practice has, thus, still to be answered.

7.8.6 Conclusion

The Orthodox—Old Catholic dialogue texts stand out as an example of a consistent eucharistic ecclesiology. Based upon a soteriology of communion (*koinonia*), the church is interpreted as the body of Christ, centred around the eucharistic celebration under the presidency of the bishop. The dialectical relationship between the local church (diocese) and the supra-local, ultimately wordwide, communion of churches is approached from the angle of the eucharist: the eucharist makes each local church the same body of Christ as every other local church. Likewise, the understanding of the ordained ministry

365 For Old Catholic regulations and Orthodox reactions, cf. REIN, *Kirchengemeinschaft*, II 168-202, 381-438; and the reply by S. KRAFT, 'Was heisst Einladung? Zur Kritik an der evangelisch/alt-katholischen Abendmahlsvereinbarung', *Una Sancta* 1985, 312-316. Since 1987, when the dialogue was completed, two other controversial issues have entered the scene: the ordination of women (cf. PAPANDREOU, 'Die gegenseitige ekklesiologische Anerkennung', 286) and the formal acceptance of homosexual relationships. See also U. VON ARX, 'Vertane Chancen. Der Dialog zwischen der Altkatholischen und der Orthodoxen Kirche, in: Evmenios of Lefka, A. Basdekis, N. Thon (eds.), *Die Orthodoxe Kirche. Eine Standortbestimmung an der Jahrtausendwende. Festgabe für Anastasios Kallis* (Frankfurt: Lembeck, 1999), 199-222, who, among other things, points at the changed ecumenical context since the Roman Catholic Church joined the ecumenical movement, by which the striving at an alliance of Catholic but non-Roman churches seems to have lost its *momentum*.

366 As is hoped for by ALDENHOVEN, 'Charakter, Bedeutung und Ziel der Dialogtexte', 44.

367 Cf. OEYEN, 'Ekklesiologische Fragen', 243-248, 254, 262-263. In *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis*, III/3.4-5 a modest start is made with this more open approach towards other Christians, but without consequences for the document's view on ecclesial unity. J. VISSER, 'Von Mäntelchen und dem Wind. Zur Frage einer altkatholischen Theologie', *IKZ* 95 (2005), 73-94, at 84-85, doubts whether the Orthodox—Old Catholic dialogue texts actually reflect mainstream Old Catholic theology, especially the hermeneutical approach to the Early Church.

is developed out of the eucharistic celebration: the bishop presides both at the eucharist and at the synod of the local church and is for that very reason also the link between the local church and the communion of churches. Finally, the concept of ecclesial (and ecumenical) unity is also derived from the eucharistic-ecclesiological starting point: unity is equated with communion; when churches recognise in one another the (intrinsically) catholic church, this recognition is the establishment of unity which is synonymous with the establishment of eucharistic communion. How this consistent eucharistic-ecclesiological view on unity and/as communion can be related to the ecumenical situation of recognised baptised Christians outside one's own ecclesial communion, is yet to be solved—either as a matter of *oikonomia*, or as the result of further theological thought.

7.9 CONCLUSION

7.9.1 Koinonia

All multilateral and bilateral texts presented in this chapter are based upon a theology of communion. *Koinonia* is the keyword for the relationality of the Trinity and of humanity created in the image of God, for sin as the disruption of relationships, for redemption as the restoration of relationships, for the church as the temporary form of a common life in restored communion, for the service to the world as contribution towards restored communion and for eschatology as its fulfillment.

7.9.2 The Church

The texts understand *koinonia* as a common bond through participation in the same divine reality. Therefore, in all texts the concept of incorporation is fundamental for ecclesiology. Baptism (or 'faith and baptism') is the sacrament of incorporation into Christ, into Christ's body. The eucharist is the sacrament by which this incorporation is continuously confirmed and renewed. The church is the communion of those who are intimately connected to, engrafted into Jesus Christ, and thereby connected to one another. Within this consensus, the F&O texts emphasise the distinction between Head and body (Christ and the church do not become identical), whereas the Orthodox—Old Catholic dialogue text emphasises the inseparability of head and body (who, together, form *totus Christus*).

7.9.3 The Eucharist

With different emphases, all texts affirm that the eucharist is the central event of the church's life. Together with baptism, the eucharist is regarded as constitutive for the *koinonia* between Christ and his body, and between the members of his body. Moreover, the eucharist is seen as the concise expression of everything that is meant by *koinonia*, in particular the communion with God, the relationality within the church, the sharing of spiritual and material gifts with all humanity and creation, and the foretaste of the eschatological consummation.

7.9.4 Mission

Again with different emphases, all texts relate soteriological, ecclesiological and eucharistic *koinonia* to the notion of mission. Although *koinonia* is proleptically experienced in the church, *koinonia* is meant for all humanity and creation. The mission of the church is to place itself in the service of God's will to reconcile the whole world into one restored *koinonia*. Most texts presented in this chapter display a preference for an understanding of mission related to the structural, corporate enhancement of *koinonia* among people and throughout creation (justice, peace, joy). Some texts, particularly the more recent F&O texts, complement this societal understanding of mission with a more personal understanding of mission as the conversion of individuals.

7.9.5 The Ordained Ministry

Among the multilateral texts, *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* (*BEM*) and *The Nature and Mission of the Church* contain the most fundamental sections on the ordained ministry. These documents recognise the exercise of *episkope* in all churches, and make the requirement that *episkope* will always be exercised in ways that do justice to its personal, collegial and communal aspects. *BEM* takes one step further by proposing an ecumenical *relecture* of the ancient threefold ministry of the bishop, the presbyterium and the deacons as a possible way out of the ecumenical deadlock regarding the mutual recognition of ordained ministries. In some layers of the texts—in *BEM* more consistently than in *The Nature and Mission of the Church*—both documents let the various tasks of the ordained ministry flow from its presiding role during the eucharistic celebration. Finally, *The Nature and Mission of the Church* affirms the need for *episkope* on the regional and universal levels.

Additionally, the Anglican—Roman Catholic and Orthodox—Old Catholic bilateral dialogue texts present a fully eucharistic understanding of the ordained ministry. Moreover, these documents not only affirm the need for universal *episkope*, but also agree that the responsibility for such *episkope*—to be

exercised in collegiality with his brother bishops and preferably with clergy and laity—belongs to the bishop of Rome.

7.9.6 The Church Local and Universal

All documents represent an understanding of the church as, in the first instance, the local church. In many cases, this local church is seen as the eucharistic community under the presidency of the bishop. In many of the texts, however, there is simultaneously the awareness that locality and universality—or rather, the local church and the communion of churches—are not incompatible, but fundamentally related. It belongs intrinsically to the local church that it is in communion with other local churches.

8 TOWARDS A LITURGICAL *KOINONIA* ECCLESIOLOGY IN ECUMENICAL PERSPECTIVE

Conclusion

8.1 INTRODUCTION

8.1.1 An Attempt at a Synthesis

The preceding chapters introduced a variety of possible shades and shapes of a 'liturgical ecclesiology'.[1] The focus of this study has been, so far, to investigate how various theologians from various churches approach their understanding of the church from the perspective of the liturgy, particularly the eucharist. As indicated in the introductory chapter, three sub-questions can be identified: how does 'looking at the church from the angle of the liturgy' inform one's theology of the ordained ministry, one's view on the relationship between the local and the universal church, and one's view on the relationship between liturgy and daily life in and outside the church?[2]

Consequently, this concluding chapter first seeks to establish the 'basics' of a systematic-theological liturgical ecclesiology. This will be done by rooting ecclesiology in the biblical-theological concept of *koinonia* (8.2) and by investigating the connection between Jesus Christ, the Holy Spirit and the church (8.3). The core of a liturgical ecclesiology is presented in section 8.4, which discusses why baptism, the eucharist and the wider liturgy are constitutive for the Christian faith and church. The remaining sections deal with the sub-questions: the ordained ministry (8.5), the local-universal dialectic (8.6) and the meaning of liturgical ecclesiology 'beyond' the liturgy (8.7).

The aim of this chapter is not simply to summarise the findings of the previous chapters, but to synthesise them into a coherent ecclesiological approach, for which the rich thought of the previous chapters is used as 'raw

1 The concept of 'liturgical ecclesiology' (including 'eucharistic ecclesiology') is introduced in sections 1.3 (Liturgical Theology) and 1.4 (Liturgical Ecclesiology).

2 Cf. section 1.2 (Question and Method).

material'.[3] Therefore, the invocation of particular authors is in this chapter no longer done in order to present *their* views, but in order to substantiate my own point of view or to shed light on it from various angles.

8.1.2 Four Criteria

The choices made in this chapter are based upon the following criteria. The title of this chapter tries to reflect these presuppositions.

Firstly, any systematic-theological concept should be as internally consistent as possible. In the case of a liturgical ecclesiology, this internal consistency depends on the heuristic starting-point that ecclesiological principles should naturally flow from the internal logic of the liturgical gathering, rather than being (conceptually) imposed upon the celebrating community from outside.

Secondly, a liturgical ecclesiology aims at being deeply theological and tangibly empirical at the same time. The deepest thought about God and humanity, about creation, salvation and consummation, is to be found in the concretely visible liturgical celebration of this group of people in this locality at this moment. The thought presented in this chapter is, then, although of a systematic-theological nature, always related or applicable to the empirical reality of churches and their members, celebrations of the liturgy and the sacraments, and 'doxological living' in and outside the church. The ecclesiology presented here is by no means believed to be 'mere theory'.

Thirdly, all chapters of this study, and especially chapter 7, witness to an ecumenical convergence with regard to the theology of church, sacraments and ministry. The choices made in this chapter are meant to find themselves within the broad ecumenical consensus which is the legacy of twentieth-century theology and especially of the interrelated biblical, patristic, liturgical and ecumenical movements.[4] The effect of this criterion is that, notwithstanding the fact that the present author cannot detach himself from the particular ecclesial reality in which he lives, this chapter's basic ecclesiological lines of thought should nevertheless—either directly or *mutatis mutandis*—be applicable to the theology and practice of various churches. The principal question to the churches is not, whether they are willing to adapt themselves to one and the same ecclesiological vision and polity, but whether they are willing to re-read their own ecclesial reality in the light of ecumenical convergence, so that, having re-interpreted themselves, they will be able to recognise their own

[3] Consequently, the footnotes in this chapter will refer to the relevant paragraphs of the previous chapters. The only exception to this rule is a very limited number of footnote references to publications not yet mentioned in the previous chapters.

[4] Cf. paragraphs 2.1.6 (The Call for a Neo-Patristic Synthesis), 3.1.2 (Theological Reassessment), 3.1.3 (The Liturgical Movement), 7.1.1 (Common Ground), 7.1.2 (The Ecumenical Movement) and 7.1.3 (Goal and Method of the Ecumenical Movement).

ecclesial fullness (catholicity) in one another. This chapter aims at being a contribution to such *relecture*.

Finally, the choices that will be made in this chapter originate from an understanding of *koinonia* (*communio*, communion) which is understood in terms like 'incorporation' and 'participation' rather than just 'fellowship'. The ecclesiology of this chapter will, therefore, reflect a 'sacramental' understanding of the relationship between God and humanity, Christ and the church.[5] Some would not regard this as a separate criterion, since most theology that is done within a broad ecumenical consensus already takes this view. It seems nevertheless worthwile to mention this guiding principle explicitly, because without a sacramental, participatory perspective a liturgical ecclesiology runs the danger of being seriously misunderstood, either in a triumphalist way, as if Christ is unequivocally present in everything the church is and does, or in a 'thinly' liturgical, aesthetic way, as if the church would have little more to do than 'awaiting the next eucharistic event'.[6]

8.2 *KOINONIA*

At the heart of a liturgical ecclesiology is the biblical-theological notion of *koinonia* (*communio*, communion). Among the authors discussed in this study, there is virtually no one whose ecclesiological thought is not rooted in, or related to, a more or less thorough interpretation of the concept of communion. In some instances, particularly in the Roman Catholic and ecumenical chapters, ecclesiological thought presented itself explicitly as 'communion ecclesiology'. This section explores a number of interrelated elements of *koinonia*: trinitarian (8.2.1), anthropological (8.2.2), soteriological (8.2.3), ecclesiological (8.2.4) and eucharistic (8.2.6). The concept of *koinonia* itself is particularly treated in paragraph 8.2.5. All these aspects should be both *distinguished* and *held together* in order not to distort or reduce the complex meaning of the concept.

8.2.1 A Theology of Communion

The most fundamental root of the concept of *koinonia* is theological in the literal sense of the word: God himself is characterised by communion, by the loving relationship between the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit. As Zizioulas teaches, there is not first an abstract deity that flows into three

5 This 'participatory' principle is explained in paragraphs 8.2.5, 8.3.2 and 8.3.4. Subsequently, it is applied to baptism (8.4.1), the eucharist (8.4.3), the Word (8.4.6), doxology (8.4.7) and ethics (8.7.3, 8.7.4).

6 For Fagerberg's concept of 'thin' and 'thick' liturgy, cf. paragraph 1.3.2. The citation is from Bradshaw; cf. paragraph 5.4.1.

persons, but the person of the Father, who out of love begets the Son and brings forth the Spirit. Thus, relationality is fundamental to the Christian understanding of God.[7] And as Boff emphasises, this relationality is not limited to the begetting and forthcoming of the Son and the Spirit from the Father, but continues through the ongoing perichoresis of the divine persons. The Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit interpenetrate and interpret one another. They never exist or act on their own, but always exist and act interdependently. This perichoretic understanding of the trinitarian root of the concept of *koinonia* gives the concept its fundamental nature of 'participating in' rather than just 'having fellowship with'.[8]

In relation to the perhaps less articulated spirituality of many contemporary people, von Arx rightly points to the fact that taking the trinitarian God as the starting-point of the Christian understanding of God and humanity, the church and the world, is a vulnerable theological position. One cannot, however, dispense with it if one wants to take the Christian faith seriously in all its depth. Helping people to deepen their spiritual life and to enrich their knowledge about the Christian faith and church is, therefore, a welcome way to enliven people's faith in and understanding of the Trinity and the centrality of communion and participation in the Christian worldview.[9]

8.2.2 An Anthropology of Communion

Communion is not only characteristic of God himself, it is also characteristic of his creation, especially of humanity created 'in [God's] image, according to [God's] likeness' (Genesis 1:26). When, for example, de Lubac emphasises the 'social' character of the church and all humanity, he does so on the basis of the 'social' character of God. Because God is not a self-centred individual, but a unity of persons in loving and sharing relationality, humanity created in this divine image is created out of, and destined for, living in communion. Such communion is different from both individualism (insofar as it sees the person as an independent monad) and collectivism (insofar as it suppresses personhood through the standardisation of individuals into a mass). True personhood in the image of the trinitarian God respects difference but keeps the differences together in mutuality.[10] Tillard says the same by contrasting individualism with 'singularity', that is, true personhood which is neither divided into individualism nor absorbed into collectivism.[11] This fundamental *relationality*

7 Cf. paragraph 2.3.5.
8 Cf. paragraph 3.4.7.
9 Cf. paragraphs 4.8.2 and 4.8.3. See also 6.4.6 (Wainwright).
10 Cf. paragraphs 3.2.2 and 3.2.7.
11 Cf. paragraph 3.5.2.

of Christian anthropology, based upon trinitarian theology, is underlined by many authors throughout this study.[12]

When God's communion overflows into his creation and particularly into humanity, this means that humanity is destined to participate in the divine trinitarian life. In this context, Stalder helpfully mentions a biblical verse like John 17:22, where Christ says to the Father, 'The glory that you have given me I have given them, so that they may be one, as we are one'. Unity/communion among Christians and ultimately all humanity is, in this perspective, a horizontal unity/communion rooted in the transcendent unity/communion of the trinitarian God.[13] In Tillard's words: 'being in communion' is always 'being in co-communion' (being *syn-koinonoi*) with the trinitarian God.[14]

Pickstock expresses similar thought, when she speaks of the Christian life as a 'non-identical repetition' of the divine gift in creation and incarnation. Having received their being from God, people offer themselves to God in praise and life, and receive themselves back from God in the ongoing economy of grace. There is only one gift: the love of the trinitarian God which he shares with his creation and which people non-identically (in their own ways and situations) return—most manifestly in doxology. Therefore, one could say with Pickstock that a human being is called to become a liturgical, doxological person. Human life—'doxological' as it is in liturgy and daily life—is, thus, participation in the supreme gift which is God's trinitarian love. Human life is participation in the divine trinitarian life and transformation into God.[15] This is why, in Orthodox terminology, the destiny of humanity is *theosis*. Such 'divinisation' is not the elimination of the difference between God and humanity, but the return of humanity into the loving communion of the trinitarian God.[16]

8.2.3 A Soteriology of Communion

If God is understood as communion in himself, and if humanity is understood as fundamentally relational through its creation in the image of the God who is communion in himself, it is consistent to understand salvation as the restoration of communion. In this study, this approach to soteriology is particularly exemplified by Zizioulas, de Lubac, Tillard and Stalder.[17] It is also manifestly present in the Faith and Order documents *Church and World*, *Towards Koinonia in Faith, Life and Witness* and *The Nature and Mission of the*

12 Cf. paragraphs 3.3.7 (Ratzinger), 4.7.2 (Aldenhoven), 5.6.3 (Williams) and 7.3.1 (*Church and World*). For Zizioulas's anthropology see paragraph 8.3.2.
13 Cf. paragraph 4.5.4.
14 Cf. paragraph 3.5.2.
15 Cf. paragraphs 5.7.2 and 5.7.7.
16 Cf. paragraph 7.8.1 (Orthodox—Old Catholic dialogue).
17 Cf. paragraphs 2.3.5 (Zizioulas), 3.2.2 (de Lubac), 3.5.2 (Tillard) and 4.5.2 (Stalder).

Church,[18] as well as in the Anglican—Roman Catholic and Orthodox—Old Catholic dialogue texts.[19]

The state of 'fallen' humanity is, then, a state of disrupted communion, broken relationship, negated love, between humans and God as well as between humans themselves. The autarchic tendency of individualised humanity is the main characteristic of sin and a fundamental obstacle to authentic personhood. The process of salvation history is needed for the restoration of the relational personhood which is the creational and eschatological destiny of humanity. As Babel stands for the dispersion of humanity, it is at Pentecost that humanity is reunited. As Adam stands for the rupture of personhood-in-communion, it is by and in Jesus Christ that personhood is recovered.

For a Christian, the person and life of Jesus Christ is the summit of God's movement to draw humanity into himself. '[I]n Christ God was reconciling the world to himself' (2 Corinthians 5:19). The *mysterium Christi* (incarnation, words and signs, death and resurrection, sending of the Spirit, ascension, kingship, coming again), culminating in the *mysterium paschale* (death and resurrection), constituted by God through the Holy Spirit, is the way in which God inaugurates the new creation, the restored divine-human communion. This reconciliation takes place through being drawn into the salvific life of Christ, in other words, by being incorporated into Christ. As Zizioulas makes clear, Christ is not an individual entity, seeking parallel relationships to every individual, but a 'corporate' person who draws the world into himself.[20] Salvation happens, therefore, through participation in Christ's life, death and resurrection. Christ, and all who are drawn into him, are the new Adam (Romans 5:12-17; 1 Corinthians 15:22,45), the 'new creation' (2 Corinthians 5:17). Christ is the true person in the image of God, who both embodies and exemplifies what restored communion means. In and through him, the renewal takes place of the relationship between God and humanity and of the justice, peace and joy among humans. In the words of the letter to the Ephesians (1:8-10):

> With all wisdom and insight [God] has made known to us the mystery of his will, according to his good pleasure that he set forth in Christ, as a plan for the fullness of time, to gather up all things in him, things in heaven and things on earth.

In language probably more directly appealing to contemporary people, Avis presents this soteriology of communion under the banner of a 'wholeness paradigm'. God wants to make people whole, well, healed—not just individually but also communally. God's mission towards the world is

[18] Cf. paragraphs 7.1.5 (introduction on *koinonia*), 7.3.1 (*Church and World*), 7.5.2 (*Towards Koinonia in Faith, Life and Witness*) and 7.6.1 (*The Nature and Mission of the Church*).

[19] Cf. paragraphs 7.7.1, 7.7.6 (ARCIC) and 7.8.1 (Orthodox—Old Catholic dialogue). See also 7.9.1 (conclusion on *koinonia*).

[20] Cf. paragraphs 2.3.5 and 2.3.6. See also paragraph 8.3.2.

'essentially ecclesial', because the healing of human identity is a form of 'personal integration that comes from social integration'.[21] As ARCIC puts it, salvation is a process from 'alienation' through 'transformation' to 'communion'.[22]

In such a soteriology of communion, salvation is not understood as an individual affair, but as incorporation into Christ and as participation in his kenotic life. What traditionally is called 'justification' is understood as becoming part of the body of Christ. What traditionally is called 'sanctification' is understood as a lifelong growing into the likeness of Christ. Such a soteriology of incorporation and participation is crucial if a liturgical ecclesiology is to be a consistent part of the Christian faith in general, rather than a 'liturgical' superstructure on top of an otherwise individualist concept of Christianity.[23]

8.2.4 An Ecclesiology of Communion

If salvation is the restoration of communion, and if salvation is really taking place, there must be some tangible community of redeemed divine-human and inter-human relationality. If salvation is still going on and has still to embrace all humanity and all creation, this tangible community of redeemed relationality may not yet coincide with the ends of the earth, but it must nevertheless be present somewhere in the world. Theologically—and, hopefully, to some extent empirically—the church is this provisional community in which salvation as the restoration of communion already becomes tangible. As Stalder boldly says, if there would be no such thing as a church in which something of redeemed communion can be experienced, salvation has apparently not taken place or has been in vain.[24]

A theology, anthropology and soteriology of communion, therefore, points inevitably to an ecclesiology. As the authors presented in this study repeatedly substantiate, the character of Christianity is 'social' (de Lubac),[25] Christian convictions are ultimately only intelligible in the context of 'communion'

21 Cf. paragraph 5.5.9.

22 Cf. paragraph 7.7.1.

23 See also paragraph 8.2.7. For a critical exegetical basis of salvation as participation in a corporate union, cf. H.J. DE JONGE, 'De plaats van de verzoening in de vroegchristelijke theologie', in: L.J. van den Brom *et al.* (eds.), *Verzoening of Koninkrijk. Over de prioriteit in de verkondiging* (Baarn: Callenbach, 1998), 63-88 (esp. 75-84); D.G. POWERS, *Salvation through Participation: An Examination of the Notion of the Believers' Corporate Unity with Christ in Early Christian Soteriology* (Louvain: Peeters, 2001); M. PLOEGER, 'Life—Death—Resurrection—Church: On the Coherence of Some Central Christian Notions', *IKZ* 96 (2006), 45-50. For a liturgical-theological investigation into the same theme, cf. S.K. WOOD, 'Participatory Knowledge of God in the Liturgy', *Studia Liturgica* 29 (1999), 29-52.

24 Cf. paragraph 4.5.3. See also 4.8.3 (von Arx).

25 Cf. paragraph 3.2.2.

(Ratzinger),[26] the New Testament presents being saved as belonging to the community of salvation, so that, '[i]n the strict sense, there is no individual faith' (Tillard),[27] redemption takes place in the 'organism of salvation' which is the church (Rinkel),[28] salvation *is* communion and therefore implies a community (Stalder),[29] the intersubjectivity of the Christian faith sees 'the consummation of [one's] personal life in the new community of the body of Christ' (Visser),[30] it requires more than some vague religious feelings to appreciate the Christian understanding of salvation-in-communion (von Arx),[31] the church is not a sum of individuals, but a 'family' (*The Parish Communion*),[32] corporate and individual language about salvation is equally legitimate, as long as the order is recognised: the individual Christian only exists as Christian because he or she has entered the body (Ramsey),[33] 'redemption is not only about the salvation of the individual [... but] about the life of communion in the body of Christ' (Avis),[34] it is God's will to transform the world into a 'comprehensive human community', a 'new humanity' (Williams),[35] the participatory nature of Christian salvation points inevitably to a community of salvation (Pickstock and Wainwright),[36] the church is not an abstract idea, but the tangible gathering of people around a meaningful juxtapositon of rites (Lathrop),[37] even in an age of 'individuation', the Christian faith can only exist if there is a 'partially communal identity' of shared meaning, language and symbols (Ploeger and Ploeger-Grotegoed),[38] the justice, peace and joy of the kingdom, embodied in and exemplified by Jesus Christ, are to some extent already present in the renewed community of the church as 'mystery' and in its mission in and for the world as 'sign' (*Church and World*).[39]

In such an ecclesiology of communion, the *church* is neither less nor more than one element in the larger context of God's intention for the whole *world*.[40]

26 Cf. paragraph 3.3.7.
27 Cf. paragraph 3.5.2.
28 Cf. paragraph 4.2.2.
29 Cf. paragraph 4.5.2.
30 Cf. paragraph 4.6.2.
31 Cf. paragraphs 4.8.2 and 4.8.3.
32 Cf. paragraph 5.2.5.
33 Cf. paragraph 5.4.3.
34 Cf. paragraph 5.5.9.
35 Cf. paragraphs 5.6.3 and 5.6.4.
36 Cf. paragraphs 5.7.4 (Pickstock) and 6.4.6 (Wainwright).
37 Cf. paragraph 6.5.6.
38 Cf. paragraphs 6.6.7 and 6.6.8.
39 Cf. paragraphs 7.3.1 and 7.3.2. See also 7.4.2 (*Confessing the One Faith*), 7.5.3 (*Towards Koinonia in Faith, Life and Witness*), 7.6.1 (*The Nature and Mission of the Church*), 7.7.1 (ARCIC) and 7.8.1 (Orthodox—Old Catholic dialogue).
40 Ways in which the church and the eucharist point beyond themselves are discussed in section 8.7.

The church is, on the one hand, no less than the contemporary form of the restored communion that God wants humanity and the world to become. The church is part of 'the mystery of [God's] will [...], to gather up all things in [Christ]' (Ephesians 1:9-10). On the other hand, the contemporary church is no more than a preliminary form. Creation's full restoration to communion will reach beyond the boundaries of the empirical church and even beyond the fullness of Christ: 'When all things are subjected to him, then the Son himself will also be subjected to the one who puts all things in subjection under him, so that God may be all in all' (1 Corinthians 15:28).

Therefore, it is in a *koinonia* ecclesiology not easy, and perhaps not very important either, to indicate precisely when the church has come into being and when it will have ceased to be. In some sense, the church has always been there, in the trinitarian communion of love. One could also detect the church—the *ecclesia ab Abel*—in all God's dealings with his people, particularly with Israel and with all the righteous ones throughout the ages.[41] If limited to the explicit followers of Jesus Christ, the calling of the first disciples can be seen as the beginning of the church. Probably most theologically correct, the church's organic life—ordered through baptism, eucharist and ministry—is regarded as originating from the paschal mystery, including Christ's death and resurrection and the outpouring of the Spirit.

As for the 'end' of the church, one could say that in the consummation of salvation the church and the sacraments will be no more. This is the case if one takes the church in its institutional sense and the sacraments in their ritual sense. Then, church and eucharist are instruments (means of grace) towards the goal (eschatological fulfillment). One could, however, say equally well that in the consummation of salvation everything will be 'church', everything will be 'eucharist'. This is the case if one regards church as 'being restored to *koinonia* and living this *koinonia*' and the eucharist as 'experiencing *koinonia* and sharing this *koinonia*'. Then, church and eucharist are not so much an instrument towards the goal, as the proleptic experience of the goal itself—*Mundus reconciliatus, Ecclesia* (Augustine).[42] In a liturgical ecclesiology, the eschatological element has both sides: awareness of the church's provisional, imperfect character as well as of its proleptic, iconic character.

8.2.5 Communion as Incorporation and Participation

It is not coincidental that the awareness of an ecclesiology of communion—as an element in a theology, anthropology and soteriology of communion—developed in the twentieth century in the wake of the (neo-) patristic, liturgical

41 Cf. paragraph 3.5.2 (Tillard).

42 Cf. paragraph 3.2.3 (de Lubac). See also 6.3.4 (von Allmen) and 6.4.6 (Wainwright).

and ecumenical movements.[43] The (neo-) patristic, biblical-theological understanding of salvation in terms of communion and participation differs from the rather forensic and contractual emphasis in later medieval thought, as continued in the theology of both Reformation and Counter-Reformation.[44] As particularly came to the fore in the Anglican and ecumenical chapters above, a different understanding of the key notion of 'participation' is at the heart of contemporary dissensus between, roughly speaking, an ecumenically 'Catholic' and an evangelically 'Protestant' approach.[45] One's understanding of *koinonia*, particularly the range of the concept of participation, has immediate effect on one's evaluation of the role of the church in relation to, on the one hand, Jesus Christ and, on the other hand, the individual believer. In other words, one's interpretation of *koinonia* has immediate bearing on one's ecclesiology.

The understanding of *koinonia* advocated throughout this study is not exhaustibly described as 'fellowship'. *Koinonia* is more than a 'horizontal' fellowship among Christians. It is also more than a 'vertical' fellowship with Christ in a spiritualised sense, either cerebral (knowledge of Christ, thinking of Christ), emotional (feelings of affinity with Christ) or fideistic (contact, especially individual contact, with Christ through faith and prayer). Many authors discussed in this study insist that 'having *koinonia* with' should be understood in the rather 'sacramental' sense of 'participating in', 'sharing in', 'being drawn into'. The *koinonia* between God and humanity, between Christ as the head and the church as his body, involves 'incorporation' and 'participation'.[46] Tillard can even formulate that Christians are 'assumed', 'absorbed', 'inserted' into Christ.[47] A rendering of *koinonia* that includes these elements is, for example, ARCIC's phrase: 'a relation between persons resulting from their participation in one and the same reality'.[48]

At several stages in this study it has become clear that such a participatory understanding of divine-human and inter-human communion is essential for a liturgical or eucharistic ecclesiology. Without the aspect of 'being drawn into Christ', both eucharist and church loose their cutting edge and become no more than instances of comparison—'as if' they connect people to Christ and to one

43 Cf. paragraphs 2.1.6 (The Call for a Neo-Patristic Synthesis), 3.1.2 (Theological Reassessment), 3.1.3 (The Liturgical Movement), 7.1.1 (Common Ground) and 7.1.2 (The Ecumenical Movement).

44 Cf. paragraphs 5.3.2 (Dix) and 5.7.5 (Pickstock).

45 Cf. paragraphs 5.4.1 (Excursus: Evangelical and Catholic Anglicans) and 7.7.3 (Excursus: The Nature of Salvation and Participation).

46 Cf. paragraphs 3.2.4 (de Lubac), 3.3.8 (Ratzinger), 3.4.7 (Boff), 5.4.3 (Ramsey), 5.5.7 (Avis), 5.6.5 (Williams), 6.2.7 (Noordmans and van der Leeuw), 7.2.2 (*Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*), 7.3.2 (*Church and World*), 7.5.2 (*Towards Koinonia in Faith, Life and Witness*) and 7.6.1 (*The Nature and Mission of the Church*).

47 Cf. paragraph 3.5.3.

48 Cf. paragraph 7.7.1. Similar phrases in 3.5.2 (Tillard), 4.7.4 (Aldenhoven), 4.8.5 (von Arx) and 7.8.5 (Orthodox—Old Catholic dialogue).

another. In such a reduced understanding of *koinonia* and thereby of the church and the sacraments, it makes no sense to consider the eucharist as central and, eventually, the church as of principal relevance in the Christian faith.[49] Such centrality and relevance can only be maintained if one accepts Wainwright's radical observation that 'Christianity glories in the fact, the strict matter of fact, that reality can be known only by participation'.[50] Pickstock works out this theme of participation in its ontological depth. She makes clear how forensic, contractual ('covenantal') thought about God, Christ and salvation and a 'miraculous', static understanding of the eucharist—which she ascribes to Scotus—is conceptually consistent with the late medieval, Reformation and Counter-Reformation approach to christology and salvation as well as to the church and the sacraments. Conversely, the analogical, participatory ontology, including a 'holistic' view on Christ and the eucharist—which she ascribes to Aquinas—seems to return in the twentieth-century neo-patristic, liturgical and ecumenical thought that features so dominantly in this study.[51] An ecclesiology of *koinonia* is, then, an ecclesiology of incorporation and participation.

8.2.6 The Eucharist as the Paradigm of Communion

Continuing the line of thought from the trinitarian God, through an approach to anthropology and soteriology that fundamentally aims at communion, to the church as the preliminary form of restored divine-human and inter-human communion, an ecclesiology of communion finds its natural centre in the tangible celebration of communion: the eucharist.[52] In a liturgical ecclesiology, the celebration of 'bath, word and meal' (Lathrop)—that is, 'the eucharist' presupposing faith-and-baptism and including the ministry of the Word—is the 'paradigm of *koinonia*' (Avis).[53] This is true because the eucharist is neither just a *koinonia* in the sense of a gathering of people, nor just an expression of a spiritualised *koinonia* with Christ. Rather, it is precisely the sacramental, participatory understanding of *koinonia* as described in the previous paragraph which points to the eucharist as its paradigm. The eucharist is the gathering of those who have *koinonia* with one another through their corporate *koinonia* with Jesus Christ, and through him with God. This 'double *koinonia*' (Rinkel)[54] is exemplarily expressed in 1 Corinthians 10:16-17, which can be regarded as eucharistic ecclesiology's foundational biblical text:

49 Cf. paragraphs 5.4.1 (Excursus: Evangelical and Catholic Anglicans) and 7.7.3 (Excursus: The Nature of Salvation and Participation).
50 Cf. paragraph 6.4.6.
51 Cf. paragraphs 5.7.1, 5.7.4 and 5.7.5.
52 This subject is further discussed in section 8.4.
53 Cf. paragraphs 5.5.6 (Avis) and 6.5.2 (Lathrop).
54 Cf. paragraph 4.2.4.

> The cup of blessing that we bless, is it not a sharing [*koinonia*] in the blood of Christ? The bread that we break, is it not a sharing [*koinonia*] in the body of Christ? Because there is one bread, we who are many are one body, for we all partake of the one bread.

8.2.7 Conclusion

A thorough understanding of a liturgical or eucharistic ecclesiology does neither start with the liturgy or the eucharist, nor with the church. It starts with God, his being and his mission in and for the world. There, in God's trinitarian being, the notion of *koinonia* finds its source. From there, the notion of *koinonia* leaves its mark on a Christian view on humanity as God has created it and as God wants to restore it. Within this context of humans destined to live in *koinonia* with God and one another, the church has its natural place as the preliminary form of restored divine-human and inter-human *koinonia*, a place that is simultaneously indispensable and provisional. As the preliminary form of *koinonia* between God and humanity and between reconciled humans among themselves, the church finds its natural centre in the tangible source and expression of *koinonia*, the eucharistic liturgy.

This embedding of the church and the sacraments in an overarching vision of salvation is an important mark of a communion ecclesiology. In such an approach, commonly shared beliefs such as God, Jesus Christ and the Holy Spirit do not function as a 'substructure' which can *ad libitum* (for example, when one is a Catholic) be supplemented by a 'superstructure' of more specific beliefs such as the church, the sacraments and the ordained ministry. The merit of a communion ecclesiology is that the church, and everything that can be said about it, is not *added to* but *integrated in* the basic beliefs of the Christian faith.

To do justice to the concept of *koinonia*, it is not sufficient to translate it into *communio* or 'communion'. It is certainly not enough to render it as 'fellowship'. The full biblical-theological meaning of being incorporated into a fundamental unity through corporate participation in one divine reality has to be taken into account.

8.3 CHRIST, THE SPIRIT AND THE CHURCH

8.3.1 The Body of Christ

In a liturgical or eucharistic ecclesiology, one element of *koinonia* is particularly central: the *koinonia* between Jesus Christ and the church. In the wider context of God's ways with the world—the salvific process towards the restoration of *koinonia* which aims at embracing all humanity and the whole creation—the church is the preliminary shape of such restored divine-human

and inter-human *koinonia*. This *koinonia* (that is, this salvation) is wrought by Jesus Christ, under whom God wants to reunite all creation. People are brought into *koinonia* with Jesus Christ and this *koinonia* is the church.[55]

The best-known description of the church as *koinonia* between Christ and humans is the biblical term 'body of Christ'. Most authors presented in this study do not interpret this term as a metaphor, but as a reality of faith.[56] That is, they do not perceive the relationship between Christ and the church as, ultimately, a cerebral or emotional or fideistic matter. The members of the church are not just related to Christ 'as if' they were his body. The relationship between Christ and the church is rather an 'ontological' (essential) connection, a corporeal unification, of a sacramental nature. Through baptism, one is incorporated into Christ (cf. 1 Corinthians 12:12-13), one dies and resurrects with Christ (cf. Romans 6:3-11), one lives the resurrected life of Christ (cf. Colossians 3:1). In the eucharist, this being part of Christ's body is time and again reinforced by taking part in Christ's eucharistic body in order to become Christ's ecclesial body (cf. 1 Corinthians 10:17).

This section will further investigate the relationship between Christ and the church. Paragraph 8.3.2 deals with the concept of *totus Christus* as the pneumatological and eschatological unity between Christ as the head and the church as his body. Paragraph 8.3.3 tries to put the ecclesiological terms 'people of God', 'body of Christ' and 'temple of the Spirit' into a coherent perspective. Paragraph 8.3.4 asks the question how the 'ontological' (rather than metaphorical) character of the term 'body of Christ' is related to the fact that Christ is not swallowed up by the church but also remains its over against. Finally, paragraph 8.3.5 points to the potential of a eucharistic 'body of Christ' ecclesiology to offer a balanced, multi-faceted view on the church in which the empirical and the spiritual meet.

8.3.2 Totus Christus: Head and Body

If both Jesus Christ and contemporary people are seen as individuals, it is hard to understand how the relationship between contemporary individuals to the individual Jesus Christ could be anything other than a spiritual(ised) relationship through knowledge of him, through feelings of affinity, or at best through faith and prayer. The rather ontological *koinonia* described so far roots in a different understanding of the personhood of Jesus Christ and all humanity.

As Zizioulas teaches, the biblical account of Jesus Christ is full of references to the Holy Spirit (for example at the annunciation and at his baptism), who made Christ an eschatological person. Constituted as Christ by

[55] Cf. paragraphs 8.2.3 and 8.2.4.

[56] Cf. paragraphs 2.3.5 (Zizioulas), 3.2.5, 3.2.6 (de Lubac), 3.3.5 (Ratzinger), 4.2.3 (Rinkel), 5.3.3 (Dix), 5.5.7 (Avis), 5.7.5 (Pickstock) and 7.4.1 (*Confessing the One Faith*).

the Spirit of *koinonia*, Christ is not an 'individual', but a 'person', a relational being in the image of God. By drawing people into himself, Christ gives humans a share in this personal, relational being which is participation in the trinitarian life of God. This participation takes place through incorporation into himself: Christ makes humans a part of himself. This incorporation of people into Christ is possible because, constituted by the eschatological Spirit of *koinonia*, Christ is by definition a 'corporate personality'. He cannot be thought without those who belong to him. As a corporate personality, Christ *is* the church: Christ is both head and body. People who are drawn into him, are made 'ecclesial persons', that is, they are transformed from the fallen state of being individuals to the redeemed state of being persons-in-communion. But this close relationship—amounting to an identity—between Christ and (the members of) the church is an *eschatological* relationship, for it is the eschatological Spirit who constitutes both Christ and (the members of) the church as one corporate unity. This means that, between *iam* and *nondum*, the identity between Christ and the church is an eschatological identity which is in this *aeon* best approximated in the eschatological event *par excellence*—the eucharist. In the eucharist, Christ and the church are epicletically one. Outside the eucharist, the likeness of Christ has to be sought for: we should become what we *shall* be, we should become what we sacramentally (epicletically) already *are*.[57]

The classical expression of this ontological unity between Jesus Christ and (the members of) the church is the phrase *totus Christus*. 'The whole Christ' is not the historical and resurrected Christ on his own, but the historical and resurrected Christ together with those who are incorporated into him. Incorporation into Christ takes place through baptism and is time and again reaffirmed by the eucharist. The eucharistic celebration is an act of *totus Christus*, a simultaneous act of the head and the body: Christ, the living head, is present in the eucharistic body, which transforms the church into his living body. Therefore, the eucharist is on the one hand the most manifest *expression* of the unity of *totus Christus*. On the other hand, it is the most powerful *source* of this unity.[58]

8.3.3 People of God, Body of Christ, Temple of the Spirit

The centrality of the 'body of Christ' model in a eucharistic ecclesiology does not mean that there are no other ecclesiological categories. In particular, the

[57] Cf. paragraphs 2.3.5 and 2.3.6. Similar views in 3.2.2 (de Lubac), 3.5.2 (Tillard), 4.4.2 (Küppers) and 7.6.1 (*The Nature and Mission of the Church*).

