

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

“Active Participation of the Local Church in the Enactment of the Eucharist in the Thought  
Of Edward J. Kilmartin”

A DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Faculty of the  
School of Theology and Religious Studies  
Of The Catholic University of America  
In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree

Doctor of Sacred Theology

©

Copyright

All Rights Reserved

By

Rejimon Varghese

Washington, DC

2012

“Active Participation of The Local Church in the Enactment of the Eucharist  
In the Thought of Edward J. Kilmartin”

Rejimon Varghese, S.T.D

Director: Kevin W. Irwin, S.T.D

This study investigates the pneumatological-Christological understanding of active eucharistic participation as articulated by the twentieth-century American theologian Edward J. Kilmartin, S. J.

Based on a Trinitarian model of theology in connection with the insight gained from the ancient eucharistic prayers (participation in the *transitus* of Jesus to the Father), Kilmartin develops the notion of interior participation as emphasized by the Fathers at the Second Vatican Council (1962-65). He thus provides a “theological” approach to the “full, conscious, and active” participation as succinctly articulated by the Fathers at the Council.

The participation by believers in the covenantal relationship with God, in and through the eucharistic celebration, necessarily involves a union with Christ. Kilmartin explains this union by establishing a strong pneumatological connection between Christ and believers resulting from the bestowal model of the Trinity. This union with Christ in the Spirit allows Kilmartin to demonstrate a parallel between Jesus’ life of faith and the life of faith required of believers. It is the Holy Spirit, whom Christ sends to his Church, which is represented by the liturgical assembly (the ordained priest and the believers) in the eucharistic celebration, that becomes the Spirit of the Church. This Spirit enables the liturgical assembly to participate fully in the mind of Christ through appropriating the sacrificial attitudes of Christ.

With Kilmartin’s description of participation in “the Spirit of the faith of Christ” which this study explores and presents, a better understanding of the notion of active

participation in the Eucharist can be attained in response to Vatican II exhortations as outlined in *Sacrosanctum Concilium* and *Lumen Gentium*. Furthermore, Kilmartin's comprehensive theological treatment of the subject grounded in the Trinitarian model is capable of including the various elements of active participation of Y. Congar, F. McManus, M. Collins, and J. Lamberts as treated in this study. This dissertation, therefore, argues that Kilmartin has made a significant contribution to the notion of active eucharistic participation in the post-Vatican II era.

This dissertation by Rejimon Varghese fulfills the dissertation requirement for the doctoral degree in the School of Theology and Religious Studies approved by Kevin W. Irwin, S.T.D., as Director, and by Dominic E. Serra, S.L.D., and Michael G. Witczak, S.L.D., as Readers.

---

Kevin W. Irwin, S.T.D., Director

---

Dominic E. Serra, S.L.D., Reader

---

Michael G. Witczak, S.L.D., Reader

## **DEDICATION**

To my brother Fr. Sojan Varghese, S.V.D., who was called in 2006 to join in the eternal communion with the Triune God. It was he who, a lover of the Eucharist and a scholar of eucharistic theology, introduced Edward J. Kilmartin to me.

## CONTENTS

	Page
<b>DEDICATION .....</b>	<b>iii</b>
<b>ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....</b>	<b>xi</b>
<b>GENERAL INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>1</b>
Chapter	
<b>I. UNDERSTANDING OF THE CHURCH AND THE EUCHARISTIC LITURGY BEFORE AND AFTER THE SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL .....</b>	<b>14</b>
Introduction .....	14
<b>Image of the Church and the Practice of the Eucharistic Liturgy     From Trent Until Vatican II .....</b>	<b>15</b>
<i>Societas Perfecta</i> Ecclesiology and its Theological Consequences .....	16
Theological Shift in the Church's Self-Understanding From Juridical to Eucharistic Ecclesiology .....	24
Pre-Vatican II Eucharistic Liturgy and its Theological Consequences .....	32
Rediscovery of the True Nature of the Liturgy as the Grounding for Active Participation .....	35
<b>Local Church in Vatican II and the Post-Vatican II Teachings     of the Magisterium .....</b>	<b>41</b>
The Diocesan Episcopal Eucharistic Community as the True Manifestation of the Church of Christ .....	42
Eucharist and Episcopasy: Two Principal Constitutive Elements of the Church at the Local Level .....	45

Relationship of the Local Church to the Universal Church: <i>in Quibus et ex Quibus</i> Principle .....	52
<b>Eucharistic Participation of the Local Church in Vatican II and the Post-Vatican II Teachings of the Magisterium</b> .....	55
The Operative Principle: Local Church as the Active Subject of its Eucharistic Celebration .....	57
The Local Church's Making Memory of the Paschal Mystery of Christ as Active Participation .....	59
The Local Church's Sacramental Sacrificial Offering of Christ and Sacramental Communion as Active Participation .....	65
Conclusion .....	71
 <b>II. DIVERSE INTERPRETATIONS OF ACTIVE PARTICIPATION BY THEOLOGAINS</b> .....	73
Introduction .....	73
<b>Yves Congar: Celebration of the Integration of Life and Public Worship Through Priesthood and Sacrifice</b> .....	74
Notions of Priesthood and Sacrifice in General .....	77
Distinctions Between the Inward and External Cults and the Corresponding Priesthoods of the Faithful .....	82
Relationship Between the Two Cults and Their Priesthoods and Their Incorporation into a Single Cult and Priesthood .....	89
Summary .....	105
<b>Frederick McManus: Symbolic Activity as Participation in the Mystery of Christ</b> .....	106
Silence as Liturgical Activity of the Assembly .....	107
External Signs as Liturgical Activity of the Assembly .....	110

<b>Mary Collins: Being Attentive to the Mystery We Celebrate .....</b>	<b>112</b>
Eucharistic Liturgy as Corporate Public Ritual Activity . .....	113
Contemplative Participation .....	116
<b>Jozef Lamberts: Act of Communion as the Summit of Active     Participation .....</b>	<b>119</b>
Act of Communion: Literal Participation in the Sacrifice of Christ and an Actions of Confession of Faith .....	119
Act of Communion: Readiness to Participate in the Mission of the Church...	121
Conclusion .....	122
 <b>III. INFLUENCE OF <i>MYSTERIENGEGENWART</i> THEOLOGY ON     KILMARTIN IN CONSTRUCTIONG A THEOLOGY OF THE     CHURCH’S EUCHARISTIC PARTICIPATION .....</b>	<b>124</b>
Introduction .....	124
<b>A Glance at Kilmartin’s Life .....</b>	<b>125</b>
Education and Ministry .....	126
Trinitarian Approach to Liturgy .....	131
Emphasis on Local Church .....	134
<b>Influence of <i>Mysteriengegenwart der Heilstat Christi</i> Theology on         Kilmartin Concerning the Church’s Participation in         Christ’s Sacrifice .....</b>	<b>141</b>
Odo Casel: Participation by the Liturgical Assembly in the “Objectively” Present Redemptive Acts of Christ in the Celebration of the Eucharist ...	145
Summary .....	165
Viktor Warnach: <i>Transitus</i> of Christ to the Father—the Kernel of the Mystery .....	166



Gottlieb Söhngen: “Presence of Redemptive Acts in and through Effects” and the Church’s Participation in the Mystery of Salvation Through Conformity to Christ by Faith .....	168
Pope Pius XII: Eucharistic Celebration as Act of Christ and Church .....	176
<b>Post-Caselian Influence on Kilmartin Concerning Church’s Participation in Christ’s Sacrifice .....</b>	<b>180</b>
Hans Urs von Balthasar: Church’s Participation in the Faith of Christ .....	181
Brian McNamara: Church’s Participation in the Divine Plan of Salvation and in the Self-Offering Attitude of Christ .....	186
Johannes Betz: Church’s Sharing in the Presence of the Historical Sacrificial Act of Jesus in the Form of Food as Her Participation in the Sacrificial Act of Christ .....	193
Cesare Giraudo: Participation in the Representation of the <i>Transitus</i> of the Liturgical Assembly to the Father .....	196
Conclusion .....	199
 <b>IV. EUCHARISTIC PARTICIPATION IN THE SPIRIT OF THE FAITH OF CHRIST—APPROPRIATION OF THE SACRIFICIAL ATTITUDES OF CHRIST IN THE “GRACE OF CHRIST” .....</b>	 <b>203</b>
Introduction .....	203
<b>Early Indication for Situating the Liturgical Event within Trinitarian and Ecclesiological Dimensions .....</b>	<b>204</b>
Kilmartin’s Method: Principle of “Both”—Liturgical-Theological Integration .....	204
Sacramental Participation and Sanctification .....	218
“New Theological Components” of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy .....	231

<b>Setting the Context for a Spirit-Worked Active Participation From <i>Lex Orandi and Lex Credendi</i></b> .....	241
Content and Function of Early Eucharistic Prayers—Access to the the Authentic Eucharistic Theology .....	241
<i>New Testament Texts</i> .....	242
<i>Eucharistic Prayers</i> .....	247
Presence of the Elements of the Self-Offering of Jesus—Sacrificial Character of the Eucharist .....	259
Sacraments and Salvation History .....	278
<b>Constructing a “Theological” Approach Toward a Proper Mission of the Holy Spirit for Articulating Active Eucharistic Participation</b> .....	284
The Present State of Research on the Personal and Proper Mission of the Holy Spirit .....	285
Theology of the Liturgy as Theology of the Economic Trinity .....	311
<i>Liturgical-Theological Implications of the Correspondence     Between the Economic and Immanent Trinity</i> .....	322
<i>Procession Model and its Insufficiency for an Adequate     Description of Sanctification</i> .....	326
<i>Bestowal Model and its Complementary Function for an Adequate     Description of Sanctification</i> .....	333
Kilmartin’s Application of the Pneumatological Consequences of the Bestowal Model to Liturgical Theology .....	342
The Mystery of the Liturgy and its Celebration .....	357
<i>The Mystery of the Liturgy</i> .....	357
<i>The Liturgy Celebrated</i> .....	364
Salvation Historical-Liturgical Theology of the Eucharistic Sacrifice .....	369

<i>Being Present to the Salvific Acts of Christ in the Act of Anamnesis</i> .....	373
<i>Metaphysical Affirmation of the Presence of the Salvific Acts of Christ</i> .....	377
<i>Participating in the Mystery of God in Christ in the Spirit of the Faith of Christ</i> .....	381
Conclusion .....	402
<b>V. A CRITICAL EVALUATION OF KILMARTIN'S THEOLOGY</b> .....	406
Introduction .....	406
<b>Weakness of Kilmartin's Theology</b> .....	408
Reference and Linguistic Problems .....	408
Inaccurate Conclusions and Sweeping Statements.....	413
Methodological Issues .....	420
Relative Lack of Baptismal Theology .....	423
Further Limitations .....	425
<b>Kilmartin's Theological Contribution to Active Participation</b> .....	428
Methodology, Trinitarian Theology of Liturgy, and the Notion of Christian Sacrifice .....	428
Theological Ordering of the Modes of Christ's Presence in the Liturgy.....	435
Establishing a Strong "Connection" Between the Life and Faith of Christ and that of Believers .....	442
Eucharist as the Enactment of the Local Manifestation of the <i>Totus Christus</i> .....	448
Relation of the Act of Communion to the Sacrifice of Christ .....	452
Emphasis on Liturgical Symbol .....	453

Kilmartin's Influence on Theologians .....	456
Conclusion .....	462
<b>GENERAL CONCLUSION</b> .....	463
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b> .....	479

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

For me writing this dissertation was as much an academic exercise as it was spiritual nourishment. I humbly acknowledge that I could not have completed a work of this kind without the help of many. First and foremost, I thank God for being with me throughout this endeavor. Next, I thank my mentor Rev. Msgr. Kevin W. Irwin, S.T.D. for his academic guidance, friendship, and patience. In my numerous meetings with him, I personally experienced him as an inspiring scholar and priest and an understanding man. I also thank Rev. Dominic E. Serra, S.L.D. and Rev. Michael G. Wiczak, S.L.D. With their sharp eyes (and words of encouragement) they faithfully served as readers for the completion of this dissertation. I express gratitude to my S.V.D. Japan Province for allowing me to pursue my study at the Catholic University of America and to the S.V.D. Chicago Province for accommodating me. Last but not least, I thank all who helped me in one way or another, especially those who edited my manuscript at its various stages.

## GENERAL INTRODUCTION

*“The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ and the love of God and the communion of the Holy Spirit be with you all.”* (The Roman Missal, ICEL 2010, ed.)

This study investigates the pneumatological-Christological understanding of active eucharistic participation as articulated by the twentieth-century American liturgical-sacramental-theologian Edward J. Kilmartin, S. J. Kilmartin convincingly and skillfully spells out a participation in “the Spirit of the faith of Christ” (or in “the grace of Christ”) developed from a Trinitarian theology and occurring in the midst of the action of liturgical rites and prayers that has theological consequences for all sacramental celebrations, especially the Eucharist.

To invigorate the Christian life of the faithful, among other things, the Fathers at the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965) undertook the reform and promotion of the sacred liturgy of the Church in order to make it more consistent with the true and traditional sense of the liturgy as an ecclesial act, that is, an act of the liturgical assembly under the leadership of the presiding priest. With this goal in mind, they articulated, asserted, and emphasized the communal nature of the liturgy of the Church.<sup>1</sup> Active participation was the main goal of the

---

<sup>1</sup>I specifically refer to two magisterial documents of the Second Vatican Council, the Twenty-first Ecumenical Council of the Roman Catholic Church, convoked by Pope John XXIII but completed under the watch of Pope Paul VI: *Sacrosanctum Concilium* (also known as the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy) was promulgated on 4 December 1963; and *Lumen Gentium* (also known as Dogmatic Constitution on the Church) was promulgated on 21 November 1964. For Latin texts, see *Constitutio de sacra Liturgia (Sacrosanctum Concilium)*, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 56 (1964): 97-138; *Constitutio dogmatica de Ecclesia (Lumen Gentium)*, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 57 (1965): 5-75. For English translations, see Austin Flannery, ed., *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents* (Bandra, Bombay: St. Paul Publication, 1975), 21-52; 323-386. Unless otherwise mentioned, all

liturgical reform of the Church.<sup>2</sup> The reform was also based on the recognition that the liturgy is a sacred action by means of which, particularly “in the divine sacrifice of the Eucharist,” the work of our redemption is made a present reality and the faithful of God are enabled to witness to the mystery of Christ both in their lives and in the world.<sup>3</sup>

*Sacrosanctum Concilium* gives prominence to the subject of liturgical participation by calling for the “full, conscious, and active participation in liturgical celebrations”<sup>4</sup> of the Church. It acknowledges that the liturgy is the summit and font (*culmen et fons*) of the entire Christian life and the source for achieving “the sanctification of men in Christ and the glorification of God”<sup>5</sup> in the most effective way. It explains that the communal nature of the liturgy, the baptismal character of the Christian people, and the self-actualization of the Church in its liturgical celebrations demand this kind of participation.<sup>6</sup>

The Council Fathers thus succeeded in affirming and effecting a correct understanding of Catholic worship in which the liturgical assembly would be the active agent of the Church’s liturgical services. The formulations of the participation of the liturgical assembly in the eucharistic sacrifice raise the consciousness of the faithful to the fact that liturgical celebrations are actions of the entire liturgical assembly.<sup>7</sup> The faithful are urged to give thanks to God and to offer “the immaculate victim,” as well as themselves, together with

---

references hereafter made to these two documents as well as other various magisterial documents in this present work correspond to the article numbers of their English translations indicated in footnotes.

<sup>2</sup>See *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 14

<sup>3</sup>See *ibid.*, 2.

<sup>4</sup>*Ibid.*, 14.

<sup>5</sup>*Ibid.*, 10. Also see *Lumen Gentium*, 11.

<sup>6</sup>See *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 7, 14, 26.

<sup>7</sup>See *ibid.*, 48.

the ordained priest.<sup>8</sup> In short, all the faithful (clergy and laity alike) become the active agents, and for that matter the proper subject, of the liturgical action. But no specific explanation is offered how both the ordained priest and the baptized faithful offer the sacrifice together.

Josef Andreas Jungmann reports that the liturgical involvement desired and emphasized by the Council Fathers is “an interior participation, that is, a conscious participation elevating the heart and soul” which should find expression in, and be aided by, the exterior rite.<sup>9</sup> It is this understanding of participation that Kilmartin decided to deepen theologically. The Council opened the way for a deeper appreciation of the richness of both liturgical tradition and patristic sources which underlie that tradition. Kilmartin understood that the Church in the post-conciliar period was free to re-discover the fuller eucharistic faith of the ancient Church unaffected by any controversies. In 1973 he began studying ancient texts of eucharistic liturgies of the undivided Church to garner the authentic eucharistic faith as expressed in liturgical prayer situated in the broader context of Scripture and the thought of the Fathers of the Church. Kilmartin’s body of work in liturgical theology is notable for his attempt to integrate liturgy and theological reflection, his dialogue with the liturgical traditions of the Eastern Churches (especially the subject of the personal mission of the Holy Spirit), and his Trinitarian approach to Christian sacrifice and worship. Kilmartin’s well-

---

<sup>8</sup>See *ibid.*

<sup>9</sup>Josef Andreas Jungmann, “Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy,” in *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II*, vol. 1, ed. Herbert Vorgrimler, trans. Lalit Adolphus (New York: Herder and Herder, 1967), 35.



crafted pneumatological-Christological Trinitarian theology<sup>10</sup> supports the theology reflected in the *lex orandi* (Eucharistic Prayer) of the Church.<sup>11</sup>

Kilmartin begins his exposition of the Eucharist with its sacrificial dimension. He understands that the analytical model for this sacrificial dimension of the Eucharist should be derived from an analysis of the classical eucharistic prayers whose shape of meaning is essentially the same—renewal of the covenant. This approach, he contends, will help avoid constructing a concept of eucharistic sacrifice based on a history-of-religions sense that is foreign to the Christian economy of salvation. What would emerge from his analysis of the eucharistic prayers is the idea that the eucharistic celebration is the liturgical medium of participation in the single *transitus* (passing over) of Jesus to the Father. Kilmartin could not, however, find an explanation in the Eucharistic Prayer for how the representation of this *transitus* of Jesus is made through the ritual memorial. But the orientation of these prayers, from the ecclesial assembly to the Father, revealed to him that the eucharistic assembly is presented sacramentally to the once-for-all saving event accomplished in Jesus Christ for the salvation of the world.

In examining the New Testament institution narratives in the early eucharistic prayers, Kilmartin saw the establishment of the New Covenant as an important theme. He noted a twofold movement in Jesus' establishment of this covenant. Sent by the Father, Jesus invites

---

<sup>10</sup>“In order that we might be unceasingly renewed in him [Christ] (cf. Eph. 4:23), he has shared with us his Spirit who, being one and the same in head and members, gives life to, unifies and moves the whole body.” *Lumen Gentium*, 7.

<sup>11</sup>*Sacrosanctum Concilium* expresses the earnest desire of the Church that “through a good understanding of the rites and prayers they [the faithful] should take part in the sacred action, conscious of what they are doing, with devotion and full collaboration” when they celebrate the eucharistic sacrifice. *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 48. It should, however, be pointed out that Kilmartin differs from the overarching Christomonistic theology of this Constitution, especially as enunciated in article 7.

humankind to enter into his covenant with the Father. As the representative of the new humankind, Jesus' response to establishing the New Covenant between the Father and humankind is to become the response of all people. This covenantal relationship between humanity and God includes Jesus' person/actions and his relationship with the Father. Kilmartin, therefore, understands that humanity's participation in that covenantal relationship, in and through the celebration of the Eucharist, would necessarily involve a union with the person of the Son and so a union with the Father by virtue of the filial relationship of Jesus Christ. Kilmartin asserts that all eucharistic prayers, in one or other way, ask for a renewal of the covenant with the Father in Jesus Christ. He views the praise of God for the works of salvation and redemption as the request for a renewal of that covenantal relationship through the Church's union with Christ.

In order to support theologically these understandings of the eucharistic liturgy, Kilmartin realized the need for a greater integration of the Holy Spirit into the eucharistic theology, given that it had been noticeably absent in the West. A look at Kilmartin's bibliography reveals that much of what he published in the 1980's witnessed to his study of the role of the Holy Spirit in the eucharistic liturgy. In the process, he noted two things: the inadequacy of the traditional Trinitarian procession models (East and West) in considering the personal mission of the Holy Spirit; the need for a new model of the work of the Trinity to remedy this inadequacy. Kilmartin comes to embrace David Coffey's bestowal model of the Trinity. This model will serve as the pillar of Kilmartin's Trinitarian eucharistic theology because it will allow him to describe the personal mission of the Holy Spirit as mediation of

the personal immediacy of Christ to believers in the liturgical celebration. In other words, the Spirit unites Christ and believers.

The primary goal of Kilmartin's theological endeavor is to highlight the theology of the Trinity and its application to the Eucharist. In articulating a Trinitarian theology of liturgy, Kilmartin demonstrates that Christian worship should be understood as the self-communication of the Father in Christ through the Spirit and the response of faith of the liturgical assembly to this divine communication. He emphasizes that the mystery of the liturgy is the mystery of God's life and activity in history for the sanctification and salvation of humanity. At the same time, Kilmartin understands that the liturgy (Eucharist) is a human celebration. Hence, he develops a participation in the context of liturgical action that will respect the theological principle articulated in the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, namely, the need to hold together *lex orandi* (prayer) and *lex credendi* (theology). In the process, he makes more understandable the themes of eucharistic participation and the personal mission of the Spirit succinctly articulated in *Sacrosanctum Concilium* and *Lumen Gentium*.

Kilmartin relies on the procession and bestowal models of the Trinity for his theological reflection and uses them as the means by which he organizes and presents the various aspects of the mystery of Christ. He begins with the Trinitarian life *ad extra* (the economy of salvation) and applies it to the inner-Trinitarian life (*ad intra*) in order to demonstrate the principle of the consistency of God for liturgical theology. He articulates this consistency of God as the economic Trinity is the immanent Trinity and *vice versa*. After highlighting the complementary knowledge of the immanent and economic Trinity that results from each

model, he will apply that knowledge, in a systematic presentation, to a Trinitarian theology of the eucharistic liturgy.

While Kilmartin appreciates the importance of the procession model, he sees that in and of itself it is insufficient for an adequate liturgical theology. For him, the procession model is unable to clarify an important liturgical element of the process of human sanctification as corresponding to the sanctification and return of Jesus in the Spirit to the Father, as expressed and celebrated in the *lex orandi* of the classical eucharistic prayers. The answer is found in the bestowal model. This model, Kilmartin believed, will not only address the insufficiency of the procession model but also will give appropriate attention to the role of the Holy Spirit in the Trinity, the Church, and the liturgy, making possible a theological explanation of active participation.

Kilmartin begins with the consideration of the bestowal model in the immanent Trinity and applies this model to the economic Trinity in order to gain insight into the theology of the Trinity and God's salvific action. He points out that, like in the procession model founded on a descending Christology, in the bestowal model, founded on an ascending Christology, the Incarnation of Jesus is unique as the only instance of the highest realization of the supernatural potency of a human union with the divine. But this particular insight of ascending Christology is gained when the role of the Holy Spirit in the Incarnation is explained as the one who sanctifies the humanity of Jesus, joining that humanity in union with the person of the Word who assumes it. This action of the Spirit corresponds to the manner of the bestowal of the Spirit on the Son by the Father in the Trinity. Based on this consideration Kilmartin is able to establish a correspondence between the Spirit's work of

sanctification of the humanity of Jesus in the grace of union and that of believers in the order of grace. Kilmartin's ascending Christology, therefore, allows for a parallel between Jesus' life of faith and the life of faith required of believers.

In the economy of salvation, the Father sends the Spirit into the Church in order to unite believers to the risen Lord, making them children of the Father in the Son. The bestowal of the Spirit for the sanctification of believers, conditioned by an acceptance in faith, corresponds to the bestowal of the Spirit on the Son in the immanent Trinity in that the bestowal seeks to transform believers into children in the one Son. At the same time, the sending of the Spirit by the risen Lord, which has the purpose of drawing believers into union with the Son so as to love the Father like him, corresponds to the bestowal of the Spirit on the Father by the Son in the immanent Trinity. Accordingly, the sending of the Spirit by the risen Lord is a theandric act which, as divine act, is also the sacrament of a purely divine act of the Father who bestows the Spirit. The word and sacraments of Christ celebrated in the Church reflect the sending of the Spirit by the risen Lord to draw the liturgical assembly into communion with the Son in worship of the Father and so correspond to the bestowal of the Spirit by the Son on the Father in the immanent Trinity.

A theology of grace that emerges from the bestowal model is the identification of the grace of Christ with the Holy Spirit. This understanding of grace represents a departure from the Scholastic position in which the Son, through the grace of union, is the only divine person who exercises a personal role in human sanctification. Although influenced by the Eastern Orthodox theology of the Spirit, in creating the personal mission of the Spirit for the West, Kilmartin is able to maintain proper distance between his pneumatological thinking and the

Eastern understanding of the mission of the Spirit as a replacement of the mission of Christ at Pentecost. In his bestowal model, Kilmartin attributes human sanctification to the combined personal missions of the Son and the Spirit, hence his insistence to consider both the procession and bestowal models of the Trinity for liturgical theology.

Kilmartin explicitly articulates the goal of the celebration of the Eucharist as allowing the liturgical assembly to associate itself with and participate in Christ's sacrifice. The possibility of this participation lies in his Trinitarian theology, that is, with a particular emphasis on the sanctifying work of the Spirit, who is active both in the Incarnation and life of faith of Jesus and in the lives of believers. Jesus offered himself as a sacrificial response to the Father in the Spirit. Through that same Spirit, Christ invites the Church participate in his sacrificial response. In the sending of the Spirit to the Church by the risen Lord, the Spirit becomes the Spirit of the Church. In the eucharistic celebration, the Spirit gives the Church the grace to recall and to render itself present to the Christ of history, passing from the world to the Father. The response of faith by the liturgical assembly is a participation in the life of faith of Jesus insofar as its response is conformed to the sacrificial attitudes of Christ.

Kilmartin's emphasis on the need for the incorporation of Trinitarian theology into eucharistic theology must be viewed in light of his reaction to the post-Tridentine eucharistic theology, particularly with regard to the "moment of consecration." He viewed this narrow theological focus as conditioned by the late Scholastic reflection on the Eucharist, mostly dictated by the theological controversy over the real presence of Christ in the eucharistic

species. In so doing, according to Kilmartin, it sacrificed the Trinitarian orientation of liturgical and sacramental prayer resulting in certain serious consequences.<sup>12</sup>

By contrast, in his study of the early eucharistic prayers, Kilmartin learns that the *lex orandi* of the early Church always focused on the Trinitarian perspective. Furthermore, faith and liturgical expression of the Church were also shaped according to this perspective. Hence, echoing the vision of Cesare Giraudo, Kilmartin declares that the task of the future eucharistic theology is the integration of the *lex credendi* into the *lex orandi*.

The title of this dissertation, “Active Participation of the Local Church in the Enactment of the Eucharist in the Thought of Edward J. Kilmartin,” calls for an examination of the understanding of the Church and its eucharistic liturgical practice before and after the Second Vatican Council, which I will present in Chapter One. This presentation will help to determine the shift that has taken place in these areas since the Council—the repeated conciliar assertion and emphasis, especially in *Sacrosanctum Concilium* and *Lumen Gentium*, on the communal nature of the liturgy, active participation, and the realization of the nature of the Church as “sacrament of unity” in its liturgical celebration imply a new direction from the past.

---

<sup>12</sup>For Kilmartin these consequences include: (1) reduction of the proper context of the institution narrative within the Eucharistic Prayer to one single moment of consecration; (2) reduction of the rite of Holy Communion to a non-essential (integral) element of the eucharistic sacrifice; (3) objectification of the sacramental presence of the sacrifice of Christ on the cross; (4) active participation of the assembly through a theology of direct representation of Christ by the ministerial priesthood; (5) distortion of the witness of the eucharistic prayers of the first millennium; (6) downplaying of the pneumatological and ecclesial dimensions of the liturgy; and (7) the privilege of the *lex credendi* over the *lex orandi*. See Edward J. Kilmartin, *The Eucharist in the West: History and Theology*, ed. Robert J. Daly (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1998), 365-368; idem., “The Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology: Towards the Third Millennium,” *Theological Studies* 55 (1994): 436-441.

In Chapter Two I will consider the interpretation of active participation by four Catholic theologians (Y. Congar, F. McManus, M. Collins, and J. Lamberts). My purpose is to show that theologians have interpreted the concept of active participation differently, yet they do not provide a valid theological approach to active participation in the strict sense. Hence, a need arises to treat the concept of active participation in a broader theological context as treated by Kilmartin.

In Chapter Three I will outline the *Mysteriengegenwart* (mystery presence) controversy. The development of this controversy is vital to understanding Kilmartin's eucharistic theology. The question of mystery presence theology, which was raised in the early part of the twentieth century, concerns the manner of the presence of Christ and his saving deeds in the liturgy. The discussion of this question has an impact on the sacramental/liturgical theology and celebration but no satisfactory answer has been achieved. Since the publication of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, the question of how Christ and his saving deeds are present in the liturgy almost disappeared from theological discussion. This question, however, occupied Kilmartin's thought throughout his academic career. He searched for a satisfactory explanation because for him the early twentieth century debate about the mystery presence was far from finished. He judged that neither Odo Casel's description of objective perennialization of some elements of Christ's saving acts in the liturgy nor neo-Scholasticism's description of the operation of Christ's deeds as instrumental cause of the grace given by God to recipients of the sacraments could adequately respond to the relationship between Christ's saving deed and liturgical presence. Kilmartin's continued engagement with the question of the mystery presence of Christ, by means of studying the



literature on this subject, led him to identify the lack of an adequate Trinitarian theology, especially pneumatology, in the West as the main problem in establishing the relationship between the presence of Christ, his saving deeds, and the liturgical celebration. By a developed Trinitarian theology, Kilmartin articulates a metaphysical presence of the saving acts of Christ in the believers through the work of the Spirit who is the “mediated immediacy” of Christ to believers, conforming them to the sacrificial attitudes of Christ. From this description it was but a short step for Kilmartin to articulate theologically the notion of active participation as a participation in the Spirit of the faith of Christ.

In Chapter Four I will detail Kilmartin’s Trinitarian liturgical theology in determining this description of active participation. As a solution to the mystery presence question, Kilmartin began to construct a Spirit-Christology which becomes fruitful for establishing the relationship between the presence of Christ and his saving deeds and the liturgy. Based on his Trinitarian models, Kilmartin develops a Trinitarian theology of the liturgy with particular focus on the role of the Holy Spirit in the celebration of the Eucharist. In this context he explains the concept of Christian sacrifice and the notion of active participation from the standpoint of the Trinitarian relationship. Clearly he proposes his explicit Trinitarian approach to liturgy and sacraments as a solution to the mystery presence question. He believes his approach is more acceptable than the solutions proposed by other theologians both in terms of an adequate description of the mystery presence and a theological explanation of eucharistic participation because he includes a necessary discussion of the role of the Holy Spirit in the celebration of the Eucharist.

In Chapter Five I will offer a critique of Kilmartin's theology. In so doing, I intend to highlight certain limitations of his theology and his contributions toward an understanding of a fruitful sacramental engagement insofar as active participation is considered. Active participation in Kilmartin's theology is both soteriological and eschatological. Furthermore, he views that participation, understood as an essential element of sacramental action (engagement in faith), as necessary for the efficacy of the sacraments.

In General Conclusion, by way of summing up the elements of Kilmartin's theology of active participation, I will demonstrate how his theology is helpful for (1) a better understanding the eucharistic participation presented in *Sacrosanctum Concilium* and *Lumen Gentium* and (2) a meaningful participation in the eucharistic celebration.

**CHAPTER I**  
**UNDERSTANDING OF THE CHURCH AND THE EUCHARISTIC LITURGY**  
**BEFORE AND AFTER THE SECOND VATICAN COUNCIL**

Introduction

The goal of this Chapter is to present an understanding of the Church and of the eucharistic liturgy before and after the Second Vatican Council. For this purpose this Chapter is divided into three sections. In Section One I will begin with the exploration of the prevalent juridical ecclesiology and the eucharistic practice from Trent until Vatican II. I will demonstrate that such ecclesiology and liturgical practice were theologically insufficient to understand the nature of the Church and the true nature of the liturgy as reflected in Scriptures and the writings of the Fathers of the first centuries. I will also present the voices of both theologians and popes that led to the pre-Vatican II revival of the scriptural and patristic notions of the Church and the eucharistic liturgy. The next two Sections concentrate primarily on Vatican II and post-Vatican II magisterial documents. In Section Two I will analyze both this “new” understanding of the Church as sacramental realization that occurs in concrete eucharistic assembly under its bishop and the key theological elements for such realization of the Church. In Section Three I will argue that the called-for eucharistic active participation in these documents is an internal participation in the paschal mystery of Christ and will highlight the implications such participation has for the Church and each Christian.

## Image of the Church and the Practice of the Eucharistic Liturgy from Trent until Vatican II

For the Roman Catholic Church, the period from the Council of Trent (1545-1563) to the Second Vatican Council (1962-1965) was marked by great institutional stability, due largely to ecclesiastical reforms initiated by the Fathers at Trent and maintained by the hierarchical and juridical organization of the Church. Consequently, stability was also reflected in Catholic theology and liturgical practice well into the middle of the twentieth century.<sup>1</sup>

The notion of a *societas perfecta* (perfect society) was already present in Greek political theory defined as complete, independent in itself and possessing all the means to achieve its proposed finality. Applying this concept to the Church, it was analogously modeled after a State. Apologists judged that it was necessary for the Church to present itself as a *societas perfecta* for a number of reasons.<sup>2</sup> From the nineteenth to the first half of

---

<sup>1</sup>See Avery Dulles, "A Half Century of Ecclesiology," *Theological Studies* 50 (1989): 419-425; Pierre Journel, "From the Council of Trent to Vatican Council II," in *The Church at Prayer: Principles of the Liturgy*, vol. 1, ed. A. G. Martimort, trans. Matthew J. O'Connell (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1987), 63-72; Yves Congar, *Lay People in the Church: A Study for a Theology of Laity*, trans. Donald Attwater, revised edition (The Newman Press, Westminster: Maryland, 1965), 42-54, hereafter *Lay People in the Church*; Christopher O'Donnell, *Ecclesia: A Theological Encyclopedia of the Church* (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1996), 141; Bernard P. Prusak, *The Church Unfinished: Ecclesiology Through Centuries* (Mahwah, New Jersey: Paulist Press, 2004), 242, hereafter *The Church Unfinished*.

<sup>2</sup>It was used against the philosophies of the age which reduced religion to a private affair, the ideologies of *Kollegialsystem*, Gallicanism, Febronianism, Josephinism, the French Revolution, and the *Kulturkampf* which tried to make the Church depend on the State, and those Reformers who argued that the Church was a *collegium* within a State and denied that the Church possessed a supernatural means necessary for the salvation of its members. For canonists presenting the Church as perfect society also meant that the Church possessed the authority structures needed to function adequately and to enforce its decrees. See Rembert Weakland, "Images of the Church: From 'Perfect Society' to 'God's People on Pilgrimage,'" in *Unfinished Journey: The Church 40 Years After Vatican II*, ed. Austen Ivereigh (London: Continuum, 2003), 79-80; Patrick Granfield, "The Rise and Fall of *Societas Perfecta*," in *May Church*

the twentieth centuries, in particular, the Church was officially depicted in this most dominant image, as a *societas perfecta*.<sup>3</sup>

### *Societas Perfecta* Ecclesiology and its Theological Consequences

As a response to the post-Reformation controversies during the sixteenth century, Robert Bellarmine (1542-1621) constructed an ecclesiology that emphasized the Church's divinely willed authority; its possession of four notes (one, holy, catholic, and apostolic) which proved it to be the one true Church of Christ; and its external visibility, which he compared with that of secular states.<sup>4</sup> Bellarmine defined the Church as follows:

The one true Church is the community of humans brought together by profession of the true faith and communion in the same sacraments, under the rule of recognized pastors and especially of the sole vicar of Christ on earth, the Roman Pontiff. . . . The Church is indeed

---

*Ministers be Politicians?*, eds. Peter Huizing and Knut Walf, *Concilium* 157 (New York: Seabury, 1982), 4-5. Moreover, by employing the biblical image of the Church as the Body of Christ (Rom 12:5; 1 Cor 12:12-30; Eph 4:12; 15:21-33; Col 1:18, 24), Protestants wanted to show the inner, invisible union of each Christian to Christ. On the contrary, Catholics were concerned about the Church as a centralized single, visible, universal society and the visible public witness of the Church to Christ. This understanding was also the reflection of the baroque mentality of the time in which the supernatural was to be manifest in visible realities. At the same time, Catholics never denied the Church's own properly invisible elements such as the constant life-giving presence of the glorified Lord and His Spirit. See Bonaventure Kloppenburg, *The Ecclesiology of Vatican II*, trans. Matthew J. O'Connell (Chicago, IL: Franciscan Herald Press, 1974), 3-4; Paul McPartlan, *Sacrament of Salvation: An Introduction to Eucharistic Ecclesiology* (London: T and T Clark, 1995), 41, hereafter *Sacrament of Salvation*; Eugenio Corecco, "The Bishops as the Head of the Local Church and its Discipline," in *The Sacraments in Theology and Canon Law* 38, eds. Neophytos Edelby, et al., (New York: Paulist Press, 1968), 54; Emmanuel Lanne, "The Local Church: Its Catholicity and Apostolicity," *One in Christ* 6 (1970): 292.

<sup>3</sup>*Societas perfecta* image was so dominant because it was considered to be Catholic faith (*De fide catholica*), for it was proposed to be held by ordinary universal magisterium as would be seen in the following pages. Also see O'Donnell, *Ecclesia*, 359, 141; Avery Dulles, *Models of the Church* (Garden City, New York: Image Books, 1987), 8-9; Patrick Granfield, "The Church as *Societas Perfecta* in the *Schemata* of Vatican II," *Church History* 46 (1979): 431.

<sup>4</sup>See Prusak, *The Church Unfinished*, 248; Patrick Granfield, "The Church as Institution: A Reformulated Model," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 16 (1978): 426.

a community [*coetus*] of humans, as visible and palpable as the community of the Roman people, or the kingdom of France, or the republic of Venice.<sup>5</sup>

The juridico-hierarchical understanding of the Church gradually grew out of the Counter-Reformation's effort to defend the Catholic system of papacy, priesthood, sacraments, and the tendency to conceive the Church as a pyramidal society in which bishops governed the priests and the laity; but bishops received their jurisdiction from the pope.<sup>6</sup> This *societas inaequalis hierarchia* image is reflected in Pope Gregory XVI's (1831-1846) presentation of the Church. "No one can overlook the fact that the Church is an unequal society in which God has destined someone to command and others to obey. The latter are the laity, while the former are the clergy'."<sup>7</sup> The Church thus appeared to be an unequal organization established by Christ.<sup>8</sup>

After the uprising against the Papal States in 1830, an increasing emphasis on a theology of the kingship of Christ and on the ecclesiological notion of perfect society<sup>9</sup> asserted that the Church which manifested the "kingdom of God" carried forward Christ's threefold office of prophet, king, and priest. Henceforth, power and authority in the Church,

---

<sup>5</sup>Robert Bellarmine, *De controversiis Christianae fidei adversus nostri temporis haereticos*, vol. 2, *Prima Controversia generalis*, book 3: *De Ecclesia militante*, chapter 2, "de definitione Ecclesiae" (Ingolstadt, 1601), cols, 137-138, cited in Prusak, *The Church Unfinished*, 248.

<sup>6</sup>See McPartlan, *Sacrament of Salvation*, 40.

<sup>7</sup>Cited in Yves Congar, "Moving Towards a Pilgrim Church," in *Vatican II Revisited By Those Who were There*, ed. Alberic Stacpoole (Minneapolis, Minnesota: Winston Press, 1986), 133.

<sup>8</sup>See Prusak, *The Church Unfinished*, 248; Hervé-Marie Legrand, "The Revaluation of Local Churches: Some Theological Implications," in *The Unifying Role of the Bishop*, ed. Edward Schillebeeckx (New York: Herder and Herder, 1972), 60.

<sup>9</sup>See Giuseppe Alberigo, "The Authority of the Church in the Documents of Vatican I and Vatican II," *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 19 (1982): 120; Prusak, *The Church Unfinished*, 249.

the constitutive keys of such kingdom,<sup>10</sup> would be discussed in terms of the tripartite distinction of teaching, ruling, and sanctifying. Instead of including all humanity, the scriptural sense of the kingdom of God was narrowed with the Church to its visibility of hierarchy, authority, and administration of sacraments as the means to salvation.<sup>11</sup>

The Church as an original and autonomous society possessing all the powers by divine right to obtain its supernatural end was given a juridical foundation by Pope Pius IX (1846-1878) in his various constitutional allocutions.<sup>12</sup> “This supernatural power of ecclesiastical rule is different from and independent from political authority. For this reason the kingdom of God on earth is a perfect society, which is held together and governed by its own laws and its own rights.”<sup>13</sup> Pope Leo XIII (1878-1903) favored this juridical description of the Church in order to deal with the Church’s nature and its relationship to the State.<sup>14</sup> Hence, he asserted:

This society is made up of men, just as civil society is, and yet is supernatural and spiritual, on account of the end for which it was founded, and of the means by which it aims at attaining that end. Hence, it is distinguished and differs from civil society, and, what is of highest moment, it is a society chartered as of divine right, perfect in its nature and in its title, to possess in itself and by itself, through the will and loving kindness of its Founder, all needful provision for its maintenance and action. And just as the end at which the Church aims is by far the noblest of ends, so is its authority the most exalted of all

---

<sup>10</sup>See Leo XIII, *Satis Cognitum*, *Acta Sanctae Sedis* 28 (1896): 708-739, English translation in *The Papal Encyclicals 1878-1903* (Ann Arbor: The Pierian Press, 1990), 387-404, here 13.

<sup>11</sup>See Prusak, *The Church Unfinished*, 249.

<sup>12</sup>See Pius IX, *Maximae Quidem*, in *Pii IX Pontificis Maximi Acta Pars Prima*, vol. 3 (1864): 674-679, here 1-3; Pius IX, *Vix duam a Nobis*, *Acta Sanctae Sedis* 7 (1874): 567-573, here 2-4, English translations in *The Papal Encyclicals 1740-1878* (Ann Arbor: The Pierian Press, 1990), 379-380, 435-438.

<sup>13</sup>Pius IX, *Vix duam a Nobis*, 4.

<sup>14</sup>See Leo XIII, *Diuturnum Illud*, *Acta Sanctae Sedis* 14 (1881): 3-14; Leo XIII, *Immortale Dei*, *Acta Sanctae Sedis* 18 (1885): 161-180; Leo XIII, *Libertas Praestantissimum*, *Acta Sanctae Sedis* 20 (1888): 593-613, English translations in *The Papal Encyclicals 1878-1903* (Ann Arbor: The Pierian Press, 1990), 51-58, 107-119, 169-182.

authority, nor can it be looked upon as inferior to the civil power, or in any manner dependent upon it.<sup>15</sup>

Reference to the theme of *societas perfecta* is also reflected, although in a minimal way, in the writings of Pope Pius XI (1922-1939).<sup>16</sup> In 1943 Pope Pius XII (1939-1958) published the most comprehensive official Catholic pronouncement on the Church prior to Vatican II. However, this encyclical, *Mystici Corporis Christi*, was by no means a repudiation of the previous official teaching. The Pope emphasized that the corporate constitution of the Church must be “something definite and perceptible to the senses.”<sup>17</sup> In the one, undivided, visible, and organically, and hierarchically constituted Church, the Pope stated that “those who exercise sacred power in this Body are its first and chief members, [which] must be maintained uncompromisingly. It is through them, by communion of the Divine Redeemer Himself, that Christ’s apostolate as Teacher, King and Priest is to endure.”<sup>18</sup> Moreover, he placed the bishops as deriving their juridical power from the pope. “Yet in exercising this office they are not altogether independent, but are duly subordinate to the lawful authority of the Roman Pontiff enjoying the ordinary power of jurisdiction which they receive directly from the same Supreme Pontiff.”<sup>19</sup>

Identification and unity of the Church with its external organization and the dependence of bishops on the pope for their juridical power also had their roots in the ninth-

---

<sup>15</sup>Leo XIII, *Diuturnum Illud*, 10.

<sup>16</sup>See Pius XI, *Divini Illius Magistri*, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 22 (1930): 49-86, English translation in *The Papal Encyclicals 1903-1939* (Ann Arbor: The Pierian Press, 1990), 353-372, here 11, 13, 18.

<sup>17</sup>Pius XII, *Mystici Corporis Christi*, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 35 (1943): 193-248, English translation in *The Papal Encyclicals 1939-1958* (Ann Arbor: The Pierian Press, 1990), 37-63, here 17.

<sup>18</sup>*Ibid.*, 17.

<sup>19</sup>*Ibid.*, 42.



to-the-twelfth-century eucharistic controversy, the theology of ordination (Eucharist as sacrifice and priest as its offerer) of Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274), and the separation of order and jurisdiction in the subsequent medieval theology respectively.

In 831 Paschasius Radbertus (c.790-c.860) treated the presence of the real body of Christ in the Eucharist in a systematically doctrinal way in his *De Corpore et Sanguine Domini*. For the first time he was the first theologian to deal with the Eucharist as an independent theological reality isolated from its immediate theological context—the experience and ritual action of the community at prayer. Ratramnus (9<sup>th</sup> c.), a confrere of Paschasius, distinguished the historical body of Christ from the spiritual and sacramental body internally present in the host.<sup>20</sup> Due to the later eucharistic controversy intensified by Berengar of Tours (c. 1010-1088),<sup>21</sup> the transposition of the terms for the Eucharist as the real body (*corpus verum*) of Christ and the Church as the mystical body (*corpus mysticum*) of Christ<sup>22</sup> caused profound damage to thinking about the Eucharist as grounding the unity of the Church.

---

<sup>20</sup>It can be said that in emphasizing the physical presence of the real body of Christ in the Eucharist, Radbertus failed to consider the sacramental signs with full seriousness. On the other hand, for Ratramnus the presence of Christ was real and sacramental. See Nathan Mitchell, *Cult and Controversy: The Worship of the Eucharist Outside Mass* (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1990), 73-86, hereafter *Cult and Controversy*.

<sup>21</sup>Distinguishing sign and reality, Berengar argued that bread and wine could not be the invisible reality (*res*) signified, namely, Christ's body and blood, without changing their appearance. His sacramentalism envisioned a spiritual eating of Christ's body. See Mitchell, *Cult and Controversy*, 142-145. In a profession of faith imposed by Cardinal Humberto da Silva in 1059 and in a revised formula of it in 1079, Berengar had to accept the "substantial change" of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ. See Prusak, *The Church Unfinished*, 193.

<sup>22</sup>See Joseph Ratzinger, "The Pastoral Implications of Episcopal Collegiality," *Concilium* 1 (1965): 27-28; Henri de Lubac, *Corpus Mysticum: L'Eucharistie et l'église au moyen âge. Etude historique* (Paris: Aubier, 1944), 39-46; Paul McPartlan, *Eucharist Makes the Church: Henri de Lubac and John Zizioulas in Dialogue* (Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1993), 75-85; idem, "The Eucharist as the Basis for Ecclesiology," *Antiphon* 6 (2001): 15; Walter Kasper, *Sacrament of Unity: The Eucharist and*

In addition, the isolation of order in relation to the Eucharist and of jurisdiction in relation to the Church that grew out of the medieval theology resulted in the development of a theology of the Eucharist which was isolated from the Church and an ecclesiology which lost its essential sacramental and eucharistic dimension. In this perspective, priests were concerned with the real body of Christ in the celebration of the Eucharist; bishops were to govern the mystical body of Christ, the Church community.

This Scholastic consensus had its grounding in Aquinas's teaching of ordination.<sup>23</sup> According to him, bishops did not receive any additional priestly powers in their episcopal consecration. So bishops and priests were considered to be equal in their power specifically because they shared the same power to consecrate the Eucharist. For Aquinas priestly character received through ordination was a spiritual configuration to Christ. In this case the image of Christ received was that of Christ the High Priest, Christ of the Epistle to the Hebrews (4:12-10:18, priest and victim), and Christ seen as priest instituting the Eucharist and offering himself in the sacrifice of the cross.

However, according to Aquinas, bishops did receive an office of jurisdiction in their episcopal consecration and, as successors of the apostles, they were superior in their

---

*The Church*, trans. Brian McNeil (New York: Herder and Herder, 2004), 138-139, hereafter *Sacrament of Unity*.

<sup>23</sup> Aquinas had never developed any systematic theology of local Church or episcopacy in his writings because these particular issues had not yet become a concern of the Church in Aquinas's time. However, theologians were encouraged to do theology based on Aquinas. Pope Pius V ordered a new complete edition of Aquinas's work in 1570 to replace Peter Lombard's *Sentences* as the standard theological text for priestly training. See McPartlan, *Sacrament of Salvation*, 39. Later in 1879 Pope Leo XIII proposed Aquinas as the master, guide, and norm for Catholic theology. See Leo XIII, *Aeterni Patris, Acta Sanctae Sedis* 12 (1879): 97-115, English translation in *The Papal Encyclicals 1878-1903* (Ann Arbor: The Pierian Press, 1990), 17-28, here 17-33.

jurisdiction over the mystical body of Christ, the Church,<sup>24</sup> because episcopal consecration, in his view, was an incorporation into the Church.<sup>25</sup> So Aquinas concluded that episcopacy was not a sacramental order beyond priesthood, but rather a “dignity” in which one was consecrated to rule.

Aquinas also held that power and knowledge for ruling and teaching, (“the keys,” Matthew 16:19) came from Peter to other apostles and the pope to the bishops.<sup>26</sup> He thereby accepted that bishops received their jurisdiction from the pope in the sense that the pope determined the subjects over whom the bishop exercised jurisdiction. Invoking the Aristotelian principle that “wherever many are ordered to one goal, there has to be a universal ruling power above particular ruling power,” Aquinas argued that not only is the pope above bishops, but that power must descend from him to the bishops.<sup>27</sup>

Presenting the Church as a *societas perfecta* based on the juridico-hierarchical system had an adverse effect on the interrelation among the Eucharist, Church, and bishop. This awareness came about largely from insights gained from theological scholarship since the nineteenth century.

The conceptual understanding of the Church as juridical diminished the sacramental constitution of the Church. The biblical and patristic vision of the Church as a faith community incorporated into Christ through the Eucharist which is presided over by a bishop,

---

<sup>24</sup>See Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Contra Gentiles* 4, trans. Charles J. O’Neil (Notre Dame, London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1957), Chapters 74-76; idem, *Summa Theologiae* II, 2, q. 184, a. 6; 3, q. 82, a. 1, ad 4; 3, q. 67, a. 2, ad. 1 and q. 72, a. 11, trans. Fathers of the English Dominican Province (New York: Benzinger Brothers, Inc., 1947).

<sup>25</sup>See *ibid.*

<sup>26</sup>See Aquinas, *Summa Contra Gentiles* 4, Chapters 72, 76; Prusak, *The Church Unfinished*, 231.

<sup>27</sup>See Prusak, *The Church Unfinished*, 231.

who served as a symbol of sacramental unity, was replaced with the concept of the Church as an organization of *Corpus Christianorum* which was unified by the juridical powers of the Church.<sup>28</sup> A priestly sacrificial power of the bishop was thus cut off from the role of gathering and presiding over an assembly that would celebrate the Eucharist and become transformed into what the community received, the body of Christ.<sup>29</sup>

Furthermore, this replacement of the Eucharist with episcopal authority of jurisdiction that derived from the pope as the source of ecclesial unity reduced the local Churches presided over by bishops to abstract administrative units because such ecclesiology did not view them as having full legislative, juridical, and coercive power. Disconnected from its sacramental roots and its collegial dimension, the bishop's office no longer reflected the structure of the Church as communion of communions as had been understood in the earlier centuries.<sup>30</sup> Bishops were regarded as the successors to the apostles by divine institution; but in effect both catholicity and apostolicity referred to Peter and the essential communion with his successor, the pope.

The concept of the Church as a *societas perfecta* was inadequate even to describe the social and visible aspects of the Church because it failed to acknowledge that the universal Church is actualized in the local celebration of the Eucharist.<sup>31</sup> This ecclesiology failed to

---

<sup>28</sup>See *ibid.*, 230; Marcel Metzger, *History of the Liturgy: The Major Stages* (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1997), 125; Walter Kasper, "Church as *communio*," *Communio* 13 (1986): 107.

<sup>29</sup>See Prusak, *The Church Unfinished*, 194-195; McPartlan, "Liturgy, Church, and Society," *Studia Liturgica* 34 (2004): 156.

<sup>30</sup>See Ryan Seamus, "Episcopal Consecration: the Legacy of Schoolmen," *Irish Theological Quarterly* 33 (1966): 33.

<sup>31</sup>See Karl Rahner, "The New Image of the Church," trans. David Bourke, *Theological Investigation* 10 (New York: Crossroad, 1977), 10; Granfield, "The Rise and Fall," 6.

integrate the divine and human dimensions of the Church. The intense preoccupation with external and hierarchical elements became a hindrance for understanding the Church as mystery. The word “Church” primarily referred to the body of bishops with the Roman Pontiff and not to the community of believers.<sup>32</sup> Consequently, the ancient idea of the “sense of the faithful” (*sensus fidelium*), the role of the entire community as anointed by the Holy Spirit for keeping alive the beliefs of the Church, receded.

Moreover, in this ecclesiology the loss of the idea of the gift of the Spirit as the principle of unity and diversity brought a rigid uniformity into the concept of the life of the Church. The institutional image of a Church overwhelmingly dominated by its clergy made the Church incapable of serving and challenging society as required by the Spirit of Christ. In short, “perfect society” ecclesiology led to a static ecclesiology.

In this way, recognition grew “of the historical changes of terminology and doctrinal emphasis that had accompanied the rise of the pyramid was decisive for gradual rehabilitation of an earlier model”<sup>33</sup> of the Church, the eucharistic ecclesiology of the patristic era, which would eventually be discussed and adopted at Vatican II.

### Theological Shift in the Church’s Self-Understanding from Juridical to Eucharistic Ecclesiology

From the nineteenth century onward there was an ecclesiological revival among Catholic theologians. Johann Adam Möhler (1796-1838) stressed that the life of the Spirit in

---

<sup>32</sup>See Prusak, *The Church Unfinished*, 249-250; Joseph A. Komonchak, “Ministry and the Local Church,” in *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America* 36 (1981): 65; O’Donnell, *Ecclesia*, 451; Granfield, “The Rise and Fall,” 6-7.

<sup>33</sup>McPartlan, “Liturgy, Church, and Society” 157.

the Church was paramount.<sup>34</sup> This marks the beginning of a strikingly different ecclesiology which placed emphasis on the whole body of Christ in defining the Church. Möhler's writings signaled a return to the ecclesiology of the early Fathers, who saw the Church as a mystery of the Spirit and the community of salvation. In regard to the theology of the local Church, Dom Adrien Gréa (1820-1927) offered a framework in which the bishop was the head of the local Church, the episcopal college was placed in relation to the pope, and the local Church was understood to contain all that the universal Church was.<sup>35</sup> This view was realized in a systematic and detailed manner by Catholic historians. In Pierre Batiffol's view: "For a historian, Catholicism is, at first glance, a scattering of local churches'."<sup>36</sup> This movement later extended to exegetes. Karl L. Schmidt recaptured the theological dimension of the Church as a people called by God. This approach emphasized the essentially communitarian dimension based on this call of God to invite people to be hearers of his word, to communicate his salvation to them as a people and to make them a sign and carrier of this salvation before the world, and the local dimension of the Church.<sup>37</sup> Later Lucien Cerfaux summed up this idea by noting that one sees in each local Church the realization of the

---

<sup>34</sup>Möhler emphasized the role of the Holy Spirit in the Church in order to argue for the Church's origin, doctrines, unity in diversity, the Church as a living organism, the role of bishops, and the Eucharist as the highest expression of Christian community. See Johann Adam Möhler, *Unity in the Church or The Principle of Catholicism*, trans. and ed. Peter C. Erb (Washington, District of Columbia: The Catholic University of America Press, 1996).

<sup>35</sup>See Olegario Gonz  le de Cardedal, "Development of a Theology of the Local Church from the First to the Second Vatican Council," trans. James H. Provost, *The Jurist* 52 (1992): 14-15; Henri de Lubac, *The Motherhood of the Church: Followed by Particular Churches in the Universal Church*, trans. Sergia Englund (San Francisco, Ignatius Press, 1982), 190.

<sup>36</sup>Pierre Batiffol, *L' glise naissante et le catholicisme*, 3<sup>d</sup> ed. (Gabalda, 1909), 1, cited in de Lubac, *The Motherhood of the Church*, 180.

<sup>37</sup>See de Cardedal, "Development of a Theology of the Local Church," 17.

universal Church, either as a people, or as assembly of God, or as the celestial Church present on earth.<sup>38</sup>

Lambert Beauduin (1873-1960) offered perspectives from Eastern ecclesiology in the ecumenical review, *Irénikon*. In it he presented critical understanding of *Sobornost*, conciliarity, catholicity, and simultaneousness in plurality and unity supported in the experience of the Spirit rather than just law and authority.<sup>39</sup> During the 1940s many Catholic theologians produced notable studies of the ecclesiology of the Fathers, which led to the revival of the theology of the mystical body. In his study of the Pauline metaphor of the body of Christ, Yves Congar (1904-1995) found the central meaning to lie not in strict visibility but rather in unity in plurality.<sup>40</sup> New spiritual reality appeared in ecclesial awareness: the Eucharist was put forth as the center of the Church which led to the rediscovery of the local Church.

Endeavors of theological renewal of the Church prior to Vatican II also touched on the theology of ministry as service. Consequently, a new sense of the importance of bishops in the universal Church, the papacy as ministry of service within the episcopal college, and the powers of the bishop linked to episcopal consecration developed.<sup>41</sup> Laity were seen as active and responsible subjects in the Church and their call to the apostolate was seen as rooted in faith, baptism, and confirmation.<sup>42</sup>

---

<sup>38</sup>See *ibid.*, 15-17.

<sup>39</sup>See *ibid.*, 19.

<sup>40</sup>See Dulles, "A Half Century of Ecclesiology," 425.

<sup>41</sup>See *ibid.*, 426.

<sup>42</sup>See *ibid.*

Realizing the partiality and deficiency of the ecclesiology of the time, Leo XIII made an effort to draw attention to the interior and constitutive elements of the Church's own mystery in his three encyclicals in which he dealt with the Church as the body of Christ, the Holy Spirit and its sanctifying action both on the individual and the community, and the Eucharist as the sacrament of unity.<sup>43</sup> He also emphasized the episcopal element as the essential constitution of the Church based on Luke 6:13:

... by the fact that the bishops succeed the Apostles, they inherit their ordinary power, and thus the episcopal order necessarily belongs to the essential constitution of the Church. Although they do not receive plenary, or universal, or supreme authority, they are not to be looked as vicars of the Roman Pontiffs; because they exercise a power really their own, and are most truly called the *ordinary* pastors of the peoples over whom they rule.<sup>44</sup>

However, the Pope was quick to point out that the bishops' right and power of ruling are always in union with the pope.<sup>45</sup>

*Mystici Corporis Christi* was an important departure from a naturalistic conception of the Church. In it Pius XII took up the Augustinian term, the whole Christ (*totus Christus*), the Head and the members, in defining the Church.<sup>46</sup> Moreover, the Pope made an attempt to integrate the Pauline doctrine of the body of Christ by incorporating the patristic and Scholastic thought on the interior reality of grace and the role of the Holy Spirit, who "fills and unifies the whole Church,"<sup>47</sup> with the *societas perfecta* image<sup>48</sup> so that "perfect" referred

---

<sup>43</sup>See Leo XIII, *Satis Cognitum*; Leo XIII, *Diuturnum Illud*; Leo XIII, *Mirae Caritatis*, *Acta Sanctae Sedis* 34 (1902): 641-654, English translation in *The Papal Encyclicals 1878-1903* (Ann Arbor: The Pierian Press, 1990), 499-507.

<sup>44</sup>Leo XIII, *Satis Cognitum*, 14. Emphasis original.

<sup>45</sup>See *ibid.*, 15.

<sup>46</sup>See Pius XII, *Mystici Corporis Christi*, 67.

<sup>47</sup>*Ibid.*, 62.



to the life of Christ within the Church in the here-and-now,<sup>49</sup> for “as supernatural gifts have their fullness and perfection in [Christ], it is of this fullness that His Mystical Body receives.”<sup>50</sup> Furthermore, the Pope emphasized the visible and the invisible aspects of the Church: “. . . Christ, Head and Exemplar of the Church ‘is not complete, if only His visible nature is considered . . . , or if only His divine, invisible nature . . . , but He is one through the union of both and one in both . . . so is it with His Mystical Body’ . . . .”<sup>51</sup> He also underscored the unique significance that the Eucharist and the episcopacy have for the mystery of the Church:

By means of the Eucharistic Sacrifice Christ our Lord willed to give to the faithful a striking manifestation of our union among ourselves and with our divine Head . . . .

The Sacrament of the Eucharist is itself a striking image of the Church’s unity, if we consider how in the bread to be consecrated many grains go to form one whole and that in it the very Author of supernatural grace is given to us, so that through Him we may receive the spirit of charity in which we are bidden to live now no longer our own life but the life of Christ, and to love the Redeemer Himself in all the members of His Social Body.<sup>52</sup>

Of the episcopacy, the Pope stated:

What we have thus far said of the Universal Church must be understood also of the individual Christian communities, whether Oriental or Latin, which go to make up the one Catholic Church. For they, too, are ruled by Jesus Christ through the voice of their respective Bishops. Consequently, Bishops must be considered as the more illustrious members of the Universal Church, for they are united by a very special bond to the divine Head of the whole Body and so are rightly called “principal parts of the members of the Lord”; moreover, as far as his own diocese is concerned, each one as a true Shepherd feeds the flock entrusted to him and rules it in the name of Christ.<sup>53</sup>

---

<sup>48</sup>See *ibid.*, 63.

<sup>49</sup>See *ibid.*

<sup>50</sup>*Ibid.* 48.

<sup>51</sup>See *ibid.*, 64.

<sup>52</sup>*Ibid.*, 82-83.

<sup>53</sup>*Ibid.*, 42.

Thus this encyclical was a welcome advance beyond the mere juridical ecclesiologies of the manuals.

The Fathers at Vatican II adopted a theology of the Church as a sacramental realization in local Churches that celebrate the Eucharist under the presidency of its bishop.<sup>54</sup> *Lumen Gentium* describes that “the Church, in Christ, is in the nature of sacrament—a sign and instrument, that is, of communion with God and of unity among all men.”<sup>55</sup> In presenting the mystery of the Church, *Lumen Gentium* means by “mystery” that the Church has its origin in and is a part of God’s divine economy of salvation.<sup>56</sup> “The eternal Father . . . chose to raise up men to share in his own divine life”<sup>57</sup> through the redemptive work of Christ,<sup>58</sup> which describes the sacramental basis for the unity of all with one another and with God and exhibits “the inner nature of the Church.”<sup>59</sup>

In *Mystici Corporis Christi* Pius XII opposed to the merely mysterious and intangible image of *Corpus Christi mysticum* (the Church) by emphasizing its corporate constitution as visible elements.<sup>60</sup> While emphasizing this statement of Pius XII,<sup>61</sup> *Lumen Gentium* is

---

<sup>54</sup>For the foundational role of the Eucharist and of bishop for the actualization of the Church, see *Lumen Gentium*, 3, 7, 11, 26; *Decretum de Pastoralis Episcoporum Munere in Ecclesia (Christus Dominus)*, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 58 (1966): 673-696, English translation in Austin Flannery, ed., *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents* (Bandra, Bombay: St. Paul Publication, 1975), 510-533, here 8, 16; *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 2, 41.

<sup>55</sup>*Lumen Gentium*, 1.

<sup>56</sup>For St. Paul God’s eternal plan of salvation is accomplished in Christ once for all. The recipient of this salvific mystery is the Church. See Maximillian Heinrich Heim, *Joseph Ratzinger: Life in the Church and Living Theology: Fundamental of Ecclesiology with Reference to Lumen Gentium*, trans. Michael J. Miller (San Francisco, Ignatius Press, 2007), 40.

<sup>57</sup>*Lumen Gentium*, 2.

<sup>58</sup>See *ibid.*, 3, 4.

<sup>59</sup>*Ibid.* 6.

<sup>60</sup>Pius XII, *Mystici Corporis Christi*, 14.

concerned about the unity in tension of the visible and invisible elements of the Church. The Council's harking back to the scriptural and patristic concept of the *mysterium* (sacrament) made possible a more comprehensive view of the "complex reality" of the Church. Hence *Lumen Gentium* states:

[T]he society structured with hierarchical organs and the mystical body of Christ, the visible society and the spiritual community, the earthly Church and the Church endowed with heavenly riches, are not to be thought of two realities. On the contrary, they form one complex reality which comes together from a human and divine element.<sup>62</sup>

In this way, *Lumen Gentium* adopts both a mystical understanding of the Church and her visibility (hence avoids an "either . . . or" principle). In the Council's understanding, the visible reality of the Church and its mystery permeate one another because the Church is "the kingdom of Christ now present in mystery," which "grows visibly through the power of God in the world."<sup>63</sup> The Church, which Christ called together from different nations and made "his own Body,"<sup>64</sup> therefore, has a visible as well as spiritual component.

This *mysterium*-nature of the Church in *Lumen Gentium* is fundamentally brought into focus through the Pauline image of the body of Christ.<sup>65</sup> This vision of the Church is particularly evident in the celebration of the Eucharist in which the members are constituted

---

<sup>61</sup>"The one mediator, Christ, established and ever sustains here on earth his holy Church, the community of faith, hope and charity, as a visible organization through which he communicates truth and grace to all men." *Lumen Gentium*, 8.

<sup>62</sup>Ibid.

<sup>63</sup>Ibid., 3.

<sup>64</sup>Ibid., 7.

<sup>65</sup>Galations 6:15; 2 Corinthians 5:17; 1 Corinthians 12:13, 10:17, 12:12, 12:26; Ephesians 4:11-16, 5:23-28; *Lumen Gentium*, 7-8.

“in a hidden but real way” into the body of Christ<sup>66</sup> which effects our union with God and with one another,<sup>67</sup> which is mediated through the Church as sign and instrument of salvation.<sup>68</sup>

*Lumen Gentium* declares that God makes humans holy and saves them by making them into a people.<sup>69</sup> In this regard, the Church as the people of God (1 Pet 2: 9-10) is a historical community of humans living in time and space. Moreover, unlike *Mystici Corporis Christi*,<sup>70</sup> *Lumen Gentium* describes the people of God as a priestly people, sharing a “common priesthood of the faithful.”<sup>71</sup> This theological vision serves as the basis of a revitalization of the local Church at worship, which generates a widespread participation on the part of communities and secures the theological importance of the local Church.

The crucial foundation for the concept of collegiality is the Council’s definitive declaration that the consecration of a new bishop is a sacramental ordination bestowing the apostolic gift of the Spirit.<sup>72</sup> Hence contrary to *Mystici Corporis Christi*,<sup>73</sup> this statement by the Council means that bishops receive their *munera* (offices) of sanctifying, teaching, and governing from Christ himself in their episcopal consecration.<sup>74</sup> The Council renewed the episcopate in view of its form of coresponsibility for the mission of the Church. This principle of collegiality is based on the recognition of the reality of local Churches.

---

<sup>66</sup>See *Lumen Gentium*, 7, 11.

<sup>67</sup>See *ibid.*, 1.

<sup>68</sup>See *ibid.*, 3, 5, 9, 28.

<sup>69</sup>See *ibid.*, 9.

<sup>70</sup>Pius XII had introduced the idea of diversity of members with a heavy emphasis on their differences in rank. See Pius XII, *Mystici Corporis Christi*, 17.

<sup>71</sup>*Lumen Gentium*, 10.

<sup>72</sup>See *ibid.*, 21.

<sup>73</sup>See Pius XII, *Mystici Corporis Christi*, 42.

<sup>74</sup>See *Lumen Gentium*, 21.

Individual bishops are visible source and foundation of unity of this collegiality in their own local Churches,<sup>75</sup> which are essential for the existence of the universal Church.

### Pre-Vatican II Eucharistic Liturgy and its Theological Consequences

Eucharistic worship during the first Christian centuries had always been primarily a communitarian experience. The bishop celebrated the Eucharist, but the community was seen as concelebrating with him according to their rank.<sup>76</sup> The principal emphasis was given to the fact that the Eucharist is the image and source of the unity of the Christian community and that the Mass is a personal participation in Christ's sacrifice of himself to the Father.

But this was not the case in the life of the Church from Trent until Vatican II. In order to understand the post-Tridentine liturgical practice, it is crucial to determine the immediate context in which the Council of Trent was held. Trent was summoned mainly to define the doctrines of the Church in reply to the theological heresies (doctrinal and liturgical) and to bring about a thorough reform of the inner life of Christians.<sup>77</sup>

In fact, the origins of a change in liturgical practice predated Trent, in a period marked by the consolidation of Scholastic theology. In the wake of the eleventh-century eucharistic controversy, Scholastic theology tried to understand and explain sacraments, in particular the Eucharist, through philosophical reasoning and argumentation. For Scholastic theologians Mass was first and foremost the official worship of the Church, offered to God

---

<sup>75</sup>See *ibid.*, 23.

<sup>76</sup>See Joseph M. Powers, *Eucharistic Theology* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1967), 15.

<sup>77</sup>See H.J. Schroeder, trans. *The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent* (Rockford, Illinois: Tan Books and Publishers, Inc., 1978), iii.

by priests acting on behalf of the Church. So experiential participation, although desirable on the part of the laity, was not viewed as necessary<sup>78</sup> which explains the reason for the development of Catholic piety from the thirteenth century onward.

During this period Mass was not celebrated in the language of the people, but in Latin. So the laity watched the Mass and were normally passive before it. They rarely received Communion.<sup>79</sup> Eucharistic piety was directed to the cult of worshipping the presence of Christ in the host. There was thus a clear loss from the consciousness of the people in appreciating the Mass as something to be participated in both verbally and sacramentally.<sup>80</sup>

In addition, at this time the Church had to respond to the theological heresies brought into the Catholic faith by the Reformation movement. In his Reformation treatise, the “Babylonian Captivity,” Martin Luther (1483-1546) attacked the Catholic understanding of the Mass as sacrifice (*opus*) as having neither scriptural basis nor sound reasoning.<sup>81</sup> He rejected Mass as a sacrifice that we offer to God because, according to him, if the Mass were understood of having any propitiatory value, then it would prove the insufficiency of Christ’s

---

<sup>78</sup>See Robert Cabié, *The Church at Prayer: The Eucharist*, vol. 2, ed. A. G. Martimort, trans., Matthew J. O’Connell (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1986), 176-177; Iréné Henri Dalmais, “Theology of the Liturgical Celebration,” in *The Church at Prayer: Principles of the Liturgy*, ed. A. G. Martimort (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1987), 229; David N. Power, *The Eucharistic Mystery: Revitalizing the Tradition* (Crossroad, New York: 1995), 292, hereafter *The Eucharistic Mystery*.

<sup>79</sup>Therefore, the Fathers at the Fourth Lateran Council (1215) decreed that at least once a year, preferably during the Easter season, laity should receive Communion, which is reaffirmed at Trent in Session 13, canon 9. See Schroeder, trans., *The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, 80.

<sup>80</sup>See Kevin W. Irwin, *Models of the Eucharist* (Mahwah, New Jersey: Paulist Press, 2005), 224-225.

<sup>81</sup>See Timothy F. Lull, ed. *Martin Luther’s Basic Theological Writings* (Minneapolis, Fortress Press, 1989), 267-340.

once-for-all sacrifice offered for our salvation.<sup>82</sup> For him, Mass was instead a testament (*beneficium*) from God to us.<sup>83</sup>

The Fathers at Trent affirmed the reality of the Mass as sacrifice and its intrinsic relation to the sacrifice of the Cross in Session 22 canons 1 and 2.<sup>84</sup> They left the reform of the liturgy of the Mass to the Roman Pontiff in Session 25.<sup>85</sup> Liturgy was carefully regulated by a body of rubrics with detailed and minute instructions from the Sacred Congregation of Rites, established by Pope Sixtus V in 1588. In the process of regulating the liturgy, there was little that could help the people take part in the mystery being celebrated.<sup>86</sup>

In the practice of the private Mass, the priest, without the essential participation of the community, was seen as necessary for the enactment of Mass because of the prevalent juridical and legalistic mentality of the time.<sup>87</sup> The widespread practice of silent Mass meant that most people could not participate actively. Architectural barriers and the laity's own sense of their unworthiness largely restricted their participation to passivity during the Mass.

---

<sup>82</sup>Luther also rejected the Mass as a sacrifice for various other reasons such as sacerdotalism, avarice, and his concern for an evangelical reform. See Irwin, *Models of the Eucharist*, 221-223. In the Catholic circles propitiatory value of the Mass was understood in terms of theology and piety as commonly practiced before Trent. At the same time, it was rare for the laity who attended the Mass to receive Communion. See *ibid.*, 222.

<sup>83</sup>See Lull, ed., *Martin Luther's Basic Theological Writings*, 294ff.; R.C.D. Jasper and G.J. Cumming, eds., *Prayers of the Eucharist: Early and Reformed* (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1975), 191-194.

<sup>84</sup>“ . . . in the mass a true and real sacrifice . . . is offered to God . . . ” “If anyone says that by the sacrifice of the mass a blasphemy is cast upon the most holy sacrifice of Christ consummated on the cross; or that the former derogates from the latter, let him be anathema.” Schroeder, trans., *The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, 149.

<sup>85</sup>See *ibid.*, 255.

<sup>86</sup>See Robert Cabié, *The Church at Prayer: The Eucharist*, 176-177.

<sup>87</sup>Regarding the validity of the sacraments Trent stated in Session 7, canons 8, 10: “If anyone says that by the sacraments of the New Law grace is not conferred *ex opere operato*, but that faith alone in the divine promise is sufficient to obtain grace, let him be anathema.” “If anyone says that in ministers, when they effect and confer the sacraments, there is not required at least the intention of doing what the Church does, let him be anathema.” Schroeder, trans., *The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, 52.

The treatment of the Eucharist at Trent, which emphasized sacrament and sacrifice, was perpetuated in catechesis in subsequent centuries. This treatment made the Catholics think of these elements of the Eucharist as separate rather than intrinsic, interrelated facets of the celebration and of the theology of the Eucharist.<sup>88</sup> Watching the consecrated host took precedence over participating verbally and sacramentally. In the process, Eucharist became an object (without the reception of Communion), not an event.<sup>89</sup> When Communion was given, it was not given normally to the people at an appropriate moment within the celebration of the Eucharist, that is, after the Communion of the priest.<sup>90</sup> Reception of Communion was, thus, almost a private devotion divorced from any sense of participation in the sacrifice of Christ.<sup>91</sup> In short, Mass was no longer understood to be a real participation in the sacrifice of Christ and a corporate action of the whole body of Christ.

#### Rediscovery of the True Nature of the Liturgy as the Grounding for Active Participation

If the Fathers at Trent were concerned with consolidating doctrinal matters, then the Fathers at Vatican II were concerned with urging the faithful to take part in the paschal mystery of Christ in the celebration of the Eucharist. What made the Fathers at Vatican II take this measure for the liturgical renewal was the rediscovery of the true nature of the

---

<sup>88</sup>See *ibid.*, Sessions 13, 21, 22; Irwin, *Models of the Eucharist*, 225-228.

<sup>89</sup>See Irwin, *Models of the Eucharist*, 225.

<sup>90</sup>See Bernard Botte, *From Silence to Participation* (Washington, District of Columbia: Pastoral Press, 1988), 2-3; McPartlan, "Liturgy, Church, and Society" 149-150.

<sup>91</sup>See James F. White, *Roman Catholic Worship: Trent to Today* (Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 2003), 37.



eucharistic liturgy as the “action of Christ the Priest and of his Body, which is the Church”<sup>92</sup> and the importance it has in the life of the Church and of each Christian. “[T]he liturgy is the summit toward which the activity of the Church is directed; it is also the fount from which all her power flows.”<sup>93</sup> Through the Church’s liturgy Christians “are enabled to express in their lives and manifest to others the mystery of Christ and the real nature of the true Church.”<sup>94</sup> This awareness was largely due to the widespread revival of scholarly interest in the sacred liturgy which spanned from the nineteenth century through the middle of the twentieth century.

In the 1830s in France, Prosper Guéranger (1805-1875)<sup>95</sup> initiated an historical and theological approach to liturgical studies when personal piety was so prevalent. Despite the limitations of his own personality and the time in which he lived, which was Romanticism and the love for the Middle Ages, he understood liturgy as mystery and underscored the importance of the paschal mystery of Christ in the life of the Church. He asserted that the celebration of the Eucharist, the sacrament of the paschal mystery, is the principle and means of entering into this mystery.<sup>96</sup> This approach, which was to develop into a liturgical science in the years to come, can be described as a major turning point in liturgical scholarship.<sup>97</sup>

---

<sup>92</sup>*Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 8.

<sup>93</sup>*Ibid.*, 10.

<sup>94</sup>*Ibid.*, 2.

<sup>95</sup>For a detailed and balanced treatment of his life, works, and theology, see Cuthbert Johnson, *Prosper Guéranger (1805-1875): A Liturgical Theologian: An Introduction to His Liturgical Writings and Work* (Rome: Studia Anselmiana, 1984).

<sup>96</sup>See *Ibid.*, 370-371.

<sup>97</sup>In 1975 Pope Paul VI named Guéranger as “the Author of the liturgical movement, *Auctor illius spiritalis motus*.” *Ibid.*, 14. However, there is a division of opinion as to the value and significance of his role in the liturgical movement. For the criticism that is leveled against him, chiefly as being a traditionalist, see R. Kevin Seasoltz, *The New Liturgy: A Documentation, 1093-1965* (New York: Herder

In the latter part of the nineteenth century Catholic scholars began to question the individualistic approach to the Eucharist. The first half of the twentieth century witnessed the steady increase in biblical, patristic, historical, and liturgical research. Based on the biblical scholarship of *qahal* (assembly duly summoned), it came to light that the liturgical assembly was a theological reality and that it was the actual gathering of a local Christian community for worship.<sup>98</sup> Realizing that the liturgy attains its full purpose in people's engagement as the response to God's initiative, Catholic scholars suggested the celebration of the Mass be in the vernacular and that people should take part actively rather than just devoutly watching or being involved in personal devotion. In the twentieth century there was steady encouragement from popes for liturgical renewal.

Pius X (1903-1914) in his 1903 *motu proprio*, *Tra le sollecitudini*, pleaded for the faithful to take an active part in the celebration of the mysteries since this celebration was the primary and indispensable source of Christian life. In it he stated that the foremost fount of the true Christian spirit was active participation in public prayer and considered it to be the chief source of renewal:

It being our ardent desire to see the true Christian spirit restored in every respect and be preserved by all the faithful, we deem it necessary to provide before everything else for the sanctity and dignity of the temple, in which the faithful assemble for the object of

---

and Herder, 1966), xxiv-xxvi; John Fenwick and Bryan Spinks, *Worship in Transition: The Liturgical Movement in the Twentieth Century* (New York: Continuum, 1995), 19; Virgil C. Funk, "The Liturgical Movement (1830-1969)," in *The New Dictionary of Sacramental Worship*, ed. Peter F. Fink, (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1990), 696; Daniel P. Grigassy, "The Liturgical Movement," in *The New Dictionary of Theology*, eds. Joseph A. Komonchak et al., (Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1987), 586.

<sup>98</sup>See Louis Bouyer, *Liturgical Piety* (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1954), 23-37.

acquiring this spirit from its foremost and indispensable fount, which is the active participation in the holy mysteries and in the public and solemn prayer of the Church.<sup>99</sup>

Participation becomes full only when the faithful share in the Lord's table. In keeping with this thought, Pius X also issued a decree in 1905 in support of frequent Communion.<sup>100</sup> In 1910 he published another decree lowering the age of First Communion for Catholic schoolchildren.<sup>101</sup>

Beauduin, among others, understood the impact of Pius X's *motu proprio* and realized that liturgy is not for a select few but for all God's people. In an address delivered at the National Congress of Catholic Works at Malines in 1909, Beauduin called for full and active participation in Church life and worship as the most effective way to nourish and deepen Christian faith and life. In his only written book, he asserts that a right to active participation in the liturgy underpins a theology of the Church as the mystical body of Christ and a theology of the priesthood of the laity.<sup>102</sup>

Through his extensive research on early Christian worship, Odo Casel (1886-1948) developed an explanation of the sacraments which was more patristic than Scholastic. Employing the Greek Fathers' practice of referring to the sacraments as mysteries, Casel interpreted them as rites in which the saving activity of the risen Christ became present in

---

<sup>99</sup>Pius X, *Tra le sollecitudini*, *Acta Sanctae Sedis* 36 (1903): 329-339, cited from the English translation in Seasoltz, *The New Liturgy: A Documentation*, 1903-1965, 4.

<sup>100</sup>See Pius X, *Sacra Tridentina Synodus*, Decree issued by the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments at the direction of Pius X, *Acta Sanctae Sedis* 38 (1905): 400-406, English translation in Seasoltz, *The New Liturgy: A Documentation*, 1903-1965, 11-14.

<sup>101</sup>See Pius X, *Quam Singulari*, Decree issued by the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments at the direction of Pius X, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 2 (1910): 577-583, English translation in Seasoltz, *The New Liturgy: A Documentation*, 1903-1965, 17-22.

<sup>102</sup>See Lambert Beauduin, *Liturgy the Life of the Church*, trans., Virgil Michel (Collegeville, Minn.: The Liturgical Press, 1926), 1-7.

addition to the received notion of the sacraments that they conferred grace. Hence, for Casel, it was crucial to emphasize our participation in the paschal mystery of Christ in the celebration of the Eucharist. He asserted that we make Christ's salvation real in us by our active participation, which he interpreted as both *anamnetic* and sacramental through the sacred actions, in the redeeming act of Christ.<sup>103</sup> This understanding initiated a movement toward a more participatory interpretation of the sacraments in Catholic theology.

Significant statements regarding the eucharistic participation and the role of the Eucharist for the life of the Church were underscored by Pius XII. In *Mystici Corporis Christi* he stated that in the Eucharist Christ unites the Church to his sacrifice and the faithful offer Christ through the priests who act *in persona Christi*, the Head of the Church:

For in this Sacrifice the sacred minister acts as the vicegerent not only of our Savior but of the whole Mystical Body and of each one of the faithful. In this act of Sacrifice, through the hands of the priest, by whose word alone the Immaculate Lamb is present on the altar, the faithful themselves, united with him in prayer and desire offer it to the Eternal Father a most acceptable victim of praise and propitiation for the needs of the whole Church.<sup>104</sup>

In the encyclical *Mediator Dei*, often known as the *Magna Carta* of the liturgical renewal, Pius XII gave the liturgical renewal a decisive and added impetus by insisting on the importance of the liturgy and the need for participation of the people, which he emphasized based on their common priesthood:

---

<sup>103</sup>See Odo Casel. *The Mystery of Christian Worship*, ed. Burkhard Neunheuser, O.S.B., with an introduction by Aidan Kavanagh, O.S.B (Westminster, Mary Land: The Newman Press, 1962). Also see Funk, "The Liturgical Movement (1830-1969)," 696; Fenwick, *Worship in Transition*, 26-28.

<sup>104</sup>Pius XII, *Mystici Corporis Christi*, 82.

By the waters of baptism, as by common right, Christians are made members of the Mystical Body of Christ the Priest, and by the “character” which is imprinted on their souls they are appointed to give worship to God. Thus they participate, according to their condition, in the priesthood of Christ.<sup>105</sup>

Thus by reason of their baptism, Christians participate in the eucharistic liturgy by offering Christ not only *through* but also *with* the priest. “Now the faithful participate in the oblation, understood in this limited sense, after their own fashion and in a twofold manner, namely, because they not only offer the sacrifice by the hands of the priest, but also, to a certain extent, in union with him.”<sup>106</sup> He emphasized the importance of sacramental Communion as part of the sacrifice, as receiving the life of Christ, and as the unity of the members of His body.<sup>107</sup> This called-for liturgical renewal reached its culmination at Vatican II in its Liturgical Constitution, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*.

---

<sup>105</sup>Pius XII, *Mediator Dei*, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 39 (1947): 521-595, English translation in *The Papal Encyclicals 1939-1958* (Ann Arbor: The Pierian Press, 1990), 119-154, here 88.

<sup>106</sup>*Ibid.*, 92.

<sup>107</sup>See *ibid.*, 112. Although the Pope urged the faithful to receive Communion, in the same breath he repeated what Trent had said that it is not a requirement for the integrity of the sacrifice, which is obligatory only on the part of the priest. See *ibid.*, 112, 118, 119. Also see Session 22, Chapter 6 and canon 8 of Trent in Schroeder, trans., *The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, 147, 150.

## Local Church in Vatican II and the Post-Vatican II Teachings of the Magisterium<sup>108</sup>

One of the significant themes to emerge from Vatican II was that of the local Church. However, the Council was not consistent in applying the terms for the local Church.<sup>109</sup> Many conciliar documents use “particular church” to mean a diocese as local Church.<sup>110</sup> But they also used “local” and other variants such as “individual” and “various” for the same purpose.<sup>111</sup>

The description of the local Church in these documents is a recapturing of the manifestation of the Church in her liturgical context, particularly as a localized sacramental realization in the celebration of the Eucharist under the sacred ministry of its bishop.<sup>112</sup>

Accordingly, it is an affirmation about the unifying role of the Eucharist and of the priestly

---

<sup>108</sup>Documents considered here are *Lumen Gentium*; *Christus Dominus*; John Paul II, “*Ai vescovi degli Stati Uniti durante l’incontro nel Seminario Minore di nostra Signora di Los Angeles*” in *Insegnamenti di Giovanni Paolo II*, vol. 10, n. 3 (Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1987), 552-572 (reference to this document is made to its page number); Congregatio pro Doctrina Fidei, *Litterae ad Catholicae Ecclesiae Episcopos de aliquibus aspectibus Ecclesiae prout est Communio, Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 85 (1993): 838-850, English translation in The Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, “Some Aspects of the Church Understood as Communion,” *Origins* 22 (1992): 108-112; The Roman Catholic Church and the world Council of Churches, “The Church: Local and Universal. A Study Document Commissioned and Received by the Joint Working Group,” *Faith and Order Paper* 150 (Geneva: WCC Publications, 1990), 1-15, hereafter “The Church: Local and Universal”; “Church Unity Rooted in Eucharist,” *L’Osservatore Romano*, English edition (1993), 4 and 10, (reference to this document is made to its page number).

<sup>109</sup>For an analysis of the terms, see O’Donnell, *Ecclesia*, 271-272; Emmanuel Lanne, “The Local Church: Its Catholicity and Apostolicity,” *One in Christ* 6 (1970): 297-298; de Lubac, *The Motherhood of the Church*, 171-190; Patrick Granfield, “The Local Church as a Center of Communication and Control,” *The Catholic Theological Society of America* 35 (1980): 256-257.

<sup>110</sup>See *Lumen Gentium*, 23, 27; *Christus Dominus*, 6, 11, 28, 36. Also see The Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, “Some Aspects of the Church Understood as Communion,” 8-13; “Church Unity Rooted in Eucharist,” 4, 10.

<sup>111</sup>See *Lumen Gentium*, 23, 26; *Christus Dominus*, 36.

<sup>112</sup>See *Lumen Gentium*, 26.

ministry of the bishop and the role of the whole assembly for the concrete realization of the Church.

### The Diocesan Episcopal Eucharistic Community as True Manifestation of the Church of Christ

From the very first document of Vatican II, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, we get a picture of the Church displayed with special clarity at its local level. The Fathers at Vatican II offered elements pointing to a specific conception of the Church such as “the real nature of the true Church,”<sup>113</sup> that is, “the principal manifestation of the Church consists in the full, active participation of all God’s holy people . . . especially in the same Eucharist, in one prayer, at one altar, at which the bishop presides.”<sup>114</sup> The Fathers also taught that “the bishop is to be considered as the High Priest of his flock from whom the life in Christ of his faithful is in some way derived and upon whom it in some way depends.”<sup>115</sup> Therefore the faithful are urged to consider particularly the eucharistic life of the diocese centered around its bishop.<sup>116</sup> Consequently, the Council gave, in addition to *Lumen Gentium*,<sup>117</sup> in *Christus Dominus* a definition of a diocese as local Church, which contains the whole theology of the local Church:

---

<sup>113</sup>*Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 2.

<sup>114</sup>*Ibid.*, 41.

<sup>115</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>116</sup>See *ibid.* Also see *Lumen Gentium*, 23; *Christus Dominus*, 11; The Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, “Some Aspects of the Church Understood as Communion,” 11; The Roman Catholic Church and the World Council of Churches, “The Church: Local and Universal,” 15-16. Also see Komonchak, “Ministry and the Local Church,” 56; Richard McBrien, “The Ecclesiology of the Local Church,” *Thought* 66 (1991): 360-362; Sabbas J. Killian, “The Meaning and Nature of the Local Church,” in *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America* 36 (1981), 250.

<sup>117</sup>See *Lumen Gentium*, 26.

A diocese is a section of the People of God entrusted to a bishop to be guided by him with the assistance of his clergy so that, loyal to its pastor and formed by him into one community in the Holy Spirit through the Gospel and the Eucharist, it constitutes one particular church in which the one, holy, catholic and apostolic Church of Christ is truly present and active.<sup>118</sup>

Accordingly, the Church is present in those communities in which there are the elements of the Spirit, the Gospel, the Eucharist, and the apostolic tradition.<sup>119</sup>

The relationship between the Eucharist and the Church goes back to the Church's origins. One of the ancient names for the Eucharist is *synaxis*, a coming together, which, however, is not limited only to the Eucharist. Every liturgical gathering is also understood as *synaxis*. This act of gathering is an essential element in understanding theologically what the celebration of the Eucharist and the Church are, mean, and how they relate to each other.<sup>120</sup> That is, such a gathering of the faithful is required by, is part of, and is necessary for the celebration of the Eucharist, by means of which the Church is constituted.

Every eucharistic gathering presumes, in particular, the visible Church as the people of God who are called and gathered by God at a particular locality and time. "For these [the Churches] are in fact, in their own localities, the new people called by God; in the power of

---

<sup>118</sup>*Christus Dominus*, 11.

<sup>119</sup>See *Lumen Gentium*, 23, 26, 28; The Roman Catholic Church and the World Council of Churches, "The Church: Local and Universal," 15.

<sup>120</sup>See Irwin, *Models of the Eucharist*, 69; Margaret Mary Kelleher, "Assembly," in *The New Dictionary of Theology*, eds. Joseph A. Komonchak et al., (Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, Inc, 1987), 67.



the Holy Spirit . . . .”<sup>121</sup> It was primarily to this concrete local manifestation of the eucharistic life of the Church that the Greek term *ekklesia* was applied.

In this way, the rediscovery of the local Church in these documents is a retrieval of the ancient consciousness of the Church. “In each altar community, under the sacred ministry of the bishop, manifest symbol is to be seen of that charity and ‘unity of the mystical body, without which there can be no salvation’.”<sup>122</sup> Thus the Eucharist and diocesan bishop are key elements for the understanding and structure of the local Church and its self-realization.

---

<sup>121</sup>*Lumen Gentium*, 26. The presumption here is the diocese understood as episcopal eucharistic assembly. However, these documents do speak about parishes. Parishes are always seen as extension of the mission of the bishop who is the Ordinary of his diocese by the canonical mission from the Pope. In this way, parishes are recognized as the local expression of the diocese. Priests sanctify and govern under the bishop’s authority that part of the flock entrusted to them. Moreover, priests depend on the bishop in the exercise of their sacramental power and represent the bishop in their own localities by reason of their sharing in the priesthood and mission of the bishop. See *Lumen Gentium*, 28; *Christus Dominus*, 15; The Roman Catholic Church and the World Council of Churches, “The Church: Local and Universal,” 18. Also see Andrien Nocent, “The Local Church as the Realization of the Church of Christ and subject of the Eucharist,” in *The Reception of Vatican II*, eds. Giuseppe Alberigo et al., (Washington, District of Columbia: The Catholic University of America Press, 1987), 216; Rahner, “The New Image of the Church,” 10; Seamus Ryan, “Vatican II: The Rediscovery of the Episcopate,” *Irish Theological Quarterly*, 33 (1966): 218; Susan Wood, “A Liturgical Theology of the Episcopacy,” in *Unifying Patience and Sound Teaching: Reflections on Episcopal Ministry in Honor of Rembert G. Weakland*, ed. David A. Stosar (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 2003), 31-32.

<sup>122</sup>*Lumen Gentium*, 26. Also see *ibid.*, 20; The Roman Catholic Church and the World Council of Churches, “The Church: Local and Universal,” 16, and “Church Unity Rooted in Eucharist,” 4; Granfield, “The Local Church as a Center,” 257; de Lubac, *The Motherhood of the Church*, 180-183; Corecco, “The Bishops as the Head,” 98.

## Eucharist and Episcopacy: Two Principal Constitutive Elements of the Church at the Local Level

The concept of communion for the Church employed by these documents<sup>123</sup> is seen as having primary and fundamental importance for the understanding of the Church, whether local or universal. The principle of the concept of communion is rooted in the Trinity, and in its primary sense, communion is participation in the life of God through Christ in the Holy Spirit. All people are called by God “to share in his own divine life” and

When the work which the Father gave the Son to do on earth (cf. Jn. 17:4) was accomplished, the Holy Spirit was sent on the day of Pentecost in order that he might continually sanctify the Church, and that, consequently, those who believe might have access through Christ in one Spirit to the Father (cf. Eph. 2:18).<sup>124</sup>

The renewed understanding of communion ecclesiology is eucharistic ecclesiology. Hence, the statement in *Lumen Gentium* is a positive affirmation about the Eucharist as “the creative force and source of communion”<sup>125</sup> for the sacramental realization of the Church:

Taking part in the eucharistic sacrifice, the source and summit of the Christian life, [the faithful] offer the divine victim to God and themselves along with it. And so it is that, both in the offering and in the Holy Communion, each in [one’s] own way, though not of course indiscriminately, has [one’s] own part to play in the liturgical action. Then, strengthened by the body of Christ in the eucharistic communion, they manifest in a concrete way that

---

<sup>123</sup>See *Lumen Gentium*, 1, 4, 8, 13-15, 18, 21, 24-25; The Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, “Some Aspects of the Church Understood as Communion,” 1-6.

<sup>124</sup>*Lumen Gentium*, 4. Also see John Paul II, “*Ai vescovi degli Stati Uniti durante l’incontro nel seminario Minore di nostra signora di Los Angeles*,” 552-553.

<sup>125</sup>The Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, “Some Aspects of the Church Understood as Communion,” 5. Also see J. M. R. Tillard, *The Bishop of Rome. Theology and Life* 5, trans. John de Stagé (Wilmington: Glazier, 1983), 150-151; McPartlan, “The Eucharist as the Basis for Ecclesiology,” 15; Joseph A. Komonchak, “The Church is a Communion,” *Liturgy* 3 (1983): 7.

unity of the People of God which this holy sacrament aptly signifies and admirably realizes.<sup>126</sup>

Celebration of the Eucharist in a locally assembled community is crucial because the Church is constituted in that particular community.<sup>127</sup> Accordingly, this eucharistic ecclesiology has its starting point in the local Church.<sup>128</sup> “In them [local Churches] the faithful are gathered together through the preaching of the Gospel of Christ, and the mystery of the Lord’s Supper is celebrated ‘so that, by means of the flesh and blood of the Lord the whole brotherhood of the Body may be welded together’.”<sup>129</sup> The communion achieved through the sacramental participation in the body and blood of Christ in the celebration of the Eucharist is twofold: communion with God and communion among the faithful:

Really sharing in the body of the Lord in the breaking of the eucharistic bread, we are taken up into communion with him and with one another. “Because the bread is one, we, though many, are one body, all of us who partake of the one bread” (1 Cor. 10:17). In this way all of us make members of his body (1 Cor. 12:27) . . . .<sup>130</sup>

---

<sup>126</sup>*Lumen Gentium*, 11. Also see *ibid.*, 3; Pedro Romano Rocha, “The Principal Manifestation of the Church (*Sacrosanctum Concilium*. 41),” in *Vatican II: Assessment and Perspectives*, ed. René Latourelle, vol. 2 (Mahwah, New York: Paulist Press, 1989), 3; Komonchak, “The Church is a Communion,” 8.

<sup>127</sup>See *Lumen Gentium*, 26; The Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, “Some Aspects of the Church Understood as Communion,” 5; The Roman Catholic Church and the World Council of Churches, “The Church: Local and Universal,” 23.

<sup>128</sup>See John Paul II, “*Ai vescovi degli Stati Uniti durante l’incontro nel seminario minore di nostra signora di Los Angeles*,” 555; The Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, “Some Aspects of the Church Understood as Communion,” 1, 3, 5; Karl Rahner and Joseph Ratzinger, *The Episcopate and the Primacy* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1962), 23; Gerardo J. Békés, “The Eucharist Makes the Church: The Ecclesial Dimension of the Sacrament,” trans. Leslie Wearne, in *Vatican II: Assessment and Perspective*, vol. 2, ed. René Latourelle (Mahwah, New York: Paulist Press, 1989), 347.

<sup>129</sup>*Lumen Gentium*, 26.

<sup>130</sup>*Ibid.* 7.

This twofold communion is the result of God's initiative carried out in the paschal mystery of Christ.<sup>131</sup>

The most fundamental and explicit conciliar text that deals with the connection between the Eucharist and the Church is that “the sharing in the body and blood of Christ has no other effect than to accomplish our transformation into that which we receive’.”<sup>132</sup> This communion/transformation of the faithful into the body of Christ in the Eucharist is underscored as the greatest manifestation of the Church: “[T]he Pauline expression *the church is the body of Christ* means that the eucharist, in which the Lord gives us his body and transforms us into one body, is where the church expresses herself permanently in most essential form.”<sup>133</sup> This concept of communion captures the sacramental nature of the unity of the Church, which makes the faithful into members of an organically structured community, the Church.<sup>134</sup>

This understanding of the communion has its roots in the Old Testament, in which a sacred meal is understood to be a symbolic sacramental sign of the communion of a person with God and with his fellow human beings.<sup>135</sup> Likewise, Eucharist is that sacred meal for Christians because it forms and renews the community of the holy people of God.

---

<sup>131</sup>See *ibid.*, 9; The Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, “Some Aspects of the Church Understood as Communion,” 3.

<sup>132</sup>*Lumen Gentium*, 26.

<sup>133</sup>The Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, “Some Aspects of the Church Understood as Communion,” 5, *emphasis original*.

<sup>134</sup>See *Lumen Gentium*, 1. Also see The Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, “Some Aspects of the Church Understood as Communion,” 3; de Cardedal, “Development of a Theology of the Local Church,” 12.

<sup>135</sup>See Békés, “The Eucharist Makes the Church,” 351.

Communion is also rooted in the bishop of the local Church which has a eucharistic ecclesiological background. As emphasized in *Lumen Gentium*, it is primarily the bishop's task to offer the Eucharist, which is the same everywhere.<sup>136</sup> The college of bishops symbolizes the unity that exists among the altar communities which each bishop represents in his office. Moreover, in accordance with canon 4 of the First Council of Nicaea (325), it is the custom of the Church to summon a number of bishops (minimum three) to participate in the consecration of a new bishop.<sup>137</sup> This act signifies receiving the new bishop into the episcopal college: "One is constituted a member of the episcopal body in virtue of the sacramental consecration and by the hierarchical communion with the head and members of the college."<sup>138</sup> The collegial nature of the Church as communion of communions is sacramentally signified in the episcopal consecration.

The basis for the doctrine of episcopacy is the calling and sending of the Twelve by Jesus.<sup>139</sup> Since the mission of the apostles will "last until the end of the world,"<sup>140</sup> after their death it was necessary that other approved men would take up their ministry.<sup>141</sup> The Council teaches that "bishops have by divine institution taken the place of the apostles as pastors of the Church."<sup>142</sup> For this reason, the mission of bishops becomes a continuation of Christ's own mission on earth; therefore, the office of bishops is an irrevocable and essential component of the Church's structure.

---

<sup>136</sup>See *Lumen Gentium*, 26.

<sup>137</sup>See *ibid.*, 21.

<sup>138</sup>*Ibid.*, 22.

<sup>139</sup>See *ibid.*, 19.

<sup>140</sup>See Matthew. 28:20; *Lumen Gentium*, 20.

<sup>141</sup>See *Lumen Gentium*, 20.

<sup>142</sup>*Ibid.*

The episcopacy belongs exclusively to the sphere of ministerial sharing in the function of Christ. The Council teaches that “the fulness of the sacrament of Orders is conferred” on the bishop in his episcopal consecration, that is, the “high priesthood, the acme of the sacred ministry”<sup>143</sup> because he alone is commissioned by God for the fullness of ministry in the Church as a successor of the apostles. In his consecration the bishop receives the same Spirit which was given to Christ himself:

... by the imposition of hands and through the words of the consecration, the grace of the Holy Spirit is given, and a sacred character is impressed in such wise that bishops, in a resplendent and visible manner, take the place of Christ himself, teacher, shepherd and priest, and act as his representatives (*in eius persona*).<sup>144</sup>

Thus all the initiatives of the bishop in teaching, sanctifying, and guiding have their origin in his identification with Christ—the sole true teacher, priest, and shepherd. For this reason the Council teaches: “In the person of bishops, then, to whom the priests render assistance, the Lord Jesus Christ, supreme high priest, is present in the midst of the faithful.”<sup>145</sup>

The understanding of the bishop in relation to the local Church is important because his office is the primary pastoral office of the local Church.<sup>146</sup> The bishop is the source and foundation of the unity of the local Church entrusted to his priestly ministry.<sup>147</sup> The priestly ministry of the bishop is preeminently exercised in the celebration of the Eucharist, the sacrament of unity:

---

<sup>143</sup>Ibid., 21.

<sup>144</sup>Ibid.

<sup>145</sup>Ibid.

<sup>146</sup>See *ibid.*, 20.

<sup>147</sup>See *ibid.*, 23; The Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, “Some Aspects of the Church Understood as Communion,” 13. Also see Nocent, “The Local Church as Realization,” 215.

The bishop, invested with the fulness of the sacrament of Orders, is “the steward of the grace of the supreme priesthood,” above all in the Eucharist, which he himself offers . . . from which the Church ever derives its life and on which it thrives . . . [hence] every legitimate celebrations (*sic*) of the Eucharist is regulated by the bishop . . . .<sup>148</sup>

The eucharistic center of the Church thus serves the basis for the sacramental position of the unifying role of the priestly ministry of bishop in his local Church, whereby the center of his priestly activity makes the local Church pre-eminently eucharistic.

Together with the eucharistic ecclesiology, the recapturing of the priestly character of the episcopate was vital for determining the nature and the structure of the local Church.<sup>149</sup> Thus for the fullness of the Church to be made present most perfectly in the celebration of the Eucharist, the priestly ministry of the bishop is required because of his possession of the fullness of the sacrament of Orders, which belongs to the ecclesial unity.<sup>150</sup>

---

<sup>148</sup>*Lumen Gentium*, 26. Also see The Roman Catholic Church and the World Council of Churches, “The Church: Local and Universal,” 16.

<sup>149</sup>See *Lumen Gentium*, 23; The Roman Catholic Church and the World Council of Churches, “The Church: Local and Universal,” 16. Also see Paul McPartalan, “Presbyteral Ministry in Roman Catholic Church,” *Ecclesiology* 1 (2005): 12-14; Joseph Cunnane, “The Local Church,” in *The Meaning of the Church*, ed. Donal Flanagan (Dublin: Gill and Son, 1966), 81.

<sup>150</sup>The ecclesial signification of the episcopal consecration is that it confers the fullness of the sacrament of Orders because bishops are commissioned by God for the highest ministry in the Church to carry on the work of the apostles as *vicarius Christi* in teaching, governing, and priestly functions. The fullness represented in the episcopacy is the membership in and union with the college of bishops, an essential element within episcopal consecration. Bishops, in addition to their representative functions within the local eucharistic communities, represent those communities in the college of bishops. See Susan Wood, “The Sacramentality of Episcopal Consecration,” *Theological Studies* 51 (1990): 482, 485, 494; Ratzinger, “The Pastoral Implications,” 22-23; Bernard Botte, “The Collegial Character of the Priesthood and the Episcopate,” *Concilium* 4 (1965): 90; Seamus Ryan, “Vatican II: The Re-Discovery of the Episcopate,” *Irish Theological Quarterly* 33 (1966): 218; Wood, “A Liturgical Theology of the Episcopacy,” 43.

In addition to the ministry of sanctifying, the Council's assertion that "episcopal consecration confers . . . the duty also of teaching and ruling"<sup>151</sup> is also a strong affirmation of the theology of the local Church. That is, the teaching and governing ministries also directly come from Christ himself.<sup>152</sup> In this way, it is a departure from conceiving of the Church as one vast universal diocese or the local Church as an administrative unit of the universal Church to the local Church as wholly Church.<sup>153</sup> Thus episcopal consecration is linked to the anointing of kings, prophets, and priests of the Old Testament and is understood as commissioning the recipient to be ruler, teacher, and priest of the new people of God. Accordingly, the radical dissociation of *potestas ordinis* and *potestas jurisdictionis* and the understanding of the episcopacy as adjunct to the order of priest, which had characterized the ecclesiology of the Church since the Middle Ages, are overcome.<sup>154</sup> Moreover, this recognition of the role of the bishop in the eucharistic community shows the New Testament roots and the patristic vision of the interrelationship of the Eucharist, Church, and bishop.<sup>155</sup> But there still remains the need to articulate the relation of the local Church to the universal Church.

---

<sup>151</sup>*Lumen Gentium*, 21.

<sup>152</sup>See *ibid.*, 27. However, the office of governing and teaching can only be exercised in hierarchical communion with the college of bishops, of which the Pope is the head. See *ibid.*, 21; Nocent, "The Local Church as Realization of the Church of Christ," 228.

<sup>153</sup>See *Lumen Gentium*, 27.

<sup>154</sup>See Ryan, "Episcopal Consecration," 204; Ryan, "Vatican II: The Re-Discovery of the Episcopate," 220.

<sup>155</sup>See Nocent, "The Local Church as Realization of the Church," 225; Hervé-Marie Legrand, "The Presidency of the Eucharist According to the Ancient Tradition," in *Living Bread, Saving Cup*, ed. R. Kevin Seasoltz (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1987), 209-215.



### Relationship of the Local Church to the Universal Church: *in Quibus et ex Quibus* Principle

The relationship of the local Church to the universal Church, the worldwide Church, is rooted in communion (eucharistic) ecclesiology. The Council expressed this relationship in *Lumen Gentium* in the formula *in quibus et ex quibus*: “[Local Churches] are constituted after the model of the universal Church; it is in these and formed out of them that the one and unique Catholic Church exists.”<sup>156</sup>

According to *Lumen Gentium*, the universal Church is the body of the local Churches.<sup>157</sup> This understanding makes possible to apply the concept of communion to the union among the local Churches and helps to grasp the multiplicity of the local Churches within the unity of the universal Church. That is, this concept holds the local and universal dimensions as two integrated aspects of one reality at the place of the Eucharist.<sup>158</sup> The one and universal Church is gathered together in the local Churches. It is present in them and it is in them and from them that it exists.

Theologically underscored here is the realization of the whole mystery of the Church in the local Churches. That is, because of the celebration of the Eucharist in every local Church, Christ is present and by virtue of which the *una, sancta, catholica, et apostolica Ecclesia* is present in them.<sup>159</sup> Local Churches are modeled after the universal Church because there is only one Church of God and these local Churches are “the manifold

---

<sup>156</sup>*Lumen Gentium*, 23.

<sup>157</sup>See *ibid.*

<sup>158</sup>See The Roman Catholic Church and the World Council of Churches, “The Church: Local and Universal,” 5.

<sup>159</sup>See *Christus Dominus*, 11; *Lumen Gentium*, 26.

particular expressions of the saving presence of the one church of Christ” with all her essential elements.<sup>160</sup> This “essential mystery”<sup>161</sup> or the “mutual interiority”<sup>162</sup> of the Church/es is summed up in the formula *in quibus et ex quibus*.

Because of the eucharistic nature of the Church, the local Church is not a closed entity. As part of the body of Churches, by means of the celebration of the Eucharist, each local Church maintains its reality as a Church by relating to other local Churches and to the universal Church.<sup>163</sup> The particular elements that link each local Church with other local Churches in the universal Church are the Eucharist and the bishop. “Unity, or communion between the particular churches in the universal church, is rooted not only in the same faith and in the common baptism, but above all in the eucharist and in the episcopate.”<sup>164</sup>

It is rooted in the Eucharist because the eucharistic sacrifice while celebrated in a local Church is never a celebration of that Church alone, for it is the same Christ and the same sacrifice that are offered and present in other local Churches. The oneness and indivisibility of the eucharistic body of Christ implies the oneness and indivisibility of the one Church of Christ. Moreover, each local Church that celebrates the Eucharist receives the entire gift of salvation:

. . . the eucharistic sacrifice, while always offered in a particular community, is never a celebration of that community alone . . . the community, in receiving the eucharistic

---

<sup>160</sup>The Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, “Some Aspects of the Church Understood as Communion,” 7.

<sup>161</sup>*Ibid.* 9.

<sup>162</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>163</sup>See *ibid.* 8.

<sup>164</sup>*Ibid.*, 11.

presence of the Lord, receives the entire gift of salvation and shows . . . particular form that is the image and true presence of the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic church.<sup>165</sup>

The unity of the Church is rooted in the unity of the episcopate.<sup>166</sup> This unity of the episcopate is perpetuated through the means of apostolic succession.<sup>167</sup> The historical concept of the local Churches means having as their ministerial head the successors of the apostles, the bishops.<sup>168</sup> For each local Church to be fully Church, there must be present in it the episcopal college, which each bishop represents in his local Church.<sup>169</sup>

The local Church has primacy insofar as the entire Church is understood in and beginning with the local realization of the one Church of Christ in the celebration of the Eucharist in a concrete community.<sup>170</sup> As an historical reality the universal Church is comprised of local Churches scattered and living throughout the world, which shows the catholicity of the undivided Church.<sup>171</sup> Therefore, belonging to the Catholic Church is realized by belonging to a particular local Church.

The *in quibus et ex quibus* relationship of the local Church to the universal Church calls for a renewed ecclesiology, which suggests that the local Churches and the universal Church cannot be understood in “the parts” and “the whole” as in the sense of mere human

---

<sup>165</sup>Ibid.

<sup>166</sup>See *Lumen Gentium*, 18, 21-22.

<sup>167</sup>See *ibid.* 20.

<sup>168</sup>See *ibid.* 18; “Church Unity Rooted in Eucharist,” 4.

<sup>169</sup>See *Lumen Gentium*, 20, 23; The Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, “Some Aspects of the Church Understood as Communion,” 13.

<sup>170</sup>See The Roman Catholic Church and the World Council of Churches, “The Church: Local and Universal,” 14.

<sup>171</sup>See *Lumen Gentium*, 23.

society.<sup>172</sup> It is the unique characteristic of the Church that it is capable of existing in its entirety in a local eucharistic community. This awareness underscores that every local Church is truly and wholly Church and the whole ecclesial force of the Church of Christ is present and manifest in it. As a result, each Christian comes in contact with the complete life of the Church only *at* the local level.<sup>173</sup>

### **Eucharistic Participation of the Local Church in Vatican II and the Post-Vatican II Teachings of the Magisterium<sup>174</sup>**

According to the traditional teaching of the Church, the sacrifice of the cross is celebrated mysteriously in the eucharistic liturgy. The Council teaches: “At the Last Supper . . . our Saviour instituted the eucharistic sacrifice of his Body and Blood . . . in order to perpetuate the sacrifice of the Cross throughout the ages until he should come

---

<sup>172</sup>See The Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, “Some Aspects of the Church Understood as Communion,” 9; “Church Unity Rooted in Eucharist,” 4.

<sup>173</sup>See Karl Rahner, *Bishops: Their Status and Functions* (London, 1964), 38; Cunnane, “The Local Church,” 74; Corecco, “The Bishops as the Head of the Local Church and its Discipline,” 89; Joseph A. Komonchak, “Ecclesiology of Vatican II,” *Origins* 28 (1999): 765.