[58] Cf. paragraphs 3.2.4, 3.2.5, 3.2.6 (de Lubac), 3.3.8, 3.3.9 (Ratzinger), 6.3.5 (von Allmen), 6.6.10 (Ploeger and Ploeger-Grotegoed) and 7.8.2 (Orthodox—Old Catholic dialogue).

church is also the 'people of God' and the 'temple of the Spirit'.[59] The consistent context of a theology, anthropology and soteriology of communion makes clear that christology is embedded in a theology and a pneumatology. The mission of God is, ultimately, not to incorporate people into Christ, but to reunite all creation in God's trinitarian life. The way God does so, is by drawing people into *koinonia* with himself.[60]

His covenant with Israel was God's first engagement with humans whom he gathered together into one people. This makes, as Ratzinger states, God's covenant with Israel the paradigm of the way in which God unites humanity into *koinonia*. By the paschal events of Exodus (liberation) and Sinai (covenant), Israel is constituted as a people that worships God and lives accordingly. The cult of this people is the continuous reaffirmation of their *raison d'être*: the cult is the constant reconstitution of this people as the people of God.[61]

God's covenant with Israel continues,[62] but is opened up towards all people through the covenant in Jesus Christ. As Ratzinger goes on to explain, on the one hand, the covenant in Christ clearly takes the covenant with Israel as its paradigm. The calling of the twelve apostles expresses Christ's will to establish a people (*Volk*) analogous to the people of Israel. The institution of the eucharist expresses Christ's will to establish a cultic people (*Kultvolk*), with the Christian paschal meal (the eucharist) as an analogy to the Jewish paschal meal. As much as the Jewish cult continuously reconstitutes Israel as the people of God by reaffirming its constitutive events of liberation and covenant, the eucharist continously reconstitutes the church as the people of God and the body of Christ by reaffirming its constitutive events: Christ's death and resurrection. On the other hand, Ratzinger emphasises that the covenant in Christ has something 'new' in relation to the covenant with Israel (which, as should be said again, continues to exist). The 'Israel paradigm' of calling a cultic people into existence by liberation and covenant applies to the church, but in the case of the church the particularity is that this covenant is potentially offered to all peoples and is rooted in the salvific life and work of Jesus Christ. This is why Ratzinger convincingly states that the church is only adequately defined as the people of God if the qualification is added that the church is the people of God because it is the body of Christ.[63] In the context of God's overarching will to restore all creation to communion, the characteristic of the *church* is that God does so

[59] *The Nature and Mission of the Church* takes as its four key 'images and insights': people of God, body of Christ, temple of the Spirit and the overarching concept of *koinonia*; cf. paragraph 7.6.1.

[60] Cf. section 8.2 (*Koinonia*). See also paragraph 8.4.5, for the importance of the gathering (*qahal*, *ekklesia*).

[61] Cf. paragraph 3.3.4.

[62] Cf. paragraphs 3.3.4 (Ratzinger), 3.5.3 (Tillard) and 6.6.3 (Ploeger and Ploeger-Grotegoed).

[63] Cf. paragraphs 3.3.4 and 3.3.5.

through the person of *Jesus Christ* and through the incorporation of humans into him.

Throughout this study runs a tendency to affirm not just the continuing role of *Israel* and the role of the *church* in God's salvific process towards the restoration of communion, but also the role of *all humanity*.[64] Ploeger and Ploeger-Grotegoed explicitly state that they regard the 'longing' by Israel, the church and all humanity as three equally important ways towards eschatological fulfillment.[65] They root this conviction in their trinitarian approach, which they propose as an alternative to what they see as an over-emphasis on christology in Christian theology and ecclesiology. On the one hand, they affirm a kind of pneumatological christology not unlike Zizioulas's emphasis on the fact that Christ's life and work is constituted by the Spirit, and that it is the Spirit who incorporates people into Christ. This approach underlines the *interdependence* of christology and pneumatology.[66] On the other hand, however, the Ploegers apply their pneumatological emphasis in a rather *independent* way. The Spirit evokes in all sorts of people the 'longing for the righteous and good life' in all sorts of ways. This approach sometimes places pneumatology over against christology.[67]

In the context of a *koinonia* ecclesiology, however, it seems unnecessary to divide the Trinity into persons who act relatively independently. To do justice to the role of all humanity in the history of salvation, it seems more consistent to keep the trinitarian persons perichoretically interdependent. The ultimate restoration of *koinonia* at all levels of that term (and this ultimate restoration of *koinonia* is the longing of all humanity) is the will of the trinitarian God to draw all creation into his relational, loving life. The covenant with Israel shows that constituting humans into one 'people of God' is the paradigm of how God draws humanity back into *koinonia* with himself. According to this paradigm, the covenant in Jesus Christ constitutes humans into a 'people of God' by incorporating them into the 'body of Christ'. The work of the Spirit is not an independent, third connection between God and humanity, because the constitution of the church is already unthinkable without the work of the eschatological Spirit of *koinonia* who constitutes Christ and who constitutes the church in Christ. The fact that all humanity is meant to be reconciled with God and with one another, and the fact that all sorts of people already long for and work towards this fulfillment, is a work of the Spirit who is inseparable from the Father and the Son. Without endorsing the independence of the Spirit, one

64 This becomes especially clear in the paragraphs 3.2.2, 3.2.3, 3.2.7 (de Lubac), 3.4.7 (Boff), 3.5.2, 3.5.3 (Tillard), 4.7.2 (Aldenhoven), 5.6.4, 5.6.7 (Williams), 5.7.2 (Pickstock), 6.3.3 (von Allmen) and 6.4.6 (Wainwright), but it is implied by most other authors as well.

65 Cf. paragraphs 6.6.2 and 6.6.3.

66 Cf. paragraph 6.6.6. See also 4.6.3 (Visser).

67 Cf. paragraphs 6.6.5, 6.6.6, 6.6.7 and 6.6.10. Perhaps not unrelated is Noordmans's insistence that the Spirit's free operation is relatively independent of the church and its liturgy; cf. paragraph 6.2.4.

can, however, affirm that evoking the longing of all humanity for the righteous and good life is the *proprium* of the Spirit who communicates the loving *koinonia* of the trinitarian God.

8.3.4 Christ and the Church: Identity or Over Against?

In a liturgical ecclesiology, the concept of the 'body of Christ', interpreted in a strong participatory way, serves primarily the deep connection between Jesus Christ and (the members of) the church through the church's incorporation into Christ by baptism and the eucharist. Those who have become the body of Christ through their baptismal incorporation into Christ are time and again reconstituted as the body of Christ through their eucharistic participation in the body of Christ. This double reality—once-for-all incorporation through baptism and repeated incorporation through the eucharist—points to a certain tension between, on the one hand, the church's corporate unity with Christ and, on the other, the remaining difference between Christ and the church. Those who are already one with Christ must always become more one with him. Those who are already made a part of Christ must always grow further into his likeness. As Augustine tells his people in the context of both the eucharist and the church as the body of Christ: 'Be what you see, receive what you are'.[68]

The thought presented throughout this study reflects both sides of the paradox. There are authors who emphasise the *unity*, sometimes amounting to an *identity*, between Christ and the church, although in all these cases there is also some qualification which secures the *distinction* between Christ and the church. De Lubac, for example, can affirm Bossuet's saying that the church is 'Christ extended and communicated', and can call the church 'Christ continued'. On the other hand, de Lubac's pioneering use of the idea of the church as the 'sacrament of Christ' makes clear that, although Christ cannot be separated from the church, he has nevertheless to be distinguished from it: the church is a 'sacrament' of Christ, not Christ himself. Especially the sins of the church must not be concealed behind an alleged identity between Christ and the church.[69] Rinkel can call the church 'the present Christ, the incorporation of his continued work', but he adds that the church is so in an 'earthly', 'imperfect' way.[70] Probably the strongest language is used by Dix when he says that, by baptism, the church is *in* Christ and the church *is* Christ. It should be mentioned, however, that this stands in the context of two of Dix's main emphases: martyrdom and eschatology, which gives a non-triumphalistic qualification to his strong identification of Christ and the church.[71] A strong emphasis on a *theologia crucis* qualifies Ramsey's saying that the church is, at it were, the

68 Cf. paragraphs 3.2.4 (de Lubac) and 3.5.3 (Tillard). See also 5.4.4 (Ramsey).
69 Cf. paragraph 3.2.3.
70 Cf. paragraph 4.2.2.
71 Cf. paragraph 5.3.3.

biography of Christ.[72] The Orthodox—Old Catholic dialogue text is able to state that the church continues the salvific work of Christ, but this is put in a trinitarian, particularly pneumatological, perspective.[73]

When asked where the body of Christ is, Ploeger and Ploeger-Grotegoed answer: 'The eucharistic bread and the congregation are the risen body of Christ'. Nevertheless, the Ploegers are exemplary for those who fear an understanding of the church as the body of Christ in which the identity between Christ and the church is not applied to all members of the church but to the clergy. They especially fear this distortion in a body of Christ ecclesiology that focuses on the eucharist of which the clergy are the dispensers. Instead, they emphasise the Pauline stress on the variety of members. It is by the mutal acceptance of various charisms that the body of Christ is built up (cf. 1 Corinthians 12).[74] However, the fear for a clericalist distortion is not substantiated by most eucharistic ecclesiologies presented in this study. As will be expounded in the section on the ordained ministry below, those ecclesiologies which *are* liable to such a distortion, suffer from an inconsistency which has to be corrected.[75]

In addition to these theologians who offer a qualified emphasis on the identity between Christ and the church, this study also presents thought that rejects too strong an identification. *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, for example, balances its ecclesiology of incorporation and participation by insisting that Christ's 'incarnation, life, death, resurrection and ascension' are 'neither repeated nor prolonged'. The church lives 'in communion with Christ', but it is neither a prolongation of the incarnation nor the present shape of Christ.[76]

Williams, standing within the theological tradition that sees Christ and the church as intimately related, issues a warning that comes from his deep awareness of the church's empirical half-heartedness. The church 'does not exhaust [Christ's] identity or activity'. Christ's presence in the church is that of a judge, so that his presence in the church is most adequately seen when the church asks self-corrective questions. Williams is especially critical of seeing church and world as hallowed by the incarnation. In that concept he sees a lurking sacralisation of the societal and ecclesiastical *status quo* and a lurking self-aggrandisement of the church. Because not the incarnation but the paschal event (crucifixion and vindication) is the centre of Christ's mission, Christ's presence in the church is an upsetting rather than a reassuring presence: 'we should all be wearing crash helmets' in church. To some extent balancing this critical approach, Williams affirms the deep relationship between Christ and the

72 Cf. paragraph 5.4.3.
73 Cf. paragraph 7.8.2.
74 Cf. paragraph 6.6.10.
75 Cf. section 8.5 (especially paragraph 8.5.3).
76 Cf. paragraph 7.2.3.

church—including the church's growth towards Christ-likeness—in the sacraments. The transformation into the likeness of Christ takes place through baptism and the eucharist, and should from there be carried on in daily life in church and society. Especially in the eucharist, the church is what it should be: one with Christ and one as an egalitarian community. In the eucharistic celebration the church becomes 'epiphanic': it shows Christ to the world and to itself, which it often fails to do outside the liturgy. The church's task is to *become* what it sacramentally already *is*.[77]

Williams's approach is, although formulated in more critical language, not dissimilar to Zizioulas's insistence that the identity between Christ and the church is an eschatological, pneumatological, sacramental reality and that, therefore, the church is most itself in the eucharist. In the eucharist, the Spirit realises the eschatological unity of the church with Christ, which is in its turn a part of the unity of creation with the trinitarian God. Outside the eucharist, this eschatological reality has always to be strived for, but is never completely there.[78]

A different approach to the relationship between Christ and the church was encountered in two excursuses on what was summarised as 'Evangelical' ecclesiology. In the first excursus, based on Bradshaw's Evangelical Anglican ecclesiology, it was established that Evangelical theology does not see the relationship between Christ and the church in terms of identity or participation, but in terms of a covenantal relationship. As a result, the church is not seen to be 'in Christ'; rather is Christ, through the Spirit, seen to be 'in the church'. The term 'body of Christ' is not explained in such a way that *totus Christus* is both head and body; rather is Christ as the head clearly distinguished from the church as the body.[79] In the second excursus, based on Evangelical Anglican opposition to the theology of ARCIC, it became clear that Evangelical theology does not want New Testament phrases like being 'in Christ', being the 'body of Christ', having 'communion with Christ', growing into the 'likeness of Christ' to be interpreted in terms of a far-reaching mutual indwelling between Christ and the church. The Evangelical approach retains a fundamental distance between Christ and the church and sees their relationship in terms of a covenant, whereas more 'ecumenical' and 'Catholic' approaches see Christ and the church in a 'sacramental', 'intimate, organic relationship', which does not suppress their distinction, but emphasises their unity. This different approach to the notion of participation is not unrelated to a different approach to christology. If salvation in Christ is, as in later medieval and in Reformational thought, largely restricted to a forensic understanding of his propitiatory death, this contributes to a contractual ('covenantal') understanding of the relationship between Christ and the church. If, as the (neo-) patristic and biblical-theological rediscoveries of the

77 Cf. paragraphs 5.6.4, 5.6.5, 5.6.6, 5.6.7 and 5.6.8.
78 Cf. paragraph 2.3.6. See also 8.3.2.
79 Cf. paragraph 5.4.1.

first half of the twentieth century brought to light, salvation in Christ can be put in the larger perspective of his incarnation, words, signs, death, resurrection, ascension, sending of the Spirit and kingship, the relationship between him and the church looses its strictly forensic character and becomes rather a matter of sharing in the salvation not only wrought by, but also embodied in him.[80]

8.3.5 Theological and Empirical, Spiritual and Institutional

A remarkable feature of a eucharistic-ecclesiological understanding of the church as the body of Christ is that it combines the tangible and the reflective, the empirical and the theological, the institutional and the spiritual. As Ratzinger mentions, the term 'body of Christ' refers on the one hand to the church's innermost ('dogmatical') kernel: the church's intimate relationship to Jesus Christ and his *pascha.* On the other hand, it concretely refers to the church as a visible ('institutional') corporation with its sacraments and ministries. In a eucharistic ecclesiology, the term 'body of Christ' should therefore neither be reduced to a spiritualised, 'mystical' interpretation, nor to an overly organisational, hierarchical interpretation. Both are sides of the same coin and find their point of connection in the eucharist, which is at once the spiritual and the tangible centre of the church as the body of Christ.[81]

This gives to a eucharistic ecclesiology its sensation of, simultaneously, empirical concreteness and tangibility *and* theological depth and cohesion. Empirical concreteness, for this ecclesiology does not evaporate into abstraction as long as it is related to the gathering of the celebrating community in a given place at a given time. Theological depth, for a eucharistic ecclesiology is, in all its concreteness, about nothing less than the foundations of the Christian faith. This remarkable combination of the empirical and the theological is explicitly encountered in the work of some authors and is a general characteristic of communion ecclesiology.[82] As the young Ratzinger recounts, the awareness that the deepest reality about God and the world is to be found in the most fragile form of an historic community celebrating simple rites, was dear to the heart of one of the fathers of eucharistic ecclesiology, Augustine.[83]

8.3.6 Conclusion

In the light of a liturgical ecclesiology, the ecumenical and Catholic interpretation of the relationship between Christ and the church in terms of

[80] Cf. paragraph 7.7.3. See also 5.3.2 (Dix), 5.7.5 (Pickstock) and 8.2.5 (Communion as Incorporation and Participation).

[81] Cf. paragraph 3.3.5. See also 3.6.1 (Communion Ecclesiology).

[82] Cf. paragraphs 2.2.10, 2.4.1 (Afanasiev), 3.2.5 (de Lubac), Ratzinger (3.3.5), Boff (3.4.2), 4.2.2 (Rinkel) and 3.6.1 (Communion Ecclesiology).

[83] Cf. paragraph 3.3.3.

incorporation and participation seems particularly appropriate. This is especially the case when the lurking dangers of an all too easy identification between Christ and the church are balanced by the liturgical-ecclesiological emphasis on the eschatological, pneumatological and therefore fundamentally *sacramental* character of this identity. The (members of the) church's incorporation into *totus Christus* and participation in Christ's kenotic and resurrected life is not a static and fulfilled reality, but a dynamic and ever strived-for reality. It is an eschatological reality which, by the Spirit, is proleptically experienced in the church through baptism and the eucharist. This eschatological, pneumatological and sacramental character gives the corporate, corporeal, organic relationship between Christ (head) and the church (body) its paradoxical identity of ever *becoming* what one already *is*.[84] Any attempt to solve this paradox falls in the pit of either a rather poor understanding of the strong New Testament language of incorporation and participation, due to a limited, forensic approach to christology, or a rather triumphalist self-aggrandisement of the church which would be in flagrant opposition to its empirical state.

8.4 BAPTISM, THE EUCHARIST AND THE LITURGY

The previous sections on a theology of *koinonia* and on the relationship between Jesus Christ and his church already pointed to the constitutive role of baptism and the eucharist in this type of ecclesiology. If the restoration of *koinonia* is the aim of God's salvation, and if this *koinonia* is proleptically experienced through the church's eschatological, pneumatological and therefore sacramental participation in Christ, baptism and the eucharist must be the sacraments through which this incorporation into *koinonia* takes place. And if 'communion' is such a central category of ecclesial being, the actual liturgical gathering of the 'community' must be paradigmatic for ecclesial existence. This section, then, first explores the place of baptism (8.4.1, 8.4.2) and the eucharist (8.4.3, 8.4.4) in an ecumenical liturgical ecclesiology. After that, the centrality of the liturgy is approached from three angles: the liturgy as the gathering of the church which conveys meaning to the church and the Christian faith (8.4.5), the proclamation of the Word of God as an integrated element of a liturgical ecclesiology (8.4.6) and doxology as the basic attitude of liturgical life (8.4.7).

[84] The dialectic between 'is' and 'should be' is the characteristic of Pauline ethics (cf. Romans 6-8; 1 Corinthians 6; Galatians 5; Philippians 3; 1 Thessalonians 4). It is the ontological simultaneity of definitely being a Christian and daily having to grow in being a Christian. The necessity of the 'should be' does not impart the reality of the 'is'; the 'is' does not suppress the necessity of the 'should be'.

8.4.1 Baptism is the Basis

One of the reasons why this study chooses the term 'liturgical' rather than 'eucharistic' ecclesiology,[85] is that the more general term 'liturgy' includes baptism, which so clearly features as a constitutive element in most ecclesiologies that are usually styled 'eucharistic'. The father of 'eucharistic ecclesiology', Afanasiev, lays such an emphasis on the baptismal dignity of every member of the church, that his eucharistic ecclesiology could equally well be called a baptismal ecclesiology, as long as the consequence of baptism, the incorporation into the eucharistic community, is taken into account. Baptism is, according to Afanasiev, the 'ordination' of every member of the church—laity and clergy alike—into the *ordo* of the *laikos*, that is, of being a member of the people of God, which is a royal priesthood. Therefore, the deepest, most essential ('ontological') difference does not lie between laity and clergy, but between those who are baptised and those who are not. All who are baptised have received some kind of 'ministry' from the Spirit. All members of the church are 'charismatic' and 'institutional' alike, because it is by the gift of the Spirit that they receive their *ordo* within the organic whole of the church. The conclusion of Afanasiev's view is that every baptised one is 'ordained' into the *ordo* of those who participate in the priestly *leitourgia* of the church, which is first of all the celebration of the eucharist. Afanasiev, then, opposes an understanding of baptism in which being baptised is sufficient in itself (*gratuitement*). Being baptised is being incorporated into the celebrating community in which people have to take up their role, to exercise their *ordo* of being *co-liturges*, concelebrants. This is expressed when the rites of initiation—baptism, confirmation/chrismation, first communion—are kept together as close as possible, at least conceptually, preferably also temporally.[86] To say the same in Wainwright's choice of words: baptism is a *deputatio ad cultum*.[87]

It is clear, then, that the centrality of the eucharist presupposes the centrality of baptism (Tillard).[88] Everything a eucharistic ecclesiology has to say about continuing incorporation and participation in Christ, has its roots in the once-for-all incorporation and participation in Christ that is granted by baptism. Avis rightly asks for the explicit recognition, also from 'eucharistic' ecclesiologists, that 'Baptism is the basis!'[89] Most authors encountered in this study actually do so. For Zizioulas, baptism is the incorporation into communion and therefore the restoration of personhood.[90] In a not dissimilar way, Williams calls baptism the transition from natural, self-centred humanity

85 Cf. paragraph 1.4.3.
86 Cf. paragraphs 2.2.2, 2.2.3 and 2.2.4.
87 Cf. paragraph 6.4.7.
88 Cf. paragraph 3.5.5.
89 Cf. paragraphs 5.5.5 and 5.5.10.
90 Cf. paragraphs 2.3.5 and 2.3.9.

to the new solidarity of living in communion,[91] von Allmen calls baptism both a judgement of natural humanity and a promise for those who enter the realm of God's kingdom,[92] and Lathrop calls baptism, juxtaposed to teaching, the entrance into a community where social relationships exist in a re-ordered manner.[93] De Lubac emphasises the 'social', ecclesial character of baptism as well as the more personal element of rebirth.[94] This double character of baptism—personal and ecclesial—is also taught by Ploeger and Ploeger-Grotegoed.[95] Ratzinger affirms that baptism makes a person a member of the church, as long as one recognises that becoming a member of the church means becoming a member of the eucharistic community.[96] Aldenhoven points to the fact that, by having become members of the body of Christ, all baptised—not just the clergy—are representatives of Christ.[97] Likewise, Avis draws attention to the fact that the interpretation of the 'body of Christ' as a reality of faith rather than a metaphor must lead to the conviction that all baptised act *in persona Christi* in a way that cannot be more foundational.[98] Dix says even more boldly that, because every baptised one is a 'member of Christ', the church that consists of all baptised is *in* Christ and *is* Christ.[99] Finally, the ecumenical texts—especially *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* and *The Nature and Mission of the Church*—use strong sacramental, participatory language to affirm baptism as the incorporation of people into the body of Christ.[100]

8.4.2 Baptism and Ecumenism

The authors discussed in this study are at one in their affirmation that baptism, administered in whatever church, creates a basic 'zone of communion' (Tillard).[101] Baptism is 'the widest boundary of the *one* church' (Rinkel). Rinkel rightly says that, although baptism may not be necessary for *God* to draw people into communion with himself, it is nevertheless '*from the human side* the *conditio sine qua non*'. God is not bound by the signs he gave us, but we are. Baptism is then, from the point of view of the church, indispensable and unrepeatable—but frequently to be commemorated—as the incorporation into the one church, the one body of Christ. Baptismal recognition is, therefore, the

91 Cf. paragraph 5.6.5.
92 Cf. paragraphs 6.3.2 and 6.3.3.
93 Cf. paragraph 6.5.6.
94 Cf. paragraph 3.2.4.
95 Cf. paragraph 6.6.10.
96 Cf. paragraph 3.8.8.
97 Cf. paragraph 4.7.5.
98 Cf. paragraph 5.5.7.
99 Cf. paragraph 5.3.3.
100 Cf. paragraphs 7.2.2 (*Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*), 7.6.1 and 7.6.4 (*The Nature and Mission of the Church*).
101 Cf. paragraph 3.5.3.

basis of ecumenical recognition of one another as Christians and of, at least to some extent, the ecclesiality of all Christian communities.[102]

Baptism is, although indispensable from the church's view, not claimed as the *sine qua non* for God who wants to draw humanity to himself. Wainwright calls it a 'non-exclusive promise'. As an 'effective sign', baptism both presupposes and effects faith, justification, incorporation into Christ. But because it is 'non-exclusive', God's own ways with humanity outside the church are not denied. This distinction between sacramental membership from the church's perspective and eternal salvation from God's perspective makes it possible for the church self-consciously to maintain its own identity and describe its own boundaries without implying a judgement about people's eternal destiny in God's sight.[103]

In the context of a liturgical or eucharistic ecclesiology, baptism is at once fundamental and just the beginning.[104] It is fundamental because everything that has to be enfolded in a 'eucharistic' life of doxology and service, is already present in the gift of baptism. On the other hand it is just the beginning, because the once-for-all gift of baptism has to be unpacked during a lifetime of personal, ecclesial and societal living (*koinonia*), expressed in *leitourgia*, *martyria* and *diakonia*.

8.4.3 The Eucharist is the Centre

That all theologians who are discussed throughout the previous chapters affirm, in one way or another, the centrality of the eucharist for the nature, life and mission of the church, is not a conclusion of this study, but the presupposition for their inclusion in this study. However, conclusions can be drawn from the theological foundations they give to the centrality of the eucharist.

First and foremost, the centrality of the eucharist is inconceivable when the eucharist is regarded as just one 'sacrament' among many, as a rather isolated 'means of grace' administered by a member of the clergy to individual laypeople. Although they do not deny, of course, that the eucharist is a 'sacrament' and a 'means of grace', all authors presented in this study perceive the eucharist as a communal, corporate celebration, as the gathering *par excellence* of all baptised, the whole church. More important than its 'systematic' treatment under the heading of the sacraments is the eucharist's 'empirical' character as a gathering and a celebration, even as *the* gathering and *the* celebration of the body (the church) together with its head (Christ). In other words, a eucharistic understanding of the church presupposes an ecclesial

[102] Cf. paragraphs 4.2.4, 4.2.7 and 5.5.8.
[103] Cf. paragraph 6.4.7.
[104] Cf. paragraph 5.5.6.

understanding of the eucharist. Both are two sides of the same eucharistic-ecclesiological view.[105]

This approach is important for a correct understanding of a eucharistic ecclesiology. Eucharistic ecclesiology does not reduce the church to its 'liturgical' aspect, as if ecclesial life is little more than 'awaiting the next eucharistic event' (as Bradshaw thinks it does).[106] Eucharistic ecclesiology regards the eucharist as the heart of the church, because in the eucharist the church is—both empirically and theologically—gathered together as what it really is: the people of God, the body of Christ, the temple of the Spirit. The eucharist is, then, paradigmatic for what the church—also outside the liturgy—is and stands for. In Williams's words:

> The Church may be perfectly the Church at the Eucharist, but its life is not exhausted in the Eucharist: there is a life that is always struggling to realise outside the 'assembly' what the assembly shows forth.[107]

In an ecumenical context, one element of this conviction should be mentioned explicitly: a eucharistic ecclesiology does neither start with a specific eucharistic theology or devotion, nor with a specific liturgical style. It is rather the corporate celebration of the eucharist *tout court* that forms the starting point of a eucharistic ecclesiology. The very fact that the eucharist is celebrated *at all*, is in itself already 'a monument of unity' (Rinkel). Only in a second move one can evaluate theological, liturgical and devotional styles as to their consistency with eucharistic-ecclesiological convictions.[108]

The rediscovery of a eucharistic view on the church and an ecclesial view on the eucharist, and therefore the deep connection between church and eucharist, took primarily place in the first half of the twentieth century through the interrelated (neo-) patristic, liturgical and ecumenical movements. De Lubac's historical-theological investigation into the concept of *corpus mysticum* has become exemplary for this rediscovery. De Lubac makes clear that the interplay between eucharist and church was the natural background of the ecclesiological thought of biblical, patristic and medieval authors such as Paul, Augustine and Aquinas. *Totus Christus*, the whole Christ, was as much present in the church as in the eucharist. The body of Christ was seen as a *corpus triforme*, in which the earthly and resurrected body, the sacramental body and the ecclesial body were supposed to be interconnected. Only in the (higher and)

105 Cf. paragraphs 2.2.10 (Afanasiev), 2.3.3 (Zizioulas), 3.1.1 (The Second Vatican Council), 3.3.3 (Ratzinger), 4.1.3 (Neo-Gallican liturgy), 4.2.4 (Rinkel), 4.4.2 (Küppers), 5.2.3 (the Parish Communion), 5.2.4 (Hebert), 5.2.5 (the Parish Communion movement), 5.8.5 (the corporate character of the liturgy) and 6.4.6 (Wainwright).

106 Cf. paragraph 5.4.2. See also 2.3.6 (Zizioulas).

107 Cf. paragraph 5.6.5.

108 Cf. paragraphs 2.2.9 (Afanasiev), 2.3.3 (Zizioulas) and 4.2.7 (Rinkel). This subject is taken up again at the end of paragraph 8.4.4.

later Middle Ages, the connection between Christ's earthly and resurrected body and the eucharistic bread lost something of its sacramental character by being overly historicised and materialised, while their relationship to the church lost its ontological, sacramental character by becoming interpreted in a metaphorical manner. A changing choice of words reflects this changing interpretation. In patristic times, the word *corpus* (not yet in combination with the word *mysticus*) referred both to the eucharist and to the church. The word *mysticus* meant 'sacramental'. From the ninth century, it became fashionable to call the eucharist *corpus mysticum*, while the word *mysticus* was still understood as 'sacramental'. If one had to choose, the 'real' body of Christ (*corpus verum*) was the church, because the church was seen as the fullness of the body of Christ (*totus Christus*). Only in the twelfth century these terms changed meanings. The eucharistic host became the 'real' body of Christ (*corpus verum*), which of course it had always been, but not in such an emphatic way. The church, in its turn, became the *corpus mysticum*, because the word *mysticus* was no longer understood as 'sacramental' but as 'not real' (like in our contemporary understanding of 'mystical' or 'mysterious'). De Lubac convincingly pleads for a return to a sacramental understanding of both eucharist and church in close interaction.[109]

This connection between Christ, the eucharist and the church can only be maintained when all three are approached from a pneumatological and eschatological perspective. As was already acknowledged in the section on Christ, the Spirit and the church,[110] the mutual indwelling of Christ and (the members of) the church can become blasphemous when it is too easily identified with the empirical church. The *koinonia* (communion, participation) between Christ and the church is an eschatological reality, always to be strived-for epicletically. As Tillard says, the eucharist is a celebration of what the church *is*, but also a proclamation—critically *ad intra* and missionary *ad extra*—of what the church *should be*.[111] As Zizioulas and Williams emphasise, the identity between Christ and the church is a full reality only in the eucharist. In the eucharist, the Spirit reveals the *eschata*, so that in the eucharist we sacramentally (that is, pneumatologically and eschatologically) become 'what we will be', namely Christ-like (cf. 1 John 3:2). The church needs the eucharist in order to be its very self, because otherwise there would not be an occasion in which the 'empirical' church coincides with its 'theological' essence. Only in the eucharist the church becomes 'epiphanic'. *Outside* the eucharist, the church has to try to live up to its eucharistic Christ-likeness, especially in its zeal for justice, peace and equality. But *without* the eucharist, the church would have no

[109] Cf. paragraphs 3.2.4 and 3.2.5. See also 3.3.5 (Ratzinger) and 5.4.4 (Ramsey).
[110] Cf. paragraph 8.3.4.
[111] Cf. paragraph 3.5.3.

occasion in which its potential Christ-likeness is proleptically enacted. 'Riteless it's rootless', as Hobson summarises Williams's perspective.[112]

For a eucharistic ecclesiology it is, therefore, important not to approach the eucharist in a univocal way, as if the eucharist grants the church, as it were, an immanent Christ-likeness. As Pickstock meditates, the movements of the eucharistic liturgy express 'the hope that there might be a liturgy'. The goal of the liturgical journey lies 'always vertically beyond'. The eucharist is celebrated apostrophically, that is, in the vocative mode, in the language of desire. Certainly, the church becomes what it is through the celebration of the eucharist, but not by an attitude of mastery over the eucharistic object, only by an attitude of dependence upon the One who is being invoked.[113] In other words, the eucharist—and the 'effect' of the eucharist: the ecclesial body of Christ—is an eschatological reality, proleptically experienced through the Spirit.

Upon these thoughts on the essence and function of the eucharist, a eucharistic ecclesiology builds its thesis that the church is, in the first instance, a eucharistic community. Already in the above section on the concept of *koinonia* it was mentioned that God's will to restore all creation to communion finds its preliminary form in the communion of the church, which in its turn finds its tangible centre in the communion of the eucharist.[114] Without saying that the church has nothing else to do than to celebrate the eucharist, a eucharistic ecclesiology nevertheless states that the church is essentially a eucharistic community, so that the ecclesial communion and the eucharistic communion coincide. As Ratzinger exemplarily teaches, by celebrating the eucharist, the church reaffirms its *raison d'être*: its (epicletic) dependence upon Christ's death and resurrection. By celebrating the eucharist, the church is reconstituted as what it (through baptism) most fundamentally is: the body of Christ. The church is nowhere deeper inserted into Christ, and therefore nowhere nearer to its own identity, than in the eucharist, where the historical/resurrected, eucharistic and ecclesial meanings of the body of Christ merge. The church is most itself during the eucharistic celebration. Everything else that can be said of or done by the church finds its source and summit there.[115]

Von Allmen enriches this insight by not only referring to the 'body of Christ' language, but also to the nuptial imagery of Christ and the church. In the eucharist, the groom and the bride meet one another and are united to one another. The eucharist is the wedding banquet of the Lamb (Jesus Christ) and his bride (the church). This imagery not only evokes the eschatological character of the eucharist, it also gives each eucharist a deep layer of joy and beauty. Another contribution by von Allmen, flowing from his interest in both

[112] Cf. paragraphs 2.3.3, 2.3.4, 2.3.5, 2.3.6 (Zizioulas), 5.6.4 and 5.6.8 (Williams).
[113] Cf. paragraph 5.7.6.
[114] Cf. paragraph 8.2.6.
[115] Cf. paragraphs 3.3.3, 3.3.4, 3.3.8 and 3.3.11.

patristic and Reformation thought and practice, is his insistence that the eucharist should not be celebrated *less often* than every Sunday—which may be regarded as ecumenical consensus in theory, but not in practice, especially not in von Allmen's own (Reformed) ecclesial tradition—but that it should neither be celebrated *more often* than on Sundays (and, one might add, principal feasts). Sunday is the day of the eucharist (including the ministry of the Word), because Sunday is both the first (resurrection) and the eighth (eschatological) day. The eucharist belongs to this day of anamnetic and epicletic celebration of creation, Christ's death and resurrection, the coming of the Spirit and the consummation at the parousia. The tension between *iam* and *nondum* should, as von Allmen helpfully suggests, be reflected by the movement of 'systole and diastole' between a day of *eucharistie* (eucharistic celebration) and days of *messe* (mission in and for the world). The day of celebration and recreation is the day for the liturgy of the eucharist. The days of work, witness and service are the days for the liturgy of the hours.[116]

'The eucharist makes the church' has become a much admired catchphrase to express the principal instinct of a eucharistic ecclesiology. Although sometimes mistaken for a patristic quotation—some phrases from, for example, Augustine and Aquinas resemble it—the adage 'the eucharist makes the church' originates from de Lubac. In a neo-scholastic age, in which the church could be defined without intrinsic reference to the eucharist and in which the eucharist was reduced to one of many things done by the church, de Lubac revived the patristic perspective in which the eucharist and the church mutually explain one another. The eucharist is not just something done by the church, it is rather the event by which the church is time and again reconstituted ('made'). De Lubac does not deny that the reverse is also true. 'The church makes the eucharist': the church (those who are incorporated into Christ, those who are *totus Christus*) celebrates itself (its own mystery, Augustine would say) in the eucharist. The eucharist *constitutes* the church and is at once the most real *expression of* the church.[117]

This mutual interdependence or, so to speak, perichoresis of the eucharist and the church as expressed by the double adage 'the eucharist makes the church' and 'the church makes the eucharist' is also expressed by the ecumenical terms 'effective sign' or 'demonstrates and effects'.[118] For instance, *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* says that the eucharist 'demonstrates and effects the oneness of the sharers with Christ and with their fellow sharers'. In this sentence, the verb 'demonstrates' refers to the reality that 'the church makes the eucharist': eucharistic communion is a sign or manifestation of

[116] Cf. paragraph 6.3.5.

[117] Cf. paragraph 3.2.6. Reference to the phrase is made in paragraphs 3.5.3 (Tillard) and 6.4.8 (Wainwright).

[118] Already de Lubac uses the expression that the eucharist is a *signe efficace*; cf. paragraph 3.2.6.

already existing ecclesial communion. The verb 'effects' refers to the reality that 'the eucharist makes the church': ecclesial communion is an effect made by eucharistic communion.[119]

8.4.4 The Eucharist and Ecumenism

The baptismal and eucharistic theology presented here leads to an impasse with regard to the ecumenically pressing question of eucharistic 'intercommunion' between churches that are not yet in 'full communion'.[120] On the one hand, eucharistic ecclesiology regards baptism as *deputatio ad cultum*—as the initiation into the eucharistic community. Consequently, as soon as churches recognise one another's baptism, it seems to be consistent that they likewise recognise one another's membership of the eucharistic community. On the other hand, eucharistic ecclesiology presupposes the identity, or at least the strong interrelatedness, of ecclesial and eucharistic communion. Consequently, recognising one another as members of the eucharistic community seems only to be possible when full ecclesial communion has been established. When churches recognise each other's baptism without establishing full ecclesial communion between each other's churches, or even without recognising each other's full ecclesiality, the strange situation occurs that, either, one church recognises the baptismal status of another church and its members, but does not draw the conclusion that this status implies membership of the eucharistic community, or, one church practises eucharistic communion with another church, but does not consider itself to be in 'full communion' with this church, or does not even regard the other church as a full 'church'. In either case, there is a major inconsistency from either the baptismal or the eucharistic perspective of a *koinonia* ecclesiology.

The crucial point is, of course, that the biblical and patristic interrelatedness of baptism, the eucharist and the church presupposes the unity of the one ecclesial *koinonia*, whereas the contemporary ecumenical situation must reckon with the brokenness of ecclesial *koinonia*. As long as one does not recognise baptism in any other church, that is, as long as one presupposes that one's own church is the only church and the members of one's own church are the only Christians, there is no (conceptual) inconsistency. But as soon as one recognises baptism in other churches than one's own, one has either to draw all the (conceptual) conclusions that follow from baptismal recognition (that is, to recognise, on the basis of the fundamental meaning of baptism, one another's ecclesiality including sacraments and ministry), or to deal with anomalies and inconsistencies. In what follows, the presupposition will be that *both*

[119] Cf. paragraph 7.2.1. The terminology 'effective/effectual sign/symbol' is also used in paragraphs 5.5.6, 5.5.7 (Avis), 6.4.7, 6.4.8 (Wainwright), 7.7.1 and 7.7.2 (ARCIC).

[120] The problem of different eucharistic theologies is treated towards the end of this paragraph.

ecumenical positions are inconsistent and anomalous—either to recognise one another's baptism without accepting one another at eucharistic communion, or to practise eucharistic communion ('intercommunion') without having established ecclesial communion ('full communion').

The first position—not allowing eucharistic ('inter'-) communion as long as churches are not formally in ecclesial ('full') communion, although they recognise one another's baptism—is in this study exemplarily represented by Tillard, Rinkel, Stalder and the Orthodox—Old Catholic dialogue texts. Tillard is eager to emphasise the 'zone of communion' that exists between all baptised (as well as the 'zones of communion' that exist with Israel and all humanity), but this does not include the sharing of eucharistic communion.[121] Rinkel explains that eucharistic communion is not available separately. Eucharistic communion has no meaning on its own; it is rather the expression of ecclesial communion. As soon as churches recognise one another's essential catholicity (Rinkel thinks of a church in one locality recognising the catholicity of a church in another locality), this recognition *is* the establishment of ecclesial and therefore also eucharistic communion. Baptism on its own is insufficient for such a recognition of catholicity, because the fullness of ecclesial life is, according to Rinkel, not present in every church in the same amount.[122] As long as various churches exist in one locality, Stalder finds it inconsistent when those churches would practise intercommunion. This would, he thinks, simulate a non-existing unity.[123] The Orthodox—Old Catholic dialogue texts are extremely consistent in their emphasis on the identity between the ecclesial and the eucharistic communion/community. From this consistency follows their opinion that there can be nothing in between being in (full, official, ecclesial and eucharistic) communion or not.[124] As indicated above, this consistency is only a half-truth. The inconsistency and anomaly remains, that the recognition of the one baptism does not imply the recognition of one another as members of the one eucharistic community.

The second position—practising eucharistic communion in a situation where churches are not yet in official ecclesial communion—is in this study most forcefully advocated by Avis. In his opinion, baptism incorporates someone into Christ, into his body, into the church and all that it stands for. Therefore, he says, all churches will sooner or later draw the only consistent conclusion from baptismal recognition, namely, that every baptised person is a member of the (one) eucharistic community which is the (one) church. The

[121] Cf. paragraph 3.5.3. Moreover, in paragraph 3.5.6 it was seen that Tillard follows the Roman Catholic usage to distinguish between 'churches' and 'ecclesial communities', for which distinction the eucharist and the ordained ministry in the apostolic succesion serve as criteria.

[122] Cf. paragraph 4.2.4.

[123] Cf. paragraph 4.5.8.

[124] Cf. paragraph 7.8.5.

recognition of ordained ministries is not excluded from this view. Because ministry only exists in the context of the church, recognition of ecclesiality (which is the consequence of baptismal recognition) includes recognition of ministries.[125] Conceptually strong as Avis's plea undoubtedly is, it seems to bypass the fact that not all churches have already come to recognise these consequences of baptismal recognition. As long as some churches still withhold the recognition of sacraments and ministries in some other churches, and sometimes even the recognition of their ecclesiality, there is still no ecclesial communion between them. Claiming that ecclesial communion does already exist on the basis of baptismal recognition, tranfers ecclesial communion into the realm of an invisible spiritual unity. Ecclesial communion, rightly advocated by Avis as flowing from baptismal recognition, needs visible expression and recognition before one can speak of churches in communion. Avis's view, then, that churches should share eucharistic communion because, as a result of their common baptism, they *are* already in ecclesial communion with one another, lacks the element of visible expression and recognition and therefore retains an element of anomaly.