<sup>174</sup>Documents considered here are *Sacrosanctum Concilium*; Paul VI, *Mysterium Fidei*, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 57 (1965): 753-774, English translation in *The Papal Encyclicals 1958-1981* (Ann Arbor: The Pierian Press, 1990), 165-177; John Paul II, *Cunctis Catholicae Ecclesiae episcopis presbyteris et diaconis viris et mulieribus consecrates omnibusque christifidelibus laicis de Eucharistia eiusque necessitudine cum Ecclesia* (*Ecclesia de Eucharistia*), *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 95 (2003): 433-475, English translation in *On the Eucharist in its Relationship to the Church: Ecclesia de Eucharistia*, Vatican translation (Boston, Pauline Books and Media, 2003); Benedict XVI, *Adhortatio Apostolica Postsynodalis: Ad Episcopos Sacerdotes Consecratos Consecratasque necnon Christifideles laicos de Eucharistia vitae missionique Ecclesiae fonte et culmine* (*Sacramentum Caritatis*), *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 99 (2007): 105-194, English translation in United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, *The Sacrament of Charity: Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation*, Vatican City, Libreria Editrice Vaticana (Washington, District of Columbia, 2007); *Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani* (Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2000), English translation in United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, *General Instruction of the Roman Missal: Liturgy Documentary Series 2*, (Washington, District of Columbia, 2002), hereafter the GIRM 2002.

again . . . .”<sup>175</sup> John Paul II reasserts this close relationship of *ephapax* sacrifice of the cross to the Eucharist and *vice versa* as follows:

The Eucharist is indelibly marked by the event of the Lord’s passion and death, of which it is not only a reminder but the sacramental re-presentation. It is the sacrifice of the Cross perpetuated down the ages. This truth is well expressed by the words with which the assembly in the Latin rite responds to the priest’s proclamation of the “Mystery of Faith”: “*We announce your death, O Lord.*”<sup>176</sup>

Theologically underscored here is the sacramental perpetuation of the paschal mystery of Christ in the celebration of the Eucharist. The heart of the eucharistic celebration is the paschal mystery of Christ in which we are to take part in and to experience our redemption in and through the liturgy of the Eucharist. Hence, the Council reminds us: “For it is the liturgy through which, especially in the divine sacrifice of the Eucharist, ‘the work of our redemption is accomplished’.”<sup>177</sup>

Before I probe further into how the sacrifice of Christ is enacted (made present) and is participated in according to the magisterial documents under consideration, I should explain the subject of the eucharistic liturgy asserted in such documentation. That is, who enacts the paschal mystery of Christ and takes part in it.

---

<sup>175</sup>*Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 47. Also see Council of Trent, Session 22, Chapter 2 in Schroeder, trans., *The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, 145-146; *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 2<sup>d</sup> ed., (Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1994), 1367; Pius XII, *Mediator Dei*, 66-70; Paul VI, *Mysterium Fidei*, 34; the GIRM 2002, 2.

<sup>176</sup>John Paul II, *Ecclesia de Eucharistia*, 11, emphasis original.

<sup>177</sup>*Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 2.

## The Operative Principle: The Local Church as the Active Subject of its Eucharistic Celebration

By its very nature, liturgy is communal. That is, it is something that a liturgical assembly does together. This aspect of the liturgy is self-evident in the enactment of the Eucharist as the action of the Church:

Liturgical services are not private functions but are celebrations of the Church which is “the sacrament of unity,” namely, “the holy people united and arranged under their bishops.” Therefore, liturgical services pertain to the whole Body of the Church. They manifest it, and have effects upon it.<sup>178</sup>

In this context, the “whole Body of the Church” means the local Church which is hierarchically ordered and arranged under the bishop as a visible entity.

The Council’s recovery of the ancient principle that the assembly is the subject of the liturgical action is based on a renewed appreciation of the intimate union that exists between Christ and the faithful.<sup>179</sup> Because of their union with Christ by virtue of their baptism, the entire mystical body of the faithful has been called to participate in the liturgy as the priestly people of God.<sup>180</sup> In this regard, the Council states: “The liturgy, then, is rightly seen as an exercise of the priestly office of Jesus Christ . . . In it full public worship is performed by the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ, that is, by the Head and his members.”<sup>181</sup> The assembly is the

---

<sup>178</sup>Ibid., 26. Also see Paul VI, *Mysterium Fidei*, 32; the GIRM 2002, 16, 91.

<sup>179</sup>The recognition that *Sacrosanctum Concilium* gives to the significance of local Churches and to their realization in liturgical assemblies underscores the recovery of an ancient understanding of assembly as the liturgical subject. Although *Sacrosanctum Concilium* does not articulate explicitly that the assembly is the subject of the eucharistic liturgy, this principle is operative in *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 7, 14, 26.

<sup>180</sup>See *ibid.*, 14.

<sup>181</sup>Ibid. 7.

subject because Christ, the head of the assembly, is the ultimate subject of any liturgical celebration.<sup>182</sup> Moreover, the assertion that the Council makes in *Sacrosanctum Concilium* and Paul VI in *Mysterium Fidei* about the presence of Christ in relation to the liturgical assembly is a recognition of the liturgical importance given to the assembly.<sup>183</sup> Such an assertion and emphasis underscores the significance of the assembly and the communal

---

<sup>182</sup>See Benedict XVI, *Sacramentum Caritatis*, 36.

<sup>183</sup>What is intriguing in these two texts is the order of the listing of Christ's mode of liturgical presence in relation to the assembly. *Sacrosanctum Concilium* states: "... Christ is always present in his Church, especially in her liturgical celebrations. He is present in the Sacrifice of the Mass not only in the person of his minister, 'the same now offering, through the ministry of priests, who formerly offered himself on the cross,' but especially in the eucharistic species. By his power he is present in the sacraments so that when anybody baptizes it is really Christ himself who baptizes. He is present in his word since it is he himself who speaks when the holy scriptures are read in the Church. Lastly, he is present when the Church prays and sings, for he has promised 'where two or three are gathered together in my name there am I in the midst of them' (Mt. 18:20)." *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 7. Paul VI in *Mysterium Fidei* not only reverses the order of listing, but also presents it in greater detail: "... Christ is present in His Church when she prays, since He is the one who 'prays for us and prays in us and to whom we pray: He prays for us as our priest, He prays in us as our head, He is prayed to by us as our God'; and He is the one who has promised, 'Where two or three are gathered together in my name, I am there in the midst of them' . . . [i]n still another very genuine way, He is present in the church as she preaches, since the Gospel which she proclaims is the word of God...[Christ] is present in His Church as she rules and governs the People of God, since her sacred power comes from Christ . . . Christ is present in His Church in a still more sublime manner as she offers the Sacrifice of the Mass in His name; He is present in her as she administers the sacraments . . . [i]t is his presence in the Sacrament of the Eucharist [which is the] presence par excellence, because it is substantial and through it Christ becomes whole and entire, God and man." Paul VI in *Mysterium Fidei*, 35-39.

In its listing, *Sacrosanctum Concilium* is not describing the liturgical presence of Christ as it occurs in the celebration of the Eucharist. Hence, the theological underpinning of this order of listing lies outside the celebration of the Eucharist itself. That is, the Council Fathers begin with the presence of Christ in the eucharistic species. But Paul VI reverses the order of Christ's presence in accordance with the eucharistic celebration itself, thus placing emphasis first on Christ's presence in the liturgical assembly of faith before any other liturgical mode of his presence. What concerns us here is the adequate emphasis both these texts have given to the liturgical assembly. For an insightful and detailed historical survey of Christ's liturgical presence, see Michael G. Witczak, "The Manifold Presence of Christ in the Liturgy," *Theological Studies* 59 (1998): 680-702. Also see Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 305-312, hereafter *Christian Liturgy*; Jungmann, "Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy," 13-14; Jerome M. Hall, *We Have the Mind of Christ: The Holy Spirit and Liturgical Memory in the Thought of Edward J. Kilmartin* (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 2001), 47-49, hereafter *We Have the Mind of Christ*.

nature of the liturgy as the Church at worship which, in turn, places emphasis on the active participation of the whole Church in the liturgy.<sup>184</sup>

Having seen the local Church as the subject of the eucharistic liturgy, I now analyze the active participation of the local Church in the celebration of the Eucharist. This participation by the assembly is not to be understood only in relation to external activity during the celebration or to the exercise of a specific ministry as such. Rather it must be understood within the realm of an internal participation and the physical participation in the mystery which is being celebrated and its relationship to daily life.<sup>185</sup>

#### The Local Church's Making Memory of the Paschal Mystery of Christ as Active Participation

Active participation in the liturgy is the right and duty of the faithful and is demanded by the nature of the liturgy as described above. Therefore, the Council asserts:

Mother Church earnestly desires that all the faithful should be led to that full, conscious, and active participation in liturgical celebrations which is demanded by the very nature of the liturgy and to which the Christian people, "a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a redeemed people" (1 Pet. 2:9, 4-5) have a right and obligation by reason of their baptism.<sup>186</sup>

---

<sup>184</sup>See the GIRM 2002, 295-310. Also see Edward J. Kilmartin, "The Sacred Liturgy: Reform and Renewal," in *Remembering the Future of Vatican II and Tomorrow's Agenda*, ed. Carl A. Last (New York: Paulist Press, 1983), 34, hereafter "Sacred Liturgy"; Irwin, *Models of the Eucharist*, 70.

<sup>185</sup>See *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 48; Benedict XVI, *Sacramentum Caritatis*, 52-53.

<sup>186</sup>*Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 14.



All the documents propose various means and ways<sup>187</sup> which are meant to engage the faithful deeply in the participation of the paschal mystery of Christ, which is the fundamental principle and goal of the liturgical renewal undertaken and demanded by the Council and underscored by the magisterial documents.<sup>188</sup> In light of this understanding, *Sacrosanctum Concilium* 47-48 can be said to be the most significant conciliar texts because they describe more precisely this participation and are reflected in the subsequent magisterial teachings.

These two texts of *Sacrosanctum Concilium* are intimately related to each other because *Sacrosanctum Concilium* 47 provides the anamnestic liturgical-theological grounding for *Sacrosanctum Concilium* 48 in understanding the ritual enactment of the Eucharist as sacrifice. Moreover, the Eucharist as an enactment of the paschal sacrifice of Christ cannot be adequately understood apart from the context of the Last Supper in which *Sacrosanctum Concilium* 47 is situated. Just as the Eucharist looks back to the event at Calvary, so also the Last Supper looked forward to it and mystically anticipated it. In accordance with the universal tradition of the Church, the Council describes that the Eucharist is a memorial action:

---

<sup>187</sup>In order to achieve the devout and active participation by the faithful, *Sacrosanctum Concilium* suggests various liturgical means such as acclamations, responses, psalms, antiphons, hymns, actions, gestures, bodily attitudes, and proper reverent silence. Moreover, it proposes that each person, from bishop to the faithful, carry out only the proper role in accordance with the nature of the rite and the norms of the liturgy. Liturgical rites should be made simple, short, clear, and free from useless repetitions and they should be within the people's power of comprehension. A wider use of vernacular is suggested for the great advantage of the people. Aspects of liturgical inculturation of sacred music and arts are also encouraged provided they harmonize with the true and authentic spirit of the liturgy and the substantial unity of the Roman rite. The richness of the Bible is to be made use of more lavishly. In homily the mysteries of the faith and the guiding principles of the Christian life are to be expounded from the sacred text and the "prayer of the faithful" is to be restored. See *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 28-30, 34, 36-39, 51-53. Also see Benedict XVI, *Sacramentum Caritatis*, 38-39, 52-55, 64.

<sup>188</sup>*Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 14; the GIRM 2002, 18.

At the Last Supper, on the night he was betrayed, our Saviour instituted the eucharistic sacrifice of his Body and Blood. This he did in order to *perpetuate* the sacrifice of the Cross throughout the ages until he should come again, and so to entrust to his beloved Spouse, the Church, a *memorial* of his death and resurrection: a sacrament of love, a sign of unity, a bond of charity, a paschal banquet in which Christ is consumed, the mind is filled with grace, and a pledge of future glory is given to us.<sup>189</sup>

Liturgically significant about this text is the understanding of the Eucharist as the memorial and sacramental perpetuation of the sacrifice of Christ.

Christ instituted the Eucharist in anticipation of his imminent sacred passion so that the triumph of his passion might always be made present for our sake. By his command to “do this in remembrance of me,” Christ entrusted the Eucharist to the Church. However, in so doing Christ not only willed that the Eucharist be made sacramentally present until the end of time, but also he wished that the Church respond to his gift. Benedict XVI rightly asserts this point in his recent apostolic exhortation, *Sacramentum Caritatis*, as follows:

By his command to “do this in remembrance of me” (Lk 22:19; 1 Cor 11:25), [Christ] asks us to respond to his gift and to make it sacramentally present. In these words the Lord expresses . . . his expectation that the Church, born of his sacrifice, will receive this gift, developing under the guidance of the Holy Spirit the liturgical form of the sacrament. The remembrance of his perfect gift consists not in the mere repetition of the Last Supper, but in the Eucharist itself, that is, in the radical newness of Christian worship. In this way, Jesus left us the task of entering into his “hour.” “The Eucharist draws us into Jesus’ act of self-oblation. More than just statically receiving the incarnate *Logos*, we enter into the very dynamic of his self-giving.”<sup>190</sup>

---

<sup>189</sup>*Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 47, emphasis added. For an interesting treatment of this topic, see Cesare Giraudo, *Eucaristia per la chiesa: Prospettive teologiche sull’eucaristia a partire dalla “lex orandi,” Aloisiana* 22 (Rome: Gregorian University/Brescia: Morcelliana, 1989).

<sup>190</sup>Benedict XVI, *Sacramentum Caritatis*, 11.

Thus the Pope underscores the fact that we are called to celebrate the Eucharist as a memorial of Christ's paschal mystery so as to make the redeeming sacrifice of Christ anew and a part of our history.<sup>191</sup> In the celebration of the Eucharist we perpetuate the sacrifice of Christ in a sacramental way. But we do this in direct relation to the Eucharist understood as a memorial action.

Liturgically speaking, *anamnesis* is a highly charged concept.<sup>192</sup> It means making memory of something or someone. However, liturgical memorial is more than a mere subjective remembrance. It is the community's engagement of active liturgical commemoration of a divine intervention or saving event. In the act of commemoration what is recalled comes to be present in a certain way and enables the people to participate by faith in its saving effects.<sup>193</sup>

The origin of this concept, one of the richest elements in Jewish theology, goes back to the Old Testament and the Jewish liturgical practice. In Exodus Chapters 12 and 13 and Deuteronomy Chapter 16 the Jewish Passover as memorial is linked with this sort of commemoration. Recent attention to the Jewish liturgical influence on the Eucharist shows the power of the idea of remembrance as an objective memorial.

This objective memorial is a sacred sign given to his people by God (Exodus 12:14). This sacred sign, when commemorated, is capable of making present a mysterious permanence of *mirabilia Dei*—the work of God. In blessing and acknowledging God for

---

<sup>191</sup>See *ibid.*, 12.

<sup>192</sup>See Louis Bouyer, *Eucharist: Theology and Spirituality of the Eucharistic Prayer*, trans. Charles Underhill Quinn (Notre Dame, University of Notre Dame Press, 1968), 103-105, hereafter *Eucharist*; Irwin, *Models of the Eucharist*, 122-143.

<sup>193</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 367.

their meal and the *mirabilia Dei* of creation and redemption, the community is acknowledging and experiencing the efficacious sign of the perpetual actuality of the work of God among them, which occurred in the past, and its eschatological accomplishment in the future.<sup>194</sup> Thus the concept of anamnesis entails the aspects of past, present, and future.

It was in the context of the Passover that Christ instituted and celebrated the Eucharist and linked it to the covenant themes and his sacrificial gestures.<sup>195</sup> Christ gave a new significance to the Eucharist, however, by making reference to his approaching act of redemption. In addition, by instituting the mystery of the Eucharist (Luke 22:19-20; Matthew 26:26-28; Mark 14:22-24) he entrusted it to the Church as a sacrament to do it in memory of him.<sup>196</sup>

This biblical concept of *anamnesis* and its application to the celebration of the paschal mystery of Christ results in a dynamic eucharistic liturgical theology for our participation. In other words, the Christ-event that we commemorate in the liturgy gives the Eucharist its meaning and efficacy.<sup>197</sup> The death and resurrection of Christ truly become sacramentally present in our act of commemoration at the celebration of the Eucharist. The Council teaches that in the eucharistic liturgy “the victory and triumph of [Christ’s] death are

---

<sup>194</sup>See Louis Bouyer, *Eucharist*, 84-85.

<sup>195</sup>See Jerome Kodell, *The Eucharist in the New Testament* (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1988), 53-57.

<sup>196</sup>See Paul VI, *Mysterium Fidei*, 28.

<sup>197</sup>See Jean-Marie-Roger Tillard, *The Eucharist: Pasch of God’s People*, trans. Dennis L. Wienk (Staten Island, New York: Alba House, 1967), 212 ff.; Bouyer, *Eucharist*, 83 ff., 103 ff.; Josef Andreas Jungmann, *The Mass of the Roman Rite: Its Origins and Development*, trans. Francis A. Brunner, vol. II (Allen, TX: Christian Classics, 1986), 218-226; Cipriano Vagaggini, *The Canon of the Mass and Liturgical Reform*, trans. Peter Coughlan (Staten Island, New York: Alba House, 1967), 91 ff., 167 ff.; Kasper, “The Unity and Multiplicity of Aspects in the Eucharist,” *Communio* 12 (1985): 121-124; Cabié, *The Church at Prayer: The Eucharist*, 96-100.

made present.”<sup>198</sup> The paschal mystery of Christ is *ephapax* event, yet it is also an event that occurs still in the act of the liturgical commemoration. Thus, the faithful gathered at the eucharistic celebration take part in the paschal mystery of Christ a “here-and-now act of salvation” and look forward to its blessed fulfillment yet to come.<sup>199</sup> Therefore, *anamnesis* is a vital liturgical element and action for enacting the Eucharist:

The Mass makes present the sacrifice of the Cross: it does not add to that sacrifice nor does it multiply it. What is repeated is its *memorial* celebration, its ‘commemorative representation’ (*memoralis demonstratio*), which makes Christ’s one, definitive redemptive sacrifice always present in time.<sup>200</sup>

Thus the act of making memory is the Church’s *liturgical enactment, perpetuation, and participation* in the saving event of Christ. However, at the same time, this new act of redemption which is made present and operative here and now is intimately linked with the past event and to its future accomplishment as well.

Another important liturgical aspect in the act of *anamnesis* is the fact that, above all, our commemoration of the paschal mystery of Christ depends on the initiative of God because we make memory of what God has accomplished in Christ for our salvation. Hence, at the eucharistic liturgy we respond consciously and actively to God’s initiative and grace through the act of *anamnesis*. This understanding of liturgical memorial underscores the dialogical character of liturgy.

---

<sup>198</sup>*Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 6. Also see Paul VI, *Mysterium Fidei*, 27; John Paul II, *Ecclesia de Eucharistia*, 12.

<sup>199</sup>Irwin, *Models of the Eucharist*, 125-126.

<sup>200</sup>John Paul II, *Ecclesia de Eucharistia*, 12, emphasis original.

## The Local Church's Sacramental Sacrificial Offering of Christ and Sacramental Communion as Active Participation

The act of *anamnesis* is not an independent element in the liturgy of the Eucharist because it gives way to the act of offering sacrifice, which is self-evident in the order of the celebration of the Eucharist and in light of the development of this theme in the magisterial teaching.<sup>201</sup> *Sacrosanctum Concilium* and the *General Instruction of the Roman Missal 2002* take up the issue of what the faithful present at the Mass are expected to do after having commemorated and made present the sacrifice of Christ.<sup>202</sup> That is, offer it to the Father. Theologically what the Church does in making memory of the Christ-event leads to the act of offering this gift back to the Father. In other words, *Sacrosanctum Concilium* 47 and the *General Instruction of the Roman Missal 2002* 79e link the purpose of the act of *anamnesis* to the act of offering, as mentioned in *Sacrosanctum Concilium* 48 and in the *General Instruction of the Roman Missal 2002* 79f. In this regard, the Council states:

The Church, therefore, earnestly desires that Christ's faithful, when present at this mystery of faith, should not be there as strangers or silent spectators. On the contrary, through a good understanding of the rites and prayers they should take part in the sacred action, conscious of what they are doing, with devotion and full collaboration. They should be instructed by God's word, and be nourished at the table of the Lord's Body. They should give thanks to God. Offering the immaculate victim, not only through the hands of the priest but also together with him . . . .<sup>203</sup>

---

<sup>201</sup>See the order of *anamnesis* and offering in *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 47-48; the GIRM 2002, 79e-f.

<sup>202</sup>See *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 48; the GIRM 2002, 79f. Also see Kasper, *Sacrament of Unity*, 99.

<sup>203</sup>*Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 48.

In this text the Eucharist has been described as the “mystery of faith.” In order to make sense of what this text describes, particularly with regard to the offering, we need to pay attention to the use of the term “mystery” used here in the sense of sacrament or holy celebration. Precisely because and only when the Eucharist is the celebration of the whole Church, the faithful are called to active participation. Indeed they are called to offer the sacrifice with the priest and not merely “through him.”<sup>204</sup>

The sacrifice that is offered in the celebration of the Eucharist is the sacrifice of Christ. The Church is the body of Christ, into which the faithful are incorporated through baptism and all share in the priesthood of Christ. Hence, it can be said that the sacrifice of Christ is also offered by the Church because it is primarily the action of Christ, who is the head of the Church. “For each and every Mass . . . is an act of Christ and of the Church.”<sup>205</sup> The Church is commissioned to act in such a way because Christ on the cross gave himself for the Church and this gift is offered as that of the Church as well. The common priesthood of the faithful is the theological grounding for this offering. “[T]he faithful join in the offering of the Eucharist by virtue of their royal priesthood.”<sup>206</sup> In this regard, the words of the First Eucharistic Prayer such as *et plebs tua sancta* (“and your holy people”) give theological validity to the concept of the universal priesthood of the faithful implied in 1 Peter 2: 5 and 9. Theologically underscored here is that all must join in the offering of the sacrifice of Christ because, “the whole Church plays the role of priest and victim along with

---

<sup>204</sup>Paul VI reaffirms what Vatican II asserted that “. . . the faithful . . . participate actively, with undivided faith and the utmost devotion, in the celebration of the Most Holy Mystery, to offer it to God along with the priest as a sacrifice for their own salvation and that of the whole world and to use it as a spiritual nourishment.” Paul VI, *Mysterium Fidei*, 1.

<sup>205</sup>Ibid., 32. Also see John Paul II, *Ecclesia de Eucharistia*, 31.

<sup>206</sup>John Paul II, *Ecclesia de Eucharistia*, 28.

Christ, offering the Sacrifice of the Mass and itself completely offered in it,”<sup>207</sup> but each in accordance with their degree of participation in the priesthood of Christ.<sup>208</sup>

Moreover, it becomes clear how the act of offering is the act of the local Church in the description given in the *General Instruction of the Roman Missal 2002*. “[I]n this very memorial, the Church—and in particular the Church here and now gathered—offers in the Holy Spirit the spotless Victim to the Father.”<sup>209</sup> Thus the ritual action of the Mass is the Church’s co-offering of this sacrifice with its head, Christ.

What we offer to God is not just our offering from our initiative. Rather, we offer back to the Father what he has offered us out of his initiative in the person of Christ. Thus the act of offering possesses not only a *katabatic* (descending) dimension but also an *anabatic* (ascending) dimension. This is an act of acknowledging and thanksgiving to the Father for his benevolent gift.

It is possible to offer back this gift to the Father because the Eucharist is a liturgical celebration of Christ’s passion and victory and Christ is always personally present in the

---

<sup>207</sup>Paul VI, *Mysterium Fidei*, 31.

<sup>208</sup>While asserting the common priesthood of the faithful, Paul VI maintains the essential difference between the ministerial priesthood and the common priesthood. See *ibid.* This is again taken up and emphasized by John Paul II when he says that only the priest “who alone is qualified to offer the Eucharist *in persona Christi*.” The Pope goes on to say that this phrase, *in persona Christi*, means more than just offering in the name of or in the place of Christ. It is “in special sacramental identification” with Christ. See John Paul II, *Ecclesia de Eucharistia*, 29-30.

<sup>209</sup>The GIRM 2002, 79f. The verb “*offerimus*” in the First Eucharistic Prayer indicates that the subject of the act of offering is the “we,” the locally assembled Church. See Hans Urs Von Balthasar, “The Mass: A Sacrifice of the Church?” in *Explorations in Theology III: Creator Spirit*, trans. Brian McNeil (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1993), 186; Dulles, “The Eucharist as Sacrifice,” in *Rediscovering the Eucharist: Ecumenical Conversations*, ed. Roch A. Kereszty (Mahwah, New Jersey: Paulist Press, 2003), 182; Karl Rahner and Angelus Häussling, *The Celebration of the Eucharist* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1968), 29.



liturgy.<sup>210</sup> As a result, his historically past redemptive work is never past in its mystery. Therefore, what we can offer the Father is what Christ has accomplished in his humanity for the salvation of the world. What was accomplished once and for all is made present, realized, and is operative here and now and gives us hope to look forward to our own ultimate salvation when we will see God face to face.<sup>211</sup> That is, the here-and-now liturgy becomes a saving event. When *anamnesis* is followed by offering, the theological implication is that the liturgy accomplishes our participation, our real taking part in the paschal mystery of Christ here and now.

At the same time, the faithful are also urged to offer themselves. In offering Christ, they learn to offer themselves as a sacrifice for peace and unity of the Church and for the salvation of the world.<sup>212</sup> According to the magisterial teachings, Christ is present in the Church's life in order to incorporate Christians into his *pasch*, so that together with him they offer spiritual sacrifice to the Father. This sacrifice consists in the entire Christian life of faith, prayer, and works of mercy, which is represented in the liturgy.<sup>213</sup> Liturgical celebration teaches Christians to offer their lives with Christ, so that the mystery of Christ's self-offering may be reproduced in their living:

Offering the immaculate victim, not only through the hands of the priest but also together with him, [the faithful] should learn to offer themselves. Through Christ, the Mediator, they should be drawn day by day into ever more perfect union with God and each other, so that finally God may be all in all.<sup>214</sup>

---

<sup>210</sup>See *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 7; Paul VI, *Mysterium Fidei*, 35-39.

<sup>211</sup>See Irwin, *Models of the Eucharist*, 126-127.

<sup>212</sup>See *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 48; Paul VI, *Mysterium Fidei*, 32.

<sup>213</sup>See *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 11.

<sup>214</sup>*Ibid.*, 48. Also see the GIRM 2002, 79f.

The perpetuation of the unique sacrifice of Christ entails also our reception of Communion, which is our sacramental participation in the sacrifice of Christ. Therefore, the Council states: “The more perfect form of participation in the Mass whereby the faithful, after the priest’s communion, receive the Lord’s Body from the same sacrifice, is warmly recommended.”<sup>215</sup> Our participation in the sacrifice of Christ is made fully possible by sharing in the eucharistic species in which we are joined with the paschal dying and rising of Christ:

The saving efficacy of the sacrifice is fully realized when the Lord’s body and blood are received in communion. The Eucharistic Sacrifice is intrinsically directed to the inward union of the faithful with Christ through communion; we receive the very One who offered himself for us, we receive his body which he gave up for us on the Cross and his blood which he “poured out for many for the forgiveness of sins” (Mt 26:28).<sup>216</sup>

This sacramental participation in the sacrifice of Christ through the reception of Communion is based on multivalent theological facets. Through the reception of Communion the faithful receive the grace of eternal life.<sup>217</sup> “He who eats my flesh and

---

<sup>215</sup>*Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 55. In Pope Pius V’s Missal (1570-1969), eucharistic sharing in the consecrated elements from the same Mass is mentioned: “. . . ut quotquot, ex hac altaris participatione Sacrosanctum Filii tui Corpus et Sanguinem sumpserimus, omni benedictione caelesti et gratia repleamur.” However, in order to overcome the prevalent liturgical practice of distributing Communion from the pre-consecrated elements, which separated the sacrifice from presence, Pope Benedict XIV emphasized what is already quoted from Pius V’s Missal in his 1742 encyclical. See Benedict XIV, *Communion of the Faithful (Certiores Effecti)* in *Papal Teachings: The Liturgy*, selected and arranged by the Benedictine Monks of Solesmes, trans. the Daughters of St. Paul (Boston, Massachusetts: St. Paul Edition, 1962), 21-23, here 6-7. This view is also reiterated by Pope Pius XII in *Mediator Dei*, 117. Also see Benedict XVI, *Sacramentum Caritatis*, 55; the GIRM 2002, 85; Frederick R. McManus, *Liturgical Participation: An Ongoing Assessment* (Washington, District of Columbia: The Pastoral Press, 1988), 24; Irwin, *Models of the Eucharist*, 12, 181-182.

<sup>216</sup>John Paul II, *Ecclesia de Eucharistia*, 16.

<sup>217</sup>See Paul VI, *Mysterium Fidei*, 5.

drinks my blood abides in me, and I in him. As the living Father sent me, and I live because of the Father, so he who eats me will live because of me” (John 6:55). The liturgical and theological integrity of receiving Communion from the same sacrifice is expressed in the *General Instruction of the Roman Missal 2002*, which asserts that “the Eucharistic Sacrifice is, first and foremost, the action of Christ himself . . .” and that “. . . in the celebration of the Mass, in which the Sacrifice of the Cross is perpetuated . . .”<sup>218</sup> Since the Eucharist is a sacrificial banquet, the reception of Communion pertains to the integral and essential aspect of the sacrifice itself. Therefore, our reception of Communion from the elements consecrated at the same Mass completes our full, active participation in the sacrifice of Christ.<sup>219</sup> In instructing his disciples to eat and drink, Jesus signified his will that the consecrated elements should be consumed in order to have them all united to God through the sacrament.<sup>220</sup> This intrinsic relationship of sacrifice and meal in the liturgy is also based on the biblical context in which memorial events are shared at a meal.

Moreover, reception of Communion is also a personal encounter with the Lord Jesus in the sacrament.<sup>221</sup> In this way, each of us receives Christ in the sacramental Communion.<sup>222</sup> The eucharistic Communion brings about in a sublime way the mutual “abiding” of Christ and each of his followers (John 15:4). “Incorporation into Christ, which is brought about by Baptism, is constantly renewed and consolidated by sharing in the

---

<sup>218</sup>The GIRM 2002, 11, 27.

<sup>219</sup>See *ibid.*, 13, 85.

<sup>220</sup>See Paul VI, *Mysterium Fidei*, 66.

<sup>221</sup>See *ibid.*, 23; Benedict XVI, *Sacramentum Caritatis*, 50.

<sup>222</sup>John Paul II, *Ecclesia de Eucharistia*, 22.

Eucharistic Sacrifice, especially by that full sharing which takes place in sacramental communion.”<sup>223</sup>

By its union with Christ, the Church becomes a “sacrament” for humanity, a sign and instrument of the salvation achieved by Christ for the redemption of all. The Church’s mission stands in continuity with the mission of Christ. To carry out this mission the Church draws her spiritual power from the perpetuation of the sacrifice of the cross and her reception of the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist.<sup>224</sup>

### Conclusion

To sum up what has been asserted in this Chapter, pre-Vatican II *societas perfecta* ecclesiology and the eucharistic practice were theologically inadequate in understanding the nature of the Church and of the liturgy. Emphasizing the human elements over against the divine elements in defining the Church, this ecclesiology perceived the Church as society (with its hierarchy, orders, institutions, and authority) rather than as the sacramental manifestation in its eucharistic celebration. The eucharistic controversy of the eleventh century and the following separation of order and jurisdiction affected the eucharistic practice and the theological interrelation of the Eucharist, Church, and bishop as compared to that of the first millennium. The laity had no sense of their role in the celebration of the Eucharist as really taking part in the paschal mystery of Christ.

---

<sup>223</sup>Ibid.

<sup>224</sup>See *ibid.*, 22.

Theologically the Eucharist is intrinsically related to Church. This awareness within the Catholic circles initiated the revival of the scriptural and patristic understanding of the eucharistic ecclesiology and of the liturgy. By restoring the eucharistic ecclesiology, Vatican II emphasized the local sacramental dimension of the Church as communion with God and among the people as achieved through the participation of the faithful in the local episcopal eucharistic celebration.

Vatican II also restored the real nature of the eucharistic liturgy as the worship offered to God by Christ as head of the Church in and through his members. The Council emphasized the true dimension of the eucharistic liturgy as the realization of the paschal mystery of Christ.<sup>225</sup> In the actual enactment of the Eucharist, the faithful make present the paschal mystery of Christ through their internal participation by virtue of their common priesthood. They do it through their liturgical acts of *anamnesis* of the paschal mystery, sacramental sacrificial offering of Christ, and sacramental Communion. They thus literally take part in what they enact, the dying and rising of Christ, as a new act of salvation that still occurs here and now. They draw strength from it to live in accordance with the teaching of the Gospel while here on earth and to look forward to that fullness of salvation which is yet to come.

But what remains as future task in these magisterial documents is a “theological” deepening of the way in which the faithful are enabled to participate in the incommunicable, personal priesthood of Christ by virtue of their baptism. Such participation grounds the basis of their offering together with Christ to the Father.

---

<sup>225</sup>See *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 41.

## CHAPTER II

### DIVERSE INTERPRETATIONS OF ACTIVE PARTICIPATION BY THEOLOGIANs

#### Introduction

Recognition of active participation by the faithful, as a constituent element of liturgy, has been one of the most important renewals in the Roman Catholic liturgy since the Second Vatican Council. Theologically, the topic of active participation is so profound and vast that no single explanation can exhaust its full meaning. Hence, ever since the promulgation of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, theologians have made efforts to interpret its call for “full, conscious, and active participation” by emphasizing one or the other aspects of it. In this Chapter I will consider four Catholic theologians and present their theological approaches to the topic. First, I will investigate Yves Congar’s description of the Eucharist as the celebration of a single cult in the one priesthood of Christ by the whole liturgical assembly. Congar does so through the concepts of sacrifice and priesthood by integrating the inward and external cults and the priesthoods that serve them. Second, I will present Frederick McManus’ emphasis on liturgical silence and external signs as vital elements of communal participation in the mystery of Christ. Third, I will present the required kind of participation which Mary Collins proposes—contemplative participation. She explains this participation as being attentive to the mystery which we celebrate and our appropriation of the liturgical rites. Finally, I will consider Jozef Lamberts’ assertion concerning the act of Communion as the high point of eucharistic participation with its diverse theological implications.

In this Chapter, Congar is given a lengthy consideration because he wrote so much on the topic and had considerable influence on the theology of the latter part of the twentieth century. Furthermore, Congar's bold proposal on worship in the 1950s, first as expressing our life of faith and then celebrating this life in the liturgy through sacrifice and priesthood, is very relevant in light of the magisterial teaching, particularly of the Second Vatican Council. As a theologian, Congar was devoted to the authentic renewal and reform of the Church. Early liturgical influences on Congar effected his theological reflection throughout his life, which was marked by wholeness and balance. When Congar formulated a renewed vision of the Church, he was concerned to respond effectively to the burning questions of his time, in particular, the role of the laity and renewal in liturgy among others. He gave liturgy a significant place as a monument to tradition and as a catalyst for ecclesial reform, resulting in an ecclesiology of participation of all the faithful in liturgy.

### **Yves Congar: Celebration of the Integration of Life and Public Worship Through Priesthood and Sacrifice**

Yves Congar was a strong theological voice of the twentieth century and a major contributor to the various documents of the Second Vatican Council.<sup>1</sup> His fields of specialization were principally ecclesiology and ecumenism based on the newly revived

---

<sup>1</sup>In a personal letter, dated 17 October 1971, Congar penned: “‘At the Council [. . .] I worked on Chapter II of *Lumen Gentium* (numbers 9, 13, 16, and 17 are mine, and also parts of number 28 and of chap. 1); in *Presbyterorum Ordinis* of which I am one of the principal redactors with Father Lécuyer, in *Ad Gentes* (chap. 1 is completely my work), and on various texts of the Secretariate for Unity’,” cited in Richard J. Beauchesne, “Worship as Life, Priesthood and Sacrifice in Yves Congar,” *Eglise et Théologie* 21 (1990): 85.

understanding of the Church.<sup>2</sup> This approach to ecclesiology had major liturgical implications. He stated that the liturgy is the manifestation of the Church.<sup>3</sup> By liturgy Congar meant preeminently, but not exclusively, the eucharistic liturgy. In reference to this liturgy all other worship in and by the Church is ordered.<sup>4</sup> Congar regarded liturgy as “a sacred *action*,” “a ritualized activity,” and “a celebration.”<sup>5</sup>

Prior to the Council, Congar had noted the prevalent concept of the apologetic notion of the Church<sup>6</sup> and the idea of the laity as concerned in temporal affairs having no part in the sphere of sacred things. This understanding, according to Congar, reduced the Church to the state of a priestly system without a Christian people.<sup>7</sup> Congar credited the return to the liturgical sources with creating the demand for the active participation of the faithful in the corporate worship of the Church, particularly the Eucharist.<sup>8</sup> This participation is based on a renewed theology of the liturgy with the rediscovery of the ecclesial character of the laity as

---

<sup>2</sup>As described in the previous Chapter.

<sup>3</sup>See Yves Congar, *Tradition and Traditions : An Historical and a Theological Essay*, trans. Michael Naseby and Thomas Rainborough (New York: The Macmillian Company, 1967), 427-435, hereafter *Tradition and Traditions*; idem, “Introduction,” in *La Liturgie Après Vatican II : Bilans, Etudes Prospective*, eds. J. -P. Jossua and Y. Congar, (Paris :Cerf, 1967), 11-15; idem, “Session V Discussion,” in *Vatican II: An Interfaith Appraisal: International Theological Conference*, ed. John J. Miller (Notre Dame: Notre Dame Press, 1966), 231-232.

<sup>4</sup>See Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 161. Also see *Constitutio de sacra Liturgia* (*Sacrosanctum Concilium*), *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 56 (1964): 10, hereafter *Sacrosanctum Concilium*; United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, *General Instruction of the Roman Missal: Liturgy Documentary Series 2*, (Washington, District of Columbia, 2002), 16, hereafter the GIRM 2002.

<sup>5</sup>Congar, *Tradition and Traditions*, 428, 430.

<sup>6</sup>“[A]s the machinery of the means of grace, as the hierarchical mediation of the means of salvation.” Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 45; idem, “My Path-Findings in the Theology of Laity and Ministries,” *The Jurist* 32 (1972): 170.

<sup>7</sup>See Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 47, 13-15.

<sup>8</sup>See *ibid.*, xii; idem, “Institutionalized Religion,” in *The Word in History*, ed. T. Patrick Burke (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1966), 140.



*plebs sancta* (the consecrated people) within the mystery of the Church.<sup>9</sup> Congar also credited the liturgical movement for renewing the consciousness of the mystery of the Church as the fellowship of the faithful with God and with one another in Christ.<sup>10</sup>

According to Congar, the fellowship aspect of the Church, the ultimate reality of the Church, is expressed in the concept *Ecclesia*—the actual local congregation gathered together as “the People of God” or “the Body of Christ” to give worship to God.<sup>11</sup> Congar describes this understanding of a sacramental interpretation of the Church as the subject of liturgical action, namely the Church as the assembly of the People of God for worship, rather than as an institutional hierarchy.<sup>12</sup>

Congar assumed the realization of the Church through the demand of active eucharistic participation of the faithful<sup>13</sup> and tried to make the theological deepening of this demand a basic principle of the Church’s liturgical celebration of the *Ecclesia*. On this level, Congar referred to the idea of the common priesthood of all the baptized. In line with the ecclesial nature of worship,<sup>14</sup> Congar articulated the goal of his renewed appreciation of the laity in liturgical terms: “to conceive of a priesthood and a public worship that shall not be without a people.”<sup>15</sup>

---

<sup>9</sup>See Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, xii. Also see Aidan Nichols, *Yves Congar* (Wilton, Connecticut: Morehouse-Barlow, 1989), 63.

<sup>10</sup>See Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, xii, 28, 214.

<sup>11</sup>See *ibid.*, 28-29; *idem*, *Faith and Spiritual Life*, trans. A. Manson and L. C. Sheppard (New York: Herder and Herder, 1968), 192.

<sup>12</sup>See Yves Congar, *Dialogue Between Christians: Catholic Contribution to Ecumenism*, trans. Philip Loretz (Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1966), 51.

<sup>13</sup>It is one of the objectives of *Sacrosanctum Concilium* of Vatican II.

<sup>14</sup>Such as social, communal, public, visible, and liturgical, see Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 144; *idem*, *A Gospel Priesthood*, trans. P. J. Hepburne-Scott (New York: Herder and Herder, 1967), 79.

<sup>15</sup>Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 58.

Congar's description of active participation consists primarily in his integration of offering one's life in sacrifice to God (spiritual sacrifice) and public worship (celebration of the Eucharist). This description entails first his understanding of priesthood and sacrifice in general; then the distinctions between the inward and the external cults and the priesthoods that serve them; and finally the relationship between the two cults and their priesthoods and their incorporation into the corporate worship of the Church under a single cult and priesthood of Christ.

There is no single systematic treatment of active participation as such in any one work of Congar that would provide us with a full guide to his thought on the issue as just summed up above. Hence, to appreciate his detailed treatment and significant contribution on the subject, I will rely on and examine a variety of Congar's works through his long career.

### Notions of Priesthood and Sacrifice in General

Congar conceived of priesthood and sacrifice differently from the prevailing theology of his time. His theological view on Christian worship as life offered in sacrifice to God relates to the priesthood of all believers and to Christian sacrifice. In the 1950's, in his critical exegetical analyses of the meaning of "priesthood" in the New Testament (and also in the patristic tradition), Congar discovered that in the Christian context the words *hiereus* and *archiereus* (priest/sanctifier and archpriest) are applied only to Christ (in Hebrews) and to all the faithful (in Revelation).<sup>16</sup> He thus asserted that a spiritual and real sacerdotal quality

---

<sup>16</sup>In other words, they are not applied to the hierarchical ministers of the Church. The ministers were not acting as sacrificers in celebrating the efficacious memorial of the Lord, for they were making

belonging to Christ is communicated to all members of his body by baptism (Hebrews 10: 19-22; Galatians 3: 27): “. . . all the faithful have a real priestly quality, being incorporated in Christ by the sacramental consecration of baptism . . . .”<sup>17</sup> Congar thus situated his renewal of the theology of the laity in a reappropriation of the baptismal vocation of the Christians to share in the priesthood of Christ. Accordingly, for Congar, the concept of priesthood is “one of the facts or notions in which the ‘specifically Christian’” appears most clearly and “as such the whole meaning of the priesthood.”<sup>18</sup> Priesthood, which relates to baptism and celebrates worship as life of faith, thus pertains essentially to all Christians and defines all Christians specifically.

Congar described the idea of priesthood as fundamentally related to sacrifice.<sup>19</sup> He defined priesthood in its general meaning as “that quality which enables a man to come before God to gain his grace and fellowship with him by offering up a sacrifice acceptable to him.”<sup>20</sup> The qualification that enables the faithful to stand in the presence of God is their

---

Christ’s sacrifice actual and present to the faithful based on the power and commandment given to the apostles by Christ, see Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 132-133, 148-150; Power, *The Eucharistic Mystery*, 115. Congar, however, pointed out the Epistle of Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, AD 95, as the only exception to this usage of the terms, see Congar, *A Gospel Priesthood*, 75, 96; idem, *Lay People in the Church*, 133, 145.

<sup>17</sup>Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 151. Also see Philip J. Rosato, “Priesthood of the Baptized and Priesthood of the Ordained,” *Gregorianum* 68 (1987): 215-266; J. D. Crichton, “Recusant Writers on the Priesthood of the Laity,” *Clergy Review* 71 (1986): 455-457. The assumption here is that “what is given to one alone on behalf of all is then extended and communicated to all; what has been done by one alone on behalf of all must still be, in a way, done by all. Christ is Son, and as such, heir: we become *filii in Filio* and *cohaeredes Christi*. Christ alone is temple: the faithful are temples with him. Christ alone is priest: the faithful are priests with him.” Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 133.

<sup>18</sup>Congar, *A Gospel Priesthood*, 74.

<sup>19</sup>See Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 158, 168. Also see Gerald F. Finnegan, “Ministerial Priesthood in Yves Congar,” *Review For Religious* 46 (1987): 526.

<sup>20</sup>Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 154-155. A similar definition is also found in *ibid.*, 187; idem, *Sainte Eglise: Etudes et Approches Écclesiologiques*, (Paris: Cerf, 1963), 239-40; idem, *A Gospel Priesthood*, 93.

incorporation in Christ by baptism (also by faith and holiness of their lives). Congar thus emphasized that Christian priesthood extends beyond an exclusive focus on ministerial power to consecrate the species of bread and wine and to offer the eucharistic sacrifice.<sup>21</sup> He spoke of the priesthood of the faithful as “a reality so rich in content that no single aspect or statement exhausts it.”<sup>22</sup>

Congar described sacrifice in terms of our orientation toward God by our right relationship and preference for others.<sup>23</sup> Ultimately, this preference places God above ourselves and as such is an interior reality of mind and heart, but it must find expression in outward action.<sup>24</sup> All Christians are called to make this sacrifice. While it has as many expressions as life itself, its content is always the same—the gift of oneself in faith and love to God.<sup>25</sup> Such sacrifice is possible for Christians because it has already been made by Christ himself.

Congar rejected the conventional notion of sacrifice as something painful or loss.<sup>26</sup> “We must not take too narrow a view of it [sacrifice] by identifying it purely with what is painful” because “this preference of another over self is not essentially or necessarily painful . . . our total turning to God, answering to the highest realization of self, should be accompanied by feelings of happiness and fulfillment.”<sup>27</sup> He therefore defined sacrifice as

---

<sup>21</sup>See Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 174, 178.

<sup>22</sup>*Ibid.*, 138.

<sup>23</sup>See *ibid.*, 146. Also see Power, *The Eucharistic Mystery*, 115.

<sup>24</sup>See Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 116 ff.; *idem*, *A Gospel Priesthood*, 75ff., 117.

<sup>25</sup>See Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 122-127.

<sup>26</sup>See *ibid.*, 156; *idem*, *A Gospel Priesthood*, 92; *idem*, *Faith and Spiritual Life*, 185. Also see James L. Empereur, “Paschal Mystery,” in *The New Dictionary of Theology*, eds. Joseph A. Komonchak et al. (Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1987), 747.

<sup>27</sup>Congar, *A Gospel Priesthood*, 92. Also see *idem*, *Lay People in the Church*, 156.

that which comes from the whole of our being and activity: “When it is a question of our right relation with God—our creator, from whom comes *all* that we are and have—then it is oneself, the totality of one’s being, doing and having, that must be the ‘sacrifice’.”<sup>28</sup> This work of sacrifice is made concrete through spiritual deeds so as to make actual our relationship to God. Just as the soul of Christ’s sacrifice was his filial obedience to his Father,<sup>29</sup> so also the soul of our sacrifice must be our spiritual orientation toward God, which is the essential element of sacrifice.<sup>30</sup> Thus the spirit of sacrifice is our free and loving acceptance of God, our absolute dependence on him.<sup>31</sup> The matter of sacrifice consists “in everything which is capable of being offered up: ‘every work done with the aim of uniting oneself with God in a holy fellowship’ . . . every good, every virtuous work.”<sup>32</sup> This Godward movement is not a matter of external gifts, but of true sacrifice with mercy. If sacrifice is understood in this way, then each Christian is the priest of his or her own sacrifice. As a result, in Congar’s theology, Christian sacrifice moves beyond liturgical worship and embraces the entire Christian life as a holy and acceptable sacrifice to God (Romans 12: 1; Philippians 3: 3; 1 Peter 2: 5; Hebrews 13: 15). The efficacy of sacrifice, however, is not our doing, but that of Christ and only exists in relation to his sacrifice.<sup>33</sup>

---

<sup>28</sup>Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 156. Also see idem, *Sainte Église: Études et approches écclesiologiques*, 242.

<sup>29</sup>See Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 156-157, 160-161. Christ’s love for humankind is also the soul of his sacrifice which is inseparable from his filial obedience, see *ibid.*, 160.

<sup>30</sup>See *ibid.*, 137, 157.

<sup>31</sup>See Congar, *Faith and Spiritual Life*, 185; idem, *Sainte Eglise: Etudes et Approches Ecclesiologiques*, 242.

<sup>32</sup>Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 157, citing Augustine and referring to Aquinas with no proper references to them. Also see *ibid.*, 127, 137; François Bourassa, “Sacrifice,” in *Vatican II: Assessment and Perspectives*, vol. 1, ed. René Latourelle (New York: Paulist Press, 1989), 141-143.

<sup>33</sup>See Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 158.

The worship and sacrifice of the faithful and the corresponding priesthood are essentially a holy life, an apostolic life of religion. The sacrifice and priesthood of the faithful are spiritual—not simply in a metaphorical sense, but in the biblical sense of “spiritual-real.”<sup>34</sup> In recovering Augustine’s understanding of sacrifice, Congar appropriated it as an active principle for the lives of all the faithful, regardless of state.<sup>35</sup>

Congar attributed a variety of forms of priesthood to a variety of forms of sacrifice. He spoke of threefold priestly titles: spiritual, baptismal, and hierarchical in order to suggest the idea of a priesthood in the order of *vita in Christo*.<sup>36</sup> Congar asserted that these threefold priesthoods are “three ways of realizing the priesthood of Christ whereby we are enabled to stand before God to acquire his grace and fellowship by offering an acceptable sacrifice.”<sup>37</sup> The nature and quality of the priesthood correspond to the nature and quality of the sacrifice. A spiritual sacrifice requires a spiritual priesthood while a liturgical/sacramental sacrifice requires a liturgical/sacramental priesthood.<sup>38</sup> Hence, priesthood in Congar may be analogously predicated of Christ, the laity, and the ordained ministers:

[T]here is only one high priest, Christ, priest in Heaven for evermore; that all the faithful have a real priestly quality, being incorporated in Christ by the sacramental consecration of

---

<sup>34</sup>See *ibid.*, 135-136.

<sup>35</sup>See Congar, *A Gospel Priesthood*, 95.

<sup>36</sup>See Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 186-187. However, Congar also called them by different terms. The first he called inward, personal, interior, moral, righteous, or spiritual-real priesthood; the second, common or general priesthood; and the third, ministerial or public priesthood. See *ibid.*, 187-188. Congar, however, admitted to inconsistency in his use of terms, but justified it as a way of following the theological tradition. See *ibid.*, 184.

<sup>37</sup>See *ibid.*, 168-169.

<sup>38</sup>See *ibid.*, 158-169; *idem*, *A Gospel Priesthood*, 93. Also see Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* III, q. 82, a. 1, ad. 2; q. 63, a. 3, trans. Fathers of the English Dominican Province (New York: Benzinger Brothers, Inc., 1947).

baptism and by a living faith; and that for the Church's benefit bishops and presbyters (and deacons) have a ministry of Christ's priestly actions, most particularly of the eucharistic memorial, a ministry to which they are consecrated by a sacrament, whereby they receive a third participation in the priesthood of Christ.<sup>39</sup>

The three Christian priesthoods and their sacrifices are true, spiritual, acceptable to God, and concerned with worship "in spirit and truth." Thus in Congar's theology sacrifice and priesthood exactly correspond. This comprehensive theology of priesthood and sacrifice equally corresponds to Congar's comprehensive theology of worship.

#### Distinctions Between the Inward and External Cults and the Corresponding Priesthoods of the Faithful

Congar appropriated two different applications to the priesthood of the faithful: "one in the order of holiness of life, the offering of oneself, the other in the order of sacramental worship, and very specially of eucharistic worship."<sup>40</sup> The former he called the inward cult (spiritual sacrifice or personal worship),<sup>41</sup> to which he attributed "a spiritual priesthood of holiness."<sup>42</sup> The latter he called the external cult (or liturgical/sacramental sacrifice), to which he attributed liturgical/sacramental priesthood which included both the common priesthood of the faithful and the hierarchical (or ministerial) priesthood of the ordained.<sup>43</sup>

---

<sup>39</sup>Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 150-151.

<sup>40</sup>*Ibid.*, 191.

<sup>41</sup>As Congar also called it, see Congar, "Institutionalized Religion," 142; Congar, *A Gospel Priesthood*, 93.

<sup>42</sup>Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 193.

<sup>43</sup>See *ibid.*, 184-188. To be specific, spiritual priesthood refers to the priesthood of all the faithful expressed in ways other than participation in public/corporate worship; hierarchical or ministerial priesthood refers to the liturgical/sacramental priesthood of the ordained; and common or baptismal priesthood refers to the liturgical/sacramental priesthood of the baptized.

The inward cult is essentially one's response to the Christian call to holiness through acts of faith, hope, charity, devotion, prayer, compassion, and moral life in as much as it is a holy life offered to God.<sup>44</sup> Aquinas appropriated Augustine's definition of sacrifice<sup>45</sup> that "Christian life has, or at least is able to have, the whole value of worship and even of sacrifice in as much as it grows under the influence of the virtue of religion and of that faith of which all its acts are a sort of *protestatio*."<sup>46</sup> In other words, it is the giving of ourselves to God. The matter of worship at this level is primarily personal. Congar described this personal worship as "the offering by each one, of his whole life, of his concrete person, in so far as it plays an active role in the world"<sup>47</sup> because "the only thing God desires from us is our heart, our selves, living persons, made in his image."<sup>48</sup>

Based on the New Testament (Romans 12: 1; Philippians 3: 3; 1 Peter 2: 5; Hebrews 13: 15), and also the patristic tradition, Congar demonstrated the primacy of worship as life offered in sacrifice to God and asserted that worship, sacrifice, and priesthood at this level are not properly liturgical/sacramental, but spiritual.<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>44</sup>See *ibid.*, 191, 194.

<sup>45</sup>Augustine defined sacrifice as "*omne opus quod agitur ut sancta societate inhaereamus Deo*," cited in *ibid.*, 194.

<sup>46</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>47</sup>Congar, "Institutionalized Religion," 142.

<sup>48</sup>Congar, *A Gospel Priesthood*, 92-93.

<sup>49</sup>See Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 135-137. Also see Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* II-II, q. 85, a. 2; a. 3, ad. 1; III, q. 22, a. 2; q. 48, a. 3; Robert J. Daly, *The Origins of the Christian Doctrine of Sacrifice* (Pennsylvania: Fortress Press, 1978), 82-83; *idem*, *Christian Sacrifice: The Judaeo-Christian Background Before Origen* (Washington, District of Columbia: The Catholic University of America Press, 1978); Bernard Cooke, *Ministry to Word and Sacraments: History and Theology* (Pennsylvania: Fortress Press, 1976), 525-536; J. D. Crichton, "A Theology of Worship," in *The Study of Liturgy*, eds. Cheslyn Jones et al., (New York: Oxford University Press, 1978), 3-30. Congar pointed out here Tertullian as an exception after he had become a Montanist. In the medieval period, when the priesthood of the faithful was considered in relation to properly sacramental worship, it was defined by its relationship and



It is remarkable that the cultic [*cultuel*] vocabulary of the New Testament, generally lacking in this respect, is not at all ceremonial. It is barely cultic. It includes many expressions relating to a sacrificial vocabulary, but always in a context of faith and of a life lived from faith and in self-giving Love.<sup>50</sup>

Recognition of the inward cult as “fully acknowledged in the ecclesiology of Vatican II [*Lumen Gentium* 10-11]”<sup>51</sup> legitimizes the role which Congar emphasized that the laity have in the Church. Congar always emphasized the positive and constructive role which the laity have in the Church and in its liturgy.<sup>52</sup> The spiritual priesthood of the inward cult is a priesthood of the righteous, of the life of grace, of communion with God, and life lived in Christ and by the Holy Spirit. It offers up spiritual sacrifice to God from a life of faith lived out in the practical realities of our existence.

Hence, Congar found no dichotomy between the sacred and the profane, unless our life is made profane by sin, which is the rejection of God.<sup>53</sup> In his view, our secular life of service to humankind is at the same time our sacred offering to God. The whole of life can thus become a spiritual sacrifice if all our relationships and activities are, not only

---

subordination to the hierarchical priesthood by Catholic apologists against Luther, see Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 136.

<sup>50</sup>Yves Congar, “Le Diaconat Dans la Théologie des Ministères,” in *Le Diaconat Dans l'Eglise et le Monde d'Aujourd'hui*, eds. P. Winninger and Y. Congar (Paris: Cerf, 1966), 140, cited in Beauchesne, “Worship as Life, Priesthood and Sacrifice in Yves Congar,” 86.

<sup>51</sup>See Congar, “Institutionalized Religion,” 142.

<sup>52</sup>As opposed to the prevalent traditional negative description of the laity as those who are not clergy, Congar’s positive approximations concern all members of the People of God (laity and clergy alike) as “ordered to heavenly things” and laity are those “for whom the substance of things in themselves is real and interesting.” See Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 18-19. These positive approximations created the context for considerations of active participation by the faithful in Christian worship.

<sup>53</sup>See Congar, *Faith and Spiritual Life*, 180-181; idem, “The Laity,” in *Vatican II: An Interfaith Appraisal: An International Theological Conference*, ed. John H. Miller (Notre Dame: Notre Dame Press, 1966), 244; *Constitutio dogmatica de Ecclesia (Lumen Gentium)*, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 57 (1965): 34, hereafter *Lumen Gentium*.

horizontally, but also vertically connected with God.<sup>54</sup> “[T]he relationships which weave the fabric of our life on the horizontal plane of this world, are repeated or assumed into the vertical relationship of love which runs from God to us, and the vertical relationship of faith which runs from us to him.”<sup>55</sup> Then all our relationships and activities call for holiness in our every encounter and action as a meeting point with God, which should be our goal.<sup>56</sup> This life of holiness fits well with the biblical idea of a people consecrated to God. Here our spiritual priesthood is actualized and exercised in the offering of all that we can do to put ourselves in right order with God. This holy life or spiritual sacrifice is coherent with the earthly life of Jesus Christ—mercy toward others and thanksgiving and loving movement (obedience) toward God.<sup>57</sup> A Christologically and pneumatologically centered ecclesiology allowed Congar to reconsider worship primarily as a life of faith.<sup>58</sup> What primarily defines the Church is Christian life in Christ through the Holy Spirit, which is a life of thanksgiving to God and of service to neighbor. It is worship as life (inward cult) from which worship as liturgy (external cult) springs forth.<sup>59</sup>

Our entire moral life, that is, all of human life, may and must become worship [*un culte*], inasmuch as life expresses faith, hope and charity through which we fundamentally orient ourselves toward God. Only then are the forms of exterior and social worship (sacramental worship) to be considered. However, there is no break [*coupure*] between the

---

<sup>54</sup>See Congar, *Faith and Spiritual Life*, 181.

<sup>55</sup>Yves Congar, *Power and Poverty of the Church*, trans. Jennifer Nicholson (Baltimore, Helicon, 1964), 89-90.

<sup>56</sup>See Congar, *Faith and Spiritual Life*, 181-182.

<sup>57</sup>See Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 194-195.

<sup>58</sup>See Congar, *Ministères et Communion Ecclésiale*, (Paris: Cerf, 1971), 31-49.

<sup>59</sup>See Yves Congar, “Le Sacerdoce du Nouveau Testament; Mission et Culte,” in *Les Prêtres. Décrets “Presbyterorum Ordinis” et “Optatam Totius”*: Textes latins et traductions françaises, eds. J. Frisque and Y. Congar (Paris: Cerf, 1968), 255-56. Also see Cooke, *Ministry to Word and Sacraments*, 525-536.

exterior social forms of worship and the reality of personal Christian life: anthropology is isolated from neither theology nor doxological acts.<sup>60</sup>

The external cult is the public worship of the Church consisting in the various *protestationes fidei*<sup>61</sup>: notably of the virtue of religion in public prayer, the public confession of faith, with its supreme form in martyrdom; participation in the Church's liturgical worship, above all in its sacraments with the Eucharist as its heart. Congar asserted that Catholic Christian worship is above all the Eucharist which is institutionalized worship in its supreme form, in which we receive the gift of God and offer to him the perfect offering, Jesus Christ.<sup>62</sup>

Congar toiled hard to foster appropriate participation of all the faithful in the eucharistic liturgy, for, on the one side, not everyone is a ministerial priest whose place it is to celebrate the Eucharist, particularly in the offering and consecrating of the species. On the other side, a passive concept of participation on the part of the non-hierarchical faithful betrays a recognition of their priestly character. Congar also claimed that if we limited Christian priesthood only to the spiritual priesthood of the faithful, we would be impoverishing the Christian tradition. According to the tradition,<sup>63</sup> there is a priesthood with sacramental reference and import associated with not only holy life but also with baptismal

---

<sup>60</sup>Congar, "Le Diaconat Dans la Théologie des Ministères," 140, cited in Beauschsne, "Worship as Life, Priesthood and Sacrifice in Yves Congar," 79. For Congar "anthropology" refers to worship as life; "theology" to God as the source of worship in Christ through the Holy Spirit; "doxology" to worship as response to God through both life and liturgy, see Congar, "Le Diaconat Dans la Théologie des Ministères," 140.

<sup>61</sup>See Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 191.

<sup>62</sup>See Congar, "Institutionalized Religion," 142.

<sup>63</sup>Here Congar referred to Augustine and Aquinas, see Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 140-142, 191.

consecration whose supreme activity is participation in the offering of the Eucharist.<sup>64</sup>

According to Aquinas, Christ has ushered in the rite (*ritum, cultus* or *religio*) of the Christian religion to offer himself up as a sacrifice to God.<sup>65</sup> Accordingly the worship and sacrifice begun by Christ are “‘organized’.” This new worship is truly a sacrificial order with Christ as its high priest, the sole *verus sacerdos*, and it has its ministers, *sacramenta*, and the faithful.<sup>66</sup> Congar incorporated the sacrificial theme into the sacrifice of Christ’s communal body and the sacrifice of the altar just as Augustine did.<sup>67</sup>

The corporate sacrifice of the Church is offered by the priesthood of Christ himself; our sacrifice is joined to his.<sup>68</sup> For this purpose, Congar described the two forms of the liturgical priesthood of the ordained and the baptized that encompasses the entire body of faithful that effects this sacrifice:

Christ’s sacrifice includes our own, and ours has to be joined with it in as much as it exists under a sacramental and liturgical form in the sacraments, particularly the eucharist: and to this sacrifice of Jesus Christ there corresponds a sacramental or liturgical priesthood, that of the sacramental characters. This priesthood is truly liturgical (liturgy = public service), always thoroughly ecclesial and communal, and it is exercised by a ministerial priesthood which celebrates and a non-hierarchical priesthood which participates.<sup>69</sup>

The liturgical priesthood of the faithful and of the ordained, as a sharing in the priestly office of Christ acquired through the sacraments that confer a character, is, therefore, a matter of consecration to sacramental worship, particularly to the eucharistic liturgy of the Church. In

---

<sup>64</sup>See *ibid.*, 138; Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* III, q. 63, a. 2-6.

<sup>65</sup>See *ibid.*, q. 62, a. 5; q. 63, a. 1; q. 63, a. 3.

<sup>66</sup>See Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 143-144.

<sup>67</sup>See *ibid.*, 127.

<sup>68</sup>See Congar, “Institutionalized Religion,” 143; *idem*, *Lay People in the Church*, 187.

<sup>69</sup>*Ibid.*, 187-188.

this worship, Congar distinguished the common priesthood of the faithful, qualified by the characters of baptism and confirmation, “as active power to participate” (to share and to receive). They do it by virtue of their baptismal priesthood through consenting, receiving, and uniting with the sacrifice, through prayers and ritual participation, and most importantly, through offering themselves in order to make themselves perfect<sup>70</sup>: “Christian worship is first of all the grateful reception, in faith, of the gift of God in Jesus Christ, but it is also thanksgiving for this gift and an offering of one’s self in union with the offering of Jesus Christ”<sup>71</sup> in which the faithful come full circle to the fullness of personal worship, demonstrating the reality of the relationship between the cults. The ministerial priesthood of the ordained, qualified by the character of holy orders, is distinguished “as active power to celebrate or consecrate” in order to make others perfect. Thus there are two degrees in the priestly quality through which the Church celebrates, with its head, the worship of the New Covenant.<sup>72</sup>

Congar recognized the spiritual priesthood of the individual in the inward cult as an element of the priestly function of the Church. But, while asserting the authenticity of the spiritual sacrifice of the faithful by virtue of their spiritual priesthood, Congar was clear that it was insufficient without incorporation into “the institutionalized worship and, in a word, with the Mass”<sup>73</sup> for a number of reasons. These reasons can be stated as the relationship of these two cults and their priesthoods as described below.

---

<sup>70</sup>See *ibid.*, 212-213.

<sup>71</sup>See Congar, “Institutionalized Religion,” 147.

<sup>72</sup>Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 144-145.

<sup>73</sup>Congar, “Institutionalized Religion,” 142.

## Relationship Between the Two Cults and their Priesthoods and their Incorporation into a Single Cult and Priesthood

In distinguishing the inward and external cults and their corresponding priesthoods, Congar recognized their integral relationship of mutual dependence and continuity through his unique understanding of sacrifice and priesthood by the sacraments of baptism and order. According to Congar, all Christian worship (personal and public) is oriented toward the eucharistic liturgy. Interior sacrifice is necessarily individualistic and non-cultic but Christian faith is communal and cultic shared by all the members of the worshipping community in and through their belonging to it.<sup>74</sup> Thus, while admitting that the sacrifice of the inward cult is authentic, Congar insisted that it needs to be joined to the sacrifice of Christ in the celebration of the Eucharist for its efficacy.<sup>75</sup> “Whatever can attain to God—really to God—can do so only in and through the priesthood and sacrifice of Jesus Christ.”<sup>76</sup> Christ’s sacrifice and priesthood are “absolute, unique, and universal . . . because they are the fullness of true sacrifice and of true priesthood, of those which God accepts . . . [and] they are the principle, *the* reality in which all the others share and have their being.”<sup>77</sup> The way by which we return to God is through all that Christ did and suffered.<sup>78</sup> Our goal of attaining communion through the Christian sacrifice is possible only *per Christum et in Christo*. Jesus instituted a memorial (active celebration) of his sacrifice, so that his sacrifice celebrated and made present becomes ours and we can unite ours to it in a celebration which is ecclesial.

---

<sup>74</sup>See Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 134 ff.

<sup>75</sup>See Congar, “Institutionalized Religion,” 142-143. Also see Bourassa, “Sacrifice,” 127.

<sup>76</sup>Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 158.

<sup>77</sup>Ibid.

<sup>78</sup>See *ibid.*, 142.

Therefore, the spiritual sacrifice of the faithful “must go by way of Jesus Christ and be united to the sacrifice of Jesus Christ in order for it to be able to reach the heart of God and be acceptable to Him [1 Peter 2: 6].”<sup>79</sup> This union is therefore liturgical/sacramental and cannot be consummated without taking part in the Eucharist.<sup>80</sup> This participation is possible for us because of the sacramental character of our baptism (and confirmation) and by the ministry of ordained priests of the public priesthood. For Congar, in a cultic sacrifice, there is, besides a person and matter, a third element, namely, the consecratory rite (sacrificial action) which in the liturgical sacrifice of the public worship is a necessary element.<sup>81</sup>

In a similar manner, the sacrifice of the Church in the external cult entails the gathering together of the spiritual sacrifice of the faithful. To fail to represent the spiritual sacrifice of the faithful in the Eucharist is to celebrate no Eucharist:<sup>82</sup> “If [the eucharistic celebration] does not include the accomplishing of the spiritual sacrifice of men, if it is not fitted, in itself, to make their sacrifice real, [then] it is not really and truly the sacrifice of the *New Testament*.”<sup>83</sup> While the offering of the Eucharist itself is in an important sense primary, it has also its unitive value in gathering together all the offerings of the faithful. Christian worship takes place only when personal worship is assumed into the corporate and instituted. The chief characteristic of Christ’s sacrifice and priesthood in action is such that “it embraces the sacrifice of all men and even of God; it was outward and inward; it was the sacrifice of

---

<sup>79</sup>See Congar, “Institutionalized Religion,” 145. Also see idem, *Lay People in the Church*, 232-233.

<sup>80</sup>See Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 188, 232-233; idem, “Institutionalized Religion,” 144-145.

<sup>81</sup>See Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 155-157. Also see Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* II-II, q. 85, a. 3, ad. 3.

<sup>82</sup>See Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 177; idem, *A Gospel Priesthood*, 86-87.

<sup>83</sup>Congar, *A Gospel Priesthood*, 80.

his whole life and that of the single act of his ‘pasch’.”<sup>84</sup> It is in such a celebration that Christian worship is really accomplished.<sup>85</sup> The sacrifice associated with each cult is thus dependent on that of the other.

A similar dependency can also be perceived in Congar’s theology between priesthoods of the inward cult (the spiritual priesthood) and the external cult (the liturgical priesthoods, baptismal and hierarchical). In 1947 Congar conceived the understanding of the hierarchical priesthood as related to the common priesthood of all believers, as the former gives fullness to the latter.<sup>86</sup> Congar thus appropriated the theology of the relations between the common priesthood of the faithful and the hierarchical priesthood of the ordained to liturgical/sacramental priesthood. The priesthood of the faithful both in its spiritual and sacramental dimensions is dependent on the hierarchical priesthood for the incorporation of its sacrifice into the sacrifice of Christ in the Eucharist.<sup>87</sup> If the celebration of the Eucharist is understood to be “the active commemoration of the offering by which Jesus included us in his obedience and made us an offering to the Father with himself,”<sup>88</sup> then the ministerial priesthood is grasped in its priestly character as a power to help the members to offer the spiritual sacrifice of their lives to God through Christ. In this regard, Congar referred to *Lumen Gentium* in order to assert that the hierarchical priesthood is in the service of the spiritual sacrifice of the faithful:

---

<sup>84</sup>Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 159.

<sup>85</sup>See Congar, “The Laity,” 244. Also see *Lumen Gentium*, 10, 28; *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 48.

<sup>86</sup>See Y. M. -J Congar and François Varillon, *Sacerdoce et Laïcat Dans l’Eglise* (Paris : Vitrail, 1947), 19.

<sup>87</sup>See Congar, *A Gospel Priesthood*, 97. Also see the GIRM 2002, 5; Crichton, “A Theology of Worship,” 22.

<sup>88</sup>Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 170.



On the level of their own ministry sharing in the unique office of Christ, the mediator, (1 Tim. 2:5), they announce to all the word of God. However, it is in the eucharistic cult or in the eucharistic assembly of the faithful (*synaxis*) that they exercise in a supreme degree their supreme functions: there, acting in the person of Christ and proclaiming his ministry, they unite the votive offerings of the faithful to the sacrifice of Christ their head, and in the sacrifice of the Mass they make present again and apply, until the coming of the Lord (cf. 1 Cor. 11:26), the unique sacrifice of the New Testament, that namely of Christ offering himself once for all a spotless victim to the Father (cf. Heb. 9:11-28).<sup>89</sup>

In a different way, but certainly not against the traditional understanding of the validity of hierarchical priesthood to consecrate the Eucharist, Congar formulated hierarchical priesthood as “to offer Mass, that is, to bring men to communicate in the sacrifice of Jesus Christ.”<sup>90</sup> The faithful offer it through the priest who acts in the person of Christ as head and who makes the offering in the name of all of Christ’s members. The power of the ordained priest is to make the memorial of Christ in the Church for the continuation of the work of redemption in the Church. He does it by showing forth the relation of Christ’s sacrifice to ours and by actively associating ours with Christ’s. This double reference, Congar argued, implies that consecration concerns the whole Church and encompasses people, their faith, prayer, and spiritual sacrifice.<sup>91</sup> It is the role of the ministerial priesthood to bind together the spiritual sacrifices of the faithful to the great sacrifice of Christ in a real and sacramental manner.<sup>92</sup> “Thus the priesthood of the ordained ministry is seen to be a divinely qualified and hierarchically appointed service of the aims of

---

<sup>89</sup>*Lumen Gentium*, 28.

<sup>90</sup>Congar, “Institutionalized Religion,” 147.

<sup>91</sup>See *ibid.*; *idem*, *Lay People in the Church*, 218.

<sup>92</sup>See Congar, *A Gospel Priesthood*, 97; *idem*, *Faith and Spiritual Life*, 192.

a body which is wholly priestly.”<sup>93</sup> The hierarchical priesthood has also a certain dependence on the priesthood of all the faithful<sup>94</sup> in that it is through the priesthood of the entire Church that the sacrifice of the Church is offered. The assembly’s faith and prayer have liturgical expression throughout the liturgical action:

[B]y their faith and prayer, the faithful contribute to the effective and efficacious celebration of this liturgical act: for, truly enough, this act is not the work of the priest but of the whole Church, in whose unity alone her ministers’ powers are authentic.<sup>95</sup>

In drawing attention to the integral nature of the two cults, Congar was able to maintain the hierarchical principle as necessarily accompanied by the communal principle:<sup>96</sup>

Every idea ought to be both expressed and safeguarded in outward signs. For its proper expression in the Church, the union of our two principles has to have its significant signs, and there are no finer and better ones than those of the liturgy. . . . [T]he liturgy . . . is the sacred ark wherein the spirit of the Church is kept and expressed. We have seen how at Mass all the forms of priesthood are operative in their mutual organic relationships and connexions. When priest and people assure one another that the Lord is with them and, thus assured, the priest says, ‘Let us pray’, the hierarchical principle is effectively completed in the communal principle and the true nature of the mystical Body is made manifest. The whole Mass is a wonderful expression and making real of the Church’s symphonic unity, different members filling diverse roles in the oneness of the whole.<sup>97</sup>

---

<sup>93</sup>Congar, *A Gospel Priesthood*, 96.

<sup>94</sup>Congar strongly emphasized that one will have to keep in mind that “[t]he participation of the faithful in and . . . their consent to what the ministerial priesthood does cannot be considered as validating those ministerial actions, for the power and authority to do them does not come from the people but from Christ, the head of the Church.” Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 172. Thus, Congar was careful to avoid the Protestant understanding of the ministerial role as mere delegation by the community of faith, see *ibid.*, 171, 114; *idem*, “Institutionalized Religion,” 147.

<sup>95</sup>Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 214.

<sup>96</sup>See *ibid.*, 452; *idem*, *Christians Active in the World*, trans. P. J. Hepburne-Scott (New York: Herder and Herder, 1968) 17. Also see A. N. Williams, “Congar’s Theology of the Laity,” in *Yves Congar: Theologian of the Church*, ed., Gabriel Flynn (Louvain: Peeters Press, 2005), 144; Bruno Bürki, “The Church’s Sacramental Celebration of the Easter Mystery: Yves M. J. Congar and Ecumenical Liturgical Perspectives,” in *Yves Congar: Theologian of the Church*, ed. Gabriel Flynn (Louvain: Peeters Press, 2005), 201.

<sup>97</sup>Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 458.

In pointing out the unique quality of Christ's priesthood, Congar effectively mitigated the sharp clerical-lay dichotomy by placing them in relation to each other in the eucharistic liturgy, which manifests itself in the breadth of relation between priesthood and sacrifice as envisaged in Congar's theology. This resulted in a broader trajectory of Congar's ecclesiology from juridical structures to doxology. The union of the hierarchical priesthood and the priesthood of the faithful is in the one priesthood of the Church, or rather of Christ's. Congar thus seemed to fuse the priesthood of all the faithful both in its spiritual and sacramental dimensions (hierarchical and common) into a single priesthood, and likewise, the internal and external cults to a single cult. The Eucharist is the sacrament and sacrifice, both of Christ and of his body, the Church. The ministerial priesthood celebrates Christ's sacrifice liturgically only in making it the Church's sacrifice.<sup>98</sup> Thus the faithful and ministers, baptized and ordained, jointly and sacramentally participate in Christ's priesthood that they make one single celebration of Christ in the Church.<sup>99</sup> In short, Congar asserted the indispensability of all the modes of participation in the priestly function of the Church in which the spiritual is not independent of the liturgical/sacramental priesthood, nor the hierarchical independent of the common priesthood and *vice versa*. Likewise, the spiritual sacrifice of the faithful is not independent of the external cult and *vice versa*.

The relationship between the spiritual and sacramental priesthoods of the faithful is a function of the continuity and of the unity of Christian life between the interior and external

---

<sup>98</sup>See *ibid.*, 177.

<sup>99</sup>See *ibid.*, 173, 187.

cults: “the liturgical action is continuous from the sacrifice of the faithful to that of Christ.”<sup>100</sup>

The personal sacrifice of the inward cult enters the Church’s sacrifice of the external cult, in which it is united to Christ’s sacrifice so as to be “able to reach the heart of God and be acceptable to Him.”<sup>101</sup> Congar pointed out that in the high medieval theology the “eucharistic role [of the faithful], frequently and positively affirmed, is therefore found at a spiritual level, that of *life* in holiness.”<sup>102</sup> This understanding, less emphasized in Scholastic theology, is part of the synthetic integration of communal and hierarchical aspects that Congar sought.

On the part of the faithful, continuity of cults also describes the unity of the Christian life. Holiness demands the giving of oneself to God, which is sacrifice. The holiness and sacrifice of the individual’s daily life is not separate from, nor does it stop with the holiness and sacrifice of the corporate life of the Church, particularly in worship. The integration or “a sort of osmosis” of life and public worship through sacrifice is the essence of eucharistic participation, whereby a profound unity between one’s personal life and the communal liturgical act is achieved:

The eucharist must be given its whole truth in ourselves and in our daily lives. . . . To put the whole of life into the Mass, to put the Mass into the whole of life: that, clothed in the varying forms of each age, has always been the very practical truth preached to the faithful by the Church where participation in the eucharist is concerned.<sup>103</sup>

---

<sup>100</sup>Ibid., 221.

<sup>101</sup>Congar, “Institutionalized Religion,” 144.

<sup>102</sup>Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 214.

<sup>103</sup>Ibid., 222.

Thus the content of Christian priesthood is conveyed by two complementary actions: sacramental celebration of Christ's sacrifice and the ministry of loving service.<sup>104</sup> Hence there is no necessary separation between the secular and the sacred in the lives of the faithful. To attempt such a separation is to destroy the essential unity of Christian life. It was to emphasize this point (that the secular can be intrinsically spiritual) that Congar amended the *Lay People in the Church* in 1964.<sup>105</sup>

In this earlier work of Congar, the inward and external cults were substantially different categories for him. Moreover, despite his own best intention to the contrary, in fundamental dichotomy and a negative term he defined the laity as those who are not clerics in relation to clergy and the ecclesiastical authority.<sup>106</sup> The focus of his earlier works tends to locate the laity in relation to the hierarchy of the Church, in a way that often seemed more juridical than theological:

[The laity] have to pronounce Amen to the decisions of the Church and her hierarchical government, as they do to her liturgical action, which also is hierarchical but has its complement in their assent. In neither case is this Amen 'totalitarian' . . . ; it does not bring about validity of the hierarchical action.<sup>107</sup>

---

<sup>104</sup>See *ibid.*, 174-175; John 6: 48-58.

<sup>105</sup>Congar agreed with Karl Rahner on this point, see Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 26.

<sup>106</sup>In 1987 Congar clarified his position of the laity in the *Lay People in the Church* against the depiction of it as "'The spiritual for the clergy, the temporal for the laity'" in a review in the bulletin of the Mission de France. He affirmed that there is no need to define the laity in relation to the clergy and confessed that is what he did in this earlier work. He, rather, asserted that today the clergy needs to be defined in relation to the laity, who are the people of God by baptism. See Yves Congar, *Fifty Years of Catholic Theology*, trans., John Bowden, ed. Bernard Lauret (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1987), 65-66.

<sup>107</sup>Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 250.

Thus in his later work Congar deplored what one might call the laity's subservient role to the hierarchy in his earlier work.<sup>108</sup> Much of what Congar says of the hierarchy could be understood most narrowly institutional and authoritarian sense as when he concludes his study of the laity: "The laity . . . are not the subject of the acts by which the Church receives her structure as institution of salvation, which involve the exercise of apostolical powers; they are not the subject of the juridical mission constitutive of apostleship . . . ."<sup>109</sup>

Congar's earlier division and identification of clerics as dedicated to divine things and laity to human things<sup>110</sup> was theologically more serious inasmuch as it suggested that the laity are not dedicated to heavenly things. This identification of the laity is also reflected in Congar's preoccupation with the Catholic Action as the focus of lay Christian activity of engagement with the world. According to Congar, even if priests and religious played a large role in society, they did so *qua* lay people.<sup>111</sup> At the same time, while admitting this idea of the laity,<sup>112</sup> Congar was equally critical of and found unsatisfactory locating them too far outside the Church's "sacral order."<sup>113</sup> It is evident from his statement about clerics as those who are dispensed from family, professional, and political life in a way that the laity cannot be.<sup>114</sup> Although such a statement placed the laity in a less negative tone, it did not completely escape from the fundamental dichotomy. This division was exactly what Congar wanted to go beyond, that is, classifying the laity solely in relation to clerics and, thereby,

---

<sup>108</sup>See Congar, *Fifty Years of Catholic Theology*, 67.

<sup>109</sup>Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 452.

<sup>110</sup>See *ibid.*, 11; *idem*, *Christians Active in the World*, 289; *idem*, *Faith and Spiritual Life*, 51.

<sup>111</sup>See Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 249-392; *idem*, *Christians Active in the World*, 53.

<sup>112</sup>See Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 11-12, 18.

<sup>113</sup>Congar, *Christians Active in the World*, 79.

<sup>114</sup>See Congar, *Faith and Spiritual Life*, 137.

deeming the laity fully of the Church.<sup>115</sup> Congar was critical of those elements of the tradition which defined the laity as a concession to human weakness, even as he agreed that this idea was itself in conformity with Christian tradition and “in the last resort, with the nature of things.”<sup>116</sup> This view dominated too exclusively by the notions of renunciation and worldly wickedness, Congar was unsatisfactory even as he agreed that people do not live exclusively for heavenly things and therefore have only limited competence in relation to properly ecclesial means to life in Christ.<sup>117</sup> Congar insisted that the laity’s role in regard to the Church’s ministry must and always will be secondary or subordinate, which related to teaching authority.<sup>118</sup> Despite his insistence on the laity as engaged with the secular things (specifically in marriage and professions), Congar sought to construct his theology of the laity systematically in relation to ecclesiology and theological anthropology by extending the notion of the complementarity of the hierarchical and communal principles through the collaboration of clergy and laity as that of a couple within the context of a theology of priesthood.<sup>119</sup>

The apparent contradiction of Congar’s theology of the laity can perhaps best be understood by examining two pairs of terms in his later works in which he proposed to view in the Christian approach to life before God and life in the world. Congar pointed to the paradoxical truth that everything is fulfilled in Christ, yet we still have to bring Christ to fulfillment and build up his body. This twofold truth he described as “a dialectic of gift and

---

<sup>115</sup>See Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 24-25, xii.

<sup>116</sup>See *ibid.*, 12.

<sup>117</sup>See *ibid.*, 12, 18.

<sup>118</sup>See *ibid.*, xi, 298.

<sup>119</sup>See *ibid.*, xvii, 452; *idem*, *Christians Active in the World*, 17.

task.” He also spoke of a successive movement of devaluing and dismissing the worldly things and restoring these very things to us as “a duty and a grace.” This twofold movement he called the two arms of an antinomy.<sup>120</sup> The notion of antinomy entails holding together opposite principles because both are true and to abandon either would be to move away from the truth. This approach produced a synthesis which is precisely what Congar did in his theology of the laity. In holding together laity and clergy, hierarchy and community, and Church and world, Congar formulated a notion of synthesis which is neither clerical nor laical.<sup>121</sup>

Congar was convinced that if the Church is understood as “an organism of grace” that only needs its clergy, then it may not be able fully to accomplish its mission with the laity.<sup>122</sup> Moreover, such an understanding treats the laity as objects rather than as subjects. Congar recognized that the Church exists, not for its own sake, but for the sake of the world which prompted a mutual relation between clergy and laity<sup>123</sup> because laity cannot perfect the Church without celebrating the sacraments. The laity’s role consists in the doxological function of glorifying God in and through their daily work.<sup>124</sup> In his earlier thought, it seemed as though that the Church could be the Church without the laity as long as there are priests to offer the Eucharist. But later the paradigm has shifted significantly to “[Christ] is

---

<sup>120</sup>See Congar, *Faith and Spiritual Life*, 138.

<sup>121</sup>See Williams, “Congar’s Theology of the Laity,” 154.

<sup>122</sup>See Congar, *Christians Active in the World*, 52.

<sup>123</sup>See *ibid.*, 53; *idem*, *Lay People in the Church*, 118.

<sup>124</sup>See Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 391.



priest and sacrifice, but the faithful are priests and sacrifices with him [by virtue of their baptism].”<sup>125</sup>

The sacramental dimension of the laity’s lives emerges also in Congar’s conception of the lay vocation. The Christian vocation is most fundamentally to give oneself to the world. The faithful not only offer the Eucharist through the priest, but they also offer Christian sacrifice directly, by offering sacrifice and giving themselves.<sup>126</sup> This sacrifice has therefore to be lived: “For each of us, according to the duties of our state in life, according to the opportunities offered us, there is this essentially sacrificial life to be brought into existence every day.”<sup>127</sup> This offering of the spiritual life makes every vocation in the body of Christ a priestly one, and made so by the animation of Christ the high priest,<sup>128</sup> for Christ is not only the unifier of all priestly offerings, but is the only priest of the New Covenant.<sup>129</sup> What a Christian does as a Christian is an act of Christ,<sup>130</sup> so that all the activity of the baptized in some sense partakes of the character of his high priesthood, for every one of us there is essentially sacrificial life.<sup>131</sup> It is in this specifically sacrificial sense that the laity participate in Christ’s priesthood by offering the whole of their lives as Christ offered his. It is in this sacramental and eucharistic context that Congar’s renunciation of the world is best understood, which is never a renunciation of “*les autres*,” hence never individualistic. “[A] Christian really is withdrawn from the world, dead to the world . . . In every authentic

---

<sup>125</sup>Congar, *A Gospel Priesthood*, 75.

<sup>126</sup>See Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 220.

<sup>127</sup>Congar, *Faith and Spiritual Life*, 186.

<sup>128</sup>See Congar, *A Gospel Priesthood*, 96.

<sup>129</sup>See Yves Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, trans. David Smith (New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1983), vol. 2, 113.

<sup>130</sup>See Congar, *The Mystery of the Church*, 26-27.

<sup>131</sup>See Congar, *Faith and Spiritual Life*, 186.

Christian life, therefore, there is a kind of devaluation and dismissal of the things of this world.”<sup>132</sup> Congar could not have probably maintained a dialectic position of the laity, as involved in the things of the world and yet withdrawn from the world, if it were not for his emphasis on sacrifice. Renunciation of the world is construed as the responsibility of Christians in general, not just of clergy alone.

Congar thus overcame two powerful dichotomies of his earlier thought within the context of sacrifice and priesthood. First, his theology of the laity shows a broad movement from an apparent tendency to define their role in relation to that of clerics, to guard ecclesiastical authority, and to keep the work of the laity firmly within the world. As a result, the clergy and the laity are now understood as both standing before God offering and praying, each offering sacrifice within one’s place in the priesthood of Christ. Second, the mutuality of clergy and laity, originally parsed as a division of labor between Church and world (the sacred and the secular), is transformed into a distinction between two kinds of priesthood and sacramental life, both radically dependent on the high priesthood of Christ and the power of the Spirit in their diffusion in the world. As a result, the sharp distinction of Church and world has become more nuanced in such a way that the laity, whose apostolate is to be active in the world, are now seen as equally having a role in the Church’s life of prayer, their work comprising both the exterior activities of secular profession and mission and the interior acts of worship and prayer. Congar emphasized that a Christian is in the first place one who prays, prayer is the essential and fundamental act of Christian living, and religion essentially

---

<sup>132</sup>Ibid., 137-138.

consists in worship.<sup>133</sup> Prayer means entering into communion with the will of God.<sup>134</sup> This shift from a hierarchical framework primarily to a theology of corporate worship is one of the most important of Congar's theology of the laity<sup>135</sup> which gave him the leverage and context to consider and to emphasize active participation of the faithful in the liturgy.

Congar offered a brief acknowledgement of the cosmic implications of the continuity of the interior and external cults and the unity of Christian life.<sup>136</sup> The laity engaged in the world find the "substance of things in themselves [as] real and interesting."<sup>137</sup> Hence, the created world is part of the substance of the lives the laity bring to public worship. In doing so, they bear a cosmic element to worship. Congar's understanding of cult and priesthood brought together the faithful's liturgical and ecclesial character in a coherent way.

In 1953 Congar proposed a theology of "total ecclesiology" in his introduction to the *Lay People in the Church* as the necessary context of a theology of the laity. He envisioned a unified vision of the Church as an ecclesiology that is neither clerical nor laical, but encompasses "the people of God in the fullness of its truth."<sup>138</sup> Although Congar never wrote his total ecclesiology in a detailed and systematic manner, one gets some hints of it from his article published in 1967.<sup>139</sup> In this article he outlined the history and theology of

---

<sup>133</sup>See Congar, *A Gospel Priesthood*, 93; idem, *Faith and Spiritual Life*, 187, 189.

<sup>134</sup>Congar, *Faith and Spiritual Life*, 187.

<sup>135</sup>See Congar, *Christians Active in the World*, 10.

<sup>136</sup>Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 221-222.

<sup>137</sup>*Ibid.*, 18-19.

<sup>138</sup>*Ibid.*, xvi.

<sup>139</sup>See Yves Congar, "L' 'Ecclesia' ou Communauté Chrétienne, Cujet Intégral de l'Action Liturgique," in *La Liturgie Après Vatican II: Bilans, Etudes, Prospective*, eds. J. -P. Jossua and Y. Congar (Paris: Cerf, 1967), 242-282. English text, Yves Congar, "The *Ecclesia* or Christian Community as a Whole Celebrates the Liturgy," in Paul Philbert, trans., and ed., *At the Heart of Christian Worship: Liturgical Essays of Yves Congar* (Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 2010), 15-68.

the Church as the single, active subject of the liturgy.<sup>140</sup> Congar was considering the implications of a eucharistic ecclesiology towards the end of Vatican II.<sup>141</sup> During the Council, the People of God image of the Church in *Lumen Gentium* captured Congar's attention and influenced his ecclesiology considerably. This ultimately led him to adopt a more unified vision of the Church than the mere description of it in the *Lay People in the Church*. At a conference held in 1966, Congar was asked if it is possible "to formulate a eucharistic ecclesiology intrinsic to the People of God," to which he responded, "The eucharist makes the body of Christ; the eucharist molds the People of God into the body of Christ. . . . It is clear that here eucharistic ecclesiology has its full place."<sup>142</sup> Thus Congar's recovery of a theology of corporate worship in line with the tradition of the Fathers began to adopt the qualities of a total ecclesiology. Congar reoriented his discussion of Christian worship from a distinction between the cults to an affirmation of a single cult in which the Church, as the People of God and the Body of Christ, celebrates the spiritual and public cult inaugurated by Christ and over which he remains the sovereign celebrant.<sup>143</sup> This concept of a single cult<sup>144</sup> corresponds to a total ecclesiology: the single, total Church lives in a single, all-encompassing cult in which the personal and communal aspects are not discarded, but are incorporated into Christ's cult, the Eucharist.

---

<sup>140</sup>See *ibid.*; *idem*, *Lay People in the Church*, 176.

<sup>141</sup>See Congar, "The Church: The People of God," *Concilium* 1 (1966): 7-19.

<sup>142</sup>Congar, "Session V Discussion," 231-232.

<sup>143</sup>See "The *Ecclesia* or Christian Community as a Whole Celebrates the Liturgy," 18.

<sup>144</sup>Sustained through reference to New Testament and Patristic sources, see *ibid.*, 16-20.

In this notion of liturgy, as recovered in *Sacrosanctum Concilium* that “[t]he liturgy, then is rightly seen as an exercise of the priestly office of Jesus Christ,”<sup>145</sup> Christ is the priest, joining his Church to himself, whereby “full public worship is performed by the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ, that is, by the Head and his members.”<sup>146</sup> Congar’s mechanism of inward and external cults and the various forms of priesthood is overtaken by the essential reality of Christ’s priesthood active in a real way in the liturgy, which he expressed as “of this worship and sacrifice, Jesus Christ is alone and personally the true priest.”<sup>147</sup> In his earlier thought, Congar had formulated a progressive culmination of activity in Christ starting with the interior cult through the external cult (both of the faithful and the official minister) to the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ. But later in his thought this movement took a reverse flow in such a manner that Christ the high priest assimilates the entire body into himself in the act of worship. In other words, under and in the person of Christ Congar formulated public worship. As a result, the Eucharist as the single cult or public worship assumes all three forms of sacrifice: that of Christ, that of the community as his body, and that of the holy lives of Christians.<sup>148</sup> Also all three forms of priesthood are assumed into a single priesthood of the Church or of Christ. The unity between the sacrifice of one’s life and the cultic sacrifice of the Eucharist is found in the Fathers of the Church, particularly in Augustine. This view of the Eucharist also appears in the traditional Catholic sacramental theology’s emphasis on the efficacy of the sacrament as that it produces what it signifies.

---

<sup>145</sup>*Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 7.

<sup>146</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>147</sup>Congar, *Lay People in the Church*, 208. Also see Crichton, “A Theology of Worship,” 23.

<sup>148</sup>“*Soma* is the ‘community-body’ of Christ, the Church, which is also the temple of God; but it is so only in union, through the Eucharist, with the *soma*, the body of Jesus Christ, which is the body offered up and sacrificed on the cross, then in his eucharistic memorial.” Congar, *A Gospel Priesthood*, 78.

## Summary

To sum up briefly the result of our investigation, according to Congar, worship is primarily related to life lived in faith and holiness which is spiritual sacrifice (or inward cult). Of this sacrifice, which is the offering of one's own life to God, each individual is the priest by virtue of baptism which is the essential sacrament of priesthood. Therefore, priesthood essentially defines all Christians. Holiness of one's life begins in the sanctifying grace of baptism. This grace enables Christians to offer up their lives through acts of love in the world as spiritual sacrifice to God in a way acceptable to him. Therefore Congar insisted that the secular is capable of being offered to God, for it is not necessarily non-spiritual. What is not spiritual is only sin. In order to have its fulfillment, spiritual sacrifice must be incorporated in the sacramental celebration of the Eucharist (external cult). The faithful share Christ's priesthood sacramentally, the laity acquire common priesthood by baptism and confirmation and the ordained ministerial priesthood by the sacrament of order, in order to celebrate the sacrifice of Christ sacramentally in the Church. The participation of the baptismal priesthood of the faithful in the liturgy formally provides the opportunity of sharing actively in the eucharistic celebration and fulfilling their personal offering in Christ. Hence, the role of the liturgical priesthood of the faithful is to unite and to celebrate spiritual sacrifice in the Church's offering of the sacrifice of Christ, which alone is acceptable to God. This union is sacramental and "quasi-corporal," which can not be consummated without taking part in the Eucharist. This union is done by the common priesthood of the faithful and the ministerial priesthood of the ordained, for they are ordered to be in relation to each other

for the celebration of the Eucharist. Thus in Congar's theology the role of the laity has moved from mere positioning of them within the ecclesiastical hierarchy toward reflection that is profoundly theological and a contribution to both liturgy and ecclesiology.

### **Frederick McManus: Symbolic Activity as Participation in the Mystery of Christ**

Frederick R. McManus served in various capacities for the reform, renewal, and implementation of the liturgy during and after Vatican II.<sup>149</sup> He interpreted the conciliar call to communal celebration and active participation in more concrete terms than those which *Sacrosanctum Concilium* offered. Without minimizing the importance of the doctrinal ground for active participation as enunciated in *Sacrosanctum Concilium*,<sup>150</sup> McManus elucidated the liturgical involvement of all Christian believers of the worshipping assembly in the celebration of the Eucharist.<sup>151</sup> In other words, in the liturgical participation the whole assembly involves itself through gestures, symbolic actions, and movements. In this approach, he spoke of liturgical participation as having many elements of worship,<sup>152</sup> which "are meant to be experienced in a celebration of the liturgy which is prayerful so that physical, intellectual and emotive participation in the liturgy can lead to and itself be a true identification and participation in the life which is ours in and through Christ."<sup>153</sup> In his

---

<sup>149</sup>See R Kevin Seasoltz, "Monsignor Frederick R. McManus 8 February 1923-27 November 2005," *Worship* 80 (2006): 98-101; Mark Massa, "Frederick R. McManus, *Worship*, and the Reception of Vatican II in the United States," *Worship* 81 (2007): 123-125.

<sup>150</sup>See *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 11, 14.

<sup>151</sup>See Frederick R. McManus, "Communion Song," *Worship* 32 (1958): 510-513.

<sup>152</sup>See McManus, *Liturgical Participation*, 2. Also see Kevin W. Irwin, *Liturgy, Prayer and Spirituality* (New York: Paulist Press, 1984), 259-269.

<sup>153</sup>Irwin, *Liturgy, Prayer and Spirituality*, 249.

assessment on liturgical practice since the Council,<sup>154</sup> McManus argued that certain non-verbal liturgical elements, namely, liturgical silence and external signs, remain yet to be adequately implemented into liturgical practice as envisioned by the Council.<sup>155</sup> “[Liturgical] practice has not caught up with Vatican II’s call for active communal participation that is ‘conscious’—a key word that demands breath and depth in practice.”<sup>156</sup> Hence, he argued for the need to reemphasize the religious meaning of these elements on the part of the worshipping community, if the liturgical participation is to have its full impact. In the following pages I concentrate on McManus’ *Liturgical Participation: An Ongoing Assessment* as the primary guide to present the role of liturgical silence and external signs as vital elements of active participation.

### Silence as Liturgical Activity of the Assembly

Silence is a vital element of liturgical activity. It is an activity of the gathered assembly. It is that dimension of the liturgy which enables the community to be brought more fully into the mystery of Christ’s presence celebrated in mystery. McManus calls attention to the appreciation of the liturgical silence as emphasized in *Sacrosanctum Concilium*.<sup>157</sup> A study of *Sacrosanctum Concilium* suggests that one of its main concerns is

---

<sup>154</sup>Based on the findings of the survey conducted on the liturgical reform found in *The Order of Mass Study: A Report* (Washington: Federation of Diocesan Liturgical Communion, 1985) and “The Notre Dame Study of Catholic Parish Life” *Worship* 60 (1985): 312-333.

<sup>155</sup>See, McManus, *Liturgical Participation*, 12, 14.

<sup>156</sup>*Ibid.*, 31.

<sup>157</sup>McManus argues that whatever silence was there in the pre-conciliar liturgy was the consequence of the accidents of history, the archaic discipline, and the neglect of the audible proclamation of prayer. Hence such silence was not designated in the structures of the liturgy. See *ibid.*, 12-13.



directly linked to active participation by the body of Christian worshipers. In a fundamental and normative statement it lists the *parts* of the people:

To promote active participation, the people should be encouraged to take part by means of acclamations, responses, psalms, antiphons, hymns, as well as by actions, gestures and bodily attitudes. And at the proper time a *reverent silence* should be observed.<sup>158</sup>

McManus underscores and elaborates the appropriate understanding of the role of this liturgical silence with its two references as emphasized by the Fathers at the Council.

First, he refers to it as an expression of the assembly's corporate, attentive silence to the proclaimed word of God<sup>159</sup> and its receptivity.<sup>160</sup> In this sense, he argues that it is a "religious silence in which one hears and receives the comprehensible word of God or the presidential prayer or even the sung praise of a special choir . . . ."<sup>161</sup> As an integral dimension of the eucharistic liturgy, silence disposes the assembly to listen attentively in response to the divine initiative. Listening in silent attention is an essential form of liturgical participation. In the liturgy of the word "God speaks to his people, opening up to them the mystery of redemption and salvation . . . ."<sup>162</sup> In other words,

The proclamation and preaching of God's word constitute a divine call, to which the eucharistic celebration is a response. God calls his people together and they listen to the

---

<sup>158</sup>*Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 30, emphasis added. At the Council, liturgical silence as an active element of participation was added as an amendment to this article. See McManus, *Liturgical Participation*, 11.

<sup>159</sup>For the liturgy of the word is part of the celebration of the Eucharist. See *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 56; the GIRM 2002, 28.

<sup>160</sup>See McManus, *Liturgical Participation*, 11. Also see Michael Downey, "Liturgical Role of Silence," in *The New Dictionary of Sacramental Worship*, ed. Peter E. Fink (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1990), 1189.

<sup>161</sup>McManus, *Liturgical Participation*, 11.

<sup>162</sup>the GIRM 2002, 55.

deeds of his love; in a return of faith and love they celebrate the eucharistic and sacrificial meal.<sup>163</sup>

Hence, this sort of liturgical silence, McManus asserts, is not meant to permit oneself to engage in individual piety when the communal act of Christian people reaches its highest and central expressions, especially when the Eucharistic Prayer is recited audibly.<sup>164</sup>

Second, he refers to it as a “community silence” in which each individual, from the presiding priest to all worshipers, is given the opportunity to reflect upon the word of God, to engage in praise or prayer, to unite oneself inwardly with the rest of the people called together by God *without* divorcing oneself from the rest of the community.<sup>165</sup> “This second kind of silence,” McManus claims, “when the appointed words, forms, or actions of the liturgical rite are as it were suspended, is a radical innovation of our liturgy.”<sup>166</sup> In this sense, the silence urged in the revised eucharistic liturgy is *intentional*. The established brief periods of silence in the eucharistic celebration have various functions for each designated time during the liturgy. Within the Act of Penitence and after the invitation to the presidential prayer at Mass, a period of silence serves as a call to recollection so that all may realize that they are in God’s presence and may call their petitions to mind. A suitable pause after the readings and homily helps people meditate on and interiorize what they have heard. After Holy Communion, silence serves to allow people to praise God and pray to him in their

---

<sup>163</sup>Frederick R. McManus, “The New Rite of Mass,” *Worship* 39 (1965): 140.

<sup>164</sup>See McManus, *Liturgical Participation*, 11.

<sup>165</sup>See *ibid.*, 12.

<sup>166</sup>*Ibid.*

hearts.<sup>167</sup> Thus these definite periods of silence offer the assembly the opportunity to reflect on what is occurring in the liturgy and to appropriate what is proclaimed and enacted in the rites.<sup>168</sup>

### External Signs as Liturgical Activity of the Assembly

Liturgy is made up of a series of actions. According to McManus, insofar as communal participation is concerned, these elements are the actions, movements, gestures, signs, bearings, posture, and position of the community.<sup>169</sup> Liturgy embraces the communal participation when the external signs are given their due emphasis. The gestures and postures from the presiding priest to the gathered people contribute to the participation of all in the liturgy. Moreover, such participation enhances the understanding of the Church as communion, body, people, and liturgical rather than as individualistic and chiefly institutional.<sup>170</sup> A common posture is a sign of the unity of the members which expresses and fosters the intention and spiritual attitude of the participants.<sup>171</sup> McManus underscores the significance of the bodily positions or postures of the celebrating community in order to have movement and change in some way expressive of the progress and diversity of elements in the course of the rite.

The assembly stands, sits, marks the sign of peace, bows, uplifts or outstretches their hands (or join their hands where it is permissible) in the celebration of the Eucharist. In

---

<sup>167</sup>See *ibid.*, 13; *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 30; the GIRM 2002, 45, 51, 56; Francis Cardinal Arinze, *Celebrating the Holy Eucharist* (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2006), 58-59.

<sup>168</sup>See Irwin, *Liturgy, Prayer and Spirituality*, 268.

<sup>169</sup>See McManus, *Liturgical Participation*, 14.

<sup>170</sup>See *ibid.*, 25.

<sup>171</sup>See *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 30, 34; the GIRM 2002, 42.

regard to bodily positions or postures of the celebrating community, it is significant that the assembly be standing in the Church to hear the Gospel or to listen to presidential prayers to which it assents. The sign of peace is an authentic ritual act of community participation. It is a ritual expression of mutual reconciliation in anticipation of eucharistic communion.

Moreover, it helps to appreciate the eucharistic meal as the common table of God's people or the sacrament of the Church's unity.

McManus considers verbal elements such as song,<sup>172</sup> speech, dialogue of greeting, and the response of acclamation exchanged between priest or deacon and the liturgical assembly as modes of participation. In addition, participation can be expressed not only by the position and movement of the worshipers themselves but also of the position of the presiding celebrant and ministers. These elements of the signs of participation emphasize the response and assent to what is exchanged between the priest president and the rest of the community.

Thus eucharistic liturgy uses non-verbal elements as well to make contact with God, to respond to his presence, and to offer worshippers a means to deepen their experience of God. Individual parts of the liturgy are experienced together and they become a vehicle for active participation as demanded "by the very nature of the liturgy."<sup>173</sup> Thus external signs are intrinsic to inner faith, devotion, and meaningful worship experience. These are considerations, McManus argues, to interpret the true and full meaning of the different parts

---

<sup>172</sup>McManus argues that primacy must be given to the sung part to be taken by the entire assembly, see Frederick R. McManus, "Sacred Music in the Teaching of the Church," in *Crisis in Church Music?* (Washington: Liturgical Conference, 1976), 14-26; Frederick R. McManus, "The New Rite of Mass," *Worship* 39 (1965): 77-78; *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 113-114, 116-121.

<sup>173</sup>*Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 14.

of the celebration and the Council's call to signs of active participation by all.<sup>174</sup> Moreover, in the eucharistic celebration the assembly engages in these symbolic actions that draw it into the mystery of Christ's saving death and resurrection.

### **Mary Collins: Being Attentive to the Mystery We Celebrate**

For Mary Collins liturgy is above all the particular and actual celebration of a ritual event.<sup>175</sup> She claims that the Church in its liturgical celebration is engaged in ritual self-interpretation, an interpretation of our participation in the mystery of Christ.<sup>176</sup> She argues that full participation in the celebration of the Eucharist involves more than just intelligent ritual engagement. Her approach to this kind of participation is based on the relationships between the graced nature of liturgical action and the actual impact of the celebration of the Eucharist (or liturgical spirituality) on human behavior.<sup>177</sup> For this purpose she emphasizes liturgy as corporate ritual activity and asserts our participation as contemplative/mystical. In this section I rely on her *Contemplative Participation* for our investigation.

---

<sup>174</sup>See McManus, *Liturgical Participation*, 16, 18; *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 30, 34; the GIRM 2002, 42, 43. However, McManus cautioned that what is reverent, dignified, meaningful, and devotional will always be a matter of convention and culture. See McManus, *Liturgical Participation*, 18.

<sup>175</sup>See Mary Collins, "Critical Questions for Liturgical Theology," *Worship* 53 (1979): 303.

<sup>176</sup>See Mary Collins, *Contemplative Participation: Sacrosanctum Concilium Twnty-five Years Later* (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1990), 34, hereafter *Contemplative Participation*.

<sup>177</sup>See *ibid.*, 75-78.

## Eucharistic Liturgy as Corporate Ritual Activity

Collins identifies liturgy as a corporate public prayer, “a body of bodies at prayer,”<sup>178</sup> which she explores from the perspective of the ritual theory of cultural anthropologists. She claims that ritual theory provides us with a set of intellectual tools for understanding the mystery we celebrate. It is our ritual behavior as an assembled people that anthropological theory has helped us to understand and to appreciate in a new way that human activity mediates divine grace.<sup>179</sup> As a corporate public ritual, liturgy is a particular form of human behavior and mediates the mystery of our salvation. Collins defines eucharistic liturgy as corporate ritual activity of “*an assembly of people who, when it is timely, engage in patterned behavior valued as good for the group because it confirms group identity and advances group goals.*”<sup>180</sup>

Cultural anthropologist Clifford Geertz affirms two aspects on religion as a cultural system. First, the central meaning and beliefs of a people’s faith are most effectively communicated through rituals. Second, among a believing people’s liturgical rites one event will stand out as the center of the whole repertoire of rites for which the people assemble.<sup>181</sup> Collins identifies these two points as confirmed in *Sacrosanctum Concilium*. The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy states that the liturgy “is the summit toward which the activity of the Church is directed” and which is also “the fount from which all her power

---

<sup>178</sup>Ibid., 37.

<sup>179</sup>See *ibid.*

<sup>180</sup>Ibid., 38.

<sup>181</sup>See *ibid.*, 50.

flows.”<sup>182</sup> Moreover, *Sacrosanctum Concilium* focuses on the Sunday Eucharist and states that “[b]y a tradition handed down from the apostles, which took its origin from the very day of Christ’s resurrection, the Church celebrates the paschal mystery every seventh day.”<sup>183</sup> Thus the liturgical reform assumed the Sunday Eucharist as the normative eucharistic liturgy, which is the heart of the Catholic repertoire of corporate public ritual.<sup>184</sup> Collins makes a distinction between the Eucharist and other sacraments based on cultural and ritual theory and considers the Sunday Eucharist as the center of Catholic life. The Sunday Eucharist as a worship system has elements (other sacraments and liturgical activities) that support this center. Hence all other sacraments and liturgical gatherings are oriented toward and revolve around the Eucharist.<sup>185</sup>

Cultural theorists mark “redundancy” and “repetition” as the hallmarks of corporate public ritual system.<sup>186</sup> Redundancy means that a single mystery is being presented in a variety of ways. So all the liturgical activities mediate the mystery of Christ—the mystery of our salvation. Repetition means that the Church engages over and over again in a limited set of rites it has agreed upon as effective mediators of what it believes in. These two features of liturgical activity also serve the purpose of *anamnesis*. Collins argues that the biblical and liturgical use of the word *anamnesis* is set against the notion of spiritual amnesia, a loss of our spiritual identity. Corporate public ritual brings us together to participate actively in the

---

<sup>182</sup>*Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 10.

<sup>183</sup>*Ibid.*, 106.

<sup>184</sup>Collins distinguishes the daily eucharistic celebration as devotional and the Sunday eucharistic celebration as vital for the Church. The consequence of unnecessary absence from the latter is mortal. See Collins, *Contemplative Participation*, 50-51.

<sup>185</sup>See *ibid.*, 50-54.

<sup>186</sup>See *ibid.*, 54.

relationships revealed in the paschal mystery that identify us spiritually.<sup>187</sup> “Liturgical rites provide self-engaging activity of a symbolic form which points us to and engages us personally in the mystery within which we live. For it is both our faith and our experience that the mystery of Christ is always present.”<sup>188</sup> So we assemble to invest ourselves as a community of Christians in liturgical *anamnesis*. All liturgy is *anamnesis*. But Sunday Eucharist is the center of Christian *anamnesis*. On this weekly occasion the baptized people most profoundly assemble together to reconstitute themselves as the Church of Christ, as the body of Christ, and as a priestly people.<sup>189</sup>

In Sunday Eucharistic liturgy we move through public praise and thanksgiving for the mystery; we remember, and remembering dare to move even nearer to our shared identification in the mystery of Christ. Through sacramental Communion in the Body broken for the world’s life and the Blood poured out for the world’s forgiveness, each of us engages ourselves, each of us commits ourselves, and the Church is reconstituted by God’s gift to us.<sup>190</sup>

We explore ritually and symbolically our place in the mystery of salvation because this liturgical work is vital to our very existence as a Church. In our assembling and acting together, our identity as the Church of Christ is confirmed in this time and place.<sup>191</sup> Our constitution as Church here on earth is always partial. So it is essential that we must assemble over and over again on Lord’s day for our continued existence as Church.<sup>192</sup>

---

<sup>187</sup>See Collins, “Critical Questions for Liturgical Theology,” 308.

<sup>188</sup>Collins, *Contemplative Participation*, 55.

<sup>189</sup>See *ibid.*, 54-56; *idem*, “Güeranger: A View on the Centenary of His Death,” *Worship* 49 (1975): 323, 328.

<sup>190</sup>Collins, *Contemplative Participation*, 56.

<sup>191</sup>See *ibid.*, 59.

<sup>192</sup>See Collins, “Liturgical Celebration as Ecclesial Construction,” *Currents in Theology and Mission* 26 (1999): 261.



Liturgy is self-involving activity, in which we are physically present and personally engaged. Through self-engaging activity of liturgy we remember who we are. The very act of assembling implies engagement with and commitment to the meanings that are going to be expressed in the assembly. Such engagement invites us to commit ourselves to a life that is congruent with our identity.<sup>193</sup>

### Contemplative Participation

According to Collins, the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy's call for active participation of the faithful seemed to be a calling for a quantitative ritual increase through verbal, mental, and bodily engagement.<sup>194</sup> While acknowledging the present liturgical reforms as sound for lay active participation, Collins rephrases the Council's call for "full, conscious, and active participation" in order to emphasize beyond what has been commonly understood by it. Hence she describes the quality of participation that the present time requires as contemplative or mystical.<sup>195</sup> This kind of participation means attending wholeheartedly to the liturgy we celebrate. Contemplatives are, she says, attentive to presence and are present to the mystery within which they live.<sup>196</sup> The Church's corporate public worship—its symbolic ritual action, its liturgical celebrations—seeks to set out the mystery of Christ as the paschal mystery. That is, liturgical activity focuses on the mystery

---

<sup>193</sup>See Collins, *Contemplative Participation*, 45-46.

<sup>194</sup>See Mary Collins, "Participation: Liturgical Renewal and Cultural Question," in *The Future of the Catholic Church in America: Major Papers of the Virgil Michael Symposium* (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1991), 23; idem, *Contemplative Participation*, 82-83; *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 26-32 which speak about the laity to participate through acclamations, responses, psalmody, antiphons, songs, gestures, and postures.

<sup>195</sup>See Collins, *Contemplative Participation*, 81-82.

<sup>196</sup>See *ibid.*, 82.

of salvation revealed in Christ's sacrificial death and resurrection to life.<sup>197</sup> Rituals are about relationships; Christian liturgical assemblies celebrate relationships that save. The mystery of salvation is paschal; paschal mystery is symbolized in Jesus, risen and glorified, seated now at the right hand of the Father and interceding for the world. The paschal mystery is also symbolized in the Church which is the people of God becoming the body of Christ, dying in order to rise transformed, joined with its head interceding for the world's salvation, and continuously sent back into the world to be messengers of reconciliation on God's behalf.<sup>198</sup> Liturgy does not say these things discursively. Rather, it invites us to participate together in self-engaging activity through which we enter into and commit ourselves to meanings and relationships that give us identity and purpose of our lives.<sup>199</sup> The liturgical reform has enabled us to experience and to attend to the mystery of God as our own mystery. We experience ourselves as sacraments of salvation and celebrate what we experience. In such liturgical participation, Collins says, we are moving from our self-conscious activity to contemplative participation, rooted in our experience of the mystery of grace. That is, from the peripheral level of "full, conscious, and active participation" toward the unselfconscious conversion to the Christian mystery as the ultimate meaning of our lives.<sup>200</sup> Because liturgy is corporate public ritual that engages us directly, the mystery is about us. We are assuming

---

<sup>197</sup>See Collins, "Critical Questions for Liturgical Theology," 303.

<sup>198</sup>See Collins, *Contemplative Participation*, 45.

<sup>199</sup>See *ibid.*, 45.

<sup>200</sup>See *ibid.*, 83.

our identity as the reformed and renewed Church of Jesus Christ. We put on the mind of Christ and become his body because we trust this is the way of our salvation.<sup>201</sup>

Liturgical rites enable us to understand and assume our responsibility. In the repetitive ritualistic action we become suitable agents of divine grace. “The mystery of the risen Christ is among us and within us; the Spirit of Jesus has been given to us. Whoever sees us glimpses God at work for the world’s salvation. We ourselves as a people are the sacrament of that salvation.”<sup>202</sup> This understanding is possible if only we experience ourselves as the sacrament of salvation and celebrate what we experience, for we recognize that it is all the baptized who are *alteri Christi*, other Christs.<sup>203</sup>

Collins argues that the awareness of our own identity as the Church impels us to acts of social regeneration. Contemplative participation in liturgical prayer, as the graced moment of ritual activity, impacts on our conversion and exerts a public effect. The public effect of ritual activity depends on the personal appropriation of the identity of the liturgical rites we celebrate. The religious outlook and way of life shaped by the liturgical celebration of the mystery of Christ is the meaning of liturgical spirituality.<sup>204</sup> Liturgical spirituality has a single dynamic. It celebrates the paschal character of salvation. We who believe in the paschal mystery as the only true offer of salvation must embody the mystery, and incarnate it for the world. Contemplative participation in the paschal mystery of Christ makes possible the appropriation of the identity the rites offer. Becoming the body of Christ not only within

---

<sup>201</sup>See *ibid.*, 47.

<sup>202</sup>*Ibid.*, 82.

<sup>203</sup>See *ibid.*

<sup>204</sup>See *ibid.*, 79; Kevin W. Irwin, *Response to 101 Questions on the Mass* (New York: Paulist Press, 1999), 178.

the sanctuary but also outside it is the effect of liturgical spirituality,<sup>205</sup> pouring out one's own life to rescue others from the shadow of death.

### **Jozef Lamberts: Act of Communion as the Summit of Active Participation**

Jozef Lamberts calls active participation of the faithful in the eucharistic celebration as a “real ecclesial worship.”<sup>206</sup> While admitting other forms of active participation, he singles out the act of Communion as the high point of participation in the renewed liturgy of the Eucharist. His argument is based on his exploration of the multivalent theological meanings embedded in this liturgical act. For this purpose I primarily consider two of his articles.<sup>207</sup>

#### **Act of Communion: Literal Participation in the Sacrifice of Christ and an Action of Confession of Faith**

Lamberts states that the center of liturgy is the celebration of Christ's paschal mystery as the perfect glorification of the Father and the sanctification of the people.<sup>208</sup> He argues

---

<sup>205</sup>See Collins, *Contemplative Participation*, 85.

<sup>206</sup>Jozef Lamberts, “Who Should Communicate?”, Or: The Act of Communion as the Summit of Active Participation,” *Les Questions Liturgiques* 69 (1988): 193; idem, “Active Participation as the Gateway Towards an Ecclesial Liturgy,” in *Omnes Circumstantes: Contributions Towards a History of the Role of the People in the Liturgy*, eds., Charles Caspers and Marc Schneiders (Uitgeversmaatschappij. Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1990), 234. Lamberts' theological reason for this phrasing for active participation is from the understanding of liturgy as priestly office that is exercised through the Mystical Body of Christ, the head and his members, see *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 7. In this presentation of liturgy, he argues, distinction is not made between the priest and the faithful, but between Christ and the celebrating community. See Lamberts, “Who Should Communicate?”, 196-197; Lamberts, “Active Participation as the Gateway Towards an Ecclesial Liturgy,” 252-253.

<sup>207</sup>See the works referred to in n. 207.

<sup>208</sup>See Lamberts, “Who Should Communicate?”, 196; idem, “Active Participation As the Gateway Towards an Ecclesial Liturgy,” 252.

that liturgy is not only an activity *for* the people, but also an activity *of* the people.<sup>209</sup> In a spirit of thanksgiving the people reflect on Christ's redeeming suffering and his sacrifice on the cross perpetuated in the celebration of the Eucharist. The renewed liturgy makes Communion of the faithful an integrated part of the eucharistic celebration. Not only the presiding priest communicates, but the whole gathered people communicate at the very moment of Communion.<sup>210</sup> So the faithful do it in obedience to the Lord's command at the Last Supper. Here, Lamberts argues, the link between consecration and Communion is restored and people's participation in the sacrifice of Christ is emphasized.<sup>211</sup> Furthermore, he says that the restoration of Communion has not only restored the dimensions of sacrifice and meal, but also the rite of breaking of bread has regained its place in the function of Communion where it signifies that we, who are many, are made one body in the one bread. Hence, it is against liturgical theology that the people receive Communion from the pre-consecrated hosts.<sup>212</sup> In this regard, the *General Instruction of the Roman Missal 2002* teaches:

It is most desirable that the faithful, just as the priest himself is bound to do, receive the Lord's Body from hosts consecrated at the same Mass and that, in the instances when it is permitted, they partake of the chalice . . . , so that even by means of the signs Communion will stand out more clearly as a participation in the sacrifice actually being celebrated.<sup>213</sup>

---

<sup>209</sup>See Lamberts, "'Who Should Communicate?'" 197.

<sup>210</sup>See *ibid.*, 204. Also see *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 55; the GIRM 2002, 85.

<sup>211</sup>See Lamberts, "'Who Should Communicate?'" 204.

<sup>212</sup>See *ibid.*

<sup>213</sup>The GIRM 2002, 85.

The renewed formula “Body of Christ” and the response “Amen” emphasize the importance and proclamation of faith.<sup>214</sup> The celebration of Christ’s presence under the signs of bread and wine demands faith. Without faith there is no Eucharist, no presence of Christ under the visible signs of bread and wine.

#### Act of Communion: Readiness to Participate in the Mission of the Church

Lamberts asserts that when we say “Amen” at the end of the Eucharistic Prayer, we are not only expressing our assent, but we are also expressing our willingness for our engagement in building up God’s kingdom on earth *in unity with Christ*.<sup>215</sup> The premise of this willingness lies in the act of Communion itself. Reception of Communion also represents a commitment to live in conformity with reality that one confesses.<sup>216</sup> We celebrate Christ’s self-surrendering for the salvation of mankind. Celebrating the Eucharist is not complete without this readiness for engagement.<sup>217</sup> That is, our response of “Amen” to the “Body of Christ” during the Communion rite contains important ecclesiological meaning. We are expressing our commitment in affirming the eucharistic presence of Christ and by taking part in Christ’s eucharistic body we are affirming our readiness at the same time to be Christ’s body on earth under the auspices of the Church.<sup>218</sup> Saint Augustine made these points to the neophytes:

---

<sup>214</sup>See Lamberts, ““Who Should Communicate?”,” 202.

<sup>215</sup>See *ibid.*, 204.

<sup>216</sup>See Cabié, *The Church at Prayer: The Eucharist*, 118.

<sup>217</sup>See Lamberts, ““Who Should Communicate?”,” 204.

<sup>218</sup>See *ibid.*, 205.

If you are the body and members of Christ, it is your mystery which is placed upon the Lord's table, it is your mystery which you receive. You receive your own mystery. On what you are, you reply Amen and so you endorse it. You hear, 'The body of Christ' and you say 'Amen'. Be a member of the Body of Christ in order that your Amen be true.<sup>219</sup>

### Conclusion

To sum up the findings in this Chapter, each theologian considered here approaches the concept of active participation from a different point of view by giving emphasis to one or the other dimension of the eucharistic liturgy. While generally associated with ecclesiological and ecumenical areas of specialization, Congar was deeply influenced by liturgy and liturgical theology. Through recourse to liturgical theology in the *Lay People in the Church*, he opened the door to full participation. In placing the Church as the subject of liturgy premised on the priesthood of Christ, Congar offered a comprehensive theology of Christian worship. He showed how our personal Christian life offered to God as a spiritual sacrifice and the sacrifice of Christ in the celebration of the Eucharist are inseparably interrelated. Likewise, the common priesthood of the faithful and the hierarchical priesthood of the ordained are ordered to one another. Congar could claim so because he developed the idea of laity and the secular in positive terms. Thus in his work there is a shift from his initial hierarchical framework to a total ecclesiology, one cult and one priesthood, in the liturgy of the Church, in which all are priests but in various degrees. McManus underscores the importance of external signs for meaningful worship. He stated that liturgical signs are those dimensions of the liturgy in which we engage ourselves in order to participate in the

---

<sup>219</sup>Lamberts, "'Who Should Communicate?'," 205, cited from St. Augustine, Sermon 272 in PL 38, 1247.

mystery of Christ being celebrated. In her description of contemplative participation, Collins emphasizes our appropriation of the rites we celebrate as a community. We are always urged to live what we celebrate. We who celebrate the paschal mystery of Christ must incarnate it for the world. Lamberts highlights the reception of Communion as a vital element of the eucharistic liturgy. This liturgical engagement conveys the literal meaning of taking part in the sacrifice of Christ. He underscores that by our sharing in the gifts of bread and wine which have become the body and blood of Christ at the eucharistic celebration we can be more adequate representatives of Christ before the world as members of the body of Christ. Awareness of these various emphases of the elements of active participation should enrich and broaden the way we participate in the eucharistic liturgy. While each theologian speaks differently about eucharistic participation, they don't offer a "true" theological ground on which their interpretations can be made more convincing and meaningful.



### CHAPTER III

## INFLUENCE OF *MYSTERIENGEGENWART*<sup>1</sup> THEOLOGY ON KILMARTIN IN CONSTRUCTING A THEOLOGY OF THE CHURCH'S EUCHARISTIC PARTICIPATION

### Introduction

After a brief look at the life of the liturgical sacramental theologian Edward John Kilmartin, S.J., including his education and ministry, his Trinitarian approach to liturgy, and his emphasis on the local Church, I will consider in this Chapter the *Mysteriengegenwart* theology's influence on Kilmartin in formulating a theology of eucharistic participation. I will identify and describe what Kilmartin judged to be a significant contribution to the formulation of an adequate and a truly systematic theology of eucharistic sacrifice, the relationship between the historical acts of Christ and the liturgical celebration. In this way, I will refer to only those theologians whom Kilmartin himself considered as representative of the *Mysteriengegenwart* debate and whose views he found useful for developing his own eucharistic theology. I will trace only stages of the historical development of these insights in the twentieth century. Moreover, I will follow the order of the development of the debate as Kilmartin himself presented it.<sup>2</sup> Thus this Chapter will serve as the theological background to the development of Kilmartin's approach to the subject. In this Chapter,

---

<sup>1</sup>This term was coined by Odo Casel to mean that liturgy is primarily a reality of the sacramental order under whose rites and symbols the redemptive *passio Christi* is re-actualized (re-presented) in a very real but invisible manner. See Denis O'Callaghan, "The Theory of the '*Mysteriengegenwart*' of Dom Odo Casel, A Controversial Subject in Modern Theology," *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* 90 (1958): 247, hereafter "The Theory of the '*Mysteriengegenwart*' of Dom Odo Casel"; Edward J. Kilmartin, *The Eucharist in the West: History and Theology*, ed. Robert J. Daly (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1998), 268, hereafter *Eucharist in the West*.

<sup>2</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 267-338.

Casel's thesis will receive lengthy treatment. His basic insight, the "rediscovery of the fundamental meaning of Christian worship, participation in the paschal mystery,"<sup>3</sup> was incorporated into the Church's teaching. This Chapter will conclude with the insights and directions derived from this debate as well as those which Kilmartin would eventually develop for further clarity and formulation of the subject.

### **A Glance at Kilmartin's Life**

Multi-award winner Edward John Kilmartin was born on August 31, 1923 in Portland, Maine, USA, to Patrick Joseph and Elizabeth Gertrude Kilmartin.<sup>4</sup> He began his career as a theologian shortly before Pope John XXIII convened the Second Vatican Council. His career spanned more than thirty years. His area of specialization was historical systematic theology with an emphasis on liturgical worship and sacraments, particularly the Eucharist. He died of bone cancer on June 16, 1994.

---

<sup>3</sup>See Edward J. Kilmartin, "Theology of the Sacraments: Toward a New Understanding of the Chief Rites of the Church of Jesus Christ," in *Alternative Futures for Worship*. Vol. 1, *General Introduction*, ed. Regis A. Duffy (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1987), 132, hereafter "Theology of the Sacraments."

<sup>4</sup>Kilmartin was the recipient of the Catholic Theological Society of America's John Courtney Murray Award for Excellence in theology in 1978; of the U.S. Catholic Press Association's Best Book in Theology for his *magnum opus*, *Christian Liturgy: Theology and Practice: I. Systematic Theology of Liturgy* (Kansas City: Sheed and Ward, 1988) in 1988; of the North American Academy of Liturgy's Berakah Award for his distinguished lifetime contributions to liturgical theology in 1994.

Education and Ministry<sup>5</sup>

Upon finishing high school in 1941, Kilmartin joined the New England Province of the Society of Jesus at Shadowbrook in Lenox, Massachusetts. After concentrating on classical Greek and Latin, in 1945 he studied Scholastic philosophy at Weston College, Massachusetts, and received an A.B. in 1947 and an M.A. in the following year. His superiors initially planned to assign him to help the New England Jesuits' mission in Baghdad, Iraq, entrusted by the Holy See since 1932. During his formation period, Kilmartin was noted for his aptitude for intellectual pursuits. Eventually on two occasions he was assigned to pursue higher studies in two different fields.

First, in 1948, while still a scholastic, Kilmartin was sent to do graduate studies in physical chemistry in order to teach in Baghdad because the Jesuits had decided to establish a petroleum engineering college there. Kilmartin earned an M.S. degree *magna cum laude* in 1950. His research was entitled "Two Thermodynamic Relations of the System: Sucrose and Water." In the same year he published two articles in this field in collaboration with his major professor. After a brief teaching experience in chemistry and mathematics, he began the formal four-year program of theological studies at Weston College from 1951 to 1955, in preparation for ordination to the priesthood. During this period several professors had

---

<sup>5</sup>Sources for this section are Michael A. Fahey, S.J., "In Memoriam: Edward J. Kilmartin, S.J. (1923-1994)" *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 61 (1995): 5-35, hereafter "In Memoriam"; Jerome M. Hall, *We Have the Mind of Christ: The Holy Spirit and Liturgical Memory in the Thought of Edward J. Kilmartin* (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 2001) xiii-xviii, hereafter *We Have the Mind of Christ*; Carmina M. Magnusen Chapp, *Encounter with the Triune God: An Introduction to the Theology of Edward J. Kilmartin, S.J.* (Bethesda, Mary Land: Catholic Scholars Press, 1998), 13-35, hereafter *Encounter with the Triune God*.

notable impact on Kilmartin by sparking his interests in ecclesiology, sacramental theology, and ecumenism. He was ordained a priest in 1954.

Second, after obtaining a licentiate in theology in 1955, Kilmartin spent a year studying ascetical theology at Pomfret, Connecticut, where his superiors noticed that he was a rather talented theologian. They decided to send him for higher studies in theology in order to teach in the seminary in Baghdad because the Chaldean patriarch in Baghdad wished to replace the French Dominicans in his seminary with American Jesuits. This opportunity may have prompted Kilmartin's interest in the theology of the Eastern Churches. Kilmartin was eventually sent to Jesuits' Gregorian University in Rome to pursue an S.T.D. degree in dogmatic theology. During his stay in Rome, Kilmartin deepened his interest in ecumenism, and the topic of his S.T.D. dissertation focused on the Evanston General Assembly of 1954,<sup>6</sup> which was a meeting of the World Council of Churches. He graduated in 1958 *magna cum laude*.

Although Kilmartin was destined for the Baghdad mission to teach theology, his assignment to the Iraqi capital never came to fruition for two reasons. First, a sudden vacancy appeared in the theological faculty at Weston due to the illness of a certain sacramental theologian. So in 1958 the Provincial of the New England Province requested the General of the Jesuits to assign Kilmartin back to the province temporarily to teach sacramental theology at Weston. The request was granted, and his "temporary" assignment eventually lasted until 1977. Second, in the mid-1960's the American Jesuits were expelled

---

<sup>6</sup>Edward J. Kilmartin, "Eschatology and the Evanston Congress: A Study of Developments in Eschatology in the Twentieth Century, and its Influence on the Theology of the World Council of Churches." (S.T.D. diss., Gregorian University Press, 1958).

from Iraq by the new revolutionary government of the Baath party. By this time Kilmartin had already established himself as a recognized theologian—teacher, writer, and ecumenist.

Kilmartin's teaching career began at Weston College in 1958 and he taught there until 1977. From 1968 to 1977 he jointly taught both at Weston and Boston College. He went from there to the University of Notre Dame (1977-1984) and finally to the Pontifical Oriental Institute in Rome (1985-1990). During his stay in Rome he drew upon his knowledge of Eastern and Western sacramental theology. Besides his teaching, he published 231 works, including books, articles, essays, and book reviews.<sup>7</sup> These works demonstrate his vast knowledge in theology. In addition, he served as associate editor for the publication of *New Testament Abstracts* from 1958 to 1967; as consultant theologian and executive secretary for the Orthodox/Roman Catholic Consultation sponsored by the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops' Committee for Ecumenical and Interreligious Affairs and the Standing conference of Canonical Orthodox Bishops from 1966 to 1979; as consultant editor for *Theology Digest* from 1971; as consulting editor for *Theological Studies* from 1968 to 1990; as collaborator with the staff of the magazine *New Catholic World* from 1974 to 1981; as an assistant editor of *Emmanuel* from 1975 to 1981; and as a consultant for *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* from 1988 to 1990.

The Second Vatican Council's cry for *aggiornamento* helped Kilmartin realize what was lacking in his own post-Tridentine theological training. He was convinced that in order for the Church to respond to twentieth century society, theology would have to include the

---

<sup>7</sup>For a chronological list of his works, see Fahey, "In Memoriam," 19-35. Kilmartin's posthumously published book, *Eucharist in the West*, is not included in this list.

disciplines of biblical scholarship, historical criticism, and human sciences. Finding the manual approach inadequate for teaching sacramental theology, Kilmartin replaced it with his own scholarly notes drawn from biblical and patristic sources. He developed his own eucharistic theology from the scriptural and historical perspectives and argued for the value of such research for a modern theology of the sacraments. His emphasis on the active participation of local Church in the celebration of the Eucharist in particular and of the sacraments in general results from the dialogical character (offer and response) of the liturgy, which offers a renewed appreciation of the role of the local Church in salvation history. He argued that the priest functions *in persona ecclesiae*, not just *in persona Christi*. While at Weston College, Kilmartin attended discreet meetings between representatives of the Roman Catholic and the Orthodox Churches at the Russian Center of Fordham University in New York City. These meetings sparked his interest in the role and theology of the Holy Spirit. This interest led him to emphasize and incorporate the role of the Spirit in his theology of the Eucharist. He did so partly because he found a lack of the pneumatological dimension in Catholic eucharistic theology.

Always concerned about the general education of the faithful, Kilmartin authored two small pamphlets on the sacraments and on the Eucharist for the Paulist Press Doctrinal Series.<sup>8</sup> His concern for the education of the general population continued throughout his years, as is evidenced by his contributions to journals geared to a popular audience.

---

<sup>8</sup>Edward J. Kilmartin, *The Sacraments: Signs of Christ, Sanctifier and High Priest* (New York: Paulist Press, 1962) hereafter *Sacraments*; idem, *The Sacrificial Meal of the New Testament* (Glen Rock, New Jersey: Paulist Press, 1966) hereafter *Sacrificial Meal*.

While Kilmartin was a theological student at Weston, the most significant discussion in sacramental theology at the time concerned the presence of the mode of Christ's redemptive deeds in the liturgy and the liturgical assembly's participation in it, known as the *Mysteriengegenwart* controversy. Until Vatican II theologians continued discussing the nature of the presence of Christ's saving deeds and the manner in which the liturgical assembly participates in them through the celebration of the Eucharist. Kilmartin judged that a consensus had not been achieved on the issue because the debate failed to incorporate the various perspectives involved in the mystery of the celebration of the Eucharist. Biblical, liturgical, and dogmatic theologians expressed views about different operations rather than about a unified comprehension of the Mystery of the divine.<sup>9</sup>

This debate captured Kilmartin's attention in 1959 when he began his teaching career as a sacramental theologian. Gifted in learning new languages, Kilmartin kept abreast of the theological discussions concerning this subject in Europe, particularly in France and Germany. German theologians especially had a notable impact on his theological thinking. This is evidenced by Kilmartin's reference to a good amount of German theological literature in his *corpus*. Eventually, Kilmartin would approach the subject from a Trinitarian theological point of view.

---

<sup>9</sup>See Brian McNamara, "Christus Patiens in Mass and Sacraments: Higher Perspectives," *Irish Theological Quarterly* 42 (1975): 17-18, hereafter "Christus Patiens."

### Trinitarian Approach to Liturgy<sup>10</sup>

Kilmartin understood liturgy to be a personal encounter with the Triune God and a participation in the life of the Trinity. For him a theology of liturgy is ultimately a theology of the Trinity.<sup>11</sup> As a professor of Christian worship, Kilmartin described how Christ's redemptive works are present and how the liturgical assembly takes part in the eucharistic celebration. He judged that commonplace modern Catholic eucharistic theology was inadequate to explain this participation and offer a comprehensive theology of the Eucharist. Hence he argued that such eucharistic theology was "without a future"<sup>12</sup> for modern times. Kilmartin gradually developed the elements of an explicitly Trinitarian approach to sacramental theology in general and to eucharistic theology in particular. The premise of his approach can be said to be "[e]verything that can be identified as a peculiarly Christian truth is . . . a derivative of the one central truth that man was created in order to live forever in personal communion with the Holy Trinity."<sup>13</sup> This transcendent goal of human beings, he argued, was given in and through the life of Jesus and the role of the special mission of the Holy Spirit—in short, in the self-communication of the Triune God.

---

<sup>10</sup>Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*; idem, "The Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology: Towards the Third Millennium," *Theological Studies* 55 (1994): 405-457, hereafter "Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology." As a preliminary note, I present Kilmartin's Trinitarian approach to the eucharistic theology. This approach will be thoroughly analyzed in the next Chapter as I will present Kilmartin's theology of eucharistic participation, but here it is treated only in passing. Kilmartin's Trinitarian approach is not limited only to liturgy but also his approach to ecclesiology.

<sup>11</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 100-108.

<sup>12</sup>Expression which Kilmartin owes to the Italian theologian Cesare Girardo. See Kilmartin, "Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology," 443.

<sup>13</sup>Edward J. Kilmartin, "Foreword to the English Edition," in Jean Corbon, *The Wellspring of Worship*, trans. Matthew J. O'Connell (San Francisco, Ignatius Press, 1988), 7. Also see Kilmartin, "Theology of the Sacraments," 164-165.



Accordingly the key to Kilmartin's approach to the problem of the relation between the presence of Christ's saving acts in the celebration of the Eucharist and the participation of the liturgical assembly lies in his treatment of the subject in a wider perspective than that was carried out in the *Mysteriengegenwart* debate. For Kilmartin believed that the debate itself was formulated incorrectly and provided only further questions rather than solutions. Hence, he distanced himself from the narrowly and too "Christologically" focused dimension of the eucharistic liturgical event of the active presence of Christ and his saving mysteries as "sacramental representation of the historical sacrifice of the cross."<sup>14</sup> Instead, he moved to the understanding of the self-communication of the Triune God in the history of the economy of salvation. Kilmartin believed that this Trinitarian approach could explain the mystery presence of the saving acts of Christ and the resulting participation of the liturgical assembly in the mystery of God in Christ in a more acceptable, adequate, and comprehensive way than those approaches of the theologians who engaged themselves in explaining them in the *Mysteriengegenwart* debate.

Kilmartin claimed that, according to Scripture as interpreted by traditional theology, the salvation of human beings is a participation in the divine life of the Trinity. This salvation is a grace described as Trinitarian self-communication of the divine life of the Father through his Word and in his Spirit.<sup>15</sup> "The mystery of liturgy is the mystery of the history of salvation, fully revealed in the special missions of the Father's one Word and one

---

<sup>14</sup>Kilmartin, "Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology," 420.

<sup>15</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 100-101.

Spirit. It is, at its depth, the life and work of the Triune God in the economy of salvation.”<sup>16</sup>

The mystery of salvation history, according to Kilmartin, is not a past event, but rather an on-going event which will be completed with Christ’s *parousia*.

Kilmartin considered liturgy to be the celebration of the mystery of God’s act of gathering human persons into the communion of the Trinity by the action of Word and Spirit. “Liturgy is, above all, the work of Trinity in its *execution* and *content*.”<sup>17</sup> Consequently, liturgy can be conceived of as a realization of the economic Trinity. This understanding of liturgy, in light of the economy of salvation history, allowed Kilmartin to approach the relation of the presence of Christ’s redeeming acts and the assembly’s participation in them from the context of the action of the Trinity itself, (that is, the revelation of the immanent Trinity in the economy of divine self-communication) in order to find a satisfactory way to describe the problem. For this purpose, he constructed a theology of the liturgical presence of the mystery of the economic Trinity revealed in Christ and his saving acts and the participation of the liturgical assembly through the analysis of the classical eucharistic prayers. These prayers describe the Christian liturgy as celebration of the mystery of Trinitarian self-communication experienced in and through human history.<sup>18</sup> They also emphasize the personal activity of the Holy Spirit revealed in Christ and the Church and the Church’s liturgical celebrations as events in which the Spirit manifests the Trinitarian self-communication accomplished and revealed through the history of Christ’s humanity.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup>Ibid., 180.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid., 102.

<sup>18</sup>See Kilmartin, “Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology,” 428.

<sup>19</sup>See *ibid.*

Kilmartin thus argued for the proper description of the liturgical assembly's relationship to the temporal deeds of Christ in light of the mystery of the economic Trinity which consists of both the divine offer of self-communication and the human response.<sup>20</sup>

Kilmartin argued that liturgical celebrations are not just a means by which God offers grace to the recipients of the sacraments, but also a medium of participation by the believers in the economic Trinity, a medium of Trinitarian self-communication. The liturgical activity of the Church is a real symbol of the economy of salvation, that is, of the mystery of God's plan of salvation for the world, which reached its fulfillment in Jesus Christ and which is being further realized through the mission of the Spirit in the time of the Church.

#### Emphasis on Local Church<sup>21</sup>

Kilmartin's focus on ecclesial aspects evidently underscores the role and experience of the concrete local Church at worship.<sup>22</sup> His emphasis on the significance of the local Church is based on two grounds: concrete realization of the Church and, more importantly, liturgical activity/experience.<sup>23</sup>

---

<sup>20</sup>See *ibid.*

<sup>21</sup>Kilmartin's understanding of the role of the local Church in the liturgical activity is expressed in Edward J. Kilmartin, *The Particular Liturgy of the Individual Church: The Theological Basis and Practical Consequences*, (Bangalore, India: Dharmaram Publications, 1987), hereafter *Particular Liturgy*; *idem*, "Theology of the Sacraments," 123-175.

<sup>22</sup>Kilmartin argued that a geographical designation like that of "local church" is not useful as a category for a particular realization of the Church. Instead he preferred Vatican II's expression "particular Church" or "individual Church" as used by some theologians. Yet he did not mean to eradicate a term so safely ensconced as "local church," which he did use and by which he meant episcopal eucharistic assembly. See Kilmartin, *Particular Liturgy*, ix-xi, 66. I follow this term as it pertains to the topic of this dissertation.

<sup>23</sup>Kilmartin's emphasis on local Church does not begin with its ecclesiological existence, rather this existence results from its liturgical activity, as will be explained in the following pages.

Reflection on the Church, Kilmartin argued, should begin with local Churches because in any sound ecclesiological ontology all realizations of Church in history are localized and the one Church exists from and in many local Churches.<sup>24</sup> Moreover, Christianity is a religion of local presence. From this perspective, the Church in its first place is an episcopal eucharistic assembly of believers, which underscores the patristic understanding of the structure of the Church as communion-ecclesiology.<sup>25</sup> Thus what is most evident to us are local Churches, Kilmartin argued, which as visible reality display the elements of “one Lord, one faith, one baptism” (Ephesians 4:5). According to Kilmartin, there exists no invisible Church in history, a kind of transcendent entity, alongside the social reality. When Paul speaks of “the Church of God which is in Corinth” (1 Corinthians 1:2), he means the Church of God as it exists in Corinth.<sup>26</sup>

In addition to the Pauline concept of assembly (1 Corinthians 11:17-22), Kilmartin argued, the essential elements that constitute the local Church in the concrete are the “one, holy, catholic and apostolic” elements of the Church as confessed in the creed. These essential properties flow from the Church’s mystery—the foundation of community is the reality of the active presence of the Trinity (Ephesians 4:3, 6-7).<sup>27</sup> Hence the empirical local Church cannot be separated from its mystery. The local Church, existing in a definite place, is necessarily a kind of “laboratory of maturity,” where members are enabled to “become one

---

<sup>24</sup>See Kilmartin, *Particular Liturgy*, 66, x.

<sup>25</sup>See *ibid.*, 4.

<sup>26</sup>See *ibid.*, 19.

<sup>27</sup>See *ibid.*

in faith and in the knowledge of God's Son and form the perfect man who is Christ come to full stature [Ephesians 4:13]."<sup>28</sup>

The four qualitative properties of the Church, Kilmartin argued, are intrinsically related and are found wherever the local Church realizes, because these essential elements exist as embodied or sacramentalized only in the concrete liturgical celebration of the assembly. The ecclesiastical manifestation of these essential elements in a community of Christians, therefore, is dependent on three basic activities of that community: witness to the revelation of God in Christ; the forms of communal worship; the variety of ministerial services exercised by members on behalf of one another. These activities are always linked to a particular situation and are carried out in space and time.<sup>29</sup> The local Church is identifiable insofar as it manifests these essential properties of the Church. From the standpoint of theological principles, Kilmartin concluded, the local Church is the concrete historical appearance of the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Church.<sup>30</sup>

Kilmartin identified the reality of the self-communication of the Father through Christ in the Spirit as the ground for the formation of the community.<sup>31</sup> The Church necessarily has to exist in a place because grace is offered to and the response of faith is made by believers who exist in space and time. The grace-event occurs where the word of God is preached, liturgical-sacramental celebrations are accomplished, and the community lives in communion

---

<sup>28</sup>Ibid.

<sup>29</sup>See *ibid.*, 27.

<sup>30</sup>See *ibid.*, 25-26.

<sup>31</sup>See *ibid.*, 3, 19.

with God and one another.<sup>32</sup> Grace-events, which occur at definite points of space and time, are the historical acceptance of God's own communication of self by which the personal union between the believers and the divine is realized. Consequently, sacramental celebrations confer grace insofar as they afford the context in which God's offer of self-communication, as the goal of human existence, is existentially accepted.<sup>33</sup> All grace-events are unique and historical. Kilmartin argued that the modes of sacramental communication between God and believers cannot be simply reduced to an abstract theory of causality of sign and divine power. Rather, in the case of the sacraments, one must take account of the ecclesial dimension. The symbolized reality—God's self-communication, proportionate to the purpose of each sacrament—is so intimately connected with the sacramental rite that it can be approached as reality only through the rite as act of the believing community.<sup>34</sup>

Kilmartin considered that the conciliar reform of the liturgy offered the opportunity for a more active participation of both clergy and laity. Moreover, the implication of this legislation asserts that sacraments are to be understood as communal actions by which a concrete Christian community realizes itself. Consequently, a theology of sacraments begins with the worshipping community, which represents the Church in space and time.<sup>35</sup> Kilmartin claimed that this approach is a corrective to the abstract concept of the holy members of the universal Church as the real subject of liturgical celebrations. This concept was explained as resulting from the intention of the members of the universal Church to unite their prayer with

---

<sup>32</sup>See *ibid.*, 42.

<sup>33</sup>See Kilmartin, "Theology of the Sacraments," 130-131.

<sup>34</sup>See *ibid.*, 165; F. Tillmanus, "The Sacraments as Symbolical Reality of Faith," in *Fides Sacramenti Sacramentum Fidei*, eds., H.J. Auf der Maur et al., (Assen, the Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 1981), 253-276.

<sup>35</sup>See Kilmartin, "Theology of the Sacraments," 138.

the official prayer of the Church and their devotion contributing to the measure of blessings bestowed by God as a response to the liturgical action.<sup>36</sup> He argued that this devotion is understood now only to contribute to strengthening of the faith of those who actually engage in the liturgy.

In the new ecclesiological turn of sacramental theology, Kilmartin argued, sacraments are now more generally understood to be acts of the Church as such, not merely acts of the minister of Christ in the Church. Christian liturgy is a means by which the Christian community is newly constituted as the Body of Christ. But this effect is conditioned by the active participation of the believers who express the faith in daily life. As the communicative action of a concrete community, the liturgy brings to the surface the saving presence of God and personal union with Christ in the Church through participation in the Holy Spirit. This activity is needed because the members of the Church exist in history and must continually celebrate their common faith, lest they lose their identity as the Body of Christ.<sup>37</sup>

The mystery of salvation is effected in and through the historical event of the cross. This mystery is recalled in the liturgical celebrations of the Church and is newly presented, applied, experienced, and lived by believers. The whole community is integrated into this salvation through the rite which originated from the Last Supper and which announces Christ's self-offering on behalf of the many (1 Corinthians 10:16-17; 11: 23-26). Kilmartin argued that introduction of the community of believers into the explanation of the efficacy of

---

<sup>36</sup>See *ibid.*, 138, 163; *idem*, *Christian Liturgy*, 15, 363; *idem*, "Eucharist: Nourishment for Communion," in *Populus Dei II: Ecclesia. Studi in onore del Card. Alfredo Ottaviani*, ed. Joseph D'Ercole, *Communio* 11 (Rome, 1967), 1083-1084.

<sup>37</sup>See Kilmartin, "Theology of the Sacraments," 149.

the sacraments is required because the ritual celebration is an act in which the whole community is potentially an active subject. As acts of the Church, the liturgy pertains to the category of the religion's cult. With a coherence of images, rules of conduct, and language based on the vision of faith, the participants in the liturgy are enabled to identify themselves, to take their stand within the community, and to participate in the experience of faith of that community. The objective faith of the Church is expressed in the fixed forms of the sacramental celebrations of particular groups of Christians. Sacraments are a human activity and they objectively express the faith of the Church and that of the community gathered, to the extent that the community expresses its faith to the fixed forms of the liturgy. As a result, it is through human language and symbolic actions by which the community expresses itself that God's self-communication takes place and is received in a fruitful way. Since sacraments are a celebration of the faith of the Church by an ecclesial community, they are a proclamation of the offer of God's self-communication made to the whole community.<sup>38</sup>

The Church of Jesus Christ is the concrete place in history where this trinitarian mystery is explicitly proclaimed and accepted, where the Father's offer of self-communication through his only Son and his Holy Spirit finds a free response of praise and thanksgiving. This mystery is represented and shared in a festive way in the liturgy of the Church; it is continually offered and accepted in all the dimensions of the daily life of faith.<sup>39</sup>

Kilmartin asserted that in its liturgical activity the local Church under the leadership of the ordained minister expresses and mediates Christ in the Spirit as its ground of being.<sup>40</sup> From a phenomenological point of view, Christian worship is an activity in which the Church

---

<sup>38</sup>See *ibid.*, 165-169.

<sup>39</sup>Kilmartin, "Foreword to the English Edition," 7.

<sup>40</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 363-364.



manifests and realizes itself in the public forum. The ecclesiological insight that liturgy is the “self-expression of the Church” grounds the possibility of emphasizing the local Church.<sup>41</sup>

The concrete way of realization of the local Church is, Kilmartin insisted, essentially that of eucharistic worship in which the bishop “represents Christ who is the true host and high priest of the celebration.”<sup>42</sup> According to Christian faith, the Father is the primordial source of the saving missions of the Word and Spirit. Through the twofold mission, humanity is being gathered into the divine communion with the Father through the Son in the Spirit. Therefore the unity of the Trinity brings about the unity of the people of God. The fellowship has a sacramental basis. Baptism is the entrance into the new life of personal communion with the Trinity. In the Eucharist this fellowship is realized at the level of the communal life of the earthly Church. Christ gathers his community around himself in the power of the Spirit to praise the Father and to share in the banquet. By participating in this sacrament, the believers are united more intimately to Christ and to all those who share in the same table of the Lord.<sup>43</sup>

Thus the sacramental force that maintains and fosters the unity of the community of the baptized is the Eucharist. The Church is understood to be the eucharistic assembly in which the Trinitarian union in Christ is communicated for the realization of the communion of the people of God in Christ.<sup>44</sup> Kilmartin argued that during the fourth and fifth centuries,

---

<sup>41</sup>See *ibid.*, 40, 44.

<sup>42</sup>See Kilmartin, *Particular Liturgy*, 66.

<sup>43</sup>See *ibid.*, 63-64; *idem*, “Eucharist: Nourishment for Communion,” 1056.

<sup>44</sup>See Kilmartin, *Particular Liturgy*, 30-32; *idem*, “Eucharist: Nourishment for Communion,”

the relationship of Eucharist to the Church was discussed under the aspect of the source of unity of Christians among themselves, as reflected in the *fermentum* practice and the penitential discipline in the early Church.<sup>45</sup> Such liturgical practice underscores Kilmartin's emphasis on the local Church as the eucharistic community.

### **Influence of *Mysteriengegenwart der Heilstat Christi* Theology on Kilmartin Concerning the Church's Participation in Christ's Sacrifice**

As was described in Chapter One, as was often the case especially after Trent, the actual form which the liturgy celebrated signaled the way the Church itself was regarded. Among other things,<sup>46</sup> the condemnations of Pius IX's Syllabus of Errors in 1864 and of Pius X's "modernism" in 1907 were seen as theological censures applying to all intellectual endeavors, including the scriptural, liturgical, and patristic revivals. Against the conventional view of the liturgical/sacramental celebration and the understanding of the Church, a new approach began with the *Mysteriengegenwart* debate in the 1920s. Vatican II incorporated this approach into its teaching in *Sacrosanctum Concilium* and *Lumen Gentium*.

The cause-effect principle of the neo-Scholastic Thomistic sacramental theology, developed by Cardinal Cajetan and Francisco Suarez, was employed by Catholic theology in order to describe the working of sacramental grace. This *Effektustheorie*<sup>47</sup> (or better known

---

1052-1056.

<sup>45</sup>See Kilmartin, *Particular Liturgy*, 32-35; idem, "Eucharist: Nourishment for Communion," 1059, 1050.

<sup>46</sup>The Conciliar Movement (from thirteenth through fifteenth centuries), Reformation and Counter Reformation, Scholasticism and Neo-Scholasticism, Enlightenment rationalism, the rise of scientific method that often challenged faith, Romanticism, the *Risorgimento* in Italy, to name but a few.

<sup>47</sup>Kilmartin pointed out that this theology, a product of Thomistic tradition, is not equated with the eucharistic theology of Thomas Aquinas. See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, xxiv, 249; idem, "Catholic

as the manual theology), which was prevalent until Vatican II, described sacramental celebrations as means of grace, sacramental signs as conferring grace, and Christ's saving acts as the primary cause of that grace. This Thomistic tradition did not develop Aquinas' insight that the sacramental sign referred to Christ's passion.<sup>48</sup> Instead, this tradition viewed Christ's humanity (especially his passion) primarily as the instrumental cause of grace and described the sign as a symbol juridically constituted by Christ to bestow grace. The particular sacramental sign, by Christ's authority, indicates God's offer of grace and invites the recipient to believe and accept that gift. In this system the sign simply refers to the effect of the sacrament. Sacramental celebration was thus seen predominantly as the instrumental cause of God's bestowal of grace upon the recipients of the sacraments. The understanding was such that through the sacraments, God applies the merits of Christ's passion to the individual soul. The relationship among the deeds of Jesus, the sacramental sign, and the bestowal of grace appeared to be principally a juridical one. Sacraments have their effect because Christ, present in the liturgy, acts in virtue of the power of his past redemptive acts. Consequently, Christ's saving deeds, the instrumental cause of the sacramental grace, are

---

Tradition of Eucharistic Theology," 406-407.

<sup>48</sup>According to Aquinas, God is the principal cause of grace because grace is nothing but a sharing in the divine nature. See Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologia*, vol. 2, trans. Fathers of the English Dominican Province (New York: Benzinger Brothers, Inc., 1947), III, q.62, a.1. In the sacraments, God gives grace by using the instrumental causes of humanity of Christ and the sacraments. Aquinas related the effect of sacramental grace to the sacramental sign of Christ's passion because the passion is the cause of our sanctification, the essence of our sanctification in the present which consists in grace and virtue, and the ultimate goal of our sanctification which is our future glory. See *ibid.*, q. 60, a. 3; Anscar Vonier, *A Key to the Doctrine of the Eucharist* (Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 1925), 18-20. Aquinas considered signification as the essence of the sacrament. In his epistemology the thing signified is present in the sign and thus becomes accessible to the imagination and the mind. In the sacraments the sign does more than indicate the effect of the sacrament; it produces a true presence of the thing signified. The sacraments signify and make present not just the grace won by Christ's saving acts but also both the glorified Christ who acts in the sacraments and the suffering Christ to whom the recipient conforms. See Hall, *We Have the Mind of Christ*, 24.

present *only* in their effects. That is, Christ's passion had a "virtual" presence in the sacraments because in them the power (*virtus*) deriving from the passion is active and present.

In this manual system, the liturgical *anamnesis* of Christ was not stressed. Furthermore, this system's denial that sign makes present the thing signified caused problems for the Eucharist, in which the effects of the passion are communicated through the glorified Christ's real presence under the signs that refer to his passion.<sup>49</sup> The *Effektustheorie* with its frequent appeal to Aquinas for the workings of an instrumental efficient cause is mistaken because Aquinas explicitly asserted that the historical resurrection event is truly present to believers and the *omnes actiones et passiones Christi* effect believers' salvation here and now.<sup>50</sup> Consequently, the instrumental efficient cause of sacramental sanctification must come, directly or through a chain of events, in contact with the recipient of the sacraments in order to explain how a remote act can cause a present event. Instrumental efficient causality, however, cannot relate an act at one time and an event at another time. An act occurs in time and then does not exist. So the act cannot be an instrumental cause because action depends on existence. If the saving acts of Christ have become incapable of being present, as the *Effektustheorie* claimed, then they cannot act as instruments.<sup>51</sup>

Against such contemporary neo-Scholastic sacramental theology, Odo Casel, a monk of the Abbey of Maria Laach, Germany, initiated the *Mysteriengegenwart* debate in 1922. In fact, as was described in Chapter One, the seed for this new theology was already planted by

---

<sup>49</sup>See *ibid.*, 24-25.

<sup>50</sup>See McNamara, "Christus Patiens," 19, 35.

<sup>51</sup>See Hall, *We Have the Mind of Christ*, 25.

Guéranger in France in the 1830's. Casel asserted in his *Mysterientheologie*<sup>52</sup> that the redemptive acts of Christ are "objectively"<sup>53</sup> made present to believers under the veil of the sacramental signs in the liturgical celebrations, *a fortiori* in the Church's celebration of the Eucharist. As a result, believers experience a sanctifying contact with the historical mysteries of their salvation through the actual but the mystery presence of the saving deeds of Christ.<sup>54</sup> Theologians who refused to accept Casel's teaching responded that a past action cannot be re-actualized because it is absorbed into the particularity of time in which it occurred. Consequently, the historical life of Christ has no direct relation to the sacraments which are the symbolic representation of the real saving liturgy of the risen and glorified Lord.<sup>55</sup> By the power of Christ as the glorified Lord his saving deeds are present *only* in their effects of grace as applied to the recipients of the sacraments. The glorified Christ is present in the liturgy because it is his grace that is given to the believers. The Roman magisterium did not endorse any position on the debate. Rather, one finds in the Church's official teaching<sup>56</sup> concepts that are applicable to both positions.

---

<sup>52</sup>"Mystery theology" or "Theology of mysteries" explains the whole of the redemptive work of God, particularly in the liturgical life of the Church, with the help of the concept of "mystery" drawn from early Christian tradition. See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 268.

<sup>53</sup>"Objectively" means the presence of the salvific work of Christ existing by itself independent of and prior to its application to the recipients of the sacraments. In other words, the aspect of faith of the recipients of sacraments is not seriously considered for this presence.

<sup>54</sup>See Odo Casel, *The Mystery of Christian Worship*, ed. Burkhard Neunheuser, O.S.B., with an introduction by Aidan Kavanagh, O.S.B (Westminster, Mary Land: The Newman Press, 1962), 15-16 passim.

<sup>55</sup>See McNamara, "Christus Patiens," 19.

<sup>56</sup>Namely, Pius XII, *Mediator Dei*, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 39 (1947): 119-154.

Odo Casel: Participation by the Liturgical Assembly in the “Objectively” Present Saving Acts of Christ in the Celebration of the Eucharist<sup>57</sup>

After acquiring two doctoral degrees in theology and in philosophy<sup>58</sup> Casel served as the spiritual director of a Benedictine Convent at Herstelle. This cloistered setting provided Casel the opportunity for further study and reflection on mystery theology. In addition, the Rule of Benedict, under which Casel lived, urged him to study the Scripture and the writings of the Apostolic Fathers, where he found insights worth recovering. From his historical and patristic studies, Casel realized that when the Fathers of the Church spoke of the liturgy and Church, they had completely different notions about them than modern Catholics did. Tutored by these magnificent teachers (Scripture and the Fathers), Casel developed his thesis of mystery theology.

Concerned with deepening the understanding of the very essence of Christianity, Casel turned his attention to the mystery of Christian worship, the ritual expression of the essence of Christian religion. His teaching was simple but revolutionary to the received notions of sacraments and Church. He taught that something more crucial was to be present in the sacramental celebration than just graces for the faithful or even the Real Presence of Christ in the eucharistic species, namely, the active presence of the saving mystery of Christ and the participation by the believers in it. The core of Casel’s argument was thus the prolongation of the saving deeds of Christ, especially in the celebration of the Eucharist.

---

<sup>57</sup>Casel, *The Mystery of Christian Worship*; Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 268-282; Hall, *We Have the Mind of Christ*, 1-37.

<sup>58</sup>Concerning the eucharistic teaching of Justin Martyr in 1913 and the mystical silence of the Greek philosophers in 1919.

Hence, he taught that, in the Church's celebration of the Eucharist, Christians encounter the person of Christ in his saving deeds. This is the mystery that the liturgy celebrates, he argued, the mystery the Church cherishes as its source and center.<sup>59</sup>

Casel regarded sacraments of the Church as a special mode of this presence of mysteries and participation. His key concept was that of "mystery," which he defined as "the presence of divine salvation under the veil of a symbol"<sup>60</sup> which constitutes the *Kultmysterium* (the mystery of worship or the rites) of the Church. The basic motif is the celebration of the saving acts of Christ in a holy action. "The Mystery is a sacred ritual action in which a saving deed is made present through the rite; the congregation, by performing the rite, take part in the saving act, and thereby win salvation'.<sup>61</sup> Hence, "mystery" for Casel referred to that which is only accessible through participation in the sacred actions within the community of faith. The mystery of worship shapes and constitutes the Church by conforming Christians to Christ's dying and rising.<sup>62</sup>

According to Casel, the mystery of worship, then, includes the exterior rite and the invisible reality. Christianity is an historical deed of the redemptive work of Christ made present and accessible, revealed, and concretized in the here-and-now liturgical actions and into which believers enter through liturgy.<sup>63</sup> Because of the transcendent nature of Christ's saving acts and because Christian worship is a means of participation in the redemptive work

---

<sup>59</sup>See Casel, *The Mystery of Christian Worship*, 16, 27, 95.

<sup>60</sup>Odo Casel, "Mysteriengegenwart," *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft* 8 (1928): 145, cited in Hall, *We Have the Mind of Christ*, 6.

<sup>61</sup>Odo Casel, "Mystery-Piety," *Bonner Zeitschrift für Theologie und Seelsorge* (1926), 104, cited in Casel, *The Mystery of Christian Worship*, 54.

<sup>62</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 270; O'Callaghan, "The Theory of the 'Mysteriengegenwart' of Dom Odo Casel," 247.

<sup>63</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 269.

of Christ, Casel employed the symbolico-real approach to sacramental theology.<sup>64</sup> In this approach to sacramental theology, realities are made manifest by signs, which both point to and hide the Mystery of Christ. Thus, in the patristic sense, Casel used the Greek term *eikôn* (image) to convey the idea of participation in the reality signified,<sup>65</sup> which is a reclaiming of the ancient understanding of the liturgy as truly *leiturgia* (public service). Casel thus underscored the importance of the anthropological aspect of Christian liturgy and the sacramental rites as celebration against contemporary understanding of the sacraments.<sup>66</sup>

The essence of Christianity is the Mystery which is the deed of God that proceeds from eternity, realized in time and the world, and returns to God its goal in eternity (Ephesians 1:9). In a word this Mystery is Christ (Colossians 2:2), the final revelation of God (Hebrews 1: 1f.). The Mystery embraces first of all God's Incarnation. Yet the Incarnation as such does not exhaust the Mystery of Christ. Because of the sins of humanity, the Mystery assumed the shape of economy, God's saving plan, in Christ.<sup>67</sup> The God-man Christ, who died for our sins and rose to be one with the Father, is the summit of God's revelation. Yet God's revelation of himself in this way is not communicated to the world at large, but to those whom God has chosen, hence to the Church (John 16:3; 17:25; Ephesians 3:10). The Church, in turn, enters the Mystery through the acts by which Christ saved the world as a way to the Father. Christianity is thus a *mysterium* of revelation made by God to

---

<sup>64</sup>See Casel, *The Mystery of Christian Worship*, 16.

<sup>65</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 270.

<sup>66</sup>See Kilmartin, "Theology of the Sacraments," 131-132.

<sup>67</sup>See Casel, *The Mystery of Christian Worship*, 10.



humanity through the acts of Christ, and humanity's way to God is made possible also by this very revelation of God in Christ and his *pasch* (Romans 8:3; John 13:1).

The *pasch* is sacrifice with the consecration of the person that flows from it; it is the sacrifice of the God-man in death on the cross, and his resurrection to glory: it is the Church's sacrifice in communion with and by the power of the crucified God-man, and the wonderful joining to God, the divinization which is its effect.<sup>68</sup>

This redemptive work of Christ, Casel argued, must be made present to all generations of humanity because the salvation of all is effected according to the economy established by Christ as known to us in Scripture and tradition.<sup>69</sup> Accordingly, when Christians participate in the liturgy of the Church, the veil of symbols is lifted up and the Mystery of Christ is made a present reality.

The great theme of Casel's presentation is the oneness and uniqueness of the sacrifice of Christ. But in the Church's sacramental ritual action the Church is taken into the one sacrifice of Christ that in every new action of the Church this sacrifice is made present. It is the Church's sacrifice in communion with and by the power of Christ.<sup>70</sup> Hence these two sacrifices are fundamentally one. Casel spoke of the identity of the act of sacrifice in the Eucharist and cross. There is but one single sacrificial act of Christ in the historical act of Christ's sacrifice in its temporal moment and in the act the Church is performing. Because the Church presents this sacrifice by its action, the Church makes the sacrifice of Christ.<sup>71</sup> Eucharistic celebration is nothing but the ritual performance of the sacrifice of Christ, which

---

<sup>68</sup>ibid., 13.

<sup>69</sup>See ibid., 9, 12-13.

<sup>70</sup>See ibid., 13.

<sup>71</sup>See ibid., 38.

is capable of being present in the here-and-now liturgical celebration of the Church. The head (Christ) and members (the Church) act as one in this sacrificial offering because they, through the sacrament of baptism, are incorporated into the body of Christ (the Church). Christ, raised up by the Spirit, makes the sacrifice together with his Church. Christ does not make a new sacrifice, but through his one sacrifice he has become the glorified sacrificial gift. The Church acts and offers the sacrifice in Christ. The Church, which is not yet brought to her completion, is drawn into this sacrifice of Christ and thereby takes an active part in his sacrifice, makes it her own, and is raised with him from the world to God. Every Christian is to become Christ by participating in Christ. Christ's salvation must be made real in us by active sharing in his redeeming deed. This participation is active because Christians share in the saving acts of Christ by a deed of their own. That is, they respond to the action of God upon them (*opus operatum*) thorough their co-operation (*opus operantis*) that is carried out through grace from him. Because of the inmost oneness of being between head and body, it follows that the Church must participate in Christ's sacrifice in mystery, in sacramental service. This sacrifice is the only way to the Father. In the Mass the consecration of the eucharistic species by the ordained priest in God's power sets out the sacrifice of Christ in *mysterium*. Christ offers himself in a sacramental manner. The Church through the priest's ministry carries out the mystery and so offers Christ's sacrifice. It, then, becomes Church's sacrifice by her personal participation. By means of the re-actualization of the redemptive act of Christ in the *Kultmysterium*, the believers may participate in it and be glorified with the Lord.<sup>72</sup>

---

<sup>72</sup>See *ibid.*, 22.

Casel emphasized that in order to make Christ's salvation real in believers, they needed a living, active sharing in the redeeming deed of Christ by an act of their own. Here Casel rejected the application of a "justification" purely from "faith" or by an application of the grace of Christ. For this active sharing, Casel argued, Christ has given the Church the mysteries of worship: the sacred actions which the believers perform. Through these actions it is possible for them to share most intensively and concretely in a kind of immediate contact in Christ's saving acts. The mystery of Christ completed in time is fulfilled in the believers in symbolic forms, as images filled with the reality of the new life which is communicated to believers through Christ. This special sharing in the life of Christ, both symbolic and yet real, is called mystical. The image is so filled with the reality of the original deed that it may rightly be called a presence.<sup>73</sup> This active sharing, Casel emphasized, will only be really and truly fulfilled when liturgy is understood again at its deepest level as the Mystery of Christ and the Church:

We are to think of liturgy in its pure and ancient meaning: not an extension of aesthetically-minded ritualism, not ostentatious pageantry, but the carrying out, the making real of the mystery of Christ in the new alliance throughout the whole Church in all centuries. In it her healing and glory are made fact. This is what we mean when we say that liturgical mystery is the most central and most essential action of the Christian religion.<sup>74</sup>

While the redemptive historical acts of Christ in themselves are past; nonetheless, they are capable of being present to the worshiping Church in the mystery of worship. Worship of the Church is ultimately the worship of Christ himself. That is, it is Christ who as the glorified

---

<sup>73</sup>See *ibid.*, 16, 95.

<sup>74</sup>*Ibid.*, 27.

one is acting in the worship of the Church. Hence he is not bound by history (space and time). This worship of the Church will continue until the day of *parousia*.<sup>75</sup>

According to Casel, liturgical action is the “ritual celebration . . . a rendering present of divine work, on which the existence and life of a community is grounded.”<sup>76</sup> Without this mystery of worship, Casel argued, the Mystery of Christ could not become a present reality for believers. Therefore liturgy understood in the sense of the execution and realization of the Mystery of Christ in the Church, in view of the Church’s sanctification and glorification, is the central and essentially necessary activity of Christianity.<sup>77</sup>

When Casel first proposed his thesis of mystery presence, it lacked adequate grounding for his position. That is, how the historical redemptive act of Christ was re-presented in the liturgical celebration. Anscar Vonier in 1925 offered an interpretation of the mystery theology from the Thomist theological tradition which emphasized the commemorative role of the sacramental sign in the sacramental theology of Aquinas.<sup>78</sup> Vonier’s point of departure for his interpretation of Aquinas is the assertion of Aquinas himself that “this sacrament is called sacrifice.”<sup>79</sup> The eucharistic representative sacrifice contains a realistic representation of the sacrifice of Christ on the cross.<sup>80</sup> Consequently there is a memorial in the sense of the representation of the real and historical death of Christ. While the act is new, the sacrifice is not. It is the same sacrifice in a different mode. That is,

---

<sup>75</sup>See *ibid.* Also see Edward J. Kilmartin, “Sacramental Theology: The Eucharist in Recent Literature,” *Theological Studies* 32 (1971): 239, hereafter “Sacramental Theology.”

<sup>76</sup>Casel, *The Mystery of Christian Worship*, 53.

<sup>77</sup>*Ibid.*, 27.

<sup>78</sup>See Vonier, *A Key to the Doctrine of the Eucharist*.

<sup>79</sup>See Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* III, q. 79, a. 5 and a. 7, ad 1.

<sup>80</sup>See *ibid.*, q. 78, a. 4, ad 3 and ad 2.

this sacrificial presence is demanded by the commemorative nature of the sacramental sign. Christ's historic sacrifice on Calvary, Vonier argued, is rendered present in the eucharistic liturgy through the eucharistic body and blood because there is the repetition of the thing in the sacramental sphere.<sup>81</sup> Hence, Christ's passion is not only contained in the signs but also is made present in the natural sacrifice of Christ, according to the sacramental mode of being. For a sacramental world, Vonier concluded, the laws of space and time are irrelevant.<sup>82</sup> This interpretation of Aquinas by Vonier about the sacramental mode of being had a decisive influence on Casel's systematic thinking. This interpretation also occupied an important place in his teaching, for it provided him with an explanation of the manner in which the *passio Christi* is re-presented outside the realm of the laws of space and time. Vonier argued that the sacramental sign must make the passion present to believers in order for its power to be accessible in the celebration.<sup>83</sup> It is the glorified Christ who acts in the sacraments as the one who suffered, the *Christus passus*. The *Christus passus* is present in a supra-temporal sacramental mode of existence so that believers may enter into the essence of Christ's saving acts by faith.<sup>84</sup>

Vonier pointed out Aquinas' teaching on baptism for this sacramental mode of being as "... it is clear that the Passion of Christ is communicated to every baptized person, so that

---

<sup>81</sup>See Vonier, *A Key to the Doctrine of the Eucharist*, 125, 134, 157. Kilmartin claimed that Vonier's interpretation on Aquinas' thought based on *Summa Theologica* III, q. 60, a. 1 c is inaccurate. For the correct understanding of Aquinas' thought on this, see Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* III, q. 83, a. 1; Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 253, 277.

<sup>82</sup>See Vonier, *A Key to the Doctrine of the Eucharist*, 19.

<sup>83</sup>See *ibid.*, 31-32.

<sup>84</sup>See Hall, *We Have the Mind of Christ*, 8.

he is healed just as if he himself had suffered and died.”<sup>85</sup> The passion is communicated to the one who is baptized through the sacramental sign, in and through which Christ is present. Through the sacramental sign, the liturgical celebration links with Christ, historically and actually conforming the believers to Christ’s passion.<sup>86</sup> The sacrament is a representation of an historic act because that representation contains the immolated Christ and brings believers into contact with the events that result in their salvation.<sup>87</sup>

In the Eucharist, Vonier held, Christ’s passion is sacramentally represented in the separate consecration of bread and wine.<sup>88</sup> In his death on the cross, Christ’s blood was separated from his body. The separate consecrations of bread and wine, then, symbolically represent Christ at the moment of his death. Through the sign of the separation of the species, the glorified Christ is present in the sacramental mode as “the *Christus passus* of Calvary, who is the one represented and applied, immolated, and contained in the Eucharistic sacrifice.”<sup>89</sup> The sacramental separation represents the effect of his passion, his death. The symbolic representation of Christ’s death makes his sacrifice present in its sacramental mode, enabling the faithful to join in that sacrifice.<sup>90</sup> In this way, Vonier argued, Christ’s passion is present in the Eucharist not just as the instrumental cause of sacramental grace but also through the sacramental representation of the dead Christ.<sup>91</sup>

---

<sup>85</sup>Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* III, q. 69, a. 2; Vonier, *A Key to the Doctrine of the Eucharist*, 52.

<sup>86</sup>See Vonier, *A Key to the Doctrine of the Eucharist*, 43.

<sup>87</sup>See *ibid.*, 57, 60-61.

<sup>88</sup>See *ibid.*, 111.

<sup>89</sup>*Ibid.*, 133.

<sup>90</sup>See *ibid.*, 123.

<sup>91</sup>See *ibid.*, 43.

Casel did not agree with Vonier about the reality contained in the sacramental sign because Vonier held that it was sufficient for the sacrament *to represent* the *Christus passus*, the effect of the passion. Casel, on the other hand, believed that the sacramental celebration, in order to allow the faithful to participate in Christ's dying and rising, must *make present* the passion itself because the passion contains the mystery of salvation. For this purpose, Casel relied on Vonier's interpretation of the presence of the saving deeds of Christ in the sacramental mode of being. Christ's presence in the liturgy, then, must include the totality of salvation that he accomplished in time. In other words, the kernel of the saving acts of Christ must be present under the veil of sacramental sign in a sacramental mode of existence.<sup>92</sup> Hence, Casel concluded, metaphysical hypotheses concerning the impossibility of a renewal of historical acts are not applicable to the sacraments.<sup>93</sup>

The passion is not there according to its natural manner of being as it was historically, *in tempore*, and also not merely *in signo*, but sacramentally. Because it is not *in tempore*, it is therefore present *secundum modum substantiae*, without historical "before" or "after," precisely in its kernel as the salvific act of the God-man. Hence metaphysical hypotheses concerning time, concerning the impossibility of a renewal of historical acts and the like, *do not come up for consideration at all in the case of the sacrament*.<sup>94</sup>

Thus, in the sacrament, Casel argued, the salvation that Christ accomplished in time is present in a symbolico-real fashion, as supra-temporal reality. The sacrament is that redeeming work made present in its substance by the glorified Christ himself. The very purpose of the sacraments demands that Christ's acts be objectively present because "the

---

<sup>92</sup>Casel, however, did not specify what this kernel/substance of the saving acts is apart from just asserting so. An interpretation of this kernel by Viktor Warnach will be offered in the following pages.

<sup>93</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 270, reference made to Casel, "Mysteriengegenwart," 191.

<sup>94</sup>Casel, "Mysteriengegenwart," 191, cited in Hall, *We Have the Mind of Christ*, 10.

sacrament exists to enable the faithful to participate in the life of Christ, *as their redeemer, for their own salvation*’.”<sup>95</sup> Casel insisted that Christ’s redemptive work is not repeated or multiplied when the sacraments of the Church are celebrated.<sup>96</sup> Instead, the saving work, done once and for all, is *re-presented* by Christ through the sacramental sign. “‘The Christian liturgy is *the ritual performance of the redemptive work of Christ in and through the Church; hence it is the presence of the divine saving act under the veil of the symbol*’.”<sup>97</sup> In the rite the glorified Lord makes his redemptive work present in its essence according to the sacramental mode of being.

Regarding the relation of the sacrifice of the Mass to the historical sacrifice of the cross, according to Casel, Aquinas held that a mystery presence of the historical sacrifice of the cross is objectively realized in a sacramental mode of existence on the altar.<sup>98</sup> Aquinas held that the separate consecration of the bread and wine has the value of a commemorative sign which generates the subjective recall of the historical passion.<sup>99</sup> Central to Casel’s

---

<sup>95</sup>Ibid.

<sup>96</sup>See Casel, *The Mystery of Christian Worship*, 13.

<sup>97</sup>Casel, “Mysteriengegenwart,” 145, cited in Hall, *We Have the Mind of Christ*, 10.

<sup>98</sup>According to Kilmartin, Aquinas held for the presence of the historical sacrifice of the cross in the eucharistic celebration. But Kilmartin points out that the notion of the mystery presence of the historical sacrifice of the cross, objectively realized in a sacramental mode of being on the altar by virtue of the saving acts of Christ, becomes “eternal” is foreign to Aquinas. Rather he held that it is a presence in the willing participant for whom the sacramental celebration takes place. It is a presence in the sense of an instrumental cause which modifies the effect of the action of the principal cause, the Holy Spirit, on the recipient of the sacrament. This modification of the effect of the divine action consists in the transmission of the historical attitudes of Christ conformed to the situation of the life of faith that is signified by the particular sacrament. The presence of the historical attitudes of Christ in the event of the sacramental celebrations was maintained by Aquinas on the grounds of revelation. According to Scripture, there is a single *transitus* of the world to the Father inaugurated by Jesus and into which humanity is to be incorporated through the response of faith. Hence, from the divine perspective, the aspects of space and time are not relevant to the ultimate intelligibility of the historical mysteries of Christ’s life. See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 255, 263-264.

<sup>99</sup>See *ibid.*, 251, 254.



understanding is the idea that Christ's saving acts are "objectively" present in the liturgy which is independent of and prior to its appropriation by the believers.<sup>100</sup> The objective presence of Christ's deeds evokes the believers' response of faith. In this way, Casel emphasized that it is Christ, not the Church, who makes the redemptive work present in the Church's liturgy. Through the sacramental rite, the Church cooperates with Christ's action, entering into his redeeming work of faith.<sup>101</sup> Since Christ is present with his saving acts in the liturgical celebration, the believer meets Christ in his work of salvation. Entering into the rite with faith, the believer can join with Christ in his redeeming sacrifice.<sup>102</sup> Casel taught that the central form of this cultic reality of Christ's sacrificial self-offering and the Father's acceptance of his sacrifice for the world's salvation are most clearly present in the celebration of the Eucharist.<sup>103</sup>

Casel identified his concept of Christian mystery with the kernel of the divine revelation in Christ. This concept, Casel insisted, is not a mere human imaginative "system," but rather, "the venerable and sacred heritage of Christianity revealed and enshrined in Scripture and tradition."<sup>104</sup> Hence, to support his contention of the mystery presence of Christ's saving acts in the Christian sacraments, Casel appealed to the history of religions, to Scripture, to the Fathers (and to Aquinas as described above).<sup>105</sup>

---

<sup>100</sup>Hall notes that by his insistence on an "objective" presence, Casel cleverly avoided the danger of Pelagianism. If the sacramental presence of Christ were dependent on the sign's operation on the mind of the recipient of the sacrament, then salvation might be said to be a human work. See Hall, *We Have the Mind of Christ*, 11.

<sup>101</sup>See Casel, *The Mystery of Christian Worship*, 14.

<sup>102</sup>See Hall, *We Have the Mind of Christ*, 11.

<sup>103</sup>See Casel, *The Mystery of Christian Worship*, passim.

<sup>104</sup>O'Callaghan, "The Theory of the 'Mysteriengegenwart' of Dom Odo Casel," 247.

<sup>105</sup>See Casel, *The Mystery of Christian Worship*, 1-62; Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 278-280;

Casel attached great significance to the Hellenistic mystery cults<sup>106</sup> as the background for a true appreciation of the Christian sacraments. He argued that these mystery cults developed ritual-form (mystery) whose fundamental idea was participation in the lives of the gods portrayed in the rite.<sup>107</sup> Thus Casel saw these mystery cults as providential preparation for the Christian mysteries.

Casel found it crucial in his “mystery theology” to emphasize believers’ participation in the passion and death of Christ, for which he referred to Romans 6: 1-11<sup>108</sup> as his scriptural support. In this passage Paul says in baptism Christians die a death like that of Christ’s and are offered a resurrection like that of Christ’s. The word “like” (*homoioima*) here means “conformed to.” Christ died and rose once and for all. Christians’ death and rising in baptism conform to Christ’s so much that one may say that Christians have died and risen *in* Christ’s death and *in* Christ’s resurrection. By grace Christ allows believers, by their baptismal conformation to him, to die their own death in him and to rise in him. Christians’ lives have become one with his and his with theirs. To be “justified,” then, is to be conformed to Christ, by Christ, and in Christ by grace, faith, and sacramental participation in his saving mystery.<sup>109</sup>

Casel argued that the rite of baptism is the mystery symbol of the death of Christ, and whenever it is celebrated, the death and resurrection of Christ are re-presented because

---

Hall, *We Have the Mind of Christ*, 12-15.

<sup>106</sup>It is the synthesis of the Indo-germanic people’s forms of worship amalgamated with Greek and Eastern ideas.

<sup>107</sup>See Casel, *The Mystery of Christian Worship*, 32-33.

<sup>108</sup>The very text that Luther used in his theology of justification by faith alone, but Casel approached this text from a different perspective.

<sup>109</sup>See Casel, *The Mystery of Christian Worship*, 15-16.

otherwise Paul could not have said that Christians die and rise with Christ. No one can die together with another when that other does not really die. Because Christians really die to sin in baptism, the death of Christ must also be real because they die only with Christ. Dying with Christ was Casel's key to understanding all the sacraments. Casel therefore argued that Paul's teaching indicates Christians' "con-crucifixion" and "con-resurrection" with Christ in all the Church's liturgy, particularly in the Eucharist, and Christ's dying and rising are really and objectively present. Hence, the historical saving acts of Christ are *not represented*, but *re-presented* under the sacramental mode of being<sup>110</sup> prior to any acceptance by the recipient, because they are present in order to be applied to the believers. This mode of sacramental being determines the form of the reality of presence, and the form in turn is determined by the purpose of the sacrament in order to enable the faithful to participate in the work of redemption.<sup>111</sup> Moreover, the sanctifying power of sacraments depends on this supra-temporal sacramental presence of Christ's saving deeds.<sup>112</sup>

Casel also claimed that all the Fathers of the Church taught that in the liturgy Christ's temporal deeds are actively present in a sacramental mode of existence. "Since Christ is no longer visible among us, in St. Leo the Great's words, 'What was visible in the Lord has passed over into the mysteries.' We meet his person, his saving deeds, the workings of his grace in the mysteries of his worship. St. Ambrose writes: 'I find you in your mysteries'."<sup>113</sup> Kilmartin noted that Casel viewed the objective and actual presence of Christ's *pasch* as part

---

<sup>110</sup>Sacramental mode of being may be understood as that the reality signified has its proper mode of existence elsewhere, but is truly present in its symbolic expression.

<sup>111</sup>O'Callaghan, "The Theory of the 'Mysteriengegenwart' of Dom Odo Casel," 253-254.

<sup>112</sup>See Casel, "Mysteriengegenwart," 174.

<sup>113</sup>Casel, *The Mystery of Christian Worship*, 7. For reference to many other Church Fathers, see *ibid.*, *passim*.

of the authentic patristic teaching on the sacraments, especially for the Eucharist. This understanding of the patristic mystery theology was forgotten and eventually replaced with *Effektustheorie* by the late Scholasticism which treated sacraments as means of grace.<sup>114</sup>

Moreover, based on the *analogia fidei*, the analogy between the presence of Christ *per modum substantiae* in the eucharistic species and the presence of the redemptive acts in the rites, Casel argued that Christ can be present in his saving deeds without temporal succession wherever the Eucharist is celebrated. Likewise the divine power can actualize the passion of Christ in different places and times. Accordingly, it is a trans-historical presence.<sup>115</sup>

Kilmartin pointed out the weakness of Casel's claim of the forms of Christian worship based on his interpretations of the above mentioned sources as follows. Theologians who engaged in more developed study of the Hellenistic mystery religions and who traced the development of Christian liturgy are not as certain as Casel about the dependency of Christian worship on mystery cults. They have even argued that Hellenistic forms of mystery religions may have been influenced by Christianity itself.<sup>116</sup> Casel sought the origin of the concept of mystery in Hellenistic cults because he did not perceive the mystery quality of the Old Testament.<sup>117</sup> Moreover, mystery cults did not lead to the supernatural life of the true God. They were only a shadow of Christ's Mystery yet to come (Colossians 2:17). In

---

<sup>114</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 280; idem, "Theology of the Sacraments," 131-132. Also see Hall, *We Have the Mind of Christ*, 14.

<sup>115</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 271, 278.

<sup>116</sup>See *ibid.*, 278-279; Louis Bouyer, *Liturgical Piety* (Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1954), 86-157; Hugo Rahner, *Greek Myths and Christian Mysteries*, trans., Brian Battershaw (London: Burns and Oates, 1957); Hall, *We Have the Mind of Christ*, 12.

<sup>117</sup>See Casel, *The Mystery of Christian Worship*, 31.

addition, Christianity is a mystery religion in virtue of its own very nature and the liturgy of mysteries is the central and essential activity of this religion.<sup>118</sup> Kilmartin pointed out that Casel not only thus minimized the relation between the Hebrew and Christian understanding of communal celebrations of the mighty acts of God in salvation history, but was also guilty of espousing the thesis that the concept of cultic mystery was foreign to the Old Testament. In this case, Kilmartin referred to Damasus Winzen's claim that the world of the psalms was bound to the fundamental idea of mystery. Today there is widespread consensus in scholarly circles that the usages in the messianic communities of Judaism, above all the Passover, supplied the principal sources of the original forms of liturgical expression in the Christian religion. In addition, the liturgical memorial rites of Judaism were considered to reactualize the past saving acts of Yahweh for the benefit of his people.<sup>119</sup>

New Testament scholars do not hold the opinion that Paul offered a specific explanation of how the mode of configuration to Christ took place. According to Paul, it is the configuration to Christ risen which is the effect of the baptismal dying with Christ.<sup>120</sup> In addition, Kilmartin pointed out that it is not obvious from the above Pauline text whether Paul held a developed sacramental theology of operational presence of the mysteries of Christ in the one being baptized. But the text affirms that Christians show their moral and spiritual conformity to Christ in their attitude toward God and others in their new life.<sup>121</sup>

Referring to Jean Gaillard, Jerome Hall asserts that Casel's interpretation of the Pauline text

---

<sup>118</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 273-274, 279; Philip Gleeson, O.P., "Mystery" in Joseph A. Komonchak et al., eds., *The New Dictionary of Theology* (Wilmington, Delaware: Glazier, 1987), 690.

<sup>119</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 279-280.

<sup>120</sup>See Hall, *We Have the Mind of Christ*, 13, referring to Jean Gaillard, "Chronique de Liturgie. La Théologie des Mystères," *Revue Thomiste* 57 (1957): 524.

<sup>121</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 280.

also finds no support in Aquinas' commentary on the Letter to the Romans about the mystery presence that Casel argued.<sup>122</sup>

Casel's evaluation of the patristic evidence was challenged by scholars who distinguished between the affirmation of Christ's presence and the theological interpretation of that presence. In this case, Kilmartin argued that certain patristic sources taught some fashion of reactualization of Christ's saving work in the liturgical celebration, but in general they did not offer any unified explanation of the manner of that reactualization.<sup>123</sup> Although the Church Fathers "affirm the *fact*, they do not explain the *how*. This active presence of the mysteries of Christ under the veil of the cultic symbol may be understood entirely different from the way of Casel's system'.<sup>124</sup> Moreover, Casel's teaching was in an opposite direction from that of the patristic tradition. The patristic teaching begins from the effect of participation in Christ's life to the presence of his saving deeds. On the contrary, Casel taught that participation in the saving deeds of Christ is possible because they are made present in the liturgical celebration.<sup>125</sup> Furthermore, according to Kilmartin, Casel's description of the mystery presence of the redemptive work of Christ under the veil of symbols is a weak link between the liturgical expressions of faith and the mystery presence. As a result, the ecclesiological and pneumatological aspects of the liturgy are not well integrated.<sup>126</sup>

---

<sup>122</sup>See Hall, *We Have the Mind of Christ*, 14, referring to Gaillard, "Chronique de Liturgie: La Théologie des Mystères," 525. Also see Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 280.

<sup>123</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 280.

<sup>124</sup>Gaillard, "Chronique de Liturgie. La Théologie des Mystères," 526, cited in Hall, *We Have the Mind of Christ*, 14-15.

<sup>125</sup>See Hall, *We Have the Mind of Christ*, 15.

<sup>126</sup>See Kilmartin, "Theology of the Sacraments," 132.

Casel emphasized the primacy of the liturgy as the privileged source of the theology of worship. In his estimation this best described the event-character (*ourgia*) of the liturgical celebration by which participants are inserted into the saving work of Christ re-presented by the verbal and gestural symbolic language of liturgy. For this reason, Casel did not favor the sacramental theology of the Scholastic tradition on the grounds that it abstracted this liturgical event-character and speculated on the dynamics of the event of sanctification through philosophical principles employed from outside the realm of liturgy, namely, efficient causality. While appreciating this approach to liturgy, Kilmartin sensed the danger of conceiving the primacy of the liturgy as the sole source of the theology of worship—reduction of other sources of theology to a minor role. While liturgical sources are a true *locus theologicus*, Kilmartin argued, they are not the only source of theological knowledge of the liturgy. Hence, the ultimate meaning of the liturgy must be sought and complemented from other sources of theology as well.<sup>127</sup>

Nonetheless, making reference to Scripture, patristic writings, and ancient liturgies, Casel developed his mystery theology around three aspects of the one single Mystery because they are intimately connected to each other: (1) God, considered in himself, is “infinitely distant, holy, and unapproachable” but he reveals himself in *mysterio*, in a revelation by grace, to those whom he has chosen. Accordingly, his revelation is not open to the profane world; (2) The event of God’s coming to us in the flesh of Jesus Christ gave the word *mysterium* a new and deepened meaning. Christ and the Christ-event are mysteries because God’s revelation is open only to the faithful. This mystery of Christ is what the

---

<sup>127</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 280.

apostles proclaimed to the Church and which the Church passes on to all generations.

Christ's saving deed is the saving design of the Father. So the Church leads humankind to salvation by the sacred actions of the saving deed of Christ, especially in the celebration of the Eucharist that render present the redemptive acts of Christ; and (3) Christians meet Christ and his saving deeds in the mysteries of his worship.<sup>128</sup>

Within this framework Kilmartin made the following observation about Casel's major and significant contributions to liturgical theology.<sup>129</sup> Sacraments do not merely convey grace but they contain the redemptive acts from which grace emerges. Accordingly, Kilmartin saw in Casel's theological synthesis the stress of grace as not simply the effect of Christ's actions but as

... Christ himself and his whole redemptive work. In short, grace is not simply a power that flows from that salvific work. Rather to share in the mystery of redemption through Christ is not so much to receive a "grace," as it is an elevation of the whole person through contact with Christ, and his redemptive work.<sup>130</sup>

Sacramental celebrations, then, sacramentally re-present the past saving deed of Christ and allow the faithful to participate in it in mystery, namely, in the action of the sacramental rites. Casel understood that sacraments are in *genere signi*; at the same time they are real symbols of salvation. In this understanding, what is mediated in symbol is actually present in it. As the symbol makes present the symbolized, so the symbolic action in the liturgy mediates the symbolized. Casel stressed the symbolic action, the celebration. Kilmartin saw Casel's

---

<sup>128</sup>See Casel, *The Mystery of Christian Worship*, 5-7.

<sup>129</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 271-277.

<sup>130</sup>*Ibid.*, 269.



approach to liturgy is, above all, from the center of the sacramental action itself. Liturgy involves action on the part of believers. Since the sacraments convey the redemptive acts of Christ, Casel strongly advocated that those who enter into the rite encounter Christ in his passion, join in his sacrifice, and are transformed by sharing in his dying and rising. Sacramental sanctification, then, consists in the believers' participation in the saving acts of Christ.<sup>131</sup> Inward transformation emerges as a result of this participation in liturgy. Casel thus overcame the narrowness of the concept of sacrament and the misunderstanding of sacrament as a kind of "thingly" instrumental cause of grace.

In Casel's synthesis, liturgy innately involves the corporate community, the Church, in the accomplishment of the sacraments. This emphasis was designated by Casel to show that God has revealed himself to those whom he chose, and he wanted, in part, to address the rise of individual pietism as well.<sup>132</sup> He brought to light the fact that the mystery is a sharing in the divine life, and hence becoming holy through the drawing of believers into the saving acts of Christ in an ecclesial celebration. The Church is the ultimate bearer of Christian worship, but all her actions remain determined by the presence of Christ. Christ becomes visible to believers in the visible Church. Through her they touch him, and in him God. Casel thus called attention to the importance of accentuating the mediating reality of the Church in the sacraments. In the sacraments, the Church realizes herself in her unique binding to Christ.

---

<sup>131</sup>See Hall, *We Have the Mind of Christ*, 7.

<sup>132</sup>See Kimberly Anne Willis, "Odo Casel: Reclaiming the Mystery in Liturgy," in *Primary Sources of Liturgical Theology: A Reader*, ed., Dwight W. Vogel (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 2000), 27-28.

Casel brought forth the awareness that the dynamic power of the historical past saving work of Christ is placed in the cultic action of the Church. He emphasized the sacramental celebration of the mystery in which alone the full Christian fellowship is realized. He communicated the sacramentality and a rich understanding of the content of the Christian sacrament. According to Casel, sacraments mediate to the faithful, through the saving acts of Christ present in the sacrament “*in mysterio*” and through believers’ participation therein, access to the divine life as the true salvation of human beings. Accordingly, the central cultic actions of the sacraments are to be valued as mediating the true divine life in the midst of time. Casel stressed the cultic character of the sacraments and their ecclesial dimension.

### Summary

To sum up Casel’s thesis, for a sacramental yet real contact with the historical deeds of Christ by Christians of all generations, Casel considered symbolism as the necessary way to approach its essence, rather than discursive reasoning. Accordingly, *Kultmysterium* includes a twofold reality: the exterior rite and the invisible reality. Thus the liturgy of the Church is a special mode in which the redemptive act of Christ is “objectively” made present under the sacramental signs, to the end that the believers may participate in it and experience their salvation. Casel thus argued for the substantial presence of the passion of Christ that is prior in nature to the sanctifying effect on the believers. In other words, in Casel’s synthesis the presence of Christ precedes the exercise of the faith of believers. The Church participates in the mystery presence of Christ through her essential activity, especially in the mystery of worship.

Viktor Warnach: The Presence of the Death and Resurrection of Christ (*Transitus Domini*)  
as a Metaphysical Act<sup>133</sup>

Casel's teaching, which he claimed to be in line with that of Aquinas, was strongly criticized for opposing basic Thomist principles. In Thomist metaphysics, an act has no essence and an action is an accident that can only exist in space and time.<sup>134</sup> Casel, following the teaching of Vonier, taught that the kernel/essence of Christ's deeds can exist in a sacramental world, removed from space and time, hence historical accidents that accompanied the redemption are of no importance. Moreover, according to Casel, presence belongs to the essence of Mystery, the redemptive acts of Christ. So Casel concluded that Thomist metaphysics does not apply to the sacramental mode in which Christ's saving acts exist and have a perennial existence.

On metaphysical grounds theologians opposed Casel's proposal as not acceptable because Casel never addressed the philosophical question of how an act could exist freed from time and space. Moreover, he did not even spell out what exactly, in the last analysis, was present as the very quintessence of the economy of salvation (the substance of the redeeming act) and the act of the redeeming humanity which God had realized in Christ. Casel's failure to distinguish between an act and its transcendental substance caused the intelligibility of his thesis to suffer.

---

<sup>133</sup>This presentation relies on Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 271, 284; Hall, *We Have the Mind of Christ*, 17-18.

<sup>134</sup>See Hall, *We Have the Mind of Christ*, 15.

Although one finds no satisfactory explanation during the course of the *Mysteriengegenwart* controversy, many attempts have been made to shed light on the relationship between the historical acts of Christ and the liturgical celebration of the Church.

Kilmartin pointed out that Viktor Warnach, a close associate of Casel in Maria Laach, employed a metaphysical approach to explain the relationship of the saving acts of Christ to the liturgical celebration, which Casel seemed to have not opposed. Warnach used the distinction between worldly time (*chronos*) and the time of God's saving acts (*kairos*) in order to explain how Christ's historical acts could be freed from the confines of space and time. The salvation accomplished by Christ, Warnach argued, frees the believers from the repetitiveness of *chronos*. In Christ humanity is offered the way to God's time of salvation and it receives the eternal life in God. The movement from *chronos* to *kairos* occurred once and for all in the *pasch* of Jesus. The historical actions by which Christ passed to a new life remain as a past event, but Warnach appealed to the metaphysical act by which Christ passed from suffering to glory as the substance of the Mystery.<sup>135</sup>

. . . [T]he true event of the history of salvation, the 'christic' event, is the Pasch, i.e., the 'metaphysical' act by which Christ passed from suffering to eternal glory; that is the transformation of the earthly existence of Jesus into the majesty of the Kyrios. The Pasch of the Lord is the human-divine act that has broken the limits of time, that has broken its power, freeing those who were held captives of time.<sup>136</sup>

---

<sup>135</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 271, 284 referring to Viktor Warnach, "Zum Problem der Mysteriengegenwart," *Liturgisches Leben* 5 (1938): 9-39, Viktor Warnach, *Agape: Die Liebe als Grundmotiv der neutestamentlichen Theologie* (Düsseldorf: Patmos, 1951), 371-400, and Viktor Warnach, "Mysterientheologie," in *Lexikon für Theologie und Kirche*, 2nd ed. (Freiburg: Herder, 1962), 724-727.

<sup>136</sup>Gaillard, "Chronique de Liturgie. La Théologie des Mystères," 535, cited in Hall, *We Have the Mind of Christ*, 17.

This passage (*transitus*) of Christ to the Father, Warnach argued, is the Mystery (or kernel) of the *Kyrios* present in the liturgy, which has become part of the structure of reality and exists in a supra-temporal mode. The passing over of Christ from suffering to glory as representative of humanity has opened the way for believers to God. This action of Christ transcends all finite limits, sums up the whole work of redemption, and constitutes the real content of *Kultmysterium*.<sup>137</sup> Hence, the mystery of Christian worship allows believers “to break away from the bondage of time in order to join this supra-temporal act, and assures [their] common destiny with Christ dead and risen’.”<sup>138</sup> Through the liturgy, Christ’s *transitus* from *chronos* to *kairos* is manifested, made truly present to the worshipers for their participation in it.

While Warnach affirmed Christ’s entry into glory as a metaphysical fact and liturgy as the believers’ means of contact with Christ’s saving mystery, Kilmartin noted that he did not make clear the manner in which the liturgy allows participation in Christ’s *transitus* and frees believers from the domination of time.<sup>139</sup>

Gottlieb Söhngen: Presence of Redemptive Acts in and through Effects and the Church’s Participation through Conformity to Christ by Faith<sup>140</sup>

Casel did not specify the relationship of the mystery presence of Christ with his saving acts to the salvation of the believers. He had affirmed that in the sacramental

---

<sup>137</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 271.

<sup>138</sup>Gaillard, “Chronique de Liturgie. La Théologie des Mystères,” 535, cited in Hall, *We Have the Mind of Christ*, 17.

<sup>139</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 284.

<sup>140</sup>This presentation relies on Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 284-291; Hall, *We Have the Mind of Christ*, 18-20.

celebration, Christ is present with his saving acts in order to unite Christians with himself through the performance of the rites. But it is not just enough to identify grace with this presence and to describe sacraments in terms of it. Therefore an adequate explanation of Christian sanctification demanded the relation of the mystery presence to its effective acceptance by the recipients of the sacrament.<sup>141</sup>

Gottlieb Söhnngen, whom Kilmartin considered as the most outstanding opponent of Casel's teaching of "mystery theology,"<sup>142</sup> offered the nature and content of the mystery of the saving deeds of Christ within the framework of Thomist metaphysics. In his 1938 monograph<sup>143</sup> Söhnngen explained that *Christus passus* under the formality of *Christus patiens* is present in the liturgical mysteries. This presence of Christ implied the virtual presence of the past saving acts that are realized on their effects in the individual members of the liturgical celebration. The effect of the sacramental celebration is identified with the proper reality of the sacrament. This concept of sacrament reflected the traditional orientation of *Effecktustheorie* as explained above, hence not the sacramental act accomplished by the Church, which was criticized by Casel. In a later work concerning the theology of the eucharistic sacrifice in 1946,<sup>144</sup> Söhnngen modified this theory by developing

---

<sup>141</sup>See Hall, *We Have the Mind of Christ*, 16.

<sup>142</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 284. Hall reports that Kilmartin found Söhnngen's explanation of the subject very useful in formulating his own understanding of the mystery presence of Christ's saving act and the believers' participation in it. See Hall, *We Have the Mind of Christ*, 18, n.77.

<sup>143</sup>Gottlieb Söhnngen, *Der Wesensaufbau des Mysteriums*, Grenzfragen zwischen Theologie und Philosophie 6 (Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1938).

<sup>144</sup>Gottlieb Söhnngen, *Das Sakramentale Wesen des Messopfers* (Essen: Augustin Wibbelt, 1946).

the idea of the active and sacramental presence of the sacrificial acts of Christ grounded on the sacramental action which is a sacrifice. He further clarified this position in 1953.<sup>145</sup>

Söhnngen identified the content of the divine mystery with the supernatural reality accomplished in these acts, which is transformation of Christ, the Church, and individual believers. Consequently, according to Söhnngen, the historical deed of Christ is not the supernatural reality that is re-actualized in the sacramental celebration, as Casel had argued. The historical saving deed is, Söhnngen argued, absorbed into the particularity of time and, therefore, cannot be reproduced. The mystery present in the sacramental celebration is the configuration (imitation) of believers (as their participation) to the saving acts of Christ, who passed through death and now lives as the glorified Lord.<sup>146</sup> For Söhnngen, then, the mystery of worship is Christ's dying and rising made available to believers through faith and sacrament.<sup>147</sup> Hence, he rejected Casel's interpretation concerning the "objective" presence of Christ's saving work prior to its appropriation by the recipients of the sacraments.

Söhnngen's baptismal theology based on Romans 6:2-11 might serve to help understand his position. In this text the one who undergoes baptism dies with Christ (Romans 6:5). The difference, however, is only in the manner of the historical death of Christ and the sacramental death of the baptized. The Mystery (the divine life) is the same for both in the sense that the death of Christ leads to life and the sacramental death of the

---

<sup>145</sup>Gottlieb Söhnngen, "Christi Gegenwart in uns durch den Glauben (Eph 3, 17): Ein vergessener Gegenstand unserer Verkündigung von der Messe," in Franz Xaver Arnold and Balthasar Fischer, eds., *Die Messe in der Glaubensverkündigung*, 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. (Freiburg: Herder, 1953): 14-28.

<sup>146</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 285-286; Hall, *We Have the Mind of Christ*, 18 referring to Gottlieb Söhnngen, "Die Kontroverse über die kultische Gegenwart des Christus mysteriums," *Catholica* 7 (1938): 132.

<sup>147</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 291.

baptized also leads to life. Hence, in baptism, Söhngen argued, the death of Christ is reproduced in the one baptized in the sense that the effect of life, in the mystery of Christ's death, is re-actualized in the baptized. This effect of baptism, therefore, is the real imitation of the death of Christ in the baptized, an imitation that is the real reproduction, re-actualization, and representation of the death of Christ.<sup>148</sup>

Mystery is thus the secret content of the saving acts of Christ and of the here-and-now enactment of the sacrament—the reality of salvation, the presence of divine life. Here “Mystery” has a more specific and narrower meaning than the general notion applied to the historical saving acts of Christ. Since the Mystery is supra-temporal, it is able to be present in the historical activity of humanity. The starting point for the mystery presence is the divine mystery that, in the saving work of Christ, is accomplished in Jesus himself. This mystery is again accomplished in an efficacious manner in the Church.<sup>149</sup>

Like all other human actions, if Jesus' historical acts were also just human actions, then they would have been temporal by nature and could not be perennialized, and hence inaccessible to believers. But the content of the mystery of Jesus' historical acts is the supernatural reality accomplished in them. This supernatural content of salvation exists actually in the effect. The effect is the application of the saving work of Christ. The application of this saving work is the representation of the saving work of Christ in the believers, hence the effect or fruit of his saving work in them. The effect creates conformity to Christ and so actualizes the saving work of Christ in the believers. The presence of the

---

<sup>148</sup>See *ibid.*, 285-286.

<sup>149</sup>See *ibid.*, 286.



saving work of Christ is the reproduction of the conformity to Christ in virtue of the life-giving Spirit of Christ.<sup>150</sup> Thus Söhngen emphasized the mystery presence of the divine saving acts of Christ in their mystery content of salvation and suggested it as a solution to Casel's idea of the sacramental representation of Christ's *pasch* as "objective." Celebration of sacraments, Söhngen argued, includes the sacrament's effects in the faithful:

Sacramental imitation is not a representative image which exists in itself and for its own sake, something which stands between the death on the cross and its effects in the Church. Rather, that image exists in and with the sacramental effects in the faithful; it has no essence or substance except that of something dynamic and spiritual, the fluid existence of a spiritual power.<sup>151</sup>

The image exists in and with the sacramental reality which is the effect through imitation.

An explanation of the "objective" sacramental presence of Christ's saving deeds, Söhngen argued, contradicts the dynamic event-character of a sacrament. The sacrament effects itself in the believers, acting through faith, and exists in the use of the sacramental sign in which Christ's saving deeds must be present. The whole reality of the sacrament consists in its celebration in the faith of the Church and the sacramental grace of configuration to Christ. This grace must be understood dynamically as the new life given in Christ present and active in his Church through faith.<sup>152</sup>

While for Casel the mystery of worship was the redemptive act itself, rendered present under the sacramental signs oriented toward believers' participation in it, for

---

<sup>150</sup>See *ibid.*, 287.

<sup>151</sup>Gottlieb Söhngen, *Symbol und Wirklichkeit im Kultmysterium*, 100, cited in Hall, *We Have the Mind of Christ*, 18.

<sup>152</sup>See Hall, *We Have the Mind of Christ*, 19.

Söhngen it is Christ's dying and rising realized in the believers through the sacrament. Thus for Söhngen, the supernatural reality of Christ's historical act is represented, reproduced in the Christian by faith through the faithful celebration of the sacraments.

If we want to speak of a presence, then, we can say at all events what the Fathers said: in and through the mystery of worship the saving death of Christ becomes a true presence, which accomplishes in us sacramentally or in mystery the same death which was accomplished actually or in historical fact in Christ.<sup>153</sup>

From this point of view, the sacramental sign expresses the inner reality of the person's conformity to Christ. Christ's mystery presence is effected in the Church and in Christians through the sacramental celebration, rather than its "objective" presence in the sacrament regardless of its appropriation by the faithful.<sup>154</sup> The presence of the saving work of Christ is the reproduction of the conformity to Christ by the believers' response of faith.<sup>155</sup>

Söhngen applied this theology to the sacrificial action of the Mass. The Eucharist, which is the sacrament of the sacrifice of Christ, makes the one sacrifice present and active in the believers who offer it. The sacrificial death of Christ is reactualized in that he works in the believers in the mystery of worship, that is, the communication of the divine life, while the believers imitate the saving act of Christ himself. In the Eucharist, Christ is really present and active in the members of the Church. This represents his one sacrifice in the lives of the faithful through faith. Because Christ's sacrifice is really present in the members of the Church through the sacramental *anamnesis* of his saving death, it is really present in the

---

<sup>153</sup>Söhngen, "Die Kontroverse über die kultische Gegenwart des Christus mysteriums," 134-135, cited in Hall, *We Have the Mind of Christ*, 19.

<sup>154</sup>See Hall, *We have the Mind of Christ*, 19.

<sup>155</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 286-287.

eucharistic species.<sup>156</sup> “In this case the sacramental sacrifice of Christ does not preexist the sacrifice of the Church, but the sacrifice of Christ on the Cross is sacramentally present precisely through (the sacrifice of the Church), so that Christ makes his sacrifice as sacrifice of the Church.”<sup>157</sup> Christ’s *pasch* is not made “objectively” present on the altar in the Mass prior to its real presence in the worshipers, nor is his dying and rising “objectively” present in the act of baptism prior to its presence in the baptized. The representation of the historical sacrifice of Jesus in the Eucharist is an application made first to the Church and then to the individual believers, rather than the way Casel explained it that Christ’s saving deeds are present in the liturgy in order to be applied to the believers. It is through the liturgical co-offering of the sacrificial body of Christ resulting from the change of bread and wine that the sacrificial death of Christ is represented in the Church. The dynamic conformity to Christ in his historical self-offering on the cross is the new element of the memorial of the sacrifice of the cross.

In his later works, Söhngen closely followed the basic insight of Casel and Vonier. His later position is in line with the notion of the actual and sacramental presence of the sacrifice of the cross. Hence it deviates from his earlier position which was often identified as close to the *Effektustheorie*. He considered that *Christus passus* is the foundation for the actual presence of the passion and the substantial presence of Christ is fully realized through *Christus patiens*. Hence, without the *Christus passus* the sacramental action would be made on the reality of the elements of bread and wine. He maintained that consecration of the

---

<sup>156</sup>See *ibid.*, 288.

<sup>157</sup>Söhngen, “Die Kontroverse über die kultische Gegenwart des Christus mysteriums,” 138, cited in Hall, *We Have the Mind of Christ*, 20.

bread and wine by the priest in *persona Christi* signifies both the sacrificial act of Christ and the offering of his sacrificed body and blood as the food of eternal life. The sacrament of the Eucharist contains the *Christus passus*, which is a substantial presence of the spiritualized, glorified body of the risen Lord. What Christ himself does through the priest is a sacrificial action that imitates his historical sacrificial act of the cross and symbolically represents the historical self-offering of the cross. The mystery of the sacrifice of the cross is identical with that of the eucharistic sacrifice in which Christ offers himself in the sacramental sacrifice of the Church. This means that the sacrificial act of Christ is an actualization of the sacrificial act of the cross in a sacramental mode of being. Hence it is a sacramental sacrifice in the sense that it is a sacrificial deed in relation to the cross and is also in relation to the Church for which and through which it is offered. Without the actual and sacramental presence of the sacrifice of the cross, Söhngen argued, there would be no true and proper sacrifice.<sup>158</sup>

Casel considered that Söhngen's proposal obscured the action of Christ in the sacraments, a return to the *Effektustheorie*, and a treatment of sacraments simply as means of grace. Söhngen, however, made the important point that a sacrament is a symbolic action in which Christ acts, not a thing that exists prior to the use of the sign. Söhngen's teaching is in line with that of the Fathers; however, it is not clear that Söhngen offered an explanation of how the sacraments effect the re-actualization of the sacrifice of Christ in the believers.<sup>159</sup>

---

<sup>158</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 288-289.

<sup>159</sup>See Hall, *We Have the Mind of Christ*, 20.

Pope Pius XII: Eucharistic Celebration as an Act of Christ and Church<sup>160</sup>

Kilmartin regarded Pius XII's encyclical letter *Mediator Dei* (1947) under the category of a contemporaneous response to Casel's thesis.<sup>161</sup> He, however, remarked that this encyclical is generally assumed to have been influenced significantly by Casel's "mystery theology."<sup>162</sup> Moreover, he considered this encyclical a significant contribution to the theology of the Eucharist.<sup>163</sup>

In his earlier encyclical, *Mystici Corporis Christi* (1943), Pius XII introduced the teaching of "mystery" concept. The pope taught that our sanctification is not realized independently of the historical fact of the Christ's life, death, and resurrection, by which redemption was objectively realized. We are joined to Christ through the mystery of the cross.<sup>164</sup>

---

<sup>160</sup>This presentation relies on Pius XII, *Mediator Dei*; Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 291-300; Hall, *We Have the Mind of Christ*, 32-34.

<sup>161</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 291-300.

<sup>162</sup>For his claim, Kilmartin argued that although Pius XII did not favor Casel's theory as such, as is evident from the complaint of the Holy See to the arch-bishop of Salzburg concerning the German translation of *Mediator Dei* giving a misinterpretation of the papal support to Casel's teaching, the pope never declared explicitly or implicitly that Casel's thesis was untenable. Rather, the pope wanted a precise statement at the level of dogmatic theology. In addition, it seems clear from the encyclical that Pius XII did not reject Casel's basic insight because the pope had made use of some of Casel's teachings in it, although in a minimal and implicit way. See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 295, 298-299; J. Hild, L'Encyclique 'Mediator Dei' et le mouvement liturgique de Maria-Laach," *La Maison Dieu* 14 (1948): 15-29, here at 15; Kilmartin, "Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology," 422. Furthermore, this encyclical is an instance where the Roman magisterium has given attention to the biblical and patristic concept of mystery. See Hall, *We Have the Mind of Christ*, 32.

<sup>163</sup>"From the period of Reformation to the twentieth century, the yield of magisterial teaching on the subject of the sacrifice of the Mass has been very lean. In this regard . . . *Mediator Dei* . . . represents an important intervention into that field of the theology of the liturgy in general and the theology of the Mass in particular. A part of what he [Pius XII] states about the sacrifice of the Mass has become the standard position of subsequent papal documents." Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 291.

<sup>164</sup>See Pius XII, *Mystici Corporis Christi*, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 35 (1943): 29-31.

Kilmartin pointed out that in *Mediator Dei* the definition of liturgy as the action of Christ and Church, as described by the pope, is very similar to that of Casel's:

The sacred liturgy is . . . the public worship which our Redeemer as head of the Church renders to the Father, as well as the worship which the community of the faithful renders to its Founder, and through him to the heavenly Father. It is, in short, the worship rendered by the mystical body of Christ in the entirety of its Head and members.<sup>165</sup>

However, the pope employed a different approach to the liturgy than that of Casel's. This approach is based on the notion of practicing worship as "the virtue of religion."<sup>166</sup>

Consequently, what follows is that liturgy is the *anabatic* movement of humanity's offering of worship to God, not the *katabatic* movement of the activity of God's descent in the Incarnation and the sacrifice of Christ toward humanity in order to gather it to himself, as Casel's approach suggested.<sup>167</sup>

The pope noted that the mysteries of Christ's life are present, not only in the sacraments but also in the representation of Christ's mysteries through the liturgical year which is the Church's progress through the mysteries of Christ's life. Through the celebration of the liturgical year, the faithful are transformed and configured to Christ over the course of time.<sup>168</sup> The pope also emphasized Casel's view of the permanent presence of Christ and his saving activity in the life of the Church in relation to the exercise of the ministry of the High Priest of the liturgy.<sup>169</sup>

---

<sup>165</sup>Pius XII, *Mediator Dei*, 20.

<sup>166</sup>*Ibid.*, 13.

<sup>167</sup>See Casel, *The Mystery of Christian Worship*, 20

<sup>168</sup>See Pius XII, *Mediator Dei*, 165.

<sup>169</sup>See *ibid.*, 20.

In this encyclical, the pope offered the idea that the mystery of the cross is living and actual through the centuries.<sup>170</sup> The actual presence of Christ in liturgical action is considered to be the basis of the presence and efficacy of the historical work of salvation in the liturgy.<sup>171</sup> This actual presence of Christ in the liturgy is always seen in relation to the historical mysteries of salvation<sup>172</sup> because the goal of liturgy is to lead Christians to “enter willingly upon his [Christ’s] path of sorrow and thus finally share his [Christ’s] glory and eternal happiness.”<sup>173</sup> This makes, the pope asserted, liturgy a liturgy of the historical Christ, and not of the glorious, pneumatic Christ.<sup>174</sup> Thus on the subject of the sacramental sacrifice of the Mass, Kilmartin argued, the pope employed formulas close to Casel’s formulas. The pope stated that the *pasch* of Christ constitutes the principal mystery of our redemption: “This mystery is the very center of divine worship since the Mass represents and renews it every day and since all the sacraments are most clearly united with the cross.”<sup>175</sup>

The pope made use of Casel’s insight concerning the active presence of Christ in all liturgical actions by asserting that in every liturgical celebration Christ is present and active together with the Church. The pope explained the position by providing a list of modes of Christ’s presence:

Along with the Church, therefore, her divine Founder is present at every liturgical function: Christ is present at the august sacrifice of the altar both in the person of His minister and above all under the Eucharistic species. He is present in the sacraments, in fusing into them the power which makes them ready instruments of sanctification. He is

---

<sup>170</sup>See *ibid.*, 22.

<sup>171</sup>See *ibid.*, 19-20.

<sup>172</sup>See *ibid.*, 151.

<sup>173</sup>See *ibid.*, 162.

<sup>174</sup>See *ibid.*

<sup>175</sup>*Ibid.*, 164.

present, finally, in the prayer of praise and petition we direct to God, as it is written: “Where there are two or three gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them [Ephesians 2:19-22].”<sup>176</sup>

The pope, however, distanced himself from Casel concerning the presence of the historical saving acts in the liturgy of the Church. “These mysteries [the Christ-event] are ever present and active not in a vague and uncertain way, as some modern writers hold, but in the way that Catholic doctrine teaches us.”<sup>177</sup> Rather, he identified the mode of presence of the mysteries of Christ’s life with a presence *in us* through the effects of the mysteries by exercising efficient instrumental causality. The mysteries are present in the symbolic power of the liturgical rites which lead the Church to those mysteries of Christ and whereby individuals share in the spirit of these mysteries.<sup>178</sup> In other words, concerning the presence of the historical events of redemption, the pope followed the traditional Scholastic theology, which Casel had opposed for the instrumental cause-effect principle. Casel, rather, held on to the symbol-historicity principle. The objective character of the efficacy (sanctification) of the sacraments is affirmed by the pope. In the sacraments Christ is present “by his power,” which makes them instruments of sanctification.

Moreover, according to Kilmartin, the pope affirmed only the passion that is present in the sacraments as the efficient cause of their power and grace.<sup>179</sup> In the encyclical the real death of Christ is not said to be renewed or rendered present in the Mass.<sup>180</sup> When it is said

---

<sup>176</sup>See *ibid.*, 20.

<sup>177</sup>See *ibid.*, 165.

<sup>178</sup>See *ibid.*

<sup>179</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 298. Also see Hild, “L’Encyclique ‘Mediator Dei’ et le mouvement liturgique de Maria-Laach,” 24.

<sup>180</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 298.



that Christ does what he did on the cross, the pope made reference only to the sacrificial (unbloody) offering, as opposed to the bloody offering. Thus there is no reference to Casel's teaching concerning the possibility of the "objective" presence of the kernel of Christ's deed in the liturgical celebration. The encyclical also does not lead to the mystery presence that is exclusively in the human acts themselves. However, the pope affirmed the possibility of a natural and sacramental presence of the *Christus passus* and the presence of the *Kyrios* based on the unity between the historical saving acts and the liturgy of the Church. A virtual presence of the historical mysteries explains the union between the historical mysteries and the liturgical communication of the grace of Christ.

### **Post-Caselian Influence on Kilmartin Concerning the Church's Participation in Christ's Sacrifice**

Casel did not clearly specify the way in which the liturgical assembly participates in the Mystery of Christ other than to say that this Mystery is made present for that end. The liturgical assembly's participation was Kilmartin's real concern in the whole *Mysteriengegenwart* theology. Theologians who favored Casel's basic thesis were at the same time faced with the problem of its lack of an adequate explanation of the "objective" presence of the kernel of the temporal deeds of Christ in the liturgy. They attempted to overcome the philosophical problem contained in Casel's thesis in other ways than merely to appeal to Vonier's "sacramental world." They offered an explanation of the eternalization of some elements of Christ's acts in which the Mystery is present in the liturgy.<sup>181</sup> Kilmartin

---

<sup>181</sup>See *ibid.*, 300-301. Kilmartin claimed that Jean Gaillard identified the soul of the redemptive

considered such an explanation of the mystery presence only in passing. Instead, he turned his attention to other post-Caselian developments concerning the Church's sacramental participation in Christ's sacrifice.

### Hans Urs von Balthasar: Church's Participation in the Faith of Christ<sup>182</sup>

Based on the claim that faith is belief in something that is not seen and Jesus has seen God because of his essence (or beatific vision) in which the Father and the Son are present to each other, Scholastic theology argued that Jesus had no faith. According to Hans Urs von Balthasar, such an argument risked faith's definitive nature, the dialogic nature of faith between God's fidelity and humankind's fidelity.<sup>183</sup>

In his examination of the biblical concept of faith, Balthasar pointed out that faith is the adequate expression of faithfulness in which both the chosen people and the God of the covenant relate to each other. The faithfulness of God is to be imitated.<sup>184</sup> Moreover, the Christian attitude of faith is, Balthasar argued, still present in heaven. Although they see God,

---

acts with the immobile act of beatific love of Christ. This immobile act of beatific love by which, Gaillard argued, Christ ultimately willed and achieved salvation, continues to work instrumentally for our salvation with the divine will, and thus is present in the liturgy, referring to Jean Gaillard, "Chronique de Liturgie: La théologie des mystères," 510-551. On the other hand, Louis Monden and Edward Schillebeeckx argued that because of the personalization of the human acts of Christ by the Word, these acts participate in a duration proper to the hypostatic level, in the eternity of the Word. The beatific vision is organically part of the foundation of the presence of the saving acts of Christ in the liturgy, referring to Louis Monden, *Het Misoffer als Myserie: Een Studie over de heilige Mis als sacramenteel in het Licht van de Myserieleer van Dom Casel*, Bijdragen-Bibliotheek, Deel II (Roermond-Maasiek: J.J. Romen and Zonen, 1948); Edward H. Schillebeeckx, *Christ the Sacrament of the Encounter with God* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1963), 59-61.

<sup>182</sup>This presentation relies on Hans Urs Von Balthasar, "*Fides Christi*": An Essay on the Consciousness of Christ," in *Explorations in Theology*. Vol. 2, *Spouse of the Word*, trans., Edward T. Oates, S.J. (San Francisco: Ignatious, 1991): 43-79, hereafter "*Fides Christi*"; Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 301-302.

<sup>183</sup>See Balthasar, "*Fides Christi*," 64-65.

<sup>184</sup>See *ibid.*, 43.

the blessed do not grasp him exhaustively. In this sense, the blessed believe something because they do not know everything. It must be the same with Christ himself, Balthasar insisted, who in his glorified humanity cannot comprehend the totality of God. Even as his humanity is fixed in the beatific vision, like the blessed in heaven, Christ too exercises faith, believing something that is not seen.<sup>185</sup> From this understanding, Balthasar argued, Jesus must have had this faith that he perfectly fulfilled and lived out in his humanity, which the Father demands of all human beings.<sup>186</sup> Jesus' faith as the perfection of the covenantal relationship between the Father and the chosen people is explained by Jesus' nature as the Incarnate Word which manifests

. . . the fidelity of the Son of Man toward the Father, a trust that is placed in God once and for all and yet is realized anew in each moment in time. In the Son of Man we find the unconditional preference for the Father, for his essence, his love, his will and command in relation to all of his own wishes and inclinations. We see the unflinching perseverance in this will, come what may.<sup>187</sup>

Thus, in Jesus' faith is found the perfect trust in God's faithfulness and the free choice of God as the fulfillment of Jesus' life. The way Jesus referred to everything that he was, did, and said was in relation to the absolute trust in the Father (Matthew 19:17; Luke 18:19) who is the source of his power. This is the power that Jesus sought to inculcate in his disciples and wanted them to impart to others. So this faith that Jesus demands of his followers first and foremost refers to the Father. But Jesus is the one who possesses this attitude of faith in fullness and is capable of imparting it to those who belong to him. Jesus lived by faith with

---

<sup>185</sup>See *ibid.*, 69.

<sup>186</sup>See *ibid.*, 43.