A possible way out of this impasse is, as far as this study is concerned, suggested by Aldenhoven, von Arx, von Allmen and Wainwright. Without denying the inconsistent and anomalous—and therefore formally 'exceptional' (von Allmen)—character of 'intercommunion' rather than (full) 'communion', they advocate it on the ground that the present ecumenical situation requires it. For this conviction, Wainwright invokes not only the fact that baptismal incorporation should be followed by eucharistic participation, but also the fact that 'the eucharist makes the church': as an 'effective sign' the eucharist not only *expresses* unity, but also *effects* unity.[126] In a similar way, von Allmen proposes careful instances of intercommunion as an encouragement for churches to take their process towards full communion seriously.[127] What makes the position of these authors especially helpful, is their acknowledgement of the anomalous character of their proposal. They acknowledge the tension without trying to solve it either way. As Aldenhoven and von Arx state, this tension (paradox, inconsistency, anomaly) is theologically correct. As long as the churches remain divided, one should uphold *both* sides of the paradox: one should maintain that eucharistic communion is theologically identical with (full, visible) ecclesial communion *and* one should not refuse eucharistic communion to baptised Christians.[128] This way out of the ecumenical deadlock, without solving the theological paradox that cannot be solved before the churches will have been reunited, is probably best formulated by Wainwright. If we have to choose between the anomaly of refusing communion to baptised persons and

[125] Cf. paragraphs 5.5.6 and 5.5.7. See also 7.2.2 (*Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*).
[126] Cf. paragraph 6.4.8.
[127] Cf. paragraph 6.3.5.
[128] Cf. paragraphs 4.7.4 (Aldenhoven) and 4.8.5 (von Arx).

the anomaly of sharing communion with persons with whom we are not yet in full ecclesial communion, Wainwright says that it would be choosing for the *major* anomaly to exclude baptised Christians from receiving eucharistic communion. As Wainwright rightly says, 'we should choose the *minor* anomaly' of sharing eucharistic communion with baptised Christians, in the awareness of a not yet fully and visibly established ecclesial communion.[129]

One might wonder why the above discussion of the problem of intercommunion is not made dependent on eucharistic theology. Is not the diversity of eucharistic faith, including its presiding ministry, the main reason for the separation at the Lord's table? In the context of a eucharistic ecclesiology, however, the separation between ecclesial and eucharistic communion is the main hindrance for intercommunion, not differences in eucharistic faith and practice. For Afanasiev, churches that are not in communion experience a certain 'eucharistic unity' through the very fact that they celebrate the eucharist, even when they disagree about eucharistic theology.[130] Likewise, Rinkel says that the very fact of the celebration of the eucharist in all churches is in itself already 'a monument of unity'. Between the extremes of 'a mechanical, materialistic interpretation' and 'an extremely symbolic interpretation' one should not disavow 'the manifest life of grace' at work in the sacrament in whatever church.[131] According to Hebert, separated Christians are nevertheless united, because they celebrate the one sacrament of the one heavenly altar.[132] And Lathrop remarks that the basic liturgical *ordo* of 'bath, word and meal'—although increasingly challenged by the incompatible 'revival or frontier *ordo*'—is shared by most churches of the ecumene.[133] In a eucharistic ecclesiology, then, agreement or disagreement on eucharistic theology is not, *on its own*, decisive for sharing or denying eucharistic communion, because eucharistic sharing is not dependent on an isolated treatment of the sacrament of the eucharist, but on the wider context of ecclesial *koinonia* in which the eucharist is embedded. Differing emphases in eucharistic theology, liturgy and spirituality are acceptable, as long as they have their legitimate place within the *koinonia* between churches. Conversely, when eucharistic theology, liturgy and spirituality differ to such an extent that they are perceived as an obstacle for *koinonia*, the deeper reasons for such dissensus most probably not only apply to the eucharist, but to other aspects of *koinonia* as well, such as one's overall view of Christ, salvation and the church.[134]

129 Cf. paragraph 6.4.2, emphasis added.
130 Cf. paragraph 2.2.9. Afanasiev has in mind the implicit 'eucharistic unity' between Orthodox and Catholic churches.
131 Cf. paragraph 4.2.7. Rinkel's remarks are certainly meant to include Protestant churches.
132 Cf. paragraph 5.2.5.
133 Cf. paragraph 6.5.2.
134 Cf. the discussion on the concept of participation in paragraphs 8.2.5 and 8.3.4.

8.4.5 The Centrality of the Liturgy: The Gathering of the People of God and the Constitution of Christian Meaning

The first section of this chapter recounted salvation history as a movement from alienation, through transformation, to communion.[135] This movement was paradigmatically encountered in the gathering of Israel into one people devoted to the one God, as well as in the gathering of the church into one people by being incorporated into the one body of Christ.[136] This is why the very fact of people being 'gathered together' is a constitutive element of a liturgical ecclesiology. The fact that Israel and the church are called a *qahal* and an *ekklesia* makes 'gathering' a basic ecclesiological category: 'the church is the people gathered by God before God' (von Allmen). It also makes the liturgy a central ecclesiological category, for the liturgy is the tangible way in which the people of God become visible as a *qahal*, an *ekklesia*, an assembly, a gathering.[137]

The liturgy, then, is the primary and ordinary manifestation of the church. As Ratzinger rightly distinguishes, other forms of gathering—of which the synod or council is paramount—are secondary and (especially in the case of an ecumenical council) extraordinary manifestations of the church. Although they serve *koinonia* like the eucharist, they do so at another level than the eucharist which is—both 'horizontally' and 'vertically'—the deepest sacramental source and expression of *koinonia*.[138] If someone wants to know what the Christian faith is about, or what the Christian church is like, let him or her go to the liturgical gathering.[139] And if there is something important to celebrate in the life of the church—not least the 'celebration' of synods and ordinations—let it happen in the context of the liturgical (eucharistic) assembly.[140]

The primary meaning of 'church' is 'liturgical assembly' (Lathrop). It is in the liturgical assembly that Christian meaning is established, and it is from the liturgical assembly that Christians take their transformed identity into the world. Such distinctive Christian meaning and identity is constituted by the liturgy through, to use Lathrop's term, the 'juxtaposition' of elements which receive their transformed meaning precisely by their liturgical juxtaposition. The basic *ordo* of the liturgy consists of the juxtaposition of teaching and baptism ('bath'),

135 Cf. section 8.2.
136 Cf. paragraph 8.3.3.
137 Cf. paragraphs 3.2.3 (de Lubac), 3.3.4 (Ratzinger), 3.5.2 (Tillard), 6.2.9 (van der Leeuw) and 6.3.4 (von Allmen).
138 Cf. paragraph 3.3.8. See also 7.8.4 (Orthodox—Old Catholic dialogue), where, though intimately linked to one another, eucharistic presidency is presented as paradigmatic for synodical presidency, not the other way round.
139 Cf. paragraph 6.5.6 (Lathrop).
140 Cf. paragraph 2.2.5 (Afanasiev)

the reading and preaching of Scripture ('word'), and the thanksgiving over and the sharing of bread and wine ('meal'). Other major juxtapositions are Sunday set next to the weekdays, Easter set next to the year, praising set next to beseeching. Through such juxtapositions, each element receives its balance from the other elements. Distortions occur when elements of meaning receive uncontrolled centrality by being used in an 'unbroken' way. As Lathrop convincingly teaches, only if 'broken'—that is, only if placed in paradoxical opposition to another element of meaning, only if controlled and balanced by the juxtapositions of the *ordo*—aspects of faith receive their distinctive Christian meaning. The liturgy has, then, the critical function of transforming language, symbols and persons so that they are understood in a non-equivocal, balanced, 'broken' manner. This applies, for example, to such (possibly distorting) concepts as sacrifice, ritual and leadership. But it also applies to the obvious elements of the liturgical *ordo*—bath, word and meal interpret one another; without their liturgical juxtaposition something of their distinctive meaning would be lost.[141]

This is why the basic ecumenical *ordo* of bath, word and meal is indispensable. Liturgy as 'antiliturgy'—liturgy's critical, 'breaking', meaning-conveying function—ceases when its paradoxes are allowed to be solved, when its juxtaposed elements are allowed to become separated elements of meaning in their own right. The 'frontier *ordo*' of both the worship of Evangelicalism and Pentecostalism and the worship of modern, therapeutic spirituality, is an *ordo* largely without paradox, balance, juxtaposition. It endorses an individualist, spiritualised and sarcophobic understanding of the Christian faith. It cannot serve as an equivalent of or substitute for the *ordo* of bath, word and meal.[142]

That the liturgy creates Christian meaning and identity is not only expressed by Lathrop. Wainwright invokes the ancient adage *lex orandi lex credendi* to explain the interaction between liturgy and theology, between Christian ritual and Christian thought.[143] According to Williams, the church 'makes sense' of itself in the sacraments, the 'characteristic (i.e. self-identifying) acts of the Church'. Although the church is far more than just 'a cultic institution', the celebration of the sacraments is central in the life of the church, because they always readdress the church's focus to its *raison-d'être*.[144] As Visser says, the liturgy is 'the unique feature of the church, which none other societal institution can replace', because it is the celebration of 'what is specifically ecclesial'.[145] Ploeger and Ploeger-Grotegoed maintain that it is primarily during the liturgy that the members of the church form both their

[141] Cf. paragraphs 6.5.2, 6.5.3, 6.5.4, 6.5.6 and 6.5.7.
[142] Cf. paragraphs 6.5.2 and 6.5.5.
[143] Cf. paragraph 6.4.3.
[144] Cf. paragraph 5.6.5.
[145] Cf. paragraph 4.6.4.

personal identity and their 'partially communal identity'. In the liturgy they intersubjectively experience a multi-layered ritual, which is on the one hand not nailed down to univocal meaning, but which is on the other hand lucid enough to be interiorised in a 'partially communal' way.[146] Williams concludes that the liturgy is able to 'transform' people from a 'pre-sacramental' to a 'sacramental' state. The rite gives the partakers a new identity. By transforming people, the liturgy is a celebration of hope for the transformation of the world.[147]

8.4.6 The Centrality of the Liturgy: The Proclamation of the Word of God

Although there is no doubt that a liturgical ecclesiology is first of all a eucharistic ecclesiology, the fact that the liturgical assembly is the primary manifestation of the church has other aspects as well. The importance of baptism was emphasised above (8.4.1). Now, mention should be made of two other important elements of the liturgy: the reading and preaching of the Word (8.4.6) and the doxological character of the liturgy (8.4.7).

A liturgical ecclesiology includes an emphasis on Scripture and preaching. Although Noordmans—representing a traditional Protestant emphasis[148]—reduces the rich meaning of the term 'Word of God' to 'the vocal Word' of the sermon, and likewise reduces the many ways in which the members of the church are related to the sacrifice of Christ to the proclamation of this sacrifice in the sermon, he rightly regards the preaching of the Word of God as a (he even thinks *the*) centre of the Christian liturgy.[149] The reading and preaching of the Word of God belongs to the central elements of the liturgy, and therefore to the constitutive elements of ecclesiology, for it is not least through Scripture readings and their exposition that the liturgy conveys Christian meaning. Recalling Lathrop's theory of juxtaposition, however, one cannot follow Noordmans in his exclusive understanding of the sermon as the central element of the liturgy. The centrality of the Word should be 'broken' by the centrality of the eucharist (and *vice versa*), and by the embedding in all the other elements of the liturgy. In a liturgical ecclesiology it should particularly be avoided, that the importance of Scripture reading and preaching is reduced to its cerebral aspect. The overall importance of *koinonia* as incorporation and participation applies not only to God and creation, Christ and his body, baptism and the eucharist, but also to any other element of a liturgical ecclesiology that is worth of the epithet 'central' or 'constitutive'. When Avis, then, rightly asks for 'a more

146 Cf. paragraph 6.6.8.
147 Cf. paragraph 5.6.7.
148 Cf. section 6.1 (especially White on Protestant worship as the 'non-sacramental alternative').
149 Cf. paragraph 6.2.8.

kerygmatic eucharistic ecclesiology',[150] the kerygmatic aspect should not simply be added to, but integrated in, the overarching concept of a liturgical *koinonia* ecclesiology.

Noordmans's dialogue partner van der Leeuw points to such an integration. In response to Noordmans's emphasis on the Word of God, van der Leeuw laments that he does not miss the absence of the sacrament, but the absence of the Word in its full sense. The Word of God is not the humanist's word or the idealist's word. The Word is the creative Word of God that has been incarnated in Jesus Christ. The whole liturgy is, therefore, proclamation of the Word in a (broadly) 'sacramental' way. In this context, preaching is not only a cerebral exercise that grants the members of the church better knowledge, but one instance of the way in which God, through Christ and the Spirit, draws people to himself. Liturgical reading of Scripture and preaching of the Word is, in some sense, a sacrament of divine presence with those who celebrate the liturgy. It is not without interest here, that van der Leeuw relates preaching, as a more or less 'sacramental' proclamation of the Word, intimately to the absolution in the sacrament of reconciliation, which he also calls a proclamation of the Word.[151] The liturgical word—be it the reading of and preaching on a text from Scripture, or the formula of absolution, or the words spoken in connection to the eucharist—is always an evocative, performative, sacramental word that carries the proclamation of the Word. By the liturgical ministry of the Word, then, the participants in the liturgy should not only be reminded of their Christian identity, but should also encounter God and be drawn to him.

In a similar way, *The Nature and Mission of the Church* describes the foundation of the church as simultaneously 'theo'-logical, christological and pneumatological. First, the church is *creatura Verbi*, because it depends on God's creative Word, spoken through salvation history and recorded in Scripture. Second, the church is *creatura Verbi*, because it depends on the person and work of Jesus Christ, the incarnate Word. Third, the church is *creatura Spiritus*, because both Christ's life and work and the church's incorporation into Christ are the work of the Spirit.[152] In this rich theological understanding, the church does not emerge from preaching because preaching would be more 'Word' than the sacraments, but the church emerges from—among other things—preaching, because just like the sacraments, the reading and preaching of Scripture is an element of the interrelated constitution of the church through the Word and the Spirit. Again: the Word is simulaneously incarnated (Christ), written (Scripture) and proclaimed (preaching and witness). And the Spirit is the one who constitutes Christ and who constitutes the church through drawing people into Christ by all 'means of grace', of which preaching is one element.

150 Cf. paragraph 5.5.10.
151 Cf. paragraph 6.2.8.
152 Cf. paragraph 7.6.1.

Moreover, it is of great importance that, in the context of the liturgy, preaching is juxtaposed to the reading of Scripture, and that the reading of one Scriptural text is juxtaposed to the reading of one or more other Scriptural texts. Here, again, we meet the indispensability of the ecumenical *ordo* for a balanced understanding of Christian meaning, as encountered in Lathrop. In this case, the *ordo* safeguards that the liturgical ministry of the Word is not swallowed up by the sermon. The liturgy itself teaches that the centrality of the *kerygma* is not synonymous with the alleged centrality of one preacher's words. Rather, the *kerygma* emerges from the juxtaposition of various Scriptural texts—in the liturgical context understood as the living God's or the living Christ's words in the midst of the congregation—and from the juxtaposition of Scripture (the readings) to its contemporary exposition (the sermon), and *vice versa*.[153]

8.4.7 The Centrality of the Liturgy: Doxology

The term 'eucharistic ecclesiology' is intrinsically doxological. 'Thanks and praise' is what gives the eucharist its very name. Nevertheless, one of the reasons to choose the term 'liturgical' rather than 'eucharistic' ecclesiology is that 'liturgy' perhaps more evidently includes celebration and praise, music and beauty as expressions of doxology.[154]

The doxological character of the liturgy is deeply related to its eschatological character. As Ploeger and Ploeger-Grotegoed say, the liturgy is an anticipation of the *frui Deo* (enjoying God) that will be perfected in the eschaton.[155] Likewise, *Church and World* can say that—next to 'justice' and 'peace'—'joy' is a key characteristic of the kingdom of God, which is anticipated in the eucharistic celebration.[156] Von Allmen deepens this liturgical, eucharistic joy in an ecclesiological direction when he describes the church as the bride of Christ and the eucharist as the proleptic wedding banquet of the Lamb. In the eucharist, Christ and the church approach one another as intimitaly as lovers do. This nuptial theme, von Allmen rightly says, gives even the simplest liturgy a deep layer of joy and beauty.[157] Ratzinger adds an important insight when he points to the communion of saints, the 'cosmic' church, as the context in which all liturgy is situated. In the liturgy, the earthly church joins the heavenly church as one community of praise.[158]

In addition to this liturgical, eschatological approach, doxology can also be regarded as an ontological, anthropological category. The primary attitude of

153 Cf. paragraphs 6.5.2 and 6.5.3.
154 Cf. paragraph 1.4.3.
155 Cf. paragraph 6.6.9.
156 Cf. paragraphs 7.3.1 and 7.3.3.
157 Cf. paragraph 6.3.5.
158 Cf. paragraph 3.3.9.

humans towards God is doxological (Wainwright).[159] Von Allmen concludes from the biblical creation narrative, that humanity is 'created for conducting a cosmic liturgy': 'life is fundamentally a liturgical affair'. The primary identity of creation is doxological and the liturgy invites creation back into this identity: humans, water, bread, wine, wood, stone, light, sound, time and place receive in the liturgy their true role of adoration and intercession.[160] Pickstock says something similar when she regards doxology as 'the gift of humanity itself' and as 'ontologically constitutive of the person'. Because doxology requires full commitment in self-surrendering love, the human person finds its proper destination in the doxological mode of living. To rediscover its true self, Pickstock rightly suggests, humanity has again to learn 'to live, to speak, to associate, in a liturgical, which is to say truly human and creaturely fashion'.[161]

8.4.8 Conclusion

At the heart of a liturgical ecclesiology are baptism, the eucharist and the liturgy. Baptism is the basis, because through baptism the incorporation of all Christians into the body of Christ takes place. The eucharist is the centre, because baptismal incorporation and participation (*koinonia*) is time and again reconstituted in the eucharistic *koinonia*, where the risen body of Christ, the eucharistic body of Christ and the ecclesial body of Christ coincide and interpenetrate. Baptismal and eucharistic ecclesiology, then, presuppose and complement one another.

The centrality of baptism and the eucharist has ecumenical consequences. Baptismal recognition implies the recognition of (at least a fundamental amount of) ecclesiality. The (correct) eucharistic-ecclesiological conviction that visible ecclesial communion should coincide with the visible eucharistic communion (and *vice versa*) has to be upheld while one has, paradoxically, to accept at eucharistic communion baptised members not yet in full visible ecclesial communion. One must not choose the major anomaly (refusing communion to fellow Christians who are, through baptism, incorporated into—a decisive degree of—ecclesiality) when one can also choose the minor anomaly (having eucharistic communion with fellow Christians who are, although in some degree sharing in ecclesiality, not yet in full visible ecclesial communion).

The central place of the liturgy in ecclesiology does not only depend on baptism and the eucharist, but also on the very fact of the church's regular *gathering* for worship and on the Christian *meaning* conveyed by the juxtapositions of the Christian liturgy. Moreover, the centrality of the liturgy depends on the proclamation of the *Word of God*, understood as a performative

[159] Cf. paragraph 6.4.3.
[160] Cf. paragraph 6.3.4.
[161] Cf. paragraphs 5.7.2 and 5.7.6. See also 8.7.4.

('sacramental') proclamation of God's and Christ's word to the gathered community, by which the celebrating community is drawn to God and Christ by the Spirit. Finally, the *doxological* destination of humanity contributes to the centrality of the liturgy. In the liturgy, human identity finds itself in self-effacing doxology.

8.5 PRESIDERS OF THE CHURCH[162]

8.5.1 Exploring a 'Topological' Theology of Ministry

In a liturgical ecclesiology, the concept of ministry should, as much as possible, emerge from the internal logic of the liturgical gathering itself, rather than (conceptually) being imposed upon the celebrating community from outside. All 'elements of ecclesiastical structure and organisation' must have a relationship to the eucharistic gathering (von Allmen).[163] To explore the consequences of this approach to ministry, Afanasiev's invention of a 'topological' theology of ministry will be used as a heuristic model.[164] This means that the several ministries of the church will be investigated from the (literal) 'place' (*topos*) that ministers occupy within the architectural space of the liturgical—particularly the eucharistic—gathering. In tune with the 'neo-patristic' background of most liturgical ecclesiologies, such a topological approach has in mind the picture of something like a basilica, in which the bishop is surrounded by presbyters and deacons, and in which a number of ministers (such as acolytes, readers, singers, doorkeepers) exercise their various charisms in the midst of the whole assembled people of God.[165]

A basic observation in this respect is that all members of the celebrating community exercise some kind of ministry. The liturgical gathering knows no 'public', only celebrating participants who are aptly called 'celebrants' or 'concelebrants'.[166] Every member of the church is placed into a particular *ordo* within the gathering. Baptism—in many churches in some way accompanied by confirmation/chrismation—is the ordination into the *ordo* of the laity: the people (*laos*) of God. Therefore, one could say with Afanasiev that the unity of

[162] The reader is invited to apply the following thoughts on the ordained ministry to the context of his or her own church, perhaps starting by changing the titles of particular ministries into titles used in that church. Presupposed is the willingness to re-read one's ministerial order in the light of ecumenical convergence. The choice of ministerial titles is explained in paragraph 8.5.5.

[163] Cf. paragraph 6.3.6.

[164] Cf. paragraph 2.2.8. See also 2.3.8 (Zizioulas) and 6.4.9 (Wainwright).

[165] Cf. paragraphs 1.1.1 (Vision) and 4.4.3 (Küppers).

[166] Cf. paragraphs 2.2.2, 2.2.4 (Afanasiev), 3.5.5 (Tillard), 4.4.3 (Küppers), 5.2.5 (Parish Communion movement), 5.7.5 (Pickstock), 6.3.5 (von Allmen), 6.5.7 (Lathrop), 6.6.12 (Ploeger and Ploeger-Grotegoed), 7.8.4 (Orthodox—Old Catholic dialogue).

all who exercise this 'ministry' (*ministère*) of the baptised—both laity and clergy in the usual sense of the word—is 'ontological' (*unité ontologique*), while the difference established by the 'particular ministries' (*ministères particuliers*) of bishop, presbyter and deacon is 'functional' (*différence fonctionelle*).[167]

Two truths, however, preclude that this would lead to a 'just functional' approach to ministry. Firstly, every *function* within the liturgy is *essential* to its full celebration. As Afanasiev says, there can be no church without its presider and there cannot be a presider without the community of the church. Secondly, every function within the liturgy is exercised by virtue of a particular *charism* of the Spirit, received and recognised by the church—the whole celebrating community—through an act of *ordination*. Thus, ministry is both functional and essential, both charismatic and ordered.[168] The separation, in either way, of functional and essential (or 'ontological' if this means 'essential'), or of charismatic and institutional, creates either clericalism or anti-clericalism, and is incongenial to the logic of the corporate liturgical celebration. The liturgical celebration with its many *ordines*, including the ordo of the *laity*, points to a neither clericalist nor anti-clericalist, but rather non-competitive understanding of both lay and ordained ministries.

8.5.2 A Full Celebration with All 'Special Liturgies'

According to Afanasiev's concept just described, all members of the church—both laity and clergy in the usual sense of the word—are in the *ordo* of the baptised and exercise the 'ministry' of the baptised, while those usually called 'ordained ministers' exercise an additional 'particular ministry'. The ordination of a bishop, presbyter or deacon into the *ordo* of a 'particular ministry' does, then, not suppress his or her belonging to the *ordo* of the 'ministry' of all baptised. Ordination places the ordained into an *ordo*, as Wainwright says, within the larger *ordo* of the baptised.[169] Translated into a 'topological' understanding of ministry, this implies that ordained ministers (in the usual sense of the word) can take their literal, spacial 'place' either among the baptised (when they are *not* exercising their 'particular ministry'), or in their particular 'place' as a bishop, presbyter or deacon (when they *are* exercising their 'particular ministry'). In other words, because of their belonging to the *ordo* of the baptised, they can officiate as such by 'sitting in the pews'. Because of their belonging to the *ordo* of bishop, presbyter or deacon, they can officiate as such by taking their place in the 'sanctuary'.

[167] Cf. paragraph 2.2.3.
[168] Cf. paragraphs 2.2.2, 2.2.3 and 2.2.4.
[169] Cf. paragraph 6.4.9.

This view concurs with Lathrop's criterion of the 'broken' symbol of leadership. Those who are, on the one hand, presiders of the church are, on the other hand, baptised members of the church like every other Christian.[170] This also concurs with Dix's view that every 'order' in the church has its own 'special liturgy', but without Dix's tendency to regard the 'special liturgy' of the laity as exclusive. In Dix's mutually exclusive understanding of the *ordo* of the baptised and the *ordines* of the ordained ministers, an ordained minister who sits in the pews 'usurps [the function] of a layman' and thereby violates the principle of 'order'. One should rather say that—although, of course, one is ordained into an *ordo* with the aim of exercising it regularly, as is the core of Dix's argument—one's ordination into a 'particular' *ordo* does not suppress one's belonging to the basic *ordo* of the baptised.[171] This is affirmed by van der Leeuw when he says that the ordained ministry is a specialisation of the ministry of the whole people of God. Van der Leeuw nevertheless wants a non-presiding minister to assist his or her presiding colleague instead of sitting in the pews. This is not because he thinks that ordained ministers no longer belong to the *laikoi* (he thinks they do, as much as, the other way round, all 'laypeople' have a 'task', a *kleros*, in the church), but because he wants to break the monopoly of the single officiating minister.[172] This leads to the next observation.

As Dix says, a full celebration of the eucharist requires the exercise of all 'special liturgies'. That is, a full liturgical celebration presupposes the presence of the *ordo* of the laity and the *ordines* of the particular ministries.[173] This presupposition may be regarded as a central element in a liturgical ecclesiology. It is, so to speak, the 'ministerial' counterpart of the basic 'ecclesiological' conviction that the eucharist is not just one sacrament among many, but the celebration of the gathered church and therefore the paradigmatic manifestation of the church. 'Topologically' speaking, one's role or function or ministry in the church is defined by the 'place' one occupies during the eucharistic celebration. The other way round, the eucharist is only fully celebrated when all 'places' are occupied, when all roles are being played, when all functions or ministries are being exercised.

Therefore, many authors throughout this study emphasise that the eucharist should ideally be celebrated under the presidency of the bishop, in 'concelebration' with the presbyterium, the deacons and all laity with their various ministries of serving, reading, singing and the like.[174] The ancient

170 Cf. paragraphs 6.5.4 and 6.5.7.

171 Cf. paragraph 5.3.3.

172 Cf. paragraph 6.2.9.

173 Cf. paragraph 5.3.3.

174 With different emphases this idea can be found in paragraphs 2.2.4 (Afanasiev), 2.3.8 (Zizioulas), 3.5.3, 3.5.5 (Tillard), 4.4.3 (Küppers), 4.5.8, 4.5.9 (Stalder), 5.3.3 (Dix), 5.7.5 (Pickstock), 6.3.5 (von Allmen), 6.5.7 (Lathrop), 6.6.8, 6.6.12 (Ploeger and Ploeger-Grotegoed), 7.7.4 (ARCIC), 7.8.4 (Orthodox—Old Catholic dialogue).

'minor orders' offer non-exclusive examples of whatever ministry may be connected to the celebration in the tangible liturgical, pastoral and missionary situation of the celebrating community. With Dix, one has to deplore the gradual transition from this full 'concelebration' of the whole church to the reduced understanding of 'celebration' and 'celebrant' which left both Reformation and Counter-Reformation with the virtually ineradicable presupposition that liturgy is 'something done *by* the clergy *for* the laity', and that it is enough to have *one* member of the clergy to perform the liturgy for the people. Low Mass, rather than (Pontifical) High Mass, became the liturgical but also the theological paradigm of what liturgy and liturgical ministry is about.[175]

It is, again, a fruit of the interrelated (neo-) patristic and liturgical movements that the Sunday celebration of the whole local church—which is the diocese under the presidency of the bishop—has again become paradigmatic. This does not mean, of course, that other circumstances make the celebration of the liturgy impossible. The usual Sunday eucharist in a parish church under the presidency of a presbyter as the bishop's deputy—but, even then, preferably not without the ministry of a deacon and many lay ministries—is the best-known example of such (conceptually 'derivative') forms. In Zizioulas's words, recalling the concept of *oikonomia*, these forms are by no means impossible or unwanted, they are only a less 'perfect "icon of the Kingdom"'.[176] The ecclesial reality of every eucharistic celebration does not compromise the *paradigmatic* character of the 'full' (which need not be synonymous with 'laborious') liturgy celebrated by the whole church, present in all its *ordines*.

8.5.3 Presiding 'In Persona Christi'

In the context of the ecclesiology presented so far, it seems inconsistent to say that the presiding minister is distinguished from the gathered congregation by the fact that he or she represents Jesus Christ. The idea that the presiding minister acts *in persona Christi* while the gathered congregation does not, is precluded by the strong identification of Christ and the church through the concept of *koinonia*, understood as incorporation and participation that happens through baptism and the eucharist and makes the church part of *totus Christus*.[177] One has to say with Avis, that the whole church acts *in persona Christi* and that a reduction of the representation of Christ (including the representation of Christ's priesthood) to the ordained ministry reduces the identity between Christ and his body to a mere metaphor.[178]

[175] Cf. paragraphs 5.2.5 and 5.3.2.

[176] Cf. paragraph 2.3.8. I prefer this approach over the concept of 'critical exceptions' (Wainwright) or 'catholic exceptions' (Lathrop); see paragraph 6.5.5.

[177] Cf. sections 8.2 and 8.3.

[178] Cf. paragraph 5.5.7.

It must, therefore, be regarded as inconsistent with the overall convictions of a liturgical or eucharistic ecclesiology, when de Lubac says that the liturgy is not celebrated by the whole church but by the ordained ministers, so that '[t]he "hierarchical" church makes the eucharist'. Apart from the fact that such a view seems to disregard the depth of the church as *corpus Christi* and *totus Christus*, it has also to do with what McPartlan calls a 'narrow understanding of the Eucharist', namely an understanding largely confined to Christ's real presence in the eucharistic species, wrought by the priestly act of consecration.[179] Such a 'narrow understanding' sees acting *in persona Christi* as, if not reduced to, at least concentrated in 'impersonating' Christ during the recitation of the words of institution. Aldenhoven, however, points to the fact that the essence of presiding *in persona Christi* does not reside in imitating Jesus at the words of institution, but in the very act of presiding itself.[180]

The eucharistic community cannot exist without its presider, because 'without the ministry of the presider, the ecclesial assembly would be nothing but a shapeless crowd' (Afanasiev).[181] This both sociological and theological truth is deepened by Zizoulas when he interprets the relationship between Christ and the church as a polarity between the 'one' and the 'many'. In the symbolic (sacramental) order of the liturgy, the presider represents the 'one' (Christ) and the congregation represent the 'many' (the body).[182] According to Küppers, the symbolic, liturgical, sacramental role of the presiding minister is to occupy the uniting place of Christ in the midst of the congregation.[183] The same is expressed when the Orthodox—Old Catholic dialogue texts highlight the minister's role of 'gathering and building up', which finds its focus in eucharistic presidency, where the minister 'presides in the place of Christ and [...] represents Christ as the Head of the Church assembled around him in whose name he celebrates'.[184] Von Allmen likewise says that the reciprocity between Christ and the church is reflected in the polarity between the presider and the community. They interact as shepherd and flock, father and family, groom and bride, the one who visits and those who are visited, a witness of Christ and those who are Christ's body. Neither side of the polarity can do without the other, neither is first or second in importance.[185]

On the one hand, then, presiding includes nothing which is not simultaneously done by the whole celebrating community. The classical term for this aspect of the presider's role is presiding *in persona ecclesiae*. On the other hand, there is one indispensable aspect which is sacramentally symbolised

179 Cf. paragraph 3.2.6.
180 Cf. paragraph 4.7.5.
181 Cf. paragraph 2.2.3.
182 Cf. paragraph 2.3.6.
183 Cf. paragraph 4.4.3.
184 Cf. paragraph 7.8.4.
185 Cf. paragraph 6.3.6.

by the presider and not by the rest of the celebrating community, namely presiding over the whole gathering as Christ presides over his church. The classical term for this aspect of the presider's role is presiding *in persona Christi*. Küry expresses this aspect by saying that the ordained ministry is not placed 'above', but placed 'before' or 'in front of' the laity. The ordained ministers of the church have to take the lead at the head of their co-members of the church.[186] Presiding *in persona Christi* is, then, presiding *in persona Christi capitis*: acting as presider in the name of Christ who, as the head of the church, is the actual presider.[187] To indicate this ministry, the French translation of Afanasiev's work uses the patristic term *pro-estos* (the one who presides) and Rinkel says that the task of the ordained ministry is *prae-esse* (to preside).[188]

But, Rinkel continues, because in reality the church and the eucharist are presided by no one else than Christ himself through the Spirit, the minister who deputies for Christ in the act of presiding has to be duly ordained by the laying-on of hands and the invocation of the Spirit. Only a both institutional and charismatic ordination grants that the church is not handed over to human arbitrariness, but to a presidency that sacramentally stands for Christ's presidency. One may conclude that calling the ordained ministry 'sacramental' is the opposite of unduly exalting it.[189] As Stalder maintains, being an ordained minister is not possessing the 'right' or 'competence' to preach or to preside, but having received the 'responsibility' and 'task' to do so.[190] For the same reason, Lathrop wants the presiding minister to be 'subordinated to the *ordo* of the meeting'. Liturgical leadership is different from hosting a talk-show, delivering a lecture, entertaining a public, or—for that matter—offering a sacrifice *for* the people.[191] It is modestly presiding over a communal act of which, as Ploeger and Ploeger-Grotegoed also say, the congregation is the celebrant.[192]

After all that has been said about the church—consisting of women and men—as the sacramentally established *corpus Christi* and *totus Christus*, it seems unnecessary to say that the symbolic, liturgical, sacramental presidency *in persona Christi capitis* can be exercised by women and men alike. Even when, for example, von Allmen rightly emphasises that the ordained ministry is not a delegation by the community but a gift from Christ, granted through the Spirit in ordination (but even then, of course, never outside the context of the

186 Cf. paragraph 4.3.5.

187 I find this line of thought confirmed by G. MATTHEEUWS, 'De voorganger in de eucharistie als sacrament van de ecclesiale Christus', *Jaarboek voor liturgie-onderzoek* 15 (1999), 95-118 (esp. 106-111), who refers to relevant literature by J. Baldovin, L.-M. Chauvet, Y. Congar, E. Kilmartin, H. Legrand, G. Lukken, B. Marliangeas, D. Power and S. Wood.

188 Cf. paragraphs 2.2.4, 2.2.7 (Afanasiev) and 4.2.5 (Rinkel).

189 Cf. paragraph 4.2.5.

190 Cf. paragraphs 4.1.2 and 4.5.9.

191 Cf. paragraph 6.5.7.

192 Cf. paragraphs 6.6.8 and 6.6.12.

community of the church), even when he rightly emphasises the iconic character of the presiding minister, and even when he rightly insists on the specificity of each sex,[193] this is still in no way an argument to exclude women from this ministry, as little as the female typologies of the church and even the personal embodiment of the church in Mary exclude men from becoming part of the bride of Christ.[194] In both cases—ordination and baptism—the iconic character is *sacramentally* conferred: what counts is the iconic *ordo* into which one is placed. As Aldenhoven and Williams state, iconic representation of Christ does not root in Christ's being a circumcised Jew, nor in his manhood, but in his incarnation. God assumed humanity in order to draw humanity into himself.[195] Like at the beginning of this paragraph, one has to say with Avis that a reduction of the representation of Christ to the ordained *ministry* (in this case in relation to his manhood) turns the *ecclesial* identity between Christ and his body into a mere metaphor.[196] If Christ cannot be represented *ministerially* by women although he can be represented *ecclesially* by women, and if the *groom* cannot be represented by *women* although the *bride* can be represented by *men*, the latter representation is apparently taken in a more metaphorical manner than the former. This is inconsistent with the strong identification of Christ and the church in a sacramental *koinonia* ecclesiology.

The only aspect that is represented by the presider and not by the church as a whole is the fact that Christ (the one) is the head of his body (the many). From the perspective of a liturgical ecclesiology—that is, reasoning from the internal logic of the celebrating community—it is precisely this 'presiding' role that determines the particularity of the ordained ministry. With the Orthodox—Old Catholic dialogue texts, one can locate the primary characteristic of the ordained ministers in the fact that they are 'the presiders of the church'.[197]

Presiding over a multi-gifted community is, as Tillard says, no less and no more than holding together—in 'osmosis', 'symphony', 'communion'—the many charisms and keeping them in tune with the *acta et dicta* of Jesus Christ. The presider has 'to coordinate, but by verifying them' the charisms of the community. Justice has to be done to every personal gift of the Spirit *and* to the well-being of the communion as a whole. Ideally, one could say that justice is done to every gift of the Spirit *by* the very fact of integrating it into the community and, *vice versa*, that the well-being of the community is served by doing full justice to the rich variety of charisms that exist within it. It is precisely the task of the 'presiding' minister to do this 'enabling' and 'coordinating' but also 'verifying' work that builds up the body of Christ.[198]

193 Cf. paragraph 6.3.6.
194 Cf. paragraphs 3.2.3 (de Lubac), 3.3.5 (Ratzinger) and 5.4.3 (Ramsey).
195 Cf. paragraphs 4.7.5 (Aldenhoven) and 5.6.8 (Williams).
196 Cf. paragraph 5.5.7.
197 Cf. paragraph 7.8.4.
198 Cf. paragraph 3.5.5.

Presiding is, then, more than serving as a bloodless extension of the celebrating community. It is an active task, exercised *in persona Christi capitis* for the building-up and well-being of the body of Christ. In Stalder's choice of words, the congregation and the minister can be seen as one another's 'over against' (*Gegenüber*). Unfortunately, he grounds this 'over against' in what has to be evaluated as an overcharging of the ecclesiological potential of the Trinity, namely the connection of a certain person of the Trinity with a certain aspect or part of the church. He calls the clergy the main representatives of Christ and the laity the main representatives of the Spirit.[199] Given the interdependence of christology and pneumatology, and given the no less charismatic than christological constitution of the ordained ministry, it seems more helpful to root the ordained ministry's role of 'over against' in its symbolic, liturgical, sacramental presidency that represents Christ who is, through the Spirit, the head of the church.

8.5.4 Extensions of the Assembly

If the liturgical gathering is paradigmatic for the church and for aspects of it, such as the ordained ministry, it is consistent to interpret, at least heuristically, all the work of ordained ministers outside the liturgical assembly as 'an extension of the assembly' (Lathrop).[200] This is most obviously the case when the money, the food or other goods which were collected in the context of the eucharist are distributed to those in need by a deacon. A similarly obvious case is when the presider continues the giving of communion after the service by visiting the sick, the homebound and those in hospital. Extrapolation of these obvious examples shows how social outreach and pastoral care can be interpreted as 'extensions of the assembly', as elements of a minister's work flowing from the minister's role in the liturgical celebration. Not without sense, Lathrop can even call the sight of a visibly recognisable ordained minister walking along an inner city street a visual reminder of the hope, grace and peace that characterise the liturgical celebration.[201]

Afanasiev says that the eucharist, being the centre of ecclesial life, is the natural occasion for important ecclesial acts, such as the initiation of new members and the ordination to particular ministries. He concludes that, because the presider safeguards the structure and order of the eucharistic assembly, the

199 Cf. paragraph 4.5.5.

200 It should be mentioned that this approach overcomes the distinction between *ordo* (sacramental authority through ordination) and *iurisdictio* (administrative authority through election or appointment), by rooting both *ordo* and *iurisdictio* in the liturgical assembly. The canonical result is that *ordo* and *iurisdictio* should not only be regarded as belonging together, but even as merging—the two become two aspects intrinsic to the 'presiding' ministry.

201 Cf. paragraph 6.5.7. Not just the ordained minister's work, but every Christian's life outside the liturgical assembly is an 'extention of the assembly'; cf. paragraph 8.7.3.

presider is also the one who, outside the liturgy, safeguards the order of the community by presiding over it. This is why, for Afanasiev, the liturgical presider is also the church's administrative presider. The same applies to doctrinal and pastoral leadership—the liturgical proclamation of the Word and the liturgical presidency naturally overflow into the president's taking the lead in safeguarding the church's teaching and leading the church's pastoral responsibility.[202]

Küppers contributes to this view by referring to the architectural setting of the eucharist. The central place of the bishop at the altar, surrounded by presbyters, deacons and all the variety of the laity, stands for the bishop's unifying and representing ministry outside the liturgy. At the same time, the architectural image makes clear that this form of leadership is not exhaustively described by 'over against', but bears the marks of collegiality and communality.[203]

Moreover, Küppers emphasises that the liturgical paradigm of ministry implies its being seen in symbolic, sacramental terms rather than in a one-dimensional, functional, managerial way. This insight by Küppers can be connected to Lathrop's concept of 'broken' leadership. How much it may be true that liturgical presidency overflows into ecclesial presidency in extra-liturgical contexts, such presidency should never amount to univocal leadership, but should always be seen as a symbol, a sacrament.[204]

The task of the liturgical presider is to preside—no less and no more. This is, again, why Lathrop's concept of the *ordo* is so important. Not everything that *could* take place in the liturgy can be taken as paradigmatic for a liturgical ecclesiology. Not the isolated priest at his altar, nor the isolated preacher in his pulpit, but presidency over the communal gathering according to the *ordo* of bath, word and meal—presidency 'subordinated to the *ordo* of the meeting'—is paradigmatic for what ordained ministry is about. What the presider has to do, then, is little more than opening and closing, saying the central thanksgiving and probably also preaching the Word. As the full liturgy celebrated by all orders, ministries and charisms suggests, most of the liturgy is not 'done' by the presider, but by all kinds of other (lay and ordained) ministers.[205] *This* model of presiding—enabling, stimulating and coordinating (Wainwright); coordinating by verifying (Tillard)—is the paradigm of ecclesial leadership.[206]

The effect of the previous observation is that extra-liturgical leadership which flows from liturgical presidency has to be exercised in a 'synodical' or

202 Cf. paragraph 2.2.5. See also 7.7.4 (ARCIC).
203 Cf. paragraph 4.4.3.
204 Cf. paragraphs 4.4.3 (Küppers), 6.5.4 and 6.5.7 (Lathrop).
205 Expressed in traditional terms, the paradigm of a liturgical ecclesiology is not 'Low Mass' (with its one officiating ordained minister) but '(Pontifical) High Mass' with its variety of ordained and lay ministries.
206 Cf. paragraphs 3.5.5 (Tillard), 6.4.9 (Wainwright) and 6.5.7 (Lathrop).

'conciliar' way or, as ecumenical parlance since *BEM* puts it, in a way that is not just 'personal' but also 'collegial' and 'communal'.[207] This is not the same as turning the church into a representative democracy, but it is doing justice to the fact that the whole people of God has received the charism of 'discernment' (Afanasiev).[208] Ordained ministers among themselves should act collegially (Tillard) and their decisions should be open towards the process of reception (Rinkel).[209] The 'over against' of the clergy only functions if it is complemented by the 'over against' of the laity (Stalder). An episcopal decision is only one element in a process of finding the truth, a process in which every member of the church is involved.[210] It is, therefore, not coincidental that the Orthodox—Old Catholic dialogue texts especially highlight two instances of episcopal presidency: eucharistic and synodical. The first is paradigmatic, the second little less. In both cases the bishop presides over a gathering of the whole people of God in which all charisms have to be respected and integrated into the whole.[211]

One can conclude that it is consistent with a liturgical ecclesiology when those who preside over the eucharistic gathering also preside over the other aspects of the church's life. Exactly as in the liturgical context, this presidency in the extra-liturgical context does not need—and is not even allowed—to imply that the presider 'does everything' (including taking decisions). Both in and outside the liturgy, the presider is an icon of the head of the church, not in the 'unbroken' way of univocal leadership, but in the 'sacramental' way that reckons with the presider's simultaneous remaining within the *ordo* of the laity (the people of God). The heuristic comparison of ecclesiastical leadership to liturgical presidency shows that the former, like the latter, is to be understood in terms of enabling and stimulating, verifying and integrating.

8.5.5 An Ecumenical 'Relecture' of the Bishop, the Presbyterium and the Deacons

Following the thought of many authors discussed in this study, it seems worthwile to opt for the 'neo-patristic' experiment of trying to regain from a eucharistic perspective the basic ministerial structure of the Early Church. Exemplary for this option is *BEM*'s proposal that, although '[t]he New Testament does not describe a single pattern of ministry', and although the patristic evidence interprets the threefold ministerial model in different ways, 'nevertheless the threefold ministry of bishop, presbyter and deacon may serve

207 Cf. paragraph 7.2.4.
208 Cf. paragraph 2.2.5.
209 Cf. paragraphs 3.5.5 (Tillard) and 4.2.5 (Rinkel).
210 Cf. paragraphs 4.5.5 and 4.5.6 (Stalder).
211 Cf. paragraph 7.8.4.

today as an expression of the unity we seek and also as a means for achieving it'.[212]

What I have called the 'neo-patristic' character of *BEM*'s proposal is that it does not—in spite of criticisms based on the presupposition that it *does*—present the ministerial model of bishop, presbyterium and deacons as the necessary outcome of biblical or patristic evidence, but as a modern-day ecumenical *relecture* of a patristic model. To *BEM*'s proposal applies what Florovsky says when defining his 'neo-patristic' concept:

> It must be *Patristic*, faithful to the spirit and vision of the Fathers, *ad mentem Patrum*. Yet, it must be also *Neo*-Patristic, since it is to be addressed to the new age, with its own problems and queries.[213]

The 'problems and queries' of *BEM*'s age are primarily ecumenical problems, for which *BEM* hopes to find a solution. Therefore, appreciation of *BEM*'s phrase, 'The traditional threefold pattern thus raises questions for all the churches' is essential for a correct interpretation of *BEM*'s proposal. In other words, *BEM* does not just endorse the existing ministerial polity of 'episcopal' churches, if only because there *is* no single 'episcopal' polity, as is witnessed by the significant differences between Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Old Catholic, Anglican and sometimes Protestant episcopal theories and practices. What follows can be understood as advocating an ecumenical *relecture* or 're-reading'[214] of the patristic ministerial pattern of one bishop, a presbyterium and a number of deacons in view of the present-day situation of the churches.[215]

From a liturgical-ecclesiological perspective, any discourse on the ordained ministry should start with the observation that the liturgical gathering, the eucharistic community, is the primary manifestation of the church. One of the conclusions that can be drawn from this basic presupposition is that all ordained ministries of the church have their (literal) 'place' within the eucharistic celebration of one community in one place. Therefore, negatively formulated, it would be inconsistent with a liturgical-ecclesiological perspective, if there would exist ministries that originate from outside the liturgical gathering. Positively formulated, all ministries are rooted in some way or another in the local eucharistic community. All ministries are ministries of the 'local church'.[216]

It seems, therefore, consistent to follow Afanasiev's view that every ministry can be described in terms of its belonging to and emerging from the

212 Cf. paragraph 7.2.4 (*BEM*).
213 Cf. paragraph 2.1.6 (The Quest for a Neo-Patristic Synthesis).
214 This term is used in different ecumenical contexts in paragraphs 3.5.6 (by Ratzinger and Tillard) and 7.1.3 (by Houtepen).
215 *BEM*'s proposal will be followed here in the amended sense given to it in paragraph 7.2.4.
216 The concept of the 'local church' is further investigated in section 8.6.

local church. Even if Afanasiev tries too hard finding his own 'local' understanding of ministry in *every* existing biblical and patristic document, he must be deemed right when he insists that it is perfectly possible to (conceptually) root every ministry in a local church. This particularly applies to his understanding of the apostolate as missionary outreach from a local church. The apostolic work, he says, originated as a mission of the local church of Jerusalem. All apostles can be regarded as members of a local church, who were sent out as missionaries of and from that local church.[217] The consistency of this view must be uphold against Ratzinger's allegation that a local church inevitably tends to become inward-looking, so that missionary vigour has to be expected from the universal church rather than from local churches.[218] Although Ratzinger's concept is, of course, consistent in itself (given his understanding of the relationship between the universal church and the local churches), it is absolutely unnecessary for a missionary church to take Ratzinger's view. In a liturgical ecclesiology it is much more consistent to root every ministry, including missionary ministries, in the celebrating community, that is, in the local church.[219] This principle may also be able to prevent what Boff fears, namely that some ministerial orders—especially the bishop, sometimes even the priest—come to stand over against the local celebrating community, instead of being part of it. The functioning of the ordained ministry should be determined neither by the exercise of administrative power, nor by the upholding of male and celibate standards, but by the ordained ministry's rooting in the local celebrating community.[220]

As was already encountered in the paragraph on 'presiding', the unity of each local church is personified in the one eucharistic presider.[221] In Afanasiev's reconstruction, the sole presider has always been there, first as the 'senior' among a group of *presbyteroi* and/or *episkopoi*, later as the bearer of the 'particular ministry' of the bishop. 'Topologically' speaking, this sole presider took the 'place' which belonged initially to Christ (as presider) and later to the apostles (as presiders).[222] Zizioulas works this theory out by stating that in New Testament times every local church celebrated the eucharist in no more than one 'Church in the household' at the same time, under the leadership of one 'presiding presbyter'. When the phenomenon of the parish emerged, in the third century, this was not interpreted as a threat to the unity of the one eucharistic community under the presidency of the one bishop, but as an extension of this one community. According to Zizioulas, the bishop conceptually remained the one presider over the one eucharistic community,

217 Cf. paragraph 2.2.6.
218 Cf. paragraph 3.3.9.
219 The concept of 'mission' is further investigated in paragraph 8.7.2.
220 Cf. paragraph 3.4.3.
221 Cf. paragraph 8.5.3.
222 Cf. paragraphs 2.2.7 and 2.2.8.

which now gathered in various places by a 'spacial distribution of the Presbyter's synthronon'. These presbyters still 'concelebrated' with the bishop, just as they did when they still visibly surrounded him.[223]

This line of thought is consistently followed by von Allmen. In his opinion, the Reformed ministerial pattern (pastors, elders, deacons) reflects an attempt at restoring the threefold ministry of the Early Church (bishops, presbyters, deacons). Although 'sociologically' the Reformed churches seem to have lost episcopacy (they do not have bishops at the supra-local level), 'theologically' they regard their pastors as 'pastor-bishop of the parish'. As proof for this 'episcopalised' parish ministry von Allmen not only refers to the intentions of the Reformers, but also to the fact that the patristic bishop looked more like a parish pastor than like a regional governor. Consequently, von Allmen maintains that one community (one parish, one local church) can only have one pastor-bishop.[224]

Out of these considerations follows that someone who could be called 'the bishop' is the personal focus of the celebrating community, because he or she is the main presider over the liturgical gathering. Everything that has been said in the previous paragraphs about presiding and the presider can be applied to this bishop, as well as what will be said below, in the section on the universal church as a 'communion of communions'. It is important to keep in mind that this bishop is a *local* minister, although the concept of 'locality' can be stretched into something more regional.[225]

But there are other ordained ministries as well. The principle that the liturgical gathering consists of many charisms, *ordines*, ministries (lay and ordained) has to be reflected within the ordained ministry. The ministry of the church, including the ordained ministry, is 'a communion of ministries' (Tillard).[226] In *BEM*'s 'neo-patristic' proposal, these ministries bear the names of presbyters and deacons.[227]

Presbyters are those who form the 'college of presiders' (Afanasiev). One of these, the sole presider, grew into the 'bishop' as the one presider of the local church. The others remained 'presbyters'—members of the presbyterium that functioned as the local church's, and the bishop's, council of advice and assistance.[228] When the growth of the territory and/or the membership of the local church made separate eucharistic gatherings necessary, these were, according to Zizioulas, either separated into new episcopal communities, or served from the episcopal centre by presbyters whom the bishop sent to deputy for him. One has to maintain with Zizioulas that, as long as a diocese is not too

223 Cf. paragraph 2.3.8.
224 Cf. paragraph 6.3.6.
225 The scale of the diocese is further investigated in paragraph 8.5.6.
226 Cf. paragraph 3.5.5.
227 Cf. paragraph 7.2.4.
228 Cf. paragraph 2.2.7.

large, it still can function, and be perceived, as such an extended community around the bishop's eucharist.[229] The same concept is defended by von Allmen. His interpretation of the Reformed system allows, as we saw, for only one ('episcopalised') pastor in one local church (parish). Next to this pastor-bishop he presupposes the presence of a prebyterium, a college of presbyters (elders) who assist the bishop in his pastoral care for the whole flock, or by taking care of a part of the flock by delegation.[230]

The ministerial model advocated here requires, then, a rethinking of the relationship between the bishop and the presbyters. Rather than regarding the bishop as a provincial manager, he or she has again to be regarded as a local liturgical presider and preacher who regularly visits the limited number of parishes within the diocese.[231] Rather than regarding a presbyter as the single leader of a local church (understood as the parish), a presbyter has again to be regarded as a collegial member of the presbyterium, and as a representative of the bishop who presides over the local church (understood as the diocese). Presbyterial presidency over the eucharistic assembly and presbyterial leadership over a parish is not a 'genuinely presbyterial', but a 'delegated episcopal function' (Aldenhoven).[232] This view, of course, does not diminish the pastoral and missionary initiative of presbyters and parishes. It rather enhances the presbyter's and the parish's sense of belonging, through a renewed emphasis on the fact that both are embedded in collegiality and communality, with the bishop representing the unity of all. It also makes possible a more dynamic understanding of the presbyterium—presbyters may come from various backgrounds, not all presbyters need to become parish priests, the bishop may select those as presbyters whom can be of assistance in matters like preaching, teaching and theologising, but also in matters of administration, pastoral care (for example in sector ministries) and missionary outreach.

When the medieval concentration on the sacerdotal priest and the medieval interpretation of the bishop as a regional governor is corrected by a reinvention of the 'local' episcopate and the 'collegial' presbyterium, this should be followed by a reaffirmation of the diaconate as an, ideally, indispensable order in every celebration of the liturgy (Zizioulas).[233] The deacon represents the link between the liturgy and 'diaconal' outreach. He or she proclaims the gospel, offers intercessions and serves at the table—and carries this ministry forward by taking the lead in the church's social concern for its own community, for its neighbourhood and for the wider world. The deacon's liturgical role helps to interpret diaconal outreach as a full part of the ministry and mission of the

229 Cf. paragraph 2.3.8.
230 Cf. paragraph 6.3.6.
231 Cf. paragraph 6.5.8 (Lathrop). See paragraph 8.5.6.
232 Cf. paragraphs 2.3.8 (Zizioulas), 4.4.3 (Küppers), 4.5.9 (Stalder), 4.6.5 (Visser) and 4.7.5 (Aldenhoven).
233 Cf. paragraph 2.3.8.

church, in terms of service and reconciliation, rather than as a 'social' appendix to otherwise 'religious' functions of the church. Like the presbyters, the deacons do their 'assisting' work as representatives of the bishop. In the context of the ministerial concept proposed here, it could be well conceivable that local parishioners may prove suitable to be ordained to the diaconate with its liturgical, pastoral and societal aspects.

Finally, those who want to subsume all ordained ministries into one ministry, or at least want to merge bishop and priest—the bishop being a priest with enlarged jurisdiction—seem to miss one or more of the points elaborated here. Firstly, they probably regard the priest as a local and the bishop as a supra-local minister, a view which in this study is exemplarily found in Küry.[234] When, however, all ministries are fundamentally seen as ministries of the local church, it becomes unintelligible why the church should have two ministries which are more or less the same. In the context of the local church, each ministry should have its distinctive meaning. Secondly, as Rinkel, Küppers and Visser suspect, those who merge bishop and priest probably focus their theology of the ordained ministry on the 'power' of 'consecrating' and 'offering' invested in the 'priest'. In such a view, a deacon is 'not yet a priest' and a bishop is 'already a priest'. This medieval understanding of the 'priesthood' should be corrected into a more 'presbyterial' understanding. As Rinkel says, the ministerial task is *praeesse* (presiding over the gathering) rather than *offerre* (offering the sacrifice).[235] Thirdly, merging ministries into one ministry seems to disregard the importance of the fact that the variety of (lay and ordained) ministries within the church should be reflected by the *ordines* of the ordained ministry. As Tillard says, the ordained ministry is not only a service to the communion of the church (a 'ministry of communion'), but also a collegial community in itself (a 'communion of ministries'). Van der Leeuw's intuition is correct, that two or more ministers, who divide presiding and assisting functions among themselves, do not create a more but a less clericalist liturgy. Their cooperation expresses the variety of gifts in the one community of the church, rather than the 'unbroken' presidency of one ordained minister over against the congregation. The ideal realisation of this diversity is, of course, not the cooperation of two or more ministers of the same *ordo*, but the variety of *ordines* all playing their parts in the common celebration. Not the 'one man parish' but a team of ministries is the best way to enable the whole people of God to live according to the gifts of the Spirit (Stalder).[236]

234 Cf. paragraph 4.3.5.
235 Cf. paragraph 4.2.5 (Rinkel), 4.4.3 (Küppers) and 4.6.5 (Visser).
236 Cf. paragraphs 3.5.5 (Tillard), 4.5.8 (Stalder) and 6.2.9 (van der Leeuw).

8.5.6 Excursus: Scale and Mentality of the Diocese

A liturgical ecclesiology is simultaneously deeply spiritual and concretely tangible.[237] This seems, however, less convincingly applicable to the local concept of the ordained ministry, in particular to the bishop as the local liturgical presider, to the presbyters as members of a collegial body, and to the self-understanding of Christians as a eucharistic community in communion with their bishop. The practical implementation of this liturgical-ecclesiological approach to ministry requires, then, a reconsideration of the scale of the diocese and of the mentality of its lay and ordained members.

As for scale, some authors explicitly indicate that the 'local' understanding of the bishop, with his or her primary role as liturgical presider, requires the formation of 'dioceses of a more human size' (Tillard).[238] It is not necessary to go as far as the picture described by Zizioulas on the basis of his patristic research, where even each village had its own bishop.[239] But it is perfectly imaginable that—in line with what Stalder proposes—for example each 'market town' should have its own bishop.[240] The place where people naturally go for shopping, business and entertainment is also the most natural centre of the diocese. And the other way round—such a diocese finds its natural scope in the area that in 'secular' life is served from the market town.

In many cases such an arrangement of dioceses will coincide with already existing smaller units within a diocese, such as the area served by an auxiliary bishop,[241] an archdeacon or a dean. In other words, in many cases the actual *episkope* is currently already exercised at such a level. It will serve the consistency of ecclesiology—and particularly of a liturgical ecclesiology with its emphasis on the tangible reality of the church as, primarily, the celebrating community—when the ecclesiological theory and the empirical situation are kept (or brought) as closely together as possible.

Such a formation of smaller dioceses—perhaps, as just indicated, only by formalising already existing subdivisions within dioceses—will substantially increase the number of dioceses, which may rise practical questions concerning staffing and other facilities. The goal of having smaller dioceses, however, is not to increase bureaucracy, but to restore the church (and not least its episcopal and presbyteral ministry) to its eucharistic, local, collegial essence. Facilities

237 Cf. paragraph 8.3.5.

238 Cf. paragraphs 2.3.8 (Zizioulas), 3.5.5 (Tillard), 4.3.6 (Küry), 4.5.8 (Stalder). See also 7.2.4 (my discussion of *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*).

239 Cf. paragraph 2.3.8.

240 Cf. paragraph 4.5.8.

241 The concept of an auxiliary bishop (perhaps with the exception of a 'coadjutor with the right of succession' and the assistance offered by a retired diocesan bishop) is inconsistent with the liturgical-ministerial proposal offered here.

can generally stay where they are now, and can be shared, for example on what then would become the 'metropolitan' level.

The adoption of smaller dioceses will also, of course, increase the number of diocesan bishops, though it will eliminate the 'scandalously uncanonical institution of the *assistant bishop*', as Zizioulas calls it.[242] Smaller dioceses will therefore require some rethinking from those who are used to perceive a bishop as the now largely managerial heir of the sometime prince bishop. Perceiving a bishop as the main liturgical presider—and from there, the main but not sole preacher, pastor and administrator—of a limited area will free episcopacy from its last 'Constantinian' remnants, making it a less exceptional and more approachable ministry. What Lathrop comments about the bishop of Rome is—not least in ecumenical perspective—applicable to and desirable of every bishop: 'less would be very, very much more'.[243]

As for mentality, this practical implementation of a liturgical ecclesiology will require an amount of rethinking from all members of the diocese, lay and ordained. Instead of only subscribing in theory to the fact that the bishop is the diocese's first presider at the eucharist and preacher of the gospel, and that the presbyter is not primarily the incumbent of an *Einmannpfarramt* (one man parish; Stalder)[244] but a member of the presbyterium, they will be challenged to actually experience this by giving it tangible expression. The limited scale of the diocese will enhance the bishop's ability to preside regularly in his or her parishes, and the people's ability to share now and then in common worship at the cathedral. The limited scale of a diocese will also enhance the presbyters' perception that they belong together (and perhaps actually work together according to everyone's charisms) and that the regular deliberations of bishop-and-presbyterium (at times enlarged into a diocesan synod including laity) have a substantial meaning for the life and mission of the diocese.

For a liturgical ecclesiology to be empirically implemented, then, it is—from the side of those churches currently having an 'episcopal' polity—important to restore episcopacy to its rather unimpressive character of presidency over a limited locality, instead of having all kinds of regional officers under the umbrella of a remote diocesan bishop. It is also important to restore the presbyterium to actual collegiality and to reinvent the diaconate as a normal, local ministry. From the side of those churches currently not regarded as 'episcopal' churches, the empirical implementation of a liturgical ecclesiology requests a *relecture* of existing local and supra-local ministries. To what extent can ministries currently regarded as 'ordained ministries'—such as the ministry of 'elders'—be reinterpreted as important lay ministries? And to what extent can ministries currently subsumed under the heading of one pastoral ministry be reinterpreted as complementary—diaconal, presbyterial and

242 Cf. paragraph 2.3.8.
243 Cf. paragraph 6.5.8.
244 Cf. paragraph 4.5.8.

episcopal—ministries?[245] For *all* churches it is important that those who embody the local church—the (small) 'diocese'—mentally grow in perceiving themselves as a local, collegial, eucharistic community. Keeping or bringing ecclesiological theory and ecclesial reality together, requires not only practical reform when necessary, but also continuing spiritual teaching and growth.

8.5.7 Apostolic Succession

There is growing ecumenical convergence on the relation between the apostles and ordained ministers, especially bishops. Irrespective of one's interpretation of the apostles, either as missionaries rooted in and sent out by 'local churches',[246] or as missionaries belonging to the 'universal church',[247] many ecclesiologists regard the apostolate as a ministry unique to the apostolic era. Apostles are, then, not univocally 'succeeded' by bishops.[248]

Bishops do, however, continue certain *tasks* of the apostles. They particularly continue the apostles' task of presiding over the local church. 'Topologically' speaking, one can say with Afanasiev that the 'place' originally occupied by Jesus Christ and successively occupied by the senior apostle (in the context of the Jerusalem church, Afanasiev thinks of Peter, Stephen and James the Less successively) became the 'place' of the bishop. The bishops are, then, the 'topological' successors of the apostles, that is, they do not succeed the apostles *as apostles*, but they succeed the apostles *as presiders*.[249]

As concluded above, presiding has a deeper contents than just chairing a meeting.[250] In Tillard's already cited formulation, to preside is 'to coordinate, but by verifying'. The presider enables all charisms of the people of God to be exercised to the well-being of the church. The presider does so by keeping all charisms in contact with the *acta et dicta* of Jesus Christ as handed down by the apostolic tradition, in which, of course, Scripture has a paramount place. It is, as Tillard rightly says, an 'apostolic' task of the ordained ministry to guard the 'deposit' of the apostles, that is, to mediate the apostolic tradition to today's church.[251]

This apostolic tradition and apostolic authority—although especially guarded and exercised by the ordained ministry, in particular by the bishops—is given to the whole church. Apostolicity is not just a mark of the ordained ministry, but first and foremost a mark of the church. Apostolic succession is,

245 Cf. paragraph 7.2.4 (*Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*).
246 Cf. paragraph 2.2.6 (Afanasiev). This is also the interpretation followed in this chapter; cf. paragraph 8.5.5.
247 Cf. paragraphs 3.3.9 (Ratzinger), 4.2.6 (Rinkel), 5.4.5 and 5.4.6 (Ramsey).
248 Cf. paragraphs 2.2.7, 2.2.8 (Afanasiev), 3.5.5 (Tillard), 7.8.4 (Orthodox—Old Catholic dialogue).
249 Cf. paragraphs 2.2.7 and 2.2.8.
250 Cf. paragraph 8.5.3.
251 Cf. paragraph 3.5.5.

then, an expression of the apostolicity of the whole church and cannot be *in itself* and *on its own* a guarantee for truth.[252] Catholicity, holiness and unity are equally important.[253] Apostolic succession is not a status but a process, namely, the process of 'conciliarity'.[254]

Rinkel helpfully distinguishes three types of 'apostolic succession'. The first type is succession on one and the same episcopal *see*. In this sense, the successive bishops of one particular city are the successors of the particular apostle who, historically or legendarily, founded the church in that city. The second type of 'apostolic succession' regards the bishops (in general) as successors of the apostles (in general) because they have taken over their *functions*. The third type interprets 'apostolic succession' as the transmission of apostolic tradition and authority through *ordination*—the 'sacerdotal theory' of the 'golden channel'. Rinkel opts for the second interpretation of 'apostolic succession',[255] which concurs with the line of thought presented earlier in this paragraph. As Aldenhoven summarises, apostolic succession is not some kind of sacramental power transmitted from bishop to bishop by their ordination, but the gift of continuity which is given to and exercised by the whole church.[256]

The not only communal and collegial but also *personal* character of the ordained ministry requires, however, that the apostolic succession of the whole church does not remain an abstract idea, but finds personified embodiment. It is exactly the unifying role of the bishop—the presider, the representative of Christ as the head of his church, the representative of the local church in the wider communion of churches[257]—which makes the bishop the 'personification' of his or her church. The bishop, then, personifies the apostolic tradition and authority that is given to his or her church.[258] Therefore, the heuristically helpful concept of *episkope* should not become an abstract principle and its personal embodiment in the *episkopos* a matter of second importance.[259] Personal, collegial and communal *episkope* is lived not by structures but by persons—lay and ordained persons with their many charisms ordered into several *ordines*. The personal character of the Christian faith and the personal aspect of the ordained ministry requires a ministry of unity in which, among other things, the apostolicity of the church finds personal embodiment.

Therefore, the episcopal laying-on of hands in a line of succession is an important sign and expression of the apostolic succession of the whole

252 Cf. paragraphs 4.2.5, 4.2.6 (Rinkel), 4.5.7 (Stalder), 5.4.5 (Ramsey), 5.5.3, 5.5.4, 5.5.7 (Avis) and 6.4.9 (Wainwright). See also 4.1.2 (Ecclesiological Jansenism: Jurisdiction and Mentality).

253 Cf. paragraph 4.2.5 (Rinkel).

254 Cf. paragraphs 4.5.7 and 4.5.8 (Stalder). On conciliarity see also 8.6.5.

255 Cf. paragraph 4.2.5.

256 Cf. paragraph 4.7.5.

257 Cf. paragraphs 8.5.3 and 8.6.4.

258 Cf. paragraphs 4.2.5 (Rinkel) and 4.5.7 (Stalder).

259 Cf. paragraph 7.6.5 (my discussion of *The Nature and Mission of the Church*).

church.[260] Remarkably for a Reformed Protestant, von Allmen rightly maintains that *succession doctrinale* (what now would be called 'apostolic tradition') should normally go together with *succession pastorale* ('apostolic succession' as continuity of ministers). One church does not have to 'unchurch' another church for a break in either of these successions, but the regular way in which the church lives its continuity throughout the ages is the *combination* of these, at least if the church does not want to 'install [itself] in the extraordinary'.[261]

One can conclude that one's understanding of apostolic succession has neither to be reduced to its ministerial aspect, nor abstracted into a depersonalised concept. Embedded in an understanding of apostolic succession which regards the whole church as sharing in the apostolic tradition and authority, apostolic succesion certainly includes the 'apostolic succession of ministry' as 'a part and sign' of the 'apostolic tradition' (*Confessing the One Faith*).[262]

8.5.8 Conclusion

This section investigated what insights the heuristic viewpoint of the liturgy might contribute to the understanding of the ordained ministry in the context of the church. The point of departure was Afanasiev's 'topological' approach to ministry, which implies that someone's literal 'place' in the liturgical gathering defines his or her role within the ecclesial community. This not just applies to the presider and to the other ordained ministers, but also to the charisms of the laity. All lay and ordained charisms flourish in the 'full' celebration of the eucharist in which all 'special liturgies' have their natural place.

Amidst these charisms, there is the charism of the one who presides over the liturgical gathering. In a liturgical ecclesiology which emphasises the whole church's incorporation into the body of Christ, into *totus Christus*, the 'special liturgy' of the presider cannot be the representation of Christ *tout court*. Celebrating *in persona Christi* is, then, not an adequate description of the ministry of the presider, because it does not distinguish him or her from the other members of the liturgical community, who also celebrate *in persona Christi*. One should rather say that the presider acts *in persona ecclesiae* (coordinating the celebration of the whole gathered church and giving voice to the prayer of the whole gathered church) and *in persona Christi capitis*: the presider is the only one who does not just represent Christ (as do all baptised, who are his body the church), but who, by the very act of presiding, represents Christ *as the head* of his body the church. It is Christ who, through the

260 Cf. paragraphs 4.5.7 (Stalder) and 4.7.5 (Aldenhoven).
261 Cf. paragraph 6.3.6.
262 Cf. paragraph 7.4.3. The same is expressed in 7.8.4 (Orthodox—Old Catholic dialogue).

sacramental (pneumatological, iconic) ministry of the presider, presides over his church.

Presiding is 'coordinating, but by verifying' the charisms of the whole people of God. The verifying aspect of the presider's role has the aim of coordinating the personal charisms for the well-being of the ecclesial community. It has also the aim of keeping the community in line with the person and life of Jesus Christ. This aspect makes the ordained ministry a personal embodiment of 'apostolic tradition' or 'apostolic succession'.

From the heuristic viewpoint of a liturgical ecclesiology, the other spheres of work of the ordained ministry are to be interpreted as 'extensions of the assembly'. The liturgical 'place', the liturgical relationship of the ordained ministers to the other members of the church, is continued in their responsibilities in ecclesial life outside the liturgy. As in liturgical presidency, this does not mean that ordained ministers have to 'do' everything or even have to force decisions. Rather, they continue their sacramental, symbolic role of presiding which is 'coordinating but by verifying'.

Flowing from this liturgical, 'topological' understanding of ministry, a 'neo-patristic' *relecture* of the one bishop, the collegial presbyters and the deacons proposes itself as a possible ecumenical model. Prerequisites for such a model are a fundamentally 'local' (or limited regional) understanding of all ministries (including the episcopate), a return to the presbyteral rather than sacerdotal understanding of the presbyter, and some rethinking as to which charisms are to be included in the ordained ministry and which can be viewed as lay charisms.

8.6 Communion of Communions

8.6.1 The Catholicity of the Local Church

If the liturgy is the primary manifestation of the church and, more specifically, if 'the eucharist makes the church',[263] the local celebrating community is rightly called 'church'. And, as Afanasiev exemplarily teaches, if the whole Christ is present both in the eucharistic bread and in the church that becomes his body through baptism and the eucharist, there is no fuller presence of Christ and no fuller presence of the church than in the local eucharistic community.[264] This is why many liturgical or eucharistic ecclesiologists treat 'the local church' as their main ecclesiological category. The local church is the catholic church.

263 Cf. paragraphs 8.4.3 (eucharist) and 8.4.5 (liturgy).
264 Cf. paragraph 2.2.9.

What is meant by 'the local church'? As the above investigation into the ordained ministry already made clear,[265] the concept of local church should be so defined, that it comprises everything which is essential to this local community's being church. The internal logic of a liturgical ecclesiology requires that everything which is essentially ecclesial is an element of the local celebrating community rather than something (conceptually) superimposed upon it from outside. Therefore, the local church is the community in which all *ordines* of the people of God are present, including the three ordained ministries of the bishop, the presbyterium and the deacons, but also including such a number of lay charisms that the ecclesial life of *leitourgia*, *diakonia* and *martyria* becomes possible (von Arx).[266] One parish may be too small for such a full ecclesial life, and an area larger than one city or one small region may be too large for the effective interaction of laity and clergy and all their charisms. As indicated above,[267] a relatively small area, comprising of a limited number of 'parishes', may be the ideal size of a 'diocese' (Stalder).[268] The terms 'parish' and 'diocese', however, are irrelevant. A distinction between parish and diocese 'does definitively not belong to the essence of the church' (Aldenhoven). What counts is the presence of all *ordines* and charisms (including the ministry of the bishop) in the local church, irrespective of whether it consists of one community (then the local church is 'diocese' and 'parish' at the same time) or of a group of communities (then the local church is the 'diocese', which is subdivided into 'parishes' without losing its theological and empirical unity).[269]

Because, and insofar as, each local church comprises all *ordines* and charisms of the people of God, so that it lives the ecclesial life of *leitourgia*, *diakonia* and *martyria*, each local church is a catholic church. This requires, of course, an understanding of catholicity which is different from its exclusively geographic, quantitative sense (as in Ratzinger).[270] Both de Lubac and Rinkel maintain that 'catholic' does not primarily mean 'geographically wide-spread' but 'all embracing'. Everyone has to be saved. Every church which affirms the whole Christ and offers salvation to all, is catholic in this 'soteriological' sense.[271] Tillard says that the 'church of God', the 'whole church', exists in every local church, because—Tillard follows here the same line of thought as Afanasiev—every local church celebrates the eucharist in which the body of Christ, and the communion with Christ, are fully present. This is why Tillard affirms the 'catholicity' of the local church.[272] Likewise, the Orthodox—Old Catholic dialogue texts affirm the catholicity of each local church by referring

265 Cf. section 8.5 (especially paragraph 8.5.5).
266 Cf. paragraph 4.8.4.
267 Cf. paragraph 8.5.6.
268 Cf. paragraph 4.5.8.
269 Cf. paragraph 4.7.5.
270 Cf. paragraph 3.3.9.
271 Cf. paragraphs 3.2.2 (de Lubac) and 4.2.6 (Rinkel).
272 Cf. paragraph 3.5.4.

to the eucharist which is celebrated in every local church. The document even turns the geographical understanding of catholicity upside down: '*although* it is scattered over the whole earth' the church is catholic because 'it is always and everywhere *the same*'.[273] The local church, then, is the catholic church, if catholicity is understood in its 'qualitative' sense.[274]

8.6.2 The Communion between the Local Churches

This study has identified 'eucharistic ecclesiology' in a number of authors from a number of churches. However, the term 'eucharistic ecclesiology' and its first conceptual presentation was the work of Afanasiev in a definitely Orthodox context. The polemical focus of Afanasiev's eucharistic ecclesiology was against what he called the 'universal ecclesiology' of the Roman Catholic Church.[275] For this reason, some authors who came to appreciate the biblical, (neo-) patristic and ecumenical qualities of a eucharistic ecclesiology, felt compelled to distantiate themselves either from the term 'eucharistic ecclesiology',[276] or at least from its original use by Afanasiev.[277]

The main weakness in Afanasiev's theory is said to be its 'congregational' tendency. Because Afanasiev focuses so exclusively on the local eucharistic community, he is said to neglect the relationship between the eucharistic communities, the communion between the local churches. However, the section on Afanasiev in chapter 2 already pointed to the fact that Afanasiev does not dismiss the idea of universality, but conceptually arrives at the universal church from the local church. He does not start with a universal church, of which the local churches are necessarily only 'parts' (as, for example, in the Roman Catholic expression 'particular churches' rather than 'local churches'), but he starts with the local eucharistic assembly, which is connected to all other local churches *by the very fact that it celebrates the eucharist*. Every local church celebrates the same eucharist. In every local church the same Christ is present in the same fullness. Everyone who takes part in a local eucharistic celebration is, therefore, intrinsically united to all who celebrate the same eucharist anywhere. Not dissimilar to the above discussion of 'qualitative' catholicity,[278] Afanasiev calls this an 'interior' or 'intrinsic' universalism—an understanding of the universality of the church that is rooted in the interior, intrinsic, qualitative 'sameness' of the eucharist in every local church. Because, through the eucharist, every local church is the church in its fullness, every local church will

273 Cf. paragraph 7.8.3, emphasis added.
274 Cf. paragraphs 3.5.3, 3.5.4 (Tillard), 4.8.4 (von Arx) and 7.8.3 (Orthodox—Old Catholic dialogue).
275 Cf. paragraph 2.2.9.
276 Cf. paragraph 3.2.9 (de Lubac).
277 Cf. paragraphs 2.3.2, 2.3.7 (Zizioulas) and 3.5.2 (Tillard).
278 Cf. paragraph 8.6.1.

have a bond of 'love and concord' with every other local church.[279] It is, then, not his own invention, but his refining of Afanasiev's concept, when Zizioulas takes the eucharist as the joint between the local and the universal church. Like Afanasiev, he does not start with the concept of a universal church, but with the local eucharistic community which recognises a 'unity in identity' with all other local eucharistic communities.[280]

Other authors think the other way round. They emphasise the 'one-ness' of the church, the 'universal' church, of which the local churches are manifestations, representations, incarnations or epiphanies.[281] This line of thought rightly emphasises that the church is not only an empirical community in this or that place, but also an entity of faith, a 'theological idea': the *ecclesia ab Abel*, the communion of saints on earth and in heaven. As the Roman Catholic Ratzinger and the Reformed Protestant von Allmen maintain in a very similar fashion, Christ can have only one body, one bride. The church is one family, one city, one mother.[282] Rinkel says that there is but one church, 'and every other use of this word has derivative meaning only'. There is only one kingdom, one eternal life, one 'organism of salvation'.[283] 'The one race exists first, precedes the local ecclesia and is represented by it' (Ramsey).[284]

It is possible to consider these approaches as mutually exclusive. If Afanasiev had lived to encounter Ratzinger's theory of the 'ontological precedence' of the universal church,[285] he would probably have repudiated it by maintaining a similar precedence of the local church. In the meantime, however, ecumenical theology has progressed towards a more *simultaneous* understanding of the local and the universal church. As Zizioulas teaches, the church is simultaneously the 'one' and the 'many', because the eucharist is simultaneously celebrated in one local church and in all the churches. The church is not one because a centralist structure is superimposed upon the local churches, but because the local churches find in one another their 'unity in identity'.[286] According to Tillard, locality and universality are intertwined in the concept of 'communion'. The universal church is a 'communion of communions', not because it is simply the *sum* of all local churches, but because it is the one *communion* of all local churches. On the one hand, the universal church only exists 'in' and 'through' the local churches. On the other hand, however, a local church can only exist if it is in communion with the other local churches. As Ruddy summarises Tillard's position, asking for the

279 Cf. paragraph 2.2.9.
280 Cf. paragraph 2.3.7.
281 Cf. paragraphs 3.3.9 (Ratzinger), 5.2.5 (Farrer) and 6.3.3 (von Allmen).
282 Cf. paragraphs 3.3.9 (Ratzinger) and 6.3.3 (von Allmen).
283 Cf. paragraphs 4.2.2 and 4.2.6.
284 Cf. paragraph 5.4.6.
285 Cf. paragraph 3.3.9. There one finds also Ratzinger's explanation of his term 'ontological' as 'theological' or 'internal'.
286 Cf. paragraph 2.3.7.

'priority' of either universality or locality seems to be a 'mistaken' question.[287] Lathrop points to the fact that 'unbroken' locality and 'unbroken' universality are equally dangerous. Sheer locality can result in an unimaginative repetition of the *status quo*, which has to be broken open by a 'liberative' awareness of universality. Sheer universality can result in an escape from the necessity of inculturation and rootedness, which has to be encountered by a 'locative' awareness of the 'here and now'.[288]

On the basis of such a reciprocity of locality and universality, one has to conclude that the universal church does not just consist in the local churches, but, as *Confessing the One Faith* says, 'the universal Church consists in *the communion of* local churches'.[289] If locality and universality are simultaneous through such a perichoretic understanding of 'communion', one has to maintain that being in communion with the other local churches is imperative.[290] Not as an extrinsic (perhaps even *ad libitum*) addition to the identity (catholicity, fullness) of the local church, but as an intrinsic element of the identity (catholicity, fullness) of every local church. Not because the universal church is a 'higher' entity than the local church, but because belonging to the 'communion of communions' 'pertains to the identity of each local church' (*Confessing the One Faith*).[291] 'Communion with other local churches is *essential* to the *integrity* of the self-understanding of each local church' (ARCIC).[292]

Affirming the communion between the local churches as intrinsically essential to the integrity of each local church is not synonymous with importing the principle of uniformity or centralism through the back door. In von Arx's terms, all local churches have to recognise one another as 'theologically identical', not necessarily culturally or sociologically.[293] Catholic unity is 'unity without uniformity'. 'Centralisation is the enemy of catholicism' (Rinkel).[294]

The balance between locality and universality has, therefore, to be maintained when it comes to the question of inculturation. Offering salvation to all people requires openness to different political, economic and cultural settings (de Lubac) and to the languages and lifestyles of ordinary people in different situations and with different needs (Boff).[295] Such openness will be rewarded by the discovery that every culture is able to give expression to the Christian faith, as long as it is balanced by the critical evaluation of each culture

287 Cf. paragraph 3.5.4.
288 Cf. paragraph 6.5.8.
289 Cf. paragraph 7.4.3, emphasis added.
290 Cf. paragraphs 4.5.8 (Stalder), 4.7.3 (Aldenhoven) and 4.8.4 (von Arx).
291 Cf. paragraph 7.4.3.
292 Cf. paragraph 7.7.5, emphasis added.
293 Cf. paragraph 4.8.4.
294 Cf. paragraph 4.2.6. See also 7.8.3 (Orthodox—Old Catholic dialogue).
295 Cf. paragraphs 3.2.3 (de Lubac) and 3.4.2 (Boff).