<sup>187</sup>*Ibid.*, 52-53.

an unconditional devotion to the Father and shared this faith with his disciples. The disciples' faith, then, is a participation in Jesus' own faith, making them able to receive the love of God through Jesus and, at the same time, to give back this love through Jesus' own love of the Father. In the resurrection, this faith of Christ is made accessible to the Church. In this way, Balthasar argued, one can understand "Jesus [as] the pioneer and perfecter of our faith" as described in Hebrews 12:2. Jesus gave God's love its concrete, unique realization in salvation history through his death on the cross, and in his glorification he makes his followers participate in his own faith.<sup>188</sup>

Christian faith is, then, Balthasar argued, within the reality of what Christ did, that is, faith that shares in the fullness of the truth, the love, the suffering, and the resurrection of Christ. It is a faith in God, an unconditional trust in the living God. In Christ Christians experience the Father's faithfulness and respond with the same trust with which Christ responded.<sup>189</sup> According to Balthasar, then, Christ is the point of the faithfulness of God and the human response to God's loving faithfulness. He is sacrament of God's faithfulness and continuing offer of self-communication to humankind. His response to God's fidelity is the unique response which summarizes and grounds all the responses of humanity because as Incarnate Son he experienced and responded to God's loving faithfulness in the highest possible human way. He is also the sacrament of the perfect human response to God's love.<sup>190</sup> Christ incarnates and makes present and accessible God's fidelity in his humanity.

---

<sup>188</sup>See *ibid.*, 54-56.

<sup>189</sup>See *ibid.*, 58.

<sup>190</sup>See *ibid.*, 59-60.

The faith of Christ has opened the way to the Father.<sup>191</sup> In himself, Christ is the substantial covenant between God and humankind, inseparably holding together because of the hypostatic union that constitutes him as Incarnate Son.<sup>192</sup>

In its scriptural and liturgical sense, faith is the eternal attitude of Christ and the blessed as they receive and respond to God's self-communication. The faith of Christ, God's faithfulness and human response, is celebrated in both the earthly and heavenly liturgies.<sup>193</sup> By adopting the "faith of the Church," the faithful grasp the "faith of God" because from the apostolic time onward the Church has proclaimed to the faithful what God has done in Christ.<sup>194</sup> In his resurrection, Christ sent the Holy Spirit to draw Christians into his faith, which has become the faith of the Church. The Church, then, exists and lives in the faith of Christ. The Church must, therefore, celebrate this faith for her existence. Accordingly, the Church is a praying Church. Of all her prayers, the Eucharistic Prayer is the explicit form of this faith.<sup>195</sup>

According to Balthasar, the Eucharistic Prayer and the liturgical action are the visible expressions of the spiritual self-offering of the Church. Consequently, this self-offering is a palpable expression of the participation of the Church in the response of faith made by Christ in his humanity to the Mystery that the Father has accomplished in him for the salvation of the world. The faith of Christ belongs to the Mystery of the Father in Christ. Hence the Church's spiritual self-offering is the expression of participation in the Mystery of God in

---

<sup>191</sup>See *ibid.*, 58.

<sup>192</sup>See *ibid.*, 59-60.

<sup>193</sup>See *ibid.*, 74.

<sup>194</sup>See *ibid.*, 45, 47.

<sup>195</sup>See *ibid.*, 78-79. Also see Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 301.

Christ. The spiritual self-offering of the Church is also a participation in the response of the faith of Christ (to the Father's fidelity to his covenant). It is an acceptable response made *in Christo* (in the power of Christ), *cum Christo* (a participation in Christ's faith response to the Father), and *per Christum* (through the sharing in the one Passover of Christ to the Father which is the only way to salvation).<sup>196</sup> In this way, Kilmartin pointed out, Balthasar spoke of an "ontic" participation which makes possible the conformity of believers to the meritorious response of Christ in view of what the Father has done in him for the salvation of the world.<sup>197</sup>

Consequently, the Church is the place where God and humanity encounter each other in the faith of Christ. The Church is the community of believers in the Mystery of God in Christ through faith. This Christologically qualified faith is, Balthasar argued, the indispensable way of sharing in the Mystery.<sup>198</sup> By means of this faith and the Eucharistic Prayer the faithful are enabled to express and realize their participation in the response of Christ's self-offering to the Father, which is made possible by the divine action effecting the transmission of the sacrificial attitude of Christ. Accordingly, what follows is that the Church of Christ in reality is a Church of prayer because prayer is the communal performative form of faith through which the basic act of faith is actualized and participation in the Mystery of God in Christ is brought about.

---

<sup>196</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 301-302.

<sup>197</sup>See *ibid.*, 301. While agreeing with Balthasar regarding the Church's participation in the faith of Christ, Kilmartin was, nonetheless, unsatisfied with this notion of participation based on the ground that no one participates in the faith of Christ, which by definition is personal and incommunicable. In order to overcome this difficulty, Kilmartin will turn to a Trinitarian ground to develop a participation in the Spirit of the faith of Christ that is given to the Church.

<sup>198</sup>See *ibid.*, 302.

Thus Kilmartin found Balthasar's description of believers' participation in the *fides Christi* useful to explain the Church's participation in the sacrifice of Christ. However, he insisted that Balthasar's description required more explanation because of the unique nature of Christ's faith. Kilmartin would later develop the relationship and distinction between the faith of Christ and the Holy Spirit. He would emphasize the Spirit of the faith of Christ which is shared in the Church as the right way of describing the Church's participation in the sacrifice of Christ.

Brian McNamara: Church's Participation in the Divine Plan of Salvation and in the Self-Offering Attitude of Christ<sup>199</sup>

According to Brian McNamara, it is within the capability of speculative theology to seek to explain what is involved in the presence of the passion and death of Christ to the believers in the celebration of the Eucharist. At the root of the *Mysteriengegenwart* debate lies, he argued, the idea of causality and presence which cannot be substantiated in a realist metaphysics. Moreover, the relation between time and eternity has either been avoided or misunderstood.<sup>200</sup> In Paul's writing, *mysterion* means the divine plan of God (Ephesians 1: 4, 9, 11). In addition, the plan is a time-conditioned and providentially-directed salvation history (Ephesians 3:5). In this sense, the plan of God is the basis of salvation history. According to McNamara, the inevitable consequent difficulty of God eternally knowing, willing, and effecting a time-conditioned event can only be overcome by grasping the

---

<sup>199</sup>This presentation relies on McNamara, "Christus Patiens," 17-35; Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 312-319.

<sup>200</sup>McNamara, "Christus Patiens," 17-19.

relationship between time and eternity. The revelation of the mystery is to be understood as the timeless action of a timeless Being with temporal succession as its consequent result. In other words, because of the radical distinction and relation between a time-conditioned event and the a-temporal Being, no occurrence in this world can become timeless.<sup>201</sup> In a theological context, space and time provide the medium within which God makes his plan known and within which the plan operates.<sup>202</sup>

Therefore McNamara approached the problem concerning the presence of the saving acts of Christ and believers' participation in these saving acts in the celebration of the Eucharist from the higher perspective of the divine plan.<sup>203</sup> This perspective, he believed, considers the plan of God revealed in Christ and its time-conditioned realization. From the viewpoint of a timeless knowing, the life of Christ is a unity, not succession, as opposed to the lower perspectives. From the higher perspective of the divine plan, the Incarnation as a whole is a single *transitus* to the Father, for the Incarnate Word in his human nature is the sole response of this world to the gratuity of God. In him rests the intelligibility of this world. In and through his *transitus* to the Father the world is saved. Historically completed on the experiential level, this *transitus* is yet to be completed from the divine plan in God, until the

---

<sup>201</sup>See *ibid.*, 20-23.

<sup>202</sup>See *ibid.*, 24.

<sup>203</sup>McNamara found experiential and biblical perspectives inadequate to explain the relation of the historical life of Christ to sacraments. At the level of experiential perspective, because an event (here the Christ-event) has the character of "circumstantial *ephapax*," it cannot be repeated as an occurrence in space and time. Consequently, one can say that the passion of Christ is not repeated in the eucharistic celebration. In the biblical perspective the plan of God, the Pauline *mysterion*, is gradually revealed and accomplished. Biblical and liturgical theologies speak from this perspective. Christ, who has suffered, died, and been glorified, is present to the Church without the limitation of time and space. He is present as the glorified Lord. But his historical mysteries are not present because they lie in the past. See *ibid.*, 25-26.



consummation of the world. Temporal succession and duration are relevant to human beings' involvement in this *transitus* of the world to the Father, which reached its climactic expression in the Christ-event, and is being continued in the time of the Church. Hence the Church sets out "*in Christo*" to make explicit in her here-and-now life the single *transitus* of Christ to the Father. But such succession and duration are not relevant to the ultimate intelligibility involved because from the highest viewpoint all things are simultaneously present.<sup>204</sup>

The instrumentality of the humanity of Christ, his human life and death, McNamara argued, is the fundamental answer to the how and why of human salvation and this instrumentality cannot be adequately expressed in the Scholastic notion of "power" (*virtus*).<sup>205</sup> The intelligibility involved is the intelligibility of definite historical events. Christian insight grasps both in the life of Christ and in the sacramental celebrations the single movement of the world to the Father. However, to appreciate a coherent understanding of the relation of the historical saving acts of Christ to the sacraments, McNamara introduced first the concept of efficient causality and then the mind of Aquinas to the discussion. It is a firm teaching of the Catholic sacramental theology that the saving acts of Christ's life exercise as instrumental efficient causality in the liturgical event of the sanctification of believers.

---

<sup>204</sup>See *ibid.*, 23-24, 27.

<sup>205</sup>See *ibid.*, 26. In the treatment of the earthly life of Christ as central to the divine plan for humanity, McNamara did not suggest the rejection of time, space, and history. He approached it through the fact of the Incarnation and its subsequent presentation in the writings of St. Paul. See *ibid.*, 28.

In his metaphysical analysis of the efficient causality,<sup>206</sup> McNamara made the following presuppositions. Agent and effect are simultaneously present to one another. Agent is not present before the effect of the action is realized. Action is identifiable with the effect, as is the power which effects the action. Although the instrument is used by the agent, the intelligibility of action is not to be sought in the instrument, but in the agent. Efficient causality is, therefore, the relation of effect to cause. Its reality is to be found in the effect. The agent is not changed by acting because any change would be considered the effect.<sup>207</sup>

Applying these presuppositions to the causality of sacraments, McNamara came to the following conclusions concerning the presence of the mysteries of Christ to the believers. God is considered the agent, since he is the divine will and knowing. God acts on humanity through the instrumentality of the life of Christ. Since all historical events are present in the divine mind, the entire single *transitus* of Jesus from suffering to glory must be considered present. Because the action as intelligible is identical to the effect, the action of God in the sacraments is found in humanity, the recipient of the action is that which is effected. God as agent with the *transitus* of Jesus (the power of the agent in its instrument) is found in the recipients (the effect) because the agent and effect are present at the same time. Since the divine activity involved is a matter of configuring human beings to the likeness of Christ and this activity is mediated through the entire *transitus* of Christ, this *transitus* is present to the recipient of the sacraments as configuration to Christ as the form of the effect of the

---

<sup>206</sup>Which McNamara attributed to Bernard J. F. Lonergan's *Grace and Freedom: Operative Grace in the Thought of St. Thomas Aquinas*, ed. J. Patout Burns (New York: Herder and Herder, 1971), Chapter 4. See McNamara, "Christus Patiens," 28.

<sup>207</sup>See *ibid.*, 29.

sacraments. The intelligibility of the divine action is the relation of the recipient of sacramental grace (effect) to God (cause). The change is on the side of humanity, not in God.<sup>208</sup> Based on this argument of causality of the sacraments, McNamara explains the presence of the historical redemptive work of Jesus in the Mass.

. . . the one sacrifice of the Cross, in act (*Christus patiens et moriens*), is present to us in the eucharistic celebration not as mere commemoration but in fact, because of the transcendental perspective from which removes in time and place are ultimately unintelligible. . . . We are in the presence of Christ actually offering himself to the Father in the supreme attitude of self-sacrifice, with the communion effect in us of participation in that self-giving attitude as ultimately and supremely expressed on Golgotha.<sup>209</sup>

The continued presence of the historical *transitus* of Jesus from suffering to glory is a metaphysical presence and, therefore, need not be repeated in the liturgical celebration. The historical event has not been made eternal, but rather has always existed in the divine plan of salvation for the world.

In his analysis of some key texts of Aquinas, McNamara affirmed that the fundamental principle palpable in them is that all events are present to God.<sup>210</sup> Aquinas emphasized the relation between God eternally willing and the time-conditioned occurrences as the consequent result of that willing. Aquinas also emphasized that the whole human life of Christ is the instrument of God's salvific action and that his salvific action is present in sacramental celebration.<sup>211</sup> The core of Aquinas' treatment of sacramentality is the principal efficient causality, that is, the Father as the principal cause, the life of Christ as the

---

<sup>208</sup>See *ibid.*, 29-30.

<sup>209</sup>*Ibid.*, 35.

<sup>210</sup>See *ibid.*, 30-32; Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* I, q. 14, a. 13.

<sup>211</sup>See Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* III, q. 48, a. 6.

instrumental cause, and the consequent effect in the believers. The “*virtus mysteriorum*” is identified with the agent as agent<sup>212</sup> and the action of the principal agent,<sup>213</sup> and this power is found in the recipient of the sacrament.

In the economy of salvation, God is the principal efficient cause and the humanity of Christ is the instrument of the Godhead.<sup>214</sup> The instrumental cause is applied spiritually by faith and corporally by sacraments.<sup>215</sup> Since the humanity of Christ is the instrument of the Godhead, all his actions and sufferings operate instrumentally in virtue of his Godhead for human salvation.<sup>216</sup> Since God is the principal cause and the resurrection of Christ is the instrumental cause of our resurrection, our resurrection follows the resurrection of Christ according to the divine disposition at a certain time.<sup>217</sup>

With respect to the relation of time and eternity and the principle of causality, McNamara described the mystery presence of Christ’s historical reality to the believers in the following manner. Biblically although there remains a distinction between objective redemption that is already accomplished and subjective redemption that is still in progress, from the perspective of the divine plan that distinction disappears because “the ultimate intelligibility of the plan is the identity of one to the other.”<sup>218</sup> God is the principal agent who acts through the humanity of Christ effecting the *transitus* to save the world. The instrument of this divine action is *Christus vivens, patiens, moriens et resurgens*, not *Christus*

---

<sup>212</sup>See *ibid.*, q. 56, a. 1 ad 3.

<sup>213</sup>See *ibid.*, I-II, q. 112, a. 1 ad 1.

<sup>214</sup>See *ibid.*, III, q. 48, a. 6.

<sup>215</sup>See *ibid.*

<sup>216</sup>See *ibid.*

<sup>217</sup>See McNamara, “Christus Patiens,” 31.

<sup>218</sup>*Ibid.*, 34.

*passus, mortuus et resuscitatus*. The humanity of Christ is present in the sacramental action here and now precisely because God is acting through it as instrument. The presence of Christ's historical mysteries is in the effect on the recipient of the sacraments. This presence is a presence as metaphysically affirmed. The effect of this presence is also intelligible in the divine plan. God intends that human persons pass in Christ from this world to the order of the resurrection. The effect of God's action found in the recipient of the sacrament is a union of the believer with Christ suffering and glorified, hence a participation in the divine plan of salvation.

The effect of the presence of the historical mysteries of Christ's life to us must be some modification of the configuration to Christ which is significantly expressed in the Pauline *cum Christo convivere, conresuscitari, conglorificari* . . . it signifies a 'putting on of the mind of Christ,' a real participation in the attitude of Christ expressed in the historical actions and passions of his earthly life.<sup>219</sup>

The divinely intended transmission of the human attitude of Christ to believers is possible because of the presence of the historical life of Christ itself. This transmission establishes, revivifies, and increases believers' adopted sonship/daughtership to the Father. McNamara identified the mystery presence with believers' participation in the attitude of Christ in the liturgy. The one sacrifice of Christ, suffering and dying, is present to believers in the celebration of the Eucharist because of the transcendental perspective from which the particularity of time and space in which it occurred is unintelligible. The effect of participation in the believers is a participation in the sacrificial self-offering attitude of Christ.

---

<sup>219</sup>Ibid., 34. This configuration requires certain modification in the context of each sacramental action because each sacrament highlights particular attitude of Christ. See *ibid.*, 34-35.

Kilmartin considered McNamara's argument important because it is based not on the experiential level of understanding, but on the divine perspective of the divine plan.<sup>220</sup> Moreover, participation of believers in the attitude of Christ results in the mystery presence in the liturgy.

Johannes Betz: Church's Sharing in the Presence of the Historical Sacrificial Act of Jesus in the Form of Food as Her Participation in the Sacrificial Act of Jesus<sup>221</sup>

Kilmartin viewed Johannes Betz's and Cesare Giraudo's descriptions of participation in the sacrificial act of Christ<sup>222</sup> as modifications to Casel's thesis. Betz argued that in the Eucharist human beings encounter the glorified Lord in the sacramental symbol of a meal. In this meal the glorified Lord makes himself present and effectively applies to believers here and now the self-sacrifice of his own life by which he accomplished their salvation. This active character of Christ to believers represented as a food sacrifice and as an offering and a distribution of the meal suggests Christ's presenting himself and his saving action to believers. The pneumatic Christ is present in the celebration of the Eucharist as the *minister principalis*. He fulfills this role by his self-offering and the distribution of self as the food of the Christian feast. This actual presence of the person of Christ is visibly mediated and represented by the reality of the Church, the ecclesial body of Christ.<sup>223</sup>

---

<sup>220</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 312.

<sup>221</sup>This presentation relies on Johannes Betz's "Eucharist," in Karl Rahner, ed., *Sacramentum Mundi* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1968), vol. 2, 257-266; Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 319-321.

<sup>222</sup>As described in the following pages.

<sup>223</sup>See Betz, "Eucharist," 263-264.

The Eucharist is the *anamnetic* celebration of the work of redemption. *Anamnetic* celebration is the medium of the objective presence of the redemptive work. As *anamnesis*, the Eucharist is the actual presence of the sacrificial deed of Jesus from Incarnation to exaltation. This actual presence of the sacrificial deed of Jesus objectifies itself in the somatic real presence of his person as the victim (sacrificial object) and is rooted in it. The somatic real presence comes about within the context of and as a moment of the sacrificial event. The recognition of the priority of the sacrificial dimension of the eucharistic celebration in relation to the somatic presence as significant for the basic structure of the Eucharist may be seen from Betz's following considerations.

Acceptance by God is essential to a sacrifice. God accepts the sacrifice of the Church because it is the sacrifice of Christ made present. Just as God accepted Jesus' sacrifice on the cross and as a sign of his acceptance he raised Jesus' body from the dead, so he accepts the sacrificial gifts of the Church which are the sacraments of Jesus' once and for all sacrifice, fills them with Jesus' life and transforms them into the bodily person of Jesus. Thus the eucharistic body and blood, as signs of the redemptive death of Jesus and also of his resurrection, are revealed as the sacrament of purification from sin and communication of divine life. The consecration concerns the substance of bread and wine which is transformed into the bodily being of the person of Christ. The form (food) in which Jesus' presence comes signifies that it is to be consumed. The Holy Communion constitutes the essential part and goal of the Eucharist.<sup>224</sup> The consecration of the eucharistic elements serves as

---

<sup>224</sup>From the sacrificial dimension of the Eucharist, following the lead of Betz, Kilmartin would emphasize in his eucharistic theology the act of reception of Communion as an essential part, not an

preparation for the sacrificial meal in which the sacrificial action is brought to completion.

For the activity by which Christ gives himself to the communicants is a sacrificial activity.<sup>225</sup>

The sacrificial gift represents the giver and its acceptance by God is the acceptance of the giver, which consists in the self-communication of God to the believer. By sharing in the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, the believer enters into closest union with the sacrificial action of Christ offering himself to the Father and to others. Through it the believer is united with the Father. The somatic real presence of Jesus makes possible the deepest encounter with the Christian. Kilmartin agreed with Betz's description of the basic structure of the Eucharist as representing the contemporary common approach of Catholic theology, namely, in a sacrificial meal the believers can assimilate and appropriate the presence of the historical sacrificial act of Jesus.

Betz considered the nature of the actual subject with respect to the possibility of a past historical act becoming present. As the actions of the eternal person of the Logos, the saving deeds of Jesus have a perennial quality and are always simultaneous with passing finite time. Thus Betz called attention to the ecclesial dimension of the eucharistic liturgy. Christ relates his saving work to the eucharistic liturgy in such a way that he makes the act of the Church into the temporal mode of appearance and presence of that historical redemptive act. In this way Betz followed the solution of the reality of the historical saving acts becoming "eternalized" and therefore present in the risen Lord as the one who subsists in the Logos and is glorified forever. Moreover, Betz argued, based on Aquinas, that the acts are

---

integral part, of the celebration of the Eucharist as opposed to Pius XII who described this act as an integral part in *Mediator Dei*.

<sup>225</sup>See Betz, "Eucharist," 264-265.



somehow taken up into the glorified humanity of Jesus which remains the efficacious *instrumentum conjunctum* of the exalted Lord.<sup>226</sup> Consequently, those past salvific actions

... can now assume a new spatio-temporal presence—in and through a “symbolic reality.” This is an entity in which another being enters and reveals itself, is and acts. The real essence of the symbol as symbol is not its own physical reality, but the manifestation and presentation of the primary reality which is symbolized in it.<sup>227</sup>

#### Cesare Giraudo: Participation in the Representation of the *Transitus* of the Liturgical Assembly to the Father<sup>228</sup>

Based on an analysis of the literary structure of the Eucharistic Prayer, Cesare Giraudo argued, it is a unified prayer directed to the Father, through the Son, and in the Holy Spirit. Moreover, it reflects the dynamic relation of the partners of the new covenant in the history of salvation realized fully through Christ in the power of the Spirit. The *transitus* of the liturgical community to the Father is expressed liturgically in the Eucharistic Prayer, and although the *transitus* of Christ himself is recalled, it is not represented objectively and sacramentally to the assembly in the Eucharistic Prayer. In the eucharistic celebration the Holy Spirit is manifested both as the source of the faith in which the Eucharistic Prayer was formulated as memorial of the death of the Lord and the source of the response of the assembly to the content of this performative form of the act of faith. The Holy Spirit sanctifies both the prayer of the Church and the participants of the liturgy so that, through the medium of prayer, Christ comes to the assembly and the assembly to Christ. The Holy Spirit

---

<sup>226</sup>See Aquinas, *Summa Theologica* III, q. 62, a. 5; q. 64, a. 3.

<sup>227</sup>Betz, “Eucharist,” 265.

<sup>228</sup>Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 322-337; idem, “Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology: Response to the Berakah Award,” *Proceedings of the North American Academy of Liturgy* (Valparaiso, Indiana: Valparaiso University, 1994), 52-53.

is also the source of both the sanctification of the eucharistic gifts of the Church and of the communicants of the sacraments of Christ's body and blood. Accordingly, the Spirit is the one who brings Christ to the communicants and the communicants to Christ in such a way that spiritual unity between Christ and the communicants and between the communicants themselves is deepened.<sup>229</sup>

As the performative ritual form of faith of the eucharistic community, the ritual act serves as the medium through which the faithful are rendered present in memory to the self-offering of the Son of God in his humanity. However, the community is rendered present under the formality of active participants in Jesus' uniquely acceptable response to what the Father has done in him for the salvation of the world. This means that by responding in faith to the mystery of God in Christ, the community is not only related to Christ's self-offering but also that the actively present Christ relates his once-for-all self-offering to that of the community of faith. This reciprocal personal relation is grounded in the work of the Holy Spirit who both brings Christ to the faithful and the faithful to Christ.<sup>230</sup>

Active participation of the assembly is realized by the individual believer's appropriation of the sacrificial attitudes of Jesus at the Last Supper and in the event of his historical death on the cross as expressed verbally and gesturally in the ritual act. According to Giraudo, the idea of representation is presenting the liturgical participants to the Christ-event, not *vice versa*, and this *ripresentazione misterica* is attributed to God who represents believers to the *salutaris virtus* of the *sacrificio ephapax* in the mediation of the sacramental

---

<sup>229</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 330-331.

<sup>230</sup>See *ibid.*, 331.

sign.<sup>231</sup> Giraudo employed the notion of sacramental representation in line with Casel, but with a new orientation. He spoke of the saving event which at the level of space and time is passed but present eternally and directs the believers eschatologically toward the fulfillment of the future kingdom. He employed a distinction between “profane history” and “salvation history,” in which concepts of “physical” and “meta-physical” are operative. Thus, according to him, in the latter case the categories of “profane history” are literally transcended.<sup>232</sup> Hence, laws of space and time do not hold for the sacramental world, for which he appealed to Casel’s reference of Vonier’s interpretation of the mind of Aquinas. According to Giraudo, the relationship of the eucharistic sacrifice to the historical sacrifice of Christ is such that the sacrificial character of the Eucharist is grounded in the representation of the assembled community to the historical sacrifice of the cross, that is, to the unique event of the death and resurrection of Jesus. Giraudo agrees with Casel that the historical saving work of Christ is the foundational event of the new covenant which transcends history and so is accessible to each moment of the history of salvation. What effects the sacramental representation is

...the sacramental sign, or rather it is the salvific dynamic that underlies it; better still, it is God who represents us to the *salutaris virtus* of the *sacrificio ephapx* in the mediation of the sacramental sign. The subject passively considered, that is, represented, is the assembled Church which celebrates by the “ministry of priests.”<sup>233</sup>

---

<sup>231</sup>See Kilmartin, “Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology: Response to the Berakah Award,” 52.

<sup>232</sup>See *ibid.*

<sup>233</sup>Giraudo, *Eucaristia per la chiesa: Prospettive teologiche sull’eucaristia a partire dalla “lex orandi,”* cited in Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 335.

Giraud attributes the actualization of the foundation event to the activity of the life of the faith in the accomplishment of the prophetic sign instituted at the Last Supper. This prophetic sign, pointed to the near future of the historical event of the death of the cross and also to the distant future. It also serves as the ritual-cultic means of participation in the foundational event. Through this ritual activity the liturgical assembly is presented to the foundational event and so enabled to bind itself by faith to the salvific efficacy of the foundational event. The meaning of the foundational event as bound to the historical event itself implies a supra-temporal quality of the historical event. In virtue of this quality some elements of the historical saving act of Christ become perennial in the glorified Christ and are capable of being represented in the eucharistic celebration. Giraud argued that the saving act is made accessible in virtue of the representation of the community to it through the ritual act of the Church. Hence, the believers communicate the unique event through participation in the bread and cup. The sacramental Communion must be seen in the light of the fact that it is the believers' sacramental representation to the death and resurrection of Jesus.<sup>234</sup>

### Conclusion

When Kilmartin began his theological career, he judged that there existed no satisfactory explanation describing the relationship between the historical acts of Christ and the liturgical celebration. Although Casel's thesis had to be corrected, his basic insight of *Mysterientheologie* found acceptance in the magisterium of the Church. His insight is that

---

<sup>234</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 335-336.

through the performance of the sacramental rite the believers participate in the paschal mystery of Christ and experience their salvation.<sup>235</sup> Casel had argued that the decisive thing in liturgy is this inward participation, configuration of Christians to Christ's dying and rising. This participation does not require unconditionally that it to be made exteriorly, although such participation does belong to the intense sharing in the paschal mystery and the completion of its symbolic expression.<sup>236</sup> For this inward participation, Casel claimed for the objective presence of the kernel of Christ's historical acts, freed from the laws of space and time in which they occurred, under the veil of the sacramental symbol. So the believers have access to the mystery that those acts contain through the faithful celebration of the sacramental rite. Söhngen asserted the ritual action by faith in relation to the recipient of the sacrament is a vital element for the constitution of a sacrament. As a result, Christ's *transitus* is represented in the believers through faith and the sacramental celebration. He held that there is a real presence of Christ and his saving acts in the recipient of the sacrament and by means of the sacramental celebration the believers are configured to Christ. McNamara insisted that the effect of the sacramental celebration is the believers' participation in the divine plan of salvation, in which the saving work of Christ is placed. Consequently, in McNamara's metaphysical approach time and eternity are not confused and the eternalization of Christ's saving acts in order to become present in the liturgical celebration is irrelevant.

What emerges from this analysis of the views of these theologians is the emphasis concerning the celebration of the Eucharist as a privileged medium by which the faithful

---

<sup>235</sup>See *Constitutio de sacra Liturgia (Sacrosanctum Concilium)*, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 56 (1964): 6, 48.

<sup>236</sup>See Casel, *The Mystery of the Christian Worship*, 48.

participate in Christ's dying and rising and experience salvation. Thus, the event-character of the sacramental rite is underscored. In this sense, liturgy is an action in which the role of the local Church is crucial. In addition, the *katabatic* (as Casel explained) and the *anabatic* (as Pius XII explained) elements of the dialogical nature of the mystery that the liturgy celebrates and the role of the Holy Spirit in the Church's celebration of the liturgy (as Betz and Giraudo explained) are also underscored.

What captured Kilmartin's attention the most was the Council's incorporation of Casel's basic insight of Christian worship in which the believers are configured to Christ's dying and rising. He credited Casel with discovering this fundamental meaning of Christian worship.<sup>237</sup> Kilmartin adopted this insight together with other important elements that emerged from both contemporary and post-Caselian responses to the issue. Yet, Kilmartin constructed elements of his own approach in describing a theology of the local Church's eucharistic participation within the context of the self-communication of the Triune God and the human response to it, rather than taking an approach to the narrow "Christological" perspective.

Kilmartin believed that the faithful participate in this divine self-communication of God in Christ by a response of faith. The response of faith is an acceptance of God's offer of grace. This faith is a participation in the faith of Christ, as Balthasar explained; a way of sharing in the mystery in such a way that the believers are enabled to express their own participation in Christ's self-offering. Yet, Kilmartin argued, the Holy Spirit, in the mediation of intimacy between the believers and Christ, enables the believers to offer

---

<sup>237</sup>See Kilmartin, "Theology of the Sacraments," 132.

acceptable worship to God with Christ. The believers can, then, be said to participate in the Spirit of Christ's faith.<sup>238</sup> Thus Kilmartin sought to establish a relationship between the faith of Christ, of the Church, and of the individual believers by analyzing the Eucharistic Prayer and the liturgical rites.

---

<sup>238</sup>See Kilmartin, "Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology," 454-455.

## CHAPTER IV

### **EUCCHARISTIC PARTICIPATION IN THE SPIRIT OF THE FAITH OF CHRIST—APPROPRIATION OF THE SACRIFICIAL ATTITUDES OF CHRIST IN THE “GRACE OF CHRIST”**

#### Introduction

This Chapter will treat the development of key elements of Kilmartin’s theological explanation of active eucharistic participation. The methodology that he employs is the integration of *lex orandi* and *lex credendi*. The end-result will be a pneumatological-Christological description of active participation set within the ecclesial context and the liturgical action of the Eucharist. For Kilmartin, the sacraments are “essential engagements with Jesus Christ in the Spirit within the community of believers.”<sup>1</sup> In this way he relates more effectively the pneumatological, Christological, and ecclesiological aspects of the Eucharist to one another than Scholastic eucharistic theology, especially since Trent. These aspects, he believed, should be emphasized in any systematic theology of the Eucharist. In this Chapter, first, I will outline Kilmartin’s early indications of placing the liturgical event within the Trinitarian and ecclesiological contexts and his understanding of the relationship between the Spirit and sanctification. Second, I will describe his investigation of setting a Spirit-worked active participation from *lex orandi* (early eucharistic prayers) as well as from *lex credendi* (theology). Finally, I will present his systematic theological approach toward establishing a proper mission of the Spirit (mediation of Christ and his faith to the Church) so

---

<sup>1</sup>Edward J. Kilmartin, “A Modern Approach to the Word of God and Sacraments of Christ: Perspectives and Principles,” in *The Sacraments: God’s Love and Mercy Actualized*, ed. Francis A. Eigo, O.S.A (Villanova, Pennsylvania: The Villanova University Press, 1979), 63, hereafter “Modern Approach.”



as to support this Spirit-worked active participation in the celebration of the Eucharist. For this purpose Kilmartin constructed a particular Trinitarian theology.

### **Early Indications for Situating the Liturgical Event within Trinitarian and Ecclesiological Dimensions**

The purpose of this section is to trace the genesis of Kilmartin's thinking on the Trinitarian and ecclesiological aspects of the liturgy with special emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit. In this regard, I will present the underlying presuppositions and texts that shaped his pneumatological thinking. But first I will examine his methodology.

#### **Kilmartin's Method: Principle of "Both"—Liturgical-Theological Integration**

In order to articulate an authentic liturgical theology, Kilmartin claims, he employs a different method from that of Scholastic theology.<sup>2</sup> In its theology of liturgy, specifically the theology of grace as experienced through the liturgy, Scholastic theology considered the doctrine of Christ. This way of doing theology is sometimes derogatorily called the "Christomonistic" approach which, Kilmartin judged, does not do justice to the mystery of the liturgy in all its dimensions.<sup>3</sup> As his method is different, so will be the resulting understanding of the celebration of liturgy and theology of grace.

---

<sup>2</sup>In this sense, Kilmartin generally critiques the Scholastic approach as narrow and insufficient for sacramental theology. For the characteristics of such Scholastic theology of sacraments, see Edward J. Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy: Theology and Practice: I. Systematic Theology of Liturgy* (Kansas City: Sheed and Ward, 1988), 3-13, hereafter *Christian Liturgy*.

<sup>3</sup>Here Kilmartin is reacting against Scholastic theology's heavily Christocentric approach to the theology of grace. In this theology, when grace is said to be the grace of Christ, it is reduced to the level of a monotheistic theology of grace, namely, when it is said that Christ merited grace by his death. But grace actually pertains to the supernatural activity of the Godhead as such. See Karl Rahner, *The Trinity*,

The axiom *ut legem credendi lex statuat supplicandi* (“the law of prayer grounds the law of belief”) has its roots in the fifth century.<sup>4</sup> It is ascribed to Prosper of Aquitaine (c.390-c.455), secretary of Pope Leo I (440-461).<sup>5</sup> In fact, the premise of this theological argument goes back even further than Prosper. Liturgical practice had contributed to the development of Church doctrine from the period of Irenaeus’s (c.115-c.202) arguments concerning the sacramental practice of the Church against the Gnostic debasement of material things until St. Augustine of Hippo’s (354-430) use of infant baptism to defend a doctrine of an original sin.<sup>6</sup> Prosper used this argument to refute the errors taught by the semi-Pelagians and to emphasize the witness of tradition regarding the necessity of grace as the first step toward sanctification. He argued that liturgical prayer in which the whole Catholic Church prays everywhere in accord with the apostolic tradition holds the highest rank. The assertion of this argument is

---

trans. Joseph Donceel (New York: Burns and Oates, 1970), 13; idem, “Some Implications of the Scholastic Concept of Uncreated Grace,” trans. Cornelius Ernst, *Theological Investigations* 1 (Darton, London: Longman and Todd, 1961), 346. Kilmartin, however, does not devalue the legitimate Christological aspect of grace as is clear from his assertion that “these ritual actions [sacraments] of the Church are understandable to the extent that they are integrated into the mystery of the life of the Church, the paschal mystery of the life, death, and resurrection of Christ. They are neither more nor less than a means of participation in that mystery. Still they cannot be explained or correctly practiced without reference to their historical dimension.” Edward J. Kilmartin, “Theology of the Sacraments: Toward a New Understanding of the Chief Rites of the Church of Jesus Christ,” in *Alternative Future for Worship I: General Introduction*, ed. Regis A. Duffy (Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1987), 126, hereafter “Theology of the Sacraments.” Rather, what Kilmartin tries to achieve is a pneumatological Christological approach to the liturgical celebration which, he believed, will be more advantageous to describing the liturgical event than Scholasticism’s Christomonistic approach.

<sup>4</sup>This axiom is often shortened to *lex orandi-lex credendi*.

<sup>5</sup>This axiom is found in Prosper’s *Indiculus de Gratia* (435-442). For a detailed historical analysis and presentation of *lex orandi-lex credendi*, see Kevin W. Irwin, *Context and Text: Method in Liturgical Theology* (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1994), 3-43, hereafter *Context and Text*; Edward J. Kilmartin, *The Eucharist in the West: History and Theology*, ed. Robert J. Daly (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1998), 343-350, hereafter *Eucharist in the West*; idem, *Christian Liturgy*, 96-97; Geoffrey Wainwright, “Theology of Worship” in *The New Westminster Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship*, ed. Paul Bradshaw (London: Louisville, Westminster John Knox Press, 2002): 454-457.

<sup>6</sup>See Carmina M. Magnusen Chapp, *Encounter with the Triune God: An Introduction to the Theology of Edward J. Kilmartin, S.J.* (Bethesda, Maryland: Catholic Scholars Press, 1998), 102, hereafter *Encounter with the Triune God*.

the particularization of the Good Friday intercessions in the prayer which expresses the need of grace of God for various people such as heretics, schismatics, sinners, and catechumens for their conversion. Prosper considered the rites of priestly supplication in order to affirm that the law of prayer (*lex orandi*) establishes the law of belief (*lex credendi*). He presupposed that the semi-Pelagians recognized the law of prayer of supplication in the sense that all pray in the same way. Therefore, from this recognition they should draw the law of belief about the necessity of grace. Prosper's point in referring to the Good Friday intercessions is that in asking for God's grace for various people, the Church asserts its belief that the needed grace comes from God and it is grace, not works, that leads them to salvation. The basis for this argument is the theology reflected in these prayers. Hence, Prosper's axiom might mean that the liturgy, the Church's engagement in liturgical rites, manifests the Church's faith.

It is generally considered that *lex orandi* principally guided the Western Catholic eucharistic theology during the first Christian millennium. But by the second millennium, *lex credendi*, especially doctrines pertaining to Christology, dominated the course of the development of eucharistic theology.<sup>7</sup> The dominance of *lex credendi* was chiefly dictated by the eucharistic controversy which the Church faced and had to find a way to settle. A

---

<sup>7</sup>This approach did not appear for the first time in the second millennium. Early in the first millennium, the spread of heresies, especially Arianism that reduced the Son of God to the level of a creature by denying his divinity and pre-existence, which resulted in the erroneous prayers of the early Church, forced the reversal of the axiom *lex orandi-lex credendi*. Eventually, these prayers had to be condemned and changed to contain orthodox doctrine. As a result, the orthodox doctrine of the Church also set the prayer of the Church. This reversal was necessary for the preservation of truth. See Edward J. Kilmartin, "The Active Role of Christ and the Spirit in the Divine Liturgy," *Diakonia* 17 (1982): 99-100; idem, *Christian Liturgy*, 97; Catherine Mowry LaCugna, *God For Us: The Trinity and Christian Life* (San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1991), 116, 134-135.

classical example is the formulation of the theology of the “moment of consecration.”

However, this approach did not succeed in integrating all the dogmatic principles required for a truly systematic, authentic eucharistic theology. Kilmartin remarks that

undue stress on the dogma of the Real Presence to the neglect of other aspects of the eucharistic mystery can give the impression that the eucharistic celebration takes place primarily in order that the Christian community might adore the Divine Person of the Incarnate Son present under the forms of the consecrated food and drink.<sup>8</sup>

While Kilmartin agrees with the idea that this approach has its merit, he sees it as very limited:

It should be constantly recalled that the Western scholastic approach to sacramental theology in general, and the Eucharist in particular, concentrates on the intensive study of specific themes by reducing the perspective fields. This type of concentration has, at times, resulted in important gains. However, it has also led to loss of contact with the place of the subject under consideration within the whole of the economy of salvation.<sup>9</sup>

Furthermore, this traditional dogmatic method abstracts from the natural context of the theology of the liturgy. “There is no doubt that this development shattered the fragile equilibrium that the early scholastic theological synthesis continued to maintain well into the twelfth century.”<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup>Edward J. Kilmartin, *The Sacrificial Meal of the New Testament* (Glen Rock, New Jersey: Paulist Press, 1966), 23, hereafter *Sacrificial Meal*.

<sup>9</sup>Edward J. Kilmartin, “The Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology: Towards the Third Millennium,” *Theological Studies* 55 (1994): 456-457, hereafter “Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology.”

<sup>10</sup>Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 346.

Kilmartin viewed Odo Casel and Pius XII to be the recent representative of the two extreme positions of the axiom *lex orandi-lex credendi*.<sup>11</sup> Casel brought to the foreground of theological thought the importance of understanding theology as theology of the liturgy, namely, theological reflection on the content and meaning of liturgical practice. But, he decided to formulate the axiom solely in the direction of “the law of prayer is the law of belief.”<sup>12</sup> For Casel the truth of the faith is made available through the liturgical expression of the self-understanding of the Church. He reduced the authentic liturgical traditions to *the* source and central witness of the life and of all theology. Kilmartin judged that this one-sided emphasis on the value of liturgical-practical grounding of theological knowledge had the effect of playing down the principle of intelligibility in Christian theology, namely, “the relation of one aspect of the revealed mystery of salvation to *all the others*.”<sup>13</sup> As a consequence, Scripture and the other sources of theology are not integrated into Casel’s theological thought. Moreover, it is difficult to imagine how this approach as a single discipline of theology is capable of preserving the fullness of the real content of Christian revelation. On the other hand, due to such a reduction of the sources of theology to the law of prayer, Pius XII instructed “let the rule of belief determine the rule of prayer.”<sup>14</sup> His concern was to admit that liturgy is *a* source of the faith of the highest rank and, at the same time, to accentuate the unique value of the law of belief, guaranteed by the teaching authority of the Church, the magisterium. These two approaches express a one-sided stress on theory

---

<sup>11</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 96-97.

<sup>12</sup>*Ibid.*, 97.

<sup>13</sup>*Ibid.*, 93. Emphasis original.

<sup>14</sup>Pius XII, *Mediator Dei*, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 39 (1947): 521-595, English translation in *The Papal Encyclicals 1939-1958* (Ann Arbor: The Pierian Press, 1990), 119-154, here 48.

on the one side and on practice on the other side which, Kilmartin concluded, obscure the unique value of two different kinds of expression of faith—prayer and belief.

Kilmartin believes that sacramental theology should begin with an examination of the rites themselves, the *lex orandi* of the Church. He noted that the traditional emphasis on the theological doctrine of the Church, developed by systematic theology, resulted in the subordination of the law of prayer and caused an inadequate understanding of Christian mystery. Kilmartin, therefore, argues for the need to reintegrate the law of prayer, in proper balance with doctrine, as a privileged source of theology. He underscores the essential role of the liturgy in the task of systematic theology to clarify the principle of intelligibility in Christian theology.

For Kilmartin, the phrase “theology of liturgy” has a twofold meaning.<sup>15</sup> First, it is the theology contained in the liturgy itself. In other words, it is the theology expressed in the symbolic language and action of liturgical practice. Various branches of systematic theology focus on specific themes, whereas a systematic theology of the liturgy focuses on the liturgical symbolic activity in which the specific themes of each systematic theology are brought together. Liturgical worship is a speaking about God in the form of a speaking to God. Accordingly, liturgy is a source of theological knowledge. Second, the theology of liturgy is the object of study, whereas all other branches of systematic theology are the subjects of study. Stated in different manner, a systematic theology of Christian liturgy is derived from reflection on its nature and function within the economy of salvation. Theology of liturgy, namely, theology of the celebration of the sacraments, is an integral part of

---

<sup>15</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 93-94.

systematic theology. Liturgy is the source of all systematic theologies.<sup>16</sup> As one of their goals, systematic theologies should contribute to a better understanding of the liturgy. Thus systematic theologies should express their relevance for liturgical activity. “Systematic theologians, working in all branches of theology, should consider it a matter of the highest priority to show how their subjects can contribute to a better understanding and practice of the communal worship.”<sup>17</sup> Liturgy expresses the totality of the life of faith in symbolic activity, verbal and ritual. Thus there is a connection between faith and worship as expressed in liturgical symbolic activity. Kilmartin argues that “it is the task of a systematic theology of liturgy to maintain or recover this coherence and to do this by a consistent interpretation of the central symbolic activity of the liturgy.”<sup>18</sup> Accordingly, he understands that the role of the theology of liturgy is to explain the connection between the liturgical symbolic activity and the central mysteries of the life of faith within the scope of the comprehensive Catholic tradition.

Kilmartin considers Scripture and tradition to be primary sources for a systematic study of the Eucharist, which begins with an analysis of the rite itself. Such an approach has its roots in the time when the law of prayer of the Church founded the law of belief.

Kilmartin’s research on ancient eucharistic prayers shows that the faith of the Church was based on what and how the Church prayed. The faith is passed on from generation to

---

<sup>16</sup>Not all contemporary theologians would agree with this assertion of Kilmartin, for they do not consider liturgy either to be source or starting point for their theology. See Daniel W. Hardy and D. Ford, *Jubilate: Theology in Praise* (London: Dartman, Longman, and Todd, 1984); Dietrich Ritschl, *The Logic of Theology: A Brief Account of the Relationship between Basic Concepts in Theology*, trans. John Bowden (Pennsylvania: Fortress Press, 1987).

<sup>17</sup>Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 95.

<sup>18</sup>*Ibid.*, 95-96.

generation through the cultic acts of the community. Liturgy, therefore, preserves and passes on the faith of the Church. Therefore, what the Church believes can be found first and foremost in its sacramental celebrations. Thus, liturgy, as Kilmartin claims, may be considered a primary source of theology. Yet he recognizes that liturgical traditions are not *the* only source of knowledge of Christian faith but *a* unique source of understanding the economy of salvation:

On the one hand, the law of prayer implies a comprehensive, and, in some measure a pre-reflective, perception of the life of faith. On the other hand, the law of belief must be introduced because the question of the value of particular liturgical tradition requires the employment of theoretical discourse. One must reckon with the limits of the liturgy as lived practice of the faith.<sup>19</sup>

Liturgy, therefore, Kilmartin argues, “must always be tested and evaluated in the light of Scripture, as well as other basic sources of knowledge of the faith.”<sup>20</sup> Kilmartin says the same thing about dogmas as well. From the perspective of salvation history, he treats dogmas as sources only secondary to Scripture and tradition, but nonetheless important ones. Kilmartin acknowledges that the Scholastic method had the advantage of bringing to light important facts about the historical development of the life of faith. At the same time, he notes that it reduced Scripture and tradition to the level of proof texts to support the claim that the teaching of the magisterium is grounded in revelation. Such an approach gave the impression that the temporally and historically conditioned dogmatic formulas are the timelessly valid and are the clearest expression of the truths under consideration. This

---

<sup>19</sup>Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 97.

<sup>20</sup>*Ibid.*, 92.



understanding, Kilmartin believes, leads to incomplete statements about Christian truths.

Dogma, therefore, needs to be considered relative in a twofold sense—it stands at the service and under the authority of the Word of God in Scripture.<sup>21</sup>

Kilmartin's assertion that liturgy is theology's starting point does not mean that doctrine is to be ignored. While liturgy may establish doctrine, doctrine may also have an effect on liturgy. Kilmartin understands this effect to be the most important role of doctrine. Theology must be done in service of the liturgy. From this perspective, Kilmartin considers a comprehensive approach towards the theology of the sacraments in general and the Eucharist in particular which takes into account the relative value of the different theologies. He thus concentrates on the category of sacrament as a basic structure of all aspects of the economy of salvation.<sup>22</sup> In order to avoid either extreme of the axiom *lex orandi-lex credendi* and to bring to the surface the Christian potential of meaning symbolized in liturgy, Kilmartin believed that it is necessary to have a balance between these two "laws." Both are expressions of the faith of the Church and provide complementary material to explain the mystery of worship. Kilmartin states:

---

<sup>21</sup>See Edward J. Kilmartin, *Church, Eucharist and Priesthood: A Theological Commentary on the Mystery and Worship of the Most Holy Eucharist* (New York: Paulist Press, 1981), 3-4, hereafter *Church, Eucharist and Priesthood*. In this regard, concerning the use of the teaching of the Council of Trent on the sacrifice of the Mass, Kilmartin argues that "one has to take into account the relation between Scripture and the official teaching of the Church. The office of teaching, in its dogmatic statements, 'receives' the interpretation of Scripture furnished by theologians. But Scripture also serves as a norm for the critique of the interpretation of official teaching. Hence a valid interpretation of Trent is possible that disengages the content of its statements concerning the sacrificial character of the Eucharist (derived from the particular historically conditioned narrowness of the sixteenth century), and leads it closer to the authentic whole tradition ultimately based on the primary witness of Scripture." Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 184.

<sup>22</sup>See Edward J. Kilmartin, "Sacraments as Liturgy of the Church," *Theological Studies* 50 (1989): 547.

The liturgical act itself communicates knowledge in the process of its realization by the symbolic language, verbal and gestural, that has the power of arousing in the participants some resonances with divine realities. A descriptive theology of the liturgy resembles the process of knowledge by participation. Such a theology seeks to articulate what the symbolism of the rites intends to convey, and what experiential knowledge derives from full participation in the liturgy. The openness and ambiguity of liturgical symbolism provides a source of many insights. This symbolism is indeed susceptible or capable of evoking theological reflection. But a theology that remains wholly on the phenomenological level is not adequate to meet the needs of a Catholic theology of liturgy.<sup>23</sup>

Accordingly, Kilmartin employs not an “either-or” principle, but a principle of “both,” namely, an integration of the two laws in such a way that does not subordinate one aspect to the other. This principle is evident in his formulation of the adage “*the law of prayer is the law of belief, and vice versa*.”<sup>24</sup> This integration conveys the idea that these two sources of knowledge are neither independent of one another nor do they serve precisely the same purpose. Accordingly what Kilmartin wants to assert by liturgy is primarily as “done,” but also mediated by doctrines.

Kilmartin’s method of analyzing liturgical rites has merit in the sense that while it can lead to great insights into the importance of different aspects of theology at different points of history,<sup>25</sup> it also recognizes the neglected aspects of the economy of salvation during

---

<sup>23</sup>Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 281.

<sup>24</sup>Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 97. Italics original. This axiom is not unique to Kilmartin alone since it is also employed by his contemporary theologians. See Kevin W. Irwin, *Liturgical Theology: A Primer* (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1990).

<sup>25</sup>Chapp is mistaken in claiming that Kilmartin offers only the “what” but not the “why” of the changing emphases. See Chapp, *Encounter with the Triune God*, 106. Kilmartin does address this issue in *Eucharist in the West*. In this book, Kilmartin does not just offer a historical development of the Western eucharistic theology with its various emphases. Rather, this theology is determined in different historical, cultural, and theological contexts relevant to the people of the time with its affirmation of a certain elements and, at the same time, playing down other elements which did not seem to be so important at a given particular time of history.

different periods of history. By *lex credendi* Kilmartin does not mean only the contributions of the second theological millennium but also the neglected dogmatic tenets pertaining to the field of systematic theology: Christology, pneumatology, Trinity, ecclesiology, soteriology, and revelation of faith. So that these neglected aspects may not be forgotten but may be re-emphasized at some point in future, he says,

The history of theology makes it abundantly clear that each age has its own contributions to make to the understanding of the life of faith. These are conditioned by the variety of cultural and historical circumstance. In one age, with its peculiar questions provoked by a special religious experience and understanding of reality, some aspects of the theology of sacraments may be highlighted while others, which received attention previously, are neglected. A new age, stimulated by its own religious needs, may rediscover those forgotten aspects and contribute to the overall intelligibility by building on earlier knowledge.<sup>26</sup>

Such is the case in which Kilmartin brings to light the Trinitarian and ecclesiological dimensions and the role of the Holy Spirit in the early Eucharistic Prayers. By retrieving these aspects, Kilmartin incorporates them into his eucharistic theology while remaining faithful to tradition. Moreover, the analysis of sacramental rites as acts of the believing community is the point of departure for Kilmartin to explain the mode of mediation of the grace of Christ through the sacraments. From such an ecclesiological perspective, Kilmartin draws the following consequences in six points:

First, God's self-communication is realized historically through human communication, especially in the liturgy. Second, the sacraments, as expressions of the faith of the Church, are paradigms of the way in which God communicates self to humanity in history. Third, the subjects of the sacraments are the gathered community and the individual in whose favor the sacrament is celebrated. Fourth, all subjects of the sacraments share in the

---

<sup>26</sup>Kilmartin, "Theology of the Sacraments," 124-125.

measure of participation in the faith of the Church expressed in the rites. Fifth, sacraments announce the offer of grace and simultaneously enable the individual to transcend one's personal faith commitment so as to accept the offer with thanksgiving. Sixth, from this analysis an important corollary follows: sacraments are not a means of grace vis-à-vis the adult subject in whose favor they are celebrated; rather, they mediate the dispositions by which the individual adult is made fully the subject of the sacramental celebration.<sup>27</sup>

Kilmartin's study of the liturgical rites is very useful in that it makes neglected aspects of the tradition available to contemporary theology. To explicate these aspects, Kilmartin uses the concept of models.<sup>28</sup> He explains, "Models are conceptual images, constructed with a view to highlighting essential elements, their relations, and the principles of the reality that is being studied."<sup>29</sup> He sees the usefulness of analytical models in theology to explain real liturgical events.<sup>30</sup> In this regard, he cautions to distinguish between two types of models (exogenous and endogenous)<sup>31</sup> and insists that the value of the employment of a model in systematic theology essentially depends on its being endogenous in nature. In

---

<sup>27</sup>Kilmartin, "Theology of the Sacraments," 151-152.

<sup>28</sup>For recent Catholic theologians who applied the notion of model to revelation, ecclesiology, and the Eucharist with a view to identify the ways of understanding the nature of revelation, Church, and eucharistic liturgy, see Avery Dulles, *Models of Revelation* (Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1983); idem, *Models of the Church* (Garden City, New York: Image Books, 1987); Kevin W. Irwin, *Models of the Eucharist* (New York: Paulist Press, 2005).

<sup>29</sup>Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 158.

<sup>30</sup>See Edward J. Kilmartin, *The Particular Liturgy of the Individual Church: The Theological Basis and Practical Consequences*. Placid Lectures Series 7 (Bangalore, India, 1987), 48, hereafter *Particular Liturgy*. Kilmartin disagrees with the Tridentine theology's use of the Last Supper to serve as the analytical model for the first Mass, the institution of the ministerial priesthood, and the constitution of the Church. See Council of Trent, Session 22, Canons 1-2 in Schroeder, trans. *The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, 149. This point of view, he argues, supports only the one-sided view of apostles and their successors as celebrating the Eucharist *in persona Christi* in contrast to *in persona ecclesiae*. Rather, based on the New Testament grounding, he claims that the Easter-event together with the sending of the Holy Spirit are constitutive of Church, sacraments, and offices. Hence, strictly speaking, the Last Supper, before the death and resurrection of Jesus and the mission of the Spirit, is not the first eucharistic celebration of the apostolic Church. See Kilmartin "Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology," 420-431; idem, *Eucharist in the West*, 201; idem, *Church, Eucharist and Priesthood*, 6-7.

<sup>31</sup>The difference between exogenous and endogenous models was explained in Chapter One above. In addition, see Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 159; idem, *Eucharist in the West*, 180, 353-354; idem, *Particular Liturgy*, 48-51.

other words, the usefulness of a model depends on its correspondence with the reality being studied or on theological premises which derive from the sources of Christian revelation. In this regard, Kilmartin contrasts the two theological reflections in Western theology on the subject of eucharistic conversion: “eucharistic incarnation” and the theory of transubstantiation. In the case of the former (endogenous), the historical Incarnation of the Word provided a salvation-history perspective for understanding the eucharistic presence of Christ in the species.<sup>32</sup> In the case of the latter (exogenous), conversion is conceived in a culture characterized by a “thingly realism” and based on the model of a change in physical beings that takes place within the world. This theory makes possible the continued existence of the appearance of bread and wine while their substances are changed into the body and blood of Christ. But Kilmartin notes the limitation of this theory (it leads to a static-objective

---

<sup>32</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 353. “Eucharistic incarnation” theory was prominent since the second century. This theory is drawn from the similarities between the event of the Incarnation of Jesus and the sanctification of the eucharistic elements from the perspective of descending/Logos-Christology of John 1:14. Although an endogenous model, this theory underscores the unity between the eucharistic elements and the crucified and risen Lord. At the same time, it does not affirm the substantial conversion of the elements and seemed to imply the idea of a kind of hypostatic union of the humanity of Jesus with the substance of the bread and wine which the Council of Trent rejected. Instead, Trent affirmed a real conversion. Kilmartin attributes this limitation of eucharistic incarnation theory to its failure to integrate the sanctifying action of the Holy Spirit. He argues that this limitation can be overcome if one takes into account the uniqueness of the eucharistic change from the perspective of ascending/Spirit-Christology of Luke 1:34-35. Unlike the theory of transubstantiation, which locks a change of one material element into another within this world, the eucharistic incarnation theory refers to the historical Incarnation to explain the eucharistic change. In the historical Incarnation, there was the actualization of the potential of a created human being for union with the Son in person. This union of the humanity of Jesus with the Son was the consequence of the sanctifying action of the Spirit in the act of the creation of that humanity. Similarly, in the case of the eucharistic gifts the sanctifying action of the Holy Spirit enables the elevation of the elements into Christ sacrificed and glorified. Consequently, through the participation of the sacraments of his body and blood, Christ himself unites the believer to himself sacramentally and, at the same time, it is ultimately based on the participation of the Holy Spirit who is the mediation of the personal immediacy of Christ to the communicant and of the communicant to Christ. See Council of Trent, Session 13, Canons 1-2 in Schroeder, trans. *The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, 79; Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 180-183; idem, “Sacramental Theology: The Eucharist in Recent Literature,” *Theological Studies* 32 (1971): 243, hereafter “Sacramental Theology.”

concept of Christ's real presence)<sup>33</sup> and he laments that Western Catholic theology has not offered, to this day, a satisfactory explanation of the "how" of this change.<sup>34</sup> What Kilmartin otherwise suggests here is a pneumatological approach, as described above, for the conversion of the eucharistic elements into the body and blood of Christ.<sup>35</sup>

Kilmartin claims that the treatment of any particular theological explanation concerning the aspects of the life of faith and the identification of the model that determines the whole synthesis can lead to important results. Accordingly, he employs two endogenous, analytical models of the immanent/eternal Trinity to construct a systematic theology of eucharistic liturgy. Kilmartin argues that adherence to such models can avoid the danger of developing concepts about the theology of eucharistic liturgy that are foreign to the Christian economy of salvation. Accordingly, he is able to stress the depth dimension of the celebration of the Eucharist, the self-communication of the Triune God to humanity in their economic activity. He concludes that the theology of liturgy is the theology of the economic Trinity.<sup>36</sup> He articulates this assertion theologically in a definitive way by identifying the

---

<sup>33</sup>For a detailed presentation of the limitations of this theory, see Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 64-65, 149-153, 164, 179, 181-182, 353; idem, *Particular Liturgy*, 94. Another classical example of the use of exogenous model, in official Catholic ecclesiology from the seventeenth to the twentieth century, is the description of the Church as juridically perfect society. Vatican II partly departed from this understanding of the Church for a new orientation by stressing the idea that the unique model of the Church is that of Church-mystery. In addition to Chapter One above, see *Constitutio dogmatica de Ecclesia (Lumen Gentium)*, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 57 (1965): 8, hereafter *Lumen Gentium*; Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 159; idem, *Eucharist in the West*, 353-354; idem, *Particular Liturgy*, 48-49.

<sup>34</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 182-183.

<sup>35</sup>In this regard, Kilmartin sees that the official Vatican response to the Faith and Order report, *Baptism, Eucharist, and Ministry*, where it treats the sacramental presence of Christ under the forms of bread and wine, is open to this approach. See Edward J. Kilmartin, "The Official Vatican Response to BEM: Eucharist," *Ecumenical Trends* 17 (1988): 39-40; idem, "Catholic Tradition of the Eucharistic Theology," 431-432. Also see Michael O'Carroll, *Corpus Christi: An Encyclopedia of the Eucharist* (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1988), 21.

<sup>36</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 98.

correspondence between the economic and immanent Trinity and the use of the procession and bestowal models of the immanent Trinity. He then draws ecclesiological implications from this assertion for the active participation of the liturgical assembly in the celebration of the Eucharist.

### Sacramental Participation and Sanctification

In two early texts,<sup>37</sup> Kilmartin anticipated much of what is contained in *Sacrosanctum Concilium* and *Lumen Gentium* in the way he approached sacraments from a liturgical perspective. Moreover, these two early texts of Kilmartin demonstrate an orientation of his sacramental theological thought which will significantly guide his future research and shape his eucharistic theology.

In *The Sacraments: Signs of Christ, Sanctifier, and High Priest*, Kilmartin presents the concept of sacramental participation in the mystery of worship, particularly in relation to Christ, the Church, and the members of the liturgical assembly. He viewed the sacraments as an integral part of salvation history which is still in progress<sup>38</sup> and still unfolds itself in every sacramental celebration. Although by and large this text reflects the tendency of traditional Christological sacramental causality (the origin of the efficacy of sacraments in Christ),<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>37</sup>Edward J. Kilmartin, *The Sacraments: Signs of Christ, Sanctifier, and High Priest* (Glen Rock, New Jersey: Paulist Press, 1962), hereafter *Sacraments*; idem, "Patristic Views of Sacramental Sanctity," in *Proceedings of the Catholic College Teachers of Sacred Doctrine* 8 (1962), 59-82. This article is the point of reference in this dissertation. Two years later this very article was published under a slightly altered title "Patristic Views of Sacramental Sanctification," in *Readings in Sacramental Theology*, ed. C. Stephen Sullivan (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964), 144-164.

<sup>38</sup>See Kilmartin, *Sacraments*, 3.

<sup>39</sup>See *ibid.*, *passim*. A similar Scholastic thinking is also evident in his later work where Kilmartin attributes the possibility of the presence of Christ and his saving deeds in the celebration of the Eucharist,

Kilmartin goes beyond this approach by introducing the elements of Trinitarian theology, the work of the Holy Spirit, and the participation of the faithful as necessary conditions for sacramental celebration.<sup>40</sup>

Kilmartin begins exploring the nature of the sacraments and the communication of grace as a means of sharing in the Trinitarian life. He asserts,

From all eternity, the Trinity had decreed the creation and supernatural destiny of man: a share in the Trinitarian life. However, by reason of the Fall of Adam, the human race lost sanctifying grace and was reduced to a permanent state of aversion to God. While personal communion with the Trinity remained man's destiny, he was unable to attain it by his own powers. The initiative would have to come from God.<sup>41</sup>

This initiative of God is offered to us in the form of the sacraments. God continues to communicate his divine revelation, fulfilled in Jesus Christ once for all, in a tangible manner in the liturgical celebration of the Church. In Jesus Christ, God reveals that redemption involves a personal encounter between him and human persons. This encounter with God is made manifest as Christ becomes "the called representative"<sup>42</sup> for humankind. The twofold aspect of this encounter, God's invitation and the human response, is realized in Jesus' embodiment of the new Covenant.<sup>43</sup> "He [Christ] is not only the visible sign of God's invitation to personal love, but the representative and perfect fulfillment of man's loving answer. . . . As Head of the human race, His response is our redemption. His worship is our

---

within the context of re-presentation, to the words of the institution of the Eucharist. See Edward J. Kilmartin, *The Eucharist in the Primitive Church* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965), 2, 67-73.

<sup>40</sup>However, the treatment of these themes is limited here, especially the theme of the work of the Holy Spirit.

<sup>41</sup>Kilmartin, *Sacraments*, 3. Kilmartin's earlier writings lack use of inclusive language.

<sup>42</sup>Ibid., 4.

<sup>43</sup>See *ibid.*



sanctification.”<sup>44</sup> Kilmartin asserts that this personal communion with God is only possible in and through Christ, by offering the sacrifice of Christ and taking part in the life, death, and resurrection of Christ. By virtue of the baptismal character, the basis for participation in the one priesthood of Christ, Christians are made able to participate in the offering of the eucharistic sacrifice.<sup>45</sup> Moreover, encounter with Christ, or participation in his paschal mystery, is possible because Christ has established the sacramental medium of the Church.<sup>46</sup>

A corporeal encounter with the glorified Christ, and in Him with the Trinity, remains possible in the sacramental Church which is the earthly, visible, redemptive organ of the living, invisible *Kyrios* (the Lord). In the word and sacraments of the Church, we encounter the salvific activity of the *Kyrios* in a visible form, in a corporeal way.<sup>47</sup>

By “corporeal encounter” Kilmartin underscores the encounter with the invisible Christ and his salvific acts as mediated through the visible liturgical rites in the Church. In other words, it is through the sacramental economy of salvation that the saving work of the glorified Christ is made visible,<sup>48</sup> which otherwise, by virtue of Christ’s glorification, is invisible to us. Through the celebration of word and sacraments, “the two ways by which the Church actualizes herself as medium of salvation,”<sup>49</sup> Christ and his redemptive work are made present. Kilmartin emphasizes that the sacraments, as mediated through the Church, are the most important means of growth in holiness and in conformity to Christ.<sup>50</sup> Kilmartin’s

---

<sup>44</sup>Ibid., 4-5.

<sup>45</sup>See *ibid.*, 26. Kilmartin would go beyond this passing statement as his theological thoughts become more mature, especially with his conversation with European theologians.

<sup>46</sup>See *ibid.*, 5.

<sup>47</sup>Ibid., 6.

<sup>48</sup>See *ibid.*, 5.

<sup>49</sup>Ibid., 6.

<sup>50</sup>See *ibid.*, 7.

description of sanctification thus underscores the need for the sacraments in the life of Christians, for through the sacraments the glorified Christ continues to do the salvific work which he did in his humanity on earth.<sup>51</sup>

[The sacraments] effect a personal communion between the living Kyrios and the recipient, and thus a participation in the grace of redemption. . . . Without the sacraments our contact with Christ would be only in faith. The human dimension of the Incarnate Lord would be lost. But God in His salvific activity remains faithful to His original plan. He yet offers the Kingdom of God in earthly form: in the sacraments of the Church—the place where man obtains personal communion with Christ and, in Him, with the Trinity.<sup>52</sup>

In this text, Kilmartin does not spell out how this communion with the Trinity is achieved other than just stating that it is through the relation of Christ to the Trinity. Neither does he give a detailed treatment of the role of the Holy Spirit in the action of the sacraments other than saying that the “bestowal of the grace is the work of the Holy Spirit.”<sup>53</sup> However, he does make two references to the Spirit: first, the sanctifying activity of the Spirit in the words of the sacraments; second, the communication of the Spirit as the completion of the redemptive work of Christ in John’s theology of redemption (John 7:39, 19:30).<sup>54</sup>

Kilmartin’s interest rather lies in emphasizing the significance of the participation of the faithful in the liturgical action of the sacraments. But here too he does not adequately explicate how this participation is made possible other than referring to the common priesthood that qualifies this participation.<sup>55</sup>

---

<sup>51</sup>See *ibid.*

<sup>52</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>53</sup>*Ibid.*, 13.

<sup>54</sup>See *ibid.*, 6, 12, 14-15.

<sup>55</sup>Kilmartin will later pursue a systematic theological explanation, especially pneumatological, for believers’ participation in the unique, personal, incommunicable priesthood in relation to eucharistic

In its canons on the sacraments in general, the Council of Trent defined the efficacy of the sacraments as *ex opere operato*.<sup>56</sup> This expression originally meant that sacramental efficacy is guaranteed or sacramental grace is conferred on the recipient by the fact that sacraments are God's abiding promise of grace of the new and eternal covenant made in Christ, *opus Christi*, and by the fact that the rite is performed, that is, the accomplishment of the sacramental sign by the Church as such.<sup>57</sup> God has related his grace to the sacramental sign and established the connection between sign of grace and the grace signified.<sup>58</sup> "The sign is therefore a cause of what it signifies by being the way in which what is signified effects itself [or becomes present]."<sup>59</sup> There was no expressive disconnect established between *ex opere operato* and *ex opere operantis* in so far as a sacrament was considered to be a sign-action.<sup>60</sup> In other words, recipients' dispositions form the *opus operans* which is expressed by the sacramental sign-action in so far as it depends on the subject. In *Mediator Dei*, Pius XII insists this relation between the *ex opere operato* efficacy and the *opus*

---

participation.

<sup>56</sup>See Council of Trent, Session 7, Canon 8 in H. J. Schroeder, trans. *The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent* (Rockford, Illinois: Tan Books and Publishers, Inc., 1978), 52. It is worth noting that Trent's use of *ex opere operato* was primarily intended to oppose those who denied the objective mediation of grace through the sacraments of the Church.

<sup>57</sup>See Colman E. O'Neill, *Opus Operans, Opus Operatum: A Thomistic Interpretation of a Sacramental Formula* (Washington: International Pontifical Athenaeum "Angelicum," 1958), hereafter *Opus Operans, Opus Operatum*. This book, which is the point of reference in this dissertation, is an extract of Colman E. O'Neill, "The Role of the Recipient and Sacramental Signification," *The Thomist* 21 (1958): 257-301, 508-540. Edward Schillebeeckx, *Christ the Sacrament of the Encounter with God* (New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1963), 82-89; Karl Rahner, *The Church and the Sacraments* (New York: Herder and Herder, 1963), 24-74.

<sup>58</sup>See Rahner, *The Church and the Sacraments*, 25.

<sup>59</sup>*Ibid.*, 38.

<sup>60</sup>See O'Neill, *Opus Operans, Opus Operatum*, 42; Rahner, *The Church and the Sacraments*, 25, 34.

*operantis* of the minister and recipients of the sacraments.<sup>61</sup> The notion of sacraments as signs of faith demonstrates that the act of the reception of the sacraments is an act of worship by both the subject and the minister.<sup>62</sup> Thus the sacraments, as acts of worship, determine a relation of the acts of the dispositions of the subject to the sacraments considered as signs or *opus operatum*.<sup>63</sup> This whole concept of *ex opere operato* was often overlooked by post-Tridentine Scholastic theology until the twentieth century. Scholastic theology made a separation between *ex opere operato* and *ex opere operantis*, and such a distinction simply implied that sacraments confer grace from the work performed or a built-in efficacy of a sacrament properly conferred. This understanding, in turn, meant that neither the work of the minister nor the dispositions of the recipient play any determining roles in conferring grace. As a result, the theological content of *ex opere operato* was frequently equated with one element of sacramentalism, the valid administration of a sacrament. Kilmartin realized that this purely juridical interpretation of *ex opere operato* needed theological sharpening since it was insufficient to express the way the Church approached the sacraments. Hence he makes adjustments to the Tridentine definition of the efficacy of the sacraments as follows.

“Though the sacraments are efficacious independently of the meritorious actions of the

---

<sup>61</sup>See Pius XII, *Mediator Dei*, 36.

<sup>62</sup>By integrating to its explanation the function of the faith of the Church in relating the sacramental sign to the salvific will of God, it can be said that a sacrament, which is worthily administered and received, is a sign of faith of the Church and of the subject and minister. In other words, a valid sacrament is a common act of worship of the “whole Church.” A sacrament is fruitful if it allows to certain degree a personal act of the worship of the subject of the sacrament. This full notion of the sacraments is what Aquinas means when he says that sacraments pertain to divine worship. See O’Neill, *Opus Operans, Opus Operatum*, 46, 52-53. Also see Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologia*, vol. 2, trans. Fathers of the English Dominican Province (New York: Benzinger Brothers, Inc., 1947), III, q.61, a.4; q.63, a.2.

<sup>63</sup>See O’Neill, *Opus Operans, Opus Operatum*, 46, 55.

minister or subject, this does not mean that they are totally independent of the human activity of the one who confers or receives the sacrament.”<sup>64</sup> Kilmartin thus seeks to integrate the two sacramental concepts, *ex opere operato* and *ex opere operantis*, in the sacramental action without belittling the merits of Christ that causes the sacraments to work *ex opere operato*.<sup>65</sup> For his emphasis on the merit of Christ in relation to the efficacy of the sacraments, Kilmartin is dependent on Thomas Aquinas, for whom the efficacy of the sacraments derives from the merit of the passion of Christ. Kilmartin asserts that the efficacy of the sacraments does not depend on the action of the minister or the recipients, but on the acts of Christ.<sup>66</sup> At the same time, Kilmartin emphasizes the specific dispositions required of the recipients, besides the requisite intention to receive the sacraments, as necessary conditions for the fruitful reception of the sacraments.<sup>67</sup> Such dispositions are not meritorious of the grace received in the rite, but they determine the fullness of the share in the divine life received

---

<sup>64</sup>Kilmartin, *Sacraments*, 21. Also see Rahner, *The Church and the Sacraments*, 26.

<sup>65</sup>This act of integration is an early indication of Kilmartin’s theological method that he would employ for his future eucharistic theology. It is important to note that Kilmartin will later integrate the work of the Holy Spirit to the Christological element in order to argue for the full meaning of the term *ex opere operato* with regard to the actualization of the sacraments and the sanctification of the subjects of the sacraments. See Edward J. Kilmartin, “Ex Opere Operato” in *The New Catholic Encyclopedia* 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. vol. 5 (Detroit: Gale, 2003), 501; Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 231.

<sup>66</sup>See Kilmartin, *Sacraments*, 20.

<sup>67</sup>The disposition required for “the sacraments of the dead” is faith, hope, and contrition of heart of the sin committed and for “the sacraments of the living” is the state of grace. See *ibid.*, 21. Also see O’Neill, *Opus Operans, Opus Operatum*, 45. Kilmartin asserts that the absence of these necessary dispositions rules out the reception of sacrament as efficacious sign of grace. Sacraments are practical signs of sanctification which signify that grace is offered here and now. Therefore, the reception of the sacraments is, by its very nature, a protestation of faith, hope, and love in God. In other words, the recipient must have the attitude of Christ. See Kilmartin, *Sacraments*, 21-22. Elsewhere Kilmartin states, “God obliges Himself to give the graces of Redemption in a manner befitting the state and condition of each one [believer] implicated in the offering of the Mass.” Edward J. Kilmartin, “Eucharist as Sacrifice,” *The New Catholic Encyclopedia* 5 (New York: McGraw Hill, 1967), 614-615.

through the grace of the sacraments.<sup>68</sup> Accordingly, the sacraments require the necessary response on the part of the individual to the bestowal of grace because, according to Kilmartin, sacraments are essentially *katabatic-anabatic* events of engagement between God and human persons.<sup>69</sup> Kilmartin asserts that the sacraments “have the existence of interpersonal signs—of acts by which one person communicates with another. Involved in the sphere of personal encounter, they demand a human response by the one to whom the sign is directed.”<sup>70</sup> Kilmartin’s insistence on this interpersonal encounter in the sacraments is strengthened by his assertion that

because the reception of the sacraments is the decisive, crucial act of the Christian as Christian, there is demanded, in the ordinary course of events, an acute awareness and fervent devotion on the part of the subject. If the sacraments are not to be relegated to the shallows of lifeless formalism, they must ever bear the mark of personal engagement.<sup>71</sup>

The sacraments thus continue the offer and acceptance of the divine self-communication accomplished once and for in Christ. They are acts of the glorified Christ’s earthly worship of the Father and of the liturgical assembly’s worship in the Church. Christ’s worship, which consists in his total self offering to the Father’s love and in sanctifying the participants of the sacramental rite by allowing them to participate in his life, death, and resurrection is re-presented, that is, made present, in the sacramental celebrations. Accordingly, Christ’s acceptance of and response to the divine self-communication becomes accessible for personal appropriation by the members of the liturgical assembly. At the same

---

<sup>68</sup>See Kilmartin, *Sacraments*, 21. Also see O’Neill, *Opus Operans, Opus Operatum*, 45.

<sup>69</sup>See Kilmartin, *Sacraments*, passim. Also see Rahner, *The Church and the Sacraments*, 33.

<sup>70</sup>Kilmartin, *Sacraments*, 23.

<sup>71</sup>*Ibid.*, 23-24.

time, the sacraments are also signs of the future glory of the definitive union of humankind with the Trinity in Christ and the worship offered by the redeemed race with Christ for all eternity.<sup>72</sup> Finally, Kilmartin points out that any tendency to consider sacraments as impersonal or “thingly” things is to be avoided. They are not magical infusion of grace into the soul. Nor are they easy ways to salvation in the sense that they dispense from the personal effort that is demanded outside the scope of the sacraments for the grace of reconciliation and inner union with the Trinity.<sup>73</sup>

Kilmartin continues the themes of participation of the faithful and the role of the Holy Spirit in his text: “Patristic Views of Sacramental Sanctity.” Although these themes are treated within the context of the baptismal liturgy, they have eucharistic implications, as we will see in the following paragraphs. Kilmartin argues that according to the Pauline theology, sanctification of human persons involves a participation in the *mysterion* of the redemptive plan of God which reached its height in the union of Christ with redeemed humankind. The sanctification of humankind is effected by a participation in the *mysterion* of salvation that takes place in us through the sacramental rites of the Church, especially in Baptism and Eucharist.<sup>74</sup> By means of this participation, conformity to Christ is effected by the sacrament. In his examination of the patristic writings of the first four centuries, Kilmartin reported that the Church Fathers’ understanding of sacramental sanctification is essentially that of St. Paul, as described above.<sup>75</sup> St. Leo the Great echoed the Pauline doctrine of the sacramental

---

<sup>72</sup>See *ibid.*, 24.

<sup>73</sup>See *ibid.*, 22-23.

<sup>74</sup>See Kilmartin, “Patristic Views of Sacramental Sanctity,” 59.

<sup>75</sup>However, Kilmartin does point out that this Pauline understanding of Baptism was not always

economy of salvation in this way: after Christ's ascension, the sacraments make present Christ and his redemptive work and lead the participants to a share in the life, death, and glory of the Lord in the mystery celebration.<sup>76</sup>

The Fathers of the Church not only related this participation to the visible acts of the Church but they also emphasized the representative function of the Church in making this participation available for all. This re-presentative function of the Church was operative first in the sacrament of Baptism whose effect was, above all, spiritual rather than juridical—a participation in the mystery of salvation. The Fathers of the Church stressed that the life that began with Baptism was nourished by the Eucharist.<sup>77</sup> Christian existence was thus characterized as sacramental and related to the sacramental activities of the Church—an existence continually determined by an encounter with the redemptive work of Christ operative here and now. In and by an encounter with the *mysterion* of Christ's redemptive work, through the mediation of the visible Church, Christians were sanctified. This life they received was a life flowing forth from the community in its liturgical celebrations.<sup>78</sup> In the process of sanctification, the Fathers of the Church insisted upon personal effort, “a personal effort which always draws its supernatural strength and inspiration from the liturgy.”<sup>79</sup> In the midst of the community, Christ was understood to be re-presenting anew the redemptive work by word and gesture in order that Christians might be sanctified by actively taking part,

---

understood or rather emphasized by the Church Fathers until the fourth century. Rather, it was a slow process. At different periods of the first four centuries, the Church Fathers emphasized various aspects of Baptism such as forgiveness of sin, presence of Christ in the Christian, gift of the Holy Spirit, taking part in the Paschal Mystery, and configuration to Christ. See *ibid.*, *passim*.

<sup>76</sup>See *ibid.*, 60.

<sup>77</sup>See *ibid.*, 60-62.

<sup>78</sup>See *ibid.*, 60-61.

<sup>79</sup>*Ibid.*, 62.



by cooperating in the mighty work of redeeming the world.<sup>80</sup> Sacramental sanctification thus refers to “sanctification resulting from a participation in the redemptive work of Christ effected through the *re-presentative* power of the Church.”<sup>81</sup>

The Fathers of the Church recognized the unique place of the cultic rites of the Church that served as means for a fruitful encounter with the Lord. Through the sacraments, the human person was understood to have received “the new life or growth in that life.”<sup>82</sup> The Fathers mention the role of the Holy Spirit and his help in living this new life.<sup>83</sup> The gift of the Spirit makes Christians lead a new life free from sin, whereby he/she is made spiritual.<sup>84</sup> The possession of the Spirit is the first stage in the process of making a Christian the image and likeness of God. The Spirit is the means of acquiring spiritual growth, the point of departure in the process of divinization. Kilmartin’s study of the writings of St. Irenaeus revealed to him that the union of Christians with the Holy Spirit is “a union resulting in union with the Father and Son.”<sup>85</sup>

By the fourth century, Kilmartin reported, the Pauline teaching about baptismal sanctification being a configuration to the death and resurrection of Christ and the consequent indwelling of Christ was brought into prominence. The baptismal grace was understood to be the gift of Christ himself and his redemptive work mediated through the Holy Spirit. Thus the significant New Testament concept of filial adoption was developed to

---

<sup>80</sup>See *ibid.*, 61.

<sup>81</sup>*Ibid.*, 62.

<sup>82</sup>See *ibid.*, 63.

<sup>83</sup>See *ibid.*, 65.

<sup>84</sup>See *ibid.*, 65-66.

<sup>85</sup>*Ibid.*, 67.

its fullness: configuration to Christ and a life of love in the Spirit.<sup>86</sup> This conformity to Christ effected by baptism introduced the Christians into the history of salvation, as action related to future growth *in Christum* who is already present in the soul. Thus passage from death to life was not considered to be something purely eschatological, for it had actually happened in Baptism. Nor was it considered to have been completed in all its actuality with the rite of Baptism. On the contrary, it was understood to be taking place constantly in the lives of Christians. The function of the other sacraments, especially the Eucharist, in this context, would be to expand this growth in or resemblance to Christ in the sense of realizing in the Christians a further aspect of the personal life of Christ.<sup>87</sup>

Kilmartin reported that the patristic view of sacramental sanctification is in line with that of Scripture. That is, the economy of salvation is presented as a process of redemption still in progress; it began with creation and will end with the second coming of Christ.<sup>88</sup> Accordingly, the function of Baptism “is not so much to bestow on us the fruit of the Cross, as to crucify us with Christ.”<sup>89</sup> The sacraments are the means by which the Christians, configured more perfectly to Christ, are intimately brought into the process of Christ.<sup>90</sup> This configuration to Christ, enacted in the initiation rites, takes place primarily because of the work of the Holy Spirit in giving the participants the “Spirit of Christ.” Kilmartin asserts that “having been incorporated into Christ, the Christian, sharing the same Spirit, shares also the

---

<sup>86</sup>See *ibid.*, 79-80.

<sup>87</sup>See *ibid.*, 65, 79-81.

<sup>88</sup>See *ibid.*, 81-82.

<sup>89</sup>*Ibid.*, 82.

<sup>90</sup>See *ibid.*

same drive of the Spirit which urges the Christ within him to save the world about him.”<sup>91</sup>

Sacramental participation, then, becomes the earthly means whereby, motivated by the Spirit, the faithful enter into the same ministry of Christ, not simply as passive recipients of grace, but as agents of the gospel, acting and living in a world graced by the Spirit. Kilmartin concludes that “sacramental grace is a special participation in the life of Christ, an elevation of the whole being, whereby the Christian, according to his grade, is enabled to share actively in the very redemptive work of Christ . . . .”<sup>92</sup>

Kilmartin notes that the patristic understanding of sacramental sanctification is thus different from that of the Scholastic theology of the Western Church, which viewed the work of Christ completed on Calvary while the fruits of it are applied in the sacramental celebrations of the Church. The Fathers of the Church considered redemption as a continuing work of God, accomplished through the operation of the Holy Spirit. By incorporating the Christians into Christ’s life, the Holy Spirit acts to save the world around the Christians. While this salvation is realized through the whole life of the individual Christian, it is accomplished especially through the liturgical celebrations.<sup>93</sup> Kilmartin thus emphasized the Church Fathers’ teaching about the activity of the Holy Spirit as having a personal role in the sanctification/participation of the human persons.

In his later works, Kilmartin would continue to pursue further the concept of eucharistic participation with respect to the proper and personal mission of the Holy Spirit. It

---

<sup>91</sup>Ibid.

<sup>92</sup>Ibid.

<sup>93</sup>See *ibid.*

would not only determine and characterize his eucharistic theology but also would make it distinct and relevant.

#### “New Theological Components” of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy

According to Kilmartin, “the fact that the liturgy took first place on the agenda of the Second Vatican Council was, at least partially, the result of a new awareness in theological circles of the importance of liturgy in the life of the Church.”<sup>94</sup> This importance had, as noted previously, papal support.<sup>95</sup> Moreover, the twentieth-century-developments in scriptural, patristic, liturgical revival and the pastoral appreciation of the liturgy as the Church’s official prayer, especially through active participation,<sup>96</sup> led to the Council’s description of the liturgy. The renewed understanding of the sacramental breadth of the economy of salvation and the new consciousness of the mystery dimension of liturgical celebrations, resulting from the rediscovery of the truth that Christ is actively present in all liturgical activity, Kilmartin writes, had its effect on the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy.<sup>97</sup> The Council integrated these insights into its doctrinal approach to the liturgy and made them the teachings of the Church.<sup>98</sup> Kilmartin believed that the Council’s treatment of sacramental sanctification challenged theologians to move beyond Scholastic theology’s teachings on the

---

<sup>94</sup>Edward J. Kilmartin, “The Sacred Liturgy: Reform and Renewal,” in *Remembering the Future of Vatican II and Tomorrow’s Agenda*, ed., Carl A. Last (New York: Paulist Press, 1983), 34, hereafter “Sacred Liturgy.”

<sup>95</sup>In his *Motu proprio, Tra le sollecitudini, Acta Sanctae Sedis* 36 (1903): 329-339, Pius X taught that primary and indispensable source of the true Christian spirit is active participation in the liturgy. This very teaching is echoed almost in a similar fashion in *Constitutio de sacra Liturgia (Sacrosanctum Concilium)*, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 56 (1964): 14, hereafter *Sacrosanctum Concilium*.

<sup>96</sup>See Irwin, *Context and Text*, 19.

<sup>97</sup>See Kilmartin, “Modern Approach,” 86.

<sup>98</sup>See Kilmartin, “Sacred Liturgy,” 35.

sacraments.<sup>99</sup> Key passages of these teachings of the Council are found in *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, also in *Lumen Gentium*, which underscore a theology that is pastorally oriented to serve as the basis of the renewal of the Church's liturgical life and to describe the Church as a kind of sacrament, most truly visible in its liturgical celebrations.<sup>100</sup>

According to Kilmartin, the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy's main importance lies in its pastorally oriented theological description of the liturgy,<sup>101</sup> which connects the intrinsic unity of liturgy and sacraments and underscores the role of the participants as an expression of the Church at worship. These insights are meant to promote a more effective active participation of the worshipping community.<sup>102</sup> The Council, therefore, established norms and directives<sup>103</sup> which, Kilmartin stresses, derive from the nature of the Church, the liturgy, and their relationship to one another and are understandable only from the theology contained in the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy.<sup>104</sup>

The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy places important emphasis on the theological dimensions of liturgy. It describes the liturgy in terms of the paschal mystery and affirms the sacramental dimension of the economy of salvation in a Trinitarian context:

[W]hen the fullness of time had come [God] sent his Son, the Word made flesh, anointed by the Holy Spirit, to preach the Gospel to the poor, to heal the contrite of heart, to be a bodily and spiritual medicine: the Mediator between God and man. For his humanity united with the Person of the Word was the instrument of our salvation. Therefore, "in

---

<sup>99</sup>See *ibid.*, 34; Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 13.

<sup>100</sup>See *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 2, 5-11, 14, 59; *Lumen Gentium*, 1, 11, 26, 48.

<sup>101</sup>See Kilmartin, "Sacred Liturgy," 34.

<sup>102</sup>See *ibid.*, 34-35.

<sup>103</sup>See *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 41-46.

<sup>104</sup>See Edward J. Kilmartin, "The Achievement of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*," *Emmanuel* 84 (1978): 567; *idem*, "Sacred Liturgy," 34-35.

Christ the perfect achievement of our reconciliation came forth and the fullness of divine worship was given to us.”<sup>105</sup>

The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy underscores that the redeeming work of Christ, achieved through the paschal mystery, results in the sacrament of the Church,<sup>106</sup> which continues the work of salvation “through the sacrifice and sacraments.”<sup>107</sup> Accordingly, the heart of the theology contained in the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, Kilmartin writes, “is the work of redemption begun by God the Father and fully revealed and realized in the self-offering of Jesus—his death, resurrection, glorification.”<sup>108</sup> Since salvation for human persons consists in the free acceptance of the self-communication of God, Jesus Christ, as head of humankind, totally offered himself to the Father in order to receive the full communication of the Father’s personal love. Glorified by the Father, Jesus sent the Holy Spirit from the Father to the world to be the abiding source by which Christians are drawn into union with Christ and with the Father. In this Trinitarian work of salvation, the Holy Spirit unites human persons with Christ as they offer their lives to receive the Father’s gratuitous self-communication. The Spirit inspires the Church to express its life of faith in fixed forms that correspond to the very content of the life of faith: the self-communication of the Father, through Christ, in the Holy Spirit. Christ’s saving response to the Father’s love is continued and celebrated in the liturgy of the Church. The liturgy, thus, manifests the action of Christ and the Spirit in the Christian life and is the means by which the Church

---

<sup>105</sup>*Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 5.

<sup>106</sup>See *ibid.*

<sup>107</sup>*Ibid.*, 6.

<sup>108</sup>Kilmartin, “Sacred Liturgy,” 35.

consciously accepts that action. This active acceptance of the divine gift is the “summit and source” of all the Church’s life. The Church offers God acceptable worship and constitutes the Church as sacrament of salvation for the world. Christians, through their conscious, active participation in the liturgy, come to share in the paschal mystery as well as, by way of anticipation, in the fulfillment of the Kingdom of God yet to come. Hence, the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy teaches that the paschal mystery is not only the cause of salvation of the world, Kilmartin writes, but also the origin, foundation, and goal of the Church; the gathering of all into Christ and into union with the Father in the Spirit. Strengthening and promoting this participation is the fundamental principle of the liturgical reform undertaken by the Council. This participation in the paschal mystery on the part of believers has the task of growing into the fullness of Christ by continually dying and rising with him in the power of the Spirit so that God may be all in all. The liturgical activity of the Church has the function of revealing and realizing the work of redemption in partnership with Christ who is its active head. Thus, the Church’s liturgy is a co-working of Christ and the Church. Christ is in the liturgical activity to associate the Church with himself in the work of redemption. In the liturgy, sanctified in and through Christ, believers offer acceptable worship to the Father.<sup>109</sup>

Since liturgical celebration is a response of faith made to the self-communication of God, it is primarily a prayer. This prayer is made in union with Christ who, in the power of the Spirit, is the source of the prayer of faith.<sup>110</sup> This understanding is involved in the

---

<sup>109</sup>See *ibid.*, 35-37; *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 2, 5-12, 14.

<sup>110</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 14.

Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy's stress on liturgy as the type of activity that moves the participants so that "their minds are raised to God."<sup>111</sup> The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy teaches that liturgical celebration is an event of faith. The sacraments are truly called "sacraments of faith," for sacraments "not only presuppose faith, but by words and objects they also nourish, strengthen, and express it."<sup>112</sup> Accordingly, in sacraments the conviction of the faith of the Church is expressed.<sup>113</sup> The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy thus emphasized the intimate relationship between faith and sacraments and provided the basis for understanding the formulas of the essential sacramental rites as primarily prayer.

Since liturgy is the most expressive manifestation and realization of the work of redemption, it is the "summit and source" of all the Church's activity. Consequently, liturgy has meaning in itself; it is not simply a means to an end. It is the activity in which the holy people of God is concretely manifested and realized; it is a real anticipation of the final gathering of all in Christ.<sup>114</sup> Here the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy underscores the interrelationship between liturgy and ecclesiology. The liturgical celebration, by virtue of its mystery character, is the realization of the Church. Kilmartin singled out the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy's explanation of the ecclesiological significance of the liturgy as its most important, permanent achievement of Vatican II.<sup>115</sup> The celebration of the Eucharist

---

<sup>111</sup>*Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 33. Also see Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 46.

<sup>112</sup>*Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 59.

<sup>113</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 45.

<sup>114</sup>See Kilmartin, "Sacred Liturgy," 36-37.

<sup>115</sup>See Kilmartin, "The Achievement of Sacrosanctum Concilium," 565.



expresses and realizes this actualization of the Church in the most profound way, hence the very summit of all ecclesiastical activity.<sup>116</sup>

Kilmartin argues that the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy's description of the liturgy as the most important activity of the Church has new elements as compared to that of post-Reformation theology. Scholastic theology based the importance of worship on the argument that "worship of God is the highest activity of the personal creature. But the Church officially fulfills this exercise of the virtue of religion in its liturgy. Therefore liturgy is the highest activity of the Church from which it can expect divine blessings."<sup>117</sup> But, according to the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, the possibility of true worship begins with God's action. God's gift of the life of faith, "in which we are so grasped by Christ that we become one with him and he with us,"<sup>118</sup> undergirds Christian worship. This worship of God derives "from Christ's present activity in the worshippers in the Spirit."<sup>119</sup> In this perspective, the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy describes liturgy, first of all, as God's action sanctifying the community and, second of all, as the response of believers. This double movement, which takes place in and through the whole liturgical activity, constitutes the theological dimension of the liturgy and its peculiar value.<sup>120</sup> The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy's treatment of the paschal mystery thus begins with the theocentric concept of the divine saving action. In other words, it does not begin from the anthropocentric concept which sees liturgy as the human rendering of worship to God. In this sense, Kilmartin notes

---

<sup>116</sup>See Kilmartin, "Sacred Liturgy," 37.

<sup>117</sup>Ibid., 37-38.

<sup>118</sup>Ibid., 38.

<sup>119</sup>Ibid.

<sup>120</sup>See *ibid.*, 38.

that the Council's treatment of the paschal mystery stands in sharp contrast to the use of the language used in Pius XII's *Mystici Corporis Christi* and *Mediator Dei*. It also stands against the Scholastic and Reformation theology's description of communal worship as merely expressing thanksgiving for what God has already done for the salvation of the world. According to Kilmartin, such emphasis on fulfilling a natural-law obligation has been a major obstacle for a new theology of sacraments.<sup>121</sup> Understood in this way, worship, then, is dialogical; in the entire liturgical event God is acting and the community is responding in faith. In the liturgy, God continues to offer self-communication in Jesus, and the community continues to respond after the manner of Jesus' answer of self-sacrificing love of the Father. The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy thus treats Christian worship within the framework of the divine initiative, a *katabatic* motion of God's love, and the human response, an *anabatic* offering of self, made perfect in Christ and continued in the Church. This presentation suggests that the mystery presence should be described in a way that involves a dynamic of dialogue between God and humankind. This description and understanding of the liturgy mark a significant focus of change from that of the manual theology.

According to Kilmartin, the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy's teaching of the liturgy as an activity of the whole Church is understood in a new perspective. Scholastic theology understood the liturgy as the activity of those deputed officially to act in the name of the whole Church. The laity participated only indirectly, by their intention and devotion, in the work done by the ordained minister.<sup>122</sup> The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, on the

---

<sup>121</sup>See Kilmartin, "Sacraments as Liturgy of the Church," 538-539.

<sup>122</sup>Pius XII reiterated this view by stating that the ordained alone are qualified "to perform those

other hand, makes the visible and concrete assembly the immediate subject of the liturgical act.<sup>123</sup> Liturgical services “are celebrations of the Church . . . namely, the whole people of God united and ordered around their bishops.”<sup>124</sup> This means that the divine self-communication is mediated through the active interrelationship of the entire assembly that celebrates the liturgy.<sup>125</sup>

Through the works of Casel and the controversy it generated in the early part of the twentieth century, Kilmartin writes, attention was drawn to the various modes of Christ’s personal presence and that of his saving acts in the liturgy.<sup>126</sup> Pius XII referred to this theme in *Mystici Corporis Christi* (1943) where he spoke of the personal activity of Christ in the whole life of the Church with special reference to the sacraments.<sup>127</sup> Later in *Mediator Dei* (1947), he developed it further,<sup>128</sup> which served as the basis for the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy’s presentation of the liturgical presence of Christ and his saving deeds.<sup>129</sup> Both of these latter documents, Kilmartin notes, begin with Christ’s presence in the

---

official acts of religion by which men are sanctified and God is duly glorified.” Pius XII, *Mediator Dei*, 42. Also see Kilmartin, “Sacred Liturgy,” 38-39.

<sup>123</sup>See Kilmartin, “Sacred Liturgy,” 38-39; idem, “The Achievement of Sacrosanctum Concilium,” 566. Kilmartin judges that this new presumption of the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy helped to correct the traditional Catholic Scholastic theology’s understanding concerning the immediate subject of the liturgy as the holy members of the Church throughout the world who unite themselves with the presiding minister by their intention. Moreover, Kilmartin argues that there is no ground for the assertion that the faith of the universal Church is immediately and directly involved in the concrete liturgical celebration of the local assembly. See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 15, 244.

<sup>124</sup>*Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 26.

<sup>125</sup>This understanding corrects the role of the minister as the mediator between laity and God, as implied in some Scholastic theologies.

<sup>126</sup>See Kilmartin, “Modern Approach,” 86. Also see Edward J. Kilmartin, “Christ’s Presence in the Liturgy,” *Emmanuel* 82 (1976): 237.

<sup>127</sup>See Pius XII, *Mystici Corporis Christi*, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 35 (1943): 193-248, English translation in *The Papal Encyclicals 1939-1958* (Ann Arbor: The Pierian Press, 1990), 37-63, here 50, 53.

<sup>128</sup>See Pius XII, *Mediator Dei*, 19-20.

<sup>129</sup>See *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 7.

eucharistic sacrifice in the person of the minister and make no attempt at a theological ordering of the modes of the presence of Christ. In *Mysterium Fidei* (1965), Paul VI places the liturgical presence of Christ in relation to the entire life of faith of the Church. Christ's liturgical presence is a special manifestation of Christ's saving presence in the entire life of the Church. Although Paul VI refers to the liturgical presence of Christ presented in the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, he develops it from the view point of Matthew 18:20 which speaks of Christ's presence in the believing community.<sup>130</sup> The Sacred Congregation of Rites' *Eucharisticum Mysterium* (1967) picks up this way of presenting Christ's presence and affirms that Christ's presence in the liturgical assembly, by faith, is the primary mode of his liturgical presence.<sup>131</sup> The other modes of liturgical presence are to be ordered to this presence in the assembly. Kilmartin notes that although *Mysterium Fidei* and *Eucharisticum Mysterium* represent the beginning of a theological ordering of the modes of the liturgical presence of Christ, they do not present a detailed theological ordering of how these modes of presence are related to one another.<sup>132</sup>

The Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy's description of the liturgy, according to Kilmartin, offered new understanding concerning the intrinsic relationship of liturgy and

---

<sup>130</sup>See Paul VI, *Mysterium Fidei*, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 57 (1965): 753-774, English translation in *The Papal Encyclicals* 1958-1981 (Ann Arbor: The Pierian Press, 1990), 165-177, here 35-39.

<sup>131</sup>This document gathered together the teachings of the modes of Christ's liturgical presence presented in *Sacrosanctum Concilium* and *Mysterium Fidei*. The order of the manifold presence of Christ in this document is in line with that of the *Mysterium Fidei*. However, the emphasis has shifted to Christ's presence by faith in the liturgical assembly before any other mode of presence. See Sacred Congregation of Rites, *Eucharisticum Mysterium*, ed., Austin Flannery, (Bandra, Bombay: St. Paul Publications, 1989), 113-114.

<sup>132</sup>For a systematic presentation of various modes of Christ's liturgical presence, see Kilmartin, "Modern Approach," 87-93; idem, "Christ's Presence in the Liturgy," 237-243. Also see Karl Rahner, "The Presence of the Lord in the Christian Community at Worship," *Theological Investigations* 10, trans. David Bourke (New York: The Seabury Press, 1977), 71-83.

sacraments. Scholastic theology viewed liturgy as an appropriate means of preparation for the reception of God's offer of grace in the sacraments,<sup>133</sup> whereas, the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy overcomes this "unreflective" distinction between liturgy as the official exercise of the virtue of religion and the sacraments as means of salvation.<sup>134</sup> Rather, in the entire liturgical activity God, in Christ is communicating sanctification, and the community is responding in praise and thanksgiving.<sup>135</sup> In this connection, the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy refers to the various modes of real presence of Christ in the entire liturgical action by which Christ associates believers with himself in the work of salvation.<sup>136</sup> This teaching goes beyond the Scholastic theology's narrow description of Christ's static presence in the eucharistic species. Moreover, the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy emphasizes the importance of symbolic communication involved in the liturgical celebration. "It [the liturgy] involves the presentation of man's sanctification under the guise of signs perceptible by the senses and its accomplishment in ways appropriate to each of these signs."<sup>137</sup> In order that the liturgy may have its full effect, then, the faithful must be aware of what they are doing, and offer themselves to be configured to Christ's paschal mystery.<sup>138</sup> Thus they will come to "full, conscious, and active participation"<sup>139</sup> both in the liturgy and in the mystery that it celebrates. From this perspective, the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy recommends proper instruction of the faithful, adequate liturgical training of ministers, simplification of

---

<sup>133</sup>See Kilmartin, "Sacraments as Liturgy of the Church," 527.

<sup>134</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 7-8; idem, "Sacred Liturgy," 39.

<sup>135</sup>See Kilmartin, "Sacred Liturgy," 39.

<sup>136</sup>See *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 7.

<sup>137</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>138</sup>See *ibid.*, 11, 12.

<sup>139</sup>*Ibid.*, 14.

rites, and proper local liturgical adaptation. According to Kilmartin, the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy underscores the purpose of liturgy so as “to serve as transparency for the active presence of Christ and so to draw the community into personal union with him and his Paschal Mystery and into worship of the Father.”<sup>140</sup> In his writings, Kilmartin will repeatedly emphasize these various “newly” rediscovered liturgical elements presented in the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy.

### **Setting the Context for a Spirit-worked Active Participation From *Lex Orandi* and *Lex Credendi***

In this section I will begin with Kilmartin’s point of departure for his eucharistic theology—analysis of early eucharistic prayers. This analysis revealed to him the need to assert the role of the Spirit in the celebration of the Eucharist. Next I will elaborate Kilmartin’s investigation of the theology of the eucharistic sacrifice which urged him to identify the elements of the redemptive acts of Christ present within the context of the eucharistic celebration. Kilmartin will describe the assimilation of these sacrificial elements of Christ in the Spirit to be the active participation. Finally, I will conclude this section with the relationship between sacraments and salvation history.

### **Content and Function of the Early Eucharistic Prayers—Access to the Authentic Eucharistic Theology**

Kilmartin believes that the starting point for an authentic eucharistic theology is the analysis of the classical Eucharistic Prayers. The function of these prayers in the liturgy is

---

<sup>140</sup>Kilmartin, “Sacred Liturgy,” 39.

important for the interpretation of their meaning. Accordingly, attention must be given to both the content and function of these prayers since they mirror salvation history of the New Testament.

In the following pages, I will follow the order and consider the analysis of only those early Eucharistic Prayers which Kilmartin studied in three articles.<sup>141</sup> But I must begin with his interpretation of the symbolic actions of the Last Supper according to the New Testament texts.

### *New Testament Texts*

Kilmartin interprets the religious and cultic significance of the eucharistic words and actions of Jesus by looking at the various New Testament accounts of the Last Supper. Despite the similarities between the Jewish table prayers and the early Eucharistic Prayers, Kilmartin underscores an essential difference between them. He notes that “the act of eating bread at the beginning of a meal was considered by the Jews as establishing a table-fellowship, and it was a sign of union among the participants.”<sup>142</sup> But the Apostles’ sharing of the body and blood of Christ, he argues, signifies their intimate union with Christ which goes beyond the unity of table-fellowship implied in the usual Jewish table-meal context.<sup>143</sup> Because Jesus identifies the bread that he gives with his own body and invites the Apostles to

---

<sup>141</sup>Edward J. Kilmartin, “The Last Supper and the Earliest Eucharists of the Church,” *Concilium* 40 (1969): 19-25, hereafter “Last Supper”; idem, “The Eucharistic Prayer: Content and Function of Some Early Eucharistic Prayers,” in R. J. Clifford and G. W. MacRae, eds. *The Word in the World: Studies in Honor of F.J. Moriarty* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: 1973), 117-134, hereafter “Eucharistic Prayer”; idem, “Sacrificium Laudis: Content and Function of Early Eucharistic Prayers,” *Theological Studies* 35 (1974): 268-287, hereafter “Sacrificium Laudis.”

<sup>142</sup>Kilmartin, *The Eucharist in the Primitive Church*, 65.

<sup>143</sup>See *ibid.*; Kilmartin, “Last Supper,” 22.

eat it, there is implied a new meaning and significance in the sharing of the body of Christ.

The Apostles possibly understood the symbolism of the sharing of food and drink as a sign of union with the Father and among the participants themselves. But, based on his study on the eucharistic words and actions of Jesus at the Last Supper, Kilmartin asserts, “the food was not considered to be a symbol of the participants of the feast or of Yahweh . . . on the contrary, the bread is interpreted as Jesus’ person.”<sup>144</sup> Drinking the wine, identified with Jesus’ blood, would have been sacrilegious and foreign to the Jewish mentality. But, it is through the sharing of the blood of Christ that the Apostles could enter into a most intimate union with Jesus.<sup>145</sup> Kilmartin thus underscores the primitive Church’s understanding of the sacramental real presence of Christ in the eucharistic species.

Kilmartin asserts that the words and actions of Jesus, which interpret the meaning of the bread and wine, involve the establishment of the new covenant which signifies the redemptive act,<sup>146</sup> for “participation in this food signifies the bestowal of redemption on the participants.”<sup>147</sup> Furthermore, “this whole action (the words and gestures of Jesus), in turn, manifests the offering which Jesus makes of His life for men and the acceptance by the Father which makes the gift possible.”<sup>148</sup> This action of Jesus becomes a model for the community of believers, for it is an imperfect community which has the task of growing according to the ways of its Lord.<sup>149</sup>

---

<sup>144</sup>Kilmartin, *The Eucharist in the Primitive Church*, 66.

<sup>145</sup>See *ibid.*; Kilmartin, “Last Supper,” 22.

<sup>146</sup>See Kilmartin, *The Eucharist in the Primitive Church*, 66.

<sup>147</sup>*Ibid.*, 67.

<sup>148</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>149</sup>See Kilmartin, “Sacrificium Laudis,” 273.



Kilmartin argues that all the New Testament accounts of the Last Supper make clear that Jesus wished this rite of bread and cup to be repeated. Hence, he underscores the memorial command of Jesus “Do this in remembrance of me” and relates the memorial Passover feast to the memorial aspect of the Last Supper. He writes,

Since Jesus used the Old Pasch, or at least the setting of the Passover, as the point of departure for the establishment of the memorial banquet of the New Law, we should place the words and actions of Jesus in the atmosphere of the Jewish Passover feast in order to appreciate their meaning.<sup>150</sup>

The memorial character of the Passover feast involved the re-presentation, the reactualization of the redemptive activity of God manifested at the time of the Exodus and the consequent sharing in this event by the participants of this feast. Similarly, the Eucharist, as a memorial celebration, involves the re-presentation, the reactualization of the redemptive work of Jesus for the sake of the participants of this celebration. “Just as the Passover was a memorial of the redemptive work of Yahweh (Ex. 12:14; 13:3, 9; Deut. 16:3), so the Eucharist is the memorial of the salvific work of Jesus.”<sup>151</sup> Yet, Kilmartin goes beyond this similarity between them. He demonstrates that the Last Supper is distinct from the Passover feast by virtue of a sacramental real presence of both the redemptive action of Christ and Christ himself. The eucharistic action of Jesus signifies the redemptive act in its totality. In the prayers and actions of presenting the bread and wine at the Last Supper, Jesus “manifests the offering of obedience and love which is present in His soul: the essence of the redemptive

---

<sup>150</sup>Kilmartin, *The Eucharist in the Primitive Church*, 44.

<sup>151</sup>*Ibid.*, 69-70.

act.”<sup>152</sup> But redemption will be completed in history through the visible suffering and exaltation of Jesus which is ritually manifested at the Last Supper. Thus the Last Supper, as the anticipated action of Jesus’s self-offering on the cross, assumes a sacramental character because it effects what it signifies: the offering of Jesus and the acceptance by the Father. Kilmartin asserts that Jesus’ action at the Last Supper “is the efficacious anticipation in ritual form of the redemptive event which will have its historical fulfillment in the actual death and Resurrection of Jesus. Sacramentally Jesus is already the Christ at the Last Supper.”<sup>153</sup> The Last Supper expresses Jesus’ intention to establish a relationship between the bread and wine and his person in the context of a Jewish ritual. Thus the words and actions of Jesus become efficacious with his pronouncement and enactment. Kilmartin maintains that

by this bread and wine, now identified with his body and blood, Jesus mediates to the disciples not merely a share in the table blessing but more properly a share in the blessings derived from his “given body” and “given blood”: freedom from the power of sin and a new covenant union with God.<sup>154</sup>

By Jesus’ words and actions what is being memorialized and signified becomes truly present. Both redeemer and redemption are made present to the Apostles.<sup>155</sup> This presence is made manifest in the new covenant in Jesus who implores the Apostles to share in his body and blood until he comes again. The Eucharist is a memorial gift that Jesus makes of himself to the Father and to the Church. As a memorial gift to the Father, it is the objective re-presentation of the self-giving of Jesus which takes place in the Church. The Church is given

---

<sup>152</sup>Ibid., 65-66.

<sup>153</sup>Ibid., 68.

<sup>154</sup>Kilmartin, “Last Supper,” 22.

<sup>155</sup>See Kilmartin, *The Eucharist in the Primitive Church*, 68-69.

this memorial gift in order to actively associate itself with the offering made on its behalf and thus to experience its fruits. Kilmartin asserts:

It was not only at the Last Supper that Jesus included the visible community in the sacramental actualization of His covenant. The ritual act by which the Apostles were given a participation in the establishment of the covenant remains in the Church. The covenant of the New Law is re-presented each time the Eucharist is celebrated, and thereby Christians are given the opportunity of manifesting their membership in the covenant and deepening their participation in it.<sup>156</sup>

In his analysis of the Institution Narratives of the Synoptic Gospels and the Pauline letters, Kilmartin asserts that “despite obvious differences between the accounts, there is an essential kernel displaying a uniform relational system which must be found in all celebrations claiming to be conformed to the tradition of the night of betrayal.”<sup>157</sup> He refers this kernel to two points.<sup>158</sup> First, the unity of the participants is founded on their relation to God of the covenant. Second, the union between Jesus and the disciples is grounded on their common union with the Father. Hence, it is a union neither founded on Christ nor on the old covenant, but the union that results from the personal relationship of the disciples to Jesus. The union of the disciples to Jesus in the Institution accounts is founded on Jesus’ work as Servant, and this union “is based on their participation in his new relation to the Father sealed by his obedience ‘unto death, even death on a cross’ (Phil 2:8).”<sup>159</sup> Thus the redemptive work of Jesus is not only the means for the union of the disciples with Jesus but also the means for their union with the Father. From this point of view, Kilmartin argues that the

---

<sup>156</sup>Ibid., 73.

<sup>157</sup>Kilmartin, “Sacrificium Laudis,” 268.

<sup>158</sup>See *ibid.*, 269.

<sup>159</sup>Ibid., 270.

Eucharist of the Church must be related to the redemptive work of Jesus; participation in the redemptive work of Christ provides communion with the Father. Kilmartin emphasizes that the Eucharist of the Church is directed towards the mission of Christ as Servant of the Father, which is an important dimension for both the understanding of the Eucharist as sacrament and for the way Christians celebrate and live the Eucharist. The words of the prayer of Jesus have the content of “ordering the meal to the mission of Jesus.”<sup>160</sup> Christians who participate in the sacrament are to take part in the redemptive work of Christ in the world by virtue of their unity with Jesus and the Father. Kilmartin asserts,

The Lord’s Supper should represent the actual situation of the Church in the time between the past sacrificial action of Jesus and the future heavenly meal with the visible Lord. It should express the struggle with the “world” which is the lot of the Church united to the absent Lord and, simultaneously, the brotherly fellowship of the participants who are called to be Christ in person serving one another and the many for whom Christ died.<sup>161</sup>

### *Eucharistic Prayers*

Kilmartin notes that in the first century the Lord’s Supper began to take the form of a ritual sacrifice with the development of combined rites of bread and cup, resulting in a unified prayer, and the replacement of the Jewish Passover meal. Consequently, in the second century a distinction emerged in the Eucharistic Prayers between the offering of the sacrifice of praise and communion of the consecrated elements. Kilmartin writes that “an investigation of these prayers shows the gradual growth in the Church’s recognition that its

---

<sup>160</sup>Kilmartin, “Eucharistic Prayer,” 118.

<sup>161</sup>Kilmartin, “Sacrificium Laudis,” 272.

‘sacrifice of praise to God, that is, the fruit of lips that acknowledge His name’ (Heb 10:15) was primarily accomplished in the Eucharistic Prayer.”<sup>162</sup>

In his analysis of the eucharistic texts of the *Didache*,<sup>163</sup> Kilmartin asserts that the prayers proclaim the Eucharist as the representation of the unique Incarnation of the Logos. “Hence *Did.*10.2 shows an incarnational-oriented view.”<sup>164</sup> The *Didache* community understood Jesus as the fulfillment of Wisdom. The community grounds its understanding of Wisdom on the tree of life and knowledge described in the book of Genesis (2:9). This understanding, Kilmartin argues, exercised a direct influence on *Didache* 9.3 which reads, “We give thanks to you, our Father, for the life and knowledge which you made known to us through your child Jesus; glory to you for evermore.”<sup>165</sup> Moreover, Kilmartin continues,

In Gen 2:9, life and knowledge are presented as actual food provided by the trees of life and knowledge. The fact that “immortality” is provided by the tree of life in Gen 3:19, and is linked together with “knowledge and faith” as fruit of the meal in *Did.* 10.2, supports the opinion that the eucharistic food is recognized as the renewal of the gifts of paradise. Hence it is understandably described as “holy” (9.5) and “spiritual” (10.3b).<sup>166</sup>

The *Didache* community thus links immortality and knowledge, the gifts of paradise, to its eucharistic sharing of food and drink. Kilmartin maintains that “there is a giving of thanks

---

<sup>162</sup>*Ibid.*, 275.

<sup>163</sup>For Greek and Latin texts of the following Eucharistic Prayers, see Anton Hänggi and Irmgard Pahl, eds., *Prex eucharistica: Textus e variis liturgiis antioquioribus selecti* (Fribourg, 1968), hereafter *Prex eucharistica*. For English texts, see R.C. D. Jasper and G.J. Cuming, eds., *Prayers of the Eucharist: Early and Reformed* (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1990), hereafter *Prayers of the Eucharist*.

<sup>164</sup>Kilmartin, “Eucharistic Prayer,” 129.

<sup>165</sup>Jasper and Cuming, eds., *Prayers of the Eucharist*, 23.

<sup>166</sup>Kilmartin, “Eucharistic Prayer,” 128.

for redemption through Christ in a rite in which the risen Lord's presence is mediated through food and drink."<sup>167</sup>

According to Kilmartin, the commentaries of Justin Martyr (the *First Apology* and the *Dialogue with Trypho*), in which one has access to the content and function of a Eucharistic Prayer used in the Church of Rome around the second century, stress that the eucharistic celebration involves the prayer of praise and thanksgiving offered for creation and redemption.<sup>168</sup> Moreover, this prayer is directed to the Father "through the name of the Son and the Holy Spirit"<sup>169</sup> and entails the aspects of benediction and thanksgiving. Justin relates this prayer offered to God in the Eucharist to the fulfillment of the prophecy of Malachi 1:10-11.<sup>170</sup> It is by means of praising Christ in the memorial of the Lord's Supper that God is glorified, which Christians do by recalling in praise and thanksgiving the redemptive work of Christ in the celebration of the Eucharist.<sup>171</sup> In his *Dialogue with Trypho* 117.1 Justin states, "So God bears witness in advance that he is well pleased with all the sacrifices in his name, which Jesus the Christ handed down to be done, namely in the eucharist of the bread and the

---

<sup>167</sup>Kilmartin, "Sacrificium Laudis," 276-277.

<sup>168</sup>See Kilmartin, "Eucharistic Prayer," 120-121; idem, "Sacrificium Laudis," 277.

<sup>169</sup>See Kilmartin, "Eucharistic Prayer," 121-123. Also see Jasper and Cuming, eds., *Prayers of the Eucharist*, 28-29. Original Greek text reads "διὰ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ υἱοῦ καὶ τοῦ πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου ἀναπέμψαι" and its Latin translation reads "per nomen Filii et Spiritus sancti." Hänggi and Pahl, eds., *Prex eucharistica*, 68-69.

<sup>170</sup>Kilmartin notes that Justin may be the first to interpret the connection between Malachi 1:10-11 and the prophecy of the Eucharist. At the same time, he claims that this connection is not unique to Justin. "Rather the liturgy itself provided him with a particular insight which he develops in *Dial.* 41, 116, 117." Kilmartin, "Eucharistic Prayer," 124. David Gill notes that as early as *Didache* 14 the text (Malachi 1: 10-11) was one of the Scripture readings used at the celebration of the Eucharist. See David Gill, "A Liturgical Fragment in Justin, Dialogue 29.1," *Harvard Theological Review* 59 (1966): 100.

<sup>171</sup>See Kilmartin, "Eucharistic Prayer," 124.

cup, and are done in every place in the world by the Christians.”<sup>172</sup> Justin understands that in the liturgical practice of the Church the elements of bread and wine are the symbols of the Church’s thanksgiving and the Eucharistic Prayer serves to evoke “the active presence of the Logos: the appropriation of the elements by the Logos who makes them his body and blood.”<sup>173</sup> Moreover, Justin speaks of a likeness of the historical event of the Incarnation present in the Eucharist to the sacramental incarnation in the eucharistic elements and emphasizes the presence of Christ in the Eucharist for the community. Kilmartin notes that in Justin’s analysis of the Eucharistic Prayer a formal epiclesis of consecration or “the moment of consecration” is absent. Rather, the whole prayer of the community was considered to be an invocation of the Logos for effecting a presence of sacramental incarnation of the Lord in the elements of bread and wine.<sup>174</sup>

Kilmartin reports that the Eucharistic Prayers of the third century generally contain elements of sacrificial language and petitions made for the faithful. In his analysis of the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus,<sup>175</sup> Kilmartin notes that “the oblation of the holy Church”<sup>176</sup> as expressed in the Communion petition entails a unified action—the faithful’s presentation of bread and wine, the deacon’s presentation of these gifts to the bishop, and the

---

<sup>172</sup>Jasper and Cuming, eds., *Prayers of the Eucharist*, 28. Also see Hänggi and Pahl, eds., *Prex eucharistica*, 72-73.

<sup>173</sup>Kilmartin, “Eucharistic Prayer,” 125.

<sup>174</sup>See *ibid.*

<sup>175</sup>Traditionally Hippolytus has been regarded as the one who authored the *Apostolic Tradition*. However, recent scholarship has cast doubt on this particular claim. For further information, see Paul F. Bradshaw, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship: Sources and Methods for the Study of Early Liturgy*, 2d ed., (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 80-83; Jasper and Cumming, eds., *Prayers of the Eucharist*, 31.

<sup>176</sup>Hänggi and Pahl, eds., *Prex eucharistica*, 81.

bishop's offering of these gifts.<sup>177</sup> The Institution Narrative occupies a central place in this Eucharistic Prayer because the Church's offering of bread and wine with thanksgiving and the reception of these transformed elements as the body and blood of Christ are viewed as the fulfillment of the command of Christ contained in the Institution Narrative. "It [the Institution Narrative] serves as both object of thanks and authority for what the Church does. The thanksgiving which precedes the narrative leads up to it, and the sacrificial prayer and petition which follow depend on it."<sup>178</sup> However, the Institution Narrative is not considered as an isolated form of consecration of the elements.<sup>179</sup> Rather, the proclamation of the history of salvation in the thanksgiving section incorporates the Institution Narrative, and the act of Christ at the Last Supper is mentioned as an important part of the history of salvation for which the people give thanks. Thus what is praised as an act of Christ, relating to the whole economy of salvation, is understood to become a sacramental reality in the celebration by the liturgical presentation of the community of believers under the leadership of the bishop through the cooperation of the Spirit who is invoked. The liturgical act of the community by which the memorial of the Last Supper becomes a sacramental reality and the indispensable role of the Spirit are expressed in the *anamnesis* and the *epiclesis*.<sup>180</sup> The *anamnesis* that follows the thanksgiving states, "Remembering therefore his death and

---

<sup>177</sup>See Kilmartin, "Sacrificium Laudis," 279. Also see Edward J. Kilmartin, "Pastoral Office and the Eucharist," *Emmanuel* 82 (1976): 314. This article is the point of reference in this dissertation. However, in the following year this very article was reprinted in a different publication as Edward J. Kilmartin, "Pastoral Office and the Eucharist," in P. Bernier, ed., *Bread from Heaven* (New York: 1977), 138-150.

<sup>178</sup>Kilmartin, "Sacrificium Laudis," 279.

<sup>179</sup>As would be the case in the later Scholastic eucharistic theology.

<sup>180</sup>See Kilmartin, "Pastoral Office and the Eucharist," 314-315.



resurrection, we offer to you the bread and the cup . . . .”<sup>181</sup> The final Communion petition asks the Spirit to come upon the offering of the Church for the sanctification of the faithful. Kilmartin, therefore, asserts that the Communion petition serves as an explanation of what the prayer as a whole ultimately intends, namely, the sanctification of the faithful through their communication in the spiritual food and drink.<sup>182</sup>

Kilmartin also studied an Alexandrian prayer, the *Strassburg Papyrus*, known to both Clement of Alexandria and Origen. Looking at this prayer, Kilmartin notes the absence of Institution Narrative, and the prayer itself is called a sacrifice.<sup>183</sup> Moreover, the emphasis of this prayer actually is on the activity of the Church. The mediation of Christ is necessary for the enactment of the liturgy of the Church and for the prayers of the Church to be made acceptable to the Father. However, the offering of the Church is stressed over against the mediation of Christ in such a way that does not diminish the mediatory role of Christ.<sup>184</sup>

According to Kilmartin, the *Anaphora of Addai and Mari* reflects a third-century East Syrian prayer that differs from the types of prayers described above. While this anaphora

---

<sup>181</sup>Jasper and Cuming, eds., *Prayers of the Eucharist*, 35.

<sup>182</sup>See Kilmartin, “Sacrificium Laudis,” 279. Also see Kilmartin, “Pastoral Office and the Eucharist,” 315. For this assertion Kilmartin refers to the text which reads, “And we ask that you would send your Holy Spirit upon the offering of your holy Church; that, gathering her into one, you would grant to all who receive the holy things (to receive) for the fullness of the Holy Spirit for the strengthening of faith in truth; that we may praise and glorify you through your child Jesus Christ; through whom be glory and honor to you, to the Father and the Son, with the Holy Spirit, in your holy Church, both now and to the ages of ages. Amen.” Jasper and Cuming, eds., *Prayers of the Eucharist*, 35.

<sup>183</sup>See Kilmartin, “Sacrificium Laudis,” 280.

<sup>184</sup>See *ibid.*, 280-281. For this affirmation Kilmartin refers to the text which reads, “You made everything through your wisdom, the light [of?] your true Son, our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ; giving thanks through him to you with him and the Holy Spirit, we offer the reasonable sacrifice and this bloodless service, which all the nations offer you, ‘from sunrise to sunset,’ from south to north, [for] your ‘name is great among all the nations, and in every place incense is offered to your holy name and a pure sacrifice.’” Jasper and Cuming, eds., *Prayers of the Eucharist*, 53-54. Square brackets are provided by Jasper and Cuming.

shares many aspects with the *Apostolic Tradition*, “the basic difference lies in the fact that the narrative of institution does not provide the hinge which unifies the prayer.”<sup>185</sup> Rather, the weight of the prayer falls on the action of the Holy Spirit.<sup>186</sup> This makes the epiclesis, which evokes the coming of the Spirit, the high point of the prayer. Moreover, unlike the other Eucharistic Prayers, namely, the Alexandrian prayer, in this text the Church’s activity is not stressed, nor is it called a sacrificial offering.<sup>187</sup>

From the fourth century onward, distinctive anaphoras began to develop in West Syria and in Egypt. Kilmartin notes that the *Apostolic Constitutions* and the *Prayer of St. James*, representative of the West Syrian or Antiochene type anaphoras, are highly Trinitarian in nature. He singles out the *Prayer of St. James* as containing a more profound, explicit Trinitarian theology than any earlier anaphoras. This prayer not only affirms the oneness of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit but also emphasizes the personal role of the Holy Spirit in the eucharistic celebration. Moreover, the eucharistic liturgy expresses itself as the synergism of the three divine Persons.<sup>188</sup> Hence Kilmartin claims, “Here the Trinity is

---

<sup>185</sup>Kilmartin, “Sacrificium Laudis,” 282.

<sup>186</sup>The epiclesis reads, “May your Holy Spirit, Lord, come and rest on this offering of your servants, and bless and sanctify it, that it may be to us, Lord, for remission of debts, forgiveness of sins, and the great hope of resurrection from the dead, and new life in the kingdom of heaven, with all who have been pleasing in your sight.” Jasper and Cuming, eds., *Prayers of the Eucharist*, 43.

<sup>187</sup>See Kilmartin, “Sacrificium Laudis,” 282.

<sup>188</sup>For this claim Kilmartin refers to the text of the *Prayer of St. James*. The text reads, “*And the bishop stands up and says privately*: Have mercy on us, [Lord,] God the Father, almighty; [have mercy on us, God, our Savior. Have mercy on us, O God, according to your great mercy,] and send out upon us and upon these [holy] gifts set before you our [all-] Holy Spirit, (*he bows*) the Lord and giver of life, who shares the throne and the kingdom with you, God the Father and your [only-begotten] Son, consubstantial and coeternal, who spoke in the law and the prophets and in your new covenant who descended in the likeness of a dove upon our Lord Jesus Christ in the river Jordan [and remained upon him,] who descended upon your holy apostles in the likeness of fiery tongues [in the Upper Room of the holy and glorious Zion on the day of the holy Pentecost; (*he stands up and says privately*):] send down, Master, your all-Holy Spirit himself upon us and upon these holy gifts set before you,] (*aloud*) that he may descend upon them,

presented not simply acting one after the other. Rather, the divine Persons are shown as entering into action and revealing themselves together: specificity of act and unity of action are admirably expressed.”<sup>189</sup> Discontented with this explanation, Kilmartin goes on to capture the theological significance of this prayer in a prolonged yet specific manner:

In the theological perspective of this prayer the whole cosmos is called to return to God in a unique liturgy which links heaven to earth. The history of salvation is viewed as animated by the synergism of the three divine Persons and crystallized around the divine image impressed on man the sinner, whom Christ, the full expression of the divine philanthropy, comes to renew in the perfection of his sacrifice. The Eucharist is understood to insert the believer into the economy of salvation, which is fully realized in the effusion of the Spirit. It is the sacrifice of propitiation which the Church, attentive to the fearful return of the Judge, ceaselessly offers to the Father to draw on itself His mercy and pardon. Simultaneously it is, for the participants of the body and blood, the source of communication of the Spirit, who divinizes man progressively in the totality of his being.<sup>190</sup>

This prayer thus unfolds the purpose of all creation: to return to God and insert the believers into the economy of salvation, namely, into the order of grace. Therefore, grace is understood to be operative by the concurrent work of the three divine Persons, especially in the realm of the liturgy.

The *Dêr Balyzeh Papyrus* (500-700)<sup>191</sup> and the *Anaphora of Serapion* (c. 359) are representative of the Egyptian type anaphoras, and both have basically the same structure.

---

[and by his holy and good and glorious coming may sanctify them,] and make this bread the holy body of Christ, (*People: Amen.*) and this cup the precious blood of Christ. (*People: Amen.*)” Jasper and Cuming, eds., *Prayers of the Eucharist*, 93. Square brackets, parentheses, and italics are provided by Jasper and Cuming. Also see Kilmartin, “Sacrificium Laudis,” 283, n. 66.

<sup>189</sup>*Ibid.*, 283.

<sup>190</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>191</sup>While it is true that the *Dêr Balyzeh Papyrus* is usually assigned to sixth to eighth centuries for its composition, the anaphora itself may be dated to the late fourth century which makes it contemporary with the *Anaphora of Serapion*. See Jasper and Cuming, eds., *Prayers of the Eucharist*, 79.

Kilmartin notes that the characteristics of these prayers are their amplified sacrificial tone and the development of two epicleses which create a sundering between the consecration of the gifts and the sanctification of the communicants.<sup>192</sup> The first epiclesis of the *Dêr Balyzeh Papyrus* asks for the sending of the Holy Spirit to transform the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, and Kilmartin claims that “the grounds for I epiclesis is the account of institution.”<sup>193</sup> The thrust of this petition, Kilmartin argues, “puts the thanksgiving in the background and so changes the orientation of the whole prayer.”<sup>194</sup> In its fragmentary form,<sup>195</sup> the second epiclesis invokes the Holy Spirit for the sanctification of the faithful in the eucharistic celebration. In the case of the *Anaphora of Serapion*, “the grounds for I epiclesis which asks for the consecration of the gifts the Church offers, is enclosed within a sacrificial prayer.”<sup>196</sup> Kilmartin claims that the enclosing of the Institution Narrative in a sacrificial prayer is referred as the reason that the Church’s sacrificial action represents the sacrificial action of Christ.<sup>197</sup> In doing what Jesus did at the Last Supper, the Church’s sacrificial action is depicted as re-presenting the sacrificial action of Christ. The Church

---

<sup>192</sup>See Kilmartin, “Sacrificium Laudis,” 284.

<sup>193</sup>See *ibid.* Since Kilmartin does not give any further explanation on this claim “the grounds for I epiclesis is the account of institution” in this article, it is not very clear what he means by it. The author of this dissertation assumes this claim to mean that the addition of the institution narrative may have introduced a desire to place this consecratory epiclesis before rather than after the institution narrative.

<sup>194</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>195</sup>Fragmentary because at least fifteen lines of the texts are missing after the proclamation of the mystery of faith until the second epiclesis. See Jasper and Cuming, eds., *Prayers of the Eucharist*, 80.

<sup>196</sup>Kilmartin, “Sacrificium Laudis,” 284. One might question Kilmartin’s presentation the consecratory value of the I epiclesis in the *Anaphora of Serapion*. In fact, the *Anaphora of Serapion* has a pre-narrative epiclectic post-sanctus which does not explicitly speak of consecration. On the other hand, this prayer has a post-institution epiclesis which seeks both the consecration and communion graces through the operation of the Logos. See Jasper and Cuming, eds., *Prayers of the Eucharist*, 77-78.

<sup>197</sup>See Kilmartin, “Sacrificium Laudis,” 284-285.

offers “the likeness of the body” and “the likeness of the blood”<sup>198</sup> of the only begotten Son. But the Church’s offering is described as “this living sacrifice, this bloodless offering.”<sup>199</sup> The second epiclesis also petitions for God’s holy Word, rather than the Spirit,<sup>200</sup> to make the bread and wine his body and blood, oriented to the sanctification of the communicants.

Kilmartin notes that by the fourth century in the West typically the prayer of the Lord’s Supper is fixed in its essentials; it “has a variable element (thanksgiving) and a stable one (sacrificial prayer enclosing the narrative of institution).”<sup>201</sup> The oldest example is found in *De Sacramentis* of St. Ambrose and it shows influence especially of the liturgies of the Egyptian tradition.<sup>202</sup> The petition of the sacrificial prayer is directed to the acceptance of the eucharistic elements rather than to their consecration. Furthermore, in this prayer a fixed “moment of consecration” is not present. Instead, the consecration of the bread and wine was viewed to result from the prayer as a whole. However, Kilmartin notes that, following the liturgical reform of the Second Vatican Council, the Roman Catholic Church produced three new Eucharistic Prayers which contain an epiclesis for sanctification of the elements and a second epiclesis for the sanctification of the communicants. Kilmartin writes, “The decisive influence on the structure of these prayers was not concern for traditional forms of

---

<sup>198</sup>Jasper and Cuming, eds., *Prayers of the Eucharist*, 77.

<sup>199</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>200</sup>This mention of the Logos is an Athanasian influence, since he considered Logos and Pneuma as inseparable. See *ibid.*, 75.

<sup>201</sup>Kilmartin, “Sacrificium Laudis,” 285.

<sup>202</sup>Kilmartin describes many elements of Egyptian Eucharistic Prayers present in the Roman Prayer. See *ibid.*, 285-286.

Eucharistic prayers, much less for modernity, but the concern of Western theology to fix the moment of consecration in the recitation of the narrative of institution.”<sup>203</sup>

At the end of his analysis of the content and function of these various Eucharistic Prayers of the early Church, Kilmartin draws certain relevant conclusions. First, he states, “The original thanksgiving prayer, which expressed the Church’s desire for participation in the covenant relation of Jesus with the Father, was gradually overrun with sacrificial prayers and petitions which emphasized the Church’s activity and the Church’s confidence in the efficacy of its prayer.”<sup>204</sup> Second, he observes that despite the emphasis on one or the other aspects of the eucharistic mystery, “the relational structure of the accounts of institution remains: thanksgiving to God for His mighty works in Christ is the *sacrificium laudis* of the Church undertaken with a view to obtaining deeper communion with the Father, especially through the sacrament of the humanity of Christ.”<sup>205</sup> Third, he asserts that the sacrificial prayer and the epiclesis of consecration gradually became the ground for “the thanksgiving prayer, spiritual sacrifice, and petition for the sacramental incarnation.”<sup>206</sup> Moreover, the sacrificial prayer and the epiclesis of consecration were given authority by the Institution Narrative. Finally, he calls attention to the significant consequence of such a development. He asserts that the attribution of a consecratory value either to the Institution Narrative or to the epiclesis of the Spirit caused the “sundering of the unity of the *sacrificium laudis* [which] had the negative effect of placing the thanksgiving on the margin of Eucharistic theology and

---

<sup>203</sup>Ibid., 287.

<sup>204</sup>Ibid.

<sup>205</sup>Ibid.

<sup>206</sup>Ibid.

consequently making the laity spectators at the rite, in which the priest does all that is really important.”<sup>207</sup> Therefore Kilmartin decided to construct a eucharistic theology that would emphasize the ecclesiological dimension of the eucharistic celebration and the way in which the members of the eucharistic assembly should participate in the paschal mystery of Christ. Here Kilmartin’s pneumatological approach, which he would later develop through a Trinitarian approach, to eucharistic theology would play a crucial role in explicating this participation.

In his later works, Kilmartin concludes that the structure of the Eucharistic Prayer is oriented to active participation of the liturgical assembly in its ritual enactment of the Eucharist.<sup>208</sup> He conceives the Eucharistic Prayer as a unified prayer directed to the Father and emphasizes that in its entirety the focus is on the sanctification of the eucharistic elements ordered to the transformation of the participants in the eucharistic Communion rite. The reception of the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ enables personal communion with Christ and so communion with the Father. Christ accomplishes this movement for humanity under the title of mediator and in virtue of the theandric act by which he sends the Holy Spirit from the Father. Kilmartin writes, “The Eucharistic Prayer provides a global and dynamic vision of this ecclesiastical mystery which requires identifying the epiclesis of transformation of the participants as the key to the ultimate meaning of the eucharistic celebration.”<sup>209</sup> Furthermore, this epiclesis expresses the theological dimension of reconciliation that all Christians are called to exercise in all aspects of their lives, especially

---

<sup>207</sup>Ibid.

<sup>208</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 355.

<sup>209</sup>Ibid.

at the moment of celebration of the Eucharist. Kilmartin maintains that the literary structure of the classical Eucharistic Prayers

mirrors the dynamic relation of the partners of the new covenant in the history of salvation realized fully through the redemptive work of Christ in the power of the Spirit. The thankful recognition of the Father's action in Christ (anamnesis) is followed by the petition (epiclesis) that the continuing fidelity of the Father to his people be expressed and realized through the sanctifying action of the Holy Spirit by which the communicants are brought to Christ (epiclesis for sanctification of communicants) and by which Christ is brought to the communicants (epiclesis for sanctification of the bread and wine).<sup>210</sup>

The Eucharistic Prayer expresses the *transitus* of the liturgical community to the Father through its participation in the single *transitus* of Jesus from suffering to glory re-presented sacramentally in the liturgical medium of the eucharistic celebration and in the power of the Holy Spirit.<sup>211</sup>

#### Presence of the Elements of the Self-offering of Jesus—Sacrificial Character of the Eucharist

In a monograph published in 1981,<sup>212</sup> Kilmartin attempted to articulate the “true” sacrificial character of the Eucharist and its relevance for the accomplishment of the eucharistic celebration. Before I will probe this theme, it is crucial to note the historical development of the theology of eucharistic sacrifice from the patristic period through the

---

<sup>210</sup>Kilmartin, “Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology,” 444.

<sup>211</sup>See *ibid.*; Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 355-356.

<sup>212</sup>Kilmartin, *Church, Eucharist and Priesthood*. What occasioned this endeavor is John Paul II's Holy Thursday letter, *Dominicae Cenaе, Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 72 (1980) in which the Pope presents a theology of the eucharistic sacrifice conceived within the thinking of the later Thomistic tradition. Kilmartin critiques this eucharistic theology of the Pope for not incorporating “the overall approach of Vatican II to the mystery and cult of the Eucharist as well as the findings of modern liturgical studies and the newer Catholic theology.” *Ibid.*, 1.



twentieth century.<sup>213</sup> Such an analysis of eucharistic theology is necessary to show not only how far the present eucharistic theology has moved away from the theology contained in the early Eucharistic Prayers, as described above, but also what needs to be re-emphasized in our day. For Kilmartin claims that “the situation which has obtained from the thirteenth to the twentieth century in the matter of the theology of eucharistic sacrifice remains unresolved.”<sup>214</sup>

In the following pages, I will focus on how the concept of the consecration of bread and wine came to be considered both as the essence and the visible sacrificial character of the Eucharist, characteristic of the “average modern Catholic theology of the Eucharist.”<sup>215</sup> Next I will present the nature of the eucharistic sacrifice which Kilmartin derives from the New Testament concept of sacrifice.

In the earliest sources of eucharistic doctrine and practice of the Latin patristic period through early Scholasticism,<sup>216</sup> the eucharistic celebration was above all a sacrificial act of the Church, made in union with Christ the High Priest who draws believers into his own worship of the Father by faith within the context of the ritual memorial of his death. According to the eucharistic theology of St. Augustine, for example, the essence of the eucharistic sacrifice of the Church is in its being one in Christ. The sacrifice of the Church is

---

<sup>213</sup>In two texts, Kilmartin, “Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology: Response to the Berakah Award,” 35-59; idem, “Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology,” 405-457, Kilmartin succinctly presents the development of eucharistic theology from the early Scholastic period until modern times. For an elaborate presentation of the same subject from the patristic period until the twentieth century, see Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*.

<sup>214</sup>Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, xxiv.

<sup>215</sup>Kilmartin, “Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology,” 431. By this expression Kilmartin means the later Thomistic eucharistic theology conceived and expressed in the magisterium of the Church down to the twentieth century.

<sup>216</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 3-115.

that of the whole Christ (*totus Christus*), Head and Body (Christ and the members of the Church). The presidential office was considered to be essentially embedded in the hierarchically ordered Church and, therefore, an essential element for the realization of the mystery of the worshiping Church. This relation of the presiding priest to the Church was dependent on his *ecclesial* status, namely, the sacramental power to represent the faith of the Church when he proclaims the Eucharistic Prayer of the Church.<sup>217</sup> Active participation of the faithful in the celebration of the Eucharist was expressed in two ways: first, in the ritual presentation of the eucharistic elements of bread and wine as a visible manifestation of their active role in a sacrificial activity; second, in the Eucharistic Prayer the presiding priest proclaimed the sacrificial prayer corresponding to the symbolic activity of the liturgical assembly. The meaning of such practice derives from the understanding of the ritual eucharistic liturgy as a constellation of liturgical actions and prayers in which the participants have a role to play, albeit limited, in the realization of the one sacrificial worship. The efficacy of the sacrificial activity of the Church and the participation in the sacraments of the body and blood of Christ was considered to be a corporate grace which had ecclesiological effect, namely, actualization and deepening of one's unity in the Church, already received in Baptism.

---

<sup>217</sup>St. Cyprian, bishop of Carthage (ca. 200-258), teaches that the celebration of the Eucharist is not possible outside the true Church. St. Hilary, bishop of Poitiers (310-367) speaks of the "consecrated body of the Lord" resulting from the liturgical sacrificial action of orthodox priests. St. Augustine, in the controversy with the churches of Donatists, recognized the existence of sacraments outside the true Church (the validity of sacraments) but did not admit their fruitfulness (the effect of sanctification). St. Augustine's Neoplatonic ontology enabled him to have this idea of a two-dimensional sacrament. See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 5, 10-11, 14; idem, "The Active Role of Christ and the Spirit in the Divine Liturgy," 105; Mary M. Schaefer, "Twelfth Century Latin Commentaries on the Mass: Christological and Ecclesiological Dimension," (Ph.D. diss., University of Notre Dame, 1983).

During the patristic period, the manner of conceiving the eucharistic sacrament of the body and blood of Christ was expressed in the two extreme positions represented by St. Ambrose of Milan (c.339-397) and St. Augustine.<sup>218</sup> St. Ambrose approached the mystery of eucharistic change from a metabolic or conversionist perspective by attributing the power of efficacy to the eucharistic words of Christ.<sup>219</sup> St. Augustine, on the other hand, approached it from a spiritual or symbolic perspective.<sup>220</sup> Between these two contrasting positions it was necessary to make a distinction between the historical body and the eucharistic body of Christ and the relation of the one to the other. The theology of eucharistic conversion, which remained operative because of the debate on the divine and human natures of Christ,<sup>221</sup> was

---

<sup>218</sup>On the difference in emphasis between St. Ambrose's realism and St. Augustine's sacramentalism in regard to the presence of Christ in the eucharistic species, see Nathan Mitchell, *Cult and Controversy: The Worship of the Eucharist Outside Mass* (MN: Collegeville, the Liturgical Press, 1982), 45, 55-56, hereafter *Cult and Controversy*; Paul Palmer, *Sacraments and Worship* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1954), 201-213.

<sup>219</sup>For this approach, St. Ambrose was influenced by the fourth-century Antiochene realistic theology of somatic real presence, as exemplified by St. John Chrysostom (c.347-407) and Theodore of Mopsuestia (c.350-428). It is, however, disputed among modern theologians whether St. Ambrose really attributed the efficacious power of consecration definitively to the words of Christ or only as a factor, hence not limited to the Institution Narrative but applicable to the mystery of the blessing prayer as a whole. See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 15-18; idem, "Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology," 419. Elsewhere Kilmartin describes that St. Ambrose's concern was to attribute the efficacious power of consecration to Christ alone rather than to fix the words of Christ as the "moment of consecration." He bases this argument on the fact that St. Ambrose does not say the bread and wine become Christ's body and blood only after the words of Christ. See Kilmartin, "Sacrificium Laudis," 286.

<sup>220</sup>See Edward J. Kilmartin, "The Eucharistic Gift: Augustine of Hippo's Tractate 27 on John 6: 60-72," in *Preaching in the Patristic Age: Studies in Honor of Walter J. Burghardt*, David G. Hunter, ed., (New York: Paulist Press, 1989), 162-163; idem, *Eucharist in the West*, 26-28. St. Augustine taught that sacrament is a holy, efficacious sign and to distinguish the holy sign (*sacramentum*) from the mystery signified (*res sacramenti*). In his Neoplatonic thinking, St. Augustine downplayed the tension between the corporeal and the invisible when speaking of the visible sacrament to the extent that the image exercises no more than the function of pointing to the properly spiritual reality. Nonetheless, in this perspective the sign and the mystery signified form an effective unity. See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 28-30.

<sup>221</sup>A particular version of Alexandrian monophysitic theology of Christology known as *Logos-sarx* approach, the Word took on flesh, affirmed that the humanity of Jesus is absorbed into the divinity in virtue of the resurrection-ascension of Jesus. Thus the monophysite moved away from the *Logos-anthropos* approach, the Word became human being, of the old Antiochene Christology. Any extreme

eventually inherited by early Scholasticism and became the primary subject of theological reflection in the wake of the eucharistic controversy between Radbertus and Ratramnus and later between Berengar of Tours and Lanfranc of Bec and others.<sup>222</sup>

Neither Radbertus nor Ratramnus had an adequate appreciation of the dynamic character of the eucharistic mystery in the commemorative actual presence of the once-for-all redemptive work of Christ. Nor did they understand the notion of somatic real presence conceived from the perspective of prototype-image thinking of the early Greek Fathers of the fourth-century Antiochene tradition. The somatic real presence is originally embedded in the theological meaning of the *anamnesis*. In Greek theology the prototype is Christ and his saving work. The eucharistic celebration is a reality of participation in the prototype. But, in Radbertus's and Ratramnus's thinking the somatic real presence became isolated. In addition, the memorial of the event of the cross was understood as a subjective memorial since it lies in the past. Kilmartin claims that the efficacy attributed to the instrumentality of the Eucharistic Prayer together with the recitation of the eucharistic words of Christ in the two

---

stress on either nature of Christ in the work of salvation places in danger both the orthodoxy and our salvation in Christ. The theology of the eucharistic conversion, therefore, was used to support the theological implications of the mystery of the Incarnation of Christ, namely, the permanence in the hypostatic union of the human and divine natures of Christ in one divine person, defined as "unconfused" and "unseparated" at the Council of Chalcedon (451). This Council arrived at this definition by synthesizing the two Christological positions of these two schools (Antiochene and Alexandrian) in light of what was already affirmed concerning the divine and human natures of Jesus at the Council of Nicea (325), the First Council of Constantinople (381), and the Council of Ephesus (431). See J. Neuner and J. Dupuis, eds., *The Christian Faith: In the Doctrinal Documents of the Catholic Church* (St. Peter's Seminary, Bangalore: Theological Publications in India, 1992), 165-167, hereafter *The Christian Faith*; Richard McBrien, *Catholicism*, 3<sup>d</sup> ed. (London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1994), 463-477.

<sup>222</sup>For the gradual development of the loosening between the sign and the signified that led to the problem of eucharistic realism, see Chapter One. Also see Kilmartin, "Modern Approach," 59-61; idem, *Eucharist in the West*, xxiv, 25-29, 79-89, 97-102, 118, 120; idem, *Church, Eucharist and Priesthood*, 29-30; idem, "The Sacrifice of Thanksgiving and Social Justice," in *Liturgy and Social Justice*, ed., M. Searle (Collegeville, Minnesota: 1980), 62, 96.

oaths<sup>223</sup> required of Berengar at the two Councils of Rome in the eleventh century was partly due to a three-fold meaning the term consecration had. Such as

(1.) the *transitus* of the elements into the eucharistic flesh and blood, (2.) the *transitus* of the consecrated flesh and blood into the heavenly body of Christ, and (3.) the purpose of the twofold *transitus*, namely, the integration of the liturgical community into this single *transitus* of Christ from suffering to glory in virtue of its self-offering made in union with Christ in the power of the Holy Spirit.<sup>224</sup>

The focus of attention on the formulation of a doctrine about the mystery of the somatic real presence of Christ under the forms of bread and wine, however, occasioned the fixing of the “moment of consecration.” The task at hand was twofold: to identify of the liturgical formula of consecration and to find an explanation of the change of the bread and wine that would account for the presence of the whole Christ under the appearances of bread and wine. The former task was settled by attributing the liturgical formula of consecration to the words of Christ as the “essential form” of the sacrament. The latter task was achieved with the development of the concept of change through the process of “transubstantiation,” officially promulgated at the Fourth Lateran Council (1215) and subsequently confirmed at the Council of Trent (1545-1563).<sup>225</sup> This process established the inner unity between symbol and reality.

---

<sup>223</sup>See Chapter One.

<sup>224</sup>Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 65-66.

<sup>225</sup>The development of the doctrine of transubstantiation was a process over centuries. But it was initiated by Lanfranc of Bec (c. 1005-1089), afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury, through the concept of change of essence in the debate with Berengar. In his approach, Lanfranc retained the symbolic character of the Eucharist without abandoning realism. This teaching of Lanfranc was further developed in the following centuries with the use of Aristotelian categories to distinguish substance (invisible) and accident (visible) realities of a thing and achieved the process of change in terms of a change of substance. The application of the verb *transsubstantiare* to this process of change is first found in the writings of Rolando

The prevalent dominant synthetic theology of eucharistic sacrifice, prior to the Council of Trent, affirmed that the Church is the principal subject of the offering of the eucharistic sacrifice. At the end of the fifteenth century Gabriel Biel (c.1420 or 1425-1495) made his own the thirteenth-century systematic theology of eucharistic sacrifice of John Duns Scotus (c.1265-1308).<sup>226</sup> This Scotus-Biel synthesis ascribes the consecration of the elements of bread and wine to the actions of Christ but mediated by the presiding priest when he recites the *ipsissima verba Christi in persona Christi*. This “moment of consecration” is, however, not the moment of the eucharistic sacrifice. Rather, in the offering of the eucharistic sacrifice the presiding priest represents the Church, *in persona ecclesiae*, as expressed in the *anamnesis*-offering prayer of the Roman Canon, which reads “. . . therefore . . . we offer . . .”<sup>227</sup> According to Scotus, the Church, not Christ, is the principal offerer, *offerens principalis*, of the eucharistic sacrifice, otherwise the Eucharist would have the same value as the historical sacrifice of Christ. Correspondingly, Scotus also emphasized the efficacy of the eucharistic sacrifice as linked to the devotion of the offerer (the Church) of the victim of the cross.

The elements of the eucharistic theology of the Scotus-Biel synthesis are included in the sixteenth-and-seventeenth-century Thomistic synthesis in ascribing the “moment of consecration” to the words of Christ spoken by the priest *in persona Christi*. But this

---

Bandinelli (c.1105-1181), afterwards Pope Alexander III. See Mitchell, *Cult and Controversy*, 145-151; O’Carroll, *Corpus Christi*, 196.

<sup>226</sup>See John Duns Scotus, *God and Creatures: The Quodlibetal Questions*, trans. Felix Alluntis and Allan B. Wolter, (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1975), 443-468; Kilmartin, “Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology,” 405-406; idem, *Eucharist in the West*, xxiv, 151, 160-163, 167, 176.

<sup>227</sup>Jasper and Cuming, eds., *Prayers of the Eucharist*, 164.

Thomistic theology also ascribes the offering of the eucharistic sacrifice to the same moment (consecration) and mode (*in persona Christi*).<sup>228</sup> In other words, according to Kilmartin, in the later Thomistic theology the “moment of consecration” is understood to be the reactualization of the liturgical self-offering of Christ performed by the presiding priest *in persona Christi*. What the Scotus-Biel synthesis defines as an ecclesiological aspect, this later Thomistic theology explains as a Christological dimension. The ecclesiological aspect is absorbed into the Christological aspect of the eucharistic sacrifice. The Council of Trent preferred this Thomistic synthesis for the purpose of debate with the Reformers. This Thomistic synthesis, with its strong emphasis on the Christological dimension of the Eucharist, offered Trent a better explanation of the comparability of the once-for-all sacrifice of Christ and the eucharistic sacrifice than the Scotus-Biel synthesis.

In the following period since Trent until modern times, a series of theories about the sacrifice of the Eucharist developed which can be generally grouped under two categories: theory of oblation and theory of destruction. The theory of oblation holds that the offering of a gift is the essence of sacrifice. In the Tridentine eucharistic theology, the offering of the

---

<sup>228</sup>Kilmartin distinguishes the Thomistic synthesis from the eucharistic theology of Aquinas. According to Kilmartin, Aquinas considered the intimate organic unity between the worship of Christ and the worship of the Church as conditioned by the special role of the presiding priest who proclaims the Eucharistic Prayer in the name of the Church and consecrates the bread and wine *in persona Christi*. However, it is not certain that Aquinas considered this “moment of consecration” to be also the moment of the offering of the eucharistic sacrifice performed by the priest *in persona Christi*. Kilmartin argues that Aquinas explicitly taught that the authority to preside at the Eucharist as representative of the Church derives from ordination in which the priest obtains the sacramental power to consecrate the gifts of the Church *in persona Christi*. But the priest represents the Church because of the nature of the eucharistic sacrifice. The Eucharist is the corporate act of the universal Church which is accomplished in favor of the Church itself. Therefore, it is because of the ecclesiological reason of the Eucharist that the priest offers the Eucharist for the entire Church, not immediately because he offers *in persona Christi, capitis ecclesiae*. See Kilmartin, “Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology,” 406-407, 412-413; idem, *Eucharist in the West*, 134. n. 17, 160-163, 175, 248-266.

gift of Christ was conceived as conditioned by the prior conversion of the bread and wine.<sup>229</sup>

This conversion was viewed as occurring simultaneously with the sacrificial offering, but according to priority of nature and not as priority of time. On the other hand, the theory of destruction holds that a change of the gift is the essence of sacrifice. Accordingly, the idea of “virtual death” through the separate consecration of the eucharistic gifts was proposed.

These approaches did not succeed in offering a satisfactory account of the nature of the identity and distinction between the historical and the liturgical sacrifice. From the Christological dimension of the Eucharist, these post-Tridentine attempts failed to offer a solution to the problem of the intimate relation of the sacrament of Christ’s somatic presence to the liturgical presence of his once-for-all historical sacrificial act on the cross. Moreover, the inner relation between the sacrifice of the Eucharist and the historical sacrifice of Christ was not grounded on the mystery presence of the latter in the eucharistic celebration.

Eucharistic sacrifice was understood to be an outward and purely figurative representation of the passion of Christ. The sacramental signs of the separated body and blood, which signified Christ’s death, were contrasted with the sacramental real presence of Christ who offered himself on the cross. This sacramental presence of Christ secured the sacramental real relation between the historical sacrifice of Christ and the Eucharist. Thus, the presence of Christ in the sacrament, as the same sacrificial victim on the altar and cross, provided the starting point for the explanation of the sacrificial character of the Eucharist. Hence, the

---

<sup>229</sup>Today it is considered that the proper starting point for a systematic theology of the Eucharist is the sacrificial character of the Eucharist and not the sacrificial sacrament that results from the actualization of the sacrificial dimension. The Tridentine preference for initiating the treatment of eucharistic theology with the sacrament of the body and blood was motivated by the agenda of the Reformers rather than by systematic considerations.



consecration of the eucharistic gifts was understood to be a sacramental renewal of the self-offering of Christ through the ministry of the presiding priest. The idea that each individual Eucharist has a value in itself as a kind of new act of Christ was supported by the typical Western way of thinking which was focused on the individual and concrete event. In addition, a disjunction between the historical sacrifice of Christ and the eucharistic sacrifice received support from the teaching of Pope Gregory the Great (590-604). He taught that Christ is offered for us again (*iterum*) in the mystery of the holy sacrifice.<sup>230</sup> Kilmartin argues that this notion of the eucharistic sacrifice as a liturgical repetition of the once-for-all sacrifice of Christ obscured the notion of the active participation of the faithful in the sacrificial activity. The eucharistic sacrifice was perceived as the offering of Christ through the ministry of the priest.<sup>231</sup>

Furthermore, Kilmartin attributes the problem of considering consecration as a visible cultic sacrificial action of the eucharistic sacrifice to Trent's use of the verb *offerre* (offer) and the notion of *repraesentatio* (representation) in speaking of the sacrificial character of the Eucharist.<sup>232</sup> In Trent's doctrinal exposition, *offerre* is used to mean both the historical

---

<sup>230</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 18, 21-22, 362, referring to Gregory the Great, *Dialogorum libri iv* 4.58 (PL 77. 425 CD). This teaching of Gregory the Great is one of the earliest sources which refers to Christ being "newly" offered, and it became the seed for the later development of the notion of the sacrifice of Christ being repeated in each eucharistic celebration in an "unbloody manner." Moreover, it was also one of the factors that contributed to the origin of the practice of private Mass, which was justified on the ground that where the priest is there Mass can be celebrated. See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 22-23.

<sup>231</sup>See *ibid.*, 22.

<sup>232</sup>But in the same breath, Kilmartin also claims that Trent's doctrine did not in fact provide any clarifications concerning what elements constitute the general notion of sacrifice. The absence of a critical edition of the *Acta* of the Council of Trent made the task of establishing the correct interpretation of the conciliar decrees extremely difficult, contributing to the development of narrow literal interpretations of these decrees that is not in line with the intention of the Fathers at the Council. See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 4; *idem*, *Eucharist in the West*, 177, 183-186.

self-offering of Christ on the cross and the liturgical-ritual sacrificial act of the eucharistic celebration (as a cultic outward sign).<sup>233</sup> This undistinguished use of the term ultimately resulted in the identification of both the liturgical and historical *offerre* to be the act of offering to God at the level of the sign of the liturgical action.<sup>234</sup> Based on scriptural ground (Hebrews 10:14), Kilmartin dismissed this notion as a pre-Christian concept of sacrifice which is *passé* and claims that such an outward form of the representation of the sacrificial action of Jesus is not found in the Eucharistic Prayer.<sup>235</sup>

Likewise, Kilmartin judged that the undefined notion of *repraesentatio* caused problems for interpretation.<sup>236</sup> Kilmartin reasons that a liturgical rite can represent the

---

<sup>233</sup>“ . . . our Lord Jesus Christ . . . though He was by His death about to offer Himself once upon the altar of the cross to God the Father that He might there accomplish an eternal redemption, nevertheless, that His priesthood might not come to an end with His death, at the last supper . . . offered [himself] up to God the Father His own body and blood under the form of bread and wine, and under the forms of those same things gave to the Apostles, whom He then made priests of the New Testament, that they might . . . offer it . . . . And inasmuch as in this divine sacrifice which is celebrated in the mass is contained and immolated in an unbloody manner the same Christ who once offered Himself in a bloody manner on the altar of the cross . . . For the victim is one and the same, the same now offering by the ministry of priests who then offered Himself on the cross, the manner alone of offering being different.” Council of Trent, Session 22, Chapters 1 and 2 in Schroeder, trans., *The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, 144-146.

<sup>234</sup> Kilmartin suggests that the theological and terminological problem of mixing up of the historical self-offering of Christ and its ritual expression can be solved if one takes into account the inner relation of the personal sacrifice of Jesus and his body and the outward form of the meal as its efficacious sign. The outward form of the representation of the sacrificial offering of Jesus is not oblation and immolation, liturgically accomplished at the conversion. Rather, it is the distribution of Christ's body and blood as food of life in which the event of the cross is represented and applied. Based on 1 Corinthians 11:26, the act of eating and drinking is an affirmation of the salvific meaning of the death of Christ. See Kilmartin, *Church, Eucharist and Priesthood*, 9-14, 20 n.19, 42; idem, *Eucharist in the West*, 198-199.

<sup>235</sup> See Kilmartin, *Church, Eucharist and Priesthood*, 12.

<sup>236</sup> Trent teaches that “He . . . our God and Lord, though He was by His death about to offer Himself once upon the altar of the cross to God the Father that He might there accomplish an eternal redemption, nevertheless, that His priesthood might not come to an end with His death, at the last supper, on the night He was betrayed, that He might leave to His beloved spouse the Church a visible sacrifice, such as the nature of man requires, whereby that bloody sacrifice once to be accomplished on the cross might be represented . . . .” Council of Trent, Session 22, Chapter 1 in Schroeder, trans., *The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, 144.

historical sacrifice of Christ in two senses: it either contains the presence of that sacrifice or presents that sacrifice at the level of external expression.<sup>237</sup> The Tridentine doctrinal explanation of the subject of representation affirms the identity of the victim and offerer of the eucharistic sacrifice: Christ offers himself through the ministry of the priests. This approach can be conceived either as that the eucharistic sacrifice is a sacramental representation of the unique sacrifice of Christ or as that, in some sense, Christ offers himself anew. Trent teaches that through the offering of the body and blood of Christ, under the forms of bread and wine, the Eucharist is a visible sacrifice which, in itself, has a sacrificial character.<sup>238</sup> Hence, in virtue of the relation established by Christ between his sacrifice on the cross and the sacrifice of the Eucharist, it was viewed that the Eucharist has the function of representing the historical sacrifice of Christ.<sup>239</sup> Each Eucharist is thus seen as a kind of new sacrifice related to the cross in which the priest and the victim are identical with the priest and the victim of the cross.<sup>240</sup> Moreover, the idea of representation leaves open the question whether, by means of the visible sacrifice, the assembled Church is represented to the historical sacrifice of Christ or *vice versa*.<sup>241</sup> The orientation of the teaching of the Fathers at Trent, Kilmartin notes, is in the latter direction which in his opinion needs adjustment.<sup>242</sup> Rather, he argues, “In the time of the Church the sacramental sacrifice exists

---

<sup>237</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 175.

<sup>238</sup>See Council of Trent, Session 22, Chapter 1 in Schroeder, trans., *The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, 144-145.

<sup>239</sup>See *ibid.*; Kilmartin, *Church, Eucharist and Priesthood*, 12; *idem*, *Eucharist in the West*, 176-177.

<sup>240</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 176-178.

<sup>241</sup>See *ibid.*, 175.

<sup>242</sup>See *ibid.*, 175, 233.

in order that the Church might be drawn into the mystery of the cross which is re-presented and so offer itself in a liturgical way in union with the crucified and risen Lord.”<sup>243</sup>

The preoccupation with the unique sacramental real content of the sacrament, understood to be Christ derived from his historical sacrifice, led to explain the sacramental nature of the Eucharist only from the act of the presiding priest, who offers the sacramental body and blood of Christ. Consequently, the term “consecration,” which originally had a threefold meaning, achieved ritually and exclusively a narrow meaning to express the idea of the conversion of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ by virtue of the proclamation of the words of Christ. Thus, where once the role of Christ’s words was to give authority to the offering and to make that offering acceptable, the Institution Narrative is considered efficacious in its own right, owing to the law of belief that the words of Christ have power. Kilmartin argues that restricting the notion of consecration to this narrow and sole understanding of the conversion of the eucharistic elements devalued the efficacy originally attributed to the *lex orandi*—the role played by the liturgical Institution Narrative within the structure of the whole Eucharistic Prayer until the middle of the twelfth century.<sup>244</sup> He remarks,

The analysis of the theological treatises on the subject of the Eucharist produced during the formative period of the Western scholastic synthesis shows that theologians and liturgists of the second millennium had no grasp of the literary structure and theological dynamic of the Eucharistic Prayer and accompanying symbolic action. They reduced the whole problematic to an imaginary “central space” within the Eucharistic Prayer, with the result

---

<sup>243</sup>Kilmartin, *Church, Eucharist and Priesthood*, 32.

<sup>244</sup>For the relation of the Institution Narrative to the rest of the Eucharistic Prayer, see Kilmartin, “Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology,” 443-444.

that the narrative of the institution of the Eucharist was poised in the air without access to the other elements of the structure.<sup>245</sup>

The identification of the exact “moment of consecration” of the eucharistic elements, the identification of the essential form of the eucharistic liturgy to the words of Christ, and the attribution of the consecration of the elements exclusively to the presiding priest are the three aspects that characterize the kernel of the later Scholastic eucharistic theology. Thus the formal reason for the Eucharist to be the sacrifice of the Church is explained by an extrinsic link between the Eucharist and the Church; Christ himself offers his once-for-all sacrifice as head of the Church through the priest who acts in the name of Christ the head of the Church.

The later Thomistic teaching explains the sacrificial character of the Eucharist through the notion of “sacramental sacrifice.”<sup>246</sup> This notion includes the idea that the presence of the mystery of the historical sacrifice of Christ in the eucharistic celebration is sacramentally represented to the liturgical assembly in the action by which the “sacrificial sacrament”<sup>247</sup> of Christ’s somatic real presence is constituted.<sup>248</sup> Kilmartin views such an understanding as conveying the notion that eucharistic celebration is above all “a visible

---

<sup>245</sup>Ibid., 443. Also see Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 351-352. These assertion, terminology, and vision are borrowed from the insight of the Italian Jesuit liturgical scholar Cesare Giraudo, *Eucaristia per la Chiesa. Prospettive teologiche sull’eucaristia a partire dalla “lex orandi,”* Aloisiana 22 (Rome: Gregorian University/Brescia: Morcelliana, 1989), 520-556.

<sup>246</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 186-187.

<sup>247</sup>“Sacrificial” as qualification of sacrament means that the presence of Christ under the forms of bread and wine is dependent on the actual presence of Christ’s self-offering which culminated on the cross.

<sup>248</sup>But there is no consensus among theologians, who held for the sacramental theory concerning the nature of the presence of the historical sacrifice of Christ in the Eucharist. Hence, two possibilities were open: a perpetual state of victimhood of the glorified Christ, which is externalized through the words of consecration; and a metahistorical presence of the historical saving act of Christ.

representation” of the unique historical sacrifice of Christ.<sup>249</sup> An incorrectly conjoining of the historical sacrifice of Christ and the Eucharist through the role of the priest resulted in a narrow cultic view which, according to Kilmartin, looked

for the grounds of sacrifice in the rite itself, and not in the representation of the sacrifice of the cross. Catholic theology did not take seriously the fact that “sacrifice” in the history-of-religions sense was abolished with the Christ-event. In the Christ-event, the sacrificial activity on the part of the creature is reduced to the obedience of Jesus before the Father, even unto death.<sup>250</sup>

Kilmartin critiques the later Thomistic eucharistic theology’s description of the visible dimension of the eucharistic sacrifice and the representation of the historical sacrifice of Christ to the liturgical assembly as obscuring the notion of active participation of the faithful in the sacrificial activity.<sup>251</sup> Kilmartin concludes that a eucharistic theology based on this Thomistic tradition is limited at best. In his own eucharistic theology, Kilmartin would attempt to overcome these limitations by retrieving from a more complete systematic understanding of the eucharistic sacrifice from the first millennium.

In order to articulate the correct understanding of the eucharistic sacrifice and the consequences that follow from it, Kilmartin appeals to “the New Testament concept of sacrifice and its description of the way in which the sacrificial devotion of Jesus is symbolically represented in the accounts of the institution of the Eucharist.”<sup>252</sup> He argues that the concept of “sacrifice” in the New Testament includes both the self-offering of Jesus

---

<sup>249</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 187.

<sup>250</sup>*Ibid.*, 184. Also see *ibid.*, 177.

<sup>251</sup>In addition to the limitations of the Scholastic eucharistic theology described in Chapter One, see Kilmartin, “Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology,” 436-441.

<sup>252</sup>Kilmartin, *Church, Eucharist and Priesthood*, 8.

and of the Christians to the Father. Jesus' sacrifice included his self-offering to the Father on behalf of the entire humanity. The sacrifice of Christians consists in the offering of self in union with the offering of Christ which includes the aspects of his love and obedience to the Father. In addition, the aspect of the initiative of the Father is important for the New Testament understanding of the mystery of the self-offering of Jesus, "the self-offering by the Father of his only Son for the salvation of the world,"<sup>253</sup> which is applicable to the self-offering of Christians as well. The self-offering of Jesus is the expression of the Father's turning to the world. "The death of Jesus is ultimately the expression of the turning of God to us. The love of the Father is the origin of the self-offering of Jesus [to the Father on behalf of the world]."<sup>254</sup> This perspective, Kilmartin claims, provides the unique New Testament understanding of the "true sacrifice" as that which is first based on the movement of the Father towards human beings rather than *vice versa*.<sup>255</sup> Kilmartin sums it up as follows:

... sacrifice in the New Testament understanding—and thus in its Christian understanding—is, in the first place, the self-offering of the Father in the gift of his Son, and in the second place the unique response of the Son in his humanity to the Father, and in the third place, the self-offering of believers in union with Christ by which they share in his covenant relation with the Father.<sup>256</sup>

This threefold aspect of sacrifice, Kilmartin stresses, is the core of the meaning of the Eucharist, which forms the loving communion between God and humankind and among

---

<sup>253</sup>Kilmartin, "Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology," 427. Also see Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 197.

<sup>254</sup>Kilmartin, "Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology," 428. Kilmartin claims that this aspect of the initiative of the Father is implicitly (in passive voice) presented in Luke 22:19; 1 Corinthians 11:23 and explicitly in John 3:16; Romans 8:32; 2 Corinthians 5:18-19.

<sup>255</sup>See Kilmartin, *Church, Eucharist and Priesthood*, 8-9; idem, *Eucharist in the West*, 197.

<sup>256</sup>Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 381-382.

themselves as expressed and realized in the enactment of the Eucharist. In accordance with the Institution Narrative of the Eucharist and the intention of Jesus, his external manifestation of the sacrificial devotion at the Last Supper is his self-offering in the signs of food to be received. Here lies an intrinsic relation between the personal self-offering of Jesus and the reception of the eucharistic food, which signifies Jesus' offering of himself as food and a thankful acceptance of this giving of himself by the participants. In this way, by the reception of the eucharistic food the believers are changed into the true body of Christ, and become themselves a holy sacrifice.<sup>257</sup>

The classical Eucharistic Prayers represent the response of the sacrifice of praise to the Father to what he has done in Jesus Christ for the salvation of the world. In this perspective, there is also the matter of the sanctifying work of the Holy Spirit who is the divine agent of the self-offering of Jesus on the cross (Hebrews 9:14) and of the presence of this unique sacrifice in the eucharistic celebration. "The Eucharist is the sacramental symbolic form under which the eternally enduring self-offering of Christ to the Father on behalf of mankind obtains power over the participants in the Holy Spirit."<sup>258</sup> Accordingly, the Church adds nothing to the sacrifice of Christ. Rather, Kilmartin makes the claim that it is more accurate to say that the liturgical assembly is liturgically re-presented to the self-offering of Christ through the medium of the Eucharistic Prayer<sup>259</sup> and is enabled to

---

<sup>257</sup>See Kilmartin, *Church, Eucharist and Priesthood*, 9, 11; idem, *Eucharist in the West*, 199-200.

<sup>258</sup>Kilmartin, *Church, Eucharist and Priesthood*, 10.

<sup>259</sup>For this assertion, Kilmartin is dependent on Cesare Giraudo who bases this opinion on the interpretation of the Institution Narrative contained in the Eucharistic Prayer. See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 176, 322-337. Also see Kilmartin, *Church, Eucharist and Priesthood*, 10-11, 32.



participate in this act of Christ in the power of the Spirit.<sup>260</sup> For on the cross Jesus offered himself in the Spirit, who is the source of his habitual, personal, individual, and communicable grace. Therefore, “[t]he sending of the Spirit at Pentecost enables [the Church to celebrate] the Eucharist in which the triumph of the death of Christ is represented and the Father is given thanks for the great gift.”<sup>261</sup> The role of the Holy Spirit is decisive in the presence of the sacrifice of Christ in the eucharistic celebration. The presence of this sacrifice, which includes the turning of the Father to us and the response of Jesus, accepting and affirming the movement of God the Father in love, happens in the power of the Spirit. Kilmartin calls this Trinitarian dimension the sacred character of the Eucharist in its cultic sacramental quality.<sup>262</sup>

Kilmartin notes that the mystery of the sacrifice of the Eucharist includes the presence of Christ offering his unique historical sacrifice in the memorial rite of the Church and the offering of the liturgical assembly which, in the power of the Spirit, is enabled to bind itself to the one living sacrifice of Christ re-presented in the rite of the bread and cup and so worship the Father in an acceptable way. In explaining the manner in which the same internal offering made on the cross is present in the celebration of the Eucharist, Kilmartin alludes to a moral identity of all the distinct acts of worship of Christ during his earthly life and passion rather than to a physical identity. In this sense, Kilmartin refers to the Last

---

<sup>260</sup>See *ibid.*, 10.

<sup>261</sup>Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 197. Also see *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 6. However, in this Constitution, despite the obligatory reference to the Holy Spirit where this Constitution speaks of the thanksgiving offered to God “through the power of the Holy Spirit,” Kilmartin notes the absence of pneumatological description in the section especially dedicated to the Eucharist (*Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 47-58). See Kilmartin, “Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology,” 434, n. 90.

<sup>262</sup>See Kilmartin, *Church, Eucharist and Priesthood*, 10-11, 14. Also see Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 197; *idem*, “Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology,” 427-428.

Supper as the offering made by the historical Jesus in the rite of bread and wine as a symbolic expression of his sacrificial dispositions of his devotion to the Father in obedience and love, which he displayed throughout his earthly life.<sup>263</sup> The final expression of this love and obedience, the final act of the supernatural virtue of charity, was elicited by Christ's human will as he died, passed over from time to eternity, and remains with the glorified Christ. By virtue of Christ's resurrection and ascension, the only essential aspects of his historical sacrifice re-presented in the eucharistic celebration are Christ himself and his internal offering of obedience and love which made his voluntary surrender to the death on the cross a religious act of highest value.<sup>264</sup> This act which summarizes all the worship of Christ's earthly life is present in the glorified humanity of Christ in the celebration of the Eucharist in the power of the Holy Spirit.<sup>265</sup> It, however, remains to be explained how Kilmartin would develop the manner in which the liturgical assembly can share in these sacrificial attitudes of Christ.<sup>266</sup> But succinctly it can be said that this moral identity is possible because two persons (Christ and believers) form a union of grace in the Holy Spirit. The idea that the Holy Spirit is the personal principle of unity in Christ and Christians was originally conceived by Heribert Mühlen (1927-2006),<sup>267</sup> and later affirmed by Pius XII,

---

<sup>263</sup>See Kilmartin, *Church, Eucharist and Priesthood*, 33.

<sup>264</sup>See Kilmartin, *Sacrificial Meal*, 15.

<sup>265</sup>See *ibid.*, 16-17.

<sup>266</sup>This theme will be treated below in detail.

<sup>267</sup>For this idea Mühlen is indebted to Matthias Joseph Scheeben (1835-1888). Scheeben, from an ecclesiological point of view, proposed a participation of Christians in the divine nature present in the Holy Spirit, analogous to, not identical with, the hypostatic union in Christ. He described the indwelling of the Holy Spirit in the human person as an intimate relationship of mutual belonging between the divine person of the Holy Spirit and the created persons. See Wolfgang Vondey, *Heribert Mühlen: His Theology and Praxis: A New Profile on the Church* (New York: University Press of America, 2004), 59, hereafter *Heribert Mühlen*. Since most of Mühlen's works are not translated into English, this book serves as an

from an ecclesiological perspective, in affirming the Church as the mystical Body of Christ.<sup>268</sup> Now the problem that lies ahead of Kilmartin is to construct a systematic theology that will explain this role of the Holy Spirit. He would systematically develop it from the perspective of a Trinitarian theology.

### Sacraments and Salvation History

According to Kilmartin, the relation of sacraments to salvation history “should begin with the objective fact that sacraments are liturgical celebrations of the life of the Church.”<sup>269</sup> Consequently, he claims that sacraments can only be understood “from the essence of the Church,”<sup>270</sup> that is, from the relation between the Church and salvation history. Moreover, he asserts that the liturgical activity of the Church is a “real symbol” of the economy of salvation, namely, the mystery of God’s plan of salvation for the world which reached its fulfillment in Jesus Christ and which is being further realized through the mission of the Spirit in the time of the Church.<sup>271</sup> In seeking to establish this relation between sacraments and salvation history, Kilmartin articulates a vital connection between the Holy Spirit, the Church, and its liturgical activity. The underlying dynamic of this connection is the Christ-event.

The life of faith of the Church is a life in Christ. Within this liturgical life of the Church, the event of the new relation between God and humanity is continually realized in a

---

excellent presentation of Mühlen’s theology made available to English readers.

<sup>268</sup>See Pius XII *Mystici Corporis Christi*, 62.

<sup>269</sup>Kilmartin, “Theology of the Sacraments,” 153.

<sup>270</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>271</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 102.

unique way. Christian liturgy has a dialogical structure in which the worshipping community is open to an engagement with the Triune God. “A theology of the sacraments cannot overlook the task of integrating the two poles of the grace event of the sacramental celebrations, the divine action and the human response.”<sup>272</sup> By their very nature sacraments are aimed at eliciting a response of faith, for sacraments mediate the proper disposition. Kilmartin asserts that the priority of the divine initiative is expressed through the sacramental celebration as an act of faith of which God through Christ in the Spirit is the source.<sup>273</sup> Liturgy is the privileged place of divine-human encounter. God communicates his saving grace (self-communication) in and through history (human communication). But the high point of the revelation of God is reached in the life, death and glorification of Jesus Christ and in the sending of the Holy Spirit to establish the Church.<sup>274</sup> A deeper understanding of the communal worship in the life of faith of the Church requires that it be explained from the entire divine plan of salvation, namely, from creation to the final fulfillment with the second coming of Christ.

The history of God’s relationship with humanity is revealed according to a consistent plan. Kilmartin notes that in the Pauline writings the concept of *mysterion* is the one divine plan of God (1 Corinthians 2:7) which entails creation, redemption, and eschatological fulfillment in Christ. From this Pauline perspective, Kilmartin conceives salvation history to be God’s continued action in history to draw human beings into personal communion with

---

<sup>272</sup>Kilmartin, “Theology of the Sacraments,” 152.

<sup>273</sup>See Kilmartin, “Theology of the Sacraments,” 152.

<sup>274</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 50, 53.

himself despite their sinfulness.<sup>275</sup> The covenant that God made with Israel and his continued faithfulness to it despite their unfaithfulness correspond to this end. In the New Testament, this divine plan is extended to the new, definitive covenant in the Incarnation, life, death, and resurrection of Jesus Christ and to the sending of the Spirit to the Church. Henceforth, all manifestations and realizations of the divine plan are grounded on the Christ-event. It will be completed when the risen Lord will come to fulfill both world history and salvation history.<sup>276</sup>

Moreover, Kilmartin conceives the mystery of redemption in the New Testament to consist in God's acceptance of sinful human beings through the mission of the Word. "The Father wills that the redemption of humanity be accomplished by ' . . . sending his only Son in the likeness of sinful flesh' (Rom 8:3)."<sup>277</sup> Accordingly, the Word, always present to and active in the world from the outset of creation, obtains a new presence in the concrete humanity of Jesus of Nazareth through the Incarnation. "Jesus Christ is the mystery of salvation—the sacrament of salvation—in person."<sup>278</sup> Salvation, therefore, occurs through participation in the mystery of God, revealed and realized in a definitive way in and by Jesus Christ in the event of the cross—the ultimate historical expression of his self-emptying and obedience to the Father. The Word of God became present under the condition of humanity, "being born in the likeness of men,"<sup>279</sup> through his self-emptying act of the glory that he had with the Father. In this condition, yet without sin (Hebrews 4:15), Jesus' love and obedience

---

<sup>275</sup>See Kilmartin, "Theology of the Sacraments," 153-154; Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 59.

<sup>276</sup>See Kilmartin, "Theology of the Sacraments," 153-154; idem, *Christian Liturgy*, 56-59; idem, *Church, Eucharist and Priesthood*, 3.

<sup>277</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 59.

<sup>278</sup>Kilmartin, "Theology of the Sacraments," 154.

<sup>279</sup>Philippians 2:7.

to the Father made on behalf of sinful humanity is accepted by the Father. For it was the intention of Jesus to include, in his self-offering to the Father, the salvation of the world.

In order to continue his saving work in the world, so that believers will be able to participate in it, the risen Lord sends the Holy Spirit from the Father to establish the new people of God. The mystery of salvation, realized through the self-emptying and obedience to the cross, continues to be realized in the liturgy of the Church in the power of the Spirit after the glorification of Jesus. Kilmartin thus associates the communication of the Spirit at the first Pentecost as something belonging to the Christ-event.

The sending of the Spirit, from the Father by the Risen Lord, follows the historical event of the Cross as something belonging to that event. In the gift of the Spirit, who forms the Church of Jesus Christ, the many are drawn into the unity of the Trinity and share in the divine life in the way proper to creatures [that is, sacramentally].<sup>280</sup>

Thus, with the event of the Pentecost, the ever-present Spirit of God in the world now obtains a new form of presence as the Spirit of Jesus Christ in the Church and in the world. The Spirit has a personal presence and mission to animate the activity in and through the Church. In the time of the Church, the new working of the Spirit is in continuity with the saving work of Christ. The Spirit is the proper source of the knowledge and power of the Church and the liturgical enactment of the event of the cross in the Church. The Spirit thus makes the Church to be the presence of the salvation, hence sacrament of salvation, effected by the Christ-event.<sup>281</sup>

---

<sup>280</sup>Kilmartin, "Theology of the Sacraments," 155.

<sup>281</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 60-61; idem, "Theology of the Sacraments," 155.

As the Body of Christ, the Church is the “mystery” of God, derived from the mystery of Jesus Christ, and becomes effective through the Christ-event. Since the Church is the mystery of God, its sacramental celebrations can only be understood from this one mystery.

The mystery of salvation is effected in and through the historical event of the Cross. This is the decisive realization of the plan of redemption. Consequently, this mystery is revealed in the liturgical celebrations of the Church, is newly presented, applied, and lived by believers now. Moreover, since this mystery includes the gift of the Spirit, the liturgy of the Church, which represents it, mediates the communication of the Trinitarian life.<sup>282</sup>

Believers are called to grow into the fullness of Christ by obedience to the cross. Thus to receive the fruit of this work of salvation, believers must live a life conformed to “the image” of Christ (Romans 8:29).<sup>283</sup> In and with Christ, the Church undertakes the work of further realizing and revealing the mystery of God. Kilmartin asserts that sacraments are the special context or moments in the history of salvation in which, grounded in the Christ-event, God’s self-communication can be more fully accepted.<sup>284</sup> Sacraments are the ways<sup>285</sup> in which believers are integrated into the mystery of Christ. In the sacramental celebrations,

---

<sup>282</sup>Kilmartin, “Theology of the Sacraments,” 155.

<sup>283</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 60.

<sup>284</sup>According to Kilmartin, grace, God’s self-communication, is always and everywhere present to human beings, orienting them toward personal communion with the Trinity. But liturgical celebration of the Church is the particular, privileged, and holy place of the offer of this grace and its acceptance in praise and thanksgiving of the community of faith. See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 10, 87-89. Also see Kilmartin, “Theology of the Sacraments,” 152, 161.

<sup>285</sup>The manner that corresponds to the different situations of the history of the individual and community. For instance, Baptism signifies the incorporation of the individual into the death and resurrection of Christ (Romans 4-5). Eucharist signifies the community’s integration into this salvation and announces Christ’s self-offering on behalf of the many (1 Corinthians 10: 16-17, 11: 23-26).

Christians already experience their salvation and yet anticipate its final fulfillment here and now.<sup>286</sup>

According to Kilmartin, the two movements of the divine economy of salvation are the descent of the divine and the ascent of human beings to the divine. They determine the theology of worship. This understanding is dramatically expressed in the patristic period as God became man in order that human beings might become divine. “Christ and his saving work are understood to be really present in mystery in Christian liturgy as source and guide of the ascent of the faithful to God.”<sup>287</sup> The participants in the liturgy experience their passing over to God in Christ as a participation in the whole salvation history which began with creation, is definitively realized in Jesus Christ, and will be fulfilled at his second coming. In this perspective, Kilmartin demarcates the Eucharist as the summit and fulfillment of all liturgical celebrations.

Under the conditions of history, that to which all liturgy refers, the unity of the people of God in Christ, is manifested and realized in the most profound way in the Eucharist. Here the community gathers around Christ in the Spirit to share in the anticipated messianic banquet to the glory of the Father.<sup>288</sup>

---

<sup>286</sup>See *Lumen Gentium*, 35.

<sup>287</sup>Kilmartin, “Theology of the Sacraments,” 157.

<sup>288</sup>*Ibid.*



### **Constructing a “Theological” Approach Toward a Proper Mission of the Holy Spirit for Articulating Active Eucharistic Participation**

Kilmartin has a goal of achieving a personal mission of the Holy Spirit in the work of sanctification in constructing a Trinitarian theology of the liturgy. In order to make his pneumatological arguments and assertions more understandable, in this section I will demonstrate Kilmartin’s search for a sound theological basis on which to articulate the role of the Spirit in the ecclesiological dimension of the eucharistic celebration. His purpose is to substantiate theologically the liturgical role of the Spirit and the pneumatological dimension of the sacrifice of Christ, which he gained from his analysis of the early eucharistic prayers of the Church and the study of the Scripture. To this extent, what is reflected here is Kilmartin’s integration of *lex orandi* and *lex credendi*. I will begin with Kilmartin’s critical evaluation of Scholastic theology’s “appropriation” of the mission of the Spirit in the order of grace as well as his observations on theologians who have deviated from it on the basis of the New Testament and patristic theology. Kilmartin generally found their contributions useful. Then I will point out the recent Trinitarian/pneumatological developments in the modern Catholic theology accepted by Kilmartin. Next, I will present Kilmartin’s Trinitarian theology with its liturgical-theological implications and his articulation of the mystery of the liturgy and its celebration. Finally, I will conclude this section with Kilmartin’s presentation of salvation history-liturgical theology of the eucharistic sacrifice by detailing his articulation of active eucharistic participation.

## The Present State of Research on the Personal and Proper Mission of the Holy Spirit<sup>289</sup>

Kilmartin claims that the early Greek and Latin Fathers attributed a personal, proper role of the Holy Spirit in the sanctification of the humanity of Jesus and the work of continuing his mission in the world.<sup>290</sup> But he notes a change in the traditional Western Scholastic theology which does not attribute a proper mission to the Spirit in the economy of sanctification.<sup>291</sup> Kilmartin explains that Scholasticism adopted the principle of the operations of the Trinity *ad extra* (in the world) as indistinctly common to all three divine persons.<sup>292</sup> The implications of this principle, based on the procession model in which the unity of the three divine persons is grounded in their one divine essence (*homoousion*) that establishes their circumincession (*perichoresis*), were expressed in two Scholastic Trinitarian axioms: “Omnia opera trinitatis (in mundo) sunt indivisa; In deo omnia sunt unum, ubi non obviat relationis oppositio.”<sup>293</sup> Scholasticism applied these two axioms to the work of the Trinity in the world.

---

<sup>289</sup>The content of this section is dependent in good measure on Kilmartin’s presentation of this subject in his various writings. In this section, insofar as Scholasticism is concerned, I will concentrate only on the theological presuppositions and concepts which, Kilmartin claims, resulted in appropriating the mission of the Spirit in the order of grace. Kilmartin succinctly presents this subject in Edward J. Kilmartin, “Outline of Lectures at Creighton University: June, 1992,” (Kilmartin Archives, Jesuit Community at Boston College), 2-3, 20-21, hereafter “Outline of Lectures,” the topic of these lectures is the Holy Spirit and the Liturgy; idem, “Modern Approach,” 65-68; idem, “Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology,” 432-436; idem, *Christian Liturgy*, 142-143, 161, 164-165, 179, 218-219, *passim*.

<sup>290</sup>See Kilmartin, “Modern Approach,” 65.

<sup>291</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 162, 218; idem, “Modern Approach,” 66.

<sup>292</sup>See Kilmartin, “Modern Approach,” 66. For an extended treatment of this theme, see Yves Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, trans., David Smith (New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 2000), vol. 2, 79-99, vol. 3, 116-125, 144-154.

<sup>293</sup>“All works of the Trinity in the world are undivided; In God all things are one, where the opposition of relation[s of origin] does not rule it out.” Kilmartin, “Outline of Lectures,” 20, Underlines original. David Coffey claims that the first axiom is found in St. Augustine’s works. See David Coffey, *Grace: the Gift of the Holy Spirit* (Manly, NSW: Australia, 1978), 8, hereafter *Grace*. The second axiom

Kilmartin agrees with Scholasticism in its application of the first axiom (“Omnia opera trinitatis (in mundo) sunt indivisa”) to creation.<sup>294</sup> He notes that this axiom in Scholasticism, however, was not applied to the Incarnation in which the Logos, based on descending Christology, assumed the human reality of Jesus through the hypostatic union, resulting in the substantial sanctification of that humanity (the grace of union).<sup>295</sup> In the instance of the sanctification of believers, a work of the Godhead as such, a personal role is attributed to the Word to the extent that his glorified humanity exercises a mediatorship function, “‘principal efficient instrumental cause’.”<sup>296</sup> Kilmartin argues that while the Holy Spirit is given the function of bestowing the created gifts of grace on the humanity of Jesus in Scholastic theology, “this sanctification was linked to the Spirit only by way of appropriation, i.e., because of its similarity with a notional attribute of the Spirit.”<sup>297</sup> In reality, the

---

was formulated in the Decree for the Jacobites (1442) at the Council of Florence (1438-1452) for the purpose of condemning tritheism. However, this fundamental principle of Trinitarian theology was first enunciated by St. Anselm of Canterbury (c.1033-1109). See Neuner and Dupuis, eds., *The Christian Faith*, 118-119. According to Coffey, in the West the idea of this axiom was held by St. Augustine for the unity of the divine essence and the distinction of the Godhead by virtue of the opposition of relationships. In the East, the substance of this axiom can be traced back to Gregory of Nazianzus. See Coffey, *Grace*, 9.

<sup>294</sup>However, it is important to note that the confession made in the first article of the Nicene Creed, “We believe in one God, the Father, the Almighty, maker of heaven and earth, of all that is seen and unseen,” gives the impression that creation is appropriated to the Father. The theology contained in this affirmation of faith, however, is that the Trinity is the source of all created things. The Father is singled out because he is the source of the other two persons in the Trinity which, in turn, presupposes that the Son and the Spirit are also equally involved in the action of creation with the Father. It is in this sense that creation is to be understood as ultimately the work of the Triune God. Moreover, the principle of common action here is required by the very nature of Christianity as a monotheistic religion. Although God is a Trinity of persons, it does not imply that he is not one. Rather, one in being, he must also be one in act. See Coffey, *Grace*, 8-9.

<sup>295</sup>See Kilmartin, “Modern Approach,” 65-66; idem, “Outline of Lectures,” 20.

<sup>296</sup>Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 162.

<sup>297</sup>Kilmartin, “Modern Approach,” 66. Also see idem, *Christian Liturgy*, 108, 114, idem, “Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology,” 432-433; idem, “Theology of the Sacraments,” 129.

sanctification of the humanity of Jesus was assigned to the Trinity as one principle which, therefore, made the Spirit's influence on Jesus to be "accidental."<sup>298</sup>

On the other hand, Kilmartin claims that Scholasticism applied this axiom to the work of sanctification of believers.<sup>299</sup> Kilmartin reasons that the cause of this recognition lies in Scholasticism's understanding of divine action *ad extra* (specifically creation) as an exercise of divine efficient causality and describing God's action in grace, as in creation, to be also an exercise not of formal but of efficient causality.<sup>300</sup> The consequence was that grace was regarded purely as a work of God in the world and common to the three divine persons as such. In this understanding of grace, Kilmartin argues, any possibility of conceiving grace as a work proper to the Holy Spirit, like the Incarnation as a work proper to the Son, was not possible. Grace was also understood in terms of efficient causality which reduces a personal reality to an infra-personal level, at least on the side of the recipient. In a theology of the presence of God in grace, based on efficient causality, the mode of divine presence is reduced to the extent that the real distinctions between divine persons disappear; and the only available option to conceive the function of the Holy Spirit in the work of sanctification was appropriation.<sup>301</sup> That is, this function is said to belong to the Holy Spirit because it is fitting that this divine person who is the bond of the Father and the Son in the Trinity should also be

---

<sup>298</sup>See Kilmartin, "Modern Approach," 66.

<sup>299</sup>See Kilmartin, "Outline of Lectures," 20.

<sup>300</sup>Thus through the notion of creation, a coincidence was made between divine efficient causality and divine action *ad extra*, common to all three Trinitarian persons. This outlook was officially endorsed by Pius XII. See Pius XII, *Mystici Corporis Christi*, 78-79.

<sup>301</sup>See Kilmartin, "Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology," 432-433; idem, *Christian Liturgy*, 108, 114; idem, "Theology of the Sacraments," 129. Also see David Coffey, "*Did You Receive the Holy Spirit When You Believed?*": *Some Basic Questions for Pneumatology* (Wisconsin: Marquette University Press, 2005), 30, hereafter "*Did You Receive the Holy Spirit When You Believed?*".

the bond of God and believers. The appropriation principle entails the idea that a divine action *ad extra* may be attributed to one particular divine person even though really it is an action of God as such and therefore common to all three persons. The common action and appropriation principle are thus related in which the latter presupposes the former.<sup>302</sup> Stated differently, while the appropriation theory places all three divine persons on the same level, it singles out one particular person only in the order of predication. This approach is clearly a reduction of the content of faith. Furthermore, it fails to recognize that some works have both *ad intra* and *ad extra* components.<sup>303</sup> In the case of the former, the act constitutes an immediate relationship with one divine person only, whereas in the latter case, the act produces a created effect common to the three divine persons. In principle there are only two such works: the Incarnation of the divine Son in Jesus Christ and the bestowal of grace by the Holy Spirit.<sup>304</sup> Kilmartin argues that on the basis of the same *ad extra* principle the mission

---

<sup>302</sup>See Coffey, “*Did You Receive the Holy Spirit When You Believed?*”, 10-11.

<sup>303</sup>In the Incarnation divinity is communicated to the humanity of Jesus that results in the hypostatic union; and in grace divinity is communicated to people which results in their union with God, but not a hypostatic union. In each of these instances both the formal and efficient causalities are present—formal causality because God is communicated to a created reality (the humanity of Jesus and believers) and efficient causality because there is a “new creation,” (humanity of Jesus and “created grace”). From the point of view of efficient causality, the Incarnation and grace are works of God in the world, for there is a creation of the humanity of Jesus and “created grace.” From the point of view of formal causality, the Incarnation and grace are not just works of God in the world, for the Incarnation is the communication of the Son alone to the humanity of Jesus and in grace the believer is united to the Holy Spirit. See Coffey, *Grace*, 39.

<sup>304</sup>See Coffey, “*Did You Receive the Holy Spirit When You Believed?*”, 32. The Incarnation is the work of the Word alone by formal causality through the hypostatic union, and proper to him, with the sacred humanity of Christ created by efficient causality in a work *ad extra* common to the three divine persons. See John J. O’Donnell, “In Him and Over Him: the Holy Spirit in the Life of Jesus,” *Gregorianum* 70 (1989): 41; Coffey, *Grace*, 9. Similarly, the bestowal of grace is a union of formal causality of the Holy Spirit alone, and proper to him, with the just re-created by efficient causality in a work *ad extra* common to the three divine persons. See Coffey, “*Did You Receive the Holy Spirit When You Believed?*”, 11, 32-33.

of the Spirit to the Church was also appropriated in Scholastic theology.<sup>305</sup> Such understandings, however, have no inner-Trinitarian correspondence.<sup>306</sup>

Kilmartin thus notes the problem involved in Scholasticism's description of sanctification of Jesus and believers as having no correspondence between them. This problem arises if one only understands that the sanctification of Jesus is the paradigm of all sanctifications, and such was the way Scholasticism understood it. In order to overcome this problem, Kilmartin realized that it is necessary to make a distinction between the work of the Godhead in creation and in the sanctification of human persons. He believed that the Spirit has a personal mission in the economy of salvation, as ascribed to the Spirit in the Eastern tradition, together with the personal mission of the Word.<sup>307</sup> "If the real grace of sanctification, the grace by which human beings are divinized, corresponds to the way in which the God-head exists in itself, it must be thought through in terms of the Father's self-communication in the missions of his Word and his Spirit."<sup>308</sup>

Kilmartin claims that the second axiom ("In deo omnia sunt unum, ubi non obviat relationis oppositio") could give the impression by its wording that the unity of the Godhead is primary and the distinction of persons secondary.<sup>309</sup> Therefore, he suggests that this axiom needs to be balanced with another principle, "In deo omnia sunt Tria, ubi non obviat unitas

---

<sup>305</sup>See Kilmartin, "Modern Approach," 66; Kilmartin, "Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology," 432-433.

<sup>306</sup>See Coffey, *Grace*, 55.

<sup>307</sup>This interplay of the mission of Christ and the Spirit is expressed as Christ is the content of the Holy Spirit, who is the Spirit of Christ. See Edward J. Kilmartin, "The Active Role of Christ and the Holy Spirit in the Sanctification of the Eucharistic Elements," *Theological Studies* 45 (1984): 234, hereafter "Active Role of Christ and the Holy Spirit"; idem, "Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology," 433; David Coffey, "A Proper Mission of the Holy Spirit," *Theological Studies* 47 (1986): 228.

<sup>308</sup>Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 162.

<sup>309</sup>See Kilmartin, "Outline of Lectures," 20.

essentiae.”<sup>310</sup> This principle, according to Kilmartin, affirms two things: first, that the only ground for distinguishing divine persons is strictly their inner-Trinitarian relations; second, that real relations between the divine persons and the works of God in the world are possible, provided that creatures are capable of being drawn into the Trinitarian life.<sup>311</sup> Kilmartin claims that the relations between the divine persons make it impossible for them to be totally identical with each other.<sup>312</sup> Although they are identical by virtue of divine nature, their relations “prevent them from coalescing and collapsing into a single person.”<sup>313</sup> This understanding, then, suggests a proper sense in which the Holy Spirit could be said to be operative in grace.

The “appropriation theory,” which reflects Scholastic theology’s inability to differentiate the Trinitarian work in sanctification from that in creation, Kilmartin judged, fails to maintain the emphasis which the Scripture places on the Holy Spirit in the life of Christ, at Pentecost, in the life of the individual believer and the Church. It obscures the

---

<sup>310</sup>“In God all are three, where the unity of essence does not rule it out.” Kilmartin, “Outline of Lectures,” 20. Kilmartin, however, does not acknowledge the source of this principle. In fact, this principle was also originally formulated by St. Anselm. See Vondey, *Heribert Mühlen*, 93, n. 143. While asserting the distinction of the Trinitarian persons emphasized in the East and criticizing for its lack in the West, Kilmartin did not have the confidence to publish this axiom. Perhaps he thought that it might promote tritheism. This lack of confidence is also seen where he does not criticize Rahner who emphasizes the unicity of the Trinitarian persons on the basis of the subsisting of the same divine essence over against their distinction.

<sup>311</sup>See Kilmartin, “Outline of Lectures,” 20.

<sup>312</sup>See *ibid.*

<sup>313</sup>Coffey, “A Proper Mission of the Holy Spirit,” 229. According to Congar, every action of *ad extra* character also reflects the order of the divine persons in the Trinity. Accordingly, the Holy Spirit, who is the expression of the communication of the divine life *intra Deum*, is the principle of this communication of God *extra Deum*. See Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, vol. 3, 150.

proper understanding of the liturgical activity of the economic Trinity in general and the personal mission of the Spirit in particular with its ecclesiological dimension.<sup>314</sup>

Kilmartin names in particular three theologians, Denis Pétau (1583-1652), Matthias Joseph Scheeben (1835-1888), and Heribert Mühlen (1927-2006), as those who reacted against Scholasticism's appropriation theology of the Spirit.<sup>315</sup> Pétau attempted to revive the New Testament and patristic concept of the personal mission of the Spirit to the Church. Kilmartin, however, does not treat Pétau's pneumatology in detail. Nonetheless, it deserves more attention because it is further developed by Scheeben and Mühlen. While acknowledging Scheeben's and Mühlen's significant pneumatological contributions, Kilmartin points out the limitations of their pneumatology—their exclusively one-sided methodology (the procession model and its corresponding descending Christology) and their failure to attribute a role to the Holy Spirit in the event of the Incarnation. For these two

---

<sup>314</sup>See Kilmartin, "Active Role of Christ and the Holy Spirit," 237; idem, *Christian Liturgy*, 104; idem, "Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology," 432-433. Also see Coffey, "A Proper Mission of the Holy Spirit," 228.

<sup>315</sup>See Kilmartin, "Modern Approach," 66; idem, "Outline of Lectures," 2. Kilmartin refers to Matthias Joseph Scheeben, *Handbuch der Katholischen Dogmatik. Gesammelte Schriften* 6.1 (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1954); idem, *The Mysteries of Christianity*, trans. Cyril Vollert (St. Louis, Missouri: B. Herder Book Co., 1946); Heribert Mühlen, *Der Heilige Geist als Person. Beitrag zur Frage nach der dem Heiligen Geiste eigentümlichen Funktion in der Trinität, bei der Inkarnation und im Gnadenbund* (Münster: Aschendorff, 1963), hereafter *Der Heilige Geist als Person*; idem, *Una Mystica Persona. Die Kirche als das Mysterium der heilsgeschichtlichen Identität des Heiligen Geistes in Christus und den Christen: Eine Person in vielen Personen*, 2<sup>nd</sup> rev. ed. (Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1967), hereafter *Una Mystica Persona*. Kilmartin considers these two texts of Mühlen to be the most complete systematic theology of the Holy Spirit. These two texts of Mühlen are to be read as two volumes of one theological endeavor of his attempt to explain the formula "one person in many persons." See Kilmartin, "Active Role of Christ and the Holy Spirit," 237. Mühlen first presented this formula in the context of Mariology at the Mariological Congress in Lourdes in 1958. This formula was the result of working out of the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in order to integrate the doctrine of grace and Mariology into a comprehensive "personal" understanding. See Vondey, *Heribert Mühlen*, xiv, 49, 62. Also see Mühlen, *Una Mystica Persona*, 447. Ralph Del Colle comments on Scheeben's and Mühlen's theology of the Holy Spirit as "the two most significant Catholic pneumatologies of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries." Ralph Del Colle, *Christ and the Spirit: Spirit Christology in Trinitarian Perspective* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1994), 120, hereafter *Christ and the Spirit*.



reasons Kilmartin esteems and singles out David Coffey's valuable contribution made to rethinking the theology of the Trinity and the Holy Spirit through the complementary roles of Spirit-Christology to Logos-Christology.<sup>316</sup> Scheeben and Mühlen do not solve the problem of Scholastic theology's description of sanctification of Jesus and believers. But Kilmartin views Mühlen as providing a direction toward a solution. Kilmartin remarks that many Catholic theologians do not accept the concept of a personal mission of the Spirit in the work of sanctification.<sup>317</sup> He especially credits Mühlen for working out a new theology of the

---

<sup>316</sup>In this regard, Kilmartin refers to David Coffey, "The 'Incarnation' of the Holy Spirit in Christ," *Theological Studies* 45 (1984): 466-480; idem, "A Proper Mission of the Holy Spirit," 227-250; idem, *Grace*. This book, *Grace*, is very useful to understand Kilmartin's claim of the need to consider the procession and bestowal models of the Trinity in the order of grace. I do not present Coffey's Trinitarian theology or pneumatology separately because Kilmartin integrates elements of it into his theology. The only point on which Kilmartin does not agree with Coffey is his explanation of the presence of the salvific deeds of Christ by way of "eternalization." Kilmartin rather argues for a metaphysical presence by use of the theology of the New Testament, Aquinas, and McNamara. In fact, Kilmartin had begun to work toward a Spirit-Christology even before his encounter with Coffey's bestowal model. In his 1979 article "Modern Approach" (64-68), Kilmartin speaks for the first time about Spirit-Christology. However, Kilmartin is still indebted to Coffey's thought in that Coffey's bestowal model made it easier for Kilmartin to develop and articulate fruitfully his incipient pneumatological thinking in a Trinitarian theology, which legitimately takes into account the proper and personal mission of the Holy Spirit in the work of sanctification. Logos-Christology (descending Christology) is that in which God's extension of salvation is conceived in terms of a movement initiated by and in God and directed away from himself toward the world. The basis of this Christology lies in the Johannine concept of Incarnation. Accordingly, the Word of God, who was with the Father from all eternity, came down to the world in the person of Jesus assuming human nature. Underlying this Christology is a notion of the Trinity in which the procession of the Word from the Father is completed in the eternal coming-forth of the Holy Spirit. Whereas Spirit-Christology (ascending Christology), grounded on the Synoptic Gospels, highlights the special role of the Spirit in the elevation of the humanity of Jesus to the unity of person with the Word, as conceived in terms of a theological movement that rises from the human to the divine. This Christology culminates in the resurrection of Jesus and presupposes that this movement is guided and directed by the divine grace, the Holy Spirit, who is active both in Jesus and in those who believe in him. See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 124-125.

<sup>317</sup>See Kilmartin, "Active Role of Christ and the Holy Spirit," 238. To name but a few, Maurice de la Taille (1872-1933) and Rahner shy away from saying that the Holy Spirit exercises a unique function in the work of grace. See Maurice de la Taille, "Created Actuation by Uncreated Act," in *The Hypostatic Union and Created Actuation by Uncreated Act*, trans. Cyril Vollert (West Baden Springs, Indiana: West Baden College, 1952), 29-41; Rahner, "Some Implications of the Scholastic Theology of Uncreated Grace"; idem, *The Trinity*, 77. Considering the importance of the Spirit in the work of grace for Kilmartin's description of active participation, it is surprising that he does not criticize Rahner for not

Spirit which allows for such a possibility. He comments that “[Mühlen’s] elaboration of the fact and consequences of the personal mission of the Spirit represents a new phase in Western pneumatology.”<sup>318</sup> Mühlen conceived the idea of the Spirit as the personal principle of unity between Christ and Christians from Scheeben’s theology of the Spirit.

I briefly present their pneumatology. Common to all three is their articulation of a personal mission of the Holy Spirit in the work of grace which can be understood as the personal relations of the Holy Spirit to the just (and for Mühlen to Christ, too). Kilmartin builds his theology of the Holy Spirit oriented toward this role of the Spirit on the pneumatological insights of these three theologians while transcending the limitations involved in their theology of the Spirit.<sup>319</sup>

Based on his study of Scripture and the Fathers, Pétau dissociates himself from the Scholastic way of conceiving sanctification from the perspective of efficient causality.<sup>320</sup> He states that the substantial holiness (or the power of sanctifying) belongs properly to the Holy Spirit as the Spirit’s personal quality, which distinguishes the Spirit from the other two divine

taking into account a personal role of the Holy Spirit in the work of grace but calmly distances himself from him. It is obvious from Kilmartin’s writings that he had high academic respect for Rahner. Therefore, the only place where he somewhat strongly raises his voice against Rahner is the latter’s rejection of an I-Thou relation between the Son and the Father in the economic and immanent Trinity. This relationship is vital for Kilmartin’s sacramental theology. Kilmartin refutes Rahner’s position on this subject by offering an explanation on the basis of Trinitarian ontology and within the procession model by employing the argument developed by L. Oeing-Hanhoff that begins with a reflection of God’s individual being. See *Christian Liturgy*, 148-152.

<sup>318</sup>Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 142. Congar supports Mühlen’s thesis in his *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*.

<sup>319</sup>In addition to Scheeben’s and Mühlen’s methodology and their failure to attribute a role to the Spirit in the Incarnation, there is a reversal of order of the procession of the Trinity in their description of sanctification which is not in accord with their use of the procession model. Pétau’s description of formal causality in the context of grace events requires adjustment.

<sup>320</sup>The following presentation is a paraphrase from Coffey, “*Did You Receive the Holy Spirit When You Believed?*”, 15-16, 24-25, 40, where he makes reference to Denis Pétau, *Dogmata Theologica*, vol.3, book.8, *De Trinitate* (Paris: Apud Ludovicum Vivès, 1865), chapters. 4, 5:456 a; 6, 6:481-484.

persons. The Spirit exercises this role not by efficient causality but by entering into union with the believers. Hence, Pétau suggests formal causality is the appropriate category for conceptualizing the activity of the Holy Spirit in the work of grace, which implies a proper function of the Holy Spirit in his union with the just.<sup>321</sup> Pétau's introduction of formal causality in the matter of grace is important because it offers the possibility of considering the bestowal of grace outside the *ad extra* character.<sup>322</sup> He makes a distinction with regard to the union of the Holy Spirit with believers. First, this union gives them the quality of adoption as children of God and as such belongs to the common divinity of the three persons of the Trinity. Second, insofar as this union is in the *hypostasis* (person) of the Holy Spirit, not merely by virtue of a created gift bestowed by the Spirit (sanctifying grace), it is proper to the Spirit and does not belong to the other two persons. The three divine persons inhabit the believers; but it is only the Holy Spirit who is the form that sanctifies and makes the just adopted children of God by his self-communication. While saying that this union is substantial (*substantialis*) and not accidental (*accidentarius*), Pétau emphasizes its relative and incidental aspects as well. He thus avoids any sense of hypostatic union that this union might otherwise seem to imply. This assertion brings out the dialectic elements of identity and difference between the Incarnation and the bestowal of grace which Kilmartin would

---

<sup>321</sup>Pétau's thesis was not acceptable to the theological community of his time because it seemed to distort the distinction between God and the world and the transcendence of God. Congar, the most celebrated twentieth-century theologian of the Holy Spirit, accommodates Pétau's thesis in his pneumatological thinking. See Congar, *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, vol.3, 151.

<sup>322</sup>Rahner speaks of formal causality as involving the effectuation of ontological union with the agent and therefore a movement into the agent. See Rahner, "Some Implications of the Scholastic Concept of Uncreated Grace," 329.

emphasize in explaining the sanctification of Jesus and of believers.<sup>323</sup> But in so doing Kilmartin would apply formal causality, which exercises a centripetal activity, to substantial form<sup>324</sup> (Word) and accidental form<sup>325</sup> (fully constituted human beings) in such a way as to underscore the distinction and identity in the work of grace when referred to the Incarnation and the order of grace. Accordingly, the distinction on the side of Christ is that in the hypostatic union by virtue of the process of sanctification, the personhood of Jesus is determined by the work of the Spirit which, however, does not require a personal response.<sup>326</sup> The Word in divine freedom accepted the mission from the Father. In the case of the sanctification of believers, a free personal response is required because they are already fully constituted human beings whose personhood remains thus intact. The identity in both cases (Jesus and believers) is that it is a union in the one Holy Spirit.

Scheeben describes the Incarnation as constituted by the anointing of the humanity of Jesus by the Word.<sup>327</sup> It is reflected in his use of the name “Christ” which denotes the

---

<sup>323</sup>Nowhere does Kilmartin make a reference to Pétiau’s idea of formal causality in the work of grace. But Kilmartin’s pneumatological thinking, the development of the formal causality in regard to grace in *Christian Liturgy*, 139-142, and the distinction and identity of grace in the lives of Jesus and the believers seem to suggest Pétiau’s influence on him.

<sup>324</sup>Understood as a determinative principle of a composite being. See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 140, 228-229. That is, in the composition of the entire being of Jesus his humanity (body, soul, human essence, and human existence) subsists as that of the Son of God. When the Son gives this subsistence to the humanity of Jesus, he is called substantial form because he is communicated to the humanity in such a way that in which it is united to him in oneness of person. See *ibid.*, 142; Coffey, *Grace*, 63.

<sup>325</sup>Understood as a determinative principle of an already existing being. See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 140, 229. That is, the Holy Spirit is understood as accidental form which establishes the distinction of a divine and human person in grace. In believers’ union with God they retain their distinct human personhood. Therefore, in grace there is a union of persons, namely, God (Holy Spirit) and believers. See Coffey, *Grace*, 47, 64.

<sup>326</sup>The only human, personal response that ever played a role in the event of the Incarnation was Mary’s *fiat* to the divine plan of God brought to her by the angel Gabriel (Luke 1:38). See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 182.

<sup>327</sup>See Scheeben, *The Mysteries of Christianity*, 331-334. In addition, for the following

constitution of Jesus as true God-man.<sup>328</sup> The Father is the agent of the anointing insofar as he is the principle of the Son. Scheeben claims that the Church Fathers's description of the anointing of the humanity of Jesus in, with, through, and by the Holy Spirit does not denote the basic anointing by the Logos that is identical with the Incarnation. Kilmartin notes that Scheeben, while arguing that the presence (indwelling) of the Holy Spirit in the just is a mission proper to the Spirit, does not conceive of a personal mission of the Spirit to Jesus.<sup>329</sup> Rather, Kilmartin points out,<sup>330</sup> Scheeben suggests that a distinction be made between a fundamental anointing of the humanity of Jesus by the Logos (sanctified substantiality) and an additional anointing of the assumed humanity of Jesus by the Spirit because the Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Logos. The communication of the Spirit results from the hypostatic union. For Scheeben does not consider the "Holy Spirit" as a proper name for the third person of the Trinity. Rather, he prefers the person of the Logos insofar as he is the (co-)principle of the Spirit.<sup>331</sup> Scheeben's thought on the anointing is determined by a descending Christology even though it is expressed in the language of an ascending Christology. That is, anointing is a theme that pertains to this latter Christology since a man is the proper object of anointing by which he is raised to a new rank and mission.

Scheeben subscribes to the principle of appropriation in regard to the role of the Holy Spirit in grace and thereby to the theology of common action and the efficient causality that it

---

presentation of the pneumatology of Scheeben, see Kilmartin, "Modern Approach," 66; idem, *Christian Liturgy*, 161, 164, 218-219; Coffey, *Grace*, 91-118.

<sup>328</sup>Coffey, *Grace*, 94.

<sup>329</sup>See Kilmartin, "Modern Approach," 66.

<sup>330</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 164; idem, "Modern Approach," 66, referring to Scheeben, *The Mysteries of Christianity*, 332.

<sup>331</sup>See Coffey, *Grace*, 95.

implies.<sup>332</sup> He also rhetorically ascribes that the Holy Spirit can take purely moral possession of a created being in a way proper to the Spirit's own person.<sup>333</sup> His reduction of the possession of the Holy Spirit in grace to the level of "purely moral" has the consequence that, if the union of the Holy Spirit with the just is not ontological, this union is not divine nor is the Holy Spirit divine.<sup>334</sup> Scheeben considers the Spirit to be the mediator of the union of the Logos and the humanity of Jesus and attributes the mediation to the Godhead indistinctly but to the Spirit only by way of appropriation.<sup>335</sup> The communication of the Spirit is a result of the fundamental anointing of the humanity of Jesus by and with the Logos because the Spirit proceeds from the Father through the Logos. It is not the communication of the Spirit but the hypostatic union (the assumption of the human reality of Jesus by the Word) that constitutes the Logos as God-man. But the communication of the Spirit to the Church, from the Logos as its source, is predicated of the Spirit personally. In other words, the Spirit is personally present in the just by an indwelling which is proper to him. This aspect of pneumatology is a commonplace today, however, the possible implications for a theology of the personal mission of the Spirit still remains to be achieved fully.

Kilmartin argues that Mühlen distinguishes the anointing of Jesus with the Spirit from the assumption of the humanity of Jesus by the Word and interprets the anointing of Jesus at his Baptism as a revelation of the anointing of the Spirit that took place at his conception.<sup>336</sup>

---

<sup>332</sup>See Scheeben, *The Mysteries of Christianity*, 133-136, 145-146, 151, 190-197.

<sup>333</sup>See *ibid.*, 166.

<sup>334</sup>See Coffey, "Did You Receive the Holy Spirit When You Believed?", 17.

<sup>335</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 161.

<sup>336</sup>See *ibid.*, 164. Also see Mühlen, *Der Heilige Geist als Person*, 197-214. What is implied here is Mühlen's recognition that what the New Testament presents in temporal sequence should be understood sometimes in logical sequence. See Coffey, *Grace*, 100.

“The anointing with and by the Spirit occurs simultaneously but logically posterior.”<sup>337</sup>

Kilmartin notes that in Mühlen’s theology the anointing corresponds to the bestowal of sanctifying grace and is distinguished from the “grace of union.” It bestows the personal presence of the Spirit and the created gifts of grace.<sup>338</sup> Kilmartin notes that Mühlen attributes the Spirit’s anointing of the already assumed humanity of Jesus by the Word to an activity linked to the proper and personal mission of the Holy Spirit, hence not proper to the Godhead as such.<sup>339</sup> But in Mühlen’s exclusive descending-/Logos-Christology, the Incarnation is the work of the Son himself who assumes the humanity of Jesus. Therefore, as the Son becomes united to the sacred humanity at the time of the Incarnation, he must at that same time bestow on this humanity the Holy Spirit proceeding from him.

Mühlen holds on to the effect of the anointing at the Incarnation as created grace because, if the radical union of Jesus with God is by the grace of union (the Son), his human sanctification which believers have in common with and derived from him as head needs to be explained. Because sanctification is the work of the Holy Spirit in believers, in Mühlen’s theology the anointing with the Holy Spirit at the Incarnation explains human sanctification or created grace in Jesus. Consequently, because Christ is head, the bestowal of sanctifying grace becomes the manifestation of the gift of the Spirit to all humanity.<sup>340</sup> But it is not clear how Mühlen can say that the anointing at the Baptism is the revelation of the anointing at the Incarnation since the differences between these two anointings in his theology are so great as

---

<sup>337</sup>Kilmartin, “Modern Approach,” 66.

<sup>338</sup>See *ibid.*; *idem*, *Christian Liturgy*, 164. Also see Mühlen, *Der Heilige Geist als Person*, 170-187; Coffey, *Grace*, 100.

<sup>339</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 161.

<sup>340</sup>See Kilmartin, “Modern Approach,” 66; *idem*, *Christian Liturgy*, 164. Also see Mühlen, *Der Heilige Geist als Person*, 170-187; Coffey, *Grace*, 100.

to rule out this possibility. For Mühlen describes the effect of the anointing at the Baptism as the prophethood of Jesus and that of the anointing at the Incarnation is Jesus' created grace. If the baptismal anointing is to be the revelation of the Incarnation anointing, the prophethood of Jesus would have to be the revelation of his created grace. It is impossible to maintain so total a distinction of person, to which corresponds the created grace of Jesus as a state of being, and office, to which corresponds his prophethood. While saying that the Son is not the agent of anointing of the humanity of Jesus at the Incarnation, Mühlen implies that the Holy Spirit proceeding from the Son anoints the humanity. According to Scripture, the agent of the anointing at the Baptism is the Father and gives no warrant for the assertion that the Son anoints his own humanity. Hence, the anointing at the Baptism is not and cannot be the revelation of the anointing at the Incarnation as understood by Mühlen.<sup>341</sup> In the Incarnation the Father anoints the humanity of Jesus with the Holy Spirit, who creates, sanctifies, and unites that humanity in person to the pre-existent divine Son not in the order of time but of nature.<sup>342</sup>

Mühlen relates the Spirit to Jesus as person to person in a relationship which is proper to the person of the Holy Spirit.<sup>343</sup> The Spirit unites himself to the person of Jesus and endows Jesus with the gifts of grace that, together with the Spirit, will be given to the Church.

---

<sup>341</sup>See Coffey, *Grace*, 107.

<sup>342</sup>See *ibid.*, 91, 107; *idem*, "Did You Receive the Holy Spirit When You Believed?," 110.

<sup>343</sup>Mühlen achieved this relation with his understanding of "person" as the essence of an actually existing person. See Kilmartin, "Modern Approach," 66-67. Also see Heribert Mühlen, *Sein und Person nach Johannes Duns Scotus. Beitrag zur Grundlegung einer Metaphysik der Person* (Werl: Dietrich-Coelde-Verlag, 1954), 68-77; *idem*, *Der Heilige Geist als Person*, 26-44; Dumitru Staniloae, "The Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and His Relation to the Son, as the Basis of our Deification and Adoption," in Lukas Fischer, ed., *Spirit of God, Spirit of Christ: Ecumenical Reflections on the Filioque Controversy* (London: SPCK and WCC, 1981), 179-180.



Mühlen interprets the anointing of Jesus with the Spirit and the gift of the Spirit to all humanity as the realization of the Church through the bestowal of the Spirit. Consequently, the Church is understood as the continuation of the unction of Christ by the Holy Spirit.<sup>344</sup> In order to assert a personal mission of the Spirit, Mühlen combines the theme of anointing of Jesus with the Holy Spirit with the procession model of the Trinity. He does so because, while making a distinction between the Incarnation and the anointing of Jesus, he conceives the anointing as another way of the Incarnation, viewed from the perspective of descending Christology. But the theme of anointing of Jesus is, in fact, a Lukan theme of ascending Christology.

From the perspective of systematic theology, Kilmartin acknowledges Mühlen's presentation is basically correct and generally in accord with the ancient tradition.<sup>345</sup> Yet he judges that a distinction made between the Incarnation and anointing of the Spirit by Mühlen based on the New Testament is questionable. Moreover, this approach is not required to avoid a form of Christomonism that would fail to situate the Spirit in a personal relation to Christ and the Church.<sup>346</sup> Rather, he claims that within the general perspective of the New Testament Spirit-Christology, it is possible to demonstrate that the Spirit personally in the Logos fills the incarnate Word and overflows from Jesus to the world after his glorification.<sup>347</sup>

---

<sup>344</sup>See Kilmartin, "Modern Approach," 67.

<sup>345</sup>See *ibid.*

<sup>346</sup>See *ibid.*; *idem*, *Christian Liturgy*, 164-165. Coffey argues that as long as in Mühlen's theology the anointing of Jesus with the Holy Spirit remains a secondary theme to the Incarnation, it is impossible to do justice to the theology of the Church, which, according to Mühlen, is a continuation of this anointing. See Coffey, "A Proper Mission of the Holy Spirit," 242.

<sup>347</sup>See Kilmartin, "Modern Approach," 66-67. Also see Coffey, "A Proper Mission of the Holy

This Spirit-Christology, Kilmartin believed, provides an indispensable starting point for a better appreciation of Christ in terms of personality which involves an identity of being in and by communion which provides the opportunity to speak of a more profound grasp of the nature of the relationship between Christ and the Church.<sup>348</sup>

Christ is Christ because he has existence in the Spirit who signals the final realization of God's self-communication to the world. He cannot be defined by himself alone but only as a reality embracing all. In the Spirit of God, as principle of communion between God and mankind, Christ is the eschatological man who includes all in himself.<sup>349</sup>

Kilmartin endorses P. Schoonenberg's claim in saying that since the Spirit is divine, the Spirit sustains the human reality of Jesus in existence along with the Logos and gives it eschatological significance.<sup>350</sup> By employing Schoonenberg's "reciprocal hypostasis,"<sup>351</sup> Kilmartin describes that Jesus is personalized by the Logos or the Spirit's presence in Jesus results from the Logos' self-communication. Kilmartin finds its correspondence to the traditional Trinitarian teaching as that the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are not only related to each other but in each other by virtue of *perichoresis*.

The Logos [proceeds] from the Father to become the Incarnate Word; the Spirit from the Logos to fill the Incarnate Word during Jesus' earthly life and to overflow to the world after Jesus' glorification. Thus, the Logos founds God's unique presence in the human reality of Jesus; the Spirit is God's presence as eschatological. Both penetrate Jesus'

---

Spirit," 241; Walter Kasper, *Jesus the Christ*, trans. V. Green (New York: Paulist Press, 1977), 254-268; P. J. Rosato, "Spirit Christology: Ambiguity and Promise," *Theological Studies* 38 (1977): 423-449.

<sup>348</sup>See Kilmartin, "Modern Approach," 67.

<sup>349</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>350</sup>See *ibid.*; Piet Schoonenberg, "Spirit Christology and Logos Christology," *Bijdragen* 38 (1977): 350-375.

<sup>351</sup>The Logos becomes person in Jesus' human reality and the human person is sustained by God's Word. See Kilmartin, "Modern Approach," 67, 103, n. 26.

whole human reality, and from his fullness the Spirit, and not precisely the Logos, is given to the world with Jesus' glorification.<sup>352</sup>

At this point, it is important to review Mühlen's description of the personal relation of the Holy Spirit which forms the Church. He presents the analogy of personal relations of the Trinity with the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and the Son as a single principle and concludes that the Father ("I") and the Son ("Thou") combine to become the "We" of the principle of the Holy Spirit.<sup>353</sup> In this analogy, the Holy Spirit is characterized in four appellations.<sup>354</sup> This analogy has the advantage of expressing clearly the relations of the persons in a truly personal way. Thus the Father-Son is I-Thou relation, the Son-Father is Thou-Thou relation, the Father-Son to the Holy Spirit is We-Thou relation, and the Holy Spirit to the Father-Son is I-You (plural) relation.<sup>355</sup> Mühlen's description of the Holy Spirit as the "We in person" between the Father and the Son, ontologically "one person in two persons," implies the property of the Holy Spirit, namely, to relate persons. In a Trinitarian context the Father and the Son are united in the person of the Holy Spirit as the bond between

---

<sup>352</sup>Ibid., 67-68.

<sup>353</sup>See Heribert Mühlen, "The Person of the Holy Spirit," in *The Holy Spirit and Power: The Catholic Charismatic Renewal*, ed. Kilian McDonnell (Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1975), 25-29.

<sup>354</sup>"Der subsistentierende Wir-Akt zwischen Vater und Sohn" (the subsistent We-act between the Father and the Son), "Wir-Akt in Person" (the We-act in person), "Das Wir in Person" (the We in person), "Eine Person in zwei Personen" (the one person in two persons). See Mühlen, *Der Heilige Geist als Person*, 126-136, 142, 157, 164.

<sup>355</sup>See Mühlen, *Der Heilige Geist als Person*, 135, 155, 158. Coffey notes that the naming of the last two relations is new in Trinitarian theology and thus goes beyond the psychological analogy of Augustine and Aquinas in which the limitation to name the relation of the Father and the Son to the Holy Spirit and *vice versa* is caused by the procession of the Spirit which is a *processio operationis* ("procession of the operation"). See Coffey, *Grace*, 34. At the same time, for the criticisms leveled against Mühlen's use of the pronoun to describe the Holy Spirit in an analogy of personal relations and the need for a proper pronominalization of the Holy Spirit within the context of the primary Trinitarian data and constitutive and notional acts, see Coffey, *Grace*, 34-37.

them. Mühlen believes that the Holy Spirit fulfills the same personal function also in salvation history and the Spirit makes possible the “We” of the Church. Mühlen’s ecclesiology can be expressed, echoing his pneumatological conclusion, as that the Church is the mystery of the union of the Holy Spirit in Christ and in Christians, “one person in many persons.” In this way Mühlen explains the understanding of the traditional formula “*una mystica persona*”—the presence of the Holy Spirit as person in Christ and in Christians that forms the Church. He substantiated this concept from the historical, biblical, and systematic theological perspectives.<sup>356</sup>

In the procession model applied to the Trinity,<sup>357</sup> it is possible to express the relation of the Father to the Son and *vice versa* because the first procession is a *processio operati* (a procession of the thing operated), that is, with the immanent term. But it is not possible to express the relation of the Father and the Son to the Holy Spirit and *vice versa* because the second procession is a *processio operationis* (procession of the operation), that is, with no immanent term. In the analogy of personal relations, it would then be necessary to express accurately the single relation between the Father and the Son on the one side and the Holy Spirit on the other side. While the concept of the Holy Spirit as the “We-act” of the Father and the Son can be accepted, Mühlen’s description of it as a common act of the Father and the Son is problematic.<sup>358</sup> Such a description needs to be nuanced since it is not only incompatible with the Western version of the procession model, which Mühlen uses, but will

---

<sup>356</sup>For Mühlen’s elaborate treatment of this topic from these perspectives, see Vondey, *Heribert Mühlen*, 99-160.