(Lathrop).[296] In Tillard's words, one has to find a balance between, on the one hand, a 'variety of verbal expressions, cultural contexts, religious rootings in the traditions of the peoples, liturgical forms, embodiments in human problems', so that local churches may be 'different in their customs, their traditions, their problems, their spirit, often even in their organisation', and, on the other hand, communion through a common identity in a 'unity of faith, of sacramental life and of mission' (Tillard).[297] From their practical-theological background, Visser, Ploeger and Ploeger-Grotegoed formulate such a balanced 'unity in pluriformity' as the quest for 'intersubjectivity'. Doing justice to the lives of contemporary people need not be in opposition to finding a Christian 'partially communal identity'. Such intersubjectivity needs constant interaction between the local congregation and the wider church.[298] In von Allmen's phrasing: the Christian faith is always both a 'promise' for and a 'judgement' of the natural world.[299]

8.6.3 Instruments of Communion: The Eucharist

How are the local and the universal church kept together in simultaneity? The following 'instruments of communion' may be distinguished: first, the eucharist, or the liturgy celebrated according to the *ordo* of bath, word and meal; second, the bishop as the intermediary between the local church and the communion of churches; finally, conciliarity and primacy as the ways in which bishops exercise their responsibility for the communion of churches.

A liturgical ecclesiology should first of all point to the celebration of the eucharist as the intrinsic bond between the local church and the communion of churches. As indicated in the previous paragraph, it was already the father of eucharistic ecclesiology, Afanasiev, who pointed to the fact that the eucharist both affirms and transcends locality. The very fact that the eucharist is celebrated in all churches—even if not formally 'in communion' with one another[300]—creates the most fundamental bond between those churches, because there is no deeper connection than the sacramental unity between Christ and the church, and thereby between Christians and churches among one another, that is established by the eucharistic celebration.[301] It was also indicated above, that Zizioulas works out this idea of Afanasiev by postulating the simultaneity of locality and universality through the eucharistic *koinonia*.[302]

296 Cf. paragraphs 6.5.6 and 6.5.8.
297 Cf. paragraph 3.5.4. See also 6.3.4 (von Allmen).
298 Cf. paragraphs 4.6.2 (Visser) and 6.6.11 (Ploeger & Ploeger-Grotegoed).
299 Cf. paragraph 6.3.2.
300 Afanasiev has in mind the relationship between Orthodox and Roman Catholics.
301 Cf. paragraphs 2.2.9 and 8.6.2.
302 Cf. paragraphs 2.3.7 and 8.6.2.

The relatively elaborate paragraph on Ratzinger's interpretation of the relationship between the local and the universal church shows that, as far as the eucharistic basis of his ecclesiology is concerned, Ratzinger has very similar thoughts on the simultaneity of locality and universality through the eucharist. Both in earlier and later publications he affirms that the eucharist grants the local church (the local, episcopal, eucharistic community) its ecclesial fullness, as long as it is embedded in the universal 'net of communions'. Although one does not have to follow Ratzinger in prioritising the universal church—as little as one has to endorse an unbalanced priority of the local church—one can follow him in his view on the *simultaneity* of locality and universality through the eucharist. Christ and the church are everywhere where the eucharist is celebrated, as long as it is celebrated in a communion that is in unity with the other communions. As the previous paragraph already affirmed, this unity is, as Ratzinger rightly says, 'not an external addition to eucharistic ecclesiology, but its internal condition'.[303]

Tillard is in this study probably the author with the most balanced approach to locality and universality from a eucharistic perspective. On the one hand, he says, the eucharist constitutes the local church as church. On the other hand, he adds, the eucharist surpasses the local church both diachronically and synchronically. The eucharist connects the local celebrating community diachronically with the church of all times and places, with the whole company of saints. The eucharist connects the local celebrating community synchronically with all other local celebrating communities. The (always tangibly local) celebration of the eucharist, then, establishes one multi-layered communion, which is both the local church in all its (qualitatively) catholic fullness *and* communion with all other eucharistic communions. In other words, Tillard applies the principle of eucharistic communion so thoroughly to the church at all levels, that there is no longer any rivalry between locality and universality, for the simple reason that the eucharist creates but *one* communion, which is both the local communion and the universal 'communion of communions'.[304]

The eucharist as the link between the local and the universal church was also encountered in Rinkel's work.[305] Moreover, not unlike Afanasiev, Rinkel maintains that the eucharist creates a bond of unity not just with other local churches 'in communion', but even with churches not formally 'in communion'. The very fact that the eucharist is celebrated throughout the churches is in itself already 'a monument of unity'.[306] A similar view is expressed by Hebert, when

303 Cf. paragraph 3.3.9. Ramsey (5.4.6) and von Allmen (6.3.3, 6.3.5) have a similar approach, in which the eucharist grants the local church its catholic fullness, but in which the universal communion retains priority.

304 Cf. paragraphs 3.5.3 and 3.5.4.

305 Cf. paragraph 4.2.6.

306 Cf. paragraph 4.2.7. Rinkel certainly includes here the churches of the Reformation.

he says that the celebration of the eucharist connects local communities to one another irrespective of denomination, because the eucharist connects every celebrating community to the same heavenly altar.[307]

The eucharist as the intrinsic link between the local and the universal church is made very tangible by Lathrop's concept of the *ordo*. The local assembly exercises things with universal meaning: the *ordo* itself—the celebration of bath, word and meal with its many balancing juxtapositions—is 'the trans-local connection each meeting needs as a balance to locality'. The interesting point Lathrop makes here, is that the liturgy as a main connection between locality and universality does not require *liturgical uniformity*—the *ordo* is no more than a broad outline—but does require *liturgical recognisability* through the basic juxtapositions such as teaching set next to the bath, the word set next to the meal, Sunday set next to the week.[308] Therefore, as long as it is not translated into strict uniformity, Ratzinger's statement makes sense that liturgy is not invented at the local level.[309]

The liturgical celebration, centred around the eucharist, is, then, the first 'instrument of communion' between the local church and the universal communion of churches. The catholic church is present in every eucharistic congregation, but because all those 'many sacramental presences of Christ' are 'strictly analogous and complementary' (Farrer),[310] 'the eucharist makes the church' both as the local church and as the supra-local, and ultimately universal, 'communion of communions'.

8.6.4 Instruments of Communion: The Bishop

The second instrument of communion is, in a liturgical ecclesiology, the ministry of the one who is both the local eucharistic community's focus of unity and its connection to all other eucharistic communities.[311] The bishop is this intermediary, communicative person who symbolically represents and actively maintains or regains the unity of the local church as a unity-in-diversity, and who represents this local church in the communion of churches.[312] It is the bishop's task to ensure that the local church does not alienate itself from the church as a whole and, *vice versa*, that the communion of churches does not neglect the life of each local church.[313] In ARCIC's formulation, those who

307 Cf. paragraph 5.2.5. The same link is made by Wainwright (6.4.6, 6.4.8).
308 Cf. paragraph 6.5.8.
309 Cf. paragraph 3.3.9.
310 Cf. paragraph 5.2.5. Similar language in 7.8.3 (Orthodox—Old Catholic dialogue).
311 Cf. paragraph 3.5.3 (Tillard).
312 Cf. paragraph 4.6.5 (Visser).
313 Cf. paragraph 4.3.6 (Küry). Küry speaks of the local congregation, which is here adapted into the local church understood as the diocese.

exercise *episkope* over a local church have also the responsibility 'to maintain it in living awareness and practical service of the other churches'.[314]

The eucharist and the bishop are the church's two 'sacramental principles of unity and order' (von Arx).[315] Because, as the previous paragraph showed, the eucharist connects the local church to the communion of churches, its presider does not just have a local function, but is also the one who relates the local church to the universal church. The very fact that the bishop is the local church's principal eucharistic presider, expresses his or her intermediary role. As the bishop presides over the local celebration of the body of Christ and personifies its unity, he or she also personifies the unity of the body of Christ in a way that surpasses the limits of the local church and connects it to the church as a whole.[316]

From the perspective of a liturgical ecclesiology, then, bishops are *simultaneously* the main presiders of their local eucharistic communities ('diocesan bishops') *and*—by the very fact that their local eucharistic presidency makes them intermediaries between the local church and the communion of churches—'members of the episcopal college', if one wants to call the supra-local, collegial episcopal responsibility by that name. Although these two sides of the episcopal task coincide, a bishop's *raison d'être* lies in his or her being the local eucharistic presider. It is inconsistent with a liturgical ecclesiology to argue the other way round—a bishop is not a bishop because he or she belongs to the universal 'college of bishops', with local presidency (being a 'diocesan') only added *ad libitum*.[317]

8.6.5 Instruments of Communion: Conciliarity

The means by which bishops exercise their intermediate ministry between the local and the universal church are conciliarity and primacy. Conciliarity (or synodality) begins already at the level of the local church. To the essence of the local church belongs the reciprocity between bishop and presbyterium and between clergy and laity. Because the ordained ministry is embedded in the church as a whole, ministers cannot exercise their ministry apart from the consensus of the church. This is why conciliarity, including the process of reception, belongs to the essence of the church.[318] In ecumenical terminology,

314 Cf. paragraph 7.7.5.
315 Cf. paragraph 4.8.3.
316 Cf. paragraph 5.4.6 (Ramsey).
317 Cf. paragraphs 3.5.6 (Tillard), 4.4.3 (Küppers), 4.6.5 (Visser) and 4.7.3 (Aldenhoven). For a different approach, cf. paragraph 5.4.6 (Ramsey).
318 Cf. paragraphs 4.2.5 (Rinkel), 4.4.3 (Küppers) and 4.5.6 (Stalder).

personally embodied *episkope* should always be exercised collegially and communally.[319]

At the supra-local level, the bishops' ministry of connecting their local churches to the communion of churches, and *vice versa*, finds its most important expression in conciliar (or synodal) meetings on all possible—for example, metropolitan, patriarchal and universal—levels. In the perspective of a liturgical ecclesiology it is important to notice that the communion between the churches is not *established* by these supra-local meetings and their structures, but by the communion that already exists through the local churches' celebration of the same eucharist in which the same Christ is present in all fullness. This ontological communion needs, however, tangible expression by the supra-local conciliarity of the local eucharistic presiders.[320] As Tillard rightly distinguishes, the exact organisational form of this conciliarity—such as episcopal conferences, synods or councils—is secondary to the very principle of 'episcopal solidarity', which can be traced back to biblical and patristic practice.[321] As on the local level, the conciliarity of bishops cannot exist apart from the consensus of the whole church. A council does not impose the orthodox faith on the church, but 'brings the corporate awareness of the church to expression' (Rinkel).[322] Conciliar decisions are important, not because they are automatically infallible, but because, as an element in the process of reception, they reflect a high amount of 'intersubjective' or 'ecclesial' truth (Stalder).[323]

8.6.6 Instruments of Communion: Primacy

Because Christ and his body are fully present in every local church as eucharistic community, the communion of churches is a bond of love between equals and the communion of bishops is collegial solidarity between equals.[324] It is, however, not incompatible with such an ecclesiology of communion, to recognise that the conciliarity of bishops—at such different levels as the metropolitan, the patriarchal and the universal—is presided over by a *primus inter pares* who, as *primus*, exercises a kind of *episkope* over a communion of churches.[325]

The primacy of such a metropolitan, patriarch or universal primate is a specification of the task of *all* bishops, namely to preside over their local church

[319] Cf. paragraphs 7.2.4 (*Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*) and 7.6.5 (*The Nature and Mission of the Church*). See also 3.5.4 (Tillard).
[320] Cf. paragraphs 2.3.7 (Zizioulas) and 4.5.8 (Stalder).
[321] Cf. paragraph 3.5.5.
[322] Cf. paragraph 4.2.6. See also 4.7.3 (Aldenhoven).
[323] Cf. paragraph 4.5.6.
[324] Cf. paragraphs 2.2.9 (Afanasiev), 4.2.6 (Rinkel), 5.4.6 (Ramsey), 6.3.3 (von Allmen) and 7.8.4 (Orthodox—Old Catholic dialogue).
[325] Cf. paragraph 7.7.5 (ARCIC).

and to serve the communion of churches.[326] The task of primates is, therefore, not to exalt themselves above their colleagues, but to preside over the conciliar process of finding the truth in every new situation.[327] As we have seen, to preside within and outside the liturgy is 'to coordinate, but by verifying' (Tillard).[328] The role of a 'presiding bishop' is, then, neither dominating over others, nor just chairing a meeting. It is exercising the responsibility of enabling conciliarity in 'collegiality' but not without the 'personal' element of taking initiatives (which is not the same as enforcing conclusions).[329] The necessity of the personal and the collegial in any ministry makes clear that granting a 'primacy of honour' to a metropolitan, patriarch or universal primate can neither be a handing over of one's own co-responsibility (as if the primate had no collegial responsibility), nor a gratuitous gesture without real content (as if the primate had no personal responsibility).[330]

History has granted primacy to the bishops of local churches with a particular 'witness' to the gospel (Afanasiev).[331] Because of the witness, in life and death, of Peter and Paul, the local church of Rome has, in Irenaeus of Lyon's phrase, 'the most excellent origin' and became generally regarded as the church which, in Ignatius of Antioch's phrase, 'presides in love'.[332] The fact that—in the context of an ecclesiology of communion, and as one (universal) primacy among other (regional) primacies—the bishop of the local church of Rome rightly 'possesses the presidency of honour in the church',[333] is recognised widely throughout this study, not just by Roman Catholics,[334] but also by Orthodox,[335] Old Catholics,[336] Anglicans[337] and Protestants.[338]

Being in communion with the bishop of Rome is not a prerequisite for being 'a true church'.[339] Nevertheless, if communion between the local churches intrinsically belongs to a eucharistic ecclesiology,[340] and if the local church of Rome is widely recognised as the 'presiding' church within the communion of churches, it is consistent to acknowledge communion with the bishop of Rome

326 Cf. paragraph 3.5.6 (Tillard).
327 Cf. paragraphs 4.5.8 (Stalder), 4.6.5 (Visser), 4.7.6 (Aldenhoven) and 4.8.4 (von Arx).
328 Cf. paragraph 3.5.5. See also 8.5.3.
329 Cf. paragraphs 4.7.6 (Aldenhoven) and 7.6.5 (*The Nature and Mission of the Church*).
330 Cf. paragraph 4.8.4 (von Arx).
331 Cf. paragraph 2.2.9.
332 Cf. paragraphs 2.2.9 (Afanasiev), 3.5.6 (Tillard) and 7.7.5 (ARCIC).
333 Cf. paragraph 7.8.4 (Orthodox—Old Catholic dialogue).
334 Cf. paragraphs 3.3.9 (Ratzinger), 3.5.6 (Tillard) and 7.7.5 (ARCIC).
335 Cf. paragraphs 2.2.9 (Afanasiev), 2.3.7 (Zizioulas) and 7.8.4 (Orthodox—Old Catholic dialogue).
336 Cf. paragraphs 4.2.6 (Rinkel), 4.3.6 (Küry), 4.5.8 (Stalder), 4.7.6 (Aldenhoven), 4.8.4 (von Arx) and 7.8.4 (Orthodox—Old Catholic dialogue).
337 Cf. paragraphs 5.4.6 (Ramsey) and 7.7.5 (ARCIC).
338 Cf. paragraphs 6.3.3 (von Allmen) and 6.5.8 (Lathrop).
339 Cf. paragraph 3.5.6 (Tillard).
340 Cf. paragraph 8.6.2.

as one of the elements of a fully realised ecclesiality. In such a qualified sense one can agree with Ratzinger that being in communion with the bishop of Rome is, rather than an addition *ad libitum* to the existence of a local church, an 'internal, formative power' that is intrinsically related to the ecclesiality of each local church.[341] Being in communion with the church and bishop of Rome seals, so to speak, the communion between all local churches. As Tillard rightly says, this primacy alone enables the church to be a *fully visible* 'communion of communions' and is therefore an integral part of a communion ecclesiology.[342] Consequently, the opposite is also true: the bishop of Rome lacks an element of fully realised ecclesiality if he is not in communion with all local churches. What is at stake in the Roman primacy is not *romanitas* on its own, but presidency over the communion of communions.

It is important to maintain this 'intrinsic' meaning of universal primacy in a communion ecclesiology over against a rather gratuitous acknowledgement of the bishop of Rome's 'primacy of honour' without an active desire to belong to the 'net of communions' over which he presides. Aldenhoven and von Arx explicitly make this remark in relation to the Old Catholic attitude towards the bishop of Rome,[343] and similar observations have been made in view of Orthodox and Anglican theology and practice.[344]

Nevertheless, acknowledging communion with the bishop of Rome as an intrinsic element of full ecclesiality should be qualified in a twofold way. First, it is only one element among many. What Ramsey says about episcopacy is even more true of the Roman primacy: those who lack it, lack one element of ecclesiality, as much as others may lack other elements. This does not deny its importance, but places it into its proper perspective.[345] Second, the recognition of the Roman primacy is qualified by the way in which it is ecclesiologically understood and practically exercised. ARCIC is particularly clear about this qualification:

> [The primacy of the bishop of Rome] does not seek uniformity where diversity is legitimate, or centralize administration to the detriment of local churches. A primate exercises his ministry not in isolation but in collegial association with his brother bishops. His intervention in the affairs of a local church should not be made in such a way as to usurp the responsibility of its bishop. [...] The *koinonia* of the churches requires that a proper balance be preserved between [primacy and conciliarity] with the responsible participation of the whole people of God.[346]

341 Cf. paragraph 3.3.9.
342 Cf. paragraph 3.5.6.
343 Cf. paragraphs 4.7.6 (Aldenhoven) and 4.8.4 (von Arx).
344 Cf. paragraphs 2.3.7 (Zizioulas) and 7.7.5 (ARCIC).
345 Cf. paragraph 5.4.5.
346 Cf. paragraph 7.7.5.

As an example of such qualification one can add, with Tillard, that the bishop of Rome does not have to appoint bishops, but has to 'receive' a locally elected bishop into communion.[347] Both ARCIC's text and Tillard's example indicate that the current exercise of the Roman primacy is not yet in accordance with an ecumenically desirable theology and practice of a 're-read' primacy that is ineradicably rooted in a communion ecclesiology.

8.6.7 Conclusion

By its very nature, a liturgical *koinonia* ecclesiology highly values both the local church and the communion of churches. Firstly, if the liturgy (especially the eucharistic liturgy) manifests the church, the local celebrating community (with all its charisms and ministries, including the ministry of the bishop) must be church in the deepest and fullest sense of the word. Secondly, because the eucharist is celebrated in all local churches, and because it is innate to a *koinonia* ecclesiology to be directed towards the communion of humanity, the local church does not exist in isolation, but in communion with all other local churches. Through the eucharist, then, the church is simultaneously local and universal, simultaneously a local celebrating community with all its particularities and a communion of communions.

The intrinsic link between the local church and the communion of churches is the eucharist. Therefore, the one who presides over the eucharistic celebration—the bishop of the local church—is also the personal link between the local church and the other churches. The episcopate is, then, simultaneously local and universal. By the very fact that the bishop is the liturgical presider of the local church (that is, by the very fact that he or she is a 'diocesan bishop'), the bishop is also a member of the communion of bishops.

The two ways in which bishops exercise their supra-local responsibility are conciliarity and primacy. These should not be regarded as two different things (certainly not as each other's opposites), but as two sides of the same ecclesial way of living in communion. The collegal process of finding the truth, in episcopal solidarity, does not exclude but imply the ministry of presiding (again, 'coordinating, but by verifying') over such conciliar processes.

8.7 A CENTRIFUGAL CENTRE

After centuries of confessional focusing on both sacrament and church as separate, rather narrow, areas of theological thought, the first half of the twentieth century saw a rediscovery of the coherence and interdependence of these, and other, themes. Rather than as dogmatic treatises (separate

[347] Cf. paragraph 3.5.6.

'departments' of theological investigation), the church and the eucharist were now seen as various aspects of one coherent way of Christian being and living.[348] A liturgical ecclesiology is, therefore, part of a 'holistic' approach to Christian theology, and of a 'holistic' approach to Christian living.

In this section, this more-than-liturgical character of a liturgical ecclesiology will be elaborated in three directions. First, when a liturgical ecclesiology is to be translated into the empirical life of the church, the question has to be asked what it means for the 'margin' when the liturgy is identified as the 'centre'. Second, a concept of 'mission' will be investigated that is congenial to a liturgical ecclesiology. The third and fourth paragraphs ask for the relevance of the liturgy for 'eucharistic ethics' and 'doxological living' in daily life.

8.7.1 On 'Centre' and 'Margin' in Church, Liturgy and Society

This study time and again investigates ecclesiological consequences of the view that the liturgy is 'central' in the life of the church. But if the liturgy is central, what is to be said of all the other elements of living in and outside the church?[349]

In a liturgical ecclesiology, the centrality of the liturgy does not refer to an isolated ritual moment which is regarded as of higher importance than other isolated moments in the life of the church, such as activities of a catechetical, diaconal, pastoral or organisational nature. Rather, all 'activities' of the church are regarded as expressions of one and the same ecclesial reality—the *koinonia* with Jesus Christ and one another.[350] The question is not, which isolated activity of the church is the most important one? The question is, in which element of ecclesial living is the *koinonia* with Jesus Christ and one another most deeply constituted and most tangibly expressed? The hypothesis of this study—and the heuristic contribution of a liturgical ecclesiology to the wider field of ecclesiological thought—is that this is the liturgy, especially the eucharistic liturgy.[351]

A liturgical ecclesiology, then, takes the liturgy as *paradigmatic* for what the church most essentially is. But saying that the liturgy is paradigmatic for the essence and life of the church is not synonymous with saying that celebrating the liturgy is enough for being church, or that all other ecclesial activities stand

348 Cf. paragraphs 2.1.6 (The Call for a Neo-Patristic Synthesis) and 3.1.2 (Theological Reassessment).

349 The dialectic of 'centre and margin' was brought to my attention by M.J.M. HOONDERT, *Om de parochie. Ritueel-muzikale bewegingen in de marge van de parochie. Gregoriaans—Taizé—Jongerenkoren* (Heeswijk: Abdij van Berne, 2006).

350 Cf. section 8.2 (*Koinonia*).

351 Cf. paragraph 3.2.6 (The Eucharist as the Paradigm of Communion).

in the shadow of the liturgy.[352] To reverse the image: they rather stand in the *light* of the liturgy. A practical implementation of a liturgical ecclesiology not necessarily implies that the life—time, energy, money—of the members of the church, including the clergy, is disproportionately devoted to preparing and celebrating the liturgy. All that is implied is that, in an implementation of a liturgical ecclesiology, the members of the church, including the clergy, experience the regular corporate celebration of the liturgy—centred around, though not limited to, the Sunday celebration of bath, word and meal—as the 'source' and 'summit' of the church's life.[353] As von Allmen says, there is one day of *eucharistie* (eucharist, liturgy) but there are six days of *messe* (mass, *missa*: being sent into the world).[354] It would, then, be a gross misunderstanding of a liturgical ecclesiology to interpret the centrality of the liturgy as in any sense pejorative towards all other aspects of daily living and working in and outside the church.

The question of 'centre and margin' has to be worked out in two further directions. The first relates to a liturgical question internal to the church's life. The second relates to a liturgical question in view of the church's 'marginal' position in Western-European society.

First, what just has been said about the centrality of the liturgy in relation to the other elements of ecclesial living, also applies to the relationship between different liturgies. As the whole of this study substantiates, and as this chapter summarises and synthesises,[355] it is theologically sustainable and ecumenically received to take the (Sunday) eucharist—including the ministry of the Word and presupposing the importance of baptism—as the central Christian liturgy. Identifying this 'centre' is, however, not the same as depreciating the 'margin'. The Christian tradition knows all kinds of non-eucharistic liturgies—especially the liturgy of the hours and the celebration of the other sacraments—which are, in some sense, 'rays' around the 'sun' of the eucharist.[356] In more systematic terms, such liturgies have a definite value of their own, but—or because—they are in some way or another related to the *koinonia* (in its multi-layered meaning) that is most fully enfolded in the eucharist. Analogical to the above discussion of the liturgy of the Word,[357] each non-eucharistic type of liturgy—from the 'traditional' hours to 'contemporary' improvised liturgies—has in some way to connect to the genuinely 'liturgical'—sacramental, participatory—

352 Cf. paragraph 2.3.6, where the same issue is discussed in relation to Zizioulas's ecclesiology.
353 Cf. paragraph 3.1.1 (The Second Vatican Council).
354 Cf. paragraph 6.3.5.
355 Cf. especially section 8.4 (Baptism, the Eucharist and the Liturgy).
356 Cf. paragraph 6.3.5 (von Allmen).
357 Cf. paragraph 8.4.6.

sense in which the liturgy conveys *koinonia*, that is, connects people to Jesus Christ and to one another and transforms these people in the process.[358]

Second, to claim that the eucharist is central is not to deny that there is an increasing amount of repeatable and incidental 'liturgy'—or at least 'ritual'—outside the church and on the threshold of the church. In contemporary society, the 'central' liturgy of the church has itself become 'marginal' for many people. It is, of course, not for the church to determine the centrality or marginality of rituals in the experience of people. Is it, though, for the church to define itself, and this study is about such self-definition of the church. Not every ritual is—nor *wants* to be—Christian liturgy. And from the point of view of the Christian faith and church, there is a centre, there are concentrical circles around the centre, and there is, eventually, a margin. But again, self-consciously affirming a centre is not the same as depreciating the margin. The other way round, it is not necessary to deny the centrality of the eucharist in Christian self-definition if one wants to take seriously what ritually goes on in the margin. But taking the margin seriously also implies trying to establish if and how 'marginal' ritual is related to the *koinonia* of Jesus Christ and his church.

What this study tries to substantiate is that the identification of the liturgy—particularly the (Sunday) eucharist—as the centre of ecclesial being and living is more than a conventional commonplace, more or less bypassed by post-modern reality. Throughout this study, the reference to theologians from sometimes quite different strands of Christianity and with different positions to modernity and post-modernity, establishes that systematic-theological thought about the Christian faith implies thought about the church and the liturgy—not as an afterthought or posterior superstructure, but as an integral part of the reflection on the basics of the Christian faith.[359] When this reflection leads to sometimes 'classical' opinions on ecclesiological and liturgical themes (though not so 'classical' as not having gone through the twentieth-century theological and ecumenical transformations), this does not contradict an 'open church'—a clearly defined church, open and welcoming to all those who wish to participate, regularly or incidentally, in 'central' or 'marginal' aspects of ecclesial living, including those aspects still to be developed according to the needs of contemporary people.[360] In a liturgical ecclesiology all those aspects are seen as welcome extensions and applications of the eucharistic centre.

These considerations about 'centre' and 'margin' are meant to put the centrality of the liturgy—and the centrality of the eucharist within liturgy—in perspective. On the one hand, there is no point in denying that the ecclesiology presented throughout this study includes an amount of normativity. The

[358] The liturgical style of Taizé is probably the most obvious contemporary example of such 'sacramentality' in 'non-sacramental' worship. The veneration of icons is a traditional example.

[359] Cf. paragraphs 8.2.3 and 8.2.7.

[360] Cf. Lathrop's plea for both a 'strong centre' and an 'open door' (6.5.6).

centrality of the liturgy and the eucharist is deeply rooted in the Christian faith and is, therefore, not simply exchangeable without changing the shape of the Christian faith. On the other hand, the wider perspective of this faith teaches that, ultimately, the church and the liturgy are no more and no less than a stage in God's ways with the world. This awareness makes it, on the one hand, both necessary and possible for the church to define itself in the light of the Christian faith. On the other hand, it relativises the boundaries of the church and opens them up to a wider perspective. The centre is centrifugal.

8.7.2 Mission

Is a liturgical ecclesiology a rather inward-looking approach to the church, or is a liturgical ecclesiology 'missionary' in any sense of the word? First of all, one has to realise with Avis that the emphasis on 'mission', as it currently shapes ecclesial practice and ecclesiological theory in many churches, does not originate so much from Catholic or Liberal strands of Christianity as rather from Evangelicalism.[361] Increasing awareness of mission can be evaluated as a welcome contribution from Evangelicalism to the wider church, but the question arises which concept of mission is at stake, and whether this concept is consistent with an ecclesiological self-understanding that differs from the Evangelical perspective. In the context of this study the question is, what concept of mission is in tune with a *koinonia* theology and with the centrality of the liturgy?

An understanding of mission in terms of the conversion of individual sinners to individual faith in Jesus Christ does not sit easily together with an overall approach rooted in *koinonia*. If God, salvation and the church are fundamentally understood as relational,[362] it seems inconsistent to understand mission in a rather individual sense. One father of *koinonia* ecclesiology, Tillard, therefore clearly states that mission is not a 'zeal for the salvation of individuals', but the church's surrender to God's zeal for all humanity and the whole universe.[363] Similarly, Avis puts mission in the perspective of *God's* mission. As a *koinonia* theology claims, it is God's mission to incorporate people into himself, to redeem relationships and to restore creation-wide communion. Mission is 'essentially ecclesial', because 'personal integration [...] comes from social integration'. With Avis, one has 'stoutly [to] resist the reduction of wholeness, healing and fulfillment to individualistic, self-centred, subjective experience'. God's mission has a social, communal, societal character: 'God is concerned with communities, as they exist structured in societies'.[364]

361 Cf. paragraph 5.5.9.
362 Cf. section 8.2 (*Koinonia*).
363 Cf. paragraph 3.5.2.
364 Cf. paragraph 5.5.9.

It is this *koinonia* understanding of God, salvation, the church and the world that determines the concept of mission in a liturgical ecclesiology. Stalder expresses one side of this concept, when he uses the word 'mission' (*Sendung*) for the mission of Jesus Christ to reconcile the world to God by restoring humanity to communion with God, that is, by making humans partakers of the divine trinitarian life.[365] Boff represents another side of the same concept, when he equates mission with 'service of others'.[366] Hebert combines these theological and practical sides when he says: What the church has to offer to the world is the restoration of fellowship in a world torn apart by individualisation and economisation.[367]

This concept of mission is also encountered in most documents of the ecumenical movement. As *Church and World* explains, in a *koinonia* ecclesiology the 'nature' and the 'mission' of the church are deeply integrated. The *nature* of the church is that it is a prefiguration of divine-human and inter-human communion. The *mission* of the church is to make sure that this prefiguration can really be experienced. In such an understanding, the mission of the church is the 'sharing of God's love' by struggling 'alongside those who suffer'. It is the church's mission to enhance 'justice', 'peace' and 'joy', because these are the signs of the kingdom which the church proleptically prefigures and which once will embrace all the earth.[368] Only in more recent ecumenical texts, this social understanding of mission is complemented by an approach to mission that focuses on the conversion of individuals. *Towards Koinonia in Faith, Life and Witness* addresses this theme explicitly, by asking the churches to seek a balance between mission as 'transforming society so that it increasingly reflects the will of God for humanity' and mission as 'the transformation of individuals through personal conversion'.[369]

It is, indeed, important to be aware of both sides of mission, that is, the social and the personal aspect. But an understanding of mission as a means to *individual* salvation is simply inconsistent with a *koinonia* ecclesiology with its deeply corporate understanding of salvation through (not least sacramental) incorporation and participation. A church that upholds a *koinonia* ecclesiology cannot—either out of genuine missionary awareness or just going with the flow of 'missionary' parlance and practice—simply imitate the 'evangelistic industry' that offers the gospel to individuals as an instant remedy. That would be 'a capitulation to the consumerist ethic if ever there was one' and it would be a move incompatible with *koinonia* ecclesiology's general convictions.[370]

365 Cf. paragraphs 4.5.3 and 4.5.4.
366 Cf. paragraph 3.4.7.
367 Cf. paragraph 5.2.4.
368 Cf. paragraphs 7.3.1 and 7.3.2.
369 Cf. paragraph 7.5.4. See also 7.6.2 (my discussion of mission in *The Nature and Mission of the Church*).
370 Cf. paragraph 5.5.9 (Avis).

Moreover, in the case of a liturgical ecclesiology, it would simply be unfair to those who are being evangelised, because it would 'sell' a 'product' that is not the product of a liturgical ecclesiology. In a liturgical ecclesiology, mission is (in the end) the establishment of local eucharistic communities,[371] mission 'must necessarily be geared towards, and lead to, initiation into Christ, into the Church as the Body of Christ'.[372] Formulated slogan-wise: mission is mystagogy. How, then, is mission conceived in a liturgical ecclesiology?

The eucharist is not only the 'summit' of the church, it is also its 'source'.[373] 'The eucharist makes the church'.[374] The eucharist, then, also engenders mission.[375] This is exemplarily expressed by von Allmen when he uses the image of the heart with its continuous alternation of systole and diastole. Like the heart, the Sunday eucharist is central and crucial, but it also knows the movement of gathering and sending out, of *eucharistie* (eucharist) and *messe* (being sent). Von Allmen rightly emphasises both sides of the coin. On the one hand, the eucharist is a genuine celebration (and in that sense a goal in itself) and must not be turned into a missionary activity (it is not done for the sake of something else). On the other hand, the contents of the celebration—divine-human communion—only reflects a preliminary stage in God's mission to incorporate the whole creation in this communion. The universal goal of God's mission, proleptically experienced in the eucharist, leads therefore to mission: letting other people share in the same *koinonia* experience, both by service and by witness.[376]

The consistent place of mission in a liturgical ecclesiology can, then, be described as follows. Mission is, first of all, *God's* mission towards creation-wide *koinonia*. The communion of the church and the liturgy (especially the eucharist) is the preliminary realisation of the eschatological *koinonia*. The very fact, then, that the liturgical celebration is a *proleptic* experience of the ultimate goal of God's mission, makes that the *setting forth* of this mission is intrinsic to the liturgical celebration: the proleptic character of the liturgy naturally strives at further fulfillment.[377] A celebrating community that forgets the provisional character of the liturgical experience, forgets a constitutive aspect of the liturgy (the eschatological). As the document *Confessing the One Faith* says:

371 Cf. paragraph 2.2.6 (Afanasiev).
372 Cf. paragraph 5.5.10 (Avis).
373 Cf. paragraph 3.3.1 (The Second Vatican Council).
374 Cf. paragraphs 3.2.6 (de Lubac) and 8.4.3 (The Eucharist is the Centre).
375 Cf. paragraph 5.2.5 (Parish Communion movement).
376 Cf. paragraphs 6.3.4 and 6.3.5.
377 It is, therefore, not true that the sacraments are 'static' and only preaching is 'dynamic', 'eschatological' and 'missionary', as Noordmans says (6.2.6), nor that the local church, centred around the eucharist, necessarily needs the 'universal church' for missionary vigour, as Ratzinger says (3.3.9).

'partaking of the same gift' should lead to the sharing of this gift; the liturgical 'prefiguration of the kingdom' should lead to mission and service.[378]

If this is the systematic place of mission in a liturgical ecclesiology, how can it practically be implemented? The model convincingly offered by Avis suggests an active but unassuming approach. If mission is first of all *God's* mission of the restoration of communion, in which the *church* participates through offering 'wholeness' to people, not just individually but in a personal, social and societal context, then all ecclesial life is *living the mission*.[379] Mission is, then, not one (evangelistic) activity among other activities of the church, but another word for everything the church is and does, but now considered from its missionary potential. Such a 'holistic understanding of mission' embraces word, sacraments and pastoral care. Through a sensitive administration of *kerygma*, *leitourgia* and *diakonia*, people in contemporary culture can be brought into contact with the Christian faith and can, slowly and gradually, grow from alienation towards belonging, that is, grow towards *koinonia*.[380] In a liturgical ecclesiology, the mode of mission is invitatory.

Such an approach does, on the one hand, full justice to a *koinonia* understanding of God, salvation, the church and the world, and to the centrality of the liturgy. On the other hand, it does full justice to the principle that you can identify a 'centre' without neglecting the concentrical circles around that centre and, eventually, the 'margin'.[381] In a liturgical ecclesiology, mission originates from the awareness that *the liturgy itself*—most importantly because of its eschatological character—*points beyond itself* towards fuller communion. The centre is centrifugal.

8.7.3 Eucharistic Ethics

That the liturgy points away from itself as a 'centrifugal centre' becomes most manifest when the liturgy is explicitly related to a way of life consistent with the celebration. As Wainwright exemplarily formulates, the eucharist wants to be continued in 'eucharistic ethics', the doxology asks for its continuity in 'doxological living'.[382] To take up the terminology used in the section on the ordained ministry, all Christian life should be an 'extention of the assembly',[383] a continuation of the eucharistic ethos. The eucharist suggests a welcoming attitude, seeking for peace, responsible living with the earth's resources and with fellow humans. Although these are, of course, rather general suggestions,

[378] Cf. paragraph 7.4.2.
[379] Cf. paragraph 5.5.9. This is in tune with *Church and World*'s teaching (just referred to) that the 'nature' and the 'mission' of the church are two sides of the same coin.
[380] Cf. paragraph 5.5.9.
[381] Cf. paragraph 8.7.1.
[382] Cf. paragraph 6.4.8.
[383] Cf. paragraph 8.5.4.

they nevertheless offer an indication what it means that the eucharist is 'a paradigm for social ethics'.[384] As Faith & Order acknowledges, Christians often take differing political and ethical views, but they are nevertheless bound to guidelines that flow from the principle of *koinonia*: 'sanctity of life', 'dignity and equality of all human beings', 'responsibility to create and develop patterns of life in which justice, peace and respect for all creation can flourish'.[385]

The Anglo-Catholic Socialists who said that Holy Communion makes us 'Holy Communists' may have been exaggerating—and most of them were not communists in the technical sense—but rightly pointed in a direction of common and communal responsibility as the natural continuation of the eucharist in daily life.[386] Their incarnational vision, which made them relativise the distinction between the 'sacred' and the 'secular', did not serve a hallowing of the *status quo*,[387] but led to the critical awareness that daily life—and the need to improve its conditions for many people—does not stand apart from the realm of the spiritual.[388] Their eucharistic vision led to the critical awareness of the 'bread and wineness' of daily life: the eucharist implies taking seriously the ordinariness and physicality of everyday reality.[389] A liturgical ecclesiology, then, cannot do without the awareness that 'the bare fact of the Church [as it becomes 'epiphanic' in the liturgy] is our social programme'.[390] Amidst a culture of accumulation for some and deprivation for many—the 'order with no Sunday'—the eucharist teaches an economy of grace. Instead of the 'non-eucharistic sacrifice' of a supposedly 'neutral' cultural, political and economic order, the 'eucharistic sacrifice' teaches that giving and receiving is always a 'non-identical repetition' of God's gift of himself to humanity in Christ, and of Christ's gift of himself to humanity in his *kenosis*. Everything we have, we have received. Everything we have received, we have received in order to pass it on.[391]

An element of ethics that is derived from the eucharist by more than one author in this study is the need for social, economic, sexual, ethnic and racial equality.[392] The eucharist transcends division and leads to unity,[393] to

384 Cf. paragraph 6.4.8 (Wainwright).

385 Cf. paragraph 7.5.4 (*Towards Koinonia in Faith, Life and Witness*). The terminological change from 'ethics' to 'morals' in *The Nature and Mission of the Church* (7.6.2) possibly reflects a narrowing of this wider approach.

386 Cf. paragraph 5.2.2 (Christian Socialist Influence).

387 As Williams detects in some strands of Anglo-Catholic incarnationalism; cf. paragraph 5.6.6.

388 Cf. paragraph 5.2.4 (Hebert).

389 Cf. paragraph 5.2.5 (the Parish Communion movement).

390 Cf. paragraph 5.6.8 (Williams). See also 5.7.1 (Radical Orthodoxy).

391 Cf. paragraphs 5.7.1, 5.7.3, 5.7.5, 5.7.7 (Pickstock).

392 Cf. paragraphs 2.3.9 (Ratzinger), 5.2.5 (the Parish Communion movement), 5.6.4 (Williams), 6.5.6 (Lathrop), 7.2.1 (*Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*) and 7.3.3 (*Church and World*).