<sup>357</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 125-129. Also see Coffey, *Grace*, 11-32; W. J. Hill, *The Three-Personed God: The Trinity as a Mystery of Salvation* (Washington, District of Columbia: Catholic University, 1982), 53-78, hereafter *The Three-Personed God*.

<sup>358</sup>See Mühlen, *Der Heilige Geist als Person*, 142-154. Also see Coffey, *Grace*, 36.

also imply two distinct principles in the Trinity. Kilmartin nuances Mühlen's peculiar way of describing the "We-act" of the Father and the Son as the source of the "We in person," the Spirit, in the following manner.

In the immanent Trinity, the Spirit is not correctly described by a personal pronoun AT THE LEVEL OF PRIMARY DATA. H. Mühlen suggests that the Spirit be called the "We in person" of which the source is the "We act" of the Father and Son. But, even in the Western version of the procession model, which Mühlen employs, the Spirit does not proceed from a common act of two subjects. The Father and Son do not relate to the Spirit as a We, which would imply two distinct principles. Rather, the procession of the Spirit derives from the MUTUAL ACT of Father and Son, from Father and Son acting as one principle.<sup>359</sup>

Thus the Father and the Son are mutually the object of each other's act which Kilmartin considered to be important for the theology of grace. It will then mean that basically and primarily the love of God is not directed beyond the Trinity, for the Trinity is self-sufficient. In addition, creation is seen as necessary neither for the existence of the Trinity nor for the self-communication of God<sup>360</sup> but as coming out of God's love. If the love of God is directed beyond the immanent Trinity to human persons, its purpose is to draw them into the Trinitarian life and to make them the object of the Father's inner-Trinitarian love whereby

---

<sup>359</sup>Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 179, n. 24. Emphasis original. Also see *ibid.*, 176; Coffey, *Grace*, 36. Kilmartin's description of the mutual act of the first and second persons of the Trinity will become clear when I present the bestowal model. In this regard, Kilmartin differs from Rahner who, convinced of the principle of the unicity of God that correspondingly requires or presupposes unicity of the divine action, rejects both common and mutual acts in the Trinity because it will presuppose two acts which are unacceptable from the perspective of inner-Trinitarian data. While acknowledging the manner of subsisting of the Father, Son, and Spirit is distinct as relations of opposition, Rahner asserts that it is the one and the same divine essence subsisting in each of the three distinct manners of subsisting. In other words, God is not distinct in these manners of subsisting, hence only one God which calls for only one action. Moreover, he holds that the Word is spoken and does not speak. The Spirit is breathed forth and does not breathe. See Rahner, *The Trinity*, 106-107, 113-114.

<sup>360</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 137.

they are in a certain way identified with the Son.<sup>361</sup> In this sense, Rahner understands creation of human beings to be a moment of God's self-communication. Based on the nature of God's self-communication and the transcendental nature of human persons, he argues that

[t]he self-communication of the free personal God who gives himself as a person . . . presupposes a personal recipient . . . If God wishes to step freely outside of himself, he must create man. There is no need to explain in detail that he must create a spiritual-personal being, the only one who possesses the "obediential potency" for the reception of such a self-communication.<sup>362</sup>

Neither Scheeben nor Mühlen considers the Incarnation in two stages, *in fieri* (formation)<sup>363</sup> and *in facto esse* (constitution), but exclusively in constitution from the viewpoint of the procession model and its descending Christology. Since the Incarnation as constituted is a union of the humanity of Jesus and the Word, a proper function of the Holy Spirit in bringing the Incarnation about is absent in their theology.<sup>364</sup> Kilmartin thus considers Scheeben's and Mühlen's failure to attribute a role to the Spirit in the event of the Incarnation beyond "the mediation of 'habitual grace,' which pertains accidentally to the 'grace of union'," <sup>365</sup> to be inadequate for his theology of grace which, on the contrary, requires attributing a personal role to the Spirit. Moreover, in their explanation of the event of sanctification, human persons are united to God by a process that inverts the order of the

---

<sup>361</sup>See Coffey, *Grace*, 37.

<sup>362</sup>Rahner, *The Trinity*, 89-90.

<sup>363</sup>That is, the union of the Word and the humanity of Jesus as viewed from the perspective of ascending Christology.

<sup>364</sup>See Kilmartin, "Modern Approach," 66-67. Scheeben and Mühlen describe it as that the Son, sent by the Father, in turn sends the Holy Spirit proceeding from him upon his humanity. For the disadvantages of this understanding of the Incarnation, see Coffey, *Grace*, 116-117.

<sup>365</sup>Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 143.

Trinitarian processions and the order of the three persons which has no inner-Trinitarian ground in the procession model.<sup>366</sup> Kilmartin claims that neither theologian

offers a solution to the traditional teaching that believers share in the “grace of Christ.” The grace of union, that is, the grace that is the assumption of the humanity by the Word, is not communicable. Also the postulated habitual grace of Jesus, a result of the assumption of the humanity, is proper to himself. As his personal grace, it is not communicable. What, then, is the grace of Christ shared with those who are sanctified? Grace of Christ can be understood in the sense that *of Christ* represents an objective genitive; it is the grace merited by Christ’s saving work and not, strictly speaking, Christ’s own grace (subjective genitive).<sup>367</sup>

Furthermore, he asks, “Is there a common grace shared by Christ and divinized human persons that accounts for the fact that believers are really united to the glorified Christ?”<sup>368</sup>

What Kilmartin implies in this rhetorical question is his understanding of the grace that emerges in the event of sanctification which is nothing but the possession of the Holy Spirit.

The significance of Scheeben’s and Mühlen’s pneumatological contribution is their conviction that the order of grace reflects the inner-Trinitarian life. Kilmartin appreciates their attempt to associate the baptismal anointing of Jesus with the Spirit to the bestowal of the Spirit at the Incarnation.<sup>369</sup> By establishing a correspondence of the possession of the Holy Spirit by believers in economy to that of Jesus in the inner-Trinitarian life through the integration of the bestowal model of the Trinity articulated by Coffey, Kilmartin will build on the basic insight of Mühlen’s pneumatological ecclesiology by harmonizing the role of the Spirit in the event of the Incarnation, which will transcend the limitation imposed by the

---

<sup>366</sup>See Coffey, *Grace*, 111-116. This inversion will be treated and become clear when I present the disadvantage of the procession model and its descending Christology in relation to sanctification.

<sup>367</sup>Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 161. Emphasis original.

<sup>368</sup>See *ibid.*

<sup>369</sup>See *ibid.*, 164.

procession model and its descending Christology. Such an approach will make it clear that liturgy is an activity of the Trinity and the worshipping assembly (the Church in action). The latter aspect is arrived at through the personal mission of the Holy Spirit in the sanctification of believers in the liturgical celebration. According to Mühlen, this special role of the Holy Spirit is nothing but “a relation of person to person”<sup>370</sup> or to relate persons. Kilmartin will call it “mediated immediacy.”<sup>371</sup>

Kilmartin claims that modern renewal of the theology of the Holy Spirit has led to a new appreciation of the peculiar role of the Holy Spirit in the economy of salvation.<sup>372</sup> Based on the implications of the Spirit-Christology of the New Testament and its articulation in patristic theology, he adds, stress is now placed on the active role of the Holy Spirit in the Incarnation and the mission of Jesus.<sup>373</sup> But he notes that this Spirit-Christology is not described as corresponding to the inner-Trinitarian Western linear procession model.<sup>374</sup> Hence he contends that there is no process in the economic Trinity that corresponds to the procession model of the immanent Trinity. Instead, a personal mission to the Spirit is awarded on the ground that the Holy Spirit is the power of assimilation of believers into the Trinity which Kilmartin judged at least as allowing one to speak about the presence of a “grace of Christ” in which human persons participate, the same Spirit who draws them into

---

<sup>370</sup>O'Donnell, “In Him and Over Him: The Holy Spirit in the Life of Jesus,” 27.

<sup>371</sup>Kilmartin, “Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology,” 435. In the context of self-communication of God, Rahner describes the Spirit as “the opening up of history into the immediacy of its fatherly origin and end.” Rahner, *The Trinity*, 47.

<sup>372</sup>See Kilmartin, “Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology,” 433.

<sup>373</sup>See Kilmartin, “Outline of Lectures,” 20.

<sup>374</sup>See *ibid.*, 20-21. This lack of correspondence will be shown below when Kilmartin's analysis of the sanctification of Jesus and believers, viewed from the procession model of the Trinity, is presented.



union with the Son.<sup>375</sup> This grace is made available by the manner of the procession of the Spirit. Kilmartin, therefore, found it necessary to show the correspondence of this manner of the procession of the Spirit in the economy of salvation (revelation of God) to the inner-Trinitarian life. Such a correspondence will also emphasize the consistency of God, namely, the necessary correspondence between the economic and immanent Trinity. For Kilmartin repeatedly asserts that the revelation of God requires that it correspond to the way God exists in Godself.<sup>376</sup>

Kilmartin recognizes that in modern theology, saving grace, participation in the divine life of the Holy Trinity, is understood to consist in personal relations with each of the divine persons.<sup>377</sup> In this regard, Kilmartin considers the distinction made between the works of the Trinity in creation and in redemption as significant. He articulates, “The distinction between the work of the Trinity in creation, which does not imply special relations of the individual divine persons to creatures, and the work of the Trinity in redemption, which implies personal relations to individual divine persons.”<sup>378</sup> In a footnote Kilmartin provides a better explanation of this distinction in the following manner:

Only a distinction of reason exists between the works of the divine persons in creation because there are no grounds for a real distinction of relations of individual divine persons to created works as such. But aspects of creation are appropriated (=strict sense) to a person because it suits the peculiarity of that person. The use of “appropriation” in the strict sense is motivated by the desire to affirm that creation is a unified work of the triune God: identity of operation; differentiated work of persons (*distinction of reason*). On the other hand, there exists a real distinction between the works of divine persons in the

---

<sup>375</sup>See *ibid.*, 20.

<sup>376</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 102, *passim*.

<sup>377</sup>See Kilmartin, “Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology,” 433.

<sup>378</sup>*Ibid.*

sanctification of human realities because there exist real relations between individual divine persons and human persons. In this case “appropriation” in the wide sense is applicable, namely, the work proper to one divine person includes the work of the other two: differentiated work of one person includes the work of the other two: differentiated work of persons (*real distinction*); real unity of differentiated operations (*perichoresis*).<sup>379</sup>

This distinction, Kilmartin argues, has influenced the teaching of the modern Roman magisterium.<sup>380</sup> He believes that attributing a proper and personal mission to the Holy Spirit in the economy of salvation has significant implications for all aspects of Christian theology in general and the Eucharist in particular. He enumerates these implications as follows.

There is the matter of the pneumatological aspect of the Incarnation of the Word and the work of the incarnate Word by which the new covenant is established between the Father and humanity, and of the role of the Holy Spirit in the work of establishing and maintaining the Church and in the process of sanctification of ordinary human persons. In the case of the Eucharist, attention must be paid to the role of the Holy Spirit in the event of the transformation of the eucharistic elements into the sacraments of the Body and Blood of Christ; to the nature of the action of the Holy Spirit by which the eucharistic community is sanctified and thus enabled to offer acceptable worship to the Father in union with the crucified and risen Lord; to the nature of sanctifying action of the Holy Spirit which sheds light both on the question of the manner of presence of the death-resurrection of Christ in the eucharistic celebration and on the question of the participation of the worshippers in this mystery of God in Christ.<sup>381</sup>

---

<sup>379</sup>Ibid., 433, n. 84.

<sup>380</sup>For these magisterial teachings of *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 6; *Lumen Gentium*, 48; Pius XII; Paul VI; and John Paul II, see Kilmartin, “Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology,” 433-434. In his encyclical of 1990, *Redemptoris Missio*, John Paul II took an official position concerning the proper mission of the Holy Spirit. Surprisingly it escapes the eyes of Kilmartin who still carries forward the complaints, made in 1988 book *Christian Liturgy*, 233-234, n. 15, into his final article of 1994 against this Pope’s previous declining to make an official position on the role of the personal mission of the Holy Spirit in his encyclical *Dominum et Vivificantem* (1986). On the other hand, Kilmartin rightly points out the absence of pneumatological reference in the section especially dedicated to the Eucharist in *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 47-58. See Kilmartin, “Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology,” 433-434.

<sup>381</sup>Ibid., 434-435.

In all these instances, Kilmartin defines the role of the Spirit as “mediation” (or mediated immediacy). He underscores this function of the Holy Spirit in the economy of salvation, namely, to bring the Church to Christ and *vice versa* and applies it to liturgy. He asserts that both these movements, which find expression in the epiclesis of the liturgies of sacraments, are essential for an effective liturgy.<sup>382</sup> Moreover, this role of the Spirit, which is the bond of unity, makes the Spirit the personal principle of unity and differentiation. Accordingly, he asserts that it is possible “to speak of the interplay between Christ and the Church without neglecting the difference; to distinguish the activity of the two without neglecting the greater mystery of their unity.”<sup>383</sup> This latter aspect guards against an overdrawn identification of Church with the Spirit. The unity between Christ and the Church is personal and immediate because it is mediated by the Spirit of Christ whom he shares with believers.<sup>384</sup>

This pneumatological evaluation and insight led Kilmartin to conclude that an adequate articulation of the sanctification of believers as the work of the Holy Spirit, which at the same time also should correspond to the sanctification of Christ, is made possible only by constructing a particular Trinitarian theology.<sup>385</sup> He believed that a theology of the Spirit

---

<sup>382</sup>See *ibid.*, 435.

<sup>383</sup>See *ibid.* According to *Lumen Gentium*, the Holy Spirit is the principle of unity between Christ and the Church, which the Spirit makes the “sacrament of salvation.” In this regard, the Council refers to the analogy between the Incarnation and Church. The distinction between the mission of the Son and the mission of the Spirit is basic for the unity and distinction between Christ and the Church and the ordering of Christ and the Church. See *Lumen Gentium*, 8, 48.

<sup>384</sup>See Kilmartin, “Outline of Lectures,” 20.

<sup>385</sup>Kilmartin points out similar concern voiced by theologians for the need of having a Trinitarian dimension in modern liturgical/sacramental theology and its absence as the obstacle for a systematic development of this theological discipline. See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 99, n. 8, referring to Lothar Lies, “Tinitätsvergessenheit gegenwärtiger Sakramententheologie?” *Zeitschrift für Katholische Theologie*

worked out through this Trinitarian theology and its application to the eucharistic liturgy will effectively articulate the liturgical role of the Holy Spirit with its ecclesiological effects in the eucharistic celebration. Moreover, Kilmartin's analysis of the classical eucharistic prayers revealed to him that the mystery of Christian worship is a participation in Jesus Christ's covenant relationship with the Father in the Holy Spirit. He found the prayer texts in words and action express the faith of the New Covenant. In this faith the Church proclaims the offer and acceptance of Trinitarian self-communication in Jesus Christ as the greatest saving deed of God. Confident of the divine purpose revealed in Jesus Christ and acting as the covenant people, the liturgical assembly petitions the Father to send the Holy Spirit to unite it with Christ so that it will be brought into communion of the Trinity.

#### Theology of the Liturgy as Theology of the Economic Trinity

According to Kilmartin, from the perspective of the *lex orandi* all Christian theology should be done in the light of the Trinitarian self-revelation.<sup>386</sup> He states that "liturgy is a comprehensive expression of the life in Christ. The life of faith is grounded on, and finds its fulfillment in, the economic Trinity. This truth leads to the conclusion that a systematic theology of liturgy can and must be brought back to a theology of the Trinity."<sup>387</sup> Accordingly, he understands that liturgy is the expression and realization of the economic Trinity. His assertion of the theology of "a liturgy as theology of the Trinity"<sup>388</sup> derives from

---

105 (1983): 290-314.

<sup>386</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 100-111.

<sup>387</sup>See *ibid.*, 92.

<sup>388</sup>*Ibid.*, 108.

the mystery of the liturgical event—the total self-communication of the Triune God in their economic activity to humanity. He notes that the mystery of the liturgy is Trinitarian in effect and accomplishment.<sup>389</sup> The effect he understands as the self-communication of the Father through the missions of the Word and the Spirit; the accomplishment he describes as the procession of the Son and the Spirit that accounts for their missions, the means of “the self-communication of the Triune God, originating from the Father.”<sup>390</sup>

Because of the Trinitarian character of the liturgy in its execution and content, Kilmartin argues, a systematic approach to theology of the liturgy should explain the relationship between the theology of the mystery of the economy of salvation and the mystery of the liturgy as well as the consequences that follow from it.<sup>391</sup> He notes that the dialogical structure of the liturgy demonstrates that it is a reality of the life of faith in which the economic Trinity is symbolically represented and communicated. Therefore, the concern of liturgy is not just the sacramentally mediated encounter with Christ but also the way in which the Church’s liturgy is the “real symbol” of the economy of salvation of the Triune God.<sup>392</sup> “The liturgical activity of the Church is a ‘real symbol’ of the economy of salvation, that is, of the mystery of God’s plan of salvation for the world, which reached its fulfillment in Jesus Christ and which is being further realized through the mission of the Spirit in the time of the Church.”<sup>393</sup> The central mystery of Christian faith is the Triune God and the grace of redemption mediated through liturgical celebration consisting of God’s Trinitarian

---

<sup>389</sup>See *ibid.*, 102, *passim*.

<sup>390</sup>*Ibid.*, 114. Also see Kilmartin, “Theology of the Sacraments,” 152.

<sup>391</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 102.

<sup>392</sup>See *ibid.*, 100-111.

<sup>393</sup>*Ibid.*, 102.

self-communication signifies God's Trinitarian life. According to Kilmartin, the explication and experience of this Trinitarian mystery is (and should be) the goal of liturgical theology and the activity of the life of faith:

A comprehensive explanation of the meaning of the liturgy must take the path that leads back to the life work of the triune God. It must be shown how Christian liturgy in general, and the chief liturgical-sacramental celebrations of the Church, derive from and are oriented to the deepest and proper mystery of Christian faith: the self-communication of the triune God in a history of salvation that is the first fruits of the trinitarian-heavenly liturgy, already in progress since the Ascension of Jesus Christ.<sup>394</sup>

Kilmartin thus underscores the fact that in all the activity of the Church, especially in its worship, believers encounter the Triune God.

In the Trinitarian approach to liturgy, the God whom Christians encounter in the worship of the Church is the Triune God. The Trinitarian God does not stand behind the risen Lord, who is present to this community assembled in his name. Rather the risen Lord is present to the assembly as its Head "in the Spirit."<sup>395</sup>

Kilmartin believes that the liturgy considered as an encounter with the Triune God is more complete than the Scholastic theology's overly Christomonistic description of the liturgy.

Kilmartin claims that a Christological theology of liturgy grounds the anthropological basis of liturgical symbolic activity.<sup>396</sup> This theology considers human beings as real symbol, embodied spirit, and also as symbol maker. They are created in the image and likeness of God. They find the meaning of their lives in becoming more like God by way of free

---

<sup>394</sup>Edward J. Kilmartin, "Foreword to the English Edition," in Jean Corbon, *The Wellspring of Worship*, trans. Matthew J. O'Connell (San Francisco, Ignatius Press, 1988), 7-8.

<sup>395</sup>Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 110.

<sup>396</sup>See *ibid.*, 104-106.

acceptance of God's self-communication. With this starting point this theology moves necessarily to a consideration of Christ as the perfect human symbol, in which the divine and the human natures are united. Jesus is the primordial sacrament of God. As the Body of Christ, the Church is the historical presence of the mystery of Christ. The Church precedes the liturgy. The role of the liturgy, then, is to serve as the way in which the Church manifests itself as the Body of Christ. The believers are thus united with God through their encounter with Christ. Consequently, "the economic Trinity is placed behind Christ who, as primordial sacrament of salvation, stands in the foreground,"<sup>397</sup> and liturgy becomes ultimately an encounter with Christ rather than with what Christ symbolizes.

Kilmartin recognizes Scholastic theology's failure to consider the aspect of symbol as mediated immediacy to be the problem involved in this Christological approach. Furthermore, he notes that although in this approach an anthropological grounding of symbol results in an emphasis on the unity of the Word and the Spirit, it neglects the implications arising from the distinction between them. Kilmartin believes that such an anthropological basis is inadequate for a theology of liturgy. He claims,

This theology of the liturgy takes the first step, that of bringing the liturgy back to the theology of Church and then to Christology. But the second step is not attempted, namely, that of showing how the liturgy can be brought back to the economic Trinity and under all its aspects. Therefore the synthesis remains unsatisfactory.<sup>398</sup>

Instead, Kilmartin argues for a replacement of it with a Trinitarian grounding of symbol on the basis of the relation of Christ to the other two divine persons of the Trinity that

---

<sup>397</sup>Ibid., 106.

<sup>398</sup>Ibid., 107.

takes into account both the unity and distinction of the divine persons.<sup>399</sup> This approach, Kilmartin believes, will help to understand the liturgy as an encounter with the Trinity as three distinct persons, not just with one person representing the whole Trinity. In the immanent Trinity, the Father and the Son are identically the divine essence which implies the divine immediacy (the absence of any intervening reality) of the Word to the Father. At the same time, the Father is the source of all. The Word proceeding from the Father is the essential image of the Father which implies the divinely mediated immediacy of the Word to the Father. Kilmartin articulates this unique relation of the Word to the Father as follows:

The Word is “real symbol” of the Father. A real symbol exists where there is unity of being between the symbol and the symbolized and yet the symbol is really distinguished from the symbolized. As essential image of the Father, the Word is identically the divine essence. But the fact that the Father and Word are identically the divine essence does not mean that the Word is the Father. Rather, the Word is from the Father, really distinguished from the Father as essential image of the Father.<sup>400</sup>

From this Trinitarian grounding of the relation between “real symbol” (Christ) and “symbolized” (the Father), Kilmartin applies the axiom “*The relation between symbol and symbolized always involves a mediated immediacy*” to the order of grace.<sup>401</sup> He refers to the teaching of the Fathers of the Church for the validity of this principle of mediated immediacy as operative in the essential aspects of the economy of salvation.<sup>402</sup> This aspect of mediated immediacy, which Kilmartin identifies with the role of the Holy Spirit, has implication for describing the participation of the liturgical assembly.

---

<sup>399</sup>See *ibid.*, 106.

<sup>400</sup>*Ibid.*, 106-107.

<sup>401</sup>*Ibid.*, 107. *Italics original.*

<sup>402</sup>Such as in Christology, ecclesiology, order of grace, and the liturgical presence of Christ. See *ibid.*



Kilmartin states that the mystery of salvation is realized in all forms in the liturgy of the Church. The transcendent goal of creating human beings is oriented to their participation in the divine life of the Trinity, which is their salvation.<sup>403</sup> The efficacy of the liturgy is a participation in the Trinitarian life achieved through prayer as a means of this efficacy.<sup>404</sup> The nature of the grace of salvation, then, is Trinitarian self-communication of divine life. “According to Christian revelation, the Father communicates self since the Father is the source of all. But he communicates self through his Word and his Spirit to his creatures.”<sup>405</sup> Kilmartin understands that grace is the active orientation of believers toward this offer of Trinitarian communion, given by God’s self-communication and corresponding to spiritual beings’ openness to it, and occurs always and everywhere in all dimensions of human life.<sup>406</sup> Yet he claims that especially and eminently grace is explicitly accepted in praise and thanksgiving in the liturgical celebration of the Church:

The Church of Jesus Christ is the concrete place in history where this trinitarian mystery is explicitly proclaimed and accepted, where the Father’s offer of self-communication through his only Son and his Holy Spirit finds a free response of praise and thanksgiving. This mystery is represented and shared in a festive way in the liturgy of the Church; it is continually offered and accepted in all the dimensions of the daily life of faith.<sup>407</sup>

Understood in this sense, the liturgy of the Church, expression of its faith, is the privileged, particular, and unique holy place of symbolical representation and realization of the divine-human encounter and the new relation between God and humanity which, within

---

<sup>403</sup>See Kilmartin, “Theology of the Sacraments,” 140; idem, *Christian Liturgy*, 100-101.

<sup>404</sup>See Kilmartin, “Theology of the Sacraments,” 140.

<sup>405</sup>Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 101.

<sup>406</sup>See Kilmartin, “Theology of the Sacraments,” 152; idem, *Christian Liturgy*, 87-89; idem, “Modern Approach,” 76.

<sup>407</sup>Kilmartin, “Foreword to the English Edition,” 7.

the broad sacral sphere of salvation history, began with creation and will be consummated with the second coming of Christ.<sup>408</sup> Of the liturgy of the Church, Kilmartin considers the Eucharist, which celebrates the sacrificial death of Christ, as the high point of this mystery in the public forum and affirms the necessity of its repeated celebrations insofar as the life of the faith of the believers is concerned. “Those who live by faith and not by vision require the constant support of the solemn proclamation of the ‘Lord’s death, until he comes’ (1 Cor 11:26).”<sup>409</sup>

Kilmartin suggests that the point of departure for a Trinitarian theology of liturgy should begin with the revelation of God in Christ and the personal missions of the Word and the Spirit. In this regard, he appreciates the teaching of *Lumen Gentium* which speaks about the mission of the Son and the complementary mission of the Spirit as an invitation to look into the nature and consequences of the personal mission of the Spirit in the economy of salvation.<sup>410</sup> Kilmartin remarks that there existed no adequate models of the Trinity, both in the theological traditions of the East and the West, when he began to construct a systematic theology of liturgy as the theology of the economic Trinity.<sup>411</sup> He understands the need for having such a Trinitarian theology for an adequate description of the economy of salvation that will underscore the “forgotten” pneumatological aspect together with the Christological and ecclesiological aspects of the liturgical event in a balanced manner that does not give

---

<sup>408</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 53.

<sup>409</sup>Ibid., 89. Also see ibid., 349.

<sup>410</sup>See *Lumen Gentium*, 3-4.

<sup>411</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 103.

priority to any one dimension.<sup>412</sup> Such is the preferred approach that Kilmartin would employ for developing a eucharistic liturgical theology. The Trinitarian theology preferred by Kilmartin for liturgical theological reflection, therefore, is the correspondence between the economic and immanent Trinity and the procession and the bestowal models of the Trinity.

David Coffey originally coined both phrases “procession model” and “bestowal model” in his 1979 book *Grace*. Accordingly, Coffey argues that the procession model illustrates the concept of procession of the Son and the Spirit while the bestowal model presents the notion of mutual bestowal of the Spirit by the Father on the Son.<sup>413</sup> Coffey developed the bestowal model in the context of the Trinitarian theology as contained in the Synoptic Gospels and patristic theology, in Augustine’s mutual-love theory of the procession model, and in his own critique of Aquinas’ Trinitarian theology.<sup>414</sup> However, in 1990 Coffey recoined the bestowal model as the “‘return’ model”<sup>415</sup> and settled on this terminology from 1999 onward.<sup>416</sup> In *Deus Trinitas*, Coffey insists that the return model is more comprehensive than the procession model. In his words, the return model deals with “the sending forth in the sweep of the larger movement of return.” Moreover, it “brings out the desired contrast with the traditional . . . ‘procession’ model . . . [and] encompasses the entire

---

<sup>412</sup>See Kilmartin, “Outline of Lectures,” 2; idem, *Christian Liturgy*, 103.

<sup>413</sup>See Coffey, “*Did You Receive the Holy Spirit When You Believed?*”, 61; idem, “The ‘Incarnation’ of the Holy Spirit in Christ,” 471.

<sup>414</sup>This critique is purported to the use of the procession model to explain the descending Christology and its implied theology of grace and to the use of the bestowal model to elucidate the ascending Christology and its implied theology of grace. See Coffey, *Grace*, 11-208.

<sup>415</sup>See David Coffey, “The Holy Spirit as the Mutual Love of the Father and the Son,” *Theological Studies* 51 (1990): 228.

<sup>416</sup>See David Coffey, *Deus Trinitas: The Doctrine of the Triune God* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1999), 5, hereafter *Deus Trinitas*.

process by which Jesus returns to the Father through his life and death in the power of the Holy Spirit.”<sup>417</sup> Thus the Trinitarian life comes to its full circle.

In his 1984 article “Active Role of Christ and the Holy Spirit,” Kilmartin begins to make reference to Coffey’s bestowal model.<sup>418</sup> Kilmartin later integrates it into his theology, which is pointed out in his *Christian Liturgy*. Kilmartin died before Coffey wrote *Deus Trinitas* in 1999. Since Kilmartin is consistent in using the term “bestowal model,” this term is employed in this dissertation. Although this model has ecumenical bearings, it is Kilmartin’s application of this model to liturgical theology is of importance here. This particular application serves to overcome the disadvantages as perceived by the exclusive use of the procession model in relation to the personal mission of the Spirit in the work of sanctification. Kilmartin thereby argues that this model has a better chance of bringing out the mission of the Spirit in the liturgical celebration. To this end, this particular approach by Kilmartin treats equally the pneumatological, Christological, and ecclesiological aspects of the liturgical celebrations.

In the faith of the New Covenant, Christians know that the transcendent God has established a personal relationship with them, revealing self as triune by those relationships. In the eucharistic liturgy, they celebrate that the Holy Spirit sanctifies them, unites them in

---

<sup>417</sup>Ibid., 5. Coffey ecumenically articulates a common ground in the return model which he believes will serve as a remedy to the disagreeable difference pertaining to the Trinitarian theologies of the West and the East. The return model presupposes the dialectical source of the procession of the Spirit: *a Patre Filioque* and *a Patre per Filium*—the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son, the Son proceeds from the Father, and the Spirit ultimately proceeds from the Father alone. Hence, he claims that if the return model can be acceptable to the Eastern tradition, then the *Filioque* issue should not stand as an obstacle to the desired communion between the East and the West. See Coffey, “A Proper Mission of the Holy Spirit,” 249; idem, “Did You Receive the Holy Spirit When You Believed?,” 50-51, 113.

<sup>418</sup>See Kilmartin, “Active Role of Christ and the Holy Spirit,” 247-248.

the Body of Christ, and gives them communion with the Father. A theology rooted in the liturgy, Kilmartin insisted, should incorporate this revelation of the economic Trinity into its speculation of the inner life of God, as well as into all aspects of its description of the life of faith. In light of the *lex orandi*, Kilmartin worked to develop a theology that would be sufficiently Trinitarian to respect the implications of the Church's liturgical celebrations of the divine mystery. Kilmartin concluded that the model of Trinitarian life that has dominated Christian theological history, one based on the fact of the missions of the Son and the Spirit, does not sufficiently reflect the interpersonal dynamic of the economy celebrated in the liturgy. That model, he argued, should be complemented by one that stresses the relationship between the divine persons, into which Christians are brought through their participation in the covenant sacrifice of Christ.

The correspondence between the economic and immanent Trinity demonstrates that the basis of our knowledge of the Trinity is always and exclusively God's self-communication in Jesus Christ. Kilmartin argues that this Christological starting point, however, can be approached in different ways: proceeding from the Incarnation as fact or as process whereby the former results in the procession model with its descending Christology and the latter in the bestowal model with its ascending Christology.<sup>419</sup> He views that both ways are authorized by Scripture (John 1: 14; Luke 1: 34-35).<sup>420</sup> These two models are the consequence of the relationship between the economic and immanent Trinity which begins

---

<sup>419</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 112-123.

<sup>420</sup>See Kilmartin, "Modern Approach," 64ff. Also see Rosato, "Spirit Christology: Ambiguity and Promise," 423-449; Kasper, *Jesus the Christ*, 254-268. For many other New Testament texts and patristic sources that refer to Spirit-Christology, see Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 163-164.

from reflection on the mystery of God in the Christ-event. To describe these two models for illuminating the inner life of the Trinity, Kilmartin uses the psychological analogy to the basic functions of the human soul (knowing and willing) used by Augustine and further developed by Aquinas for the generation of the Word by the Father and the procession of the Spirit from the Father and/through the Son.<sup>421</sup> Kilmartin considers these two models as two processes of approaching the immanent Trinity from the economic Trinity, specifically from the perspective of the processions of the Word and the Spirit from the Father, to establish the implications of the economic Trinity for the immanent Trinity. He will then apply the knowledge gained from the immanent Trinity to the order of grace to further elucidate the mystery of the economy of salvation.

The knowledge derived from ascending Christology has implications for the understanding of the immanent Trinity and other aspects of the economy of salvation which otherwise remain vague from the perspective of descending Christology only. The complimentary function of the bestowal model of the Trinity brings to light the purpose of the procession of the Spirit which is useful to describe the sanctification of the humanity of Jesus as corresponding to that of believers. Yet Kilmartin insists that this model is neither a substitute for nor an abrogation of the procession model with its descending Christology. Nor can the former be divorced from the latter. Rather, Kilmartin argues, in order to explicate the purpose of the Spirit inevitably requires the procession of the Son, described in the procession model as originating from the Father, as the necessary first step for the

---

<sup>421</sup>See *ibid.*, 125-129.

bestowing of the Holy Spirit by the Father on the Son and *vice versa*.<sup>422</sup> Consequently, each model is valid and necessary to acquire an adequate Trinitarian knowledge. Moreover, Kilmartin underscores the complementary capacity of these two “endogenous” models of the Trinity, hence the need for having them, for understanding the mystery and the celebration of liturgy. His particular concern is to establish the relationship between the sanctification of Christ and that of believers as the work of the Spirit. This understanding will result in the grace of Christ which will provide the relation between the prayer of Christ and that of the Church.

*Liturgical-Theological Implications of the Correspondence between the Economic and Immanent Trinity*

Kilmartin conceives the “economic Trinity” to be, above all, God’s self-communication. The mystery of the Trinity is essentially identical with the mystery of the self-communication of God to us in Christ and the Spirit.<sup>423</sup> It began with creation, reached its fullness in the Incarnation, and is extended to all humanity in a new way through the complementary mission of the Spirit at Pentecost to establish and animate the Church and its liturgy.<sup>424</sup> By “immanent Trinity” Kilmartin means the mystery of the inner-divine life of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, the source of the economic Trinity. Our knowledge about the

---

<sup>422</sup>See *ibid.*, 122, 133. Also see O’Donnell, “In Him and Over Him: The Holy Spirit in the Life of Jesus,” 26; Coffey, *Grace*, 18.

<sup>423</sup>See Rahner, *The Trinity*, 46. For an extensive treatment of the concept of mystery, see Karl Rahner, “The Concept of Mystery in Catholic Theology,” trans. Kevin Smyth, *Theological Investigations* 4 (New York: Crossroad, 1985), 36-73.

<sup>424</sup>The mission of the Word is fully revealed through the mission of the Spirit. See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 135; O’Donnell, “In Him and Over Him: The Holy Spirit in the Life of Jesus,” 39.

mystery of God's selfhood is only possible from the revelation of God in Jesus Christ.<sup>425</sup>

Accordingly, Kilmartin insists that given the consistency of God, the economic self-communication of God should correspond to the inner-Trinitarian mystery. "The way God reveals self in Jesus Christ is the way God exists in God's self."<sup>426</sup> If the economic Trinity does not correspond to God's selfhood, it would not then be a true and total self-communication of God himself. Moreover, it would clash with the simplicity of God, which "excludes the possibility of a communication of something of God's self. God has no parts."<sup>427</sup> The Father, the source of all, communicates self through the Word and the Spirit, who are communicated in a procession from person(s) to person. God's self-communication can then only be through these two modalities that are received.<sup>428</sup> Because the Father's self-communication has a Trinitarian structure, Kilmartin argues that the experience of the Trinitarian grace has to be the experience of the inner-Trinitarian life. He explains this axiomatic relation between God's self-revelation (grace) and the inner-Trinitarian life by employing the Rahnerian axiom "*the economic Trinity is the immanent Trinity, and vice versa*."<sup>429</sup> The latter part of the axiom helps Kilmartin to affirm the procession of the Son and the Spirit as accounting for their missions in the economy of salvation.

Kilmartin's affirmation concerning the correspondence between the economic and immanent Trinity is geared toward its relevance for a theology of liturgy, namely, to

---

<sup>425</sup>See Kasper, *Jesus the Christ*, 180.

<sup>426</sup>Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 113.

<sup>427</sup>*Ibid.*, 137. Also see Rahner, *The Trinity*, 36.

<sup>428</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 101; Rahner, *The Trinity*, 36, 84-85, 102; Coffey, *Deus Trinitas*, 60-65.

<sup>429</sup>Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 114. Italics original. Also see Rahner, *The Trinity*, 22.



explicate the implications it has for the liturgical event.<sup>430</sup> In other words, he uses this axiom in order to assert that the liturgical celebration is the active engagement of the Trinity and the Church (the worshipping assembly). This assertion, Kilmartin believed, has implications for understanding of liturgy:

Liturgical celebrations are a medium of participation of the faithful in the economic Trinity, a medium of Trinitarian self-communication. Liturgy is, above all, the work of the Trinity in its *execution* and *content*. What the community does is made possible because of the gift of the life of faith, a life lived in communion with the Father, through the Son in the Holy Spirit. Therefore, all three divine persons have an active role in the execution of the liturgy of the Church. Correspondingly, the efficacy of the liturgy is also, at its depth, a participation in Trinitarian life.<sup>431</sup>

What lies at the background of this assertion is Kilmartin's observations concerning Scholastic theology's Christocentric understanding of liturgy. Kilmartin, rather, claims that a theology of liturgy as a theology of the Trinity is the work of the immanent Trinity and simultaneously the realization of the economic Trinity. "We know by faith that the liturgy of the Church is ultimately the work of the Triune God. A theology of liturgy merely attempts

---

<sup>430</sup>Kilmartin suggests that Rahner may have used the second part of the axiom for two purposes: first, to affirm that God is eternally Triune in the highest freedom and does not come into Trinitarian self-possession through a historical process (hence against the Hegelian doctrine of the Trinity); second, to assert the necessary priority of the immanent Trinity required as the condition of possibility of the economic Trinity, God's free self-communication. See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 115; Rahner, *The Trinity*, 102, n. 21. But Rahner has something else also in mind. His real intention in articulating this whole axiom is to define grace by establishing the connection between the Trinity and salvation, hence between the Trinity and believers, through the self-communication of God according to the threefold manner of mutual relations of the three divine persons (their personal peculiarity) in which the one God subsists in the immanent Trinity. Therefore, this communication to the world can take place only in the inner-Trinitarian manner of the two divine communications of the divine essence by the Father to the Son and the Spirit. Rahner calls this communication "uncreated grace" or "God's 'indwelling'" which belongs to the Trinity (rather than to Christ *alone*). On the other hand, Rahner proposes the understanding of grace to be as that of the Word or "the incarnate *Word* as *Logos*." Here the Word is to be understood as that in which the Father expresses himself, is present, and active. From this approach also Rahner arrives at grace to be Trinitarian. See Rahner, *The Trinity*, 22-33, 35-38 passim.

<sup>431</sup>Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 102. Emphasis original.

to show how Christian worship, in all its forms, should be understood as the self-communication of the Triune God.”<sup>432</sup> As the self-communication of the Trinity, liturgy is ultimately the life and work of the Triune God in the economy of salvation. At the same time, it implies that because grace (God’s self-communication) is sacramentally offered to created beings, and because it is a matter of personal union between them and God, it necessarily presupposes a personal, free response from the side of believers which is their active engagement. The grace of God is fulfilled only when it is accepted. Hence Kilmartin asserts, “God’s self-communication to fully constituted human beings always involves personal activity on the part of conscious adults.”<sup>433</sup>

Now the task at hand for Kilmartin is to articulate the theological grounds for the personal mission of the Spirit which will offer an explanation of the active liturgical participation of believers.

---

<sup>432</sup>Ibid., 180.

<sup>433</sup>Ibid., 138. By “fully constituted human beings” Kilmartin means believers who have reached the age of reason. In the economy of salvation, namely, the order of grace, there is a dialogical element: offer of grace and response of faith. Although grace is offered, one receives it only through a free response of faith, which is applicable to only adult human beings. Human freedom is not, thus, annihilated in the event of grace. There is a distinction between the self-communication of God in the immanent Trinity and the Incarnation and in the economic Trinity. In the former two cases, there involves no personal activity, whereas in the latter case there involves a personal response. Now, in the case of infant baptism, which also involves no personal activity on the part of the child, this response of faith is provided by the gathered liturgical assembly in favor of the child being baptized. At the same time, the traditional practice of infant baptism expresses the social dimension of human person, the role of the Church as vehicle of grace, and the initiative of God in personal communication with human beings. See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 138; idem, “Theology of the Sacraments,” 152; Coffey, *Grace*, 80-81. No treatise on grace can be constructed based on infants as the normal state of human beings. See Schillebeeckx, *Christ the Sacrament of the Encounter with God*, 5. n. 2; Coffey, *Grace*, 81-82.

*Procession Model and its Insufficiency for an Adequate Description of Sanctification*

In the procession model, corresponding to the economic mission of the Word and the role of the risen Lord in the sending of the Spirit in the order of nature not time, the generation of the Word precedes the procession of the Spirit from the Father in the immanent Trinity. The Spirit is understood to proceed from the Father in such a way that the Son has a role to play because he is the essential image of the Father and receives divine essence and operation from the Father.<sup>434</sup> Accordingly, in the West the procession of the Spirit is conceived as “a Patre Filioque” (from the Father and the Son) and describes the Father and the Son acting as one principle or the Son as the “principled principle” of the Spirit, while maintaining that the Father is the “unprincipled principle.” The Eastern theology describes it as “a Patre per Filium” (from the Father through the Son). This adage does not qualify the Son with the concept of co-principle of the Spirit because the Father alone is *monarchos*.<sup>435</sup> Kilmartin argues for the need to balance these two views of the East and the West because

[t]he Eastern view can lead to excessive emphasis on the role of the Spirit in the time of the Church, to the neglect of the continuance of the mission of the risen Lord. The Western version can lead to excessive emphasis on the role of Christ in the economy of the Church, to the neglect of the mission of the Spirit. History shows that both one-sided views have existed. Still the two traditional ways of viewing the mystery of the Trinity need not lead to unbalanced theologies, nor to theologies which are in conflict on essential aspects of the economy of salvation. When the procession model is used correctly, that is,

---

<sup>434</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 125, 138-139.

<sup>435</sup>See Staniloae, “The Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and his Relation to the Son, as the Basis of our Deification and Adoption,” 175-176. This idea of *monarchos*, also known as “monopatristism,” is associated with St. Photius, the Patriarch of Constantinople in the ninth century. See Coffey, “Did You Receive the Holy Spirit When You Believed?,” 43. Despite a number of recently agreed ecumenical statements, the *Filioque* issue still remains the principal doctrinal difference between the Catholic and the Eastern Orthodox Church. For the recent ecumenical development on *Filioque* issue, see *ibid.*, 118-119, n. 66.

when new data are not introduced that go beyond what can be derived from Christology, it can order other aspects of revelation so as to bring more intelligibility to the whole.<sup>436</sup>

In Western theology, the unity and distinction between the divine persons is expressed as that all is one in God except where the opposition of relations excludes this unity. From this point of view, the Father and the Son is the one principle of the Holy Spirit and the distinction is in the order of their origin: the Father→the Son→the Spirit. This theology views the humanity of Christ as created by the Trinity acting undividedly. The Word assumes and sanctifies the humanity of Christ in the hypostatic union and anoints humanity with the grace of the Spirit. Such an explanation is in accordance with the demands of the procession model and the requirements of the correspondence between the economic and immanent Trinity. On the other hand, believers are sanctified by the work of the Spirit sent by Christ.

The procession model takes a linear shape both in the Eastern and the Western versions of the Trinitarian procession. This model has certain limitations.<sup>437</sup> First, it is unable to explain the full circle of the completion of the Trinitarian life with the procession of the Spirit. Second, it neither states nor implies the purpose of the procession of the Spirit; the mutual love of the Father and the Son is described to be the reason of it. But the Spirit proceeds from the Father and/through the Son out into “an infinite void”<sup>438</sup> without casting any light on the Holy Spirit as a distinct person, on the relationship of the Son and the Spirit,

---

<sup>436</sup>Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 121. Also see O'Donnell, “In Him and Over Him: the Holy Spirit in the Life of Jesus,” 26, 39.

<sup>437</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 131, 153-155, 160-161.

<sup>438</sup>*Ibid.*, 131.

and on the working of the Spirit in the economy of grace. Third, it presupposes the Spirit to be the “immanent term” (*processio operati*, “procession of the thing operated”) of the act of love between the Father and the Son. Fourth, the Spirit itself is distinguished from the act of mutual loving. Fifth, this model presumes that the Spirit should be an immanent term like the Son in order to be immanent in the Trinity. But the immanence of the Spirit in the Trinity is secured by the Spirit’s identity with the divine essence.<sup>439</sup> Sixth, the Spirit acts as a bridge between the Father and the Son that obstructs the immediacy between them whereby there arises the need for a mediated immediacy. Seventh, it places emphasis on the role of Jesus over that of the Spirit, resulting in a Christological theology of liturgy and grace. Finally, and most importantly, it is applicable only to a descending Christology and pneumatology, namely, from the Godhead to Christ and to grace. It views the Incarnation and grace, communication of the Son to the humanity of Jesus and the communication of the Spirit to believers, not *in fieri* (in its process of realization) but as constituted (*in facto esse*).<sup>440</sup> Consequently, when the sanctification of humanity is considered—an essential aspect of the sacramental saving event,<sup>441</sup> it presents that “the highest possibility of the actualization of a humanity results in [the hypostatic] union with the Word, while lesser actualizations [in grace] result in the union of fully constituted human persons with the Holy Spirit.”<sup>442</sup> In other words, the Spirit’s work of sanctification of the already assumed humanity of Jesus by the Word is described to correspond to the sanctification of believers which causes the

---

<sup>439</sup>See Coffey, *Grace*, 14.

<sup>440</sup>See Kilmartin, “Active Role of Christ and the Holy Spirit,” 248.

<sup>441</sup>See *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 59; Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 325; idem, “Sacraments as Liturgy of the Church,” 529.

<sup>442</sup>Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 153-154.

problem of the reversal of the order of the Trinitarian processions. Thus the economic Trinity is described as acting in a different order in the sanctification of Christ's humanity than it does in that of believers which Kilmartin found to be problematic if the Incarnation reveals the self-communication of God by which believers are saved.<sup>443</sup> This approach, he judged, is incapable of offering an answer to the difference of form of determination (the openness of humanity to God's self-communication) that exists between the union of the humanity of Jesus with the Word and the union of believers with the Holy Spirit. The order is changed into the bestowal of the Spirit by which believers are brought into union with the Son and then with the Father. Accordingly, believers are united first with the Holy Spirit, then to the Son, and finally to the Father. But this principle is not applied to Jesus even though the Incarnation is viewed as a paradigm for the sanctification of believers.<sup>444</sup> Stated in a different manner, in the procession model sanctification is considered to be the work of the Word who assumes the humanity of Jesus. Since theologically it is unacceptable to conceive that the Word likewise functions in the case of believers, the only possible way open is to turn to the Spirit who sanctifies believers, as described in the procession model. But this description in the economy of grace requires a basis in the immanent Trinity in order to make it intelligible which is not possible within the framework of the procession model and its descending Christology. Kilmartin says,

---

<sup>443</sup>See *ibid.*, 111-112.

<sup>444</sup>As will be explained in detail later, however, it is important to note at this point that sanctification of the liturgical assembly which corresponds to that of the humanity of Jesus will be crucial for understanding Kilmartin's description of the assembly's eucharistic participation and the subsequent liturgical presence of Christ and his salvific acts asserted metaphysically.

When the process of sanctification of human realities is explained in a way that corresponds to an inversion of the procession model the question is posed: What accounts for this inversion? The statement of the fact (that) the salvation history manifestation of the immanent Trinity is an inversion of the inner-Trinitarian processions does not represent a solution but rather is the formulation of a problem.<sup>445</sup>

If Jesus' own living was graced in a different manner from that of believers, what relation has the "grace of Christ" by which they are saved or how are believers to participate in the grace of Christ's faith because Christ's faith is based in the hypostatic union in which they have no share?<sup>446</sup> Kilmartin argues that while it is true that in believers' union with God, the divine persons are encountered in the order of the Holy Spirit→the Son→the Father, as stated in Galatians 4:6 and Ephesians 2:18,<sup>447</sup> it also has to be the same with Jesus since the Incarnation reveals the self-communication of God by which Christians are saved. Hence he contends that this reversal cannot simply be accepted as a fact without demonstrating the correspondence it has at the level of the immanent Trinity. A theology grounded in the Trinitarian revelation which the liturgy celebrates, Kilmartin argues, should relate its conception of the inner-Trinitarian life to the return of Son, Spirit, and the sanctified believers to the Father, which is not clarified by the fact of the processions of the Son and the Spirit.<sup>448</sup> Kilmartin, therefore, distanced himself from this inversion of the procession model as having no theological ground in the inner-Trinitarian life to explain the return of believers to the Father. But he found this return as expressed in the epicletic movement of the classical

---

<sup>445</sup>Kilmartin, "Outline of Lectures," 21.

<sup>446</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 154.

<sup>447</sup>See Kilian McDonnell, *The Other Hand of God: The Holy Spirit as the Universal Touch and Goal* (Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 2003), 102, hereafter *The Other Hand of God*; Coffey, *Grace*, 112.

<sup>448</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 135-157.

eucharistic prayers. His solution to this problem is to turn to an ascending Christology for identifying the grace by which the humanity of Christ is united to the person of the Word to be the same grace by which believers are also sanctified. This identification calls attention to the understanding of the traditional teaching that believers can share in the “grace of Christ” which he possesses in fullness and shares with them, resulting in their sanctification.

Kilmartin argues,

The Holy Spirit is the Spirit of Sonship, communicated by the Father. If the Spirit can be shown to be the Spirit of sonship in the case of the incarnation, one can see why the highest form of the determination of humanity is that in which it becomes united to the Word in unity of person, and lesser actualizations union of human persons with the Spirit.<sup>449</sup>

From this point of view, the union of believers with the Holy Spirit implies their openness to God’s self-communication. Kilmartin argues that if the economic Trinity corresponds to the immanent Trinity, and God’s self-communication shows a priority of nature not of time but of the mission of the Spirit in the event of the sanctification of human reality, it calls for a Trinitarian model that corresponds to the ascending Christology and its implied theology of grace—the bestowal model.<sup>450</sup> In this model Kilmartin found the unity of grace, grace as the gift of the Holy Spirit, which lacked in the procession model insofar as the sanctification of Jesus and believers is concerned. This bestowal model is not an invention but a recovery of the less developed one already present in the Scripture and then

---

<sup>449</sup>Ibid., 155.

<sup>450</sup>See *ibid.*, 162.



elaborated in the patristic theology concerning the theological reflection on the Trinity.<sup>451</sup>

Kilmartin cites the theology of the anointing of Jesus with the Holy Spirit in the account of Jesus' Baptism as the New Testament basis of the bestowal model. It, when linked with the role of the Spirit of God in the Incarnation of Jesus, supports a theology in which the Father is seen as "sending the Spirit to sanctify and unite the humanity of Jesus, created by an activity of the Godhead as such, to the Word in the unity of person."<sup>452</sup> This incipient theology present in the New Testament is later developed in patristic thinking. The bestowal model is especially important for Kilmartin, and his claim for the validity of this model is based on the fact that it is derived from the sources of Scripture, patristic theology, and the liturgy (Spirit epiclesis).<sup>453</sup>

Kilmartin explains that although in the post-New Testament period a Logos-Christology or a Spirit-Christology was used to explain the uniqueness of Jesus, the former Christology, however, was dominant (except in Syrian tradition) especially from the middle of the second to the middle of the fourth century. Accordingly, the Logos was understood as accomplishing his own Incarnation by anointing his humanity with the assumption and, by extension, effecting the change of bread and wine into his body and blood. But in the latter part of the fourth century, in the wake of the controversies over the divinity of the Holy Spirit against the "Pneumatomachians,"<sup>454</sup> a twofold role of the Spirit is emphasized: in the conception of Jesus and in the transformation of the bread and wine of the eucharistic

---

<sup>451</sup>See Kilmartin, "Active Role of Christ and the Holy Spirit," 244-247.

<sup>452</sup> Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 165.

<sup>453</sup>See *ibid.*, 163-166.

<sup>454</sup>A Christian sect (also known as Macedonians) which denied that the Holy Spirit is God and has the same essence as that of the Father and the Son. As this sect explicitly rejected the divinity of the Holy Spirit, it received the name "opponents of the Spirit" (*Pneumatomachoi*).

celebration. This emphasis brought a change in the content of the Eucharistic epiclesis. In the East, a Logos epiclesis, asking for the sanctification of the eucharistic bread and wine, ceased to exist. In addition, an already existing Spirit epiclesis, which originally was understood as the invocation of the Logos to transform the eucharistic gifts and the invocation of the Spirit to descend on the gifts in order to sanctify the participants of the Eucharist, began to assume the Spirit as the one who transforms the elements of bread and wine.<sup>455</sup> Yet Kilmartin will add another “source” to this model which is derived from the implications of the unique love of Jesus for the Father.<sup>456</sup>

*Bestowal Model and its Complementary Function for an Adequate Description of Sanctification*

Reintegration of the *lex orandi* and the *lex credendi*, Kilmartin insisted, must respect the teaching of the classical eucharistic prayers about the Trinitarian self-communication which proclaims that the Holy Spirit unites believers to Christ and brings them into communion with the Father through their union with Christ. This action of the Holy Spirit, Kilmartin understood, as the proper action of the Spirit in the life of Christ and in the Church. His attempt to integrate the *lex orandi* and *lex credendi* stresses the interrelationship of Christ and the Spirit in the economy of sanctification. He came to consider the Spirit-Christology of the Synoptics, recovered by Pétau, Scheeben, and Mühlen, offering a relationship between Christ and the Church.

---

<sup>455</sup>Kilmartin points out this change as witnessed especially in the Eucharistic Prayers of St. Basil and St. John Chrysostom. See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 166.

<sup>456</sup>See *ibid.*, 163. This “source” is treated below.

The recovery of the bestowal model of the immanent Trinity is derived from the reflection on the consequences of an ascending Christology. This Christology too, like a descending Christology, views the humanity of Jesus as the unique and highest possible realization of the supernatural potency of a humanity for union with the divine. But when the role of the Spirit is considered in the process of the assumption of the humanity by the Word, the Spirit is understood as the one who sanctifies the humanity of Jesus in such a way as to elevate it to union with the Word who assumes it. This same Spirit, sent by the risen Lord from the Father, unites believers with the Son and thus makes them children of the Father in the one Son. Here the grace of Christ, which he shares with the justified, is understood as the Holy Spirit.<sup>457</sup>

The bestowal model thus distinguishes the *fact* of the procession from the *manner* of the procession. The fact is that the Son proceeds from the Father by way of generation and the Spirit also proceeds from the Father. But the manner of the procession is that the Father bestows the Spirit on the Son as the object of the Father's love. In turn, the Son bestows the Spirit on the Father as the object of his answering love. "Answering" means the order of priority in which the Father precedes the Son. Hence the Father's love for the Son will precede and evoke the Son's love for the Father. Thus, the substance of this model is that the Spirit is the mutual love between the Father and the Son. In this model, unlike in the procession model, the procession of the Spirit has a termination point in the loved one. Here the terminus of this twofold procession is the Son to whom the Father communicates the Spirit and the Father to whom the Son communicates the Spirit, as the bond of love that

---

<sup>457</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 161-162.

unites them immediately to each other. The bestowal model does not presume the Spirit to be an immanent term in itself but a *processio operationis* (procession of the operation) or *operatio subsistens* (subsistent operation).<sup>458</sup> In this respect the Spirit is to be contrasted with the Son who is the subsistent term of an immanent operation in the Trinity. In other words, the Spirit is understood to be a distinct person as an operation of his principle (cause), the Father and the Son, in the Godhead. On two counts Kilmartin describes that it is not necessary for the Spirit to be conceived as an immanent term in the Trinity:

In the first place, the concept of person, as applied to the Trinity of persons, is not univocal. The Father, Son, and Spirit are not precisely person in the same way. Second, it is not necessary to conceive the Spirit as immanent term in the Trinity in order that the Spirit be conceived as immanent in the Trinity. The immanence is secured because the Spirit is identically the divine essence.<sup>459</sup>

Since the Spirit is not an immanent term, it is not necessary that the Spirit be distinguished from the act of mutual love.<sup>460</sup> As the act of the mutual love, the Spirit serves as the bond of communication between them. The theology of the Incarnation which harmonizes with the bestowal model is that within the Trinity the Father's love (the Holy Spirit) rests upon the Son as its proper object. When the divine plan of salvation is executed, this love is directed

---

<sup>458</sup>What is presumed here is the nature of the two acts of knowing and loving in psychological analogy in which love is centrifugal and has its term in the beloved whereas word is an immanent term in the act of knowing. It is then applied to the processions of the Spirit (love) and the Son (word). See *ibid.*, 128. Also see Coffey, *Grace*, 15.

<sup>459</sup>Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 128. Given the factor unique to the Trinity, namely, the *homousion*, each person has to be immanent to the Trinity. See Coffey, *Grace*, 14. For the concept of person in the Trinity, see Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 126.

<sup>460</sup>It was also the opinion of the young Aquinas who understood love as opposed to knowledge. So he held the view that the Spirit is a *processio operationis*, so distinct from the Word as the subsistent operation of love, and is not an immanent term of the divine act of love. See Coffey, *Grace*, 12-15; *idem*, "The 'Incarnation' of the Holy Spirit," 471. n.10. For the historical development of conceiving the Spirit as subsistent operation and the Son as subsistent term, see John Cowburn, *Love and the Person* (New York: Alba House, 1967), 258-272.

beyond the Godhead into the world to bring about the Incarnation. As an act of assimilation, the Incarnation is the work of the Holy Spirit or of the Father acting by the Spirit. The outgoing aspect of divine act is subordinated to its assimilative aspect. Thus the true nature of divine power is revealed in its finality which is love.

Kilmartin claims, “the most telling argument for the claim that the bestowal model pertains to the primary level of Trinitarian doctrine is derived from the reflection on the nature of Jesus’ love of the Father.”<sup>461</sup> He presents this reflection as a movement from Jesus’ basic knowledge to his basic love.<sup>462</sup> He begins with the Chalcedonian affirmation of Jesus Christ as “truly man”<sup>463</sup> and contends that it is an assertion of his self-consciousness, as experienced by all conscious human beings. But based on philosophical grounds he claims that because Jesus is unique, “the same truly God and truly man,”<sup>464</sup> his self-consciousness is not the same as that of others. “It is metaphysically inconceivable that the one who, in his humanity, is the highest ontological determination of created being, exists at a lower level of self-consciousness than lower ontological determinations, namely, ordinary human persons.”<sup>465</sup> With his subjective knowledge of self-consciousness, Kilmartin asserts, Jesus knew the mystery of his being.<sup>466</sup>

---

<sup>461</sup>Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 166-167.

<sup>462</sup>The bulk of the following presentation of this subject is from *ibid.*, 166-170; *idem*, “Sacraments as Liturgy of the Church,” 541-542, hence reference will be made where necessary. For this argument Kilmartin is heavily dependent on Coffey, “The ‘Incarnation’ of the Holy Spirit in Christ,” and appreciates Coffey’s orientation and conclusion concerning the nature of Jesus’ love of the Father described from the New Testament witness of Trinitarian doctrine.

<sup>463</sup>Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 167. Also see Neuner and Dupuis, eds., *The Christian Faith*, 165.

<sup>464</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>465</sup>Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 167. Despite presenting Jesus’ creaturely relation to the Father, Rahner employs this principle to demonstrate the nature of Jesus’ self-consciousness in order to refute a mutual I-Thou relation in the immanent and economic Trinity. According to Rahner, the source of Jesus’

Scripturally speaking, Jesus lived by faith, not by vision, and the unique characteristic of Jesus is his total conscious orientation to the Father. The Synoptic Gospels present a Jesus who speaks about the Kingdom and the Fatherhood of God rather than his divine sonship.<sup>467</sup> From this scriptural teaching Kilmartin argues, “It is this total attentiveness to the Father and the Father’s will, the psychological relationship of unity with the Father, that mediates Jesus’ subjective knowledge of self-consciousness.”<sup>468</sup> Based on the revelation of the mystery of Jesus, Kilmartin concludes that

the ontological ground of his [Jesus’] psychological relation of unity with the Father is the hypostatic union. It is grounded on the communication of that subsistence from the Father to the humanity of Jesus, which constitutes Jesus of Nazareth the Son of God in his humanity.<sup>469</sup>

The communion of being and life between the Father and the Word in the immanent Trinity is now experienced by God-Jesus which is the content of his subjective knowledge of self-consciousness that corresponds to what the Word knows in the immanent Trinity. But now the Word in Jesus knows this communion of being and life through the human experience of his psychological relationship to the Father, which also makes the Father to be the unique

---

self-consciousness is in the direct vision of God enjoyed by his humanity from the outset of conception. Rahner claims that the man-Jesus can worship and worshipped the Logos, and in the union of the Logos with the humanity of Jesus the Logos stands above Jesus (understood as man). Based on this claim, Rahner asserts that through this vision the man-Jesus’ orientation is to the Word, along with his orientation to the Father. See Karl Rahner, “Dogmatic Reflections on the Knowledge and Self-Consciousness of Christ,” *Theological Investigation 5* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1966): 206; idem, “Jesus Christ,” *Encyclopedia of Theology: The Concise Sacramentum Mundi* (New York: Seabury, 1975), 769.

<sup>466</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 167; idem, “Sacraments as Liturgy of Church,” 541.

<sup>467</sup>See Coffey, “The ‘Incarnation’ of the Holy Spirit in Christ,” 473; Wolfhart Pannenberg, *Jesus—God and Man* (London: SCM, 1968), 334.

<sup>468</sup>Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 167.

<sup>469</sup>*Ibid.*, 167-168.

object of his love because love follows knowledge.<sup>470</sup> Hence, Kilmartin asserts that “this love necessarily corresponds to his subjective consciousness and, like his consciousness, is a psychological dimension of the hypostatic union.”<sup>471</sup> Thus Jesus’ love, like his human knowledge, also has its correspondence in the immanent Trinity as the love of the Word for the Father.

Kilmartin here makes an important distinction with regard to Jesus’ basic love of the Father. Jesus’ dedication and obedience to God’s will and love marked the motive force of his life and ministry. Yet Kilmartin insists that this love of Jesus for the Father, “grounded on the hypostatic union, is not simply identifiable with his categorial acts of love of God, or the habit of love built up by these acts”<sup>472</sup> because such acts are capable of increase with the passing of time (Luke 2:52) and are finite.<sup>473</sup> Rather, because Jesus is the unique Son of God, his response to and love of the Father should also be unique.

Kilmartin argues that Jesus’ infinite divine sonship was fully realized to the fullest limits of human nature during his earthly life. The agent of this “changement” was Jesus

---

<sup>470</sup>See *ibid.*, 168; *idem*, “Sacraments as Liturgy of the Church,” 541. Also see Coffey, “The ‘Incarnation’ of the Holy Spirit in Christ,” 474; Pannenberg, *Jesus—God and Man*, 331.

<sup>471</sup>Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 168.

<sup>472</sup>*Ibid.* Kilmartin conceived the notion of the “incarnation” of the Holy Spirit from Coffey. Coffey explains that the love of Jesus for the Father “is not categorial but transcendental, and hence is neither a habit nor an act. Therefore, it cannot be identified with supernatural charity, though it will be the ground also of this in Jesus.” Coffey, “The ‘Incarnation’ of the Holy Spirit in Christ,” 475. In *Christian Liturgy* Kilmartin interchangeably uses “categorial acts” and “categorial love” without making a clear distinction between these two terminologies. See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 168-169. Nor does he provide an explanation of what exactly these terminologies mean. From the context one may assume these terminologies to mean Spirit-enabled human acts/response directed to the love of God, as is the case with human beings. In Jesus’ case, the content of his love for the Father is the Holy Spirit itself. Yet this love is expressed in his human acts unto his death. However, by the end of his career, Kilmartin uses only “categorial acts,” and this terminology is followed in this dissertation. See Kilmartin, “Outline of Lectures,” 18.

<sup>473</sup>See Coffey, “The ‘Incarnation’ of the Holy Spirit in Christ,” 475-476.

himself in his human freedom.<sup>474</sup> Likewise, although infinite in itself, the love of the Son for the Father was not beyond the obediential potency (capacity) of human nature. The Holy Spirit is the identifiable source which elicits and sustains the acceptable response of love of believers to the Father. Similarly, the divine Son in his humanity receives and returns the Spirit in a human way.<sup>475</sup> Accordingly, “the uniqueness of Jesus’ love is the fact that it is the Holy Spirit himself who is returned to the Father,”<sup>476</sup> In Jesus’ case this basic, transcendental love (the Holy Spirit) of the Son is incarnated in his categorial acts of human love, a consequence of the hypostatic union, rather than the identification of the Spirit simply with the source of the supernatural love by which the acceptable human response is made to the Father.<sup>477</sup> In other words, the realization of the divine sonship of Jesus came to expression in his “categorical love, built up through repeated human acts . . . [through which] the divine Son obtained the concrete character of the human personality of Jesus of Nazareth.”<sup>478</sup> This progressive actualization of the divine sonship of Jesus included equally the progressive realization of his transcendental love of the Father, attaining in his death its absolute limits of possibility in his human love of the Father. This same Holy Spirit is also the source of the elicited acts of love of the Father accomplished by believers.<sup>479</sup>

With his glorification, Jesus is completely filled with the Holy Spirit and is admitted to the beatific vision where he apprehends with full intellectual clarity and love the direct

---

<sup>474</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 169.

<sup>475</sup>See *ibid.*

<sup>476</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>477</sup>See *ibid.*, 168; Coffey, “The ‘Incarnation’ of the Holy Spirit in Christ,” 476.

<sup>478</sup>Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 169.

<sup>479</sup>See *ibid.*



presence of the Father which he experienced throughout his earthly life.<sup>480</sup> There remains no further room for elicited acts of love of the Father on the risen Lord's side because he is no longer bound by space and time and his whole being is now concentrated in a single act of love of the Father which incarnates his transcendental love. "Because love follows knowledge, the Spirit became fully incarnated in his [Jesus'] human love of the Father."<sup>481</sup> This beatific vision of the Father and the consequent love include all creatures known and loved by the Father. Knowing the Father's children with the knowledge with which the risen Lord knows the Father, he loves them with the same love with which he loves the Father, the Holy Spirit.<sup>482</sup> The Spirit incarnate in Jesus' human love is then twofold: the love of the Father and of his children. Hence, it is this love which grounds his divine-human (theandric) act of sending the Holy Spirit to draw humanity into union with the Son so that they may love the Father in the one Son.

The bestowal model is grounded on Jesus' love of the Father, expressed as a response to the Father's love for him. Jesus is brought into being as the God-man by the Father's bestowal of his love on him. The response of Jesus in his humanity is the return of this same love. Given the correspondence between the economic and immanent Trinity, the Spirit exists in the immanent Trinity as the mutual love of the Father and the Son. The theology of the Incarnation harmonizes with the bestowal model, and it is only against this model of the

---

<sup>480</sup>See *ibid.* Also see John H. McKenna, "Eucharistic Epiclesis: Myopia or Microcosm?," *Theological Studies* 36 (1975), 275, hereafter "Eucharistic Epiclesis."

<sup>481</sup>Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 169.

<sup>482</sup>See *ibid.* For the profound unity that exists between love of God and love of neighbor, see Karl Rahner, "Reflections on the Unity of the Love of Neighbour and the Love of God," trans. Karl-H and Boniface Kruger, *Theological Investigations* 6 (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1969), 231-249.

immanent Trinity that the incarnation of the Holy Spirit in and through Jesus' human love is rightly possible.<sup>483</sup>

Kilmartin summarizes this model in six points.<sup>484</sup> First, the Son proceeds from the Father. Second, the Spirit proceeds from the Father and is bestowed on the Son. Third, the Spirit is bestowed by the Son on the Father. The procession is viewed as analogous to that of human love, which terminates in the loved one. Fourth, there is the eternal act of communication of the Spirit as mutual love of the Father and the Son. Fifth, the Spirit is not an immanent term of a divine operation situated outside the immediacy of the Father and the Son to one another but their bond of union,<sup>485</sup> and the infinite distance between the Father and the Son is not closed by their mutual love. Finally, there is the possibility of the communication of the immanent Trinity outside itself, precisely as the communication of the mutual love of the Father and the Son, the Holy Spirit. Of the divine love in the context of the bestowal model, the most comprehensive statement about the Spirit is that it is the mutual love of the Father and the Son.

An ascending Christology or pneumatology considers the communication of the Son and the Spirit by the Father in its formation. Through this communication humanity is ordered to infinite transcendence of God. In this sanctification humanity receives a higher

---

<sup>483</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 170.

<sup>484</sup>See *ibid.*, 132-133; *idem*, "Active Role of Christ and the Holy Spirit," 247. For a visual presentation of this model, see Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 132.

<sup>485</sup>Kilmartin explains the procession of the Spirit from the perspective of the bestowal model within the psychological analogy as that "the Spirit proceeds as mutual love of the Father and the Son. But the procession is viewed as analogous to that of human love, which terminates in the loved one. The human analogue is understood to involve only a *processio operationis* of love and not an immanent term in the one loving. The procession of the Spirit, conceived as only a *processio operationis*, is only *analogous* because the Spirit is immanent in the Trinity, identically the divine essence." *Ibid.*, 131-132. Emphasis original.

determination which leaves intact the perfections that it already has. The potential of the human being is determined in the highest possible way in the Incarnation and to a lesser degree in the ontic sanctification of believers.<sup>486</sup>

### Kilmartin's Application of the Pneumatological Consequences of the Bestowal Model to Liturgical Theology

In light of the foregoing description of the bestowal model and the resulting pneumatological consequences, Kilmartin develops a number of theological insights relevant for liturgical celebration, which I will present in summary fashion below. The reference point of these insights is the dynamic of the bestowal of love by the Father on the Son and *vice versa* in the immanent Trinity.

Kilmartin applies the data gained from the immanent Trinity, from the perspective of the bestowal model, to the economy of grace. He explains that the liturgical celebration reveals the interrelation of the divine persons in which the personal characteristic of the Holy Spirit is the mutual love of the Father and the Son. In order to understand this interrelation of the Trinity expressed in the liturgical celebration of the Church, it is necessary to note Kilmartin's consideration of the two basic characteristics of Christ's sending of the Spirit which he articulates as a theandric act and a sacramental act of the Father.<sup>487</sup>

After the accomplishment of the earthly mission given him by the Father, through resurrection and glorification Jesus is completely accepted back by the Father and filled with the Holy Spirit. Christ's divinity (as the Son of God) is fully realized in his humanity which

---

<sup>486</sup>See Kilmartin, "Active Role of Christ and the Holy Spirit," 248.

<sup>487</sup>See *ibid.*, 242-243.

assures his authority to send the Spirit (John 16:7).<sup>488</sup> “Since he [Jesus] becomes fully one with the coprinciple of the Spirit, namely, the Son who bestows the Spirit on the Father, by the completion of his human nature in grace, he is able to send the Spirit in fulness [*sic*].”<sup>489</sup> Christ thus becomes the co-sender of the Spirit with the Father. The purpose of the sending of the Spirit by the risen Lord is to unite himself with believers so that they, like him, may become children of the Father and love the Father in, with, and through the one Son.<sup>490</sup> “The risen Lord sends the Spirit to enable humanity to respond to the Father with the love of daughters and sons in union with his acceptable worship.”<sup>491</sup> The sending of the Spirit by the risen Lord, then, shows the profound unity between his love of the Father and of the Father’s children, which is “ultimately the Holy Spirit incarnated in Jesus’ human love.”<sup>492</sup> Stated differently, the risen Lord’s purpose of sending the Spirit is to make believers realize the potential of their human love for the Father. In this sense Kilmartin asserts that “the Spirit and Word actualize the potential of a human being for personal communion with the Father.”<sup>493</sup> Through the Spirit they commune with Christ in the love of the Father.<sup>494</sup>

---

<sup>488</sup>Kilmartin makes a distinction between the two sendings of the Spirit: one by the earthly Jesus; the other by the risen Lord. While these two sendings are theandric acts of Christ and sacrament of the sending of the Spirit by the Father, the earthly Jesus could send the Spirit to individuals only in a limited sense, namely, by his discrete human acts which were tied to human history. On the other hand, the risen Lord sends the Spirit once-for-all conformed to his status as glorified Lord. See *ibid.*

<sup>489</sup>*Ibid.*, 249. Also see *ibid.*, 188; McKenna, “Eucharistic Epiclesis,” 276.

<sup>490</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 184.

<sup>491</sup>Edward J. Kilmartin, *Culture and the Praying Church: The Particular Liturgy of the Individual Church*, ed. Mary M. Schaefer (Ottawa, Canada: CCCB, 1990), 90, hereafter *Culture and the Praying Church*.

<sup>492</sup>Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 188.

<sup>493</sup>*Ibid.*, 101. Also see *ibid.*, 70, n.1.

<sup>494</sup>See Kilmartin, “Active Role of Christ and the Holy Spirit,” 249.

Kilmartin insists that “the divinity of Christ, as divinity realized in humanity cannot be equated with that of the Father, which is divinity simply given.”<sup>495</sup> Accordingly, Kilmartin argues that the sending of the Spirit by the risen Lord reflects but is not identical with the sending of the Spirit by the Father.<sup>496</sup> It would mean, then, that since Jesus is sent by the Father, the sending of the Spirit by Jesus is the sacrament of the sending of the Spirit by the Father. The sending of the Spirit by the risen Lord is a theandric act.<sup>497</sup> As a divine act, flowing from the glorified humanity of Christ, it signifies and accomplishes the sacrament of the transcendental act of the Father’s sending of the Spirit, a pure divine act. Its purpose is to draw believers into union with the Son, so that they may become truly the children of the one Father in his one Son.<sup>498</sup> Corresponding to the manner of the inner-Trinitarian procession of the Spirit, Kilmartin asserts that the Father’s sending of the Spirit outside the immanent Trinity is an extension of the procession of the Spirit from the Father as the bestowal of the love on the Son. Likewise, the risen Lord’s sending of the Spirit is a prolongation of the inner-Trinitarian answering love of the Son for the Father, which is ordered to enable believers to love the Father as Jesus did. It is the highest expression of the human love of the risen Lord for the Father because the explicit love of the neighbor, ordered

---

<sup>495</sup>Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 188.

<sup>496</sup>See *ibid.*

<sup>497</sup>The theology of the theandric activity of Christ is a special contribution of the Greek Fathers who taught that Christ manifested his divinity and divine salvific will through his humanity and the mysteries accomplished by it. The divine will acts through the human will of Christ which makes all Christ’s human activities salvific. See Kilmartin, “Active Role of Christ and the Holy Spirit,” 241-242.

<sup>498</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 184.

to their fulfillment of communion with God, is the primary act of human love of God.<sup>499</sup>

Kilmartin argues,

It [the risen Lord's sending of the Spirit] takes the form of a supreme act of love of the Father and for humanity. It is ordered to bringing humanity to love the Father with the love of the Son in the Spirit and at the same time is the highest expression of the human love of Christ for the Father; for the explicit love of the neighbor is the primary act of love of God.<sup>500</sup>

Hence, Kilmartin cautions that the sending of the Spirit should not be conceived merely as a prolongation of the procession of the Spirit *per Filium* or *Filioque*, as expressed in the Eastern and the Western traditions.<sup>501</sup> Kilmartin thus places a great emphasis on the unity of the love of God and the love of neighbor. An essential role of the Eucharist in the life of the Church, he held, is that of "effecting and increasing not only the union of God with [believers] but the union of [believers] among themselves."<sup>502</sup> These vertical and horizontal dimensions of the Eucharist interpenetrate one another so much so that one is not given without the other.<sup>503</sup> Kilmartin found the teaching of this unity at the heart of St. Paul's understanding of the Church as the Body of Christ, and of the Eucharist as the sacrament of Christ's body.<sup>504</sup> Through the twofold action, emanating "from the Father as purely divine act and from the risen Lord as its 'sacrament,' to which corresponds the acceptance of the

---

<sup>499</sup>See *ibid.*, 189; *idem*, *Culture and the Praying Church*, 90.

<sup>500</sup>Kilmartin, "Active Role of Christ and the Holy Spirit," 250.

<sup>501</sup>See *ibid.*, 252.

<sup>502</sup>Kilmartin, *The Eucharist in the Primitive Church*, 91.

<sup>503</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 355; *idem*, *The Eucharist in the Primitive Church*, 89-90.

<sup>504</sup>See Edward J. Kilmartin, "Eucharist and Community," *Emmanuel* 82 (1976): 87-92.

Holy Spirit by the ‘witnesses’ (Acts 4:15) of the resurrection, the Church is constituted, and believers are sanctified by faith.”<sup>505</sup>

In Kilmartin’s Trinitarian understanding, Christ sends the Spirit (the love of the Son for the Father) outside the immanent Trinity but with the intent of ultimately being bestowed on the Father by the Son and all those whom he has united to himself. Believers’ reception of the Spirit, sent by the Father through Christ, is itself a sacrament of the transcendental bestowal of the Spirit on the Son as the Spirit of the Father’s love. Worshipers’ actions of self-sacrificing love are, in turn, sacraments of the answering return of the Spirit from the Son to the Father within the immanent Trinity. While the historical Jesus sent the Spirit by discrete human acts, the risen Lord sends the Spirit once-for-all. But in the liturgical celebrations of the Church, Kilmartin argues, this sending is realized by distinct, concrete acts of the Church. In other words, “the manner in which the Spirit is offered and sent conforms to the only way in which human beings can respond in faith to the offer of the Spirit: by the word and act of Jesus of Nazareth and by his word and act in the word and act of the Church.”<sup>506</sup> This once-for-all sending of the Spirit continues to be realized in the time of the yet to be fully completed salvation history whenever the word and sacraments of Christ are celebrated in his Church through the ordained ministry. As acts of Christ, word and sacraments correspond to the Son’s bestowal of the Spirit on the Father; as acts of the Father they correspond to *vice versa*. The personal trait of the Spirit is the mutual love of the Father and the Son. The paschal mystery, which gives life to the Church, celebrated

---

<sup>505</sup>Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 188. Also see idem, *Culture and the Praying Church*, 90.

<sup>506</sup>Kilmartin, “Active Role of Christ and the Holy Spirit,” 242.

especially in the Eucharist, reveals the economic Trinity. The economy of Trinitarian self-communication, in turn, reveals the immanent Trinity. Stated differently, it is the transcendental love of the immanent Trinity that is expressed in the movement of the divine persons toward believers who are called into being in order to receive the interpersonal divine love in space and time. The action of the economic Trinity may in this sense be called sacrament of the immanent Trinity. Kilmartin thus sees the bestowal model as having a better appreciation for the mission of the Spirit which results in a Trinitarian theology of liturgy.

Kilmartin argues that in the event of the sanctification of human reality that corresponds to an ascending Spirit-Christology there is a priority of nature, not order, of the Spirit in the Incarnation. “The Holy Spirit is bestowed by the Father in the very act by which the created humanity of Jesus is sanctified and united in person to the Word . . . this sanctification by the Spirit is the fullest realization of the potential of a human being for unity with the divine.”<sup>507</sup> This ascending Spirit-Christology considers the communication of the Spirit to human reality (grace) not just *in facto esse* (constitution) but also in its process of realization (*in fieri*) which is in relationship with the life of the incarnate Word.<sup>508</sup> The realization of humanity’s finite transcendence, grounded on and ordered toward the infinite transcendence of God, takes place through this communication. The Spirit of sonship, bestowed on the Son by the Father as his love, sanctifies and unites the humanity of Jesus to the Word in an act which, in the order of nature, precedes the assumption of that humanity by

---

<sup>507</sup>Kilmartin, *Culture and the Praying Church*, 84-85.

<sup>508</sup>See Kilmartin, “Active Role of Christ and the Holy Spirit,” 248.



the Word. Corresponding to the procession of the Spirit as the bestowal of the Father's love on the Son, when the Father freely directs his love to believers, created for the purpose of receiving that love, they are necessarily drawn into union with the proper object of the Father's love, the Son. Accordingly, Kilmartin argues that the bestowal model provides the reason for the salvation history manifestation of the inner-Trinitarian processions as not an inversion of the procession model as such but as corresponding to the manner of the procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father. The bestowal model thus offers a theological ground, Kilmartin argues, for explaining the relationship between the sanctification of Jesus and that of believers, while making a distinction between these two sanctifications. In Jesus' case, the Father's bestowal of the Spirit on the Son effects the sanctification of humanity and unites it hypostatically with the person of the Word in non-sacramental fashion, making it thus a unique instance in history. In believers' case, the Spirit effects their sanctification, uniting them with the person of the Word in a real union of grace, not a unity of person but a personal union, and thus giving them the same relation with the Father as enjoyed by the Word. Accordingly, the divine adoption of believers is the work of the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of sonship. This sanctification has, then, implications for believers' liturgical participation.

The personal activity of the Spirit is revealed in the sanctification of believers as they are united with the Word in an ascending life of faith. This ascending movement, Kilmartin believes, must be reconciled with the theological traditions that have emphasized a descending Christology and the procession model of the Trinity. When applied to the economic Trinity, the bestowal model has the advantage of being able to integrate a descending and ascending Christology in a completely consistent way. Hence, from the

perspective of the economy of grace Kilmartin argues for the need to invoke both models for describing the offer and bestowal of grace oriented to the sanctification of believers.<sup>509</sup>

Believers experience both the offer and the bestowal of grace in sacramental celebrations.

The offer of the Spirit (grace) corresponds to the procession model. But it ultimately signifies the bestowal of the Spirit through immediate communication made by the Father to make believers children in the one Son which, on the part of believers, is conditioned by the acceptance in faith, and as such this bestowal of the Spirit pertains to the bestowal model. In other words, sanctification of believers is acquired sacramentally, bestowed on them by the Father in the sacrament of the offer of grace made principally by Christ in his glorified humanity. The offer of grace to believers corresponds to the procession of the Holy Spirit in the Trinity, while the bestowal of the grace on believers corresponds to the Father's bestowal of the Holy Spirit on the Son in the Trinity.

Jesus acquired his divine sonship non-sacramentally from the outset of his human existence. Hence Jesus' divine sonship is neither offered nor is it a consequence of a response of faith. Thus it means that he enjoyed a knowledge and love of the Father as an immediate vision by virtue of the grace of the hypostatic union. The hypostatic union requires that the knowledge and love of the Father be experienced psychologically as well as given ontologically. Of all people, Jesus alone was God. "But, as a human being, he lived by faith . . . [which] flowed from his divine sonship already given from the beginning of his existence."<sup>510</sup> But he actualized that sonship in progressive divine fashion through exercise

---

<sup>509</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 153-155, 170-176.

<sup>510</sup>Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 154. Scripturally, faith is understood as the attitude of subjection,

of human freedom expressed in categorial acts of love. If Jesus is seen to possess a life of faith and holiness of which the Holy Spirit is the divine source, then this divine source of the growth of his humanity in faith and holiness can, and should, be related to that of believers. Believers are sanctified and maintained in this state through a response of faith lest it might be lost due to sin. This response is made possible by the Holy Spirit's action in them. Accordingly, their divinization flows from faith.

From the side of the human being, conversion precedes the acquisition of grace; from the side of God, the human being is moved by the gift of the Spirit to the act of conversion. Consequently, from the standpoint of the bestowal of grace, faith flows from the bestowed divine sonship. But the divine sonship is received through the free response in faith to the gift of the Spirit. Hence, from the standpoint of the acceptance of grace, faith brings about divine sonship.<sup>511</sup>

Hence, according to Kilmartin, a distinction should be made between the offer and bestowal of grace. The offer of grace reaches its goal when accepted in faith; the bestowal of grace follows upon the acceptance in faith.

Kilmartin argues that the bestowal model offers a way in which to understand grace as the grace of Christ. Because the Spirit is manifested in Jesus' life as Spirit of sonship and sent upon the world through Christ's humanity, the Spirit can be described as the grace of Christ. Kilmartin says:

The theology of grace which emerges from the bestowal model makes clear that the grace of Christ, the grace that the Head and Bridegroom of the Church shares with

---

obedience, trust, and love toward God in the face of opposing difficulties and temptations. See Coffey, *Grace*, 73. In other words, the active, conscious acceptance of the divine offer of self-communication, which characterized both Jesus' action and teaching, was the faith of Christ.

<sup>511</sup>Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 154.

believers, is the Holy Spirit. This Spirit, who sanctified and united the humanity of Jesus in the unity of person to the Word of God, in the time of the Church sanctifies all who accept the Father's offer of the Spirit, sent by the risen Lord.<sup>512</sup>

This understanding of the Spirit allows Kilmartin to assert and emphasize that the personal activity of the Spirit is the principle of unity between Christ and the Church which, in turn, grounds a proper understanding of the Christ-Church relationship.

The unity between Christ and the Church is a unity in plurality of persons. . . . The bond of unity is the Holy Spirit. In this optic three false understandings of the Church are to be avoided: a monophysitic, or overdrawn identification of Church with Christ; the Nestorian tendency, or overdrawn separation of Church from Christ; and an overdrawn identification of Church with the Holy Spirit. This danger is avoided by introducing the concept of "mediated immediacy."<sup>513</sup>

According to Kilmartin's concept, in the economy of grace the Holy Spirit is the mediation of the personal and immediate union between Christ and the Church. Through the personal concept of grace the Holy Spirit is identified as the bond of unity between Christ and the Church.<sup>514</sup> "The Holy Spirit, whom Christ possesses in fulness [*sic*], was sent by him from the Father to form believers into the Church. Hence the same Spirit in Christ and in the communion of believers enables the immediacy of Christ to believers, and yet an immediacy that is mediated."<sup>515</sup> Believers experience the Spirit as Spirit of Christ, who shares the Spirit with the members of his Church, and in that Spirit they have communion with the Father. Jesus and believers become personally present to each other only in the Spirit. This presence,

---

<sup>512</sup>Ibid., 171.

<sup>513</sup>Kilmartin, "Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology," 435. Also see idem, "Sacraments as Liturgy of the Church," 535.

<sup>514</sup>See *ibid.*

<sup>515</sup>Ibid., 536.

Kilmartin insists, is an immediate, personal presence. Nothing stands between Christ and believers. So also in the communion achieved with the Father in the Spirit nothing stands between the Father and believers, not even Christ himself. Establishing this communion of persons is a work that belongs to the Holy Spirit. The Spirit, uniting the Word with the humanity of Jesus, mediated Christ's self-offering to the Father on the cross, is revealed as acting within the Trinity as mediation or mutual love between the Father and the Son.<sup>516</sup> The ecclesiological dimension of the eucharistic sacrifice is grounded on the divine activity of the Holy Spirit through whom Christ offered himself on the cross and through whom the faithful offer themselves in union with Christ.<sup>517</sup>

Kilmartin claims that the bestowal model makes it possible to speak of the personal life of Jesus and of believers as the "incarnation" of the Holy Spirit, specifically as the Spirit of the faith of Christ, which leads to the understanding that there is only one life of faith. But this one life of faith includes of its three aspects (worship, witness, and service) even when one characteristic is dominant. "However, any Christian activity has the aspects of preaching, service and worship. For the life of faith is a totality, embracing the whole of human existence, expressing itself fully in all the ways it is actualized."<sup>518</sup> It is the life lived by Jesus Christ in the Holy Spirit. Believers are to live that life in a conscious fashion.

This model respects the dialogical movement revealed in liturgical celebration. In its description of the inner-Trinitarian life the initiative comes from the Father; the Son's bestowal of the Spirit on the Father is a response to the Father's love for the Son. In the

---

<sup>516</sup>See Kilmartin, "Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology," 435-436.

<sup>517</sup>See *ibid.*, 436.

<sup>518</sup>Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 73.

economy of grace, believers respond to the Father's bestowal of the Spirit on them through sacramental participation in the Son's bestowal of the Spirit on the Father. Human persons can only open or offer themselves to the divine initiative to receive the divine gift. This self-offering which Kilmartin terms "sacrifice" is realized over time through a history of experiences and decisions that constitute a life of thankfulness, praise, and love.<sup>519</sup>

Kilmartin points out that the theology of grace resulting from the bestowal model has implications for the role of the prayer of the Church in the work of sanctification.<sup>520</sup> The prayer of Jesus, the exercise of his faith, is grounded on his divine sonship. Because the Spirit united the humanity of Jesus with the Word, this Spirit, Jesus' transcendental love of the Father, is manifest in Jesus' human love. Therefore, Jesus' prayer is always an acceptable response to the Father. It corresponds to the bestowal of the love of the Son on the Father in the immanent Trinity. Similarly, the prayer of believers is an acceptable response because it is united with Christ in the Spirit. Through Christ, the love of believers for the Father is sent to the Father, while the love of the Father for believers is sent to them. This is accomplished by the bestowal of the Spirit. As a result of this bestowal, believers have an immediate union with the Father and in Christ they have an ontological and psychological union with the Father. For this reason, the prayer of the Church can be made with confidence that it will be heard, namely, with absolute confidence in God's fidelity. "The absolute certainty of a hearing when the prayer is made in the name of Jesus implies

---

<sup>519</sup>See *ibid.*, 55, 64-65.

<sup>520</sup>See *ibid.*, 172-174.

that the prayer is integrated into the prayer of the *one mediator who is always heard*.<sup>521</sup> The prayer is made to the Father through, with, and in Christ in the power of the Holy Spirit and is an integral part of the work of salvation. Sacramental celebration represents objectively the faith of the Church in God's promise of fidelity to his people. This promise is represented in the liturgy in the form of the prayer of the Church made to the Father through Jesus Christ in the Holy Spirit. The confident response of the liturgical assembly of faith to the promise given to the Church by the Lord of absolute certainty of hearing when it prays in his name is also represented in the sacramental celebration. On the ground of the prayer of the Church, made in union with that of Christ, and the promise given with the establishment of the Church as organ of salvation, the sacramental action has its effect, namely, it serves as transparency for the action of the Father through the Son in the Holy Spirit offering salvation. The offer of salvation becomes visible in the prayer of the Church made to the Father through, with, and in Christ for the Holy Spirit. The response of the Church is the way in which the offer is proclaimed in the Church.<sup>522</sup> Kilmartin says,

The verbal formulas that accompany the essential gestural action of the sacramental celebrations should not be understood as simply announcing the offer of the grace that corresponds to the signification of the rite. It is incorrect to relegate the formulas merely to the function of signifying God's offer of grace. Rather, the sacramental word is, in the first place, a prayer—even when formulated in the indicative. Sacraments are a true offer of grace, and indeed *ex opere operato* (from the work worked), because the prayer of the Church is a sacramental manifestation of the union of the worshipping community with the one High Priest.<sup>523</sup>

---

<sup>521</sup>Kilmartin, "Sacraments as Liturgy of the Church," 537. Italics original.

<sup>522</sup>See *ibid.*, 537.

<sup>523</sup>Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 173-174. Also see *ibid.*, 212.

The sacramental word is a form of prayer of the Church for the grace signified by the entire sacramental celebration. The bestowal model is suited to a Trinitarian theology of liturgy because it demonstrates how the prayer of the Church is related to the immanent Trinity. Worship is humanity's participation in the economic Trinity, which incorporates it into the immanent Trinity.

Kilmartin, by use of the implications of the bestowal model, articulates the relationship between the heavenly and earthly liturgy. The heavenly liturgy is the eternal celebration of the fullness of God's salvation by Christ and the saints who lived and died in the faith.<sup>524</sup> The fulfillment of the divine plan for creation is the personal communion of created beings with the persons of the Trinity; the heavenly liturgy consists in this communion.

With the ascension of Jesus and the ascension of the blessed, the divine plan of salvation is fully realized for them. This means that the mystery of the inner-Trinitarian communion between and among Father, Son, and Spirit has now become liturgy because it is *communicated and shared*.<sup>525</sup>

In heaven the worship of Christ became a social reality in which the blessed, in the power of the Spirit, are united with Christ in the worship of the Father by vision. Through the bestowal of the Spirit by the risen Lord from the Father, the heavenly liturgy is extended to earth by which the people of God on earth are made cosharers of the heavenly liturgy. But this sharing in the heavenly liturgy by the participants of the earthly liturgy occurs only "to

---

<sup>524</sup>See Kilmartin, *Culture and the Praying Church*, 88.

<sup>525</sup>Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 188. Emphasis original. Also see idem, *Culture and the Praying Church*, 89.



the extent that they fully give themselves in love to the Father *and* to the Father's other children."<sup>526</sup> The Spirit, who grounds the heavenly liturgy as the transcendental love of the risen Lord for the Father and the source of the loving response of the blessed for the Father's gift, is the one who enables the return of the earthly assembly of believers to the Father through Christ.

Like the heavenly liturgy, the earthly liturgy too celebrates the Trinitarian life shared with personal creatures: the mystery of God in Christ. United with Christ, the worshipers are in communion with the Father and they offer their lives in love of the Father in union with the self-offering of Christ. But the earthly liturgy differs from the heavenly liturgy in the mode in which the life of faith is celebrated. The heavenly liturgy is the liturgy of the glorified Christ, in union with all the saints, celebrating the divine plan of self-communication.<sup>527</sup> They give praise for the fulfillment of this plan and intercede for its final fulfillment through the sending of the Holy Spirit upon all human persons. The earthly liturgy, on the other hand, celebrates the reality that the divine plan is already fulfilled in Christ and the saints but also is being fulfilled in the Church on earth. In the sacrificial life of the worshiping community, the Church already participates in Christ's *transitus* to the Father.<sup>528</sup> In the earthly liturgy, Christ is present as "worshiper of the Father in the first place, and lover of humanity for the sake of the Father."<sup>529</sup>

---

<sup>526</sup>Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 189. Italics original.

<sup>527</sup>See Kilmartin, *Culture and the Praying Church*, 88.

<sup>528</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 348.

<sup>529</sup>Kilmartin, "Sacraments as Liturgy of the Church," 536.

Active and conscious participation in the earthly liturgy, by appropriating the communication of the life of faith expressed in the verbal and gestural prayer, necessarily impels believers to that service of other human persons that continues Jesus' proclamation of God's love in deeds of love of neighbor. "If one truly enters into the spirit of the liturgy, actively participates according to the real meaning of liturgy, one is necessarily led into commitment to the common action by which the Church grows into the Body of Christ."<sup>530</sup>

### The Mystery of the Liturgy and its Celebration

Based on the foregoing application of the bestowal model of the immanent Trinity to liturgical theology, Kilmartin's presentation of the mystery of the liturgy and its celebration follow. Attention is paid to avoid irrelevant repetition from what is described above.

#### *The Mystery of the Liturgy*

Kilmartin argues that from the beginning of creation, God intended humanity's personal communion with him—a communion understood as a participation in the gift of divine life—which presupposes the initiative of God in communicating self as gift.<sup>531</sup> This self-communication of God has a Trinitarian dynamic. It

is the self-communication of the Father through the communication of his Word and his Spirit . . . This communication attains its historical fulfillment in the special missions of the Word and Spirit in the incarnation, life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, and in

---

<sup>530</sup>Kilmartin, *Culture and the Praying Church*, 72.

<sup>531</sup>See *ibid.*, 81-82.

the mission of the Spirit to establish and maintain the Church as Body and bride of Christ.<sup>532</sup>

Accordingly, Kilmartin asserts that liturgy should be situated in the context of the history of the life and work of the Triune God in the economy of salvation. Kilmartin's description of the inner-Trinitarian life becomes the context for understanding the offer of love to humanity in the economy of salvation.

But the Word is not spoken and the Spirit is not breathed forth into an eternal void. The Word is continually turned to the Father and gives self back to him in loving thanksgiving. The Spirit of the Father rests on the Word, as bestowal of his love, and the answering love of the Word to the Father is this same Spirit. The Father and the Son are "for one another" in their mutual love, the Holy Spirit.<sup>533</sup>

The love of the Trinity by its nature is mutual, self-giving, and continually drawing the divine persons into communion. This love is unfolded and shared with humanity at different phases of the economy of salvation, has the same characteristics even when it is shared with humanity, and calls humanity to return divine love through their concrete lives.

In his treatment of the action of the Trinity in the economy of salvation, Kilmartin presents creation as the first action in God's self-revelation. The Father gives over his Word and Spirit to the action of creation which Kilmartin describes "as analogous to the exercise of efficient causality."<sup>534</sup> Hence, the Trinity of persons remains hidden at this stage of God's self-communication, though creation itself bears the marks of the Word and the Spirit. Human beings are created in the likeness of God (Genesis 1:27), and so are fashioned after

---

<sup>532</sup>Ibid., 82.

<sup>533</sup>Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 181-182.

<sup>534</sup>Ibid., 182.

the image of the mystery of communion of life of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Created for fellowship with God, the mystery of human love and desire for communion reveals the identity of God in whose image humanity is created. God's gradual self-revelation in the Old Covenant, from Abraham to Mary, reveals the destiny of humanity as communion of life with God. According to Kilmartin, a human response is always associated with God's self-communication, and it is always made possible by God's action. Human response reaches a new high in Mary's "yes" (Luke 1:38). Mary's positive response is the working of the Spirit of God. When her response is joined with the "divine energy,"<sup>535</sup> there occurs a synergism. "Through this synergism, by which the Spirit of God impregnates the energies of creatures, they are drawn into personal communion with God and do the works of God."<sup>536</sup> As a result of Mary's response to God's word, a new phase unfolds in the economy of salvation (or economic Trinity); God's self-communication reaches a new height in the Incarnation of the Word.

Kilmartin describes the mystery of the Incarnation as the *kenosis* of the glory of the Son in the economy of salvation and relates it to the Son's complete self-giving love to the Father in the bestowal model of the immanent Trinity.

The divine action by which the incarnation took place has a correspondence in the inner-Trinitarian life. In the manner of procession, the Spirit is bestowed on the Son as the only object of the Father's love. Likewise, the bestowal of the Spirit by the Father on a personal being created to receive that love necessarily draws that created being into union with the proper object of the Father's love, the Word . . . In the case of the bestowal of the

---

<sup>535</sup>In Eastern theology "energy" is understood as the action worked by the Spirit. See Ibid., 183.

<sup>536</sup>Ibid.

Holy Spirit on the humanity of Jesus, the effect is that of binding it to the Son of God in unity of person.<sup>537</sup>

Accordingly, Kilmartin understands the Incarnation as the work of the Trinity—the Father sends the Spirit to effect the unity of the humanity of Jesus with the Son of God. In the working of the Holy Spirit, the *kenosis* in the Incarnation of the Son reaches its perfect fulfillment in the death on the cross in which happens something new in the relation between God and humanity. Jesus Christ becomes the sacrament of salvation in the fullest sense.

In him occurs the full self-communication of the Father through Word and Spirit. Therefore he is the holy presence of the loving Father in history. At the same time, he is the one who is able to make the perfect response to this communication of divine love, in and through which the divine plan for the world comes to full realization.<sup>538</sup>

Kilmartin probes further the Trinitarian dynamic revealed in Jesus' public life and ministry, death, resurrection, and ascension. He explains that just as the gift of love and the response of love characterized the Incarnation so also the self-gift of the Father and the perfect acceptance of the Son is revealed through the anointing with the Spirit. Jesus in his ministry (word and works) communicates the Spirit to individuals. "His word and works signify the invisible offer of the Spirit of God to those who accept the Father's beloved Son."<sup>539</sup> Using the language of correspondence, Kilmartin relates the bestowal of the Spirit by the Father to the manner of bestowal of the Spirit from the Father to the Son. Its goal, as with any sending of the Holy Spirit outside the Trinity, is to draw people into union with the

---

<sup>537</sup>Kilmartin, *Culture and the Praying Church*, 85.

<sup>538</sup>Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 183-184.

<sup>539</sup>*Ibid.*, 184.

Son. The sending of the Spirit by Christ in his public ministry corresponds to the bestowal of the Spirit by the Son on the Father and is directed toward bringing people into union with the Father. Kilmartin identifies Jesus' love expressed towards others as the incarnation of the Spirit, Jesus' transcendental love of the Father.

The expression of Jesus' love for the individual during his public life is a kind of incarnation of the Spirit, that is, the incarnation of Jesus' transcendental love. The love that Jesus displays toward others is, at its depth, the Spirit, who assumes the characteristics of Jesus' personal and individual human love of the Father. Consequently, the visible offer and sending of the Spirit, expressed in Jesus' theandric acts of love for the neighbor, corresponds to, and is ontologically grounded on, the answering bestowal of the Spirit by the Son on the Father in the immanent Trinity. Its purpose corresponds to Christ's love of the Father, that is, to enable human beings to respond to the Father as sons and daughters in the one Son.<sup>540</sup>

Kilmartin offers his reflection on Jesus' death on the cross by saying that the Spirit, who worked in the *kenosis* of the Incarnation event, also works in the *kenosis* of the cross by effecting the synergism between the Word and the humanity of Jesus which enables Jesus to offer himself in a fully human love to the Father. This role of the Spirit, as the principle of sanctification of the humanity of Jesus, corresponds to Kilmartin's understanding of grace (the Spirit) as the orientation of humanity toward God. Moreover, "[a]s the transcendental love of Jesus for the Father, the Spirit is fully incarnated in Jesus' love on the cross."<sup>541</sup> From this perspective, Jesus not only offered himself completely to the Father in the power of the Spirit but also bestowed the Spirit on the Father. "In the hour of Jesus, he gives himself completely to the Father in a love that is ultimately the Love shared by the Father

---

<sup>540</sup>Ibid.

<sup>541</sup>Ibid., 185.

and the Son in the Trinity.”<sup>542</sup> Kilmartin explains that the bestowal of Jesus’ transcendental love (the Spirit) on the Father, understood as his response to the Father’s love for the world, is the *anabatic* movement of the divine plan of salvation. This movement, in turn, reveals the prior *katabatic* movement of the Father’s self-gift in his only Son for the salvation of the world. “In short,” Kilmartin concludes, “the *kenosis* of the Father is revealed in the *kenosis* of the incarnate Son.”<sup>543</sup>

Kilmartin describes resurrection and ascension as the Father’s last response in receiving Jesus who totally offered himself in the obedience of love to the Father’s initial love. As a result,

the Father sends the Spirit of love, and the body of Christ is made alive in the Spirit. The body that rises from the grave is now and for always alive, and source of life for others . . . Jesus Christ has become the “vivifying Spirit” (1 Cor 15: 45). Along with the Father, he has become the giver of life.<sup>544</sup>

Therefore, in Jesus’ ascension are included the just who have died in the Lord. The risen Lord sends the Spirit from the Father on the just as an essential aspect of his love of the Father so that they might be united to him and share in his movement of return to the glory of the Father. With the ascension of Jesus and that of the just, the divine plan of salvation is fully realized which makes the mystery of the inner-Trinitarian communion between Father, Son, and Spirit a heavenly liturgy.<sup>545</sup>

---

<sup>542</sup>Ibid., 185-186.

<sup>543</sup>Ibid., 186.

<sup>544</sup>Ibid.

<sup>545</sup>See *ibid.*, 188

The sending of the Spirit at Pentecost has a profound unity between Jesus' love of the Father and his love of the Father's children. This love is the Holy Spirit incarnated in Jesus' human love. Fully divinized in his humanity, Jesus sends the Spirit by a theandric act which corresponds to the Father's sending of the Spirit by a transcendental act. As believers receive the Spirit as "the river of the life-giving water" (Revelation 22.1), they take part in the heavenly liturgy. But they share in the heavenly liturgy only to the extent that their own self-giving corresponds to the divine self-giving communicated in the Christ-event.

In his final reflection on the mystery of the liturgy, Kilmartin offers a reflection on the relationship between the heavenly and earthly liturgies. The heavenly liturgy, as the celebration of the fulfillment of the economy of salvation, is eternal, and can be described as "GLORY"<sup>546</sup> because in and through the heavenly liturgy the glory of the Triune God is realized, "for the divine plan of salvation is that humanity may have life."<sup>547</sup> As such, the eternal liturgy is the celebration of the sharing of the life and love of the inner-Trinitarian communion. "There is the vision of God that includes personal communion with the Father, through Christ in the Spirit, and personal communion among all those who are in Christ."<sup>548</sup> The heavenly liturgy is the mystery of the earthly liturgy. Through the ascension of Christ and Pentecost, the Church is united to Christ and in him to the Father in the Spirit. Through the bestowal of the Spirit by the risen Lord from the Father the heavenly liturgy is extended to us and our return to the Father through Christ is made possible.

---

<sup>546</sup>Ibid., 189.

<sup>547</sup>Kilmartin, *Culture and the Praying Church*, 90.

<sup>548</sup>Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 190.



The earthly liturgy is the sacramental accomplishment of the heavenly liturgy, the foretaste of an anticipated reality. The earthly liturgy is the enactment of the desire and hope for something that already exists elsewhere. But it is also a real participation in the heavenly liturgy. In the earthly liturgy the Church makes its own self-offering to the Father as bride of Christ. At the same time, the Church is united to Christ as Body to Head, quickened by the one Spirit whom Christ possesses in fullness. This unity in the one Spirit enables a loving mutuality of self-offering in which the earthly liturgical assembly is united in its worship to the eternal worship of Christ.<sup>549</sup>

Hence, the prayer of the earthly liturgy is always heard because its mystery is the eternal worship of the one high priest who is the sacrament of the divine-human love of God (glorification). Kilmartin points out that the eucharistic liturgy, the clearest example of the synergism of the Spirit and Church and Christ and Church, constitutes the essence of the earthly liturgy.

### *The Liturgy Celebrated*

According to Kilmartin, the concrete forms of the earthly liturgy are based on the principle that “the Holy Spirit is the ultimate source of the historically and culturally conditioned liturgical expressions of faith.”<sup>550</sup> He offers a further explanation of how to understand the Spirit as the source of Church’s liturgy.

The Spirit always refers the community, in its life and works, to the life and work of Jesus of Nazareth. This Spirit of Christ keeps alive the memory of Jesus and, at the same time, teaches the community how to celebrate the profound meaning of his life and work. In this sense, we must speak of the Spirit as the ultimate source of the authentic liturgical forms of expression of the Church’s faith. The Spirit is the principal cause who organizes

---

<sup>549</sup>Ibid.

<sup>550</sup>Ibid., 192.

the specific elements of the liturgy into a unity of signification that corresponds to one or another dimension of the mystery of Christ.<sup>551</sup>

For Kilmartin liturgy is always the liturgy of Christ and his Church. He asserts:

What the Church does, in all of its liturgical celebrations, manifests for the eyes of faith what Christ is doing. If the liturgical assembly worships the Father, it is *because* Christ himself is always before the Father as the chief liturgist of the communion of the blessed and of the believers on earth. If the liturgical assembly reaches out in its symbolic gestures of desire for the sanctification of the members of Christ's Body, it is *because* Christ is now, and always, reaching out as the sacrament of the divine-human love of humanity.<sup>552</sup>

Viewing the ordained ministry in the special role of representing Christ, as understood in the ordination rite with the coming of the Spirit on the candidate, Kilmartin emphasizes its special function in the worship of the Church. That function is participation “in the authority of Christ, as representative of Christ's divine-human love of humanity *and* his divine-human love of God.”<sup>553</sup> Yet he insists that it is a ministry of and in the Church and describes it as a sacramental representation of the Trinitarian mystery of the Church. Moreover, it is the synergism of the Spirit and Church and the synergism of Christ and Church. In this view, the ordained ministry is conceived in the Christ—Church relation accomplished by the Spirit.

---

<sup>551</sup>Ibid.

<sup>552</sup>Ibid., 194. Italics original.

<sup>553</sup>Ibid., 196. Italics original. For Kilmartin's extensive treatment on ordained ministry and the sacrament of Orders, see Edward J. Kilmartin, “Apostolic Office: Sacrament of Christ,” *Theological Studies* 35 (1975), 243-264; idem, “Office and Charism: Reflections on a New Study of Ministry,” *Theological Studies* 38 (1977), 547-554; idem, “The Authenticity of Christian Ministry: A Reply,” *Communio* 3 (1977), 185-188; idem, “Lay Participation in the Apostolate of the Hierarchy,” *Jurist* 41 (1981), 343-370; idem, “Active Role of Christ and the Spirit,” 243.

Kilmartin concludes the chapter “The Mystery of the Liturgy and Its Celebration” in *Christian Liturgy* on a positive note in regard to his investigation of the liturgy as the mystery of the economic Trinity.<sup>554</sup> He specifically points out that such an investigation clarifies the intimate relation between the earthly and heavenly liturgies, provides a better understanding of the inner-Trinitarian life, and gives form to various elements of the economy of salvation which otherwise remain vague. In discussing the two liturgies, Kilmartin notes that in fact “[t]here is only one liturgy, which has its earthly and heavenly realizations. The single difference between the two lies in the fact that the earthly liturgy has an earthly dimension.”<sup>555</sup> The earthly liturgy is the worship offered by the pilgrim people who live by faith, not by vision, on their way to the eternal Kingdom. Kilmartin underscores the evangelical character of the communal worship.

Although Jesus Christ, as the “man for others,” has fully redeemed humankind by the Cross, there still remains the need to extend redemption to humanity, weighed down by sin and living under the laws of the history of sinful humanity. One of the chief ways in which this salvation is communicated is the situation of communal worship of the organized church.<sup>556</sup>

The communal worship of the Church, animated by the missions of Christ and the Spirit, proclaims the *magnalia Dei* in the hope of drawing humanity into the relationship of the Father, Son, and Spirit. In Kilmartin’s theology,

The Spirit represents the term of the *exitus* from the Father and the beginning of the *reditus* to the Father of all creation. This includes the human reality of Jesus. Fully

---

<sup>554</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 196-197.

<sup>555</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>556</sup>*Ibid.*, 197. Also see *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 83.

possessed by the Spirit during his earthly life, he is fully spiritualized through his glorification. Fully possessed by the Spirit of communion: God's own openness to history, Jesus includes all mankind in himself. Fully spiritualized, the Kyrios sends the Spirit to draw mankind into union with himself and so into the life of the Father.<sup>557</sup>

At the end of the chapter "The Mystery of the Liturgy and Its Celebration" in *Christian Liturgy*, Kilmartin says that the subject of liturgical celebration is a theme that pertains to the earthly liturgy. He treats this point elsewhere in that book.<sup>558</sup> I briefly present this theme below for two reasons: as the completion of this section and as an important element insofar as active participation is concerned.

Kilmartin notes that in light of the new ecclesiological turn of sacramental theology, sacraments are now understood to be acts of the Church, to whose authority they have been entrusted. Thus he asserts that "the local assembly, which represents the Church in space and time, is the direct subject of the whole liturgical action under the leadership of the ordained ministry."<sup>559</sup> This assertion is directly applicable to the eucharistic celebration and is grounded in Kilmartin's understanding of the relationship between the action of the liturgical assembly and the sacraments in an ecclesial context. In light of the pneumatological character of the Church (the personal mission of the Spirit for the relationship between Christ and the Church), Kilmartin describes the Church as the continuation of the unction of Christ by the Spirit. This pneumatological emphasis is important for Kilmartin to avoid perceiving

---

<sup>557</sup>Kilmartin, "Modern Approach," 68.

<sup>558</sup>Kilmartin presents this theme at the end of *Christian Liturgy* in chapter "The Efficacy of the Sacraments."

<sup>559</sup>Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 363.

the Church as continuation of the Incarnation of the Logos or as *alter Christus*.<sup>560</sup> Rather, in light of *Lumen Gentium*,<sup>561</sup> he understands the Church as sacrament in Christ (sign and instrument of union with God and of the unity of humankind).

As sacrament of Christ, the church is Christ's sacrament (subjective genitive) and sacrament of his saving work (objective genitive). It is the sacrament of the man Jesus Christ as Sanctifier and as Holy One. "In Christ," it is both institution of salvation and communion of the saved. "In Christ," the church is effective sign of the vertical union of mankind with God and of the lateral union of human persons on earth.<sup>562</sup>

This description of the Church as sacrament, and of the Church's activity as signifying and effecting communion of believers with God and the unity of believers among themselves, Kilmartin argues, necessarily requires the introduction of the notion of encounter with its social dimension. "For, it is not only a question of an encounter between God and an individual but of an encounter between God and human persons and of human persons among themselves simultaneously."<sup>563</sup> In addition, Kilmartin argues that the theme of the Spirit is necessary for this description of the Church because "the Church is in Christ 'in the Spirit'."<sup>564</sup>

Kilmartin uses the concept of the German *Begegnung* of the Dialogue Philosophy of Martin Buber to explain "encounter" as meeting another in openness with the possibility for positive effects. Buber uses *Begegnung* to describe the situation of immediate contact with a

---

<sup>560</sup>For the danger involved in such perception of the Church, see *ibid.*; *idem*, "Modern Approach," 68.