393 Cf. paragraph 2.3.9 (Ratzinger).

unrestricted community.[394] The 'we-character' of trinitarian faith regulates the eucharist, the church and ethics—all are, or should be, aiming at communion,[395] more precisely at communion that, nevertheless, allows for difference.[396] The experience of communion in salvation, church and eucharist should lead Christians to a practice of communion, to being 'instruments of communion', especially in view of those whom society regards as outcasts and those whom religion tends to regard as unclean.[397] With Williams one has to say that the eucharist is central, paradoxically not because the church is a 'cultic institution', but because the sacraments bring about a 'ritual change of identity', a transformation of people into a new humanity with new solidarities.[398]

Another emphasis flowing from the eucharist is the responsibility for creation—ecology, the environment, the resources of the earth.[399] As the church confesses the redemption of the whole earth, and celebrates the highest value of earthly elements—water, bread, wine, oil—the church should also realise its responsibility towards this very earth.[400] This is a consequence of the fact that restored *koinonia*, proleptically experienced in the church and the liturgy, is meant to embrace all creation.[401]

The relationship between liturgy and life, between the cultic and the critical, receives a deep theological basis from Ratzinger's emphasis that Jesus Christ is the fulfillment of both the priestly and the prophetic line of the Old Testament. As Ratzinger importantly insists, in the New Testament 'fulfillment' means 'embodiment'. Right cult and righteous living are fulfilled in the person and work of Jesus Christ, not just as an idea, but as physical embodiment (incarnation). In his very body, Christ has lived righteousness and sacrifice. In him, righteousness becomes sacrifice and sacrifice becomes righteousness, just as the psalms and the prophets want it to be. The consequence of this christological principle is that the same mutual intrinsicality should be true of Christian living. Liturgy is 'never just a cult'—eucharistic table fellowship should be continued in social, physical fellowship outside the liturgy; the eucharistic *agape* should be continued in the *agape* of neighbourly love. The other way round, daily life is 'liturgical'—the Christian life should be a transformative life, a cult of righteousness as lived by Christ himself. Both in the eucharist and in daily life, Christians are made contemporary with Christ's self-offering.[402] Boff strikes a similar note when he warns for the potentially

394 Cf. paragraph 5.6.4 (Williams).
395 Cf. paragraph 3.3.7 (Ratzinger).
396 Cf. paragraphs 2.3.5 (Zizioulas) and 3.4.7 (Boff).
397 Cf. paragraph 3.5.2 (Tillard). See also 4.4.5 (Küppers), 4.5.9 (Stalder), 4.8.3 (von Arx) and 6.5.6 (Lathrop).
398 Cf. paragraph 5.6.5.
399 Cf. paragraphs 2.3.9 (Zizioulas) and 6.5.6 (Lathrop).
400 Cf. paragraphs 4.7.2 (Aldenhoven) and 7.3.3 (*Church and World*).
401 Cf. paragraph 7.5.4 (*Towards Koinonia in Faith, Life and Witness*).
402 Cf. paragraphs 3.3.6 and 3.3.10.

'diabolic' (separating, dividing) effect of the liturgy, when it is separated from commitment in daily life and becomes a 'magic' exercise in itself. Boff pleads for the 'symbolic' (uniting) power of Christian liturgy: uniting faith and experience, bringing together one's life with the life of the church, combining celebration and commitment.[403]

As Zizioulas and Ratzinger rightly emphasise, this 'ethical' continuation of the 'liturgical' celebration is not a social complement *to* a theological principle, but an intrinsic element *of* the theological principle.[404] Theologically, the continuation of the liturgy in daily life is an element of the liturgy itself. In Fagerberg's terms, the liturgy is an enactment of both 'liturgical theology' (Christian faith as it is liturgically celebrated) and 'liturgical asceticism' (Christian life as it is liturgically shaped).[405] The fact that liturgy and life do not just complement one another, but are intrinsic to one another, is rooted in the notion of *koinonia* as incorporation and participation. If the liturgy causes and manifests restored *koinonia* between God and humanity and between humans among themselves, the liturgy is also cause and manifestation of social and societal *koinonia* expressed in responsibility, service and reconciliation.[406] The centre is centrifugal.

8.7.4 Doxological Living

In a communion ecclesiology, the liturgy ultimately points towards the fulfillment of divine-human and inter-human communion in all the world.[407] As Boff and Williams make disconcertingly clear, the church fails more often than not in manifesting this 'new humanity'. Nevertheless, in the eucharistic celebration the church can become 'epiphanic' of what restored communion and transfigured humanity is about.[408] This is why Williams is right that the Christian faith and church must give priority to the celebratory, the doxological:[409]

> the life of God and God's Kingdom is real and concretely here, not in our achievement but in the sacraments. *There* is the steady course run by divine reality in our midst, the life and death and resurrection of Jesus, into which our lives are invited.[410]

403 Cf. paragraphs 3.4.5 and 3.4.6.
404 Cf. paragraphs 2.3.9 (Zizioulas) and 3.3.10 (Ratzinger).
405 Cf. paragraph 1.3.2.
406 Cf. paragraph 7.2.1 (*Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*). See also 7.1.3 (Goal and Method of the Ecumenical Movement).
407 Cf. section 8.2.
408 Cf. paragraphs 3.4.6 (Boff), 5.6.4 and 5.6.8 (Williams).
409 Cf. paragraph 5.6.2.
410 Cf. paragraph 5.6.4.

This is also where the 'participatory' nature of a liturgical communion ecclesiology comes in again. Baptism, the eucharist and the whole liturgical celebration incorporate people into Jesus Christ and, through him, into God. Doxology becomes, then, the ontological basis of human life and all creation because, as Pickstock rightly teaches, doxology is the utterly self-effacing mode of gratuitous love. The doxological mode of life transcends the subject-object divide, because it involves total commitment and the surrendering of oneself to the other/Other. Therefore, doxology is also the highest form of ethics. The 'dispossessing act of praise'—doxological living in and outside the liturgy—is an act of love, devotion and service.[411]

Noordmans rightly suspects that the 'liturgical' ethos includes a tendency to conceive the liturgical life as a more 'real life' than daily life outside the liturgy. This is the case insofar as, in liturgical life, true life becomes real in a pneumatological, eschatological, sacramental way. Noordmans is right that liturgical life is 'participating' life, 'communicative' life. But he is not right in his suspicion that the abundance of liturgical life is valued to the detriment of ethical reserve and moral discipline in daily life.[412] He overlooks that the concept of participation which is at stake in the liturgy is not an unconditioned affirmation of everything that is on offer in the realm of culture and aesthetics, but participation in the sense of the Spirit-given *koinonia* through Christ with God. In Lathrop's terminology, the 'breaking' of culture is a matter of affirmation *and* evaluation, of saying 'yes and no'.[413] Noordmans is right that—in the liturgical concept he combats—Christians *participate* in the liturgy rather than *attend* the liturgy, but he fails to grasp that this means that Christians 'become' liturgy and the liturgy 'becomes' them. They become a living sacrifice and the liturgical sacrifice becomes embodied in them (cf. Romans 12:1).[414] Thus, the 'real life', lived in the liturgy, becomes the paradigm for Christian living outside the liturgy. As Ploeger and Ploeger-Grotegoed say, *leitourgia* is both a cry for and a foretaste of the good and righteous life, while *diakonia* is the way in which this crying out and foretasting is continued and practised. Both *leitourgia* and *diakonia* are proleptical experiences, granted by the Spirit, of the eschatological longing for fully restored human life and *frui Deo*.[415]

The fundamental question of Christian life, therefore, 'is not "What ought we to do?", but "What kind of persons are we called to become?"'.[416] Being transformed through baptism and the eucharist, through the Word and prayer, through music and celebration, Christians are invited to return to daily life as

411 Cf. paragraphs 5.7.2 and 5.7.6.
412 Cf. paragraph 6.2.7.
413 Cf. paragraph 6.5.6.
414 On *logike latreia*, cf. paragraph 3.3.10 (Ratzinger).
415 Cf. paragraph 6.6.9. See also 7.4.2 (*Confessing the One Faith*).
416 Cf. paragraph 7.7.1 (ARCIC).

doxological persons. God's transformative power, most generously present in the liturgy, invites to an 'overflowing of response' in worship, beauty, joy, compassion and charity.[417] The centre is centrifugal.

8.7.5 Conclusion

This section used the paradoxical concept of a 'centrifugal centre' in order to elucidate that liturgical ecclesiology's identification of the liturgy as the centre of the church does not exclude but include awareness of and respect for people and activities outside this centre. It was particularly investigated how the liturgy, especially the eucharist, generates mission by its proleptical character and determines ethics by its *koinonia* character. The centrality of the liturgy in the Christian faith and church is, therefore, determined both by what the liturgy means in *itself*,[418] and by what the liturgy means *beyond* itself. The liturgy is both a *centre* and a *centrifugal* centre. So all-embracing is the 'eucharistic vision'.[419]

8.8 CONCLUSION

8.8.1 A Liturgical Koinonia Ecclesiology in Ecumenical Perspective

This chapter has been an attempt to synthesise into a coherent liturgical-ecclesiologial approach the many lines of thought of the previous chapters. The concept of *koinonia* proved to be of fundamental importance for such a synthesis. Firstly, it puts both church and liturgy in the wider perspective of the Trinity and of God's ways with humanity and all creation. It shows that the church is both indispensable and provisional. Secondly, when *koinonia* is interpreted in the ontological, sacramental sense of 'incorporation' and 'participation', it explains why the liturgical—especially the eucharistic—celebration is central to the Christian faith and church: because it 'makes' the church by incorporating the church into Christ.

This incorporation—the church as the body of Christ; Christ and the church as *totus Christus*—is a pneumatological reality, once wrought through baptism and continuously reconstituted by the eucharist. It is also an eschatological reality: the Christ-likeness of the church will only be perfected in the eschaton. In the present, the church's Christ-likeness is sacramentally (that is, pneumatologically and eschatologically) present in the eucharistic

417 Cf. paragraph 5.6.7 (Williams).
418 Cf. section 8.4.
419 Cf. paragraph 7.3.3 (*Church and World*, citing Borovoy).

celebration, whilst *outside* the liturgy it is still a sacramental reality, but has to be empirically strived-for, especially through 'doxological living' according to 'eucharistic ethics'.

Baptism is the basis of Christian existence. The incorporation into the body of Christ transcends boundaries between denominations and conveys a basic unity that, however, still seeks visible expression. The eucharist is the continuous reconstitution of Christian existence in the body of Christ. In a liturgical (eucharistic) ecclesiology, the church is, most fundamentally, the eucharistic communion. The wider liturgy—with its juxtapostions of bath, word and meal, Sunday and the week, Easter and the year, the priestly and the prophetic—is constitutive for Christian meaning and for Christian living.

The ordained ministry, as an *ordo* within the wider *ordo* of all baptised, has the responsibility to preside over the liturgical gathering and, as a consequence, to preside over the other elements of ecclesial life. Presiding is 'coordinating by verifying': the ordained ministry has the task to let all charisms of the baptised flourish to the well-being of the community and to keep them into contact with the person and life of Jesus Christ. Amidst all members of the church, who belong to the body of Christ and to *totus Christus*, the presider sacramentally represents Christ as the head of his body.

In a liturgical ecclesiology, the church is first of all the tangible liturgical gathering. Therefore, a liturgical ecclesiology highly values the 'local church'. The local church is most fully itself when it gathers in the eucharistic liturgy in the presence of all charisms and orders, lay and ordained. But this eucharist, celebrated by the local church, is the same eucharist of the same Lord in all other local churches as well. Therefore, the local church strives at being in communion with all other local churches. Those who represent the unity of their local churches when presiding at the eucharist are also the ones who represent their local churches in the supra-local, and ultimately the universal, communion of communions.

8.8.2 Celebrating Church

The centrality of the liturgy determines the church fundamentally as *a celebrating church*. The church is called time and again to 'make' the eucharist. As first-fruits of the new humanity, restored to communion with God and one another, the church is called to be a community of doxology, that is, of loving surrender to the Other and to the other.

But when the church celebrates the liturgy, is is also *celebrating the church*: celebrating its own deepest essence. The liturgy, especially the eucharist, 'epiphanises' the church as the people of God, the body of Christ, the temple of the Spirit. The eucharist 'makes' the church: by the Spirit, the eucharist incorporates the community into Christ and, through him, into God.

The liturgical celebration is an icon of the church. All that we are as a church is here.[420] Community; proclamation of the Word of God through which we grow in faith; being brought into communion with God and one another through worship and sacraments; pastoral care and responsibility for the community; diaconal and missionary outreach; ethics and politics. The gratuity of life is celebrated in doxology and invites us to doxological living and working towards a eucharistic world.

As a ship on the waters
we sail
at the turning of the tide.
Heading for the morning light
we live beyond the night,
dreaming of later, of a golden horizon,
as a ship on the waters.

As a guest at your table
we know
the promised land near,
celebrating the abundance
shoulder to shoulder, side by side,
tasting the gifts, sharing your surplus
as a guest at your table.

As a house in the world
stone by stone
refuge, where the breeze of your Spirit
awakes our desire,
where your promise resonates.
Living stones, body cherishing love
as your house in the world.[421]

420 Cf. paragraph 1.1.1.

421 S.L.S. DE VRIES, *Tegen het donker. 100 liederen om samen te zingen* (Zoetermeer: Meinema, 2002), 12-13. Verses 1, 3 and 5 of the 'Lied over de Kerk' (Hymn on the Church):

Als een schip op het water / varen wij / op het scherp van ons getij.
Koersend naar het morgenlicht / leven wij de nacht voorbij / dromend van later, –
van een gouden vergezicht, / als een schip op het water.

Als een gast aan uw tafel / weten wij / het beloofde land nabij,
vieren wij de overvloed / hecht geschouderd, zij aan zij, / proeven de gaven –
delen wij in uw tegoed / als een gast aan uw tafel.

Als een huis in de wereld / steen voor steen / schuilplaats waar uw Geesteswind
ons verlangen wakker maakt, / uw belofte weerklank vindt. / Levende stenen –
lichaam dat de liefde mint / als uw huis in de wereld.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbreviations are explained on page xxi.

AALDERS, W.J., *De incarnatie* (Groningen-Den Haag-Batavia: Wolters, 1933)

ACKERMANS, J.E.A., *Herders en huurlingen. Bisschoppen en priesters in de Republiek (1663-1705)* (Amsterdam: Prometheus/Bert Bakker, 2003)

AFANASSIEFF, M., 'La genèse de "L'Église du Saint-Esprit"', in: N. Afanassieff, *L'Église du Saint-Esprit* (Paris: Cerf, 1975 [Russian original: Paris 1971]), 13-23

AFANASSIEFF, N., 'Le sacrement de l'assemblée', *IKZ* 46 (1956), 200-213

AFANASSIEFF, N., 'The Church which Presides in Love', in: J. Meyendorff *et al.*, *The Primacy of Peter* (Leighton Buzzard: The Faith Press, 1963 [French original: Neuchâtel 1960]), 57-110

AFANASSIEFF, N., 'L'Eucharistie, principal lien entre les Catholiques et les Orthodoxes', *Irénikon* 38 (1965), 337-339

AFANASSIEFF, N., *L'Église du Saint-Esprit* (Paris: Cerf, 1975 [Russian original: Paris 1971])

ALDENHOVEN, H., 'Orthodoxes und altkatholisches Kirchenverständnis', in: *Hundert Jahre Christkatholisch-theologische Fakultät der Universität Bern* (Bern: Stämpfli, 1974), 41-55

ALDENHOVEN, H., 'Das ekklesiologische Selbstverständnis der Altkatholischen Kirchen', *Österreichisches Archiv für Kirchenrecht* 31 (1980), 401-430

ALDENHOVEN, H., 'Die spirituell-theologischen Konzequenzen der Struktur des Eucharistiegebetes', *IKZ* 70 (1980), 212-225

ALDENHOVEN, H., 'Der Zusammenhang der Frage des Ausgangs des Heiligen Geistes mit dem Leben der Kirche', in: L. Vischer (ed.), *Geist Gottes—Geist Christi. Ökumenische Überlegungen zur Filioque-Kontroverse* (Frankfurt: Lembeck, 1981), 134-143

ALDENHOVEN, H., 'Einheit und Verschiedenheit von Bischofs- und Priesteramt im Licht eines trinitarischen Kirchenverständnisses', *IKZ* 72 (1982), 145-151

ALDENHOVEN, H., 'Einladung zur Eucharistie—Eucharistiegemeinschaft—Kirchengemeinschaft', *IKZ* 77 (1987), 257-265

ALDENHOVEN, H., 'Charakter, Bedeutung und Ziel der Dialogtexte', in: U. von Arx (ed.), *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis. Deutsche Gesamtausgabe der gemeinsamen Texte des orthodox-altkatholischen Dialogs 1975-1987 mit französischer und englischer Übersetzung* (Bern: Stämpfli, 1989), 27-44

ALDENHOVEN, H., 'Der Vorsitz bei der Eucharistie im Kontext der Bildtheologie. Fragen zur ekklesialen Christusrepräsentation durch das Priestertum', *IKZ* 88 (1998), 301-311 [in English: H. ALDENHOVEN, 'Presidency at the Eucharist in the Context of the Theology of Icons: Questions about the Ecclesial Representation of Christ by the Priesthood', *Anglican Theological Review* 84 (2002), 703-712]

ALDENHOVEN, H., 'Trinitarische Analogien und Ortskirchenekklesiologie', *IKZ* 92 (2002), 65-75

ALFEYEV, H., 'The Patristic Heritage and Modernity', *Ecumenical Review* 54 (2002), 91-111

ALLMEN, J.-J. VON, *Prophétisme sacramentel. Neuf études pour le renouveau et l'unité de l'Eglise* (Neuchâtel: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1964)

ALLMEN, J.-J. VON, *Worship: Its Theology and Practice* (London: Lutterworth; New York: OUP, 1965)

ALLMEN, J.-J. VON, *Essai sur le repas du Seigneur* (Neuchâtel: Delachaux et Niestlé, 1966)

ALLMEN, J.-J. VON, *La primauté de l'Eglise de Pierre et de Paul. Remarques d'un protestant* (Fribourg CH: Editions universitaires; Paris: Cerf, 1977)

ALLMEN, J.-J. VON, *Célébrer le salut. Doctrine et pratique du culte chrétien* (Genève: Labor et Fides; Paris: Cerf, 1984)

ARX, U. VON, 'Reflexionen über Weg und Zukunft der christkatholischen Kirche', in: W. Flückiger & C. Jenzer (eds.), *Christkatholisch. Die Christkatholische Kirche der Schweiz in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Zum 100-Jahr-Jubiläum der Christkatholischen Kirchgemeinde Solothurn* (Zürich: Benziger, 1978), 207-219

ARX, U. VON, (ed.), *Koinonia auf altkirchlicher Basis. Deutsche Gesamtausgabe der gemeinsamen Texte des orthodox-altkatholischen Dialogs 1975-1987 mit französischer und englischer Übersetzung* (Bern: Stämpfli, 1989)

ARX, U. VON, 'Kurze Einführung in die Geschichte des orthodox-altkatholischen Dialogs', in: U. von Arx (ed.), *Koinonia auf altchristlischer Basis. Deutsche Gesamtausgabe der gemeinsamen Texte des orthodox-altkatholischen Dialogs 1975-1987 mit französischer und englischer Übersetzung* (Bern: Stämpfli, 1989), 11-26

ARX, U. VON, 'Zwischen Krise und Stabilität. Bericht über die Anglikanisch-Altkatholischen Theologenkonferenzen in Toronto 1987 und Morschach 1990', *IKZ* 81 (1991), 1-40

ARX, U. VON, 'Was wird bleiben? Ein Rückblick auf ein Grundanliegen von Eduard Herzog', *IKZ* 82 (1992), 206-232

ARX, U. VON, 'Der ekklesiologische Charakter der Utrechter Union', *IKZ* 84 (1994), 20-61

ARX, U. VON, 'Katholizismus und Demokratie. Überlegungen eines Christkatholiken im Blick auf seine Kirche', *IKZ* 86 (1996), 80-104

ARX, U. VON, 'Strukturreform der Utrechter Union—verschiedene Denkmodelle', *IKZ* 87 (1997), 87-115

ARX, U. VON, 'Der orthodox-altkatholische Dialog. Anmerkungen zu einer schwierigen Rezeption', *IKZ* 87 (1997), 184-224

ARX, U. VON, 'Vertane Chancen. Der Dialog zwischen der Altkatholischen und der Orthodoxen Kirche, in: Evmenios of Lefka, A. Basdekis, N. Thon (eds.), *Die Orthodoxe Kirche. Eine Standortbestimmung an der Jahrtausendwende. Festgabe für Anastasios Kallis* (Frankfurt: Lembeck, 1999), 199-222

ARX, U. VON, 'Kurt Stalder (1912-1996). Ansprache beim Trauergottesdienst am 6. Januar 1997 zu St. Peter und Paul in Bern', in: K. Stalder, *Sprache und Erkenntnis der Wirklichkeit Gottes. Texte zu einigen wissenschaftstheoretischen und systematischen Voraussetzungen für die exegetische und homiletische Arbeit*, herausgegeben von U. von Arx (Freiburg CH: Universitätsverlag, 2000), 435-442

ARX, U. VON, 'Identität und Differenz. Elemente einer christkatholischen Ekklesiologie und Einheitsvision', in: H. Hoping (ed.), *Konfessionelle Identität und Kirchengemeinschaft. Mit einem bibliographischen Anhang zu 'Dominus Iesus'* (Münster-Hamburg-London: LIT, 2000), 109-136

ARX, U. VON, 'Vorwort', in: U. von Arx & M. Weyermann (eds.), *Statut der Internationalen Altkatholischen Bischofskonferenz (IBK). Offizielle Ausgabe in fünf Sprachen* (Bern: Stämpfli, 2001), 3-11

ARX, U. VON, 'The Old Catholic Churches of the Union of Utrecht', in: P.D.L. Avis (ed.), *The Christian Church: An Introduction to the Major Traditions* (London: SPCK, 2002), 157-185

ARX, U. VON, 'Ein Porträt der christkatholischen Lehranstalt der Universität Bern', in: G. Esser & M. Ring (eds.), *Zwischen Freiheit und Gebundenheit. Festschrift zum 100jährigen Bestehen des Alt-Katholischen Seminars der Universität Bonn (1902-2002)* (Bonn: Alt-Katholischer Bistumsverlag, 2002), 209-237

ARX, U. VON, 'Ein "Petrusamt" in der Communio der Kirchen. Erwägungen aus altkatholischer Perspektive', *IKZ* 93 (2003), 1-42

ARX, U. VON, 'Was macht die Kirche katholisch? Perspektiven einer christkatholischen Antwort', in: W.W. Müller (ed.), *Katholizität—Eine ökumenische Chance* (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag Zürich, 2006), 147-186

ARX, U. VON, P.D.L. AVIS, M. PLOEGER (eds.), *Towards Further Convergence: Anglican and Old Catholic Ecclesiologies* (Bern: Stämpfli, 2006)

ARX, U. VON, & M. WEYERMANN (eds.), *Statut der Internationalen Altkatholischen Bischofskonferenz (IBK). Offizielle Ausgabe in fünf Sprachen* (Bern: Stämpfli, 2001)

AVIS, P.D.L., *Ecumenical Theology and the Elusiveness of Doctrine* (London: SPCK, 1986)
AVIS, P.D.L., *Gore: Construction and Conflict: Published to Mark the Centenary of the Appearance of LUX MUNDI* (Worthing: Churchman, 1988)
AVIS, P.D.L., *Christians in Communion* (London: Geoffrey Chapman Mowbray, 1990)
AVIS, P.D.L., 'What is "Anglicanism"?', in: S.W. Sykes, J.E. Booty, J. Knight (eds.), *The Study of Anglicanism*, Revised Edition (London: SPCK; Minneapolis MN: Fortress, 1998), 459-476
AVIS, P.D.L., *God and the Creative Imagination: Metaphor, Symbol and Myth in Religion and Theology* (London-New York: Routledge, 1999)
AVIS, P.D.L., *The Anglican Understanding of the Church: An Introduction* (London: SPCK, 2000)
AVIS, P.D.L., *Church, State and Establishment* (London: SPCK, 2001)
AVIS, P.D.L., *Anglicanism and the Christian Church: Theological Resources in Historical Perspective*, Revised and Expanded Edition (London-New York: T&T Clark, 2002)
AVIS, P.D.L., 'The Churches of the Anglican Communion', in: P.D.L. Avis (ed.), *The Christian Church: An Introduction to the Major Traditions* (London: SPCK, 2002), 132-156
AVIS, P.D.L., *A Church Drawing Near: Spirituality and Mission in a Post-Christian Culture* (London-New York: T&T Clark, 2003)
AVIS, P.D.L., *A Ministry Shaped by Mission* (London-New York: T&T Clark, 2005)
AVIS, P.D.L., 'Anglicanism and Eucharistic Ecclesiology', in: U. von Arx, P.D.L. Avis, M. Ploeger (eds.), *Towards Further Convergence: Anglican and Old Catholic Ecclesiologies* (Bern: Stämpfli, 2006), 28-45
BALTHASAR, H.U. VON, *Henri de Lubac. Sein organisches Lebenswerk* (Einsiedeln: Johannes, 1976)
Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry (Geneva: WCC, 1982)
Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry 1982-1990: Report on the Process and Responses (Geneva: WCC, 1990)
BARNARD, M., *De dans kan niet sterven. Gerardus van der Leeuw (1890-1950) herlezen. Essay over religie en cultuur* (Zoetermeer: Meinema, 2004)
BATHRELLOS, D., 'Church, Eucharist, Bishop: The Early Church in the Ecclesiology of John Zizioulas', in: D.H. Knight (ed.), *The Theology of John Zizioulas: Personhood and the Church* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 133-145
BERGER, T., 'Lex orandi—lex credendi—lex agendi. Auf dem Weg zu einer ökumenisch konsensfähigen Verhältnisbestimmung von Liturgie, Theologie und Ethik', *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 27 (1985), 425-432
BERLIS, A.K.H., *Frauen im Prozess der Kirchwerdung. Eine historisch-theologische Studie zur Anfangsphase des deutschen Altkatholizismus (1850-1890)* (Frankfurt: Lang, 1998)
'Bibliographie J.J. von Allmen 1939-1981', in: B. Bobrinskoy *et al.*, *Communio sanctorum. Mélanges offerts à Jean-Jacques von Allmen* (Genève: Labor et Fides, 1982), 1-17
BIRMELÉ, A., 'Sinn und Gefahr der Rede von einer Grunddifferenz. Bericht und Reflexionen über eine Konsultation und ihr Thema', in: A. Birmelé & H. Meyer (eds.), *Grundkonsens—Grunddifferenz. Studie des Strassburger Instituts für Ökumenische Forschung. Ergebnisse und Dokumente* (Frankfurt: Lembeck, 1992), 181-192
BIRMELÉ, A., & H. MEYER (eds.), *Grundkonsens—Grunddifferenz. Studie des Strassburger Instituts für Ökumenische Forschung. Ergebnisse und Dokumente* (Frankfurt: Lembeck, 1992)
BLANE, A., 'A Sketch of the Life of Georges Florovsky', in: A. Blane (ed.), *Georges Florovsky: Russian Intellectual and Orthodox Churchman* (Crestwood NY: SVSP, 1993), 11-217
BOEVE, L., 'Kerk, theologie en heilswaarheid. De klare visie van Joseph Ratzinger', *Tijdschrift voor theologie* 33 (1993), 139-165
BOFF, L., *Die Kirche als Sakrament im Horizont der Welterfahrung. Versuch einer Legitimation und einer struktur-funktionalistischen Grundlegung der Kirche im Anschluss an das II. Vatikanische Konzil* (Paderborn: Bonifacius, 1972)

BOFF, L., *Sacraments of Life—Life of the Sacraments* (Portland OR: Pastoral, 1987 [trans. of *Os sacramentos da vida e a vida dos sacramentos. Mínima sacramentalia*, Petrópolis: Vozes, 1975])

BOFF, L., *Ecclesiogenesis: The Base Communities Reinvent the Church* (Maryknoll NY: Orbis, 1986 [trans. of *Eclesiogênese: As comunidades eclesiais de base reinventam a Igreja*, Petrópolis: Vozes, 1977, with the addition of two more recent articles])

BOFF, L., *Church: Charism and Power: Liberation Theology and the Institutional Church* (London: SCM, 1985 [trans. of *Igreja: Carisma e poder*, Petrópolis: Vozes, 1981])

BOFF, L., *Trinity and Society* (Maryknoll NY: Orbis, 1988 [trans. of *A Trindade, a sociedade e a libertação*, Petrópolis: Vozes, 1986])

BOFF, L., *Holy Trinity, Perfect Community* (Maryknoll NY: Orbis, 2000 [trans. of *A Santíssima Trindade é a melhor comunidade*, Petrópolis: Vozes, 1988])

BOFF, L., & C. BOFF, *Introducing Liberation Theology* (Maryknoll NY: Orbis, 1987 [trans. of *Como fazer Teologia da Libertação*, Petrópolis: Vozes, 1986])

BOLEN, D., & G. CAMERON (eds.), *Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ: The Text with Commentaries and Study Guide* (London-New York: Continuum, 2005)

BONHOEFFER, D., *Widerstand und Ergebung* (Gütersloh: Kaiser, 1998)

BORCHT, E.A.J.G. VAN DER, *Het ambt her-dacht. De gereformeerde ambtstheologie in het licht van het rapport* Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry *(Lima, 1982) van de theologische commissie* Faith and Order *van de Wereldraad van Kerken* (Zoetermeer: Meinema, 2000)

BOUYER, L., *Liturgical Piety* (Notre Dame IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1954)

BRADSHAW, P.F., 'Gregory Dix', in: C. Irvine (ed.), *They Shaped our Worship: Essays on Anglican Liturgists* (London: SPCK, 1998), 111-117

BRADSHAW, P.F., 'Continuity and Change in Early Eucharistic Practice: Shifting Scholarly Perspectives', in: R.N. Swanson (ed.), *Continuity and Change in Christian Worship* (Woodbridge UK, Rochester NY: Boydell, 1999), 1-17

BRADSHAW, T., *The Olive Branch: An Evangelical Anglican Doctrine of the Church* (Carlisle: Paternoster, 1992)

BRINKMAN, M.E., *Progress in Unity? Fifty Years of Theology within the World Council of Churches: 1945-1995: A Study Guide* (Louvain: Peeters/Eerdmans, 1995)

BROWN, A., 'On the Criticism of Being as Communion in Anglophone Orthodox Theology', in: D.H. Knight (ed.), *The Theology of John Zizioulas: Personhood and the Church* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 35-78

BUGNINI, A., *The Reform of the Liturgy 1948-1975* (Collegeville MN: TLP, 1990 [trans. of *La riforma liturgica 1948-1975*, Rome 1983])

BUSS, A.E., *The Russian-Orthodox Tradition and Modernity* (Leiden: Brill, 2003)

[CAREY, G.], 'Comments of the Archbishop of Canterbury (George Carey) on the Official Roman Catholic Response' (1991), in: C. Hill & E.J. Yarnold (eds.), *Anglicans and Roman Catholics: The Search for Unity* (London: SPCK & Catholic Truth Society, 1994), 168-170

CATELLA, A., 'Theology of the Liturgy', in: A.J. Chupungco (ed.), *Handbook for Liturgical Studies*, vol. II: *Fundamental Liturgy* (Collegeville MN: TLP, 1998), 3-28

CHADWICK, W.O., *From Bossuet to Newman* (Cambridge: CUP, 1987[2] [1957[1]])

CHADWICK, W.O., *The Spirit of the Oxford Movement: Tractarian Essays* (Cambridge: CUP, 1999)

CHAPMAN, M.D., 'On Being a Radical Traditionalist: An Overview and Discussion of the Theology of Michael Ramsey', *Affirming Catholicism Journal* 21 (Winter 1996), 17-27

CHAPMAN, M.D., *Liturgy, Socialism and Life: The Legacy of Conrad Noel* (London: DLT & Affirming Catholicism, 2001)

CHAPMAN, M.D., *Anglicanism: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: OUP, 2006)

Church and World: The Unity of the Church and the Renewal of Human Community: A Faith and Order Study Document (Geneva: WCC, 1990)

CLEMENS, T.H.J., *De godsdienstigheid in de Nederlanden in de spiegel van de katholieke kerkboeken 1680-1840* (Tilburg: Tilburg University Press, 1988)

CLEMENS, T.H.J., 'Katholieke vroomheid en het schisma van 1723', *Holland* 25 (1993), 197-220
COLLINS, P., 'Authority and Ecumenism', in: D.H. Knight (ed.), *The Theology of John Zizioulas: Personhood and the Church* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 147-158
Commentary on 'Called to Common Mission' (Chicago IL: Evangelical Lutheran Church in America; New York NY: The Episcopal Church, 2002)
Common Worship: Services and Prayers for the Church of England (London: Church House Publishing, 2000)
Confessing the One Faith: An Ecumenical Explication of the Apostolic Faith as it is Confessed in the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed (381) (Geneva: WCC, 1991)
CONGAR, Y.M.J., *L'Église. De saint Augustin à l'époque moderne* (Paris: Cerf, 1970 [reprint 1997])
CONGREGATION FOR THE DOCTRINE OF THE FAITH, 'Observations on the Final Report of ARCIC I' (1982), in: C. Hill & E.J. Yarnold (eds.), *Anglicans and Roman Catholics: The Search for Unity* (London: SPCK & Catholic Truth Society, 1994), 79-91
CONGREGATIO DE DOCTRINA FIDEI, *Litterae ad catholicae ecclesiae episcopos de aliquibus aspectibus ecclesiae prout est communio* ('*Communionis notio*', 1992)
CONWAY, S. (ed.), *Living the Eucharist: Affirming Catholicism and the Liturgy* (London: DLT, 2001)
CRICHTON, J.D., *Lights in Darkness: Fore-runners of the Liturgical Movement* (Blackrock, Co Dublin: Columba, 1996)
DALES, D., *Glory: The Spiritual Theology of Michael Ramsey* (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2003)
DAVIES, H., *Worship and Theology in England*, vol. V: *The Ecumenical Century, 1900-1965* (Princeton: Princeton University Press; Oxford: OUP, 1965)
DIX, G., 'The Idea of "The Church" in the Primitive Liturgies', in: A.G. Hebert (ed.), *The Parish Communion: A Book of Essays* (London: SPCK, 1937), 95-143
DIX, G., *The Shape of the Liturgy* (London: A&C Black, 1945[2] [1945[1]])
DOYLE, D.M., *Communion Ecclesiology: Visions and Versions* (Maryknoll: Orbis, 2000)
DUBA, A.D., 'Jean-Jacques von Allmen: Christian Worship: A Reformed Perspective', in: D.W. Vogel (ed.), *Primary Sources of Liturgical Theology: A Reader* (Collegeville MN: TLP, 2000), 126-127
DULLES, A., *Models of the Church*, Expanded Edition (New York: Doubleday, 2002 [1974[1]])
EIJK, A.H.C. VAN, 'Het pleidooi voor een ruimer sacramentsbegrip', in: A.H.C. van Eijk & H.W.M. Rikhof (eds.), *De lengte en de breedte, de hoogte en de diepte. Peilingen in de theologie van de sacramenten* (Zoetermeer: Meinema, 1996), 105-131
EIJK, A.H.C. VAN, *Teken van aanwezigheid. Een katholieke ecclesiologie in oecumenisch perspectief* (Zoetermeer: Meinema, 2000)
EVANS, G.R., 'Introduction', in: G.R. Evans (ed.), *The First Christian Theologians: An Introduction to Theology in the Early Church* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2004), 1-11
EVDOKIMOV, P., 'Les principaux courants de l'ecclésiologie orthodoxe au XIX[e] siècle', in: M. Nédoncelle *et al.*, *L'Ecclésiologie au XIX[e] siècle* (Paris: Cerf, 1960), 57-76
Episkopé and Episcopate in Ecumenical Perspective (Geneva: WCC, 1980)
EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE OF THE EVANGELICAL FELLOWSHIP OF THE ANGLICAN COMMUNION, 'An Extract from an Open Letter to the Anglican Communion' (1988), in: C. Hill & E.J. Yarnold (eds.), *Anglicans and Roman Catholics: The Search for Unity* (London: SPCK & Catholic Truth Society, 1994), 283-297
FAGERBERG, D.W., *Theologia Prima: What Is Liturgical Theology?* (Chicago-Mundelein: Hillenbrand, 2004 [revised and expanded edition of *What Is Liturgical Theology? A Study in Methodology*, 1992])
FALCONER, A.D., 'Introduction', in: T. Grdzelidze (ed.), *One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic: Ecumenical Reflections on the Church* (Geneva: WCC, 2005), 1-13
FARRER, A.M., 'Eucharist and Church in the New Testament', in: A.G. Hebert (ed.), *The Parish Communion: A Book of Essays* (London: SPCK, 1937), 73-94

FIEDROWICZ, M., *Theologie der Kirchenväter. Grundlagen frühchristlicher Glaubensreflexion* (Freiburg-Basel-Wien: Herder, 2007)

FLOROVSKY, G., 'Westliche Einflüsse in der russischen Theologie', in: H.S. Alivisatos (ed.), *Procès-verbaux du premier congrès de théologie orthodoxe à Athènes 29 Novembre – 6 Décembre 1936* (Athens: Pyrsos, 1939), 212-231

FLOROVSKY, G., 'Patristics and Modern Theology', in: H.S. Alivisatos (ed.), *Procès-verbaux du premier congrès de théologie orthodoxe à Athènes 29 Novembre – 6 Décembre 1936* (Athens: Pyrsos, 1939), 238-242

FODOR, J., 'Postliberal Theology', in: D.F. Ford with R. Muers (eds.), *The Modern Theologians: An Introduction to Christian Theology since 1918*, Third Edition (Oxford: Blackwell, 2005), 229-248

FORD, D.F., *The Shape of Living: Spiritual Directions for Everyday Life* (Grand Rapids MI: Baker, 2004[2] [London: HarperCollins, 1997[1]])

FORD, D.F., *Self and Salvation: Being Transformed* (Cambridge: CUP, 1999)

FORD, D.F., 'Holy Spirit and Christian Spirituality', in: K.J. Vanhoozer (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Postmodern Theology* (Cambridge: CUP, 2003), 269-290

FREI, H.A., 'Ein Leben für die Kirche', in: U. Küry, *Hirtenbriefe* (Allschwil: Christkatholischer Schriften-Verlag, 1978), 1-42

FREI, H.A., 'Zum Gedenken an Professor Dr. theol. Werner Küppers (1905-1980) sel., Tübingen—Bern', *IKZ* 70 (1980), 137-138

FREY, C., *Mysterium der Kirche—Öffnung zur Welt. Zwei Aspekte der Erneuerung französischer katholischer Theologie* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1969)

GASSMANN, G., 'Montreal 1963—Santiago de Compostela 1993: Report of the Director', in: T.F. Best & G. Gassmann (eds.), *On the Way to Fuller Koinonia: Official Report of the Fifth World Conference on Faith and Order* (Geneva: WCC, 1994), 12-18

GILL, D., *Gathered for Life: Official Report: VI Assembly World Council of Churches* (Geneva: WCC; Grand Rapids MI: Eerdmans, 1983)

GORE, C., *The Body of Christ: An Enquiry into the Institution and Doctrine of Holy Communion* (London: John Murray, 1901)

GOSKER, M., *Het ambt in de oecumenische discussie. De betekenis van de Lima-ambtstekst als onderdeel van het BEM-rapport (Baptism—Eucharist—Ministry) uit 1982 van de Commissie voor Faith and Order van de Wereldraad van Kerken voor de voortgang van de oecumene en de doorwerking in de Nederlandse SoW-kerken* (Delft: Eburon, 2000)

GRAY, D., *Earth and Altar: The Evolution of the Parish Communion in the Church of England to 1945* (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 1986)

GREELEY, A.M., *The Catholic Imagination* (Berkeley-Los Angeles-London: University of California Press, 2000)

GROS, J., H. MEYER, W.G. RUSCH (eds.), *Growth in Agreement II: Reports and Agreed Statements of Ecumenical Conversations on a World Level, 1982-1998* (Geneva: WCC; Grand Rapids MI: Eerdmans, 2000)

GY, P.-M., '*L'esprit de la liturgie* du cardinal Ratzinger est-il fidèle au Concile, ou en réaction contre?', *La Maison-Dieu* 229 (2002/1), 171-178

HAARSMA, F., *Geest en kerk. Een pastoraal-oecumenische studie over de ecclesiologie van dr. O. Noordmans* (Utrecht: Ambo; Baarn: Bosch & Keuning, 1967)

HÄRING, H., *Theologie und Ideologie bei Joseph Ratzinger* (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 2001)

HÄUSSLING, A.A., '*Der Geist der Liturgie*. Zu Joseph Ratzingers gleichnamiger Publikation', *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 43/44 (2001/2002), 362-395

HALLEBEEK, J., *Over de oorsprong van jurisdictie* (Amersfoort: COKB, 1992)

HALLEBEEK, J., *Alonso 'el Tostado' (c. 1410-1455). His doctrine on jurisdiction and its influence in the Church of Utrecht* (Amersfoort: COKB, 1997)

HALLEBEEK, J., *De 'wondere afscheidpreekens' van pater Daneels, Oudewater 1705* (Amersfoort: COKB, 1998)

HALLEBEEK, J., 'Die Autonomie der Ortskirche im Denken von Zeger Bernard van Espen', *IKZ* 92 (2002), 76-99

HALLEBEEK, J., & J.L. WIRIX, 'Ten geleide', in: J. Hallebeek & J.L. Wirix (eds.), *Met het oog op morgen. Ecclesiologische beschouwingen aangeboden aan Jan Visser* (Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum, 1996), VII-IX

Handboek voor den Eeredienst in de Nederlandsche Hervormde Kerk, samengesteld door den Liturgischen Kring (Rotterdam: Bredée, 1934)

HEALY, N.M., *Church, World and the Christian Life: Practical-Prophetic Ecclesiology* (Cambridge: CUP, 2000)

HEBERT, A.G., *Liturgy and Society: The Function of the Church in the Modern World* (London: Faber & Faber, 1935)

HEBERT, A.G., (ed.), *The Parish Communion: A Book of Essays* (London: SPCK, 1937)

HEBERT, A.G., 'Preface', in: A.G. Hebert (ed.), *The Parish Communion: A Book of Essays* (London: SPCK, 1937), v-ix

HEBERT, A.G., 'The Parish Communion in its Spiritual Aspect', in: A.G. Hebert (ed.), *The Parish Communion: A Book of Essays* (London: SPCK, 1937), 1-29

HEIM, M.H., *Joseph Ratzinger—Kirchliche Existenz und existenzielle Theologie. Ekklesiologische Grundlinien unter dem Anspruch von Lumen gentium* (Frankfurt: Lang, 2005[2] [2004[1]])

HEMMING, L.P., 'Introduction: Radical Orthodoxy's Appeal to Catholic Scholarship', in: L.P. Hemming (ed.), *Radical Orthodoxy?—A Catholic Enquiry* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000), 3-19

HIGTON, M.A., *Difficult Gospel: The Theology of Rowan Williams* (London: SCM, 2004)

HINCHLIFF, P., 'Epilogue', in: C. Irvine, *Worship, Church and Society: An exposition of the work of Arthur Gabriel Hebert to mark the centenary of the Society of the Sacred Mission (Kelham) of which he was a member* (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 1993), 149-154

HOBSON, T., *Anarchy, Church and Utopia: Rowan Williams on Church* (London: DLT, 2005)

[HOEDEMAKER, L.A.], 'Oecumenica als theologische discipline', in: L.A. Hoedemaker, A.W.J. Houtepen, J.Th. Witvliet, *Oecumene als leerproces. Inleiding in de oecumenica* (Utrecht-Leiden: IIMO, 1993), 265-284

HOLLOWAY, R., 'Introduction', in: J. John (ed.), *Living Evangelism: Affirming Catholicism and Sharing the Faith* (London: DLT, 1996), 1-8

HOONDERT, M.J.M., *Om de parochie. Ritueel-muzikale bewegingen in de marge van de parochie. Gregoriaans—Taizé—Jongerenkoren* (Heeswijk: Abdij van Berne, 2006)

HOPING, H., 'Symbolik und Pragmatik des Glaubens. Die Bedeutung der Liturgie für die Theologie', *Liturgisches Jahrbuch* 52 (2002), 3-20

HOTZ, R., *Sakramente—im Wechselspiel zwischen Ost und West* (Zürich-Köln: Benziger; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1979)

HOUTEPEN, A.W.J., 'Reception, Tradition, Communion', in: M. Thurian (ed.), *Ecumenical Perspectives on Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* (Geneva: WCC, 1983), 140-160

[HOUTEPEN, A.W.J.], 'Oecumene en ecclesiogenese. Over het middelpuntzoekende karakter van de oecumenische beweging', in: L.A. Hoedemaker, A.W.J. Houtepen, J.Th. Witvliet, *Oecumene als leerproces. Inleiding in de oecumenica* (Utrecht-Leiden: IIMO, 1993), 5-27

[HOUTEPEN, A.W.J.], 'Eenheid en solidariteit van het verdeelde christendom. De beweging en de Commissie voor "Faith and Order"', in: L.A. Hoedemaker, A.W.J. Houtepen, J.Th. Witvliet, *Oecumene als leerproces. Inleiding in de oecumenica* (Utrecht-Leiden: IIMO, 1993), 187-264

HOUTEPEN, A.W.J., *Theologen op zoek naar God. Twintig portretten van katholieke theologen uit de tweede helft van de 20e eeuw* (Zoetermeer: Meinema, 2001)

HOUTEPEN, A.W.J., 'Lima—20 Jahre später', *IKZ* 92 (2002), 179-209

HOUTEPEN, A.W.J., *Geloven in gerechtigheid. Bijdragen tot een oecumenische sociale ethiek* (Zoetermeer: Meinema, 2005)

HUGHES, G., *Worship as Meaning: A Liturgical Theology for Late Modernity* (Cambridge: CUP, 2003)

HYLSON-SMITH, K., *High Churchmanship in the Church of England: From the Sixteenth Century to the late Twentieth Century* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993)

IRVINE, C., *Worship, Church and Society: An exposition of the work of Arthur Gabriel Hebert to mark the centenary of the Society of the Sacred Mission (Kelham) of which he was a member* (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 1993)

IRVINE, C., 'A.G. Hebert', in: C. Irvine (ed.), *They Shaped our Worship: Essays on Anglican Liturgists* (London: SPCK, 1998), 64-70

IRWIN, K.W., *Liturgical Theology: A Primer* (Collegeville MN: TLP, 1990)

IRWIN, K.W., *Context and Text: Method in Liturgical Theology* (Collegeville MN: TLP, 1994)

JASPER, R.C.D., *The Development of the Anglican Liturgy 1662-1980* (London: SPCK, 1989)

JENSON, R.W., 'Robert W. Jenson—USA—lutherisch', in: A. Birmelé & H. Meyer (eds.), *Grundkonsens—Grunddifferenz. Studie des Strassburger Instituts für Ökumenische Forschung. Ergebnisse und Dokumente* (Frankfurt: Lembeck, 1992), 217-224

JENSON, R.W., *Systematic Theology*, vol. II: *The Works of God* (New York-Oxford: OUP, 1999)

JONGE, H.J. DE, 'De plaats van de verzoening in de vroegchristelijke theologie', in: L.J. van den Brom *et al.* (eds.), *Verzoening of Koninkrijk. Over de prioriteit in de verkondiging* (Baarn: Callenbach, 1998), 63-88

KAI-YUNG CHAN, A., 'Participation in the Liturgy', in: A.J. Chupungco (ed.), *Handbook for Liturgical Studies*, vol. II: *Fundamental Liturgy* (Collegeville MN: TLP, 1998), 145-159

KASPER, W., *Sakrament der Einheit. Eucharistie und Kirche* (Freiburg-Basel-Wien: Herder, 2004)

KASPER, W., *Wege der Einheit. Perspektiven für die Ökumene* (Freiburg-Basel-Wien: Herder, 2005)

KAVANAGH, A.J., *On Liturgical Theology: The Hale Memorial Lectures of Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, 1981* (Collegeville MN: TLP, 1984)

KEHL, M., 'Ekklesiologie', in: *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*[3], vol. III (Freiburg-Basel-Wien: Herder, 1995), 568-573

KEHL, M., 'Der Disput der Kardinäle. Zum Verhältnis von Universalkirche und Ortskirchen', *Stimmen der Zeit* 221 (2003), 219-232

KELEHER, S., 'Whatever Happened to the Liturgical Movement? A View from the East', in: S. Caldecott (ed.), *Beyond the Prosaic: Renewing the Liturgical Movement* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998), 69-96

KERR, F., *Twentieth-Century Catholic Theologians: From Neoscholasticism to Nuptial Mysticism* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2007)

KHORUZHII, S.S., 'Neo-Patristic Synthesis and Russian Philosophy', in: W. Helleman (ed.), *The Russian Idea: In Search of a New Identity* (Bloomington IN: Slavica, 2004), 165-183

KINNAMON, M., (ed.), *Signs of the Spirit: Official Report of the Seventh Assembly of the World Council of Churches* (Geneva: WCC; Grand Rapids MI: Eerdmans, 1991)

KIZENKO, N., *A Prodigal Saint: Father John of Kronstadt and the Russian People* (University Park PA: Pennsylvania State University Press, 2000)

KLEEF, B.A. VAN, 'Das Utrechter Provinzialkonzil vom Jahre 1763', *IKZ* 49 (1959), 197-228; 50 (1960), 65-92, 194-224

KLEIN GOLDEWIJK, B.M.J., *Praktijk of principe. Basisgemeenschappen en de ecclesiologie van Leonardo Boff. Een wetenschappelijke proeve op het gebied van de godgeleerdheid* (Kampen: Kok, 1991)

KOFFEMAN, L.J., *Kerk als sacramentum. De rol van de sacramentele ecclesiologie tijdens Vaticanum II* (Kampen: Van den Berg, 1986)

KOHN, R., 'Rejecting Modernity: Radical Orthodoxy', radio interview in 'The Spirit of Things' (Radio National, Australia) with members and opponents of Radical Orthodoxy, 7 November 1999, transcript published at www.abc.net.au/rn/spiritofthings

KOOI, A. VAN DER, & G.W. NEVEN, 'Liturgie bij dr. O. Noordmans. De viering van de dood van Christus als het centrale moment van een levende liturgie', in: G.W. Neven (ed.), *Oecumenische ontdekkingen in het werk van O. Noordmans* (Kampen: Kok, 1990), 88-123

KOSTER, M.D., *Ekklesiologie im Werden* (Paderborn: Bonifacius, 1940)
KRAFT, S., 'Grundsätze und Ziele alt-katholischer Liturgiereform', *IKZ* 72 (1982), 82-106
KRAFT, S., 'Was heisst Einladung? Zur Kritik an der evangelisch/alt-katholischen Abendmahlsvereinbarung', *Una Sancta* 1985, 312-316
KRONENBURG, J., *Episcopus Oecumenicus. Bouwstenen voor een theologie van het bisschopsambt in een verenigde reformatorische kerk* (Zoetermeer: Meinema, 2003)
KÜPPERS, W., 'Eucharistie und Eschatologie', *IKZ* 48 (1958), 79-83
KÜPPERS, W., 'Symbolik der Alt-Katholischen Kirche', in: W. Küppers, P. Hauptmann, F. Baser, *Symbolik der kleineren Kirchen, Freikirchen und Sekten des Westens* (Stuttgart: Hiersemann, 1964), 1-27
KÜPPERS, W., 'De leer over de kerk van Vaticanum II van oud-katholiek standpunt', in: G. Baraúna (ed.), *De kerk van Vaticanum II. Commentaren op de Concilieconstitutie Over de kerk* (Bilthoven: Nelissen, 1966), vol. II, 586-605
KÜPPERS, W., 'Die Altkatholische Position heute im Rückblick auf Vatikanum I', *IKZ* 60 (1970), 124-167
KÜPPERS, W., '"Das Amt der Einheit". Theologische Erwägungen zum Bischofsamt', *IKZ* 61 (1971), 243-256
KÜPPERS, W., 'Stand und Perspektiven des altkatholisch-orthodoxen Dialogs', *IKZ* 62 (1972), 87-114
KÜPPERS, W., 'Leben in Gemeinschaft', *IKZ* 65 (1975), 50-59
KÜPPERS, W., 'Alt-katholische Kirchengemeinschaft der Utrechter Union', in: F. Heyer, *Konfessionskunde* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1977), 554-574
KÜRY, U., 'Die Wiedervereinigung der christlichen Kirchen und das altkatholische Kirchenideal im Lichte des eucharistischen Wunders', *IKZ* 20 (1930), 146-175
KÜRY, U., 'Konfession und Ökumene', *IKZ* 43 (1953), 129-145
KÜRY, U., 'Heiliger Geist, Kirche und Amt', *IKZ* 50 (1960), 107-125, 150-157
KÜRY, U., 'Der canon fidei der alten Kirche und wir', *IKZ* 52 (1962), 86-99
KÜRY, U., *Die altkatholische Kirche. Ihre Geschichte, ihre Lehre, ihr Anliegen* (Stuttgart: Evangelisches Verlagswerk, 1966)
KÜRY, U., 'Von der Katholizität der Kirche', *IKZ* 58 (1969), 1-18
KÜRY, U., *Hirtenbriefe* (Allschwil: Christkatholischer Schriften-Verlag, 1978)
LAMBERTS, J., 'Active participation as the gateway towards an ecclesial liturgy', in: C. Caspers & M. Schneiders (eds.), *Omnes circumadstantes: Contributions towards a history of the role of the people in the liturgy: Presented to Herman Wegman* (Kampen: Kok, 1990)
LATHROP, G.W., *Holy Things: A Liturgical Theology* (Minneapolis MN: Fortress, 1993)
LATHROP, G.W., *Holy People: A Liturgical Ecclesiology* (Minneapolis MN: Fortress, 1999)
LATHROP, G.W., *Holy Ground: A Liturgical Cosmology* (Minneapolis MN: Fortress, 2003)
LEEUW, G. VAN DER, *Inleiding tot de theologie* (Amsterdam: H.J. Paris, 1935)
LEEUW, G. VAN DER, *Liturgiek* (Nijkerk: Callenbach, 1940)
LEEUW, G. VAN DER, *Sacramentstheologie* (Nijkerk: Callenbach, 1949)
LEEUW, G. VAN DER, O. NOORDMANS, W.H. VAN DE POL, *Liturgie in de crisis* (Nijkerk: Callenbach, 1939). Annotated edition in: O. Noordmans, *Verzamelde werken*, vol. VI: *De kerk en het leven* (Kampen: Kok, 1986), 165-243
LERCH, J.R., 'Ecclesiology', in: *New Catholic Encyclopaedia*, vol. V (New York etc.: McGraw-Hill, 1967), 34-35
LESCRAUWAET, J.F., *De liturgische beweging onder de Nederlandse hervormden in oecumenisch perspectief. Een fenomenologische en kritische studie* (Hilversum: Brand, 1957)
LONG, D.S., 'Radical Orthodoxy', in: K.J. Vanhoozer (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Postmodern Theology* (Cambridge: CUP, 2003), 126-145
LOSSKY, N., 'The Orthodox Churches', in: P.D.L. Avis (ed.), *The Christian Church: An Introduction to the Major Traditions* (London: SPCK, 2002), 1-17
LOSSKY, V., *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church* (Crestwood NY: SVSP, 1998[4] [1976[1]; French original: Paris 1944])

LUBAC, H. DE, *Catholicisme. Les aspects sociaux du dogme* (Paris: Cerf, 1938)
LUBAC, H. DE, *Corpus Mysticum. L'Eucharistie et l'Eglise au Moyen Age. Etude historique*, Deuxième édition, revue et augmentée (Paris: Aubier, 1949 [1944[1]])
LUBAC, H. DE, *Méditation sur l'Eglise*, Troisième édition revue (Paris: Aubier, 1954 [1953[1]])
LUBAC, H. DE, *Mémoire sur l'occasion de mes écrits* (Namur: Culture et Vérité, 1989)
LUKKEN, G.M., *Rituals in Abundance: Critical Reflections on the Place, Form and Identity of Christian Ritual in our Culture* (Louvain: Peeters, 2005)
MAILHIOT, G.-D., 'Le professeur', in: G.R. Evans & M. Gourgues (eds.), *Communion et réunion. Mélanges Jean-Marie Roger Tillard* (Louvain: University Press/Peeters, 1995)
MAILHIOT, G.-D., 'Nécrologie F. Jean-Marie Roger Tillard, O.P. 1927-2000', www.collegedominicain.com/pdf
MARKSCHIES, C., 'Alte Kirche', in: H.D. Betz *et al.* (eds.), *Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart. Handwörterbuch für Theologie und Religionswissenschaft*, vol. I (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998[4]), 344-360
MARSHALL, P.V., 'Reconsidering "Liturgical Theology": Is there a *Lex Orandi* for All Christians?', *Studia Liturgica* 25 (1995), 129-150
MARTY, M.E., 'The Global Context of Ecumenism 1968-2000', in: J. Briggs, M.A. Oduyoye, G. Tsetsis (eds.), *A History of the Ecumenical Movement*, vol. III: *1968-2000* (Geneva: WCC, 2004), 3-22
MATTHEEUWS, G., 'De voorganger in de eucharistie als sacrament van de ecclesiale Christus', *Jaarboek voor liturgie-onderzoek* 15 (1999), 95-118
MCPARTLAN, P., *The Eucharist Makes the Church: Henri de Lubac and John Zizioulas in Dialogue* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1993)
MCPARTLAN, P., *Sacrament of Salvation: An Introduction to Eucharistic Ecclesiology* (London-New York: T&T Clark, 1995 [reprint 2003])
MCPARTLAN, P., 'The Local and the Universal Church: Zizioulas and the Ratzinger—Kasper Debate', in: D.H. Knight (ed.), *The Theology of John Zizioulas: Personhood and the Church* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2007), 171-182
MERSCH, E., *Le corps mystique du Christ. Etudes de théologie historique* (Louvain: Museum Lessianum, 1933)
MESSNER, R., 'Was ist systematische Liturgiewissenschaft? Ein Entwurf in sieben Thesen', *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 40 (1998), 257-274
MESSNER, R., *Einführung in die Liturgiewissenschaft* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2001)
MESSNER, R., 'Die vielen gottesdienstlichen Überlieferungen und die eine liturgische Tradition. Liturgiewissenschaft zwischen historischer und systematischer Theologie', in: H. Hoping & B. Jeggle-Merz (eds.), *Liturgische Theologie. Aufgaben systematischer Liturgiewissenschaft* (Paderborn: Schöningh, 2004), 33-56
MEYENDORFF, J., *L'Eglise orthodoxe. Hier et aujourd'hui* (Paris: Seuil, 1960)
MEYENDORFF, J., *Catholicity and the Church* (Crestwood NY: SVSP, 1983)
MEYER, H., & L. VISCHER (eds.), *Growth in Agreement: Reports and Agreed Statements of Ecumenical Conversations on a World Level* (Ramsey NJ: Paulist; Geneva: WCC, 1984)
MILBANK, J., *Theology and Social Theory: Beyond Secular Reason* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1990 [Second Edition 2006])
MILBANK, J., 'The Programme of Radical Orthodoxy', in: L.P. Hemming (ed.), *Radical Orthodoxy?—A Catholic Enquiry* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000), 33-45
MILBANK, J., 'Foreword', in: J.K.A. Smith, *Introducing Radical Orthodoxy: Mapping a Post-secular Theology* (Grand Rapids MI: Baker Academic; Milton Keynes UK: Paternoster, 2004), 11-20
MILBANK, J., 'Henri de Lubac', in: D.F. Ford with R. Muers (eds.), *The Modern Theologians: An Introduction to Christian Theology since 1918*, Third Edition (Oxford: Blackwell, 2005), 76-91
MILBANK, J., *The Suspended Middle: Henri de Lubac and the Debate concerning the Supernatural* (Grand Rapids MI-Cambridge UK: Eerdmans, 2005)

MILBANK, J., G. WARD, C.J.C. PICKSTOCK, 'Introduction: Suspending the Material: The Turn of Radical Orthodoxy', in: J. Milbank, C.J.C. Pickstock, G. Ward (eds.), *Radical Orthodoxy: A New Theology* (London-New York: Routledge, 1999), 1-20

MITCHELL, N.D., 'Liturgy and Ecclesiology', in: A.J. Chupungco (ed.), *Handbook for Liturgical Studies*, vol. II: *Fundamental Liturgy* (Collegeville MN: TLP, 1998), 113-127

MÖNNICH, C.W., *Antiliturgica. Enige aantekeningen bij de viering van de kerkelijke feesten* (Amsterdam: Ten Have, 1966)

MORRIS, J.N., 'A "Fluffy-Minded Prayer Book Fundamentalist"? F.D. Maurice and the Anglican Liturgy', in: R.N. Swanson (ed.), *Continuity and Change in Christian Worship* (Woodbridge UK, Rochester NY: Boydell, 1999), 345-360

MURRAY, P.D., 'Roman Catholic Theology after Vatican II', in: D.F. Ford with R. Muers (eds.), *The Modern Theologians: An Introduction to Christian Theology since 1918*, Third Edition (Oxford: Blackwell, 2005), 265-286

NAPIWODZKI, P., 'Eine Ekklesiologie im Werden. Mannes Dominikus Koster und sein Beitrag zum theologischen Verständnis der Kirche' (unpublished PhD thesis, University Freiburg CH, 2005, available at http://ethesis.unifr.ch/theses/#theologie)

NEVEN, G.W., *In de speelruimte van de Geest. Studies over de theologie van dr. O. Noordmans II* (Kampen: Kok, 1980)

NICHOLS, A., *Theology in the Russian Diaspora: Church, Fathers, Eucharist in Nikolai Afanas'ev (1893-1966)* (Cambridge: CUP, 1989)

NICHOLS, A., *Light From the East: Authors and Themes in Orthodox Theology* (London: Sheed & Ward, 1995)

NOCKLES, P.B., *The Oxford Movement in Context: Anglican High Churchmanship, 1760-1857* (Cambridge: CUP, 1994)

NOORDMANS, O., *Herschepping. Beknopte dogmatische handleiding voor godsdienstige toespraken en besprekingen* (Zeist: NCSV, 1934). Annotated edition in: O. Noordmans, *Verzamelde werken*, vol. II: *Dogmatische peilingen. Rondom Schrift en Belijdenis* (Kampen: Kok, 1979), 214-322

NOORDMANS, O., 'Mysterie of boodschap', *Eltheto* 89 (1935), 131-140. Annotated edition in: O. Noordmans, *Verzamelde werken*, vol. IV: *Ontmoetingen. De actualiteit der historie* (Kampen: Kok, 1988), 180-190

NOORDMANS, O., *Liturgie* (Amsterdam: Holland, 1939). Annotated edition in: O. Noordmans, *Verzamelde werken*, vol. VI: *De kerk en het leven* (Kampen: Kok, 1986), 45-164

NOORDMANS, O., 'De zon, het orgel en de preek', *Weekblad der Nederlandsche Hervormde Kerk* 31 (1947), 4th issue. Annotated edition in: O. Noordmans, *Verzamelde werken*, vol. VI: *De kerk en het leven* (Kampen: Kok, 1986), 300-303

NOORDMANS, O., *Memorandum aangaande de processie* (a text written for the Netherlands Reformed Church in 1949). Annotated edition in: O. Noordmans, *Verzamelde werken*, vol. VI: *De kerk en het leven* (Kampen: Kok, 1986), 560-562

NOORDMANS, O., 'Een oude koe', *Weekblad der Nederlandsche Hervormde Kerk* 33 (1949), 172. Annotated edition in: O. Noordmans, *Verzamelde werken*, vol. VI: *De kerk en het leven* (Kampen: Kok, 1986), 340-341

NOORDMANS, O., *Gestalte en Geest* (Amsterdam: Holland, 1955). Annotated edition in: O. Noordmans, *Verzamelde werken*, vol. VIII: *Meditaties* (Kampen: Kok, 1980), 179-478

OEYEN, C., 'Ekklesiologische Fragen in den orthodox-altkatholischen Kommissionstexten', *IKZ* 79 (1989), 237-265

OEYEN, C., 'Die Alte Kirche als Norm nach Döllinger und seiner Schule', *IKZ* 86 (1996), 26-44

OUWENS, K., *De theorie van de pentarchie en het primaatschap in de kerk* (Amersfoort: COKB, 1986)

OUWENS, K., *Het Stukjesboek. Missen en Gezangen 1745-1803. De basis van het oud-katholieke kerklied in Nederland* (Amersfoort: COKB, 1996)

OVERBOSCH, W.G., *Zo gezegd. Gebundelde overwegingen* (Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum, 1998)

PANNENBERG, W., *Systematische Theologie*, vol. III (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993)

PAPANDREOU, D., 'Die gegenseitige ekklesiologische Anerkennung', in: H. Gerny, H. Rein, M. Weyermann (eds.), *Die Wurzel aller Theologie: Sentire cum Ecclesia. Festschrift zum 60. Geburtstag von Urs von Arx* (Bern: Stämpfli, 2003), 285-291

PECKLERS, K.F., *The Unread Vision: The Liturgical Movement in the United States of America: 1926-1955* (Collegeville MN: TLP, 1998)

PECKLERS, K.F., *Worship* (London-New York: Continuum, 2003)

PECKLERS, K.F., 'The Jansenist Critique and the Liturgical Reforms of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries', *Ecclesia Orans* 20 (2003), 325-338

PELIKAN, J., *Christian Doctrine and Modern Culture (since 1700)* (Chicago-London: University of Chicago Press, 1989)

PICKERING, W.S.F., *Anglo-Catholicism: A Study in Religious Ambiguity* (London-New York: Routledge, 1989)

PICKSTOCK, C.J.C., *After Writing: On the Liturgical Consummation of Philosophy* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1998)

PICKSTOCK, C.J.C., 'Is Orthodoxy Radical?', in: J.N. Morris (ed.), *Faith and Freedom: Exploring Radical Orthodoxy* (= *Third Millennium* 6, September 2003), 5-16

PLANK, P., *Die Eucharistieversammlung als Kirche. Zur Entstehung und Entfaltung der eucharistischen Ekklesiologie Nikolaj Afanas'evs (1893-1966)* (Würzburg: Augustinus-Verlag, 1980)

PLOEGER, A.K., *Dare we Observe? The Importance of Art Works for Consciousness of Diakonia in (Post-) modern Church* (Louvain: Peeters, 2002)

PLOEGER, A.K., & J.J. PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *De gemeente en haar verlangen. Van praktische theologie naar de geloofspraktijk van gemeenteleden* (Kampen: Kok, 2001)

PLOEGER, A.K., & J.J. PLOEGER-GROTEGOED, *Morgen... in de verte. Een kerk van mensen* (Kampen: Kok, 2007)

PLOEGER, M., '"Geen spelletje". Noordmans' *Liturgie* (1939) en het *Handboek* van de Liturgische Kring' (unpublished MA thesis, Leiden University, 1995)

PLOEGER, M., 'Lex orandi lex credendi. Over liturgie als kenbron van geloofsleer', *Eredienstvaardig. Tijdschrift voor liturgie en kerkmuziek* 15 (1999), 192-194

PLOEGER, M., *High Church Varieties: Three Essays on Continuity and Discontinuity in Nineteenth-Century Anglican Catholic Thought* (Amersfoort: COKB; Sliedrecht: Merweboek, 2001 [also available through 'Project Canterbury' at www.anglicanhistory.org/academic])

PLOEGER, M., 'Een zingend wezen. Liturgie en muziek, mens en gemeenschap in het werk van David F. Ford en andere hedendaagse anglicaanse denkers', in: M.J.M. Hoondert *et al.* (eds.), *Door mensen gezongen. Liturgische muziek in portretten* (Kampen: Gooi & Sticht, 2005), 272-285

PLOEGER, M., 'De kerk als Maaltijd vierende gemeenschap', *Eredienstvaardig. Tijdschrift voor liturgie en kerkmuziek* 22 (2006), 13-17

PLOEGER, M., 'Life—Death—Resurrection—Church: On the Coherence of Some Central Christian Notions', *IKZ* 96 (2006), 45-50

PLOEGER, M., 'Catholicity, Apostolicity, the Trinity and the Eucharist in Old Catholic Ecclesiology', in: U. von Arx, P.D.L. Avis, M. Ploeger (eds.), *Towards Further Convergence: Anglican and Old Catholic Ecclesiologies* (Bern: Stämpfli, 2006), 7-27

PLOEGER, M., 'Het "onliturgische" karakter van de Liturgische Beweging', *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* 61 (2007), 109-122

POST, P.G.J., 'Ritual Studies. Einführung und Ortsbestimmung im Hinblick auf die Liturgiewissenschaft', *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft* 45 (2003), 21-45

POST, P.G.J., 'Na de lange jaren zestig. Liturgiewetenschap en *Ritual Studies*: opkomst, typering en actuele uitwerking van een relatie', *Jaarboek voor liturgie-onderzoek* 22 (2006), 89-111

POWERS, D.G., *Salvation through Participation: An Examination of the Notion of the Believers' Corporate Unity with Christ in Early Christian Soteriology* (Louvain: Peeters, 2001)

RAMSEY, A.M., *The Gospel and the Catholic Church* (London: SPCK, 1990 [reprint of 1956[2]], 1936[1])

RASKER, A.J., *De Nederlandse Hervormde Kerk vanaf 1795. Geschiedenis, theologische ontwikkelingen en de verhouding tot haar zusterkerken in de negentiende en twintigste eeuw* (Kampen: Kok, 1986[3])

RATZINGER, J., *Volk und Haus Gottes in Augustins Lehre von der Kirche* (München: Zink, 1954 [reprint St. Ottilien: EOS-Verlag, 1992])

RATZINGER, J., *Das neue Volk Gottes. Entwürfe zur Ekklesiologie* (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1969)

RATZINGER, J., *Das Fest des Glaubens. Versuche zur Theologie des Gottesdienstes* (Einsiedeln: Johannes, 1981)

RATZINGER, J., *Theologische Prinzipienlehre. Bausteine zur Fundamentaltheologie* (München: Wewel, 1982)

RATZINGER, J., *Kirche, Ökumene und Politik. Neue Versuche zur Ekklesiologie* (Einsiedeln: Johannes, 1987)

RATZINGER, J., *Zur Gemeinschaft gerufen. Kirche heute verstehen* (Freiburg-Basel-Wien: Herder, 1991)

RATZINGER, J., *Ein neues Lied für den Herrn. Christusglaube und Liturgie in der Gegenwart* (Freiburg-Basel-Wien: Herder, 1995)

RATZINGER, J., *Salz der Erde. Christentum und katholische Kirche im 21. Jahrhundert. Ein Gespräch mit Peter Seewald* (München: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1996)

RATZINGER, J., 'Erwägungen zur Stellung von Mariologie und Marienfrömmigkeit im Ganzen von Glaube und Theologie', in: J. Ratzinger & H.U. von Balthasar, *Maria. Kirche im Ursprung* (Einsiedeln-Freiburg: Johannes, 1997 [fourth, enlarged edition]), 14-30

RATZINGER, J., '"Du bist voll der Gnade". Elemente biblischer Marienfrömmigkeit', in: J. Ratzinger & H.U. von Balthasar, *Maria. Kirche im Ursprung* (Einsiedeln-Freiburg: Johannes, 1997 [fourth, enlarged edition]), 53-70

RATZINGER, J., *Aus meinem Leben. Erinnerungen (1927-1977)* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Verlags-Anstalt, 1998)

RATZINGER, J., *Der Geist der Liturgie. Eine Einführung* (Freiburg-Basel-Wien: Herder, 2000)

RATZINGER, J., *Gott und die Welt. Glauben und Leben in unserer Zeit. Ein Gespräch mit Peter Seewald* (München: Knaur, 2000)

RATZINGER, J., *Gott ist uns nah. Eucharistie: Mitte des Lebens*. Herausgegeben von S.O. Horn und V. Pfnür (Augsburg: Sankt-Ulrich-Verlag, 2001)

RATZINGER, J., *Weggemeinschaft des Glaubens. Kirche als Communio*. Festgabe zum 75. Geburtstag herausgegeben vom Schülerkreis. Redaktion: S.O. Horn und V. Pfnür (Augsburg: Sankt-Ulrich-Verlag, 2002)

RATZINGER, J., 'Réponse du cardinal Ratzinger au Père Gy', *La Maison-Dieu* 230 (2002/2), 113-120

RATZINGER, J., *Glaube—Wahrheit—Toleranz. Das Christentum und die Weltreligionen* (Freiburg-Basel-Wien: Herder, 2003)

[RATZINGER, J.], 'First Message of His Holiness Benedict XVI at the End of the Eucharistic Concelebration with the Members of the College of Cardinals in the Sistine Chapel, Wednesday, 20 April 2005', English translation from the Latin original, © Libreria Editrice Vaticana (source: www.vatican.va)

[RATZINGER, J.], BENEDIKT XVI., *'Ich vertraue auf euch'. Die Predigten und Reden zum Beginn des Pontifikats*, herausgegeben und eingeleitet von M. Posselt (München: LangenMüller, 2005)

REIN, H., *Kirchengemeinschaft. Die anglikanisch-altkatholisch-orthodoxen Beziehungen von 1870 bis 1990 und ihre ökumenische Relevanz* (Bern: Lang, 1993 & 1994 [2 vols.]).

REINHARDT, H.J.F., 'Kanonische Aspekte des ökumenischen Dialogs, vor allem im Hinblick auf die Altkatholiken', *Archiv für katholisches Kirchenrecht* 174 (2005), 3-18

'Richtlijnen voor het deelnemen aan de communie bij nog niet gerealiseerde kerkelijke gemeenschap', in: *Vademecum bij Adresboekje en Statuut* (Amersfoort: Bisschoppelijk Bureau van de Oud-Katholieke Kerk van Nederland, 2002)

RING, M., 'Ad pristinam normam patrum. Anmerkungen zum altkatholischen Reformparadigma', in: A.K.H. Berlis & K.-D. Gerth (eds.), *Christus Spes. Liturgie und Glaube im ökumenischen Kontext. Festschrift für Bischof Sigisbert Kraft* (Frankfurt: Lang, 1994), 255-264

RING, M., 'Eine neue Periode. Ein Beitrag zur Geschichte des Alt-Katholischen Seminars der Universität Bonn', in: G. Esser & M. Ring (eds.), *Zwischen Freiheit und Gebundenheit. Festschrift zum 100jährigen Bestehen des Alt-Katholischen Seminars der Universität Bonn (1902-2002)* (Bonn: Alt-Katholischer Bistumsverlag, 2002), 112-177

RINKEL, A., 'Das Hauptstück: "De Sacramentis in genere"', *IKZ* 6 (1916), 79-91, 215-231

RINKEL, A., 'Die Stellung der Altkatholischen Kirche zu den Berichten der Lausanner Konferenz', *IKZ* 18 (1928), 212-225

RINKEL, A., 'Christentum—Kirche—Sakrament', *IKZ* 20 (1930), 103-121

[RINKEL, A.], 'Liturgie', in: *Liturgisch Handboek ten dienste der Oud-Katholieke Kerk van Nederland* (Schiedam: Cor unum et anima una, 1931), 9-20

[RINKEL, A.], *Handboek voor geloofs- en zedeleer in de Oud-Katholieke Kerk van Nederland* (Utrecht: Kerkelijk Boekenfonds, [1932])

RINKEL, A., 'Die Kirche Christi und das Wort Gottes. Grundsätzliches zum zweiten Edinburgh-Thema', *IKZ* 27 (1937), 85-91

RINKEL, A., 'Wort Gottes und Tradition in der altkatholischen Kirche unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der Utrechter Konvention', *IKZ* 29 (1939), 51-61

RINKEL, A., 'Unsere Kirche in Vergangenheit, Gegenwart und Zukunft', *IKZ* 29 (1939), 222-231

RINKEL, A., 'Die Lehre von der Kirche nach der Auffassung der altkatholischen Kirche', *IKZ* 39 (1949), 1-15

RINKEL, A., 'Die heilige Eucharistie', *IKZ* 37 (1947), 1-30; 40 (1950), 156-177, 260-278; 41 (1951), 3-12, 65-85

RINKEL, A., 'Unsere Probleme im ökumenischen theologischen Gespräch', *IKZ* 38 (1948), 236-250

RINKEL, A., 'Interkommunion', *IKZ* 43 (1953), 209-230

RINKEL, A., 'Dogmatische theologie', stencilled edition 1956

RINKEL, A., 'Die heutige ökumenische Bewegung und wir', *IKZ* 47 (1957), 214-228

RINKEL, A., 'Orthodox und altkatholisch', *IKZ* 48 (1958), 2-8

RINKEL, A., 'Eucharist and Ministry', *IKZ* 48 (1958), 65-74

RINKEL, A., 'Altkatholisch und orthodox', *IKZ* 51 (1961), 257-270

R[INKEL], A., 'Lanka und Nord-Indien/Pakistan', *IKZ* 52 (1962), 48-59

RINKEL, A., 'Das altkatholische Bekenntnis', *IKZ* 55 (1965), 201-216

RINKEL, A., & G. [FISHER], 'Die Kirche von Südindien. Ein Briefwechsel zwischen dem Erzbischof von Utrecht und dem Erzbischof von Canterbury', *IKZ* 49 (1959), 1-15

RINKEL, A., & A. KÜRY, 'Erklärung zu dem Bericht der zweiten Weltkonferenz für Glauben und Verfassung', *IKZ* 30 (1940), 81-93

RINKEL, A., & U. KÜRY, 'Der Primat in der Kirche. Erklärung der Altkatholischen Bischöfe zum 18. Juli 1970', *IKZ* 60 (1970), 57-59

RITCHIE, A.W.M., 'After Christendom: Benedict, MacIntyre and the Future of Anglicanism', *One in Christ* 40 (2005), nr. 1, 73-77

ROLOFF, J., *Die Kirche im Neuen Testament* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1993)

ROOSJEN, M.J.IJ.W., 'Een kwart eeuw aan de Emmalaan', in: F. Smit e.a., *Adjutorio Redemptoris. Dr. Andreas Rinkel, aartsbisschop van Utrecht, 1889-1979* (Amersfoort: COKB, 1987), 256-259

ROWELL, D.G., 'Foreword', in: A.M. Ramsey, *The Gospel and the Catholic Church* (London: SPCK, 1990 [reprint of 1956[2]], 1936[1]), i-v

RUDDY, C., *The Local Church: Tillard and the Future of Catholic Ecclesiology* (New York: Crossroad, 2006)

SCHLEIERMACHER, F.D.E., *Kritische Gesamtausgabe*, vol. VII: *Der christliche Glaube nach den Grundsätzen der evangelischen Kirche im Zusammenhange dargestellt (1821/22)* (Berlin-New York: de Gruyter, 1980)

SCHMEMANN, A., *Introduction to Liturgical Theology* (Crestwood NY: SVSP, 1986[3] [1966[1]])

SCHMIDT-KEISER, S., *Aktive Teilnahme. Kriterium gottesdienstlichen Handelns und Feierns. Zu den Elementen eines Schlüsselbegriffes in Geschichte und Gegenwart des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Bern: Lang, 1985)

SCHOOF, T.M., *Aggiornamento. De doorbraak van een nieuwe katholieke theologie* (Baarn: Het Wereldvenster, 1968)

SCHOON, D.J., 'Oude en nieuwe bisschoppen. De "oud-katholieken" en 1853', in: J. Vis & W. Janse (eds.), *Staf en storm. Het herstel van de bisschoppelijke hiërarchie in Nederland in 1853: actie en reactie* (Hilversum: Verloren, 2002), 166-187

SCHOON, D.J., *Van bisschoppelijke Cleresie tot Oud-Katholieke Kerk. Bijdrage tot de geschiedenis van het katholicisme in Nederland in de 19de eeuw* (Nijmegen: Valkhof Pers, 2004)

SCHOOT, E. VAN DER, *Hervormde eredienst. De liturgische ontwikkeling van de Ned. Herv. Kerk* ('s-Gravenhage: Boekencentrum, 1950)

SCHUEGRAF, O., *Der einen Kirche Gestalt geben. Ekklesiologie in den Dokumenten der bilateralen Konsensökumene* (Münster: Aschendorff, 2001)

SCHULZ, H.-J., *Ökumenische Glaubenseinheit aus eucharistischer Überlieferung* (Paderborn: Bonifacius, 1976)

SCHWÖBEL, C., 'Wolfhart Pannenberg', in: D.F. Ford with R. Muers (eds.), *The Modern Theologians: An Introduction to Christian Theology since 1918*, Third Edition (Oxford: Blackwell, 2005), 129-146

SEDGWICK, P., 'Anglican Theology', in: D.F. Ford with R. Muers (eds.), *The Modern Theologians: An Introduction to Christian Theology since 1918*, Third Edition (Oxford: Blackwell, 2005), 178-193

SHORTT, R., *Rowan Williams: An Introduction* (London: DLT, 2003)

SHORTT, R., *Benedict XVI: Commander of the Faith* (London: Hodder & Stoughton, 2006[2] [2005[1]])

SHORTT, R., *God's Advocates: Christian Thinkers in Conversation* (London: DLT; Grand Rapids MI: Eerdmans, 2005)

SMIT, C.E., *Reasonable and Reverent: The Critical Orthodoxy of Charles Gore and Lux Mundi* (Amersfoort: COKB; Sliedrecht: Merweboek, 2006)

SMIT, F., 'Andreas Rinkel (1889-1979)', in: F. Smit e.a., *Adjutorio Redemptoris. Dr. Andreas Rinkel, aartsbisschop van Utrecht, 1889-1979* (Amersfoort: COKB, 1987), 3-197

SMIT, F., *Batavia Sacra* (Amersfoort: COKB, 1992)

SMIT, P.B.A.J., 'De oud-katholieke receptie van Bavincks Gereformeerde Dogmatiek: Rinkels Dogmatische Theologie', in: G. Harinck & G.W. Neven (eds.), *Ontmoetingen met Bavinck* (Barneveld: Vuurbaak, 2006), 87-105

SMIT, P.B.A.J., 'The Old Catholic View on Scripture and Tradition: A Short Study of a Theological Organism', *IKZ* 97 (2007), 106-123

SMITH, J.K.A., *Introducing Radical Orthodoxy: Mapping a Post-secular Theology* (Grand Rapids MI: Baker Academic; Milton Keynes UK: Paternoster, 2004)

STALDER, K., *Die Wirklichkeit Christi erfahren. Ekklesiologische Untersuchungen und ihre Bedeutung für die Existenz von Kirche heute* (Zürich-Köln: Benzinger, 1984)

STALDER, K., & H. ALDENHOVEN, 'Rom, Küng und die Zukunft der Ökumene in christkatholischer Sicht', *IKZ* 70 (1980), 71-76

STANCLIFFE, D., 'Evangelism and Worship', in: J. John (ed.), *Living Evangelism: Affirming Catholicism and Sharing the Faith* (London: DLT, 1996), 25-42

STAPLES, P., *The Liturgical Movement in the Netherlands Reformed Church 1911-1955: With Special Reference to the Anglican Dimension* (Utrecht: IIMO, 1983)

SUDMANN, S., 'Abgrenzung oder Nachahmung. Das Basler Konzil und die alt-katholische Kirche' in: A.K.H. Berlis & M. Ring (eds.), *Im Himmel Anker werfen. Vermutungen über Kirche in der Zukunft. Festschrift für Bischof Joachim Vobbe* (Bonn: Alt-Katholischer Bistumsverlag, 2007), 289-301

SYKES, S.W., *The Integrity of Anglicanism* (London: Mowbrays, 1978)