<sup>561</sup>See *Lumen Gentium*, 1, 5, 26.

<sup>562</sup>See Kilmartin, "Modern Approach," 68-69.

<sup>563</sup>*Ibid.*, 69.

<sup>564</sup>*Ibid.*

thou.<sup>565</sup> Since God is a Thou, only a pure personal encounter is possible with him. When encounter is understood in this way, Kilmartin argues, it refers to a mutual openness of one to the other and leads to new action or involves engagement. Kilmartin affirms that the essential Christian engagement in the Church is “Christ for us! We with Christ!”<sup>566</sup> This engagement, on the side of believers, involves commitment to the New Covenant and hope of eternal life based on their experience of the encounter with Christ in the Church. The paradigm of this encounter with Christ is the Eucharist in which believers “express their innermost being, their deepest intentions and feelings, and their love for one another”<sup>567</sup> in symbolic actions and words.

#### Salvation-Historical and Liturgical Theology of the Eucharistic Sacrifice

This theme is presented in three points below which, according to Kilmartin, are ordered to one another as a systematic theology of eucharistic sacrifice. Kilmartin developed this theology within the context of the literary structure or theological movement of the eucharistic prayers while integrating the theology of the liturgical role of the Holy Spirit gained from his development of the bestowal model and Spirit-Christology. Liturgical action of the eucharistic assembly underlies these points, specifically the assembly’s engagement in the ritual acts, words and actions as the symbolic expression, of the Eucharistic Prayer. This engagement is made possible by the working of the Holy Spirit who is the source of the Eucharistic Prayer that formulates the faith of the Church which is

---

<sup>565</sup>See *ibid.*

<sup>566</sup>*Ibid.*, 70.

<sup>567</sup>Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 221.

ultimately the faith of Christ.<sup>568</sup> The Spirit is the source of the faith of Christ, who lived his life of faith in the Spirit, and the mediation of this faith to believers. Consequently, the eucharistic assembly is enabled to participate in the liturgy in which the unique sacrificial response by Christ to the Father is made present. This participation allows for the experience of salvation here and now while inviting the anticipation of its final fulfillment in the eternal Kingdom.

Kilmartin describes salvation history as “the history of acceptance of God’s love through the exercise of human freedom”<sup>569</sup> or as the divine offer of personal communion to human beings and their free response.<sup>570</sup> The effect of the divine offer of self-communication is achieved to the extent that a response is made to it. This response is the offering of self, in union with that of Christ, to receive the meaning of life from God. Through the revelation of God in Jesus Christ the divine gift is the self-communication of the Father through the Son in the Spirit. Kilmartin argues that the individual aspects of the “shape of meaning” of the Eucharist<sup>571</sup> are ordered to communion in the Holy Spirit with Christ and through him with the Father as well as communion with the Church in the unity of

---

<sup>568</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 374; idem, “Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology,” 437.

<sup>569</sup>Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 87.

<sup>570</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 356.

<sup>571</sup>Kilmartin describes them as follows. “In general, they are symbolic acts which cause by signifying: (1) they are instituted by God and supplied with the promise of God’s saving actions; (2) they involve the mutual remembrance of God and his people by which they are present to one another and share in a holy partnership; and (3) they possess a sacrificial character and meal character which are, just as is the substantial real presence of Christ, specific eucharistic aspects.” Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 340. By “shape of meaning” Kilmartin specifically refers to the form of accomplishment which provides the celebration its meaning. Through this meaning individual aspects of the celebration acquire their theological significance and are linked to one another making them a single event. He also identifies the “shape of celebration” of the Eucharist with the material expression of the formal shape of meaning constitutive for the symbolic actions of the celebration such as words, actions, elements, and the ordering of the entire celebration. See *ibid.*, 339-340.

the Holy Spirit.<sup>572</sup> The progressive growth of this personal communion with the Trinity occurs through the exercise of the psychological aspect of the life of faith—trust and hope in and love of the Trinity.<sup>573</sup> The high point of the salvation history process takes place in the special missions of the Word and Spirit in the Christ-event: the Incarnation, life, death, and glorification of Jesus Christ.<sup>574</sup> Kilmartin explains the special mission of the Word in a twofold dimension.<sup>575</sup> First, the mystery of Christ, as the Incarnation of the Son of God, is the final expression of the Father's fidelity to his covenant with humanity which is the sending of his only Son. Second, the mystery of Christ includes the response of the incarnate Son in his humanity as the embodiment of the fidelity of humanity to the covenant relation with the Father.

By applying the insights gained from his study of the Jewish festive meal ritual<sup>576</sup> to the literary-theology of the classical eucharistic prayers,<sup>577</sup> Kilmartin articulates the formal liturgical-theological shape of meaning of the Eucharist as the ritual representation of the dynamic covenant relationship between God and his people.<sup>578</sup> The configuration of the eucharistic prayers is in the form of a discourse between two partners of a covenant, God and

---

<sup>572</sup>See *ibid.*, 340.

<sup>573</sup>See *ibid.*, 356.

<sup>574</sup>See *ibid.*

<sup>575</sup>See *ibid.*

<sup>576</sup>See Kilmartin, "Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology," 445-448.

<sup>577</sup>The most complete literature on this subject is Giraudo, *La struttura letteraria della preghiera eucharistica*. Kilmartin's heavy dependence on it is evident in Edward J. Kilmartin, "Ecclesiological Implications of Classical Eucharistic Prayers," *Wort und Wahrheit, Supplementary Issue No. 5: Fifth Ecumenical Consultation Between Theologians of the Oriental Orthodox Churches and the Roman Catholic Church, Vienna-Lainz, September 18-25, 1988* (Vienna: Herder, 1989), 85-99; *idem*, "Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology," 443-452.

<sup>578</sup>See Kilmartin, "Ecclesiological Implications of Classical Eucharistic Prayers," 85; *idem*, "Epiclesis," *New Catholic Encyclopedia* 18: Supplement (New York: McGraw Hill, 1988) 150; *idem*, *Eucharist in the West*, 339; *idem*, "Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology," 448.



humanity.<sup>579</sup> The eucharistic prayers, as performative form of the faith of the Church, articulate a theology of covenant, modeled on the Old Covenant established and realized between God and his people.<sup>580</sup> Accordingly, Kilmartin identifies the Eucharist as an efficacious event of communication of the grace of the covenant, communion between God and creatures.

Kilmartin describes the literary structure of traditional Jewish public prayer as bipartite: a remembrance of God's saving activity for the people and a petition for renewal of this activity that enables the people to remain in the covenant relationship with God.<sup>581</sup> The classical eucharistic prayers, in Kilmartin's analysis, implore for the renewal of the covenant made in Jesus Christ and describe the mystery of the celebration of the Eucharist as a participation in Jesus Christ's covenant relationship with the Father in the Holy Spirit.<sup>582</sup> All the classical eucharistic prayers, he argues, express the Church's desire "for fellowship with Christ, the sharing in his saving work, and his glory mediated through the 'food of immortality.'"<sup>583</sup> The prayer texts, Kilmartin found, describe the liturgy as the verbal and gestural prayer that expresses the faith of the New Covenant. In this faith the Church proclaims that the greatest of God's saving deeds is the offer and acceptance of Trinitarian self-communication in Jesus Christ. Confident of the divine purpose revealed in Jesus Christ, the liturgical assembly, acting as the covenant people, petitions the Father to send the Holy Spirit to unite it with Christ, bringing the Church and its members into the communion of the

---

<sup>579</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 355.

<sup>580</sup>See *ibid.*, 339-340; *idem*, "Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology," 449.

<sup>581</sup>See Kilmartin, "Ecclesiological Implications of Classical Eucharistic Prayers," 85.

<sup>582</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 339; *idem*, "Ecclesiological Implications of Classical Eucharistic Prayers," 85-91.

<sup>583</sup>Kilmartin, "Epiclesis," 151.

Trinity. The classical eucharistic prayers of the Church claim that God desires to receive the covenantal love of the members of the liturgical assembly, united with the sacrificial offering of love of Jesus Christ through the action of the Holy Spirit. In the order of grace, God freely and lovingly determines the divine self to a relationship with creatures in space and time which is received only in the order of grace and by participation in the covenant faith of Jesus Christ. The classical eucharistic prayers ask for the interpersonal relationship with God that the liturgy celebrates. Kilmartin would theologially enflesh these insights which he found in the *lex orandi*, the early eucharistic prayers, as follows.

*Being Present to the Salvific Acts of Christ in the Act of Anamnesis*

It is generally considered that the biblical notion of *anamnesis* identified with an objective act in and by which a past event commemorated is actually made present here and now, specifically, in the eucharistic celebration the liturgical occurrence of the objectivized presence of the past redemptive work of Christ.<sup>584</sup> Kilmartin saw this particular concept of *anamnesis* not only questionable but also insufficient for establishing the relation between the activity of the believing community and the mystery presence of Christ and his saving works.<sup>585</sup> Therefore, for an adequate explanation, he suggests that it is necessary to consider the relationship of memory, faith, the Holy Spirit, and the presence of Christ and his salvific acts in the lives of believers and in the life of the Church.

---

<sup>584</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 367.

<sup>585</sup>See Kilmartin, "Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology," 437-438.

A particular dynamic of covenant renewal is found in the Jewish prayers from which the eucharistic prayers developed. In his study of the commemorative feasts of the Jewish tradition, Kilmartin understood these feasts as the medium by which the participants are rendered present to the foundational event that is commemorated.<sup>586</sup> According to this dynamic, the participants are present to the foundational event and to God's gracious action of establishing the covenant. The participants' return consists in the sharing of the blessings analogous to those imparted in the historical event. Applied to the celebration of the Eucharist, Kilmartin argues that the eucharistic assembly is analogously, that is, "in some sense," represented to the foundational event of the death and resurrection of Christ and is enabled by faith to participate in its salutary effects.<sup>587</sup> Kilmartin finds support for this notion of biblical *anamnesis* in the classical eucharistic prayers. He writes, "The idea that the eucharistic celebration is the liturgical medium of participation in the single *transitus* of Jesus from suffering to glory is gleaned from the Eucharistic Prayer itself, from the *lex orandi*."<sup>588</sup> At the same time, he notes that the Eucharistic Prayer itself does not supply an adequate response to how to understand the idea of representation of the saving acts of Christ in and through the ritual memorial. He, therefore, judged that the Eucharistic Prayer lacks a theological explanation of the way in which the eucharistic assembly is represented to the Christ-event. Nevertheless, he sees the law of prayer as providing a valuable clue for its correct interpretation which he describes as "the orientation of the Eucharistic Prayer from

---

<sup>586</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 367.

<sup>587</sup>See Kilmartin, "Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology," 438.

<sup>588</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 355.

the ecclesial assembly to the Father of Jesus Christ.”<sup>589</sup> In this regard, Kilmartin specifically highlights the function and trait of the prayer of the narrative of institution of the Roman Canon. “Through the additions of *ad te Deum Patrem* and *tibi gratias agens* the narrative of institution is directed to the Father, showing the intention of the liturgical assembly to enter into the sacrificial prayer of Jesus himself.”<sup>590</sup>

Consequently, Kilmartin integrates pneumatological aspects into the act of *anamnesis*. Thereby he articulates the existential presence of the participants of the Eucharist to the sacrifice of Christ through the act of liturgical remembering of Christ’s sacrifice in the Spirit.<sup>591</sup> He says that in the eucharistic celebration “the Spirit gives to the Church the grace to recall, to render herself present to the Christ of history, passing from the world to the Father.”<sup>592</sup> The eucharistic assembly’s memory in the Spirit allows itself to bring the sacrifice of Christ to the center of its life. The movement is from the assembly to the event of the historical sacrifice of Christ. The eucharistic assembly is made present to it. The movement by which the assembly “meets” the past event of the sacrifice of Christ Kilmartin calls “memory.”<sup>593</sup> The eucharistic assembly is rendered present in memory to the historical salvific acts of Jesus by the divine activity of the Holy Spirit in the medium of the ecclesial ritual prayer and its accompanying symbolic action of the Eucharistic Prayer, the performative form of the activity of faith of the eucharistic assembly. The assembly is rendered present under the formality of active participants in Jesus’ response to the Father in

---

<sup>589</sup>Ibid., 356.

<sup>590</sup>Kilmartin, “Sacraments as Liturgy of the Church,” 531.

<sup>591</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 368.

<sup>592</sup>Kilmartin, “Sacramental Theology: The Eucharist in Recent Literature,” 246.

<sup>593</sup>See *ibid.*

the sense that the assembly responds in faith to the mystery of God in Christ. In this process the community is not only related to Christ's self-offering but the actively present Christ also relates his once-for-all self-offering to that of the community of faith. This mutual personal relation is grounded on the work of the Holy Spirit who brings Christ to the faithful and *vice versa*.<sup>594</sup> Accordingly, Kilmartin concludes that "the eucharistic assembly is presented sacramentally to the once-for-all saving event accomplished in Jesus Christ for the sake of all humanity."<sup>595</sup>

Kilmartin thus attempted to develop the relationship between the action of the eucharistic assembly and the memory of Christ's temporal deeds in the Spirit<sup>596</sup> and emphasized the role of the Spirit in the process of recalling in faith the actions of Jesus. Liturgical *anamnesis* is not just a human subjective act but also the work of the Holy Spirit, personally present in the faith of Christ and the faith of the liturgical assembly. In the liturgy the Spirit acts in the memory of the Church, expressed in word and action to communicate the saving attitudes of Christ's faith. The risen Lord enables the assembly to live from his death and resurrection because he sends the Spirit from the Father. Accordingly, liturgical *anamnesis*, Kilmartin understood, is a liturgical assembly's concrete activity of the faith by which Christ's past action is recalled in order to give meaning to the present and to hope for the eschatological fulfillment.<sup>597</sup> Kilmartin held that the accuracy of liturgical *anamnesis* is the work of the Holy Spirit and argued that in liturgical *anamnesis* the Spirit of Christ's faith

---

<sup>594</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 371.

<sup>595</sup>*Ibid.*, 356.

<sup>596</sup>See *ibid.*, 303-304.

<sup>597</sup>See *ibid.*, 304.

given to the Church is actualized in the believers. In the liturgical celebration of the memory of Jesus' life of faith, the Holy Spirit actively integrates personal memory and arouses the desire for God in order to conform believers to Christ. Kilmartin held that the activity of the Holy Spirit in the prayer of memory is properly personal. The Spirit acts in the eucharistic assembly's celebration of the mysteries of Christ's life. The Spirit of Christ makes believers present by memory to the temporal deeds of Jesus Christ in order that they may know him as person whose faith they share in the liturgical celebrations, especially the Eucharist.

*Metaphysical Affirmation of the Presence of the Salvific Acts of Christ*

According to the divine plan of salvation for the world, the effect of participation in the New Covenant is the integration into the single *transitus* of Jesus to the Father from suffering to glory (the mystery of the death-resurrection-glorification of Christ). This integration takes place through the action of the Holy Spirit in the worshipers. The Spirit transmits the sacrificial attitudes of Christ which requires a response of saving faith. Such a transmission is always offered by the Spirit but is only bestowed on the properly disposed subjects who freely accept it under the movement of the Spirit.<sup>598</sup> In this process the Holy Spirit, sent from the Father by the risen Lord, is the principal agent and the cause of sanctification. The eternal divine activity of the Spirit, Kilmartin explains, is a consequent term in the willing subjects in whom the action, the power, and the effect are identical. "The divine action of the Spirit, the agency of the human living of Jesus, and the effect of divine adoption, together with the psychological aspect of conformity to the meritorious attitudes of

---

<sup>598</sup>See *ibid.*, 358.

Christ, are coexistent in the properly disposed person.”<sup>599</sup> This eternal activity of the Spirit, which effects the divinization of the willing subjects, is modified by the historical salvific acts of Jesus so as to bring about the transmission of the spiritual attitudes of Jesus. Worshipers are thereby enabled to respond to the offer of divinization and participate proleptically in the single *transitus* of Jesus from the world to the Father.<sup>600</sup>

Kilmartin understands that Christ’s temporal deeds are present in the eucharistic celebration as the instrumental cause modifying the divinizing action of the Holy Spirit.<sup>601</sup> That is to say, because of these temporal deeds, the Holy Spirit comes to worshipers as the Spirit of the faith of Christ. Christ actualized the Spirit of his faith throughout his entire life through categorial acts of love of the Father and neighbor, especially in his death on the cross.<sup>602</sup> Thomist metaphysics states that Christ’s deeds as instrumental cause are present in their effect in the worshipers. These categorial deeds modify the action of the Holy Spirit in the sense that the effect of the Spirit’s action in the worshipers causes their configuration to Christ who possessed the sacrificial faith in the Spirit. The categorial deeds, then, are present in the worshipers’ reception of Christ’s sacrificial attitudes. Worshipers actualize these attitudes in the celebration of the Eucharist. In other words, the categorial deeds of Christ are active and present in the Spirit-worked sanctification of believers as they celebrate the memorial of Jesus Christ. This understanding of the presence of the sacrifice of Christ, sacrifice understood as Jesus’ human acts of love of the Father and neighbor all through his

---

<sup>599</sup>Kilmartin, “Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology,” 453. Also see idem, *Eucharist in the West*, 358-359.

<sup>600</sup>See Kilmartin, “Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology,” 453-454.

<sup>601</sup>See *ibid.*, 455.

<sup>602</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 172.

life which finally culminated in his death on the cross, allows the concept of sacrifice to be reappropriated.

It is from the effect of the action of the Spirit conforming worshipers to Christ's attitudes that Kilmartin wants to describe the mode of liturgical, real presence of the salvific acts of Christ.<sup>603</sup> He explains that the *transitus* of Jesus to the Father as the ultimate meaning of the world, witnessed by the New Testament, is historically completed in Jesus Christ with his glorification. But it still remains to be accomplished in the divine plan for the world and is the instrumental cause of conformity to Christ effected by the divinely intended transmission of the spiritual attitudes of Christ that are bestowed on the willing subjects.<sup>604</sup> From the divine perspective insofar as the liturgical involvement of the worshipers in the *transitus* of the world to the Father is concerned, the temporal succession and spatial duration are relevant. But they are not so with the ultimate intelligibility of the divine plan.<sup>605</sup> The divine plan is eternal (without succession). From this perspective, all historical salvific events are consequent terms of and present to the divine. Kilmartin argues that the divine causative knowledge has determined the relation of the effect of participation of believers in the passing over of Jesus to the presence of the historical saving acts of Jesus.

The ultimate intelligibility of the historical salvific acts of Jesus . . . is determined by the divine plan of salvation, in which the single transitus of Jesus from suffering to glorification is made the only way of salvation for the world. Concretely this means that in virtue of the divine causative knowledge there exists a real relation of dependence: the effect of the participation of ordinary human beings in the mystery of God in Christ is

---

<sup>603</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 359.

<sup>604</sup>See Kilmartin, "Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology," 452; idem, *Eucharist in the West*, 359.

<sup>605</sup>See Kilmartin, "Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology," 452.



dependent on the presence of the historical saving acts of Jesus—of Jesus as agent of modification of the sanctifying action of the Holy Spirit.<sup>606</sup>

The continued presence of the historical *transitus* of Jesus from suffering to glory is, then, a metaphysical presence which consists in the modification of the sanctifying action of the Holy Spirit by which the meritorious attitudes of Christ are communicated to willing subjects to enable them to join in the acceptable response of Jesus to the Father.<sup>607</sup> The *virtus salutaris* working through the instrumentality of the historical living of Jesus is the power of the Holy Spirit which produces the effect. Thus there is a relation between Jesus' passing over and the passage of all humanity from this world to the Father. Consequently, Kilmartin argues that "we can speak of the real presence of the historical saving actions to the effect of the action of the Spirit conforming the believer to Christ's attitudes."<sup>608</sup> He asserts that such a presence respects the distinction between the eternity of God and the consequent terms.

[The] real presence of the saving acts of Jesus in the beneficiary of the action of the Spirit . . . is not to be understood as a local presence in virtue of a process of "eternalization" of the saving acts. All such postulates fail to make the distinction between the eternity of God and the consequent terms that flow from the divine knowing, willing, and acting.<sup>609</sup>

---

<sup>606</sup>Ibid., 453.

<sup>607</sup>See *ibid.*, 454; *idem*, *Eucharist in the West*, 359.

<sup>608</sup>Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 359.

<sup>609</sup>*Ibid.* Kilmartin's description of the presence of Christ's salvific deeds is thus different from that of Casel, Giraudo, and Betz. In these theologians' descriptions is present the notion of perennialization of some aspects of those deeds by virtue of which they could be made present and saving by the glorified Christ in the Church's liturgy. Kilmartin judged that this approach is not only faced with the problem of metaphysical contradiction but also not respecting the distinction between time and eternity. See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 255, 321, 334-335; *idem*, "Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology," 450-451.

On two counts Kilmartin opposes such postulation of eternalization of the salvific acts of Christ: “denial of the possibility of historical salvific acts becoming ‘eternalized,’ and proof that the historical salvific acts of Jesus need not be repeated in order to be effectively present in the liturgical celebration.”<sup>610</sup> This claim of Kilmartin is based on the implications of the scriptural witness to the divine plan of salvation and is supported by the realist metaphysics of Aquinas.<sup>611</sup>

The metaphysical affirmation of the presence of the categorial deeds of Christ as instrumental cause of modifying the action of the Holy Spirit, then, explains how the Spirit acts in the liturgy to bring believers in memory back to those deeds. The categorial acts of Christ as such remain locked in history but are present in the sacrificial attitudes of Christ given and received by believers. Christ’s sacrifice is made present by faith in the members of the eucharistic assembly as they celebrate their participation in the mystery of God in Christ in the verbal and gestural prayer of the Church’s Eucharist.

*Participating in the Mystery of God in Christ in the Spirit of the Faith of Christ*

The covenantal theology of the Eucharist, Kilmartin notes, is enfleshed by the content of the New Covenant, the mystery of the economy of the Triune God in relation to the new people of God of which the crucified and risen Lord is the head.<sup>612</sup> The content of the classical eucharistic prayers reflects a formulation of the covenant response of the eucharistic assembly to the Father’s fidelity to his covenant with humanity fulfilled in the special

---

<sup>610</sup>Kilmartin, “Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology,” 452.

<sup>611</sup>See *Ibid.* For the references to Aquinas, see Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 316.

<sup>612</sup>See *ibid.*, 370-371.

missions of the Son and the Holy Spirit. The response corresponds to the personal response of the faith of Jesus to the Father. The classical eucharistic prayers and accompanying symbolic activity thus reflect a theology of salvation history conformed to the witness of the New Testament.<sup>613</sup>

According to Kilmartin, the salvation-history theology reflected in the classical eucharistic prayers and its symbolic action is a participation in the mystery of God in Christ, the New Covenant.<sup>614</sup> Kilmartin describes the Eucharist as the corporate act of the ecclesiastical community by which it actively participates in the mystery of God in Christ.<sup>615</sup> This participation, Kilmartin asserts, has a Christological dimension to the extent that it takes place on the side of the response of faith of Jesus, and the eucharistic assembly's response is conformed to the meritorious sacrificial attitudes of Christ which he expressed in his human response to the Father's work in him for the salvation of the world.<sup>616</sup> This participation in the response of Christ consists in the self-offering of the members of the eucharistic assembly of faith conformed to that of Christ which had its highest expression in his death on the cross. The human response of Christ, an expression of his faith (trust, hope, and love of the Father and love for the Father's children), allows participation in or reappropriation of the faith of Christ. It is in this sense that Kilmartin understands the faith of Christ pertains to the mystery of God in Christ. He argues that in order for the response of faith of believers to become a participation in the life of faith of Christ their response should be conformed to the

---

<sup>613</sup>See Kilmartin, "Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology," 442-443.

<sup>614</sup>See *ibid.*, 449.

<sup>615</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 360.

<sup>616</sup>See *Ibid.*, 357, 360; *idem*, "Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology," 449.

meritorious attitudes of Christ.<sup>617</sup> Participation, on the side of believers, takes place through prayer and sacramental Communion of the body and blood of Christ.<sup>618</sup> Through participation in Christologically qualified faith the members of the eucharistic assembly are conformed to the meritorious response of Christ to the Father by accepting in trust, hope, and love what the Father has accomplished in Jesus for the salvation of humanity. Thereby they are enabled to express and realize their participation after the manner of Christ's response of self-offering to the Father. This enablement, Kilmartin argues, is not a matter of simple human effort but the result of the divine action effecting the transmission of the sacrificial attitudes of Christ.<sup>619</sup> The Holy Spirit, sent by the risen Lord from the Father, is the source of both sanctification of believers, which places them in an ontological state of "divine adoption," and psychological and ontological reality of the life of faith that results from their sanctification understood as children of the Father in the one Son.<sup>620</sup>

While suggesting that participation in the faith of Christ is an indispensable way of taking part in the mystery of God in Christ, an idea conceived from Balthasar, Kilmartin argues that this notion of participation requires qualification because a direct participation in the faith of Christ is not possible.<sup>621</sup> For the faith (as well as the response) of Christ is rooted in the personal principle of the unique Son of the Father based on the hypostatic union of humanity and divinity of Christ. Hence, the faith and response of Christ are personal,

---

<sup>617</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 357.

<sup>618</sup>See *ibid.*, 360.

<sup>619</sup>See Kilmartin, "Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology," 455.

<sup>620</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 358.

<sup>621</sup>See Kilmartin, "Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology," 455.

individual, and incommunicable in which fully constituted human persons have no share.<sup>622</sup>

Kilmartin gained this idea of the impossibility of an ontic participation in the faith of Christ by his application of Aquinas's description of "a kind of participation" of the worshipping community in the incommunicable priesthood of Christ to the faith of Christ.<sup>623</sup> Aquinas never got to explain specifically what the depth dimension of this participation is other than stating it is the community's baptismal character. Because of his understanding of the unique nature of the faith of Christ, Kilmartin judged that Balthasar's description of an existential/direct participation in the faith of Christ is theologically inaccurate in the strict sense.<sup>624</sup> Kilmartin, therefore, examines the response of the faith of Christ, the only acceptable response to the Father, and highlights its universal nature in addition to its unique nature.<sup>625</sup>

Kilmartin explains that Jesus' knowledge and love of the Father are consequences of his Incarnation. Through the objective content of his consciousness Jesus experienced his basic orientation to the Father as the knowledge of his special relation to the Father and the mystery of the Father's special love for him, resulting in his all-consuming love of the Father. Christ expressed this knowledge and love of the Father (the life of faith) in his human acts of faith by responding to his own mystery, the fidelity of the Father to his covenant with

---

<sup>622</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 356; idem, "Sacraments as Liturgy of the Church," 541-542.

<sup>623</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 248, referring to Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* III, q. 63, a. 3 c.

<sup>624</sup>See Kilmartin, "Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology," 454-455; idem, *Eucharist in the West*, 301-302; Hans Urs von Balthasar, "'Fides Christi': An Essay on the Consciousness of Christ," in *Exploration in Theology*. Vol.2, *Spouse of the Word*, trans. Edward T. Oakes, S.J. (San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1991), 43-79.

<sup>625</sup>See Kilmartin, "Sacraments as Liturgy of the Church," 540-544.

humanity. Because Jesus' love for the Father is incarnated in his humanity, his response of love for the Father is unique. "This uniqueness," Kilmartin explains, "consists in the 'incarnation' of the substantial love of the Son for the Father in Christ's human love, i.e. the Holy Spirit."<sup>626</sup> The response of Jesus is thus distinguished from that of believers who have received the grace of Christ, the Holy Spirit.<sup>627</sup>

On the other hand, Kilmartin sees the universal meaning of the response of the faith of Jesus in the accomplishment of response of faith in his humanity for the "many" which grounds the response of faith of all humanity.<sup>628</sup> In other words, Christ offered himself once-for-all for the world but not to the extent that it diminished the opportunity and need of believers' repeated sacramental self-offering in union with the self-offering of Christ in the celebration of the Eucharist. For "his [Jesus'] self-offering was not a substitute for our self-offering made in union with him."<sup>629</sup> Believers' self-offering, to be acceptable, can only be made in union with that of Christ. According to a relational ontology,<sup>630</sup> "the proper being of a person is the coming together of being and relation, of being and meaning for others."<sup>631</sup> Jesus was totally realized as a person of faith as he died; being and relation were united as he offered himself "once and for all to the Father to receive from the Father the meaning of his

---

<sup>626</sup>Ibid., 542.

<sup>627</sup>See ibid., 541-542.

<sup>628</sup>See ibid., 542.

<sup>629</sup>Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 374.

<sup>630</sup>According to Kilmartin, "an ontology is called relational because relation is conceived as a kind of transcendental, in the sense that it belongs to being as such." The theological basis of this relational ontology is the relational nature of God in the inner-Trinitarian life and the relational connection between God and human beings in the order of grace for mutually exercised self-communication. For this insight Kilmartin is indebted to Ludger Oeing-Hanhoff. See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 146, referring to Ludger Oeing-Hanhoff, "Trinitarische Ontologie und Metaphysik der Person," *Trinität, Quaestiones Disputatae* 101, ed. W. Breuning (Freiburg: Herder, 1984), 143-181, especially at 163.

<sup>631</sup>Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 147.

life.”<sup>632</sup> Being and meaning for believers came together as he offered himself “as man for others to draw believers into personal communion with himself and so into communion with the Father.”<sup>633</sup> In this sense, Jesus’ mission was not just to be loved by the Father and to return that love through his sacrificial self-offering but also to bring all people into that love. Jesus’ prophetic blessing and sharing of bread and wine at the Last Supper proclaimed that the covenant sacrifice of his life was offered not for his own sake but for “the many.” In his death, he believed, God’s faithful love would be manifested, and a new covenantal relationship between God and human persons would be established through him. The table prayer and the sharing of food and drink revealed his faith that through his self-offering the Father would give “the many” a participation in the communion of the New Covenant. In Jesus Christ the incarnation of the fidelity of God and the perfect human response of faith come together. In his life of faith, Jesus actualized his acceptance of his relationship with the Father, developing a personal history in which he accepted and responded to the divine self-communication. In that history of faith Christ is the substantial covenant between God and humanity, and he anticipates in himself the new people of God.

In Kilmartin’s understanding, Jesus’ human faith, by whose exercise human persons are saved, was itself a freely received gift of the Holy Spirit whom Jesus experienced as the Father’s unique love for him. The acts of worship, witness, and service which the Gospels attribute to Jesus were constitutive of his life of faith, and Jesus invited his disciples to accept

---

<sup>632</sup>Kilmartin, “Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology,” 445.

<sup>633</sup>Ibid.

these acts.<sup>634</sup> The Spirit gave power and efficacy to Jesus' word in order to open up Jesus' relationship with the Father to others. Jesus is the sacrament of salvation in the fullest sense, namely, he is the one in whom occurred the full self-communication of the Father through Word and Spirit and the one who made the perfect response to this communication of divine love which realized the divine plan of salvation for the world. In the Incarnation, then, there occurred a new relation between God and creatures through the working of the Spirit. In his public ministry, Jesus thus became the sacrament of the divine-human love of humankind (sanctification) and the sacrament of the divine-human love of the Father (glorification).<sup>635</sup> In these two movements (Jesus' human love of the Father and for the Father's children) the Spirit acquires a personal history which Kilmartin terms as "the incarnation of the Spirit." In this twofold movement Kilmartin understands Jesus as the "primordial sacrament."<sup>636</sup> The Church, in turn, he understands as "the sacrament of Christ in the Spirit."<sup>637</sup> The Church's self-offering, united by the Holy Spirit with the self-offering of Christ, is the sacrament of the transcendental love with which the Son responds to the Father's love in the immanent Trinity.

Jesus' words of blessing of bread and cup at the Last Supper expressed his faith and his love for others. The cross-event where Jesus refused to stop loving was the means of fully actualizing his faith.<sup>638</sup> At the moment of his death, Jesus' gift of self to the Father was humanly complete. His embodiment of the gift of the Holy Spirit was fully actualized,

---

<sup>634</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 167-169.

<sup>635</sup>See Kilmartin, "Sacraments as Liturgy of the Church," 542; idem, *Christian Liturgy*, 184, 216-217; idem, "Outline of Lectures," 25.

<sup>636</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 215-217.

<sup>637</sup>See Kilmartin, "Modern Approach," 71.

<sup>638</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 185. Also see O'Donnel, "In Him and Over Him," 34-36.



perfectly expressing his human love for the Father and for the Father's children.<sup>639</sup>

Throughout his life Jesus had expressed his love of the Father by discrete acts of love for the Father's children. But in the moment of his death his final act of love for the Father was to pray for the Spirit of his sonship to descend on the Father's children so that they would love the Father and neighbor as he did.<sup>640</sup> At the moment of his death Jesus, incarnating the Holy Spirit as the Son's love for the Father, was glorified. As a result, he sends the Spirit to be the mediation between the disciples and the Father, thereby establishing the Church as the people who live in the New Covenant of love.<sup>641</sup> Kilmartin identified Jesus' sending of the Spirit as his high priestly work. "Through his eternal intercession (Heb. 7.25), the life-giving Spirit is sent in the final divine *kenosis*. . . . Now the Spirit binds believers to the dead and risen Lord."<sup>642</sup> It is only by participation in the mystery of Christ, that is, in the response of faith of Christ to the Father for what he has done in Christ for the salvation of the world, Kilmartin concludes, that one participates in the covenant between the Father and humanity.<sup>643</sup>

One may ask, then, in what sense do believers actually participate in the faith of Christ? In his understanding of the Holy Spirit as the source of the eucharistic prayers and of the faith of Christ and as the grace of Christ, Kilmartin found a proper answer to the question of the sacramental basis for participating in the unique faith of Christ. It is a participation in the grace (the Holy Spirit) of Christ's faith through the appropriation of the sacrificial attitudes of Christ consisting in his love of the Father and love for the Father's children.

---

<sup>639</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 185.

<sup>640</sup>See *ibid.*, 188-189.

<sup>641</sup>See *ibid.*; *idem*, "Modern Approach," 74.

<sup>642</sup>Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 190.

<sup>643</sup>See Kilmartin, "Sacraments as Liturgy of the Church," 541.

Kilmartin means this sacramental participation when he says that participation in the substantial covenant (Christ), “in a certain sense, is a participation in the faith of Christ.”<sup>644</sup>

Accordingly, Kilmartin makes a distinction between the faith of Christ,<sup>645</sup> which cannot be shared as such, and “the Spirit of the faith of Christ,”<sup>646</sup> which can be shared. The Spirit of faith, Kilmartin stresses, is thus distinct from Christ’s own personal faith based on the hypostatic union. The Spirit is given to the Church by the risen Lord and this Spirit becomes the Spirit of the Church, thereby a unity of grace is established. Grace is, then, the Gift of the Holy Spirit.<sup>647</sup> Since the Spirit is manifested in Jesus’ life as Spirit of sonship and is sent upon the world through Christ’s humanity, the Spirit can be described as the grace of Christ. This grace effects the sanctification of humanity and unites it, hypostatically in the case of Jesus and sacramentally in the case of believers, with the person of the Word. As a result, a unity of activity of Christ and that of believers becomes possible. Because the faith of Christ is given to believers, their full, conscious, and active participation is the way in which the sacramental action is made effective. The Spirit of Christ’s faith, Kilmartin argues, makes it possible for believers to participate sacramentally in the faith of Christ.<sup>648</sup> Kilmartin insisted that the liturgical celebration should be considered in the context of faith and

---

<sup>644</sup>Ibid., 542.

<sup>645</sup>Elsewhere Kilmartin also expresses it in subjective genitive, “Christ’s own faith.” See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 161.

<sup>646</sup>See Kilmartin, “Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology,” 449. This development of the pneumatological dimension of the faith of Christ is Kilmartin’s own contribution to liturgical theology. He also applies this pneumatological ground to the unique priesthood of Christ in which believers sacramentally participate. This explanation, then, makes explicitly clear what was implied in Aquinas’ description of “a kind of participation” in the priesthood of Christ as referenced above.

<sup>647</sup>See Kilmartin, “Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology,” 454. A point asserted by Coffey as well. See Coffey, *Grace*, x.

<sup>648</sup>In light of this notion of the role of the Holy Spirit it can be said that Balthasar’s claim of participation in the faith of Christ appears more significant.

emphasized the relationship between the faith of Christ, the faith of the Church, and the faith of believers, a relationship that is rooted in the activity of the Holy Spirit.

In the special mission of the Word, Kilmartin identifies the Holy Spirit as the divine source of the sanctification of the humanity of Jesus. The Spirit elevated the humanity of Jesus to unity of person with the Word. The response of faith made by Jesus in his humanity corresponds to his dispositions of trust, hope, and love, whose source was the Holy Spirit. This response of faith of Christ, made throughout his entire life, was the progressive upward growth of his humanity toward the goal of the highest possible embodiment of the acceptable response to the covenant initiative of the Father in him. Jesus achieved this goal at its utmost level in his death on the cross.<sup>649</sup> The incarnate Word knows and loves the Father in his humanity in virtue of the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. “In the power of the Holy Spirit he knows by faith what he knows by divine knowledge in the inner-Trinitarian life; he loves in his humanity the only object of his love in the inner-Trinitarian life, i.e. the Father.”<sup>650</sup> Just as the Spirit anointed Jesus at his Incarnation as well as at his Baptism and remained with him throughout his life, so also the Spirit anoints believers at their Baptism and is present with them at the covenant renewal which takes place in the celebration of the Eucharist.<sup>651</sup> Kilmartin says that participation in Christ’s response of faith is given as enduring gift to the Church. “For the Church is the enduring communion of those who participate in Christ’s response of faith to the Father, and thereby are united to Christ and share in the fidelity of the

---

<sup>649</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 356-357; idem, *Christian Liturgy*, 183.

<sup>650</sup>Kilmartin, “Sacraments as Liturgy of the Church,” 541.

<sup>651</sup>See Kilmartin, “Sacrificium Laudis,” 279; idem, “Theology of the Sacraments,” 155.

Father worked in him.”<sup>652</sup> The Church was formed through the mission of the Holy Spirit by forming the disciples into the communion. But this forming was conditioned by their free response to the gift of faith bestowed by the Holy Spirit.<sup>653</sup>

Kilmartin articulates the relation of the faith of the Church to that of Christ as twofold.<sup>654</sup> First, it is a participation in Christ’s response of faith because the risen Lord is actually present in the Church realizing his relationality as the “man for others” to the faith of the Church. Second, a pneumatological ground accounts for the immediacy of the faith of the Church to Christ as a mediated immediacy in the sense that the Holy Spirit whom Christ possesses in fullness is shared with the Church. The Spirit is the mediation of personal intimacy between Christ and believers and reveals Jesus as mediating God’s movement toward believers.<sup>655</sup> Jesus is the mediator between God and believers but his mediation is done in the Holy Spirit. Only in the Spirit do Jesus and believers become personally present to each other. This presence, Kilmartin insisted, is an immediate personal presence. The relationship between Christ and believers is a relationship in the Holy Spirit, who is the mediation of personal immediacy between them.

The pneumatological dimension of the mystery of the Church (one Spirit in Christ and believers) furnishes the proper relationship of the ecclesiological and Christological dimensions of the eucharistic sacrifice. “For it shows that the ecclesiological dimension of the eucharistic sacrifice is grounded on the divine activity of the Holy Spirit through whom

---

<sup>652</sup>Kilmartin, “Sacraments as Liturgy of the Church,” 542.

<sup>653</sup>See *ibid.*

<sup>654</sup>See *ibid.*, 543.

<sup>655</sup>See Kilmartin, “Modern Approach,” 68-74; *idem*, “Sacraments as Liturgy of the Church,” 536.

Christ offered himself on the cross and through whom the faithful offer themselves in union with Christ.”<sup>656</sup> Kilmartin asserts that the life of faith of the Church is not something different from the mystery of Christ but the way of participation in that mystery.<sup>657</sup> By participating in the eucharistic celebration, whose formal structure and official prayers express the faith of the Church which is the faith of Christ, believers appropriate that faith as their own. In the prayer of faith, the Spirit unites believers with the person of Christ as they actively receive his attitudes of love for the Father and for the Father’s children. In this way, the Spirit of mutual love, who unites the humanity of Christ with the object of Father’s love, the Son, moves believers through desire and memory to accept the divine gift of communion with the Trinity. The Spirit of Christ’s faith, “the living memory of the People of God,” rouses the memory of the attitudes of Christ’s heart in the eucharistic assembly so that its members may be consciously and actively united with Christ in the sacrifice of the New Covenant.<sup>658</sup> As mutual love of the Father and the Son, the Spirit has a proper personal action of “divinization,” of joining believers to the person of the Word. This personal action is modified through Christ’s life; it communicates the attitudes of loving self-sacrifice that Jesus expressed throughout his life of faith and ultimately in his death on the cross.<sup>659</sup> The Spirit, sent by the risen Lord from the Father, is both the divine source of sanctification (ontological state of divine adoption) of willing subjects and the source of their psychological reality of the life of faith which flows from the state of their divine adoption, namely, as

---

<sup>656</sup>Kilmartin, “Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology,” 436.

<sup>657</sup>See Kilmartin, “Sacraments as Liturgy of the Church,” 543.

<sup>658</sup>Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 306.

<sup>659</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 172.

children of the Father in the one Son, the result of their sanctification.<sup>660</sup> The Spirit gives to believers their participation in the New Covenant.<sup>661</sup> The Spirit, the content of Christ's faith, gives believers a share in his experience of being uniquely loved by the Father and his sacrificial attitudes of response to the Father's love.<sup>662</sup> The Spirit is sent upon the Church as the Spirit of Christ's faith to mediate the Father's self-communication and Jesus' sacrificial response of self-offering. The Spirit of mutual love is received as the Spirit of the faith of the New Covenant, through which believers enter into and participate in the covenant sacrifice of Christ and so into the covenant relationship of communion with the Trinity.<sup>663</sup> Members of the eucharistic assembly participate in the mystery of the substantial covenant of God with humanity, the mystery of Christ, extended in history through the mission of the Spirit.

Kilmartin thus articulates a common source, pneumatological, of the faith of Christ and that of the Church and thereby the unity of activity of Christ and of the members of the eucharistic assembly. But he insists that on the side of the Church, the Spirit is received always as the Spirit of Christ. The Holy Spirit was the divine source of life of faith of Jesus, inspiring him to carry out his mission in complete fidelity to the will of the Father. This same Spirit, as the Spirit of Christ, is the divine source of the eucharistic assembly's participation in the mystery of God in Christ and draws believers into the response of faith that corresponds to that of Jesus'. "The possibility of this active participation . . . is based on the working of the Holy Spirit, who is the mediation of the personal immediacy of believers

---

<sup>660</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 358.

<sup>661</sup>See *ibid.*

<sup>662</sup>See *ibid.*, 357-358.

<sup>663</sup>See Kilmartin, "Sacraments as Liturgy of the Church," 542.

to Christ and of the divinely transmitted conformity to the spiritual attitudes of Christ.”<sup>664</sup> In their lives of faith believers actualize the Spirit of that faith which Christ actualized on the cross, realize the Father’s love for them as members of Christ and the self-offering response of Christ’s love for the Father, and make the spiritual attitudes of Christ their own. Thereby the eucharistic assembly is enabled to enact its worship in, with, and through Jesus Christ which accounts for the acceptability of its worship and the response of the Father to the assembly’s intercession for the sanctification of the participants and the gifts of the Church and the effective intercession made for those living and the dead.<sup>665</sup>

The Holy Spirit, divine source of the acceptable human worship of the incarnate Son, is sent by Christ from the Father as his Spirit to enable the acceptable worship of the disciples of Christ. It is dependent on Jesus who offered the sole acceptable worship to the Father, and to which the worship of others must be conformed if it is to be accepted: a conformity that is grounded on the inspiration of the Holy Spirit of Christ.<sup>666</sup>

Kilmartin asserts that the eucharistic assembly’s worship of the Father in, with, and through Christ achieves a new depth of meaning in the theology of the Holy Spirit’s personal

---

<sup>664</sup>Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 357. Kilmartin clarifies the notion of “mediated immediacy” as follows. “The notion of ‘mediated immediacy’ is applied to the role of the Spirit as ‘mediation of the mediator,’ namely, Jesus Christ. The accent is placed on the fact that the Spirit does not exercise the role of mediator, but rather is mediated in the theandric act of the risen Lord, under the formality of the spirit of Christ. Hence the mystery of the personal immediacy of the Church to Christ can be expressed with the formula: the one and the same Spirit in Christ and in the believing members of the Church.” Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 357, referring to Mühlen, *Una Mystica Persona*, 11.70-11.82. Kilmartin says that “one cannot say that the Logos is in the strict sense one and the same in the Father, in his human nature, and in us, for that would mean the ‘extension’ of the hypostatic union also to us. Still less one can say . . . that the Father is in the strict sense one and the same in the Son, in the Holy Spirit, and in us. The Holy Spirit, however, is, in the strictest sense, one and the same in the Father, in the Son, in the human nature of Jesus, and in us! The Spirit is, without qualification, the universal mediation which, on the basis of [his] going out from the Father and from the Son, mediates all with all.” Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 358, n. 15 cited from Mühlen, *Una Mystica Persona*, 11.77.

<sup>665</sup>See *ibid.*, 372-374; *idem*, “Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology,” 445, 449.

<sup>666</sup>Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 372-373.

mission in the Church.<sup>667</sup> “In Christ” means that the worship takes place in personal communion with Christ, grounded on the participation in the one Spirit of Christ, which is the depth dimension signified by membership in the ecclesial community of which Christ is the head. “With Christ” means that the worship of the eucharistic assembly relates to that of Christ. “Through Christ” means the dependency of the worship of the eucharistic assembly on Christ who, as risen Lord, is the theandric source of the mission of the Holy Spirit. On the other hand, it can also be said that Christ worships in, with, and through the Church (eucharistic assembly) in the sense that he associates the Church with his once-for-all sacrifice made possible by the Holy Spirit, the same Spirit in Christ and in the assembly of believers. “In the Church” means that Christ is actively present in the worship of the Church. “With the Church” means that Christ’s activity is related to (but really distinguished from) that of the Church through the Holy Spirit. “Through the Church” means that Christ’s eternal sacrificial attitude acquires in the liturgical action of the Church a representative visible form.<sup>668</sup> Kilmartin thus emphasizes the intimate organic unity between liturgical sacrificial act of Christ and that of the Church or the worship of Christ and that of the Church as conditioned by the role of the Holy Spirit. In sacramental celebrations the members of the Church thus can be united with the activity of Christ in space and time. Accordingly, the participants are drawn into communion with the historical saving work of Christ really present as agents of the work of the Spirit and are united to Christ in his worship of the Father. In this sense Kilmartin asserts that

---

<sup>667</sup>Ibid., 372-375.

<sup>668</sup>Also see Rahner, *The Celebration of the Eucharist*, 27, n. 21.



... the risen Lord is present to the assembly as its Head “in the Spirit.” The Spirit, whom Christ possesses in fullness, whom Christ promised to his Church, is possessed by the holy assembly. The one Spirit, in Christ and in the Church, is the personal agent through whom the Lord is united to his Church, the personal source of divine power by whom the Lord is personally present, uniting the worshipping assembly to his eternal worship.<sup>669</sup>

This relationship between Christ and the Church and their activity are grounded on the role of the Spirit as that of mediation, which is reflected in the epiclesis of the Eucharistic Prayer, namely, to bring Christ to the Church and *vice versa*.<sup>670</sup>

The faith of Christ, Kilmartin argued, is the means through which believers enter into the mystery of the economic Trinity. It was in this faith, developed through Jesus’ earthly life, that he experienced and accepted the mystery of the Trinity, the mystery of his own person. This faith, in which he knew the divine plan of self-communication, was the basis of his intercession for the sending of the Spirit upon his disciples so that all believers might enter into the Trinitarian mystery. It was in this faith that Jesus offered himself in the sacrificial response of love that established the New Covenant of Trinitarian self-communication. It is this sacrificial faith of Christ that is (and should be) represented in the liturgical celebration because it is through this faith that worshipers participate in the mystery of Trinitarian self-communication. The faith of Christ is the gift of the Holy Spirit. In this way, the Spirit acquired a personal history in Jesus’ experience of being loved by the Father and of responding to the Father’s initiative with a self-offering acceptance expressed in his categorial acts of love of God and neighbor. The Spirit, sent through Jesus’ intercession at

---

<sup>669</sup>Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 110.

<sup>670</sup>See Kilmartin, “Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology,” 435.

the moment of his death and glorification, comes to worshipers as the Spirit of Christ's sacrificial faith. In their eucharistic celebration, worshipers actualize the Spirit of Christ's sacrificial faith, receiving his sacrificial attitudes of love of God and neighbor. As they fully, consciously, actively participate in the celebration in memory of the saving acts in which Christ expressed his sacrificial faith, the Spirit unites worshipers with Christ, in whose faith they are acting. In this way, the prayer of memory and faith brings worshipers' sacrificial offering of their own lives, celebrated in the liturgy, into sacramental union with the deeds in which Christ offered his own life in sacrifice. The worshipers are made present through the act of memory to Christ's actualization of his faith in order to receive his sacrificial attitudes, which they in turn actualize in the celebration of the Eucharist.

Taking into consideration the biblical notion of the relationship between sacrifice and meal and the underlying emphasis of the New Testament accounts of the institution of the Eucharist on the relationship between eating and drinking of the bread and cup and thus participating in the New Covenant, Kilmartin asserts the meal process as that by which the sacrifice of Christ and the Church is realized liturgically.<sup>671</sup> In other words, although the meal aspect belongs to the shape of celebration, it is bound to the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist. Insofar as the meal contains formal elements of meaning, these elements are part of the essential traits of sacrifice and communion. The shape of meaning is that of a sacrificial event constituted in the form of a ritual meal process.<sup>672</sup> For Kilmartin understands that the eucharistic prayers are the sacramental symbolic form under which the

---

<sup>671</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 380.

<sup>672</sup>See Kilmartin, "Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology," 437.

self-offering of Christ to God and to humanity is related to the concrete eucharistic assembly. “The eucharistic body is not (as traditional teaching would have it) offered as an isolated gift vis-à-vis the community at a ‘moment of consecration’ in the midst of the Eucharistic Prayer in order to entice the community to associate itself with Christ’s sacrifice by an act of private devotion.”<sup>673</sup> Rather, Kilmartin argues,

The Eucharistic Prayer, as prayer of the liturgical assembly, has the orientation from us to the Father. It corresponds to the covenant response of Jesus on the cross to the initiative of the Father in sending the Son for the salvation of the world. On the other hand, the rite of Communion has the orientation from the Father to us. It corresponds to the response of the Father accepting the self-offering of the Son: the sending of the Holy Spirit to quicken the dead body of Jesus. For here, the divine sacrifice, the sacrificial gift of Jesus, having been bestowed on the gifts of the Church by the sending of the Spirit to effect the “eucharistic consecration,” is given to the communicants in order that they may live. But for this to be realized requires that the communicants accept the gift in faith with its consequences of fidelity to the New Covenant. It requires, in other words, the self-offering of the communicants in obedience and love to the demands of the covenant relationship.<sup>674</sup>

The covenant people share in the covenant sacrifice not only spiritually, by their intention, but also sacramentally, by eating and drinking the sacrificial food and drink. Thus the act of Holy Communion connects Jesus’ self-sacrificing response to the Father’s love and the Christians’ sacramental communion with the covenant sacrifice of Christ. Jesus’ words of blessing over the bread and cup proclaim the faith in which he offers his life to the Father for the life of the world. Believers express their participation in Jesus’ sacrificial faith, the faith of the New Covenant, by their eating and drinking.<sup>675</sup> It is through the faith expressed in their eating and drinking that the believers have a share in the fruits of Jesus’ sacrificial death.

---

<sup>673</sup>Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 381.

<sup>674</sup>*Ibid.*

<sup>675</sup>See Kilmartin, “Sacrificium Laudis,” 271.

Accordingly, following the lead of Betz, Kilmartin argues that the meal aspect is an essential part of the sacrifice of the Eucharist.

Insofar as the meal contains formal elements of meaning they are already given in the essential traits of sacrifice and communion: namely, the aspect of the self-offering of Christ for the salvation of the world, the acceptance of the giver by the communicants, and the response of self-offering by the communicants in order to achieve the meaning of their lives.<sup>676</sup>

In this sense Kilmartin argues that “the transformation of the eucharistic elements is subordinated to the eschatological transformation, that is, to the reconciliation of all those who participate in the eucharistic communion.”<sup>677</sup> This eschatological transformation of the members of the eucharistic assembly, rather than the narrative of institution, Kilmartin considered to be the high point of the Eucharistic Prayer and the ultimate meaning of the eucharistic celebration.<sup>678</sup> This transformation implies the theological dimension of sin of human existence and the reconciliation that Christians are called to live both at the moment of celebration of the Eucharist and in their daily lives.

---

<sup>676</sup>Kilmartin, “Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology,” 437.

<sup>677</sup>Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 342-343. Also see idem, “Epicicles,” 150; McKenna, “Eucharistic Epicicles,” 266-267; Robert J. Daly, “Sacrifice Unveiled or Sacrifice Revisited: Trinitarian and Liturgical Perspectives,” *Theological Studies* 64 (2003), 37.

<sup>678</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 355. Based on his investigation of the liturgical employment of the narratives of institution of biblical feasts of the Old Covenant as well as Jewish liturgical prayers, Kilmartin argues that the narrative of institution of the Eucharist, situated in the movement of the Eucharistic Prayer as direct address to the Father, is parallel to the numerous embolisms of biblical and Jewish prayers. The purpose of such embolisms is to recall to God his commitment to his covenant relation with his people and to promise them of the salvation-history value of the liturgical activity. Introduced into the context of prayer discourse with the Father, the liturgical account of institution of the Eucharist acquires the role of a prayer of petition. This epiclectic role of the narrative of institution functions in virtue of the intimate connection between the liturgical narrative and anamnesis-offering prayer and the following connection between them and the epiclesis for the sanctification of the gifts of the Church and the participants who share in the sacraments of the body and blood of Christ. See *ibid.*, 348-349.

The accomplishment of the ritual acts as performative form of the faith of the Church (ecclesial dimension) evokes the individual believer's response of faith (participants of the liturgy) to the offer of the Trinitarian self-communication appropriate to the human and social situation of the life of faith being lived in the mode of ecclesial celebration of the life of faith.<sup>679</sup>

The transformation of the members of the eucharistic assembly, understood as becoming more fully and more truly the body of Christ, is the eschatological transformation of the participants. Yet Kilmartin asserts that the real foundation and condition of the transformation of the participants is the transformation of the eucharistic gifts.

The first epiclesis asks the Father to send the Spirit to effect the transformation of the eucharistic gifts of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ. This epiclesis is, in turn, ordered to the second epiclesis for the sanctification of the liturgical assembly through its reception of the sacrificial food and drink which serves as the sacramental means for the building up the Body of Christ, the Church.<sup>680</sup> Christians participate in the New Covenant by their sharing in Christ's covenant sacrifice; sharing in Christ's faith, they offer their lives in love for "the many." This offering, as well as the consequent reception of covenant blessings, is symbolized in the proclamation of the Eucharistic Prayer and in sacramental communion in the sacrificial food and drink.<sup>681</sup> Moreover, insofar as Jesus instituted the memorial of his self-offering within the symbolic actions of the Last Supper, the sacrificial and meal aspects are inseparable.<sup>682</sup> The eucharistic elements signify, in addition to the personal presence of

---

<sup>679</sup>Ibid., 360.

<sup>680</sup>See *ibid.*, 341, 355; *idem*, "Outlines of Lectures," 42.

<sup>681</sup>See Kilmartin, "Eucharist and Community," 89-92.

<sup>682</sup>See Kilmartin, "Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology," 437.

Christ, the action of Christ offering himself to the Father and to the communicants.<sup>683</sup> “Since this meal is the meal of the people of God, gathered around the High Priest unto the glory of the Father, its mystery is the self-offering of Christ to the Father ‘on behalf of the many’ and the self-offering of the Lord to the community under the form of sacrament of his Body and Blood.”<sup>684</sup> Christ relates himself to the bread and wine, which symbolizing the self-offering of the Church, become realizing signs of Christ’s offering of self to the Father and for personal communion with the children of the one Father. The change of bread and wine is in a perfect correspondence of being and meaning between the symbol and the reality signified.<sup>685</sup>

Kilmartin argues that sacrifice in its New Testament concept, and in its Christian understanding, is reflected in the rite of Holy Communion in the sense that

in the first place, [it is] the self-offering of the Father in the gift of his Son, and in the second place the unique response of the Son in his humanity to the Father, and in the third place, the self-offering of believers in union with Christ by which they share in his covenant relation with the Father.<sup>686</sup>

Believers’ reception of the Holy Communion implies their intention to deepen their relationship with Christ. “The faithful receive the sacrament of Christ’s body and blood in order to bind themselves more consciously to their Head and explicitly commit themselves to his way of *kenosis*, of dying to self, in order to rise in glory.”<sup>687</sup> The concept “blessing-commemoration” (*eulogia*) applied to the Eucharist consists in the mutual giving and

---

<sup>683</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 211.

<sup>684</sup>*Ibid.*, 191.

<sup>685</sup>See *ibid.*

<sup>686</sup>Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 382.

<sup>687</sup>Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 192.

receiving of the gift of the bread and wine. It expresses the self-offering of God in Jesus Christ to humanity, effected through the Holy Spirit, which sanctifies individuals and establishes fellowship of the believers in the Lord and the self-offering of individuals to God as well as that of the liturgical community united to Christ through the Holy Spirit.<sup>688</sup>

The epicletic word of prayer and the reception of Communion are the sacramental sign of the Spirit-worked communion with Christ and with the members of his Body, the Church. In this twofold aspect occurs the realization of covenant with God in the Church filled with the Spirit of Christ and united through him under the sacramental signs with and in Christ. The Eucharist thus constitutes the self-realization of the Church of Jesus Christ that occurs at the level of liturgical action.

For this celebration has a katabatic-anabatic basic structure in and through which God and people are bound together. This binding happens through the actualization of the covenant relationship in which the (katabatic) self-gift of the Father through Christ in the Holy Spirit to human beings finds the faith response of the (anabatic) self-gift of human beings through Christ in the Holy Spirit to the Father.<sup>689</sup>

### Conclusion

In his study of patristic theology, Kilmartin discovered the relation between the Spirit and sanctification of believers. His investigation into the *lex orandi* through analysis of the content and function of classical eucharistic prayers brought his attention to the significant role of the personal mission of the Spirit in relation to eucharistic participation. At the same time, he noted that these prayers do not actually supply a thorough theological explanation of

---

<sup>688</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 341-342.

<sup>689</sup>*Ibid.*, 341.

the liturgical role of the Spirit. The analysis of these prayers, however, deepened his conviction that Christian theology should attend to the ascending dynamic of sanctification manifested in the liturgy for which he constructed his Trinitarian theology. In this theology Kilmartin came to embrace an ascending Spirit-Christology and a bestowal model of Trinitarian life that emphasize the truths about God's self that are revealed in the event of liturgical celebration.

Kilmartin also was able to find the theological ground for the possibility of effectively relating the life and faith of Jesus Christ, in which he experienced and responded to the divine self-communication, to that of believers. The fact that Jesus had a life of faith, in which the Holy Spirit is experienced and expressed, is an essential point for Kilmartin which he called the "incarnation" of the Spirit in Jesus' human love. In the liturgy, he argued, the Holy Spirit is revealed as the mutual love uniting the Father and the Son, uniting believers with Christ, and therefore with the Father as well. The Spirit is the mediation of the personal immediacy of believers to Christ and *vice versa*, which Kilmartin defined as the proper mission of the Spirit.

The categorial deeds of Christ are the realization of his life of faith and of his love of God in acts of love of neighbor. The Trinitarian plan of personal self-communication to human persons is fulfilled in Jesus' life of faith. The New Covenant between God and humankind is established in Jesus' personal life and sealed with his death. With Jesus' glorification the heavenly liturgy is established and is extended to the world through the sending of the Holy Spirit upon the Church.



The Church's Eucharist celebrates the covenant faith in which Jesus passed from this world to the Father. In the Spirit, as Spirit of Jesus' faith, the Church remembers Jesus' deeds and the attitudes of love they expressed. The Spirit of Christ's faith gives Christians the attitudes that Christ expressed in the covenant sacrifice. The Spirit is the mediation of the divinely transmitted conformity to the sacrificial attitudes of Christ. Actualizing the Spirit of Christ's faith in the eucharistic celebration, the assembly appropriates Christ's sacrificial attitudes and enters into the New Covenant on the side of Christ's humanity as they accept the gift of configuration to Christ in his self-offering response to the Father's love.

The gift of the Spirit of Christ's faith, actualized throughout his personal history and given definitive shape in his death on the cross, creates the Church, the covenant people. This Spirit gives to the disciples their participation by faith in the New Covenant. The Spirit, the content of Christ's faith, gives the disciples a share of both Jesus' experience of being uniquely loved by the Father and his sacrificial attitudes of response to the Father's love. In this way the Spirit brings human persons into the covenantal relationship of divine self-communication and human self-offering established in Jesus' own life of faith and sealed with his death on the cross. In the Spirit of Christ's faith, believers are able to love the Father as Christ loves the Father, that is, by loving their neighbors in total self-offering because of their experience of being loved by the Father.

Eucharistic celebration, as act of the faith of the Church, is itself the manifestation and actualization of the mystery of Christ. Through this activity the mystery of the Father's love for humanity, represented in the mystery of Christ, is now represented as the participation of the eucharistic assembly in this central event of salvation history.

The priestly worship of the eucharistic assembly is grounded on its character as a priestly people of God that participates in the priestly worship of Christ which takes place in the power of the Holy Spirit. In the Spirit as divine source of the human worship, Jesus offered himself to the Father in faith. The same Spirit is also the source of the acceptable worship of believers conformed to the worship of Christ's humanity. In this sense, the Spirit of Christ is the source of the participation of the Church in the priesthood and worship of Christ.

## CHAPTER V

### A CRITICAL EVALUATION OF KILMARTIN'S THEOLOGY

#### Introduction

Kilmartin was a great thinker in the true sense of the expression. He understood that theology is not a discipline that remains stagnant but is ever evolving, making new theological discoveries and answering-questions to meet the spiritual needs of the time. In such circumstance, according to him, what may have been emphasized at a particular time may not be sufficient to respond to the new questions and spiritual needs that arise from another time. Each period in history thus witnesses to particular emphases on certain aspects of theology according to the theological climate. Accordingly, Kilmartin judged that the theological models and systems of the past grounded essentially on a Christological model, which he identified as the second millennium's Scholastic/Tridentine theology, was inadequate to meet the demands of the liturgical/sacramental theology of the third millennium. At the same time, he maintained that "it is fruitless to attempt to refute the findings of the one theological approach by the other. Rather, the basic problem concerns the relative value of the different theologies."<sup>1</sup> What is clear from this statement is that Kilmartin had no intention of refuting the entire Scholastic theology as useless. On the contrary, he acknowledged its value in its own day while realizing the need for another model which would be more appropriate for the theological needs of the present time. His solution was to shift from the old Scholastic model to a well-founded comprehensive

---

<sup>1</sup>Edward J. Kilmartin, "The Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology: Towards the Third Millennium," *Theological Studies* 55 (1994): 456, hereafter "Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology."

Trinitarian approach which, he believed, could carry Catholic theology into the third millennium. It would be appropriate to point out at the outset that Kilmartin's critique of "the average modern Catholic theology of the Eucharist"<sup>2</sup> involves theology and not doctrine. This fundamental observation is important because his rejection of the Scholastic model/system,<sup>3</sup> contained in this modern eucharistic theology, does not mean that he rejected the doctrine and orthodoxy of the Catholic Church.

This section will evaluate the merits and weaknesses of Kilmartin's theology. Under weaknesses are his reference and linguistic problems, certain inaccurate conclusions and sweeping statements, and certain methodological questions. These will be followed by Kilmartin's theological contributions. I will present only those elements of Kilmartin's theology which show the theological consequences of his Trinitarian approach for a better understanding of the mystery of the Eucharist and the notion of active participation. I will present also how Kilmartin's theology has been helpful for certain theologians in terms of articulating effectively their theological views on certain liturgical elements.

---

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., 443.

<sup>3</sup>Such as Scholastic theological methodology and terminology, the theory of transubstantiation, the identification of the eucharistic words of Christ as the essential form of the sacrament of the Eucharist and the Christological point of departure for eucharistic theology, the direct relationship of the priest to Christ expressed in the theology of *in persona Christi*, and the objective mystery presence of Christ and his salvific deeds in the eucharistic celebration independent of the act of faith of liturgical assembly.

## Weakness of Kilmartin's Theology

### Reference and Linguistic Problems

Kilmartin had great strengths in synthesizing the thinking of other theologians, making them his own, and applying them to liturgical theology. This skill in synthesis was both his strength as well as his weakness. His theology, largely built upon the thinking of others coupled with his “terse style”<sup>4</sup> of writing, often is not presented in an easily accessible fashion to his readers. This presentation often makes it difficult to grasp the complexity of his thoughts and so taxes the willingness of readers to follow the direction in which he wants to lead. He, at times, abstracted others’ thoughts without offering the proper context or references to the original works.<sup>5</sup> It has been pointed out that Kilmartin did not relate his own valuable work to other contemporary liturgical theologians,<sup>6</sup> “even though the basic findings of their work seem to be quite congenial to those of his.”<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>4</sup>Kevin W. Irwin, *Liturgical Theology: A Primer* (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1990), 52.

<sup>5</sup>Concerning the difficulty in identifying the sources of Kilmartin’s conclusions about the theological content and function of the ancient eucharistic prayers, Hall reports that “Kilmartin never presented his understanding of the literary-theological structure of the Eucharistic Prayer in a fashion that is conspicuously accessible to the reader. Only in his first book, *The Eucharist in the Primitive Church*, did he provide extensive quotations from translations of the classical prayer texts.” Jerome M. Hall, *We Have the Mind of Christ: The Holy Spirit and Liturgical Memory in the Thought of Edward J. Kilmartin* (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 2001), 63, hereafter *We Have the Mind of Christ*. Robert J. Daly, who edited Kilmartin’s posthumously published book *Eucharist in the West*, also reports facing similar problems. See Robert J. Daly, “Editor’s Foreword,” in Edward J. Kilmartin, *The Eucharist in the West: History and Theology*, ed. Robert J. Daly (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1998), xvi.

<sup>6</sup>Robert Daly and Kevin Irwin make this observation. See Daly, “Editor’s Foreword,” xxi; Irwin, *Liturgical Theology: A Primer*, 52.

<sup>7</sup>Daly, “Editor’s Foreword,” xxi. Recent comparative studies carried out on Kilmartin’s theology, however, do demonstrate the capability of his theology to interact with the theology of others. See Steven J. Lopes, “From the Trinity to the Eucharist: Towards a Trinitarian Theology of the Sacrifice of Christ and its Representation in the Eucharist of the Church,” (S.T.D. diss., Pontifica Universitas Gregoriana, 2005),

Kilmartin had a good knowledge of the scriptural, patristic, historical theological (Scholastic and modern), and liturgical disciplines. Generally speaking, on methodological grounds he wanted to dissociate himself from the language of Scholastic theological synthesis, but he also wrote for an audience whom he assumed to be theologically well-informed. As a result, he often refrained from explicitly explaining the theological understanding of certain terms which he used in his writings, and so the reader is left to gather the meaning of the terms only from the context of his writing. But theological methodology requires clarity and distinction of terms.

I start with Kilmartin's use of the term "sacrament," employed in the context of the application of the bestowal model to commonly characterize the sending of the Spirit as the bestowal of the Spirit in the Trinity. Specifically, he attempts to explain the relationship of the sending of the Spirit by the risen Lord to the transcendental act of the bestowal of the Spirit by the Father. At the same time, Kilmartin used the term "sacrament" in a Scholastic context as well as in reference to the seven sacraments of the Church.<sup>8</sup> What remains unclear, then, is his definition of sacrament when compared with that of Scholastic theology. In manual theology "sacrament" is defined as an outward sign instituted by Christ to

---

hereafter "From the Trinity to the Eucharist"; Stephen J. Sauer, "Naming Grace: A Comparative Study of Sacramental Grace Language in Edward Kilmartin, S.J. and Louis-Marie Chauvet," (S.T.D. diss., The Catholic University of America, 2007); Robert Gabriel Pivarnik, "Towards a Trinitarian Theology of Liturgical Participation in the Writings of Cipriano Vagaggini, OSB, and Edward J. Kilmartin, SJ," (S.T.D. diss., The Catholic University of America, 2009), hereafter "Towards a Trinitarian Theology of Liturgical Participation."

<sup>8</sup>See Edward J. Kilmartin, "The Active Role of Christ and the Holy Spirit in the Sanctification of the Eucharistic Elements." *Theological Studies* 45 (1984): 250, hereafter "Active Role of Christ and the Holy Spirit"; idem, *Christian Liturgy: Theology and Practice: I. Systematic Theology of Liturgy* (Kansas City: Sheed and Ward, 1988), 171, hereafter *Christian Liturgy*.

communicate grace.<sup>9</sup> But in Kilmartin's application of the bestowal model, it does not seem that he meant this Scholastic definition of sacrament but the Trinitarian aspect. In other words, the context of his writing suggests that he used "sacrament" in the sense of "signifying" so as to demonstrate the relationship between what is experienced from the economic Trinity and what exists in the immanent Trinity.

Secondly, Kilmartin's expression of "full realization of divinity in humanity" to describe the state of the risen Lord is somewhat ambiguous. Negatively speaking, it suggests the idea that there was something imperfect about the Incarnation which had to be set aright with the resurrection, hence a progression constituted in the divinization of Jesus' human nature in the resurrection. It can also imply something deeper pertaining to the principle of union between the two natures in the person of Christ. What can be presumed from the context is that Kilmartin is referring to the glorification of Jesus' humanity in the resurrection and the corresponding return movement to the Father. But he did not supply the explanation required to support this view. In addition, in light of his statements<sup>10</sup> it is difficult to conclude that Kilmartin is simply referring to the divinization of Jesus' human nature in the resurrection because the issue is not Jesus' humanity but his divinity. Steven J. Lopes concludes that Kilmartin's

---

<sup>9</sup>See Kenan B. Osborne, *Sacramental Theology: A General Introduction* (New York: Paulist Press, 1988), 7; Kilmartin, "Theology of the Sacraments," 127.

<sup>10</sup>Such as with the completion of his nature in grace the Son is able to send the Spirit in fullness; the resurrection as the "gateway" for Jesus to share in the beatific vision in which he is finally able to apprehend the Father "with full intellectual clarity"; and articulation of an inequality in the divinity of the Father (divinity given) and the Son (divinity realized in humanity) so as to assert the Father as the principle of divinity in the Trinity. Accordingly, Kilmartin presents the resurrection as the moment in which the divinity "fully penetrated human being of Jesus." See Kilmartin, "Active Role of Christ and the Holy Spirit," 249; Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 186-188.

phrasing must be set against the backdrop of his suggestion of progression or development in Christ from the Incarnation through the resurrection and ascension. Unfortunately, Kilmartin's trinitarian theology is presented over the course of only a few paragraphs in *Christian Liturgy* and "The Role of Christ and the Spirit," and so without further explication from Kilmartin's other material the question remains open as to what he means by the "full realization" of divinity only at the resurrection.<sup>11</sup>

Thirdly, Kilmartin's unqualified use of the borrowed concept of "incarnation"<sup>12</sup> of the Holy Spirit in Jesus' love for the Father is problematic because it may seem that he is proposing the incarnation of the Holy Spirit together with the traditionally accepted Incarnation of the Son. Thus Kilmartin's non-traditional use of this notion risked the significance of theological language. Again one will have to glean from the context of Kilmartin's writing to know that he, like Coffey, used this concept not in a formal but in an analogous sense.

Finally, Kilmartin introduced in his writing the idea that the priest, acting in the person of Christ, "bestows new meaning on the bread and wine by employing the words of

---

<sup>11</sup>Lopes, "From the Trinity to the Eucharist," 205, n. 158.

<sup>12</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 184-185, 188, 215; idem, "Active Role of Christ and the Holy Spirit," 249. Kilmartin borrowed this concept from Coffey. Coffey used it in a qualified manner and analogously to the Incarnation of the Word: "Orthodox Christian faith understands the high point of God's presence to man in terms of 'incarnation,' i.e., in the language of the Council of Chalcedon, the assumption of a human nature by God the Son, who had existed from eternity in the divine nature, so that from that time the divine Son existed as the man Jesus of Nazareth. Faith further understands this presence of God as radiating out from the Incarnation and being shared in by all who make the submission of faith through Christ. This is accomplished through the Holy Spirit, who, also existing from eternity, is now sent by Christ to men and women, to unite them to himself and ultimately to the Father. 'Through him (Christ) we both (Jews and Gentile) have access in one Spirit to the Father' (Eph 2:18). It is clear that this entry of the eternal Spirit into God's plan of salvation happens through Christ and in dependence on him. We can even call it an 'incarnation' of the Holy Spirit in Christ, provided that we keep the word in inverted commas, understanding it only by analogy to the incarnation of the divine Son in the human being of Jesus." David Coffey, "The 'Incarnation' of the Holy Spirit in Christ." *Theological Studies* 45 (1984): 466.



Christ”<sup>13</sup> so as to bring about the transformation of the eucharistic elements. This language of Kilmartin which is employed for describing the eucharistic transformation is far removed from what the Scholastic synthesis stresses as transubstantiation and what the Church teaches about the ontological change of the eucharistic elements. While it is true that Kilmartin never intended the change to be only in meaning/signification, his phrasing invites such impression. Had he completely avoided using this language of transignification, Kilmartin could have also avoided the misunderstanding of invoking a change in meaning/signification and could have strengthened his theological writing.

Interestingly, Kilmartin also attempts to explain this change from a pneumatological perspective, as the sanctification of the eucharistic elements. What is immediately noticeable here is Kilmartin’s resistance to using the Scholastic term “transubstantiation” to denote this transformation as affirmed by the Council of Trent. While Kilmartin’s approach is different, the change that he ultimately arrives at is well within the boundaries of the Church’s express and ultimate definition of the transformation of the bread and wine<sup>14</sup> which, in itself, is a

---

<sup>13</sup>Kilmartin, “Active Role of Christ and the Holy Spirit,” 235.

<sup>14</sup>“But since Christ our Redeemer declared that to be truly His own body which He offered under the form of bread, it has, therefore, always been a firm belief in the Church of God, and this holy council now declares it anew, that by the consecration of the bread and wine a change is brought about of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of His blood. This change the holy Catholic Church properly and appropriately calls transubstantiation.” The Council further asserts this change as that “in the sacrament of the most Holy Eucharist are contained truly, really, and substantially the body and blood together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and consequently the whole Christ.” Council of Trent Session 13, Chapter 4 and Canon 1 in Schroeder, trans., *The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent*, 75, 79. This definition in whole or in part is repeated in the various vehicles of the magisterial teaching of the Eucharist. See Paul VI, *Mysterium Fidei*, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 57 (1965):11, 39; *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 2<sup>d</sup> ed., (Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1994), 1376; John Paul II, *Ecclesia de Eucharistia*, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* (2003): 95, 15.

defined expression of patristic theological tradition.<sup>15</sup> This interpretation, then, suggests that Kilmartin was concerned not about the doctrine but the theological explanation of “how” that change occurs, maintaining that Western theology has limited itself to a “moment of consecration” theology which does not do justice to either the mystery of Christ or to the Church’s prayer. Moreover, according to him, the theory of transubstantiation promotes a static-objective notion of Christ’s real presence, for it is a theory exogenous in nature. Kilmartin’s rejection of the language of transubstantiation should be evaluated in light of the adoption of this term at the Council of Trent as the most apt way, not the only way, of describing the substantial change of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ. It, then, seems to indicate that what is doctrinal is not the terminology *per se* but the orthodox theological expression of eucharistic transformation. From this point of view, Kilmartin’s description of sanctification concerning the eucharistic change is acceptable. But his rejection of the use of the term transubstantiation for the eucharistic change somewhat conflicts with the magisterium of the Church which to this day depends on certain Scholastic terms for describing one or other element of theology. Transubstantiation is one of such terms.

### Inaccurate Conclusions and Sweeping Statements

A critical look at Kilmartin’s corpus shows a strong tendency to make some inaccurate conclusions and sweeping statements at various occasions throughout his career. Such conclusions and statements may perhaps be best understood as his “style” to call

---

<sup>15</sup>See *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 1375.

attention to his proposed theological direction, which he believed to be the right one, and to have his readers concur with that direction. At the same time, one may question the accuracy of those conclusions and statements.

In the early part of his long academic career, Kilmartin took up the task of analyzing the texts of the early eucharistic prayers of the undivided Church in order to glean a eucharistic theology from them. In the process he came upon the Trinitarian theology which bore significant implications on his understanding of the Eucharist. He then articulated this Trinitarian theology in a number of articles and later integrated it into his reformulated eucharistic theology. However, at the end of one particular article, Kilmartin abruptly and negatively concluded that the three new Eucharistic Prayers of the post-Conciliar (Vatican II) liturgical reform are situated in the “moment of consecration” theology. Kilmartin writes:

The new Roman Eucharistic Prayers of 1968 (II, III, IV) do not accept the orientation of *De sacramentis*. The epiclesis of the Spirit for sanctification of the elements substitutes for the *Fac nobis*, a prayer for acceptance of the offering. A simple epiclesis of sanctification of the communicants replaces the *Et petimus*, a prayer for consecration of the elements. The decisive influence on the structure of these prayers was not concern for traditional forms of Eucharistic prayers, much less for modernity, but the concern of Western theology to fix the moment of consecration in the recitation of the narrative of institution . . . The implication of the thanksgiving prayer, spiritual sacrifice and petition for the sacramental incarnation, was gradually articulated by sacrificial prayers and epiclesis of consecration. These in turn were given authority by the narrative of institution . . . Later theological reflection would give a consecratory value either to the narrative of institution or to the epiclesis of the Spirit. This sundering of the unity of the *sacrificium laudis* had the negative effect of placing the thanksgiving on the margin of Eucharistic theology and consequently making the laity spectators at the rite, in which the priest does all that is really important.<sup>16</sup>

---

<sup>16</sup>Edward J. Kilmartin, “Sacrificium Laudis: Content and Function of Early Eucharistic Prayers.” *Theological Studies* 35 (1974); 287, hereafter “Sacrificium Laudis.”

Kilmartin's concern here is the so-called split epiclesis so as to emphasize the "moment of consecration." Thus these new Eucharistic Prayers, according to Kilmartin, represent a deviation from the traditional forms of the eucharistic prayers and perpetuate a sort of liturgy at the expense of active participation of the liturgical assembly.

Although Kilmartin is right in noting the structure of the new Eucharistic Prayers as containing some element worthy of criticism, his conclusion of the structure of these prayers as not respecting the traditional forms of eucharistic prayers while reducing lay participants to the role of mere "spectators" contains certain bias. It is important to note that Pope Paul VI authorized the *Consilium ad exsequendam constitutionem de sacra liturgia* (Commission for Implementing the Constitution of the Sacred Liturgy) to prepare these three new Eucharistic Prayers in order to promote participation.<sup>17</sup> Moreover, a number of scholarly publications which thoroughly treat the content of these new prayers, both before and after the publication of Kilmartin's article,<sup>18</sup> are in agreement with the fact that these new Eucharistic Prayers are indeed in continuity with the traditional forms.<sup>19</sup>

---

<sup>17</sup>See Enrico Mazza, *The Celebration of the Eucharist: The Origin of the Rite and the Development of Its Interpretation*, trans. Matthew J. O'Connell (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1999), 269, hereafter *Celebration of the Eucharist*. Mazza points out that "in comparison, the Roman Canon was a loser, being remote in time and therefore not useful for prayer by reason of its themes and language and its length and structure. The text of the Canon was seen as an obstacle to the active participation that had become the goal of the reform [of the Second Vatican Council]." He continues, "It is difficult to use this Eucharistic Prayer [Roman Canon] because it is simply a lengthy plea, or intercession, for the offering of the sacrifice. This does not mean that the Roman Canon is not to be used any longer in the liturgical celebration; it means only that we must keep in mind that a Eucharistic Prayer needs to be prayed, and therefore we must decide whether a particular eucharistic assembly is capable of expressing its own prayer by means of the Roman Canon." Mazza, *Celebration of the Eucharist*, 269-270, nn. 26, 31.

<sup>18</sup>See Enrico Mazza, *Eucharistic Prayers of the Roman Rite*, trans. Matthew J. O'Connell (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1986), 88-190; Cipriano Vagaggini, *The Canon of the Mass and Liturgical Reform* (New York: Alba House, 1967), 124-141; Raymond Moloney, *Our Eucharistic Prayers in Worship, Preaching, and Study* (Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier Books, 1985), 29-34, 56, 122-124; Jeremy Driscoll, "Uncovering the Dynamic of *Lex Orandi-Lex Credendi* in the Anaphora of

Kilmartin's criticism of John Paul II's *Dominicae Cenaе* (1980) as having no Trinitarian or pneumatological reference is also not exactly accurate. This document, indeed, contains some implicit, if not explicit, references to the Trinitarian elements.<sup>20</sup> Moreover, in his final year Kilmartin criticized the Pope's stated intention in the encyclical *Dominum et Vivificantem* (1986) of not resolving "questions about the Holy Spirit that are presently under discussion"<sup>21</sup> but did not make any reference to the encyclical *Redemptoris Missio* (1990) which contains the Pope's official position on the proper mission of the Holy Spirit. It is surprising that someone like Kilmartin, who advocated the Trinitarian theology and the role of the Spirit in liturgy all through his career, could miss this latter important document of the Pope. A consideration of this document would have strengthened Kilmartin's arguments for the need to emphasize the Trinitarian and pneumatological elements of the liturgical celebration.

Kilmartin was partly disappointed by the fact that his proposed solution to the mystery presence question was not integrated into the modern Catholic eucharistic theology,

---

*The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus*," *Ecclesia Orans* 19 (2002), 85-100; John Baldovan, "Hippolytus and the Apostolic Tradition: Recent Research and Commentary," *Theological Studies* 64 (2003), 520-542.

<sup>19</sup>It is worth noting that Eucharistic Prayer II "derives verbatim from the anaphoral text in the *Apostolic Tradition*, which has been attributed to Hippolytus." Mazza, *Celebration of the Eucharist*, 271. Yet Mazza points out that there does exist some differences between these two texts. See *ibid.* The authors of Eucharistic Prayer III "while following the usual pattern of Antiochene anaphora, composed the text using the sacrificial themes proper to the Roman Canon, in order that these might not be completely forgotten." *Ibid.*, 273. Eucharistic Prayer IV is indeed an original composition but based on the Byzantine anaphora of St. Basil. It has an Alexandrian style epiclesis. See *ibid.*, 273-275. Mazza further points out that "the text of the epiclesis of Anaphora IV is thoroughly classical and traditional. It asks for the transformation of the sacred gifts without committing itself to any theological theory of explaining the transformation. Such a noncommittal approach is normative for liturgical texts." Mazza, *Eucharistic Prayers of the Roman Rite*, 172-173.

<sup>20</sup>See John Paul II, *Dominicae Cenaе*, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 72 (1980): 3, 7 where the Pope makes the Trinitarian references to liturgical worship and Christian life.

<sup>21</sup>Kilmartin, "Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology," 434.

largely shaped by the Western tradition of *Trinitätsvergessenheit*. According to him, this theology too narrowly focused on the passion of Christ rather than on the economy of Trinitarian self-communication revealed in and through Christ's temporal deeds. Hence, such an approach, he believed, could not provide a more satisfactory answer to the mystery-presence question than the one he proposed. So he bluntly characterized the modern Catholic eucharistic theology as one "without a future" in terms of the present task of theology.<sup>22</sup> Kilmartin's characterization of the inadequacy of modern Catholic eucharistic theology is somewhat problematic because he himself mentions that this theology is embraced by the magisterium of the Church. While it is true that Kilmartin is criticizing only the theology,<sup>23</sup> however, he is not in the position to decide this eucharistic theology of the Church as having no future, especially when he points out the positive contribution of the magisterium of the Church toward the development of a better eucharistic theology, specifically the liturgical role of the Holy Spirit as articulated in the liturgical reforms of Vatican II<sup>24</sup> and in the new Roman Eucharistic Prayers.<sup>25</sup>

Kilmartin criticizes a direct application of the *in persona Christi* concept to explain the place of the ordained priest to Christ in the Eucharist.

---

<sup>22</sup>Ibid., 443.

<sup>23</sup>In Kilmartin's own words the weakness of the modern Catholic eucharistic theology is articulated as follows: "Finally, the average modern Catholic theology of the Eucharist displays only a weak integration of trinitarian theology. Most importantly, the theology of the role of the Holy Spirit needs to be thoroughly integrated, and the consequences drawn. In fact, it is the lack of a systematic approach to the role of the Holy Spirit that lies at the basis of the overall weak Western theology of the Eucharist." Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 368.

<sup>24</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 109, wherein he refers to *Lumen Gentium*, 4.

<sup>25</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 378-379.

The concept “in the person of Christ,” as used in modern Catholic theology, as we have seen, means: in specific sacramental identity with Christ. Frequently in this connection one finds such expressions as: “participation in the unique priesthood of Christ.” or: Christ makes presbyters “participate in his consecration and mission.” These sayings need interpretation, for no human being, as such, participates in the unique, personal, and incommunicable priesthood of Christ. If misunderstood, such sayings can lead to such exaggerated sayings as: “The priest, therefore, participates in Christ’s work permanently and efficaciously in and for the whole Church because he is in his very being identified with Christ.”<sup>26</sup>

Kilmartin judged that the *in persona Christi* concept is a Scholastic creation.<sup>27</sup> “Since the thirteenth century, the term *in persona Christi* is related to the priest’s role in the Eucharist . . . Clearly this modern concept *in persona Christi* is a development of the Tridentine theology of the relation of the ordained priest to the Eucharist.”<sup>28</sup> In his attempt to move beyond the “moment of consecration” theology, Kilmartin contends that the “erroneous idea the words of consecration, while pronounced by the human minister of Christ, are in reality words spoken by the risen Lord in and through his minister” is actually promoted by the traditional Catholic Scholastic theology “with its dominant Christological orientation.”<sup>29</sup> Kilmartin is correct only to the extent that the phrase *in persona Christi* is indeed Scholastic in origin but not insofar as the theology it contains, which has a patristic foundation. For example, in its presentation of the Christological foundation of the Eucharist, the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* refers to both Scholastic theology (Aquinas and the Council of Trent) and patristic Fathers.<sup>30</sup> In his homily on Holy Thursday, St. John Chrysostom writes:

---

<sup>26</sup>Ibid., 376-377.

<sup>27</sup>See *ibid.*, 143, 348, 376-377.

<sup>28</sup>Ibid., 376-377.

<sup>29</sup>Ibid., 348.

<sup>30</sup>See *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 1374-1375.

Christ is present, and he who prepared the Lord's table [at the Last Supper] now also prepares this table. It is no mere man who causes the gift to become the Body and Blood of Christ, the very Christ who was crucified for us. The priest is playing a role when he says these words; the power and the grace, however, are God's. "This is my Body," he says. The word transforms the gifts . . . .<sup>31</sup>

This patristic perspective, then, challenges Kilmartin's contention that *in persona Christi* concept is a Scholastic invention. What Kilmartin rejects is only the *direct* relationship of the priest to Christ, not the theology of *in persona Christi per se* which is important for his eucharistic theology. For a number of reasons he approaches to this reality from a different perspective in which he gives importance first to the ecclesiological role of the ordained priest in the eucharistic celebration.

Although the playing down of a direct sacramental relationship between the ordained priest and Christ caused the authenticity of Kilmartin's theology of ordained ministry to suffer a bit,<sup>32</sup> it was, nonetheless, important for him. It involves his application of Trinitarian theology to the eucharistic celebration, which seeks to situate the presiding minister in the context of the active role of the Holy Spirit at Eucharist rather than in strictly

---

<sup>31</sup>Lawrence J. Johnson, *Worship in the Early Church: An Anthology of Historical Sources*, Vol. 2 (Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 2009), 194. Original Greek text reads: "Πάρεστιν ὁ Χριστός, καὶ νῦν ἐχθὺς ὁ τὴν τράπεζαν διακοσμήσας ἐκείων, οὗτος καὶ ταύτην διακοσμεῖ νῦν. Οὐδὲ γὰρ ἀνθρωπὸς ἐστὶν ὁ ποιῶν τὰ προκείμενα γενέσθαι σῶμα καὶ αἷμα Χριστοῦ, ἀλλ' αὐτὸς ὁ σταυρωθεὶς ὑπὲρ ἡμεῶν Χριστοῦ. Σχῆμα πληρῶν ἔστηκεν ὁ ἱερεὺς, τὰ ῥήματα φθεγγόμενος ἐκεῖνα ἢ δὲ δύνამεις καὶ ἡ χάρις τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐστι. Τοῦτό μοι ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα, φησί. Τοῦτό τὸ ῥῆμα μεταρρυθμίζει τὰ προκείμενα." The translation of the role of the priest in Latin reads: "Figuram implens stat sacerdos verba illa proferens: virtus autem et gratia Dei est. *Hoc est corpus meum*, inquit. Hoc verbum transformat ea, quae proposita sunt." St. John Chrysostom, "Proditionem Jude 1:6," *Patrologiae Graecae* 49 (1862), 380.

<sup>32</sup>For a number of issues raised against Kilmartin's downplaying of direct sacramental relationship between the ordained priest and Christ, see Paul Palmer, "The Authenticity of Christian Ministry," *Communio* 3 (1976): 272-279; Donald O'Keefe, "Sacramental Sexuality and Ordination of Women," *Communio* 5 (1978): 228-251. Edward J. Kilmartin's "The Authenticity of Christian Ministry: A Reply," *Communio* 3 (1976): 185-188 is a response to Palmer.



Christological context as Scholastic theology had done. Furthermore, in Kilmartin's view, a direct sacramental relationship between the priest and Christ replaces the traditional order of Christ—Church—Eucharist (in which the ministerial priest is embedded and his role is conceived in terms of a reciprocal relation to Christ and the Church) by introducing a new order of Christ—ministerial priest—Church—Eucharist.<sup>33</sup> Accordingly, Kilmartin argues that the attribution of the power of offering *exclusively* to the ordained priest in Scholastic theology, in which the priest is understood as acting specifically in the capacity of *in persona Christi*, perpetuates a fundamental misunderstanding of the structure of the eucharistic sacrifice: (1) it gives the impression that there is a sacrificial rite which, understood as the sacramental sacrifice of the unique sacrifice of Christ in the signs of bread and wine, takes place in the Eucharistic Prayer; (2) it promotes the idea that the faithful offer through the ordained priest whereby the role of the priesthood of the faithful is not properly recognized and exercised; and (3) it obscures the relationship between the Eucharistic Prayer and Holy Communion.<sup>34</sup>

### Methodological Issues

A principal example of Kilmartin's methodological problem is his use of the theology of the immanent Trinity as the starting point for his reflection.<sup>35</sup> Kilmartin clearly states that he uses the bestowal model of the immanent Trinity to "order the data" of Christology and

---

<sup>33</sup>See Kilmartin, "The Authenticity of Christian Ministry: A Reply," 186; idem, "Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology," 439-440.

<sup>34</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 379.

<sup>35</sup>Kilmartin articulates his intention of following this methodology in Kilmartin, *Culture and the Praying Church*, 83, n. 4.

pneumatology.<sup>36</sup> Thus his obvious preference for a speculative method is clear. Accordingly, Kilmartin's focus on the conclusions that he draws from the bestowal model of the immanent Trinity seems to suggest, at times, as though he wanted to make the data of revelation somehow "correspond" to those conclusions.<sup>37</sup> After establishing the identification of the economic Trinity with the immanent Trinity, Kilmartin applies the implications that result from the bestowal model of the immanent Trinity to understanding liturgy. Accordingly, his understanding of a theology of the Trinity suggests that a theology of liturgy must show how the liturgy is the work of the immanent Trinity and, at the same time, the realization of the economic Trinity.<sup>38</sup> One might question if Kilmartin's approach of beginning with the theology of the immanent Trinity ignores the data of revelation or, at least, fails to ground his speculative theological assertions in the economic experience of the missions of the Word and the Spirit. This may be made further clear in the following way. In comparison with some recent theologians who seriously consider the witness of Scripture in regard to the role of the Holy Spirit in the life of Jesus to articulate a Spirit-Christology,<sup>39</sup> Kilmartin's own consideration of scriptural foundation for the bestowal model is very minimal.<sup>40</sup> Rather, Kilmartin bases his approach more on the general theme of anointing than on a reflection on

---

<sup>36</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 133, 158, 170; idem., "Active Role of Christ and the Holy Spirit," 248.

<sup>37</sup>See Kilmartin, "Active Role of Christ and the Holy Spirit," 248-253; idem, *Christian Liturgy*, 182-192.

<sup>38</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 102.

<sup>39</sup>See John J. O'Donnell, "In Him and Over Him: the Holy Spirit in the Life of Jesus," *Gregorianum* 70 (1989): 25-45; Ralph Del Colle, *Christ and the Spirit: Spirit-Christology in Trinitarian Perspective* (New York: Oxford, 1994); Raniero Cantalamessa and Alan Neame, *The Holy Spirit in the Life of Jesus: The Mystery of Christ's Baptism* (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1994).

<sup>40</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 170, wherein he offers only a paragraph for the discussion of the scriptural foundation for the bestowal model.

the scriptural data and the accounts of the action of the Spirit in Jesus' life.<sup>41</sup> Consequently, when Kilmartin applies the bestowal model to the data of revelation and articulates Jesus' action as a bestowal of the Spirit,<sup>42</sup> it seems to be a forced conclusion that is grounded neither in Scripture nor in Tradition. Rather, in his theology this conclusion is derived from reflection on the nature of Jesus' love of the Father.<sup>43</sup> Accordingly, Kilmartin argues that "the visible offer and sending of the Spirit, expressed in Jesus' theandric acts of love for the neighbor, corresponds to, and is ontologically grounded on, the answering bestowal of the Spirit by the Son on the Father in the immanent Trinity."<sup>44</sup> Kilmartin thus places the basis of this argument more on his speculation concerning the implications of the unique love (the Spirit) of Jesus for the Father.

In addition, even though Kilmartin uses both the procession model and the bestowal model of the Trinity in his articulation of liturgical theology, his real preference is clearly for the latter model. By using the bestowal model Kilmartin is able to offer a true theological insight into the notion of active eucharistic participation. Although the bestowal model has scriptural and patristic roots,<sup>45</sup> its theological development is relatively new. Unlike the procession model, this "not-so-traditional" model is not only less known but also remains yet to be well defined, established, and accepted. Coffey first presented the bestowal model in 1978 in his book *Grace*. But since then over a number of years he refined this model and decided to call it a "return model" in his 1999 book *Deus Trinitas*. The challenge, then, is

---

<sup>41</sup>See *ibid.*, 163, 165.

<sup>42</sup>See Kilmartin, "Outline of Lectures," 18; Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 170-171.

<sup>43</sup>Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 166-170.

<sup>44</sup>*Ibid.*, 184.

<sup>45</sup>See *ibid.*, 163-166.

that any application of the bestowal model to liturgical theology demands that this model be an equally compelling one like the procession model.

What emerges is a methodological question at the level of fundamental theology on whether or not theology should use a speculative method or a faith-based logical reflection on the economic data of revelation in an attempt to unfold the mystery of God. The method preferred by Kilmartin ultimately has to do with his own understanding of the very definition of theology and his appreciation of the relative value of this method for theology. Any initial attempt to enter into an unexplored avenue of theology, to further unfold the mystery of God, will necessarily have limitations. Yet such an attempt may not always be without some merit. Given the benefit of Kilmartin's methodology as a new approach to the mystery of God and the theological consequences that result from it for liturgical theology, its limitations can be justified.

#### Relative Lack of Baptismal Theology

Kilmartin's own treatment of baptismal theology is notably very minimal<sup>46</sup> even though he considered the implications of the baptismal theology of the Fathers of the Church and Jesus' baptism as expounded by Scheeben and Mühlen in determining the liturgical role of the Holy Spirit for believers' participation in the single *transitus* of Jesus to the Father and finally in the divine life of the Trinity. Kilmartin regarded Söhngen as the most outstanding

---

<sup>46</sup>In this important article of Edward J. Kilmartin, "A Modern Approach to the Word of God and Sacraments of Christ: Perspectives and Principles," in *The Sacraments: God's Love and Mercy Actualized*, ed. Francis A. Eigo, O.S.A (Villanova, Pennsylvania: The Villanova University Press, 1979), 63, hereafter "Modern Approach," the treatment of baptismal theology does not go more than a single line. See *ibid.*, 90-91.

opponent of Casel's mystery theology. Even Söhngen's position concerning the Church's eucharistic participation through conformity to Christ by faith becomes understandable only in light of his baptismal theology. *Sacrosanctum Concilium* repeatedly asserts that through the sacraments of initiation believers are given visible place in the Church, have the sacred right to liturgical participation that is full, conscious, and active, and are equipped with the knowledge and faith to take part in the paschal mystery by entering into the one *transitus* of Christ.<sup>47</sup> In other words, Christian life, understood as a life in the mystery of Christ (for that matter in the Trinitarian life) and the Church, begins with the sacrament of baptism.

Dominic E. Serra notes,

Christian initiation is the incorporation into the Church, the body of Christ, that is simultaneously a conforming of the initiate to the image of Christ, the Son of God. The conformity is so thoroughgoing that it makes the neophyte a child of God by adoption and liberated from sin through participation in the Divine Life of the Trinity. It is an entrance into the communion of being that is the blessedness of the Reign of God ushered in by the Lord's death and rising and made available through all the ages in this world's existence by the operation of the Holy Spirit, who is sent into the world to bring the paschal mystery to its completion. Thus Christian initiation is an incorporation into Christ by means of an immersion into his paschal mystery that brings the initiate into a new relationship with the Father through the operation of the Holy Spirit of adoption.<sup>48</sup>

He goes on to state that admission to the Eucharist is viewed as the accomplishment of Christian initiation.<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>47</sup>See *Constitutio de sacra Liturgia (Sacrosanctum Concilium)*, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 56 (1964): 6, 10, 14, hereafter *Sacrosanctum Concilium*. *Catechism of the Catholic Church* states: "Holy Baptism is the basis of the whole Christian life, the gateway to life in the Spirit (*vitae spiritualis ianua*), and the door which gives access to other sacraments." *Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 1213.

<sup>48</sup>Dominic E. Serra, "Baptism and Confirmation: Distinct Sacraments, One Liturgy," *Liturgical Ministry* 9 (2000), 63. Also see *ibid.*, 68-69.

<sup>49</sup>See *ibid.*, 69.

Because baptism is the entry into the life of faith of Christ, Kilmartin could have offered in his work a substantial consideration of the full initiation of believers as the moment when active participation in the paschal mystery and, by extension, in the divine life begins. Kilmartin rather concentrated on the sources of early eucharistic prayers to determine and articulate a Trinitarian reference to the sacramental action of the Eucharist and participation. The reason for this approach may be that he was searching for an appropriate solution to the relationship between the mystery presence of the redemptive acts of Christ and liturgical celebration. Accordingly, in Kilmartin's theology his particular explanation of active participation derives from his particular explanation of the presence of Christ's salvific acts in the eucharistic celebration.

#### Further Limitations

Kilmartin places a particular emphasis on the *lex orandi* over the *lex credendi*. He thus gives primacy to the liturgical rites. Moreover, he also reverses the liturgical role of the ordained priest from *in persona Christi* to *in persona ecclesiae* whereby the former is included in the latter. *In persona ecclesiae* is given pride of place in Kilmartin's theology in representing the faith of the Church by virtue of ordination. The role of the ordained priest in his theology is, then, not limited to the "moment of consecration" but includes all the activity of the priest. To this end, Kilmartin effectively favors certain elements of theology that are different from those of Scholastic theology. While this approach has certainly an advantage of drawing attention to the pneumatological, ecclesiological dimension of the ordained ministry and the liturgy as the celebration of faith, it also possesses a disadvantage.

Kilmartin's own theology is somewhat limited by the Scholastic system in as much the same way as he himself accuses the Scholastic theology of being limited by the theology of the Council of Trent.

Kilmartin favors a metaphysical perspective (McNamara)<sup>50</sup> of understanding the presence of the redemptive acts of Christ in the sacraments over and against the experiential perspective (Casel and Giraudo) because, according to him, so far no attempts to explain the externalization of the historical acts of Christ have been successful. Contrary to this claim, the experiential perspective can be acceptable if one incorporates the findings of the human sciences, particularly studies in ritual, symbol, and imagination, into theology.

Regardless of the order of presence,<sup>51</sup> Casel and Giraudo assert that the present liturgical assembly experiences the redemptive act of Christ as an event that occurred in the past. What is required here is a way to interpret the experience of liturgy that will shed light on how the presence of the past event is made known.<sup>52</sup>

George S. Worgul argues that ritual mediates a root metaphor of a culture which is the basis for its interpretation of life. Applied to the Christian culture, the root metaphor is the Christ-event (Jesus' life, death, and resurrection), and Christian liturgy is the means by

---

<sup>50</sup>Gabriel Pivarnik points out that Kilmartin's reliance on McNamara to articulate the Thomistic viewpoint on sacramental causality and the mystery presence of Christ is questionable because McNamara was not a strong theological voice, nor was he a Thomist but a Lonerganian. Moreover, he authored only one article on the mystery presence of Christ. This is partly because he died relatively young. See Pivarnik, "Towards a Trinitarian Theology of Liturgical Participation," 268-269.

<sup>51</sup>While Casel claims that the liturgical act renders Christ and his saving work present to the community, Giraudo argues from the opposite direction, that is, the community becomes present to the salvific acts of Christ through the liturgical celebration.

<sup>52</sup>What follows is a paraphrase of George S. Worgul, "Ritual," in *The New Dictionary of Sacramental Worship*, ed. Peter Fink (Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1990), 1101-1106; idem, "Imagination, Ritual, and Eucharistic Real Presence," *Louvain Studies* 9 (1982): 198-210.

which this root metaphor is revealed. Christian liturgy communicates the paschal mystery as the foundation for the meaning of Christian life. By way of instruction, interpretation, and indoctrination, ritual mediates the values of the community.<sup>53</sup> The function of Christian liturgy as the mediator of Christian values and of the root metaphor is complemented by ritual behavior. The structuring of behavior that occurs in ritual produces intimacy, social direction, and interiorization which result in a presence of the community to the founding event. In the Christian liturgy, participants become present to the paschal mystery. Christ's presence in the Eucharist is, then, a presence through celebration. The eucharistic presence of Christ is a presence that can be discovered by the imagination. This imagination in turn is made up by a world of symbols.

The human imagination is not fantasy, but a creative human interplay with symbols. It is the nexus of imagination and symbol which makes presence real and not imaginary. Symbols point to another reality and make it present without being absolutely identical to the symbolized reality. The human imagination perceives the symbolized reality in the expressed symbol and applies its meaning heuristically.<sup>54</sup>

Worgul names that aspect of the imagination which enables us to focus on a particular reality and bring about its real presence as "directionality." Directionality limits the application of the imagination to the symbols at hand and allows us to recognize that which is being made present in the symbol. It is this function which allows the real presence of Christ in the liturgy to be made known. Hence, it is through ritual and imagination that Christ is present

---

<sup>53</sup>Ritual instructs by creating an experience for the participants. In the Christian liturgy, it creates an experience of the Last Supper. Ritual offers the accepted communal interpretation of the experience of the Last Supper from the past community to the present community for a specific reason. Ritual indoctrinates the participants into the values of the community. In the Christian liturgy, the values of Jesus are mediated and accepted by those participating.

<sup>54</sup>Worgul, "Imagination, Ritual, and Eucharistic Real Presence," 205.



in the Eucharist. The experiential perspective of the presence of Christ and his saving deeds, as suggested by Casel and Giraudo, can be appreciated.

Kilmartin's position concerning liturgical theology, theology of the ordained ministry, and the metaphysical explanation of the mystery presence should be seen only as one among the many approaches to these themes rather than as a definitive approach, as Kilmartin claims. These limitations aside, certainly there is much that is commendable in Kilmartin's theology, especially the Trinitarian context of the Eucharist and liturgical celebration as presented below.

### **Kilmartin's Theological Contribution toward Active Participation**

#### **Methodology, Trinitarian Theology of Liturgy, and the Notion of Christian Sacrifice**

Kilmartin's methodology, beginning with the rites, helps to understand that the liturgical prayer of the Church contains different cultural emphases and sheds light on neglected aspects which may be reemphasized at some future time. Recognition of emphasis of certain aspects in eucharistic prayers during a certain particular period shows something about the culture to which those elements were important. This understanding may be applicable to the present day, especially after the Second Vatican Council, when considerable attention is given to active participation. Kilmartin's research underscores the need to integrate the "forgotten" Trinitarian aspect, in particular the liturgical role of the Holy Spirit, into sacramental theology for the formulation of a theology of active participation. For this purpose Kilmartin uses a model of the Trinity as his methodology.

According to Avery Dulles, “model” indicates that the subject matter<sup>55</sup> is and will remain a mystery.<sup>56</sup> Access to this subject matter, therefore, is by means of analogy and image rather than direct reflection. A model is based on imagery and symbolism as a means of communicating a spiritual or theological reality. A model seeks to integrate various aspects of the mystery and leads to an ever deeper, if imperfect, understanding of the mystery. Dulles concludes that a reflective and critical use of an image, ordered to deepen one’s theological understanding of a reality, results in what we call a model.<sup>57</sup> From this point of view, Kilmartin’s use of a model of the Trinity (as the systematic context) is helpful to understand the mystery of the liturgy, particularly the Eucharist. He believed that an articulation of the eucharistic faith, discovered in the liturgical practice of the ancient Church, required a different model of the Trinity than the traditional Trinitarian theology.

In *Christian Liturgy* (1988) Kilmartin developed a Trinitarian theology to support his idea of the “true” nature of the sacrifice of Christ and its liturgical enactment in the Eucharist which he initially presented in *Church, Eucharist, and Priesthood* (1981) and developed thereafter.<sup>58</sup> In *Eucharist in the West* Kilmartin states that the nature of Christ’s sacrifice is Trinitarian because it begins and ends in the mystery of the Trinity.<sup>59</sup>

The viability of Kilmartin’s Trinitarian approach can be summed up in four points: (1) it concentrates on all three divine persons; (2) it has the capability of consistently being

---

<sup>55</sup>Such as Trinity, Eucharist, Church, or Revelation.

<sup>56</sup>See Avery Dulles, *Models of the Church* (Garden City, New York: Image Books, 1987), 2.

<sup>57</sup>See *ibid.*, 15.

<sup>58</sup>See Kilmartin, “Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology”; *idem*, *Eucharist in the West*.

<sup>59</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 381-382.

applied to and systematically explicating a number of theological themes<sup>60</sup>; (3) it includes the various themes of Christology, pneumatology, soteriology, ecclesiology, Christian anthropology, and fundamental theology in presenting a systematic reflection of liturgy, particularly the Eucharist, as the point of convergence and articulation of these theological themes, and (4) it allows for accommodation and becomes the theological basis for the interpretations of active participation treated by Congar, McManus, Collins, and Lamberts in this work. These interpretations become more meaningful when integrated into Kilmartin's Trinitarian theology of liturgy.

Kilmartin's identification of the theology of liturgy with the theology of Trinity is important, for he asserts that the Trinity has an integral role in the theology of liturgy. This claim is based on his understanding that worship is humanity's participation in the Trinity. If the goal of worship is to be united to God through Christ in the Spirit, then the final result would be a oneness of God and believers, thus giving believers a share in the Trinity. Kasper claims that "in the economic self-communication the intra-trinitarian self-communication is present in the world in new way, namely, under the veil of historical words, signs and actions, and ultimately in the figure of the man Jesus of Nazareth."<sup>61</sup> Worship, as believers' participation in the economy of salvation and therefore in the economic Trinity, is a

---

<sup>60</sup>Such as creation; Jesus' Incarnation, life, ministry, and self-offering on the cross; liturgical role of the Holy Spirit; sanctification of believers; the relationship of the presiding minister to the liturgical assembly; liturgy as the action of the *totus Christus*; dialogical nature of the liturgy; relationship between faith and sacraments; Trinitarian nature of Christian sacrifice; and importance of symbol and liturgical inculturation.

<sup>61</sup>Walter Kasper, *The God of Jesus Christ*, trans. Matthew J. O'Connell (New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1984), 276.

participation in the immanent Trinity. Kilmartin is thus justified and unique in relating the theology of liturgy to the theology of the Trinity.

Robert J. Daly claims that the history of the doctrine on Christian sacrifice demonstrates an attempt to situate the death of Christ in the sacrifice of the history-of-religions sense.<sup>62</sup> Accordingly, Daly presents a general definition of sacrifice that was applied to the Eucharist in which he points out that the destruction of a victim is the determining element of true sacrifice.<sup>63</sup> Such an emphasis when applied to the Eucharist runs afoul of what the Epistle to the Hebrews states about the unrepeatable sacrifice of Christ (Hebrews 7:28; 9:11-12, 15, 28). On this ground Kilmartin had already contended in 1981 that the conventional notion of sacrifice is inadequate for an understanding of the core mystery of the Eucharist, for the “Christ event did away with sacrifice in the history-of-religions sense of the word.”<sup>64</sup> Therefore, a different model is needed, one that is both relational and Trinitarian, for an understanding of the mystery of Christ’s sacrifice and, by extension, the celebration of that sacrifice in the Eucharist of the Church. For Kilmartin, Trinitarian theology becomes the proper context for understanding both the mystery of Christ’s sacrifice and that of the Eucharist.

---

<sup>62</sup>See Robert J. Daly, “Sacrifice Unveiled or Sacrifice Revisited: Trinitarian and Liturgical Perspectives,” *Theological Studies* 64 (2003), 24-25, hereafter “Sacrifice Unveiled or Sacrifice Revisited.”

<sup>63</sup>“Sacrifice is a gift presented to God in a ceremony in which the gift is destroyed or consumed. It symbolizes the internal offering of commitment and surrender to God. The purpose is primarily for the offerers to acknowledge the dominion of God, but also to bring about the reconciliation of themselves (and possibly others) with God, to render thanks for blessings received, and to petition for further blessings for oneself and others.” *Ibid.*, 25.

<sup>64</sup>*Ibid.*, 26-27, referring to Kilmartin. See Edward J. Kilmartin, *Church, Eucharist and Priesthood: A Theological Commentary on the Mystery and Worship of the Most Holy Eucharist* (New York: Paulist Press, 1981), 12, hereafter *Church, Eucharist and Priesthood*; *idem*, *Christian Liturgy*, 342, 344.

Kilmartin affirms that the central reality and meaning of Christian sacrifice begins with divine action and he underscores the three “moments” involved in sacrifice: the self-offerings of the Father, of the Son, and of believers.<sup>65</sup> Daly calls this understanding of sacrifice “the core event of the economic Trinity.”<sup>66</sup> In Kilmartin’s presentation of the Trinitarian theology of sacrifice and the Eucharist, the role of the Spirit is a major point of access to that theology.

Kilmartin’s theology of sacrifice, like his Trinitarian theology, begins with the initiative and original self-gift of the Father. His theology of sacrifice in its Trinitarian context does not identify the sacrifice of Christ solely with the cross-event (death on the cross) to describe the sacrifice of the Eucharist. Rather, the self-giving of Jesus Christ is extended to the whole Christ-event such as his life, works, death, resurrection, and subsequent sending of the Holy Spirit. Daly’s identification of the sacrificial material, agents, recipients, and purpose involved in the death of Christ, when viewed from Trinitarian theology and the complete Christ-event, explains Kilmartin’s Trinitarian understanding of the sacrifice of Christ and its liturgical celebration.<sup>67</sup> So the sacrificial “material” of Christ’s

---

<sup>65</sup>“For sacrifice is not, in the first place, an activity of human beings directed to God and, in the second place, something that reaches its goal in the response of divine acceptance and bestowal of divine blessing on the cultic community. Rather, sacrifice in the New Testament understanding—and thus in its Christian understanding—is, in the first place, the self-offering of the Father in the gift of his Son, and in the second place the unique response of the Son in his humanity to the Father, and in the third place, the self-offering of believers in union with Christ by which they share in his covenant relation with the Father . . . The radical self-offering of the faithful is the only spiritual response that constitutes an authentic sacrificial act according to the New Testament (Romans 12:1).” Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 381-383.

<sup>66</sup>Daly, “Sacrifice Unveiled or Sacrifice Revisited,” 28.