SYKES, S.W., *Unashamed Anglicanism* (London: DLT, 1995)

TANNER, M., 'Ecumenical Theology', in: D.F. Ford with R. Muers (eds.), *The Modern Theologians: An Introduction to Christian Theology since 1918*, Third Edition (Oxford: Blackwell, 2005), 556-571

TANNER, M., 'Ministry in Faith and Order: One Woman's Ecumenical Memory', in: T. Grdzelidze (ed.), *One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic: Ecumenical Reflections on the Church* (Geneva: WCC, 2005), 169-179

'Text of The Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral 1886/1888', in: J.R. Wright (ed.), *Quadrilateral at One Hundred: Essays on the Centenary of the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral 1886/88-1986/88* (Cincinnati OH: Forward Movement Publications; London-Oxford: Mowbray, 1988), vii-ix

'Text on Ecclesiology: Called to be the One Church: An Invitation to the Churches to Renew their Commitment to the Search for Unity and to Deepen their Dialogue', www.oikoumene.org/en/resources/documents

'The 1988 Lambeth Conference: Resolution 8 and Explanatory Note regarding ARCIC I', in: C. Hill & E.J. Yarnold (eds.), *Anglicans and Roman Catholics: The Search for Unity* (London: SPCK & Catholic Truth Society, 1994), 153-155

The Book of Common Prayer (New York: The Church Hymnal Corporation, 1979)

The Gift of Authority (Authority in the Church III) (London: Catholic Truth Society; Toronto: Anglican Book Center; New York: Church Publishing, 1999)

The Meissen Agreement: Texts (London: Council for Christian Unity, 1992)

The Nature and Mission of the Church: A Stage on the Way to a Common Statement (Geneva: WCC, 2005)

The Nature and Purpose of the Church: A Stage on the Way to a Common Statement (Geneva: WCC, 1998)

'The Official Roman Catholic Response to the Final Report of ARCIC I' (1991), in: C. Hill & E.J. Yarnold (eds.), *Anglicans and Roman Catholics: The Search for Unity* (London: SPCK & Catholic Truth Society, 1994), 156-166

The Porvoo Common Statement (London: Council for Christian Unity, 1993)

THORNTON, L.S., *The Common Life in the Body of Christ* (Westminster: Dacre Press, [1941])

THURIAN, M., (ed.), *Churches Respond to BEM: Official Responses to the 'Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry' Text*, vol. I-VI (Geneva: WCC, 1986-1988)

THURIAN, M., 'The Lima Document on "Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry": The Event and its Consequences', in: M. Thurian (ed.), *Churches Respond to BEM: Official Responses to the 'Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry' Text*, vol. I (Geneva: WCC, 1986), 1-27

TILLARD, J.-M.R., *L'Eucharistie. Pâque de l'Eglise* (Paris: Cerf, 1964)

TILLARD, J.-M.R., *L'Evêque de Rome* (Paris: Cerf, 1982)

TILLARD, J.-M.R., *Eglise d'Eglises. L'ecclésiologie de communion* (Paris: Cerf, 1987)

TILLARD, J.-M.R., 'Introduction', in: *Confessing the One Faith: An Ecumenical Explication of the Apostolic Faith as it is Confessed in the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Creed (381)* (Geneva: WCC, 1991), vii-viii

TILLARD, J.-M.R., *Chair de l'Eglise, chair du Christ. Aux sources de l'ecclésiologie de communion* (Paris: Cerf, 1992)

TILLARD, J.-M.R., *L'Eglise locale. Ecclésiologie de communion et catholicité* (Paris: Cerf, 1995)

TOL, C., 'Liturgische notities', in: F. Smit e.a., *Adjutorio Redemptoris. Dr. Andreas Rinkel, aartsbisschop van Utrecht, 1889-1979* (Amersfoort: COKB, 1987), 232-238

TOL, C., *Concelebratie* (Amersfoort: COKB, 1988)

TONGEREN, A.J.M. VAN, 'Een gemeenschappelijke oriëntatie. Over de *Ritual Studies* en ontwikkelingen binnen het liturgiehistorisch onderzoek', *Jaarboek voor liturgie-onderzoek* 22 (2006), 135-151

Towards Koinonia in Faith, Life and Witness: A Discussion Paper (Geneva: WCC, 1993)

TRACY, D., *The Analogical Imagination: Christian Theology and the Culture of Pluralism* (London: SCM, 1981)

UNDERHILL, E., *Worship* (London: Nisbet, 1936)

VALLIERE, P., *Modern Russian Theology: Bukharev, Soloviev, Bulgakov: Orthodox Theology in a New Key* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 2000)

VEN, J.A. VAN DER, *Ecclesiologie in context* (Kampen: Kok, 1993)

VERCAMMEN, J.A.O.L., *Identiteit in beraad. Theorie en praktijk van het parochieel identiteitsberaad in vier oud-katholieke parochies* (Baarn: Gooi & Sticht, 1997)

VISSER, J., *Rovenius und seine Werke. Beitrag zur Geschichte der nordniederländischen katholischen Frömmigkeit in der ersten Hälfte des 17. Jahrhunderts* (Assen: Van Gorcum/Prakke, 1966)

VISSER, J., 'Zur Erlösungs- und Gnadenlehre', *IKZ* 59 (1969), 278-293

VISSER, J., 'Überlegungen zu Hans Küngs Buch "Unfehlbar?"', *IKZ* 61 (1971), 272-287

VISSER, J., 'De oorzaken van 1723', in: J. Visser, F. Smit, P.J. Maan, *Onafhankelijk van Rome, toch katholiek. 250 jaar oud-katholieke geschiedenis* (Hilversum: Gooi & Sticht, 1973), 12-22

VISSER, J., *De kandelaar van het licht. Over het probleem van de kerkstructuren* (Amersfoort: COKB, 1976)

VISSER, J., 'De geloofsleer [1]', in: P.J. Maan *et al.*, *De Oud-Katholieke Kerk van Nederland. Leer en leven* (Hilversum: Gooi & Sticht, 1979), 91-115

VISSER, J., *Het ideaal van de 'ecclesia primitiva' in het jansenisme en het oud-katholicisme* (Amersfoort: COKB, 1980)

VISSER, J., 'Episcopus oecumenicus', in: C. van Kasteel, P.J. Maan, M.F.G. Parmentier (eds.), *Kracht in zwakheid van een kleine wereldkerk. De oud-katholieke Unie van Utrecht* (Amersfoort: COKB, 1982), 89-100

VISSER, J., 'Episcopacy Today: An Old Catholic View', in: P. Moore (ed.), *Bishops: But What Kind? Reflections on Episcopacy* (London: SPCK, 1982), 41-50

VISSER, J., 'Jansenismus und Konziliarismus: ekklesiologische Anschauungen des Nicolas LeGros (1675-1751)', *IKZ* 73 (1983), 212-224

VISSER, J., 'Old Catholic Spirituality', in: G. Huelin (ed.), *Old Catholics and Anglicans 1931-1981: To Commemorate the Fiftieth Anniversary of Intercommunion* (Oxford: OUP, 1983), 96-108

VISSER, J., 'De oud katholieken en het Petrusambt', in: J. van der Lans *et al.*, *Petrusambt: tot uw dienst* (Nijmegen: Theologische Faculteit van de Katholieke Universiteit Nijmegen, 1985), 47-54

VISSER, J., 'De dogmatisch theoloog', in: F. Smit e.a., *Adjutorio Redemptoris. Dr. Andreas Rinkel, aartsbisschop van Utrecht, 1889-1979* (Amersfoort: COKB, 1987), 207-221

VISSER, J., 'Kirchenstruktur und Glaubensvermittlung', *IKZ* 79 (1989), 174-191

VISSER, J., 'Ökumene—Welt—Utrechter Union: Die Aufgabe der altkatholischen Kirche', *IKZ* 84 (1994), 92-113

VISSER, J., 'Ik en de ander of de ander en ik', in: C. Bakker & R.R. Ganzevoort (eds.), *Omgaan met de ander. Afscheidscolleges van Jan Visser en Piet Steegman* (Utrecht: Faculteit der Godgeleerdheid van de Universiteit Utrecht, 1994), 21-41

VISSER, J., 'Systematisch theologische beschouwing over "De vrouw in het ambt"', in: J. Visser *et al.*, *De Haagse teksten. Referaten en beschouwingen op de studiedagen 'Vrouw en kerkelijk ambt' 18-20 januari 1994* (Amersfoort: COKB, 1995), 35-48

VISSER, J., 'Zusammenfassung und Zukunftsvision', *IKZ* 85 (1995), 61-69

VISSER, J., 'Die Alte Kirche als hermeneutisches Prinzip', *IKZ* 86 (1996), 45-64

VISSER, J., 'Het licht onder de korenmaat?', in: J. Visser *et al.*, *Staat de kerk haar eigen boodschap in de weg?* (Amersfoort: COKB, 1998), 37-55
VISSER, J., 'De geloofsleer [2]', in: A.K.H. Berlis *et al.*, *De Oud-Katholieke Kerk van Nederland. Leer en leven* (Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum, 2000), 163-191
VISSER, J., 'The Old Catholic Churches of the Union of Utrecht', *International Journal for the Study of the Christian Church* 3 (2003), 68-84
VISSER, J., 'Die Beziehungen zwischen dem Vatikan und der Utrechter Union aus altkatholischer Sicht', in: H. Gerny, H. Rein, M. Weyermann (eds.), *Die Wurzel aller Theologie: Sentire cum Ecclesia. Festschrift zum 60. Geburtstag von Urs von Arx* (Bern: Stämpfli, 2003), 309-325
VISSER, J., 'Von Mäntelchen und dem Wind. Zur Frage einer altkatholischen Theologie', *IKZ* 95 (2005), 73-94
VISSER, J., 'Tradition, Unfehlbarkeit und Primat', in: A.K.H. Berlis & M. Ring (eds.), *Im Himmel Anker werfen. Vermutungen über Kirche in der Zukunft. Festschrift für Bischof Joachim Vobbe* (Bonn: Alt-Katholischer Bistumsverlag, 2007), 355-368
VOBBE, J., *Brot aus dem Steintal. Bischofsbriefe* (Bonn: Alt-Katholischer Bistumsverlag, 2005)
VOGEL, D.W., 'Liturgical Theology: A Conceptual Geography', in: D.W. Vogel (ed.), *Primary Sources of Liturgical Theology: A Reader* (Collegeville MN: TLP, 2000), 3-14
VOLF, M., *Trinität und Gemeinschaft. Eine ökumenische Ekklesiologie* (Mainz: Matthias-Grünewald-Verlag; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 1996)
VRIES, S.L.S. DE, *Tegen het donker. 100 liederen om samen te zingen* (Zoetermeer: Meinema, 2002)
WAINWRIGHT, G., *Eucharist and Eschatology* (London: Epworth, 1971)
WAINWRIGHT, G., *Doxology: The Praise of God in Worship, Doctrine and Life: A Systematic Theology* (London: Epworth, 1980)
WAINWRIGHT, G., *The Ecumenical Moment: Crisis and Opportunity for the Church* (Grand Rapids MI: Eerdmans, 1983)
WAINWRIGHT, G., *Worship with One Accord: Where Liturgy and Ecumenism Embrace* (New York-Oxford: OUP, 1997)
WAINWRIGHT, G., 'Church', in: N. Lossky *et al.* (eds.), *Dictionary of the Ecumenical Movement* (Geneva: WCC, 2002), 176-186
WALF, K., *Vragen rondom het nieuwe kerkelijk recht* (Hilversum: Gooi & Sticht, 1988)
WARE, T., *The Orthodox Church* (London: Penguin, 1997[5])
WEBSTER, J., 'Systematic Theology after Barth: Jüngel, Jenson, and Gunton', in: D.F. Ford with R. Muers (eds.), *The Modern Theologians: An Introduction to Christian Theology since 1918*, Third Edition (Oxford: Blackwell, 2005), 249-264
WEGMAN, H.A.J., *Riten en mythen. Liturgie in de geschiedenis van het christendom* (Kampen: Kok, 1991)
WEILER, T., *Volk Gottes—Leib Christi. Die Ekklesiologie Joseph Ratzingers und ihr Einfluss auf das Zweite Vatikanische Konzil* (Mainz: Matthias-Grünewald-Verlag, 1997)
WHITE, J.F., *The Cambridge Movement: The Ecclesiologists and the Gothic Revival* (Cambridge: CUP, 1962)
WHITE, J.F., *Protestant Worship: Traditions in Transition* (Louisville KY: Westminster John Knox Press, 1989)
WILLIAMS, G.H., 'The Neo-Patristic Synthesis of Georges Florovsky', in: A. Blane (ed.), *Georges Florovsky: Russian Intellectual and Orthodox Churchman* (Crestwood NY: SVSP, 1993), 287-340
WILLIAMS, R.D., *Open to Judgement: Sermons and Addresses* (London: DLT, 1994)
WILLIAMS, R.D., 'Postscript: Talk of the Devil', in: J. John (ed.), *Living Evangelism: Affirming Catholicism and Sharing the Faith* (London: DLT, 1996), 97-102
WILLIAMS, R.D., *On Christian Theology* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2000)
WILLIAMS, R.D., *Anglican Identities* (London: DLT, 2004)

WILLIAMS, R.D., 'Eastern Orthodox Theology', in: D.F. Ford with R. Muers (eds.), *The Modern Theologians: An Introduction to Christian Theology since 1918*, Third Edition (Oxford: Blackwell, 2005), 572-588

WILLIAMS, R.D., *Tokens of Trust: An Introduction to Christian Belief* (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 2007)

WINKLER, G., & R. MESSNER, 'Überlegungen zu den methodischen und wissenschaftstheoretischen Grundlagen der Liturgiewissenschaft', *Theologische Quartalschrift* 178 (1998), 229-243

WIRIX, J.L., 'De *ecclesia primitiva*: een spiegel voor de kerk van nu!', in: J. Hallebeek & J.L. Wirix (eds.), *Met het oog op morgen. Ecclesiologische beschouwingen aangeboden aan Jan Visser* (Zoetermeer: Boekencentrum, 1996), 233-241

[WITVLIET, J.TH.], 'De moderne oecumenische beweging en haar historisch-maatschappelijke context', in: L.A. Hoedemaker, A.W.J. Houtepen, J.Th. Witvliet, *Oecumene als leerproces. Inleiding in de oecumenica* (Utrecht-Leiden: IIMO, 1993), 29-45

WOOD, S.K., *Spiritual Exegesis and the Church in the Theology of Henri de Lubac* (Grand Rapids MI: Eerdmans; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1998)

WOOD, S.K., 'Participatory Knowledge of God in the Liturgy', *Studia Liturgica* 29 (1999), 29-52

WRIGHT, J.R., 'Heritage and Vision: The Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral', in: J.R. Wright (ed.), *Quadrilateral at One Hundred: Essays on the Centenary of the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral 1886/88-1986/88* (Cincinnati OH: Forward Movement Publications; London-Oxford: Mowbray, 1988), 8-46

ZIZIOULAS, J.D., *Eucharist, Bishop, Church: The Unity of the Church in the Divine Eucharist and the Bishop during the First Three Centuries* (Brookline MA: Holy Cross Orthodox Press, 2001 [Greek original: 1965])

ZIZIOULAS, J.D., *L'être ecclésial* (Genève: Labor et fides, 1981)

ZIZIOULAS, J.D., *Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church* (Crestwood NY: SVSP, 1985)

ZIZIOULAS, J.D., *Communion and Otherness: Further Studies in Personhood and the Church*, edited by P. McPartlan (London-New York: T&T Clark, 2006)

SAMENVATTING

Christelijke kerken zijn te definiëren vanuit verschillende invalshoeken. Deze studie probeert een kerkvisie te ontwikkelen vanuit de optiek van de gemeenschappelijke viering van de kerkgemeenschap: de liturgie. Welke ecclesiologische inzichten vloeien voort uit het heuristische uitgangspunt dat de liturgie het centrum van het kerkzijn is? Een uit dergelijke inzichten opgebouwde kerkvisie kan een 'liturgische ecclesiologie' (Lathrop) worden genoemd. Methodisch bevindt deze studie zich daarmee op het snijvlak van de systematisch-theologische oecumenische ecclesiologie en de systematisch-theologische tak van de liturgiewetenschap, de zogenaamde 'liturgische theologie'.

Een liturgische ecclesiologie verstaat zich als een variant van de 'eucharistische ecclesiologie' die zich, stammend uit de orthodoxie, in de tweede helft van de twintigste eeuw in brede kringen van de oecumene een relevante plaats heeft verworven. Daarom behelst het grootste deel van deze dissertatie een inventarisatie van de liturgisch-ecclesiologische bevindingen van circa 25 twintigste-eeuwse theologen uit verschillende landen en kerkgenootschappen. Deze beschrijving en analyse is ingedeeld op basis van de kerkelijke achtergrond van de auteurs: achtereenvolgens komen orthodoxe, rooms-katholieke, oud-katholieke, anglicaanse en protestantse theologen aan het woord. Daarnaast wordt ook een zevental oecumenische dialoogteksten behandeld. Zo ontstaat een overzicht van wat er in de breedte van de oecumene aan liturgisch-ecclesiologisch gedachtegoed is ontwikkeld in met name de periode 1930-2000.

Als geestelijk vader van de eucharistische ecclesiologie geldt de russisch-orthodoxe theoloog Nicolas Afanassieff (1893-1966). Zijn ontwerp van een 'eucharistische' ecclesiologie is expliciet bedoeld als alternatief voor de 'universele' rooms-katholieke ecclesiologie. 'Eucharistisch' staat bij Afanassieff dan ook voor de verworteling in de lokale kerk rond de lokale bisschop. De grieks-orthodoxe theoloog en metropoliet Johannis Zizioulas (geb. 1931) heeft de aanzetten van Afanassieff filosofisch-theologisch verdiept en oecumenisch verbreed. Het eerste met name door een (neo-) patristisch persoonsconcept te presenteren dat zich bevindt tussen individualisme en collectivisme en dat de *koinonia* in Christus en tussen mensen antropologisch verankert. Het tweede vooral door de lokale kerk intrinsiek te verbinden met alle andere lokale kerken, zodat het accent op de lokale kerk het universele verband van kerken niet langer uit- maar insluit. Het denken van Afanassieff en

Zizioulas geldt in deze dissertatie niet alleen genealogisch maar ook theologisch als richtinggevend.

In de rooms-katholieke kerk is de eucharistische ecclesiologie vooral bekend geworden door het adagium *L'Eucharistie fait l'Eglise* van de Franse jezuïet Henri de Lubac (1896-1991). Ook wordt zijn historisch-theologische studie *Corpus Mysticum* (1944) nog altijd aangehaald als het gaat om de relatie tussen Christus, de eucharistie en de kerk. Alledrie zijn 'lichaam van Christus', de één niet minder werkelijk (*verum*) dan de ander: historisch/verrezen, sacramenteel (*mysticum*) en ecclesiaal. De Duitse theoloog Joseph Ratzinger (geb. 1927)—de huidige bisschop van Rome, Benedictus XVI—is eveneens een aanhanger van de eucharistische ecclesiologie, zij het dat deze bij hem niet leidt tot een nadruk op de lokale kerk. Hoewel de bijbels-theologische fundamenten van zijn ecclesiologie (zoals Exodus en Pasen, 'volk Gods' en 'lichaam van Christus', de vervulling van het priesterlijke en het profetische in Christus) een grote relevantie hebben voor een oecumenische eucharistische ecclesiologie, staan deze bij hem—hoewel daarmee niet altijd intrinsiek verbonden—in het kader van een universele ecclesiologie, die weliswaar niet zijn theologische drijfveren maar wel zijn kerkpolitieke opvattingen dicteert. Als tegenvoeter fungeert de Braziliaanse theoloog Leonardo Boff (geb. 1938). Hoewel deze met zijn bevrijdingstheologie en zijn radicaal lokale kerkvisie tot geheel andere conclusies komt dan Ratzinger, is er niettemin verwantschap in de trinitarische aanzet, het *communio*-denken en de nadruk op sacramentaliteit. In dit hoofdstuk geeft een beschouwing over Boffs sacramentele denken bovendien aanleiding tot het analyseren van verwantschap en verschil tussen een ecclesiologie van 'de kerk als sacrament' en een eucharistische ecclesiologie. De Frans-Canadese dominicaan en oecumenicus Jean-Marie Tillard (1927-2000) was een belangrijk promotor van de *communio*-ecclesiologie. Een dergelijke ecclesiologie bezit in het oecumenische discours een sterke actualiteit, hoewel de (schijnbare) consensus rond het *communio*- of *koinonia*-begrip dient te worden genuanceerd door te onderscheiden hoe verschillende auteurs aan dit concept uiteenlopende betekenissen en gevolgtrekkingen hechten (Healy). Bij Tillard is het *communio*-begrip bijbels-theologisch en patristisch geworteld en dient het een kerkvisie die, hoewel herkenbaar rooms-katholiek, de grenzen zo wijd mogelijk trekt en de definities—niet in de laatste plaats die van het primaat van de bisschop van Rome—zo oecumenisch mogelijk formuleert. Daarmee biedt het denken van Tillard menige aanzet voor de oecumenische liturgische ecclesiologie die in het slothoofdstuk van deze studie wordt geschetst.

Een afzonderlijk hoofdstuk is gewijd aan oud-katholieke liturgische of eucharistische ecclesiologie. Dit hangt niet alleen samen met de eigen achtergrond van de auteur, maar ook met het feit dat de recente ecclesiologische preambule bij het statuut van de Internationale Oud-Katholieke Bisschoppen-conferentie (2001) een schoolvoorbeeld is van eucharistisch-ecclesiologische formuleringen en uitgangspunten. In dit hoofdstuk van de dissertatie wordt

onderzocht in hoeverre deze eucharistische ecclesiologie te vinden is in het werk van een aantal belangrijke twintigste-eeuwse oud-katholieke theologen. Geconcludeerd wordt dat dit nog niet het geval is bij de Nederlandse theoloog en aartsbisschop Andreas Rinkel (1889-1979) en de Zwitserse theoloog en bisschop Urs Küry (1901-1976), hoewel eerstgenoemde aanzetten vertoont in de richting van een kerkvisie die vanuit de eucharistische viering wordt opgebouwd. De omslag in de richting van een volwaardige neo-patristische eucharistische ecclesiologie is, niet toevallig, te vinden bij iemand die intensief in de dialoog met de orthodoxe kerk betrokken was: de Duitse theoloog Werner Küppers (1905-1980). Bij hem is de liturgische viering paradigmatisch voor het denken over kerk, sacrament en ambt. Op geheel eigen wijze komt de Zwitserse theoloog Kurt Stalder (1912-1996) tot vergelijkbare conclusies. Hij plaatst een conciliaire, episcopaal-synodale, eucharistische en lokaalkerkelijk georiënteerde ecclesiologie in het kader van een bijbels-theologische geloofsvisie die het herstel van 'gemeenschap' beschouwt als de kern van de soteriologie. In het spoor van Stalder, maar met een eigen hermeneutische inbreng vanuit de praktische theologie, komt de Nederlandse theoloog Jan Visser (geb. 1931) tot een hedendaagse verwoording van een lokaalkerkelijk, rond eucharistie en bisschop gecentreerd kerkmodel. Het oud-katholieke hoofdstuk besluit met een analyse van het werk van de Zwitserse theologen Herwig Aldenhoven (1933-2002) en Urs von Arx (geb. 1943). Hun systematisch-theologisch verankerde ontwerpen plaatsen de oud-katholieke ecclesiologische uitgangspunten in het kader van een oecumenische eucharistische ecclesiologie, waarin ook—voor de oud-katholieke identiteit interessant—de recentere oecumenische perspectieven op het primaat van de bisschop van Rome zijn verwerkt.

Het anglicaanse hoofdstuk—dat zich beperkt tot Engelse auteurs—is opgebouwd uit twee gedeelten. Het eerste deel richt zich op de tijd rond de jaren '30, een periode waarin in alle kerken tot dan toe ongekende ontdekkingen werden gedaan op bijbels-theologisch, patristisch, liturgisch en oecumenisch gebied. Gabriel Hebert (1886-1963) en de mede door hem geïnitieerde *Parish Communion*-beweging trachtte (niet zonder succes) vanuit ecclesiologische beginselen het gemeenschapskarakter van de liturgie en daarmee samenhangend het primaat van de eucharistie op zondagmorgen in het anglicaanse bewustzijn te doen herleven. Tot deze beweging behoorde ook de benedictijn Gregory Dix (1901-1952), wiens werk *The Shape of the Liturgy* (1945) beroemd geworden is onder liturgisten, maar niet minder van belang is voor ecclesiologen. Eén van zijn interessante beschouwingen betreft de breuk tussen vroegkerkelijke en middeleeuwse—en met name de continuïteit tussen middeleeuwse, reformatorische en contra-reformatorische—uitgangspunten op theologisch, ecclesiologisch en liturgisch terrein. Dit deel wordt besloten met een beschouwing van het ecclesiologische denken van theoloog en aartsbisschop Michael Ramsey (1904-1988), die zijn anglo-katholieke theologie trachtte te verbinden met en verankeren in bijbels-theologische uitgangspunten die destijds

als het prerogatief van evangelischen werden beschouwd. Dit kenmerk van Ramsey's denken geeft bovendien aanleiding tot een excurs over evangelische theologie (Bradshaw). In het tweede gedeelte van dit hoofdstuk worden drie hedendaagse anglicaanse theologen behandeld. Paul Avis (geb. 1947) is een richtinggevend ecclesioloog die, onder andere via een genuanceerde kritiek op tendensen in het anglo-katholieke denken, uitkomt bij een volwaardige oecumenische liturgische of eucharistische ecclesiologie. Boeiend is dat ook de veelgeroemde theoloog en huidige aartsbisschop van Canterbury, Rowan Williams (geb. 1950), een liturgische ecclesiologie vertegenwoordigt. Juist doordat Williams een zeer kritische theologie en ecclesiologie hanteert, is de rol die hij aan de sacramentele viering toekent veelzeggend: alleen daarin komt tot uitdrukking wat de kerk ten diepste is en in de praktijk zou moeten zijn. Tenslotte vertegenwoordigt de theologe Catherine Pickstock (geb. 1970) een 'post-seculiere' variant van een liturgische, doxologische visie op kerk en wereld. Vanuit de beweging *Radical Orthodoxy* presenteert zij een filosofisch, antropologisch en theologisch ontwerp waarin de liturgie een cruciale plaats heeft.

De verschillende kerken van het protestantisme gelden niet als bakermat van liturgische ecclesiologie. Inderdaad ziet een deel van het protestantisme zich eerder als het 'niet-sacramentele alternatief' (White). Toch hebben de bijbels-theologische, (neo-) patristische, liturgische en oecumenische bewegingen het protestantisme niet onberoerd gelaten. In dit hoofdstuk worden voorbeelden gegeven van liturgisten en theologen die, hoewel niet representatief voor het gehele protestantisme, een protestantse variant bieden van een liturgische ecclesiologie. Op twee 'zijpanelen' komt een aantal Nederlandse theologen naar voren. Ten eerste wordt de discussie tussen Oepke Noordmans (1871-1956) en Gerardus van der Leeuw (1890-1950), een liturgische-theologische klassieker, geanalyseerd vanuit een systematisch-theologische invalshoek. Zo komen definitieverschillen aan het licht op het gebied van christologie en pneumatologie, sacramentaliteit en liturgie, die niet alleen prototypisch zijn voor het intern-protestantse debat, maar ook paradigmatisch voor theologische stromingen dwars door de oecumene heen. Ten tweede wordt in het werk van de praktisch-theologen Albert Ploeger (geb. 1937) en Joke Ploeger-Grotegoed (geb. 1941) een hedendaagse vertolking aangetroffen van een kerkvisie die liturgie en diakonaat beschouwt als twee polen van een ecclesiologische ellips. Op het 'middenpaneel' van dit hoofdstuk figureren drie internationaal en oecumenisch bekende protestantse liturgisten: de Zwitserse gereformeerde Jean-Jacques von Allmen (1917-1994), die het protestantisme, niet in de laatste plaats de reformatorische ambtsopvatting, 'herleest' tegen de achtergrond van de vroege kerk, de Brits-Amerikaanse methodist Geoffrey Wainwright (geb. 1939), die vooral bekend is geworden door zijn op de wisselwerking tussen *lex orandi* en *lex credendi* gebaseerde systematische theologie *Doxology* (1980) en wiens oecumenisch georiënteerde liturgische

ecclesiologie hier wordt geanalyseerd, en de Amerikaanse lutheraan Gordon Lathrop (geb. 1939), aan wie deze dissertatie niet alleen de term *liturgical ecclesiology* ontleent, maar wiens gedachten over *juxtaposition* ook inhoudelijk richtinggevend zijn voor deze studie: alleen door de in de liturgie voltrokken naast-elkaar-plaatsing van aspecten van het christelijk geloof (zoals Schrift en Tafel, zondag en de week, Pasen en het jaar, smeekbede en lofprijzing) worden deze op zich eenzijdige aspecten zodanig 'gebroken' dat zij hun werkelijk christelijke betekenis ontvangen.

Zoals uit de voorgaande hoofdstukken blijkt, opent een benadering van de ecclesiologie vanuit de liturgie of eucharistie perspectieven voor oecumenische toenadering. In een afzonderlijk hoofdstuk wordt daarom een aantal ecclesiologische rapporten van de Commissie voor *Faith and Order* van de Wereldraad van Kerken bestudeerd, evenals twee bilaterale dialoogteksten. De beschouwing start met het bekendste document van F&O: het 'Limarapport' *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* (1982), waarin de liturgisch-ecclesiologische invalshoek onmiskenbaar is. Interessant genoeg geldt dit ook voor *Church and World* (1990), een document waarin het theologische eenheidsstreven van de Wereldraad wordt gekoppeld aan haar maatschappelijke betrokkenheid. Zo komt, overigens niet voor het eerst, de meer-dan-liturgische reikwijdte van de liturgie aan het licht. Ook in de oecumenische uitleg van het credo van Nicea, *Confessing the One Faith* (1991), is de liturgisch- of eucharistisch-ecclesiologische inzet herkenbaar. In *Towards Koinonia in Faith, Life and Witness* (1993) wordt voor het eerst de invloed van een minder op gemeenschap en meer op individuele bekering gerichte theologie merkbaar. Die invloed breekt opmerkelijk door in het meest recente document *The Nature and Mission of the Church* (2005), zoals een analyse van dit document in relatie tot de laatste proefversie aantoont. Hoe deze verschuiving ook te waarderen is, zij zal in elk geval fundamenteler dienen te worden geïntegreerd in het tot op heden gangbare denken van F&O. Tenslotte, in de twee bestudeerde bilatere dialoogteksten—die tussen de anglicaanse en rooms-katholieke kerken (ARCIC) en die tussen de orthodoxe en oud-katholieke kerken—is het liturgisch- en eucharistisch-ecclesiologisch gedachtegoed in sterke mate aanwezig. Daarbij is de eerstgenoemde tekstreeks vooral opvallend vanwege de plaats die de bisschop van Rome erin ontvangt, de tweede vooral vanwege het thema intercommunie in een consequent toegepast eucharistisch-ecclesiologisch concept.

Dit overzicht brengt een grote mate van convergentie aan het licht ten aanzien van belangrijke ecclesiologische uitgangspunten. Tevens wordt duidelijk welke nuances er *tussen*, maar evenzeer *binnen*, de kerkelijke tradities bestaan. De gesignaleerde convergentie is dikwijls terug te voeren op een aantal met elkaar verweven stromingen uit het interbellum, die van fundamenteel belang zijn gebleken voor de ontwikkeling van de theologie tot op dit moment: de patristische herontdekkingsbeweging, de liturgische beweging en de oecumenische beweging. Zij bemiddelen een theologische denktrant die in deze

studie meestal (naar Florovsky) 'neo-patristisch' wordt genoemd—omdat deze zich baseert op vroegkerkelijk denken maar met het oog op vragen in het heden—en die anders is dan zowel de voorafgaande neo-scholastiek als de 'moderne' theologie.

In een uitvoerig slothoofdstuk wordt het 'materiaal' uit de voorafgaande hoofdstukken gebruikt als bouwsteen voor een liturgische *koinonia*-ecclesiologie in oecumenisch perspectief. Hierbij dient een sacramenteel, participatorisch *koinonia*-begrip tot uitgangspunt. Dit begrip wordt bijbels-theologisch gefundeerd in de drie-eenheid, de verzoening door Christus en het werk van de Geest. Zo worden God en mens, kerk en wereld, gezien als prinicipieel gericht op (herstel van) eenheid in verscheidenheid. De kerk is van deze eenheid de voorlopige realisering, de eucharistie het belangrijkste paradigma.

Voorwaarde voor een dergelijke ecclesiologie is een visie op Christus die principieel pneumatologisch en (dus) eschatologisch en sacramenteel is. Door de Geest is Jezus Christus een eschatologisch persoon, die als eenheid in verscheidenheid de zijnen in zijn lichaam opneemt. Daarom kan de kerk *totus Christus* worden genoemd: de gehele Christus bestaat uit het hoofd (Christus) en het lichaam (de kerk). Deze intieme verbinding tussen Christus en de kerk wordt alleen daardoor niet tot een heilloze identificatie, dat zij sacramenteel en eschatologisch van aard is. Zo blijft Christus zelf degene die beoordeelt of de kerk wel 'is' wie zij 'zal zijn'.

De initiatie tot deze *koinonia* met Christus is de doop. De doop is incorporatie in Christus en zijn lichaam en daarmee niet van goddelijke maar wel van menselijke zijde de noodzakelijke voorwaarde voor het behoren tot de kerk (wat niet synoniem is met de voorwaarde voor het verwerven van het heil). Daarmee is de doop in principe ook de incorporatie in de eucharistische *koinonia*, die de kerk is. De doop is tevens de basis van de oecumene, want zij is 'de wijdste grens der éne kerk' (Rinkel). Van die kerk is de eucharistie het hart. Dit roept de vraag op naar de 'toelating' tot de communie. Zolang de christelijke kerk is gespleten in verschillende kerkgemeenschappen, ontkomt niemand aan een inconsistentie: ofwel de inconsistentie van het weigeren van de eucharistische gemeenschap aan hen die door de doop tot de kerkgemeenschap behoren, ofwel de inconsistentie van een eucharistische gemeenschap die niet samenvalt met een zichtbare kerkgemeenschap. In het besef van deze inconsistentie dient een praktijkoplossing zich aan: kiezen voor de 'geringste anomalie' (Wainwright) van eucharistische gemeenschap bij nog niet volledig gerealiseerde kerkgemeenschap. Het onthouden van de eucharistie aan gedoopte medechristenen zou de grootste anomalie zijn.

Het heuristische uitgangspunt van een liturgische ecclesiologie is dat alles wat over de kerk kan worden gezegd, uit de liturgische viering is af te leiden. In die lijn denkend introduceerde Afanassieff zijn 'topologische' ambtsopvatting.

Deze behelst dat de betekenis van het ambt is af te leiden uit de (letterlijke en figuurlijke) 'plaats' die de ambtsdrager tijdens de liturgische viering inneemt. Daarbij is—zoals steeds in een liturgische ecclesiologie of een ecclesiale liturgie—het uitgangspunt niet de eenvoudige viering van de gemeente met één voorganger die alles 'doet', maar de feestelijke viering waarin velerlei ambten en charismata een aandeel hebben. Temidden van zo'n viering (waarbij iedereen op grond van de doop 'in Christus is' en Christus vertegenwoordigt) bekleedt de 'voorganger' de plaats die aan Christus toebehoort en die ook door de apostelen werd waargenomen, namelijk de plaats van Christus als hoofd van zijn lichaam. Heel de gemeente viert ('celebreert') dus *in persona Christi*, maar de voorganger gaat in de viering voor *in persona Christi capitis*. Van daaruit is het kerkelijk ambt te definiëren als 'voorgangerschap' in coördinerende, stimulerende maar ook verifiërende zin. De taak van ambtsdragers *buiten* de liturgie laat zich definiëren als uitvloeisel van het liturgisch voorgangerschap, waarbij dezelfde kenmerken van toepassing zijn. Voor de concrete oecumenische ambtspraktijk wordt in deze studie het voorstel van het Limarapport opgepakt, om de vroegkerkelijke ambten van de ene bisschop, het presbyterium en de diakens te 'herlezen' als model voor een verenigde kerk van nu. Daarbij wordt, uitgaande van het principe dat de vierende gemeenschap de constitutieve factor in de (liturgische) ecclesiologie is, het bisschopsambt gepresenteerd als een lokaal (in de praktijk beperkt regionaal) ambt, en het 'bisdom' als een kleine regio die enerzijds groot genoeg is om *leitourgia*, *diakonia* en *martyria* serieus vorm te geven, maar die anderzijds klein genoeg is om zichzelf als eucharistische gemeenschap rond de bisschop te ervaren. Tenslotte wordt ingegaan op het oecumenische vraagstuk van de 'apostolische successie', die wordt opgevat in de ruime zin van 'apostolische traditie', waarbij echter de persoonlijke belichaming van deze traditie in de zin van de klassieke bisschoppelijke 'successie' als een onderdeel van de 'apostolische traditie' wordt gezien.

Een ander oecumenisch struikelblok waarvoor een liturgische ecclesiologie een opening biedt, is de verhouding tussen de lokale kerk en de (uiteindelijk universele) *communio* van lokale kerken. Enerzijds is elke lokale kerk een volwaardige katholieke kerk die de volheid van haar ('intrinsieke') katholiciteit viert in de eucharistie. Anderzijds is zij, in een niet-competitieve simultaneïteit, juist door de viering van dezelfde eucharistie verbonden met alle andere lokale eucharistische gemeenschappen. De eucharistie is dus de eerste verbinding tussen 'lokaal' en 'bovenlokaal' of 'universeel' in de ecclesiologie. De tweede verbinding vormen de voorgangers in de eucharistie, de bisschoppen. Doordat zij hun kerk voorgaan vormen zij tevens de schakel tussen deze kerk en de andere kerken. De bisschoppen geven deze gemeenschap concrete gestalte door de polariteit (die geen tegenstelling is) tussen conciliariteit en primaat. Op elk denkbaar niveau in de bovenlokale gemeenschappen van kerken is er zowel conciliair beraad als primaat. Voor het primaat geldt hetzelfde als voor het

liturgisch voorgangerschap: het heeft een coördinerende, stimulerende maar ook verifiërende taak; het is dus geen strikt ceremoniële functie, maar brengt een inhoudelijke verantwoordelijkheid en dus ook competentie met zich mee. Op het wereldwijde niveau wordt dit primaat uitgeoefend door de bisschop van de lokale kerk van Rome. De huidige opvatting en invulling van dat primaat past echter nog niet in een oecumenische *communio*-ecclesiologie.

Het is tenslotte van belang te signaleren dat een liturgische ecclesiologie niet duidt op een rituele reductie van het kerkzijn of op een uitsluitend binnenkerkelijk oriëntatie. Juist het 'centrum' van een liturgische ecclesiologie—de viering van doop, Schrift en eucharistie—wijst 'centrifugaal' van zich af. Daarom is het geen depreciatie van de 'marge' om de liturgie als 'centrum' aan te wijzen. De eucharistische liturgie nodigt uit tot een steeds wijder delen van Gods goede gaven, hetgeen zowel een missionaire als een diakonale kant heeft. De liturgie nodigt uit tot een voortzetting van de liturgie in een 'eucharistische ethiek' en een 'doxologische levensattitude'.

CURRICULUM VITAE

Mattijs Ploeger was born in 1970 in the village of Westervoort, the Netherlands. He attended the *Christelijk Atheneum* (later a part of the *Van Lingen College*), Arnhem, and was educated as an amateur organist. From 1989 he studied at the Theological Faculty of Leiden University (MA 1996), and acted as organist and choirmaster in the Old Catholic church of St Frederick & St Odulph, Leiden. Meanwhile he was being trained for the ministry at the Reformed Seminary, Leiden, and at the Old Catholic Seminary, Utrecht (certificate 1998). Additionally, he spent five months at the Anglican theological college Westcott House, Cambridge.

From 1998 to 2002, he worked as an assistant pastor in the Old Catholic parish of St Agnes, Egmond, where he was ordained to the diaconate and the presbyterate in 1999. He was also assistant archivist of the Old Catholic Church of the Netherlands, Amersfoort (1998-2000), a staff member of the annual Conference for Liturgy and Church Music of the Protestant Church in the Netherlands (1999-2005), and managing editor of *Eredienstvaardig*, a Dutch ecumenical journal for liturgy and church music (2001-2002). From August 2002 to September 2007 the Old Catholic Seminary, affiliated to Utrecht University, employed him as a half-time research assistant. In the same period he was parish priest of St Nicholas's, Krommenie, with St Mary Magdalene's, Zaandam, and assistant organist at St Agnes's, Egmond.

Mattijs Ploeger is currently the parish priest of St Agnes's, Egmond. Additionally, he is a member of the editorial board of *Eredienstvaardig*, a member of the *Liturgie Kamer* (Liturgy Chamber) of the Professor Dr G. van der Leeuw-Stichting and a member of the *Genootschap voor Liturgiestudie* (Society for the Study of the Liturgy). Mattijs Ploeger is married to Astrid Kromhout and father of Stijn (2003) and Sem (2005).