<sup>67</sup>Daly contends that if one conceives these elements of Christ’s sacrifice within the context of history-of-religions sense, then the sacrificial material is the body of the human Jesus destroyed on the cross. The agents are the Roman government and its soldiers, certain Jewish authorities, and Jesus himself. The recipient is God the Father. The goal is reconciliation with God and others. See *ibid.*, 29-31.

death is the “free, responsive self-giving self-communicating, en-Spirited love of the Son to the Father—and also to and for us.”<sup>68</sup> This transcendent essence of Christ’s sacrifice, understood as a life of self-giving love, is important for Kilmartin which he described as the true nature of Christ’s sacrifice present in the celebration of the Eucharist, specifically as the sacrificial faith/attitudes of Christ. This transcendent essence also corresponds to Kilmartin’s definition of the second person of the Trinity in the bestowal model. Given the place of the death of Christ in the whole loving plan of God’s work of salvation, the primary agency is divine because the sacrifice is revealed as the event through which the self-offering initiative of the Father, in the gift of the Son, is communicated to the Church by the Holy Spirit. This understanding corresponds to Kilmartin’s description of Christian sacrifice as beginning with divine activity. Similarly, if the true nature of Christian sacrifice is such, then there is no proper recipient either of the sacrifice of Christ or of the sacrifice of the Eucharist, for “no *thing* is being given” in the authentic Christian sacrifice. The Trinity is understood as “being in communion,”<sup>69</sup> and so the dynamic of sacrifice is nothing but the gift and communion of self that corresponds to the relationship among the persons of the Trinity. Hence Kilmartin’s emphasis on the self-communication of the Trinity. What sacrifice in the history-of-religions sense and in the Christian sense holds in common is only the purpose: setting aright the relationship with God and with others.

---

<sup>68</sup>Ibid., 29.

<sup>69</sup>For a detailed presentation of this concept of the Trinity, see John D. Zizioulas, *Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church*, with a foreword by John Meyendorff (Crestwood, New York: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 2002), especially 15-122.

The benefit of Kilmartin's fundamentally Trinitarian understanding of sacrifice for Christian worship is that it situates the theology of Christ's sacrifice and its re-presentation in the eucharistic celebration within the whole experience of the economy of salvation. In his theology it becomes clear that sacrifice and acts of sacrificial love begin from and reveal the very nature of the Trinity. The idea of the self-offering of believers in union with Christ is a key element throughout Kilmartin's Trinitarian theology of the Eucharist. A particular strength of Kilmartin's theology of sacrifice is that it returns to a solid scriptural foundation and avoids many of the terms and categories which, over the centuries, have arisen out of the discipline of speculative theology. While Kilmartin's theology is helpful in articulating a Trinitarian context for understanding the sacrifice of Christ in general, it is ultimately geared toward the celebration of that sacrifice in the Eucharist because his purpose is to unfold a liturgical theology. From the transcendent viewpoint of the sacrifice of Christ, the Eucharist is the action of the Church, the Body of Christ. Therefore, for Kilmartin, the believers' participation in the sacrifice of Christ is a consequence of the sacramental unity with Christ achieved in the Spirit. In Kilmartin's eucharistic theology, the underlying dynamic of participation in Christ's passing over from suffering to glory in the celebration of the Eucharist is Trinitarian. He asserts that this participation "is only possible because of the Father's self-gift in the sending of the Son and the response of the Son in his humanity, and the sanctifying work of the Spirit in the Incarnation and in the life of faith of Jesus."<sup>70</sup> The believers' eucharistic response, understood as *sacrificium laudis*, consists in their thanksgiving for the Father's self-gift in the Son and their offering of themselves couched in

---

<sup>70</sup>Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 382.

the transmission of the sacrificial attitudes of Christ in the medium of the Eucharistic Prayer, by the working of the Holy Spirit.

### Theological Ordering of the Modes of Christ's Presence in the Liturgy<sup>71</sup>

Kilmartin presents a theological ordering of the manifold liturgical presence of Christ and the significance of this doctrine for theological reflection on the active eucharistic participation.<sup>72</sup> Kilmartin's analysis of the modes of Christ's presence is from the perspective of the "working definition of the liturgy"<sup>73</sup> given in the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy which he presents as follows:

According to *Sacrosanctum Concilium* 7, the liturgy of the earthly Church is primarily the work of the High Priest, Jesus Christ. It is accomplished by him as Head of the Church, his Body, bound to him by faith, and as Bridegroom who acts together with the Church, his Bride, united to him in the one Spirit. In the liturgical celebration a mutual and real presence of the Lord and his Church occurs, enabled by the Holy Spirit. Hence, through the effective and expressive symbolic verbal and gestural elements of the liturgy, Christ continues his saving work for the salvation of humankind and the glorification of the Father.<sup>74</sup>

---

<sup>71</sup>Rather than strictly a critique, the purpose of this section is to present Kilmartin's systematic ordering of manifold presence of Christ in the liturgical celebration which has implications to the active participation.

<sup>72</sup>The following presentation is from Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 303-355; idem, "Modern Approach," 86-93. Hence reference will be made where necessary.

<sup>73</sup>Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 350.

<sup>74</sup>Ibid. As will be seen, Kilmartin, however, will differ from the order of Christ's liturgical presence presented in *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 7 because his purpose is to articulate a liturgical theology. In *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 7 the order is as follows: Christ is present in the action of the priest at Mass→in the eucharistic elements→in the sacraments→in the word→in the liturgical assembly gathered for prayer and song. The reason for this order is obvious, namely, not to downplay the doctrine of transubstantiation. See Michael G. Witczak, "The Manifold Presence of Christ in the Liturgy," *Theological Studies* 59 (1998): 683.



This working definition of the liturgy, according to Kilmartin, affirms that the glorified Lord has joined the Church to himself in the Spirit. The personal presence of Christ in the Church results from the initiative of the risen Lord who effected faith in his abiding presence through the resurrection appearances. This abiding presence is a new presence in the Spirit, who can be called the “medium” of this mutual presence of Christ and the Church. This means that the Spirit is the same in Christ and members of the Church and is the efficacious presence of Christ for the salvation of humankind as well as the condition for any liturgical celebration accomplished by the Church in union with Christ. Consequently, in all liturgical accomplishments the action of Christ and the action of the assembly in the same Spirit constitute together the full mutual presence of the Lord and the Church. This understanding of the liturgical presence of the Lord, Kilmartin argues, provides access to the explanation of the unity and differentiation of the individual modes of Christ’s liturgical presence. The one unique personal presence of Christ in the faith of the Church includes the presence of his saving work which cannot be separated from his person. Christ brings himself and his saving work to the temporal-spatial conditions of the liturgy in order that the assembly might be incorporated into his *transitus* to the Father. This mystery presence is unfolded in different ways, which enable believers to encounter and accept him through a response of thanksgiving and commitment.

In the definition, cited above, Kilmartin sees the manifold presence of Christ in the liturgy as having *anabatic* (worship of the Father) and *katabatic* (sanctification of the liturgical assembly) characteristics. This dynamic of dialogical character of worship and sanctification, which takes place in the liturgical celebration, is important for Kilmartin in

presenting the manifold liturgical presence of Christ.<sup>75</sup> Kilmartin's intention in relating systematically the various modes of Christ's liturgical presence to one another is primarily ordered to liturgical theology which, in the process, unfolds the order of the celebration of the Eucharist as well. All modes of liturgical presence of Christ, except his substantial presence in the consecrated bread and wine, are actions of the Church that makes Christ's presence relational and active. So when Kilmartin speaks of the presence of Christ and his saving deeds in the eucharistic action, he means that this presence is in the modalities of symbolic expression and communication. Hence in his theology the presence of Christ and his saving deeds is experienced through active participation, understood as a response to this presence.

According to Kilmartin, a personal encounter with the glorified Christ is possible only in faith. The risen Christ continues the Spirit-filled mission of his earthly life in a new way. He gathers the "eyewitnesses" (Acts 1:6) to form the new people of God through his resurrection appearances to the disciples in which, through the personal gift of the Spirit, he bestows the gift of faith in his abiding presence "for them." "He is both present to them as conscious content of their act of faith and present in them as sharing source of their act of faith through the Spirit."<sup>76</sup> The theandric act (appearance) by which the risen Lord makes himself present to these witnesses is sacrament of the transcendental act by which the Spirit enables them to "see" the Lord (John 20:18; 1 Corinthians 15:5-8). The activity of Christ together with the complementary work of the Spirit creates faith in Christ's abiding presence

---

<sup>75</sup>Also see Witczak, "The Manifold Presence of Christ in the Liturgy," 697.

<sup>76</sup>Kilmartin, "Modern Approach," 89.

in the disciples (Matthew 28:20). Kilmartin asserts that this presence of Christ through the Spirit in the liturgical assembly as sharing source of the act of faith is fundamental to all other modes of his personal presence in the worship of the Church.<sup>77</sup> This presence of Christ in the members of the Church is more intimate and intense because the Holy Spirit whom Christ possesses in fullness is given to believers whereby they are united to Christ in the one Spirit. Hence Kilmartin considers the liturgical assembly as the central symbol in Christian liturgy and argues that all other symbols of the liturgy should be treated in reference to that most basic and central symbol.<sup>78</sup> Kilmartin's stress on the presence of Christ in the liturgical assembly as primary may be understood as "prerequisite" for the sacramental action from which result other modes of Christ's liturgical presence. For in his theology the liturgical assembly constitutes the living context for the realization of other modes of Christ's liturgical presence in the celebration of word and sacraments.

The resurrection appearances which effected faith in the saving presence of the Lord are unique in the sense that from this point onward the personal presence of Christ to the chosen witnesses and in their lives of faith is maintained through their memory in the Spirit. It is through the witness of their faith that the personal presence of Christ is mediated to others.<sup>79</sup> Through the presence of the Spirit of Christ in the believers the actual presence of Christ in the liturgy of the Church is made possible. Christ and the believers are rendered mutually present to one another through the Spirit and so communicate with one another

---

<sup>77</sup>Ibid., 87. Also see Karl Rahner, "The Presence of the Lord in the Christian Community at Worship," *Theological Investigations* 10, trans. David Bourke (New York: The Seabury Press, 1977), 73-74.

<sup>78</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 322.

<sup>79</sup>See *ibid.*, 330.

through the word and sacraments and offer acceptable worship to God. The personal presence of Christ through the Spirit makes the acts of the Church to be acts of Christ, and so the reality present in the mystery of worship is adequately described. The liturgical assembly recalls Christ and his saving deeds in the Spirit which are spiritually re-presented. This approach affirms the concrete activity of the liturgical assembly, the Christian conscience sustained by the Spirit, and the witness of liturgy in explaining the saving acts of Christ in the liturgy. The presence of Christ in his passing over from suffering to glory results from the mutual presence of Christ and the liturgical assembly through the Spirit. The movement is from the liturgical assembly to Christ in his passing over. It is by remembrance in the Spirit that the liturgical assembly is rendered present and participates in the passing over of Jesus Christ.<sup>80</sup>

The unity of head and members is represented especially in the liturgical assembly constituted by the presiding minister and the community of believers. The personal encounter of the minister and community, in which takes place the encounter of Christ and his members, is achieved in the common prayer of the Church, the preaching of the word of God, and the celebration of the sacraments. The Eucharist is the highest possible instance of the personal presence of Christ, for it includes his substantial and actual presence under the form of the permanent sacrament of his body and blood. In the reception of the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, the faithful encounter Christ in a fully and active corporeal way. The “chosen witnesses” constituted the Church in the Spirit and preached their faith. In later

---

<sup>80</sup>See Kilmartin, “Modern Approach,” 88; idem, “Sacramental Theology: The Eucharist in Recent Literature,” *Theological Studies* 32 (1971): 245-246, hereafter “Sacramental Theology.”

communities the office of ministry derives from the exercise of the faith of the Church and the call of the Spirit. The presence of Christ in the exercise of office is a special mode of presence realized through the ordained minister's witness to apostolic faith. Likewise, the word of God preached and the sacraments celebrated in the Church express and represent the faith of the Church of which the Spirit of Christ is the source. This faith cannot but represent Christ and his redemptive act. The Lord represents himself and his saving work through the symbolic word and action of the liturgy. But the assembly of believers and its liturgical activity constitute this symbolism. The mystery of Christ appears in its objective reality in the relative, temporal, and spatial conditions of the Church's liturgy. The mystery employs the worshipping community as means of its expression. Therefore in the liturgy there is the objective offer of salvation by Christ, and also the human mediation of this offer, for the offer can only be realized in and by human communication.<sup>81</sup>

Human cooperation is the essential condition for the possibility of the presence of the mystery of salvation in the liturgy of the Church. The concept of the relational nature of the human being<sup>82</sup> has important application in the field of theology of the liturgy. The essential relationality of the Lord to the believing community, and *vice versa*, makes intelligible the reciprocal presence of the Lord and community in the accomplishment of the liturgy of the Church. For such a mutual presence believers must become contemporaneous with the risen Lord who now lives outside the condition of historical space and time. In other words,

---

<sup>81</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 332.

<sup>82</sup>“According to Scripture, the human being is a creature essentially related to the Creator, and determined by God to responsible relational activity toward the Creator and the whole creation. The relationality to other persons pertains to the essence of personhood. It is ultimately grounded on the Trinity: the essential relationality of the divine persons to one another.” Ibid., 333.

believers must enter into God's time while remaining under the temporal conditions of history. God's time, as the time of God's love, has entered history in Jesus Christ who responded to the love of the Father. Jesus' love for the Father is the revelation of the Father's love for him and all humanity in him. It is the reciprocal presence of God's love for the world and the human being's definitive response to that love. After the ascension, the *Kyrios* is present to the world, opening humankind to God's time by the sending of the Holy Spirit who establishes the Church.

For the Church is the concrete presence of God's time in its life of faith, hope, and love. Above all, the liturgy of the Church is a manifestation and realization of God's time. Here the mutual loving presence of the Lord and the assembly of believers, in the one Holy Spirit, is realized in the most intense way possible under the conditions of history.<sup>83</sup>

The concrete form of expression of this mutual presence of Christ and the Church is the word and symbolic actions of the liturgy through which Christ and his saving work is personally present to believers. But the one who structures the liturgical word and symbolic action of faith, hope, and love for the presence of the person and saving work of Jesus is the Holy Spirit.

The mystery of the Eucharist consists in the presence of Christ's self-offering to the Father and his self-offering to the community in the sacrament of his body and blood. The condition for this twofold presence was the apostolic act of acceptance of the meaning of the Last Supper, as understood in the light of faith awakened through the experience of the

---

<sup>83</sup>Ibid., 335.

resurrection of Christ. Hence, the eucharistic presence of Christ is only possible in the realm of the faith of the Church.

### Establishing a Strong “Connection” between the Life and Faith of Christ and that of Believers

For Kilmartin, the bestowal model of the Trinity not only addresses the deficiencies of the procession model but also gives appropriate attention to the role of the Holy Spirit in the Trinity and, by extension, in the union between Christ and believers.

According to Hall, unlike Kilmartin’s predecessors who sought a solution to the mystery presence, Kilmartin was fortunate to work within the theological and philosophical assumptions that developed in the latter part of the twentieth-century.<sup>84</sup> So Kilmartin was able to approach Jesus’ passion and death on the cross as the expression and actualization of his life of faith and the liturgical presence of these deeds as the mystery of the economic Trinity. Thus his proposed solution to the mystery presence of Christ and his saving deeds in the liturgical celebration of the Church is from the perspective of the divine plan of salvation which takes into consideration: (1) the action of the Trinity in the economy of divine self-communication; (2) the metaphysical distinction between time and eternity; and (3) a better connection between the categorial deeds of Christ and the action of the Church in its eucharistic celebration where the liturgical role of the Holy Spirit is given importance.

---

<sup>84</sup>Because of the development of the personal mission of the Spirit in regard to grace, Kilmartin was not hindered by the theological assumption that all the acts of the Trinity *ad extra* are acts of efficient causality done by the Godhead acting as one principle. Kilmartin also benefited from a more developed approach to a person’s humanity which viewed Christ’s humanity as a reality that developed and formed through a personal history. In this understanding, it was possible to speak of Christ’s life of faith in the biblical sense of trusting the Father which Jesus preached. See Hall, *We Have the Mind of Christ*, 151-152.

Because of Kilmartin's understanding of the transcendent essence of the sacrifice of Christ, in his solution to the mystery presence theology, he dismisses a consideration of perennialization of some aspect of the categorial deeds of Christ.<sup>85</sup> Rather, he treated those deeds as temporal, special, and unique (perfect, sufficient, and once-for-all) in human history,<sup>86</sup> but also as Jesus' human response in faith and love of the Holy Spirit to the divine offer of self-communication. This response was the unique acceptance of the divine purpose for creation and, in and through this response, that divine purpose was accomplished in human history.<sup>87</sup> Yet Kilmartin argued that there are certain possibilities in which these deeds could be present in the celebration of the Eucharist: from the perspectives of (1) a relational ontology; (2) the eternal divine knowing and willing; and (3) Jesus' categorial deeds as the instrumental cause modifying the divinizing action of the Holy Spirit.

Through the bestowal model Kilmartin is able to overcome the traditional "appropriation theory" attributed to the Spirit in relation to the sanctification of humankind. Drawing human persons into the Trinitarian life may be a common work in the broad sense but each divine person has a unique role to play. The operation comes from the Father, through the Son, and is accomplished in the Holy Spirit. According to Kilmartin, the resurrection made Jesus the full realization of divinity in humanity and so the co-sender of the Spirit with the Father in which the role of the Father is purely divine while that of Christ is theandric, a divine act of the glorified humanity of Christ. The sending of the Spirit at

---

<sup>85</sup>As mentioned above, Kilmartin judged that such consideration only raised more problems than it solved.

<sup>86</sup>That is, the discrete categorial actions of Jesus' response of sacrificial faith as belonging to the space and time in which they occurred, hence not existent for us in the strict sense.

<sup>87</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 183-184.



Pentecost signifies the mutual bestowal of the Spirit by the Father on the Son. The sending of the Spirit by Christ at Pentecost is the sacrament of the bestowal of the Spirit from the Father out of love for the Son. This bestowal in love now includes all the members of the Son whose capacity to receive and return love is effected by the paschal mystery. The paschal mystery is the event through which Christ is transformed and receives the fullness of the Spirit, and which enables him to share the Spirit with his brothers and sisters.<sup>88</sup> From this consideration Kilmartin moved to the application of the bestowal model to the sanctification of believers. Sanctification is merely the continuation of the same dynamic of the mutual bestowal of love.<sup>89</sup> The difference between traditional theology's and Kilmartin's description of the sanctification of believers is not in the description of their sanctification itself (both affirm the Spirit as its source) but whether it corresponds to the sanctification of Christ who is the model of all sanctification. In this sense, it should be said that Kilmartin's theology offers a better theological explanation than the so-called traditional theology. His approach to discussing the sanctification of believers is thoroughly traditional yet excitingly new.

The eucharistic assembly's relationship to the deeds of Christ, Kilmartin believed, is properly described only in light of the mystery of the economic Trinity, revealed in Christ's death and resurrection. This mystery includes the divine offer of self-communication and the human response of self-sacrificing acceptance. The insertion of believers into the Trinitarian relationship of the Father and the Son is accomplished by the work of the Spirit. In

---

<sup>88</sup>Also see John H. McKenna, "Eucharistic Epiclesis: Myopia or Microcosm? *Theological Studies* 36 (1975): 276, hereafter "Eucharistic Epiclesis."

<sup>89</sup>See Kilmartin, "Active Role of Christ and the Holy Spirit," 250.

Kilmartin's theology, the eucharistic assembly (Church), Eucharist, and Trinity dynamic can only be understood in the Spirit because it is the Spirit, poured out from the Father and the Son, who gives the members of the liturgical assembly a share in Christ's life and relationship to the Father and enables them to associate themselves at the deepest and most intimate level with the sacrificial action of Christ. Believers, acting in the Spirit, actualize the most intimate relationship with Christ by entering eschatologically and proleptically into that event of the self-offering initiative of the Father in the gift of his Son. They respond to this initiative of the Father in the self-communicating love of the Son. Kilmartin's explanation of active participation is thus particularly significant because of the pneumatological union of the members of the worshiping assembly with Christ. In this union they share the Spirit of the faith of Christ in the activity of the Holy Spirit as the personal mediation between Christ and believers.

Christ's sacrifice is made present in believers through their participation in the worship that Christ offers to the Father. United in the sacrifice of Christ by the working of the Spirit, the members of the eucharistic assembly have communion with the Father. The Spirit comes to believers as the Spirit of Christ's faith and moves them to actualize that faith especially in liturgical celebration.<sup>90</sup> Believers actualize the faith that Christ actualized on the cross verbally and gesturally in the ritual act by their devotion and commitment to what they celebrate. Thus they appropriate the sacrificial attitudes of Christ.<sup>91</sup>

---

<sup>90</sup>“If on the cross [Christ] acted alone, in the eucharist he acts with the Church, and the Church is enabled to share actively in his sacrifice because she has his Spirit dwelling in her.” John O'Donnell, *Hans Urs von Balthasar* (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1992), 122.

<sup>91</sup>Such as trust in God, self-offering, love for God and neighbor, and thankfulness for God's

The active participation of the assembly is realized by the individual believer's degree of agreement with the religious attitudes expressed liturgically and gesturally in the ritual act, and which mirror the sacrificial attitudes of Jesus expressed at the Last Supper and in the event of his historical death of the cross.<sup>92</sup>

The union with the Son, effected by the Spirit who was in Jesus and empowered his perfect loving response, commits believers to emulate in their own lives the radical self-giving of Jesus (the virtuous dispositions of the human Jesus in his response to the Father) as the only acceptable response to the Father's initiative. Likewise, Kilmartin asserts that "the radical self-offering of the faithful is the only spiritual response that constitutes an authentic sacrificial act."<sup>93</sup> Empowerment by the Holy Spirit enables believers to share in Jesus' covenantal relation with the Father.

Kilmartin explained how the Spirit of faith, by which Jesus passed from this world to the Father, works in the prayer of the believing Church, making Christ present through the ritual prayer and action of liturgical assembly. Kilmartin's theology of grace, derived from the bestowal model, thus has implications for the role of the prayer of the Church in the work of sanctification. Because the Spirit united the humanity of Jesus with the eternal Word, this Spirit is manifest in Jesus' human life, and so his prayer is always an acceptable response to the Father. Likewise, the prayer of believers, when united with the prayer of Christ in the Spirit, becomes an acceptable response.

---

loving self-communication.

<sup>92</sup>Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 371.

<sup>93</sup>Ibid., 382-383.

Kilmartin took the conventional understanding of *anamnesis* a step further by introducing the liturgical role of the Holy Spirit into the act of recalling the saving event of Christ. The concept itself comes from the Israelites' paschal feast which entails the re-presentation/renewal of the redemptive act of Yahweh. In this context Kilmartin understood Jesus' institution of the Eucharist as something that belongs to the category of a memorial feast which involves a re-presentation of his redemptive work.

As memorial gift to the Father, it is the objective re-presentation of the self-giving of the Servant. It renders visible on earth the once-for-all sacrifice which Christ offered sacramentally at the Last Supper and which he manifested through His physical death on the cross. But this re-presentation takes place in the Church. The Church is given this memorial gift so that she may actively associate herself with the offering made on her behalf and thus reap its fruits.<sup>94</sup>

The dynamic described is Trinitarian in the sense that Jesus' self-gift is a movement of response in relation to the Father. The Church's association with that gift enables a share in that same relationship. Accordingly, for Kilmartin, in the act of *anamnesis* the liturgical assembly recalls Christ and his saving deeds in the Spirit and they are spiritually re-presented through the liturgical *anamnesis* of the believing assembly. This approach affirms both the concrete activity of the liturgical assembly and the work of the Holy Spirit. In the liturgy the Spirit acts in the memory of the Church, expressed in word and action, developed through history to communicate the saving attitudes of Christ's faith to the liturgical assembly. The Spirit is personally present in the faith of Christ and the faith of the liturgical assembly. "The Spirit who awakens acts of faith is the source of the representation of the believing

---

<sup>94</sup>Edward J. Kilmartin, *The Eucharist in the Primitive Church* (Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965), 73.

community to the Passover of Jesus. On the other hand, the Spirit is the source of the representation of the historical acts of Christ to the believers.”<sup>95</sup>

#### Eucharist as the Enactment of the Local Manifestation of the *Totus Christus*

Central to Kilmartin’s theology of the Church’s sharing in the sacrifice of Christ is the understanding that the eucharistic offering is an action of the locally manifested *totus Christus* in the participation of the unique priesthood of Christ by the working of the Holy Spirit. As such, the Eucharist becomes the privileged place/event which reveals the insertion of the members of the eucharistic assembly by the working of the Holy Spirit, into the mystery of Christ and his relationship with the Father. The Church is therefore eucharistically constituted since it is through the Eucharist that believers are incorporated into Christ’s ascent to the Father. Exercising their participation in the sonship of Christ, their lives become an offering of thanksgiving to the Father. The Church realizes its essential being-in-relationship with the Trinity in and through the Eucharist.

Accordingly, Kilmartin explains that the one acting in the here-and-now ritual action of the Eucharist is the locally engaged eucharistic assembly under the presidency of the ordained ministry of the Church of Jesus Christ. This ecclesiological conviction urged him to extend the narrow Scholastic notion of the *in persona Christi* axiom to *in persona Christi capitis ecclesiae*. He made clear that “the concrete eucharistic assembly physically present and actively engaged by faith is the active subject. This assembly is the local embodiment of the social body of Christ, and represents the universal communion of eucharistic

---

<sup>95</sup>Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 375.

assemblies.”<sup>96</sup> For Kilmartin, liturgy is always the liturgy of Christ and the Church. He asserts that

Christ himself is also actively present as head of the Church and high priest of the worship of his earthly Church. Hence it can be said that the eucharistic worship is enacted by the eucharistic community in communion with Jesus Christ, head, priest and bridegroom of his body, priestly people and bride.<sup>97</sup>

Kilmartin notes that leadership was one of the stable elements of the constitution of the Church which arose out of Pentecost event.<sup>98</sup> Christ’s sending of the Spirit at Pentecost is the sacrament of the transcendental sending of the Father. Likewise the ordained minister receives, in a particular way, the risen Lord’s offer of the Spirit—an offer which itself is a sacrament of the Father’s offer of the Spirit. “If the offer is accepted, it becomes an authoritative sending of the Spirit by the risen Lord through the ordained minister. The ordained receives, with the Spirit, a participation in the authority of Christ to offer and send the Spirit to others.”<sup>99</sup> In the eucharistic celebration, the ministerial priest is sent by the Father to represent Christ, while sent by the risen Lord as the sacrament of the transcendent sending of the Father.

By authoritatively placing the signs of Christ [that is, repeating the words and actions by which Christ instituted the Eucharist], the priest sends the Spirit in an act which is sacrament of the theandric act of Christ and so sacrament of the sending of the Spirit by the Father to transform the gifts.<sup>100</sup>

---

<sup>96</sup>Ibid., 372.

<sup>97</sup>Ibid.

<sup>98</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 195; idem, *Eucharist in the West*, 375.

<sup>99</sup>Kilmartin, “Active Role of Christ and the Holy Spirit,” 250.

<sup>100</sup>Ibid., 251.

Accordingly, in this nature and ministry of the priest, the priest represents Christ and co-operates with the Spirit in the sanctification of the eucharistic elements. The Spirit alone “establishes the unity of being between the bread and wine and the glorified Christ”<sup>101</sup> which corresponds to the bestowal of the Spirit by the Father on the Son. At the same time, the sanctification of the eucharistic elements by the risen Lord, through his minister, corresponds to the bestowal of the Spirit on the Father by the Son because the ultimate goal is the transformation of communicants so that they are enabled to love the Father as his children.

In contrasting the *in persona Christi* theology of the West with the teaching of the East, which attributes sanctification of the gifts to the personal mission of the Spirit,<sup>102</sup> Kilmartin followed the present trend in the West, especially after the Second Vatican Council, which gives a renewed attention to pneumatology in sacramental theology. His favorite way of phrasing the *in persona Christi* theology is that the priest first represents the faith of the Church, of which Christ is the head, and therefore he represents Christ the head of the Church. In this approach the role of the priest is embedded in the Christ—Church relationship that enacts the Eucharist. Kilmartin understood the priest as sacramental representation of the Trinitarian mystery of the Church.<sup>103</sup> This representation has a twofold characteristic. “Insofar as the ordained ministry officially represents the life of faith of the Church [to God] in the leadership of liturgical prayer, it also represents the Trinitarian self-

---

<sup>101</sup>Ibid.

<sup>102</sup>See Ibid., 235-236.

<sup>103</sup>See Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 196.

communication [to Church] under the aspect of enabling the response of the worshipping community to God's offer of love."<sup>104</sup>

Kilmartin claims that while a Christological ecclesiology investigates the concept of Church as Body of Christ, a Trinitarian ecclesiology explores the notion of Church as people of God, a people brought into unity by the power of the Holy Spirit. Vatican II's understanding of the Spirit's mission in the Church as principle of unity, source of all activity, and guide into the fullness of truth, opens itself to an ecclesiology in which the Trinity serves as a model for the Church.<sup>105</sup> Kilmartin says that

... the new people of God is called to live a style of life like that of the Trinity, in which unity and multiplicity are bound together in a dynamic union of divine life ... In the measure that the Church strives to be more perfectly the image of the Trinity, it reveals the mystery of the economic Trinity, the source of life, to itself and to the world.<sup>106</sup>

A Trinitarian ecclesiology, Kilmartin argues, has important consequences for the relationships that exist in the concrete life of the Church.<sup>107</sup> The relationship between the authority of those in office and those with personal charisms mirrors the relationship that exists between the persons of the Trinity. Furthermore, the personal responsibility of each member of the Church in her mission is analogous to the personal mission of each person of the Trinity. For this reason, Kilmartin asserted that the communal nature of liturgy and the contributions of each worshipping member of the community must be emphasized.<sup>108</sup>

---

<sup>104</sup>Ibid. Also see idem, "Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology," 440.

<sup>105</sup>See *Constitutio dogmatica de Ecclesia (Lumen Gentium)*, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 57 (1965): 4, 8, 13-14, 48, hereafter *Lumen Gentium*.

<sup>106</sup>Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 226-227.

<sup>107</sup>See *ibid.*, 227.

<sup>108</sup>Also see *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 28.



### Relation of the Act of Communion to the Sacrifice of Christ

Kilmartin argues that the outward form of the representation of the sacrificial gift of Jesus is found in the distribution of the consecrated gifts ordered to the accomplishment of the meal process. He rather considers the relation of the personal self-offering of Jesus and his Body the Church and the meal aspect, as the efficacious sign of offering. He articulates the effect of this relation as follows.

The sacramental sharing in the body and blood of Christ makes the community one body and draws it into the fate of the body of Christ. Christ gives himself to the communicants sacramentally and they receive Christ sacramentally. In this way Christ is there to build up the faithful into a spiritual temple, in order that the faithful become changed into the true body of Christ and so become themselves a sacrifice pleasing to God.<sup>109</sup>

The Eucharistic Prayer is the sacramental symbolic form under which the self-offering of Christ to God and to humanity has influence over the liturgical assembly. From this point of view, Kilmartin explains that the relation of the cross to the movement of the memorial includes the liturgical assembly's being enabled to participate in the self-offering of Christ. The orientation of the Eucharistic Prayer, as the prayer of the eucharistic assembly from the assembly to the Father, corresponds to the covenant response of Jesus on the cross to the initiative of the Father in sending the Son for the salvation of the world. Conversely, the rite of Communion has the orientation of the Father to the eucharistic assembly.<sup>110</sup> Thus the rite of Communion mirrors the New Testament concept of sacrifice. Furthermore, Jesus

---

<sup>109</sup>Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 381.

<sup>110</sup>See *ibid.*

can be said to have instituted the memorial of his self-offering in the symbolic actions of the Last Supper. In this sense, the sacrificial and sharing-of-meal aspects are interrelated. The act of Communion actualizes the ritual act of sacrifice, and so it is bound to the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist. Eucharistic celebration is a sacrificial event (the shape of meaning), and this event is constituted in the form of a ritual meal process. The act of Communion includes the aspect of the self-offering of Christ for the salvation of the world, the acceptance of Christ by the communicants, and the response of self-offering by the communicants with an eye toward achieving the eucharistic meaning of their lives.<sup>111</sup> This understanding of the Communion rite challenges the attitude of those who choose to refrain from the reception of Communion while “taking part” in the eucharistic worship. It reduces their participation to the level of associating themselves with Christ’s sacrifice only by an act of intention and is contrary to the command of Christ.

#### Emphasis on Liturgical Symbols

In Kilmartin’s application of his theology of the Trinity to the liturgy, the historically and traditionally conditioned liturgical symbols (words and actions) are vital for active participation. In those symbols is forged the faith of the Church. Kilmartin’s insistence that the action of eucharistic eating and drinking should always be referred back to the faith of Christ embodied by the liturgical assembly gives some indication of his understanding of how the sacramental sign works to communicate the sacrificial attitudes of Christ.

---

<sup>111</sup>See “Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology,” 437.

According to Kilmartin, the theological principle of liturgical inculturation derives from the nature of Christian revelation and its witness.<sup>112</sup> Revelation, the self-communication of God, has a universal character. Kilmartin insisted on the historicity of the liturgical transmission of the Church's faith. He claims that liturgy preserves and passes on the faith of the Church. Christians actualize the Spirit of Christ's faith, and mediate the presence of Christ to each other through concrete liturgical celebrations of communities.<sup>113</sup> In the risen Lord's appearance to his disciples he gave them the Spirit of his faith, and so established the Church as a community of covenant faith.<sup>114</sup> The action of Christ and the Spirit in these appearances made the disciples the first witnesses of the resurrection. In the following ages of the Church, the faith that the first witnesses received from Christ in the Holy Spirit has been mediated by covenant communities. The covenant is transmitted through the members of the community as they perform the activities of worship, witness, and service that characterize Christ's life of faith. The faith of Christ and the Church, according to Kilmartin, is thus always given to believers in an historically and culturally conditioned way. In Kilmartin's theology, because the Church is constituted in particular worshipping communities, the Church is always a localized event, expressing the one faith of Christ in its particular culture.

---

<sup>112</sup>See Edward J. Kilmartin, *Culture and the Praying Church: The Particular Liturgy of the Individual Church*, ed. Mary M. Schaefer (Ottawa, Canada: CCCB, 1990), 61, hereafter *Culture and the Praying Church*.

<sup>113</sup>See *ibid.*, 62; *idem*, *Christian Liturgy*, 22, 60.

<sup>114</sup>See Kilmartin, "Modern Approach," 64-65.

Kilmartin emphasizes the efficacy that results from the relationship between faith and sacraments.<sup>115</sup> Aquinas explains that the power of the sacrament derives from faith and the passion of Christ. The “word” is the form of the sacrament, and the meaning of the word is fixed by faith. The word works in the sacrament because it is believed, that is, according to the meaning of the word held by faith. Hence, celebration of the sacraments in different languages does not obstruct the power of the sacraments to signify. In Kilmartin’s understanding, the word witnesses to the event of the new relation between God and humankind in the Christ-event, known as saving revelation, and so enables believers to hear and accept God’s gift. This event continually occurs in faith, and believers grasp the content of this event in faith. “[The word as witness to the event] conceptualizes what happened before and what happens now in the offer and acceptance of God’s saving grace and, consequently, furnishes the hearer with appropriate response.”<sup>116</sup> Hence, Kilmartin argues that wherever the offer of God’s gift is celebrated, the object of the faith (that which is believed) and the act of faith (that by which God’s self-communication is accepted) are essentially the same but not necessarily the conceptualization of that event.

The believer accepts Jesus Christ as Lord. But the witness of faith, i.e., the verbal formulation of the reciprocal act of bestowal and acceptance of God’s grace, does not remain the same. It cannot remain identical because human beings must conceptualize it with the help of their particular, culturally conditioned understanding of reality.<sup>117</sup>

---

<sup>115</sup>See Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 259-260, referring to Aquinas, *Summa Theologiae* III, q. 60, a. 7; Kilmartin, *Christian Liturgy*, 366-367. Second Vatican Council reasserted the necessity of faith as a presupposition for the realization of the sacraments. See *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 59.

<sup>116</sup>Kilmartin, *Culture and the Praying Church*, 62.

<sup>117</sup>*Ibid.*

Kilmartin's entire theological system is based on the understanding that the Christian life is a response to God's initiative. He generally asserted that life has a dialogical character: life is received gratuitously and demands some sort of response. He insisted that this dialogical nature is present in the life of grace—where the dynamic is that of the divine initiative and human response, as witnessed in the life of Christ in whom God reveals that the dynamic of self-communication and an answering response is at the heart of the Trinity.

### Kilmartin's Influence on Theologians<sup>118</sup>

Kilmartin's understanding of participation finds support in current theological circles. I offer two examples here.

First, Thomas Pott describes active participation from the viewpoint of priesthood and sacrifice.<sup>119</sup> He asserts that the proper liturgical participation of the faithful is found in their self-offering to the Father, realized through their participation in the sacrifice of Christ celebrated in the liturgy. This self-offering of believers embodies their active participation in the eucharistic celebration as well as the full exercise of their priesthood. Furthermore, Pott notes that this participation goes beyond the realm of the liturgical celebration itself as it extends to one's entire Christian life. In this way, liturgical celebration serves as a means to conformity to the sacrificial life of Christ whose entire life was also a sacrifice. The liturgy, consequently, must play a significant role in achieving that end.

---

<sup>118</sup>Specifically the purpose of this section is to demonstrate how certain elements of Kilmartin's theology have become useful for contemporary theologians to articulate their own theological insights.

<sup>119</sup>See Thomas Pott, "Une Réflexion Spirituelle et Mystagogique Renouvelée sur la Participation Active," in *The Active Participation Revisited: La participation active 100 ans après Pie X et 40 ans après Vatican II*, ed. Josef Lamberts (Leuven: Peeters, 2004), 76-78.

Second, Patrick Prétot explains that participation has a profound connection to the theology of Christian worship, especially to its Trinitarian dimension.<sup>120</sup> For him participation refers to the pneumatological effect in the liturgy—the active participation is the work of the Spirit within the Church.

Kilmartin's Trinitarian sense of sacrifice, the true Christian dynamic of self-gift and sacrifice and the implication it has for describing the Eucharist as the action of the Church, helps to evaluate whether past assertions about the theology of sacrifice best conveyed the dynamic of Christ's sacrifice. At the same time, it has influenced theological reflection on the Christian sacrifice in a manner that is faithful to Tradition. H. B. Meyer's favorable comment in his review article of Kilmartin's *Christian Liturgy* in regard to the relative novelty of the liturgical theology from a Trinitarian perspective elevates Kilmartin's theology to a level with which other theologians must interact.<sup>121</sup> This interaction can be seen as already taking place, especially among American theologians who already use certain elements of Kilmartin's theology to articulate better their own understanding of one or other element of liturgical/sacramental theology. Here I will consider the positions of Daly, Hahnenberg, Witczak, and Sanders.

---

<sup>120</sup>See Patrick Prétot, "Retrouver la 'participation active' tâche pour Aujourd'hui," *La Maison-Dieu* 242 (2005): 166.

<sup>121</sup>"In our opinion no book of similar scope has yet appeared that on the basis of the theological traditions of East and West offers such a systematic, consistently structured trinitarian theology of Christian worship and sacrament." Hans Bernhard Meyer, "A Trinitarian Theology of Liturgy and Sacrament," trans. Hugh M. Riley (Kilmartin Archives, Jesuit Community at Boston College), 20. In addition, of all the American liturgical-sacramental theologians of the twentieth century, George S. Worgul, Jr., makes this positive comment about Kilmartin: "It is important that theologians and educated adults know the work and the writing of Ed Kilmartin. He is a significant figure in the history of American theological thought." George S. Worgul, Jr., "Forward" in Carmina M. Magnusen Chapp, *Encounter with the Triune God: An Introduction to the Theology of Edward J. Kilmartin, S.J.* (Bethesda, Maryland: Catholic Scholars Press, 1998), ix-x, hereafter *Encounter with the Triune God*.

In his article “Sacrifice Unveiled or Sacrifice Revisited: Trinitarian and Liturgical Perspectives,” Daly explicates the authentic meaning of Christian sacrifice, for which he is indebted to the insights and scholarship of Kilmartin.<sup>122</sup> Following the lead of Kilmartin, Daly attempts to unlock the meaning of Christian sacrifice from an *event* that begins with the self-offering of the Father in the gift of his Son whose response is also a self-offering. He asserts that the core of this sacrifice is “*self-offering/self-gift*—in the Father, and in the Son, and in us.”<sup>123</sup> He claims that the Spirit-worked self-giving of the Son to the Father, understood as its transcendental essence and eschatological reality, is present in the eucharistic sacrifice and is the dynamism involved in it. Daly contends that this understanding clarifies what traditional theology could only express unspecifically about the eucharistic sacrifice as “unbloody,” “sacramental,” or “metahistorical.” Furthermore, this transcendental essence of the sacrifice of Christ is what makes the eucharistic celebration the action of the Church. The authentic Christian sacrifice is a self-offering response in union with the self-offering response of the Son. This self-offering of the participants becomes increasingly significant only if one understands that Christian sacrifice is a conjoined self-offerings of the Father, the Son, and believers.

Daly cautions that the liturgical assembly’s self-offering, in its appropriation of the sacrificial dispositions of Christ, is far from being perfect and complete. It needs to be repeated until the Last Day. The essence of Christian sacrifice is the liturgical assembly’s

---

<sup>122</sup>Daly was present in the audience when Kilmartin addressed the Trinitarian dynamic of sacrifice at his acceptance speech of Berakah Award in 1994. Daly, although not a stranger to the theology of sacrifice as such, shared with this author that he was so impressed with Kilmartin’s presentation that it reignited his interest in exploring further the nature of the sacrifice of Christ.

<sup>123</sup>Daly, “Sacrifice Unveiled or Sacrifice Revisited,” 28. Emphasis original.

entering, through the Spirit, “into the fullness of the totally free, self-giving, loving personal life of God.”<sup>124</sup> Echoing Kilmartin, he concludes that the radical self-offering (*sacrificum laudis*) of the faithful constitutes an authentic sacrificial act whose goal is participation in the divine life of the Triune God.

Edward P. Hahnenberg owes much to Kilmartin for articulating his understanding of the relationship between priesthood and sacrifice. “A proper understanding of priesthood is conditioned by a proper understanding of sacrifice—something on which Kilmartin had a great deal to say.”<sup>125</sup> He continues, “When Kilmartin described Jesus’ high priesthood in terms of his final human act of sending the Holy Spirit, he had in mind the ‘acceptable worship’ that is nothing other than Jesus’ life of faith that culminated on the cross.”<sup>126</sup> This high priestly work is a theandric act of sending the Spirit which can only be understood within the context of the entire life of faith of Jesus which characterized his sacrifice. The Spirit who is sent is marked by the traits of Jesus’ life of faith and, as the Spirit of Jesus’ faith, links the sacrificial priesthood of Christ to the sacrificial priesthood of all believers. Believers, to repeat, participate in the priesthood of Christ in the actualization of his sacrificial faith, a faith shaped by the particular acts of love of God and love of neighbor that characterized Jesus’ own life.<sup>127</sup> Accordingly, Hahnenberg describes priesthood and sacrifice in terms of an offering of self rooted in the divine self-offering and in conformity to the self-

---

<sup>124</sup>*Ibid.*, 41.

<sup>125</sup>Edward P. Hahnenberg, “The Ministerial Priesthood and Liturgical Anamnesis in the Thought of Edward J. Kilmartin, S.J.,” *Theological Studies* 66 (2005): 257.

<sup>126</sup>*Ibid.*, 262.

<sup>127</sup>See *ibid.*, 267.



offering of Christ.<sup>128</sup> Sacrifice is closely related with the self-communication of the Trinity. Because the priesthood of Christ is related to the sacrifice, the priesthood also assumes Trinitarian dimension. Consequently, the liturgical assembly's participation in the priesthood of Christ acquires Trinitarian meaning. This notion of priesthood transcends the narrow identification with eucharistic cult and extends to the notion of sacrifice as self-offering. Within this corporate response of faith, Hahnenberg argues that the ministerial priesthood, by calling to mind the saving deeds of Christ (*anamnesis*) and invoking the Spirit (*epiclesis*), serves the priesthood and self-offering of believers that manifests a response of their entire lives as that of Jesus.

Using Kilmartin's theology of Christ's liturgical presence as a principal guide<sup>129</sup> to evaluate the manifold liturgical presence of Christ presented by various modern theologians,<sup>130</sup> Wiczak contends that their presentation "is driven by the Tridentine emphasis on transubstantiation and real presence and ends up dealing with ontological issues surrounding presence."<sup>131</sup> He rather relies on Kilmartin's theology of *anabatic-katabatic* presence of Christ to articulate his own understanding of the various active presence of Christ in the different parts of the eucharistic celebration.<sup>132</sup> He notes that in Kilmartin's theology the various modes of the liturgical presence of Christ are not an intensified presence culminating in the somatic real presence but that they derive from the perspective of liturgical theology—"the dynamic of adoration and sanctification that takes place in the

---

<sup>128</sup>See *ibid.*, 258, 263.

<sup>129</sup>See Wiczak, "The Manifold Presence of Christ in the Liturgy," 681, n. 4.

<sup>130</sup>Such as Edward Schillebeeckx, Joseph Powers, Alexander Gerken, David Power, Robert Sokolowski, and Raymond Moloney.

<sup>131</sup>See Wiczak, "The Manifold Presence of Christ in the Liturgy," 698.

<sup>132</sup>See *ibid.*, 700-702.

liturgy, revealing its fundamentally dialogic character,”<sup>133</sup> understood as *actio*. In the vein as Kilmartin, Witczak states that the various modes of Christ’s presence are found in the sacramental action of the Church for which the presence of Christ in the assembly is fundamental.<sup>134</sup> According to Witczak, in Kilmartin’s description of the order of the “anabatic presences (Christ speaking to the Father) and katabatic presences (Christ speaking to us)”<sup>135</sup> believers’ relationship to Christ and through him to the Father and to one another becomes important.<sup>136</sup> In this sense, the active presence of Christ in the liturgy connects the relationship between the priest and the assembly. “Through the priest’s service and mediation, the community remembers and petitions God that Christ’s sacrifice may be present and shared in communion.”<sup>137</sup>

Noting the crucial liturgical role of the Holy Spirit in Kilmartin’s liturgical theology, Peter C. Sanders acknowledges Kilmartin’s valuable contribution to liturgical theology, which he characterizes as “comprehensive and coherent” and “integral to the overall theology of God and the Trinity.”<sup>138</sup> He claims that Kilmartin’s description of the Church as a “sacrament of the Spirit” and the continued work of the Spirit in and through the members of the Church provides an opportunity for understanding that individual believers serve as instruments of the activity of the Spirit’s action in the world.<sup>139</sup> From this perspective, active liturgical participation becomes all the more significant. Sanders views Kilmartin’s work in

---

<sup>133</sup>Ibid., 697.

<sup>134</sup>See *ibid.*, 700.

<sup>135</sup>Ibid., 697.

<sup>136</sup>See *ibid.*

<sup>137</sup>Ibid., 702.

<sup>138</sup>Peter C. Sanders, “Pneumatology in the Sacramental Theologies of Geoffrey Wainwright, Jean Corbon and Edward Kilmartin,” *Worship* 68 (1994): 344.

<sup>139</sup>See *ibid.*, 350-351.

this respect as promising because it provides a guarantee that the liturgical activity of the Church is guided and directed by the Spirit. He says that the ecclesial community is symbol of the action of the Spirit.<sup>140</sup>

### Conclusion

In comparison to Scholastic theology which tends to pay less attention to liturgical rites, the usefulness of Kilmartin's theology lies in the fact that it begins with such rites themselves in explicating the mystery of the liturgy. Because of the significance of the liturgy for the sanctification of the faithful and the glorification of God, Kilmartin gives importance to liturgical participation and the liturgical assembly as the proper subjects of liturgical celebration. His approach is strengthened by the fact that the liturgy as the sacred action was recognized by the Church at Vatican II and has come to define the Roman Catholic liturgical reform since then.

---

<sup>140</sup>See *ibid.*, 352.

## GENERAL CONCLUSION

This section brings the present study to its conclusion. Having studied Kilmartin's theology, it is clear that he stands among prominent theologians who have contributed significantly to eucharistic theology since Vatican II. Of particular importance is Kilmartin's contribution to advancing understanding of the relationship between the mystery presence of Christ's salvific deeds and the liturgy, the Trinitarian dimension of eucharistic sacrifice, and the notion of active participation as understood by the Council Fathers. Here I wish to show how these elements of Kilmartin's theology help provide (1) a deepening or elaboration of the theology of active participation as envisioned in *Sacrosanctum Concilium* and *Lumen Gentium* and (2) a meaningful participation in the eucharistic celebration (a taking part in the paschal mystery of Christ) that allows the liturgical assembly to experience the mystery of salvation by understanding and engaging the liturgical action which it unfolds.

The core text in *Sacrosanctum Concilium* that underscores active eucharistic participation is no. 48, which reflects the norms for participation in the liturgy as articulated in paragraph 14. Paragraph 48 spells out that full, conscious, and active participation is exercised through a good understanding of and involvement in the rites and prayers of the sacred action of the Eucharist, for through them the faithful come to understand "the mystery of faith" which they gather to celebrate. To cite once again this paragraph:

The Church, therefore, earnestly desires that Christ's faithful, when present at this mystery of faith, should not be there as strangers or silent spectators. On the contrary, through a good understanding of the rites and prayers they should take part in the sacred action conscious of what they are doing, with devotion and full collaboration. They should be instructed by God's word, and be nourished at the table of the Lord's Body. They should give thanks to God. Offering the immaculate victim, not only through the hands of the priest but also together with him, they should learn to offer themselves. Through Christ, the Mediator, they should be drawn day by day into ever more perfect union with God and each other, so that finally God may be all in all.<sup>1</sup>

*Sacrosanctum Concilium* enunciates in these theological statements that the mystery of salvation is revealed and manifested in the most prominent way in the person and work of Christ.<sup>2</sup> *Sacrosanctum Concilium* stipulates that any salvation of humankind as well as any worship of God can only be in some form a participation in the salvific event of Christ, in which he gave perfect glory and praise to God.<sup>3</sup> Hence, it cites the inspiring words of the Sacramentary of Verona: "[in Christ] the perfect achievement of our reconciliation came forth and the fullness of divine worship was given to us."<sup>4</sup> This "fullness of divine worship" is the divine mystery revealed in the sacred liturgy. Thus there is an inextricable identity between the events of the passion and death of Christ and the liturgical event.

---

<sup>1</sup>*Constitutio de sacra Liturgia (Sacrosanctum Concilium)*, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 56 (1964): 48, hereafter *Sacrosanctum Concilium*. Traditionally this offering by the lay faithful is understood to take place by uniting their prayers and intentions with those of the presiding priest.

<sup>2</sup>See *ibid.* 6.

<sup>3</sup>See *ibid.*, 5.

<sup>4</sup>*Ibid.* "Da nobis haec, quaesumus, domine, frequentata mysteria: quia quotiens hostiae tibi placatae commemoratio celebra[n]tur, opus nostrae redemptionis exeritur: per." Leo Cunibert Mohlberg, ed., *Sacramentarium Veronense, Rerum Ecclesiasticarum Documenta, Series Maior, Fontes I* (Rome: Herder, 1966), 13. Contrary to the commonplace understanding, the Leonine Sacramentary (known now as the *Sacramentarium Veronense*) is not a sacramentary in the strict sense but a private collection of Roman formularies. F. Bianchini used this name in his 1735 edition of the text. This name is still associated with it despite being proven wrong by Mohlberg in his recent works. See Cyrille Vogel, *Medieval Liturgy: An Introduction to the Sources*, trans. William G. Storey and Niels Krogh Rasmussen (Washington, District of Columbia: The Pastoral Press, 1986), 38-39.

Accordingly, the introduction of some liturgical elements<sup>5</sup> might be seen as the way the Council Fathers envisioned the desired achievement of the full engagement of the lay faithful in the eucharistic action. Neither in *Sacrosanctum Concilium* nor in *Lumen Gentium*, however, did the Council Fathers offer a specific theological explanation of how the lay faithful participate in the eucharistic sacrifice apart from stating that it is by virtue of their baptismal character, through a good understanding of the rites and prayers, and the reception of the sacramental body and blood of Christ. Although *Lumen Gentium* goes a step further to establish a pneumatological relation between Christ and the Church, it does not explicitly elaborate on it.<sup>6</sup> This lack of complete theological explanation of participation by the Fathers at the Council may be best understood from the nature of the Council as expressed negatively by Piet F. Fransen. “A Council is not a theological faculty, and is not expected consequently to work out a more articulated exposition of the doctrine.”<sup>7</sup>

While echoing the participation of the faithful in the offering of the Eucharist in “virtue of their royal priesthood” as articulated in *Sacrosanctum Concilium*,<sup>8</sup> *Lumen Gentium* differentiates between the liturgical roles of bringing about and the offering of the sacrifice

---

<sup>5</sup>Such as revision of the Order of the Mass, simplification of the rites, more use of Scripture, emphasis on homily, restoration of “prayer of the faithful,” use of the vernacular in Masses, and reception of the Lord’s body from the same sacrifice celebrated. See *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 50-55, 34. Also see Joanne M. Pierce and John F. Romano, “The *Ordo Missae* of the Roman Rite: Historical Background,” in *A Commentary on the Order of Mass of The Roman Missal*, ed. Edward Foley (Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 2011), 31.

<sup>6</sup>See *Constitutio dogmatica de Ecclesia (Lumen Gentium)*, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 57 (1965): 4, 7, 48, hereafter *Lumen Gentium*.

<sup>7</sup>Piet F. Fransen, “Sacraments as Celebrations,” *Irish Theological Quarterly* 43 (1976): 156. Fransen makes this statement in relation to the Council of Trent as the reason of its lack of presenting a complete doctrine of the sacraments.

<sup>8</sup>See *Lumen Gentium*, 10.

with emphasis on the essential difference between the ministerial/hierarchical priesthood<sup>9</sup> and the common priesthood of the lay faithful. Both forms of priesthood, however, are ordered to one another and are seen as participation in the one priesthood of Christ.<sup>10</sup>

According to *Lumen Gentium*, the ordained priest, acting in the person of Christ, effects (brings about) the eucharistic sacrifice and offers it to God in the name of all the people.<sup>11</sup>

People join the ordained priest who offers in their name so that they do the offering together.

A new dimension emerges from this explanation: the bringing about of the eucharistic sacrifice is carried out only by the ordained priest *in persona Christi* and he not only shares with the faithful the offering of the Eucharist to God but also does so in the name of all the people. In the eucharistic action, then, the ordained priest acts in a dual capacity: for *in persona Christi* he confects the eucharistic sacrifice and offers it to God *in persona Christi* and *in nomine totius populi*.

While teaching that the ordained priest and the lay faithful participate in the eucharistic sacrifice by virtue of their baptismal identity, both Constitutions emphasize the sacramental character of the priest's action while underlining the offering of the lay faithful. But neither Constitution gives full and immediate clarity to the relationship between the

---

<sup>9</sup>Coffey contends that the use of "hierarchical" or "ministerial priesthood" does not seem to be apt terms in the post-conciliar period. While the former conveys a sense of domination, the latter does not adequately distinguish the difference between the clerical and lay ministries, especially at present when many lay ministries have been given a place in the Church and in the liturgy. See David Coffey, "The Common and Ordained Priesthood," *Theological Studies* 58 (1997): 211. For a brief account of these lay ministries, see Kenan B. Osborne, *Christian Sacraments in a Postmodern World: A Theology for the Third Millennium* (New York: Paulist Press, 1999), 33; Carmina M. Magnusen Chapp, *Encounter with the Triune God: An Introduction to the Theology of Edward J. Kilmartin, S.J.* (Bethesda, Mary Land: Catholic Scholars Press, 1998), 96-97.

<sup>10</sup>See *Lumen Gentium*, 10.

<sup>11</sup>See *ibid.* Also see *ibid.*, 28; *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 7.

hierarchical priesthood and the royal priesthood of the lay faithful particularly in relation to participation in the eucharistic action. Nor do they offer an explanation of how the offering of the ordained priest and the lay faithful relates to one another or how their offering is joined in the sacramental action. The answer requires further theological reflection between the two ways of sharing in the single priesthood of Christ in the eucharistic sacrifice.

In his development of *in persona Christi* theology, Kilmartin gives the ordained priest a relation not only to Christ but also to the Church. His analytical reflection on the use of the terms *in persona Christi* and *in persona ecclesiae* gives significant attention first to the differentiation of the ordained from the lay faithful and then to the use of the expression *in persona Christi* in relation to the status and capacity in which the priest acts in the eucharistic action.

Kilmartin reasons that the difference of the two forms of priesthood expressed in *Lumen Gentium* as different “essentially and not only in degree”<sup>12</sup> means “a new kind of ministry, mission and authority of the ordained which is radically different from that of the laity because it is established by Christ and the Spirit.”<sup>13</sup> Hence, ordained ministry is not a deputation by the liturgical assembly. Furthermore, the distinction is an indication that “a functional differentiation” exists between the ministries of the two forms of priesthood in the Church.<sup>14</sup> The priest, who possesses sacramental power, by virtue of his ordination, is given certain definite ministries which he alone can fulfill in their full scope. Of these ministries

---

<sup>12</sup>*Lumen Gentium*, 10.

<sup>13</sup>Edward J. Kilmartin, “Lay Participation in the Apostolate of the Hierarchy,” *Jurist* 41 (1981): 346.

<sup>14</sup>*Ibid.*, 347.



the presidency over the eucharistic liturgy is the most preeminent. With regard to the ordained priest acting *in persona Christi*, Kilmartin explains that the term has a sacramental meaning. “It stresses the fact that Christ himself, in relation to the human minister, is the first actor [in sacramental functions].”<sup>15</sup>

By placing the Christological referent within the context of the *ecclesia*, Kilmartin explains how the priest acts in his dual capacity: *in persona Christi* and *in persona ecclesiae*. He believes that an unqualified and direct representation of Christ by the ministerial priest risked the loss of the pneumatological and ecclesiological dimensions of the liturgical celebration as well as the apostolic ministry. For Kilmartin the primary reality is the Church, not the priest. The ministerial priest is not a mediator between Christ and the Church; the role of the priest should be embedded in the Christ-Church relationship. Kilmartin interprets the Scholastic notion of the minister’s intention *faciendi quod facit ecclesia* in administering the sacraments to signify an ecclesial context. To intend “to do what the Church does” means that the minister must represent the faith of the Church in order to serve as minister of Christ, that is, to validly administer the sacraments of Christ which “would seem to imply that a representation of Christ by the minister takes place only through the direct representation of the faith of the Church.”<sup>16</sup>

Kilmartin argues that the structure of the Eucharistic Prayer reveals that the recitation of the account of institution, where the ordained priest’s acting *in persona Christi* is most evidently expressed, is within the context of the assembly’s corporate prayer of *anamnesis*,

---

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., 362.

<sup>16</sup>Edward J. Kilmartin, “Apostolic Office: Sacrament of Christ,” *Theological Studies* 35 (1975): 252.

offering, and *epiclesis*. The priest pronounces the words of institution as representative of the faith of the Church in an act of corporate worship, and so represents Christ the head of the Church. “The whole prayer is a sacramental word: a word of faith of the Church and form of the ritual action.”<sup>17</sup> For Kilmartin, the Eucharistic Prayer as a whole denotes the action and faith of the Church, and so connotes the activity of Christ.<sup>18</sup> His concern to allow the *lex orandi* to inform the *lex credendi* guided his own methodological choice and explains his repeated claim that the ministerial priest represents Christ because he first represents the faith of the Church of which Christ is the head. Kilmartin sought to correct an imbalance that has assumed Christ binding his presence to institutions that operate independently of the faith of the Church.<sup>19</sup>

Kilmartin contends that when a ministerial office is considered as an essential aspect of the sacramental reality of the Church, the ordained priest represents Christ. But he says that the royal priesthood of the lay faithful, by virtue of baptism, also represents Christ. Kilmartin refers to *Lumen Gentium* no. 10 to affirm the magisterial position that all the faithful share in the mission of Christ. Kilmartin distinguishes between the Christological and ecclesiological aspects of the ordained priest’s role in the eucharistic celebration. The ecclesiological dimension is not primarily because the ordained priest offers the Eucharist in the person of Christ the head of the Church (*in persona Christi capitis ecclesiae*) as described

---

<sup>17</sup>Kilmartin, “Bishop and Presbyter as Representatives of the Church and Christ,” in *Women Priests: A Catholic Commentary on the Vatican Declaration*, eds. Leonard Swidler and Arlene Swidler (New York: Paulist Press, 1977), 299.

<sup>18</sup>See *ibid.*

<sup>19</sup>See Kilmartin, “Apostolic Office: Sacrament of Christ,” 248, 256.

by the neo-Scholastic theology. Rather, it is a unified action of the offering of the *totus Christus*, Christ and the Church (presiding priest and the faithful).

Kilmartin reasons that a eucharistic celebration is not possible without the faith of the Church. Furthermore, a proper understanding of the Eucharistic Prayer makes it possible to see the relation of Christ to the Church and of the ordained priest to that of the lay faithful. The ordained priest, missioned by Christ and commissioned by the Church through ordination, exercises as leader of the “Church of Christ” in the eucharistic liturgy.<sup>20</sup> Hence, he acts as representative of Christ, the head of the Church. But he proclaims the Eucharistic Prayer in the name of the Church and therefore represents the Church of which Christ is the head. Kilmartin claims that this approach makes intelligible only if one considers that the entire Eucharistic Prayer is the prayer of the Church and the “essential form” of the Eucharist.<sup>21</sup> The Eucharistic Prayer is a unified prayer and is prayed in the power of the Holy Spirit. Addressed to the Father, the Eucharistic Prayer represents the *transitus* of Christ and joins the Church with it, allowing a participation in it. In virtue of his theandric act as divine person, Christ mediates the Holy Spirit to the Church and unites it with him in the mediating role of his humanity by which true worship is given to the Father. In virtue of Christ’s theandric act, the ordained priest mediates the Spirit to the Church. In representing Christ as mediator he also represents the Church which is Christ’s body and is one with him in offering the sacrifice to the Father, in virtue of the presence and activity of the Spirit.

---

<sup>20</sup>Edward J. Kilmartin, “The Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology: Towards the Third Millennium,” *Theological Studies* 55 (1994): 440.

<sup>21</sup>*Ibid.*

Kilmartin argues that the ordained priest, as equipped with the power of the Spirit in the ordination rite, should function in the ecclesial context, namely, by representing the faith of the Church in order to serve as minister of Christ. The lay faithful who receive the Spirit of Christ, as sent by Christ himself through the ministry of the ordained priest in the eucharistic celebration, are enabled to offer the immaculate victim to the Father in and with the ordained priest by virtue of their royal priesthood. They offer themselves as well. The Eucharist is thus offered through the exercise of the faith of the Church ritually re-presented by the ordained priest, which is ultimately the Spirit of the faith of Christ. Through this Spirit-worked faith, or participation in the priesthood, of Christ, the whole Church (Christ and his members) offers its sacrifice to God. “The local eucharistic assembly offers the sacrifice of the whole Christ on the side of (i.e., as) the body of Christ (i.e., it, *as body of Christ*, offers the sacrifice of the whole Christ).”<sup>22</sup> Consequently, in Kilmartin’s theology not only the action of Christ and the ordained ministry are affirmed as an essential aspect of the eucharistic celebration but also the role of the royal priesthood of the lay faithful in that celebration is underscored.

Kilmartin’s reflection on eucharistic theology, by means of a systematic development of a Trinitarian theology to elucidate the theology contained in the *lex orandi* (Eucharistic Prayer), is useful for understanding the brief statement about eucharistic participation as presented in *Sacrosanctum Concilium* and *Lumen Gentium*. His theology helps to articulate the fundamental shift in the role of the liturgical assembly called for by the Council Fathers,

---

<sup>22</sup>Edward J. Kilmartin, *The Eucharist in the West: History and Theology*, ed. Robert J. Daly (Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1998), 374, hereafter *Eucharist in the West*. Italics original.

and reinserts pneumatology into the contemporary theological discussion. In his interpretation of active participation, Kilmartin gives primary emphasis to the internal aspect of eucharistic participation while without ignoring the importance of its external dimension, which complements the former. In this way, he is faithful to the participation enunciated in *Sacrosantum Concilium*. Furthermore, his pneumatological-Christological explanation of participation is grounded in the insight articulated in *Lumen Gentium*. Kilmartin's overarching approach is both attentive to the richness of tradition and responsive to the spiritual needs of the present.

Kilmartin identifies the literary theological-movement of the Eucharistic Prayer with a unified prayer of the Church addressed to the Father. Through the act of *anamnesis* (the thankful remembrance of the action of the Father in Christ) and the *epiclesis* (the petition for the realization of the continuing fidelity of the Father to his people through the sanctifying action of the Holy Spirit), the Church asks for the renewal of the New Covenant fulfilled, once for all, in Jesus Christ for the salvation of the world. The Eucharistic Prayer thus reflects a dynamic covenant relation between God and humanity. The sacrament of the body and blood of Christ is seen as the sacramental re-presentation or response to the prayer of the Church. In the eucharistic celebration the *transitus* of Christ is recalled, and the *transitus* of the liturgical assembly to the Father is liturgically expressed and accomplished. The eucharistic celebration is a symbolic (content contained) reality that enables the liturgical assembly to participate in the single *transitus* of Christ. But Kilmartin notes that the Eucharistic Prayer, understandably, does not offer a theological explanation of how the salvific work of Christ is re-presented in and through the ritual memorial. Nor does it say

how the liturgical assembly is represented to and is enabled to participate in that work.

Kilmartin, therefore, realized that a systematic development of a Trinitarian theology, with emphasis on pneumatology, was required to respond to these questions.

Kilmartin effectively and intrinsically integrates a theology of participation into the Trinitarian economy of salvation which unfolds in the eucharistic celebration and, at the same time, is at the heart of that celebration. Grounding his theology of participation in the liturgical action of the Trinity and of the worshiping assembly, Kilmartin persuasively argues for a sounder theological understanding of active participation than many other theologians. In his theology, the reality of active participation is a constitutive element of the ritual enactment of the Eucharist.

Salvation history reached its highest point in the missions of the Word and the Spirit, specifically in the Christ-event (his life, death, resurrection, and the sending of the Spirit at Pentecost). This event, celebrated in the liturgy, is the response of faith and love of Jesus in his humanity to the Father's work in him, "the embodiment of fidelity of humanity to the covenant relation with the Father,"<sup>23</sup> because the Word has joined humanity in his person. Furthermore, this response of the faith of Jesus is "the upward growth of his humanity toward the goal of the highest possible embodiment of the acceptable response to the covenant initiative of the Father in him."<sup>24</sup> Jesus attained this goal in his self-offering which reached its "most climactic expression, never to be surpassed, and never to be repeated in historical

---

<sup>23</sup>Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 356.

<sup>24</sup>Ibid.

space and time, in the event of the Cross,”<sup>25</sup> the highest event of the mystery of salvation expressed in the eucharistic sacrifice.<sup>26</sup>

Participation occurs in the context of the doctrinal and liturgical re-presentation of the reality of the primordial offer of the gift of divine life in God’s self-communication in Christ, through the Spirit, to save the world and in humanity’s response of offering of self in faith.

The accomplishment of the ritual act as performative form of the faith of the Church (ecclesial dimension) evokes the individual believer’s response of faith (participants of the liturgy) to the offer of the trinitarian self-communication appropriate to the human and social situation of the life of faith being lived in the mode of ecclesial celebration of the life of faith.<sup>27</sup>

The acceptance, through faith, of the Trinitarian self-communication is the very way the liturgical assembly participates in the salvific acts of God. This participation by the liturgical assembly is a faith response that corresponds to the Spirit-worked life of faith of Christ. According to Kilmartin, liturgical prayer and its symbolic action (ritual) are activities in the life of faith of which the Spirit is the source. Through the medium of liturgical activity the Holy Spirit transmits the spiritual attitudes of Christ by which the worshipping assembly is enabled to have the mind of Christ. In this way, participants are drawn into communion with the historical saving acts of Christ really present as agents of the work of the Spirit, united to Christ in his worship of the Father.

---

<sup>25</sup>Ibid., 360.

<sup>26</sup>*Sacrosanctum Concilium* describes the eucharistic sacrifice as the event in which “the work of our redemption is accomplished,” and “the fullness of divine worship was given to us.” *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 2, 5.

<sup>27</sup>Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 360.

Understood in this way, this faith response is attainable only through the power of the Holy Spirit because human initiative alone is incapable to bring about the necessary conformity of worshipers to the sacrificial attitudes of Christ. Furthermore, Christ sent his Spirit to unite the Church to himself in its worship of the Father—that worship and sending of the Spirit continue to be realized sacramentally through the celebration of word and sacrament in his Church. The *anabatic* faith response is manifested and brought to its fullest expression in liturgical prayer with its corresponding symbolic action. In other words, the faith response is expressed when the liturgical ritual activity (*lex orandi*) of the Church gives expression to its faith (*lex credendi*). It is, therefore, through the medium of liturgical ritual action (*actio*), understood as the function of the ritual activity of the Eucharistic Prayer, that the worshipping assembly is enabled to participate in the highest form of Christ's worship of the Father. Kilmartin describes this participation, understood as the integration of the liturgical assembly into the *transitus* of Christ, as “the effect of participation in the New Covenant.”<sup>28</sup>

Thus, the eucharistic celebration, the corporate act of the ecclesial assembly, is the means by which the liturgical assembly actively and consciously participates in the mystery of God revealed and completed in Christ. Kilmartin insists on the need for the continued self-offering of the participants because, although Christ offered himself totally and once for all for the world, it was not a substitute for the participants' self-offering in union with him. It is this offering which *Sacrosanctum Concilium* urges the liturgical assembly to learn to

---

<sup>28</sup>Ibid., 358.



offer along with Christ because Christ's passing over to the Father is the culmination of his acceptable response of faith.<sup>29</sup>

Participation in the eucharistic celebration takes place through the blessing-prayer (shape of meaning) and the reception of the sacramental body and blood of Christ (shape of celebration) derived from the traditions of the Last Supper of Jesus with his disciples as accounted in the New Testament. These two basic dimensions (shape of meaning and shape of celebration) correspond to the activity of Jesus' "giving of thanks to God and the distribution of the food and drink as symbols of the participation of his disciples in his prayer and fate."<sup>30</sup> It is this twofold dimension, Kilmartin argues, that the dominical mandate "Do this in my memory" finds its meaning. According to Kilmartin, the essence of the active participation is realized by the worshiping assembly's degree of agreement with the religious attitudes of Jesus represented in the liturgical words and action that correspond to Jesus' sacrificial attitudes expressed at the Last Supper and in the event of his historical death on the cross. The efficacy of the active participation Kilmartin describes is determined by the participants' "devotion" which includes a willingness to work for the active service of the gospel of Jesus, impelled by love.

Kilmartin explains that the worshiping assembly enacts the Eucharist in, with, and through Christ, and that Christ also worships in, with, and through the Church. He gives a new depth of meaning to this Christological dimension by integrating the liturgical role of the Holy Spirit into the relationship between Christ and the Church. Christ's historical sacrifice,

---

<sup>29</sup>See *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 48.

<sup>30</sup>Kilmartin, *Eucharist in the West*, 361.

eternally accomplished and accepted by the Father, acquires a representative visible form in the action of the Church in the Spirit. Kilmartin speaks of a threefold sense in which the Spirit of Christ is the source of the Church's participation in the worship and priesthood of Christ. The Spirit is (1) the medium of the Eucharistic Prayer by which the liturgical assembly is re-presented to the passing over of Jesus and *vice versa*; (2) the mediation of the personal immediacy of the liturgical assembly to Christ and *vice versa* because Christ and the assembly are personally united in the one Spirit; and (3) the source of Jesus' human worship of the Father and of the worship of the Church conformed to the worship of Jesus.

Kilmartin emphasizes that the local Church is the immediate and proper subject of the eucharistic celebration, in eucharistic participation, placed in the very ritual action of the liturgy. He asserts that sacramental-liturgical life occurs only in the local Church. By local Church Kilmartin means the worshipping assembly physically present and actively engaged by faith in the liturgical celebration. He identifies it with the local episcopal eucharistic assembly as primary and the parish eucharistic assembly, with the ordained priest, representing the local bishop, as the presider, as secondary. This understanding reflects Vatican II's definition of the local Church.<sup>31</sup>

In Kilmartin's theology, a strong pneumatological connection established between the life of faith of Jesus and that of the participants pushes a theology of self-sacrifice to the level of the concrete life of Jesus. This connection reminds the liturgical assembly that faith is an active participation, through the Spirit, in Jesus' fully-human response to the Father's self-gift. Stretching beyond a neo-Scholastic theology of intellectual assent, Kilmartin casts faith

---

<sup>31</sup>See *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 41; *Lumen Gentium*, 26.

as a total self-offer in response to the love of the Father (the self-communication of the Father) made in union with Christ through his Spirit. This faith is dynamic in the life of Jesus and in the lives of believers. The primacy of faith in Kilmartin's theological system enables a participation in the sacrifice of Christ through a life of personal self-offering. Not only Jesus' death on the cross but also his entire life was an act of self-offering to the Father. Similarly, believers' self-offering takes place in all aspects of their lives but eminently and most effectively in the eucharistic celebration. When the members of the assembly seek to live out in their daily lives what they celebrate and profess in their worship, they can witness to the mystery of Christ in their lives and in the world. In other words, spiritually strengthened by the eucharistic celebration, they are enabled to live a life of faith in conformity to Christ's own self-offering, making the Passover of the Lord the passover of their own lives.

Kilmartin thus might be said to have made the most substantial and significant contribution to *Sacrosanctum Concilium* no. 48 since Vatican II by creatively explicating a theology of active eucharistic participation in the true sense of the expression and intent of the Council Fathers. From this point of view, he will always remain a point of reference.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY<sup>1</sup>

### Magisterium:

Benedict XIV. *Certiores Effecti* (Communion of the Faithful). In *Papal Teachings: The Liturgy*, 21-23. Translated by the Daughters of St. Paul. Boston, Massachusetts: St Paul Editions, 1962.

Benedict XVI. *Sacramentum Caritatis. Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 99 (2007): 105-194. English translation in United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, *The Sacrament of Charity: Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation*, Vatican City, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, Washington, District of Columbia, 2007.

*The Canon and Decrees of the Council of Trent*. Translated by M. J. Schroeder. Rock Ford, Illinois: Tan Books and Publishers, Inc., 1978.

*Catechism of the Catholic Church*, 2<sup>d</sup> edition. Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1994.

Congregatio pro Documentis Fidei, *Litterae ad Catholicam Ecclesiam Episcopos de Aliquibus Aspectibus Ecclesiae prout est Communio. Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 85 (1993): 838-850. English translation in The Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith. "Some Aspects of the Church Understood as Communion." *Origins* 22 (1992): 108-112.

*Sacrosanctum Concilium. Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 56 (1964): 97-138. English translation in *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*. Edited by Austin Flannery, 21-52. Bandra, Bombay: St Paul Publication, 1975.

*Lumen Gentium. Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 57 (1965): 5-75. English translation in *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*. Edited by Austin Flannery, 323-386. Bandra, Bombay: St. Paul Publication, 1975.

*Decretum de pastoralis Episcoporum Munere in Ecclesia, Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 58 (1966): 673-696. English translation in *Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post Conciliar Documents*. Edited by Austin Flannery, 510-533. Bandra, Bombay: St. Paul Publication, 1975.

*Institutio Generalis Missalis Romani*. Vatican City: Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 2000. English translation in United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, *General Instruction of the Roman Missal: Liturgy Documentary Series 2*. Washington, District of Columbia: 2002.

---

<sup>1</sup>The listing of bibliographical sources is done in alphabetical order.

John Paul II. “Ai vescovi degli Stati Uniti durante l’incontro nel seminario minore di nostra signora di Los Angeles” in *Insegnamenti di Giovanni Paolo II*, vol. 10, n. 3, 552-572. Libreria Editrice Vaticana, 1987.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Ecclesia de Eucharistia*. *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 95 (2003): 433-475. English translation in *On the Eucharist in its Relationship to the Church: Ecclesia de Eucharistia*. Boston, Pauline Books and Media, 2003.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Dies Domini del Santo Padre Giovanni Paolo II all’episcopato, al clero e ai fedeli sulla sanctificazione della Domenica*. *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 90 (1998): 731-746. English translation in *Dies Domini: Apostolic Letter of the Holy Father Pope John Paul II: On Keeping the Lord’s Day Holy: To The Bishops, Clergy, and Faithful of the Catholic Church*. Boston, Pauline Books and Media, 1998.

Leo XIII. *Aeterni Patris*. *Acta Sanctae Sedis* 12 (1879): 97-115. English translation in *The Papal Encyclicals 1878-1903*, 17-28. Ann Arbor: The Pierian Press, 1990.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Diuturnum Illud*. *Acta Sanctae Sedis* 14 (1897): 3-14. English translation in *The Papal Encyclicals 1878-1903*, 51-58. Ann Arbor: The Pierian Press, 1990.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Immortale Dei*. *Acta Sanctae Sedis* 18 (1885): 161-180. English translation in *The Papal Encyclicals 1878-1903*, 107-119. Ann Arbor: The Pierian Press, 1990.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Libertas Praestantissimum*. *Acta Sanctae Sedis* 20 (1888): 593-613. English translation in *The Papal Encyclicals 1878-1903*, 169-182. Ann Arbor: The Pierian Press, 1990.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Mirae Caritatis*. *Acta Sanctae Sedis* 34 (1902): 641-654. English translation in *The Papal Encyclicals 1878-1903*, 499-507. Ann Arbor: The Pierian Press, 1990.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Sapientiae Christianae*. *Acta Sanctae Sedis* 22 (1890): 385-404. English translation in *The Papal Encyclicals 1878-1903*, 211-223. Ann Arbor: The Pierian Press, 1990.

J. Neuner and J. Dupuis, eds. *The Christian Faith: In the Doctrinal Documents of the Catholic Church*. St. Peter’s Seminary, Bangalore: Theological Publications in India, 1992.

Paul VI. *Mysterium Fidei*. *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 57 (1965): 753-774. English translation in *The Papal Encyclicals 1958-1981*, 165-177. Ann Arbor: The Pierian Press, 1990.

Pius IX. *Maxima Quidem*. In *Pii IX Pontificis Maximi Acta Pars Prima*, vol. 3 (1864), 674-679. English translation in *The Papal Encyclicals 1740-1878*, 379-380. Ann Arbor: The Pierian Press, 1990.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Vix duam a Nobis. Acta Sanctae Sedis* 7 (1874): 567-573. English translation in *The Papal Encyclicals 1740-1878*, 435-438. Ann Arbor: The Pierian Press, 1990.

Pius XI. *Divini Illius Magistri. Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 22 (1930): 49-86. English translation in *The Papal Encyclicals 1903-1939*, 353-372. Ann Arbor: The Pierian Press, 1990.

Pius XII. *Mediator Dei. Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 39 (1947): 521-595. English translation in *The Papal Encyclicals 1939-1958*, 119-154. Ann Arbor: The Pierian Press, 1990.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Mystici Corporis Christi. Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 35 (1943): 193-248. English translation in *The Papal Encyclicals 1939-1958*, 37-63. Ann Arbor: The Pierian Press, 1990.

Pius X. *Quam Singulari*. Decree issued by the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments at the direction of Pius X, *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* 2 (1910): 577-583. English translation in R. Kevin Seasoltz, *The New Liturgy: A Documentation 1903-1965*, 17-22. New York: Herder and Herder, 1966.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Sacra Tridentina Synodus*. Decree issued by the Sacred Congregation of the Sacraments at the direction of Pius X, *Acta Sanctae Sedis* 38 (1905): 400-406. English translation in R. Kevin Seasoltz, *The New Liturgy: A Documentation 1903-1965*, 11-14. New York: Herder and Herder, 1966.

\_\_\_\_\_. *Tra le sollecitudini. Acta Sanctae Sedis* 36 (1903): 329-339. English translation in R. Kevin Seasoltz, *The New Liturgy: A Documentaton 1903-1965*, 3-10. New York: Herder and Herder, 1966.

The Roman Catholic Church and the World Council of Churches. *The Church: Local and Universal. A Study Document Commissioned and Received by the Joint Working Group.* Faith and Order Paper 150, 1-15. Geneva: WCC Publications, 1990.

Sacred Congregation of Rites, *Eucharisticum Mysterium*. Edited by Austin Flannery, 106-137. Bandra, Bombay: St. Paul Publications, 1989.

### **Kilmartin:**

Kilmartin, Edward J. "The Achievement of Sacrosanctum Concilium." *Emmanuel* 84 (1978): 565-571.

\_\_\_\_\_. "The Active Role of Christ and the Spirit in the Divine Liturgy." *Diakonia* 17 (1982): 95-108.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Active Role of Christ and the Holy Spirit in the Sanctification of the Eucharistic Elements." *Theological Studies* 45 (1984): 225-253.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Apostolic Office: Sacrament of Christ." *Theological Studies* 35 (1975): 243-264.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Bishop and Presbyter as Representative of the Church and Christ." In *Women Priests: A Catholic Commentary on the Vatican Declaration*, eds. Leonard Swindler and Arlene Swindler, 295-302. New York: Paulist Press, 1977.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Catholic Tradition of the Eucharistic Theology: Response to the Berakah Award," 34-59. Proceedings of the North American Academy of Liturgy, Valparaiso, Indiana: Valparaiso University, 1994.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Catholic Tradition of Eucharistic Theology: Towards the Third Millennium." *Theological Studies* 55 (1994): 405-457.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Christian Liturgy: Theology and Practice: I. Systematic Theology of Liturgy*. Kansas City: Sheed and Ward, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Christ's Presence in the Liturgy," *Emmanuel* 82 (1976): 237-243.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Church, Eucharist and Priesthood: A Theological Commentary on the Mystery and Worship of the Most Holy Eucharist*. New York: Paulist Press, 1981.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Culture and the Praying Church: The Particular Liturgy of the Individual Church*. Edited by Mary M. Schaefer. Ottawa, Canada: CCCB, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Ecclesiological Implications of Classical Eucharistic Prayers." *Wort und Wahrheit, Supplementary Issue No.5: Fifth Ecumenical Consultation Between Theologians of the Oriental Orthodox Churches and the Roman Catholic Church, Vienna-Lainz, September 18-25, 1988*, 85-99. Vienna: Herder, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Epiclesis." *New Catholic Encyclopedia* 18: Supplement, 76-78. New York: McGraw Hill, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Eucharist and Community." *Emmanuel* 82 (1976): 87-92.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Eucharist as Sacrifice." *The New Catholic Encyclopedia* 5, 609-615. New York: McGraw Hill, 1967.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Eucharist in the Primitive Church*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1965.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Eucharist in the West: History and Theology*. Edited by Robert J. Daly. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1998.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Eucharist: Nourishment for Communion." In *Populus Dei II: Ecclesia. studi in onore del Card. Alfredo Ottaviani*, edited by Joseph D'Ercole, 1043-1085. Rome, 1967.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Eucharistic Gift: Augustine of Hippo's Tractate 27 on John 6: 60-72." In *Preaching in the Patristic Age: Studies in Honor of Walter J. Burghardt*, edited by David G. Hunter, 162-182. New York: Paulist Press, 1989.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Eucharistic Prayer: Content and Function of Some Early Eucharistic Prayers." In *The Word in the World: Studies in Honor of F.J. Moriarty*, edited by R. J. Clifford and G. W. MacRae, 117-134. Cambridge, Massachusetts: 1973.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Ex Opere Operato." In *The New Catholic Encyclopedia* 2<sup>nd</sup> ed. Vol. 5. Detroit: Gale, 2003. 501-502.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Foreword to the English Edition." In Jean Corbon, *The Wellspring of Worship*, translated by Matthew J. O'Connell, 7-9. San Francisco, Ignatius Press, 2005.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Last Supper and the Earliest Eucharists of the Church." *Concilium* 40 (1969): 35-47.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Lay Participation in the Apostolate of the Hierarchy." *Jurist* 41 (1981): 343-370.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Modern Approach to the Word of God and Sacraments of Christ: Perspectives and Principles." In *The Sacraments: God's Love and Mercy Actualized*, edited by Francis A. Eigo, O.S.A., 59-109. Villanova, Pennsylvania: The Villanova University Press, 1979.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Office and Charism: Reflections on a New Study of Ministry." *Theological Studies* 38 (1977): 547-554.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Official Vatican Response to BEM: Eucharist." *Ecumenical Trends* 17 (1988): 37-40.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Outline of Lectures at Creighton University: June, 1992." Kilmartin Archives, Jesuit Community at Boston College.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Pastoral Office and the Eucharist," *Emmanuel* 82 (1976): 312-318.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Particular Liturgy of the Individual Church: The Theological Basis and Practical Consequences*. Placid Lectures Series 7, Bangalore, India, 1987.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Patristic Views of Sacramental Sanctity." In *Proceedings of the Catholic College Teachers of Sacred Doctrine* 8, 59-82. 1962.



- \_\_\_\_\_. "Sacramental Theology: The Eucharist in Recent Literature," *Theological Studies* 32 (1971): 233-277.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Sacraments as Liturgy of the Church." *Theological Studies* 50 (1989):527-547.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Sacraments: Signs of Christ, Sanctifier, and High Priest*. Glen Rock, New Jersey: Paulist Press, 1962.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Sacred Liturgy: Reform and Renewal." In *Remembering the Future of Vatican II and Tomorrow's Agenda*, edited by Carl A. Last, 33-47. New York: Paulist Press, 1983.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Sacrificial Meal of the New Testament*. Glen Rock, New Jersey: Paulist Press, 1966.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Sacrificium Laudis: Content and Function of Early Eucharistic Prayers." *Theological Studies* 35 (1974): 268-287.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Sacrifice of Thanksgiving and Social Justice." In *Liturgy and Social Justice*, edited by M. Searle, 53-71. Collegeville, Minnesota: 1980.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Sacrificial Meal of the New Testament*. Glen Rock, New Jersey: Paulist Press, 1966.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Theology of the Sacraments: Toward a New Understanding of the Chief Rites of the Church of Jesus Christ." In *Alternative Futures for Worship I: General Introduction*, edited by Regis A. Duffy, 123-175. Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 1987.

### **Others:**

- Alberigo, Giuseppe. "The Authority of the Church in the Documents of Vatican I and II." *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 19 (1982): 119-145.
- Arinze, Francis Cardinal. *Celebrating the Holy Eucharist*. San Francisco, Ignatius Press, 2006.
- Aquinas, Thomas. *Summa contra Gentiles* 4. Translated by Charles O'Neil. Notre Dame, London: University of Notre Dame Press, 1957.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Summa Theologica*. Vol. 2. Translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province. New York: Benzinger Brothers, Inc., 1947.

- Baldovan, John. "Hippolytus and the Apostolic Tradition: Recent Research and Commentary." *Theological Studies* 64 (2003): 520-542.
- Balthasar, Hans Urs von. "'Fides Christi': An Essay on the Consciousness of Christ." In *Exploration in Theology*. Vol. 2, *Spouse of the Word*, translated by Edward T. Oakes, S.J., 43- 79. San Francisco: Ignatius, 1991.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Mass: A Sacrifice of the Church?" In *Explorations in Theology III: Creator Spirit*, translated by Brian McNeil, 185-243. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1993.
- Beauchene, Richard J. "Worship as Life, Priesthood and Sacrifice in Congar." In *Église et Théologie* 21 (1990): 79-100.
- Beauduin, Lambert. *Liturgy the Life of the Church*. Translated by Virgil Michel. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1926.
- Békés, Gerardo J. "The Eucharist Makes the Church: the Ecclesial Dimension of the Sacrament." In *Vatican II: Assessment and Perspective*. Vol. 2, translated by Leslie Wearne, ed. René Latourelle, 347-363. Mahwah, New York: Paulist Press, 1989.
- Bonaventure, Kloppenburg. *The Ecclesiology of Vatican II*. Translated by Matthew J. O'Connell. Chicago, Illinois: Franciscan Herald Press, 1974.
- Botte, Bernard. "The Collegial Character of the Priesthood and the Episcopate." *Concilium* 4 (1965): 88-90.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *From Silence to Participation: An Insider's View of Liturgical Renewal*. Translated by John Sullivan. Washington, District of Columbia: Pastoral Press, 1988.
- Bourassa, François. "Sacrifice." In *Vatican II: Assessment and Perspectives*, Vol. 1, edited by René Latourelle, 121-159. New York: Paulist Press, 1989.
- Bouyer, Louis. *Liturgical Piety*. Notre Dame, Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press, 1954.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Eucharist: Theology and Spirituality of the Eucharistic Prayer*. Translated by Charles Underhill Quinn. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1968.
- Bradshaw, Paul F. *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship: Sources and Methods for the Study of Early Liturgy*, 2d ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 2002.
- Bürki, Bruno. "The Church's Sacramental Celebration of the Easter Mystery: Yves M. J. Congar and Ecumenical Liturgical Perspectives." In *Yves Congar: Theologian of the Church*, translated by Marie-Humbert Kennedy and edited by Gabriel Flynn, 183-204. Louvain: Peeters Press, 2005.

- Cabié, Robert. *The Church at Prayer: The Eucharist*, vol. 2. Translated by Matthew J. O'Connell, edited by A.G. Martimort. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1986.
- Cantalamessa, Raniero and Alan Neame. *The Holy Spirit in the Life of Jesus: The Mystery of Christ's Baptism*. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1994.
- Casel, Odo. "Mysteriengegenwart." *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft* 8 (1928): 145-224.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Mystery of Christian Worship*. Edited by Burkhard Neunheuser. Westminster, Mary Land: The Newman Press, 1962.
- Chapp, Carmina M. Magnusen, *Encounter with the Triune God: An Introduction to the Theology of Edward J. Kilmartin, S.J.* Bethesda, Mary Land: Catholic Scholars Press, 1998.
- Chenderlin, Fritz. "Do This As My Memorial": *The Semantic and Conceptual Background and Value of Anamnesis in 1 Corinthians 11:24-25*. Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1982.
- Coffey, David, "The Common Priesthood and the Ordained Priesthood" *Theological Studies* 58 (1997): 209-236.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Deus Trinitas: The Doctrine of the Triune God*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Did You Receive the Holy Spirit When You Believed?: Some Basic Questions for Pneumatology*. Wisconsin: Marquette University Press, 2005.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Grace: the Gift of the Holy Spirit*. Manly, NSW: Australia, 1978.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Holy Spirit As the Mutual Love of the Father and the Son." *Theological Studies* 51 (1990): 193-229.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The 'Incarnation' of the Holy Spirit in Christ." *Theological Studies* 45 (1984): 466-480.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "A Proper Mission of the Holy Spirit." *Theological Studies* 47 (1986): 227-250.
- Collins, Mary, *Contemplative Participation: Sacrosanctum Concilium Twenty-Five Years Later*. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Critical Questions for Liturgical Theology," *Worship* 53 (1979): 302-317.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "Guéranger: A View on the Centenary of His Death," *Worship* 49 (1975): 318-328.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Liturgical Celebration As Ecclesial Construction," *Currents in Theology and Mission* 26 (1999): 257-269.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Participation: Liturgical Renewal and Cultural Question." In *The Future of the Catholic Church in America: Major Papers of Virgil Michael's Symposium*, 20-42. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1991.
- Congar, Yves. *Christians Active in the World*. Translated by P. J. Hepburne-Scott. New York : Herder and Herder, 1968.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Church: The People of God," *Concilium* 1 (1965): 7-19.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Le Diaconat dans la théologie des Ministères." In *Le Diaconat dans l'église et le monde d'Aujourd'hui*, edited by P. Winninger and Y. Congar, 131-141. Paris: Cerf, 1966.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Dialogue Between Christians: Catholic Contribution to Ecumenism*. Translated by Philip Loretz. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1966.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "L' 'Ecclesia' ou communauté chrétienne, sujet intégral de l'action Liturgique." In *La Liturgie après vatican II : Bilans, études, prospective*, edited by J. -P. Jossua and Y. Congar, 242-282. Paris : Cerf, 1967.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Faith and Spiritual Life*. Translated by A. Manson and L. C. Sheppard. New York: Herder and Herder, 1968.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Fifty Years of Catholic Theology*. Translated by John Bowden, edited by Bernard Lauret. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *A Gospel Priesthood*. Translated by P. J. Hepburne-Scott. New York: Herder and Herder, 1967.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *I Believe in the Holy Spirit*, vol. II. Translated by David Smith. New York: The Seabury Press, 1979.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Introduction." In *La Liturgie après vatican II: Bilans, études prospective*, edited by J. -P. Jossua and Y. Congar, 11-15. Paris : Cerf, 1967.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Institutionalized Religion." In *The Word in History*, edited by T. Patrick Burke, 133-153. New York: Sheed and Ward, 1966.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Laity." In *Vatican II: An Interfaith Appraisal: An International Theological Conference*, edited by John H. Miller, 239-249. Notre Dame: Notre Dame Press, 1966.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Lay People in the Church: A Study for a Theology of Laity*. Translated by Donald Attwater. Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1965.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Ministères et communion Ecclésiale*. Paris: Cerf, 1971.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Moving Towards a Pilgrim Church." In *Vatican II Revisited By Those Who were There*, edited by Alberic Stacpoole, 129-152. Minneapolis, Minnesota: Winston Press, 1986.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "My Path-Findings in the Theology of Laity and Ministries." *The Jurist* 32 (1972): 169-188.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Power and Poverty in the Church*. Translated by Jennifer Nicholson. Baltimore, Helicon, 1964.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Le Sacerdoce du nouveau testament; Mission et culte." In *Les Prêtres. décrets "presbyterorum ordinis" et "otatam totius" : Textes latins et traductions françaises*, edited by J. Frisque and Y. Congar. 233-256. Paris : Cerf, 1968.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Sainte Eglise : Etudes et approches Ecclesiologiques*. Paris: Cerf, 1963.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Session V Discussion." In *Vatican II: An Interfaith Appraisal: International Theological Conference*, edited by John J. Miller, 231-236. Notre Dame: Notre Dame Press, 1966.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Tradition and Traditions : An Historical and a Theological Essay*. Translated by Michael Naseby and Thomas Rainborough. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1967.
- Congar, Y. M. –J and François Varillon. *Sacerdoce et laïcat dans l'Eglise*. Paris : Vitrail, 1947.
- Corecco, Eugenio. "The Bishop As Head of the Local Church and Its Discipline." In *The Sacraments in Theology and Canon Law* 38, edited by Neophytos Edelby, Teodoro Jimenez-Urresti, and Petrus Huizing, 88-104. New York: Paulist Press, 1968.
- Cowburn, John. *Love and the Person*. New York: Alba House, 1967.
- Crichton, J. D. "Recusant Writers on the Priesthood of the Laity." *Clergy Review* 71 (1986): 455-457.

\_\_\_\_\_. "A Theology of Worship." In *The Study of Liturgy*, edited by Cheslyn Jones et al., 3-30. New York: Oxford University Press, 1978.

Cunnane, Joseph, "The Local Church." In *The Meaning of the Church*, edited by Donal Flanagan, 72-88. Dublin: Gill and Son, 1966.

Dalmais, Irénée Henri. "Theology of the Liturgical Celebration." In *The Church at Prayer: Principles of the Liturgy*, translated by Matthew J. O'Connell, edited by A.G. Martimort. Collegeville, 229-280. Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1987.

Daly, Robert J. *Christian Sacrifice: The Judaeo-Christian Background Before Origen*. Washington, District of Columbia: The Catholic University of America Press, 1978.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Editor's Foreword." In Edward J. Kilmartin, *The Eucharist in the West: History and Theology*, edited by Robert J. Daly, xv-xxii. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1998.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Origins of the Christian Doctrine of Sacrifice*. Pennsylvania: Fortress Press, 1978.

\_\_\_\_\_. "Sacrifice Unveiled or Sacrifice Revisited: Trinitarian and Liturgical Perspectives." *Theological Studies* 64 (2003): 24-42.

de Cardedal, Olegario Gonzále. "Development of a Theology of the Local Church from the First to the Second Vatican Council," Translated by James H. Provost. *The Jurist* 52 (1992): 11-43.

de Lubac, Henri. *Corpus Mysticum : L'eucharistie et l'église au moyen âge. Étude historique*. Paris : Aubier, 1944.

\_\_\_\_\_. *The Motherhood of the Church: Followed by Particular Churches in the Universal Church and an Interview Conducted by Gwnedoline Jarczyk*. Translated by Sergia Englund. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 1982.

Del Colle, Ralph. *Christ and the Spirit: Spirit-Christology in Trinitarian Perspective*. New York: Oxford, 1994.

Downey, Michael. "Liturgical Role in Silence." In *The New Dictionary of Sacramental Worship*, edited by Peter E. Fink, 1189-1190. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1990.

Driscoll, Jeremy. "Uncovering the Dynamic of Lex Orandi-Lex Credendi in the Anaphona of *The Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus*." *Ecclesia Orans* 19 (2002): 85-100.

Dulles, Avery. "A Half Century of Ecclesiology." *Theological Studies* 50 (1989): 419-442.

- \_\_\_\_\_. *Models of the Church*. Garden City, New York: Image Books, 1987.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Models of Revelation*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday, 1983.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Eucharist as Sacrifice." In *Rediscovering the Eucharist: Ecumenical Conversations*, edited by Roch A. Kereszty, 175-187. Mahwah, New Jersey: Paulist Press, 2003.
- Duffy, Eamon. *Saints and Sinners: A History of the Popes*. New Haven/ London: Yale University Press, 1997.
- Empereur, James L. "Paschal Mystery." In *The New Dictionary of Theology*, edited by Joseph A. Komonchak et al., 744-747. Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1987.
- Fahey, Michael A. "In Memoriam: Edward J. Kilmartin, S.J. (1923-1994)," *Orientalia Christiana Periodica* 61 (1995): 5-35.
- Fenwick, John and Bryan Spinks. *Worship in Transition: The Liturgical Movement in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Continuum, 1995.
- Finnegan, Gerald F. "Ministerial Priesthood in Yves Congar," *Review For Religious* 46 (1987): 523-532.
- Fransen, Piet F. "Sacraments as Celebrations." *Irish Theological Quarterly* 43 (1976): 151-170.
- Funk, Virgil C. "The Liturgical Movement (1830-1969)." In *The New Dictionary of Sacramental Worship*, edited by Peter F. Fink, 696-715. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1990.
- Gill, David. "A Liturgical Fragment in Justin, Dialogue 29.1," *Harvard Theological Review* 59 (1966):98-100.
- Giraud, Cesare. *Eucaristia per la chiesa: Prospettive teologiche sull'eucaristia a partire dalla "lex orandi," Aloisiana* 22. Rome: Gregorian University/Brescia: Morcelliana, 1989.
- Gleeson, Philip. "Mystery." In *The New Dictionary of Theology*, edited by Joseph A. Komonchak et al., 688-692. Wilmington, Delaware: Glazier, 1987.
- Granfield, Patrick. "The Church as Institution: A Reformulated Model." *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* 16 (1978): 425-447.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Church as *Societas Perfecta* in the *Schemata* of Vatican II." *Church History* 46 (1979): 431-446.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Local Church as a Center of Communion and Control." In *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America* 35 (1980): 256-263.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Rise and Fall of *Societas Perfecta*." In *May Church Ministers Be Politicians?*, edited by Peter Huizing and Knut Walf, 3-8. *Concilium* 157, New York: Seabury, 1982.
- Grigassy, Daniel P. "The Liturgical Movement." In *The New Dictionary of Theology*, edited by Joseph A. Komonchak et al., 586-591. Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1987.
- Hardy, Daniel W and D. Ford. *Jubilate: Theology in Praise*. London: Dartman, Longman, and Todd, 1984.
- Hall, Jerome M. *We Have the Mind of Christ: The Holy Spirit and Liturgical Memory in the Thought of Edward J. Kilmartin*. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 2001.
- Hänggi, Anton and Irmgard Pahl, eds. *Præx eucharistica: Textus e variis liturgiis antiquioribus selecti*. Fribourg, 1968.
- Heim, Maximilian Heinrich. *Joseph Ratzinger: Life in the Church and Living Theology: Fundamentals of Ecclesiology with Reference to Lumen Gentium*. Translated by Michael J. Miller. San Francisco: Ignatius Press, 2005.
- Hild, J. "L'Encyclique 'Mediator Dei' et le Mouvement liturgique de Maria-Laach," *La Maison Dieu* 14 (1948): 15-29.
- Howell, Clifford. "From Trent to Vatican II." In *The Study of Liturgy*, edited by Cheslyn Jones, et. al., 285-294. New York: Oxford University Press, 1992.
- Hill, W. J. *The Three-Personed God: The Trinity as a Mystery of Salvation*. Washington, District of Columbia: Catholic University, 1982.
- Irwin, Kevin W. *Context and Text: Method in Liturgical Theology*. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1994.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Liturgical Theology: A Primer*. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Liturgy, Prayer and Spirituality*. New York: Paulist Press, 1987.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Models of the Eucharist*. New York: Paulist Press, 2005.



- \_\_\_\_\_. Response to 101 Questions on the Mass. New York: Paulist Press, 1999.
- Jasper, R.C.D and G.J. Cuming, eds. *Prayers of the Eucharist: Early and Reformed*. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1975.
- Johnson, Cuthbert, *Prosper Gueranger (1805-1875): A Liturgical Theologian: An Introduction to his Liturgical Writings and Work*. Analecta Liturgica 9. Rome, 1984.
- Jounel, Pierre. "From the Council of Trent to Vatican Council II." In *The Church at Prayer: Principles of the Liturgy*, vol. 1, translated by Matthew J. O'Connell, edited by A.G. Martimort, 63-84. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1987.
- Jungmann, Josef Andreas. "Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy." In *Commentary on the Documents of Vatican II*, vol. 1, translated by Lalit Adolphus, edited by Herbert Vorgrimler, 1-87. New York: Herder and Herder, 1967.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Mass of the Roman Rite: Its Origins and Development*, vol. 2. Translated by Francis A. Brunner. Allen, Texas: Christian Classics, 1986.
- Kasper, Walter. "Church as *Communio*." *Communio* 13 (1986): 100-117.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The God of Jesus Christ*. Translated by Matthew J. O'Connell. New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1984.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Jesus the Christ*. Translated by V. Green. New York: Paulist Press, 1977.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Sacrament of Unity: The Eucharist and the Church*. Translated by Brian McNeil. New York: Herder and Herder, 2004.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Unity and Multiplicity of Aspects in the Eucharist." *Communio* 12 (1985): 115-138.
- Kelleher, Margaret M. "Assembly." In *The New Dictionary of Theology*, edited by Joseph A. Komonchak et. al., 67-70. Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier, Inc., 1987.
- Killian, Sabbas J. "The Meaning and Nature of the Local Church." In *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America* 36 (1981): 244-255.
- Komonchak, Joseph A. "The Church is a Communion." *Liturgy* 3 (1983): 7-11.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Ecclesiology of Vatican II." *Origins* 28 (1999): 763-768.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Ministry and the Local Church." In *Proceedings of the Catholic Theological Society of America* 36 (1981): 56-82.

- Kodell, Jerome. *The Eucharist in the New Testament*. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1988.
- LaCugna, Catherine Mowry. *God For Us: The Trinity and Christian Life*. San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1991.
- Lamberts, Jozef. "Active Participation as the Gateway Towards an Ecclesial Liturgy." In *Omnes Circumstadnes: Contributions towards a History of the Role of the People in the Liturgy*, edited by Charles Caspers and Marc Schneiders, 234-261. Uitgeversmattschappij. Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1990.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "“Who Should Communicate?’, Or the Act of Communion as the Summit of Active Participation,” *Le Questions Liturgiques* 69 (1988): 193-205.
- Lanne, Emmanuel. "The Local Church: Its Catholicity and Apostolicity." *One in Christ* 6 (1970): 288-313.
- Legrand, Hervé-Marie. "The Presidency of the Eucharist According to the Ancient Tradition." In *Living Bread, Saving Cup*. Edited by R. Kevin Seasoltz, 196-221. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1987.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Revaluation of Local Churches: Some Theological Implications." In *The Unifying Role of the Bishop*, edited by Edward Schillebeeckx, 53-64. New York: Herder and Herder, 1972.
- Lopes, Stephen J. "From the Trinity to the Eucharist: Towards a Trinitarian Theology of the Sacrifice of Christ and its Representation in the Eucharist of the Church." S.T.D. diss., Pontifica Universitas Gregorian, 2005.
- Massa, Mark. "Frederick R. McManus, *Worship*, and the Reception of Vatican II in the United States." *Worship* 81 (2007): 121-141.
- Timothy F. Lull, ed. *Martin Luther's Basic Theological Writings*. Minneapolis, Fortress Pres, 1989.
- Mazza, Enrico. *The Celebration of the Eucharist: The Origin of the Rite and the Development of Its Interpretation*. Translated by Matthew J. O'Connell. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1999.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Eucharistic Prayers of the Roman Rite*. Translated by Matthew J. O'Connell. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1986.
- McBrien, Richard. *Catholicism*, 3d ed. London: Geoffrey Chapman, 1994.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Ecclesiology of the Local Church." *Thought* 66 (1991): 359-367.

- McDonnell, Kilian. *The Other Hand of God: The Holy Spirit as the Universal Touch and Goal*. Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 2003.
- McKenna, John H. "Eucharistic Epiclesis: Myopia or Microcosm?" *Theological Studies* 36 (1975): 265-284.
- McManus, Frederick R. "Communion Song." *Worship* 32 (1958): 510-513.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Liturgical Participation: An Ongoing Assessment*. Washington, District of Columbia: The Pastoral Press, 1988.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The New Rite of Mass," *Worship* 39 (1965): 67-88.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The New Rite of Mass," *Worship* 39 (1965): 139-165.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Sacred Music in the Teaching of the Church." In *Crisis in Church Music?* 14-26. Washington: Liturgical Conference, 1976.
- McNamara, Brian. "Christus Patiens in Mass and Sacraments: Higher Perspectives." *Irish Theological Quarterly* 42 (1975): 17-35.
- McPartlan, Paul. "The Eucharist as the Basis for Ecclesiology." *Antiphon* 6 (2001): 12-19.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Eucharist Makes the Church: Henri de Lubac and John Zizioulas in Dialogue*. Edinburgh: T and T Clark, 1993.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Liturgy, Church, and Society." *Studia Liturgica* 34 (2004): 147-164.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Presbyteral Ministry in Roman Catholic Church." *Ecclesiology* 1 (2005): 11-24.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Sacrament of Salvation: An Introduction to Eucharistic Ecclesiology*. London: T and T Clark, 1995.
- Metzger, Marcel. *History of the Liturgy: The Major Stages*. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1997.
- Meyer, Hans Bernhard. "A Trinitarian Theology of Liturgy and Sacrament." Translated by Hugh M. Riley, 1-26. Kilmartin Archives, Jesuit Boston College.
- Mitchell, Nathan. *Cult and Controversy: The Worship of the Eucharist Outside Mass*. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1990.
- Mohlbert, Leo Cunibert. ed., *Sacramentarium Veronense, Rerum Ecclesiasticarum Documenta, Series Maior*, Fontes I. Rome: Herder, 1966.

- Möhrer, Johann Adam. *Unity in the Church or The Principle of Catholicism*. Translated and Edited by Peter C. Erb. Washington, District of Columbia: The Catholic University of America Press, 1996.
- Moloney, Raymond. *Our Eucharistic Prayers in Worship, Preaching, and Study*. Wilmington, Delaware: Michael Glazier Books, 1985.
- Mühlen, Heribert. *Sein und Person nach Johannes Duns Scotus. Beitrag zur Grundlegung einer Metaphysik der Person*. Werl: Dietrich-Coelde-Verlag, 1954.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Person of the Holy Spirit." In *The Holy Spirit and Power: The Catholic Charismatic Renewal*, edited by Kilian McDonnell, 25-29. Garden City, New York: Doubleday and Company, Inc., 1975.
- Nicholas, Aidan. *Yves Congar*. Wilton, Connecticut: Morehouse-Barlow, 1989.
- Nocent, Adrien. "The Local Church as Realization of the Church of Christ and Subject of the Eucharist." In *The Reception of Vatican II*, trans. Matthew O'Connell, edited by Giuseppe Alberigo et al., 215-229. Washington, District of Columbia: The Catholic University of America Press, 1987.
- O'Callaghan, Denis, "The Theory of the 'Mysteriengegenwart' of Dom Odo Casel, A Controversial Subject in Modern Theology," *Irish Ecclesiastical Record* 90 (1958): 246-262.
- O'Carroll, Michael. *Corpus Christi: An Encyclopedia of the Eucharist*. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1988.
- O'Donnell, Christopher. *Ecclesia: A Theological Encyclopedia of the Church*. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1996.
- O'Donnell, John. *Hans Urs von Balthasar*. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 1992.
- O'Donnell, John J. "In Him and Over Him: the Holy Spirit in the Life of Jesus," *Gregorianum* 70 (1989): 25-45.
- O'Keefe, Donald. "Sacramental Sexuality and Ordination of Women." *Communion* 5 (1978): 228-251.
- O'Neill, Colman E. *Opus Operans, Opus Operatum: A Thomistic Interpretation of a Sacramental Formula*. Washington: International Pontifical Athenaeum "Angelicum," 1958.

- Osborne, Kenan B. *Christian Sacraments in a Postmodern World: A Theology for the Third Millennium*. New York: Paulist Press, 1999.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Sacramental Theology: A General Introduction*. New York: Paulist Press, 1988.
- Palmer, Paul. "The Authenticity of Christian Ministry." *Communio* 3 (1976): 272-279.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Sacraments and Worship*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1954.
- Pannenberg, Wolfhart. *Jesus—God and Man*. London: SCM, 1968.
- Pierce, Joanne M and John F. Romano, "The *Ordo Missae* of the Roman Rite: Historical Background." In *A Commentary on the Order of Mass of the Roman Missal*, edited by Edward Foley, 3-33. Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 2011.
- Pivarnik, Robert Gabriel, "Towards a Trinitarian Theology of Liturgical Participation in the Writings of Cipriano Vagaggini, OSB, and Edward J. Kilmartin, SJ., S.T.D. diss., The Catholic University of America, 2009.
- Pott, Thomas. "Une réflexion spirituelle et mystagogique renouvelée sur la participation Active," 70-82. In *The Active Participation Revisited: La participation active 100 ans après Pie X et 40 ans après Vatican II*, edited by Josef Lamberts. Leuven: Peeters, 2004.
- Power, David N. *The Eucharistic Mystery: Revitalizing the Tradition*, Crossroad, New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1995.
- Powers, Joseph M. *Eucharistic Theology*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1967.
- Prétot, Patrick. "Retrouver la 'participation active' tâche pour Aujourd'hui," *La Maison-Dieu* 242 (2005):151-177.
- Prusak, Bernard P. *The Church Unfinished: Ecclesiology Through Centuries*. Mahwah, New Jersey: Paulist Press, 2004.
- Rahner, Hugh. *Greek Myths and Christian Mysteries*. Translated by Brian Battershaw, London: Burns and Oates, 1957.
- Rahner, Karl. *Bishops: Their Status and Functions*. Translated by Edward Quinn. London: 1964.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Church and the Sacraments*. Translated by W. J. O'Hara. New York: Herder and Herder, 1963.

- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Concept of Mystery in Catholic Theology." *Theological Investigation* 4. Translated by Kevin Smyth, 36-73. New York: Crossroad, 1985.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Dogmatic Reflection on the Knowledge and Self-Consciousness of Christ." *Theological Investigation* 5. Translated by Karl-H. Kruger. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1966.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Jesus Christ." In *Encyclopedia of Theology: The Concise Sacramentum Mundi*, 730-772. New York: Seabury, 1975.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The New Image of the Church." *Theological Investigation* 10. Translated by David Bourke, 3-29. New York: Crossroad, 1977.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Presence of the Lord in the Christian Community at Worship." *Theological Investigations* 10. Translated by David Bourke, 71-83. New York: The Seabury Press, 1977.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Reflections on the Unity of Love of Neighbour and the Love of God." *Theological Investigation* 6. Translated by Karl-H and Boniface Kruger, 231-249. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 1969.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Some Implications of the Scholastic Concept of Uncreated Grace." *Theological Investigations* 1. Translated by Cornelius Ernst, 319-346. Darton, London: Longman and Todd, 1961.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Trinity*. Translated by Joseph Doncel. New York: Burns and Oates, 1970.
- Rahner, Karl and Angelus Häussling. *The Celebration of the Eucharist*. Translated by W. J. O'Hara. New York: Herder and Herder. 1968.
- Rahner, Karl and Joseph Ratzinger. *The Episcopate and the Primacy*. Translated by Kenneth Barker. New York: Herder and Herder, 1962.
- Ratzinger, Joseph. "The Pastoral Implications of Episcopal Collegiality," *Concilium* 1 (1965): 20-34.
- Ritschl, Dietrich. *The Logic of Theology: A Brief Account of the Relationship between Basic Concepts in Theology*. Translated by John Bowden. Pennsylvania: Fortress Press, 1987.
- Rocha, Pedro Romano. "The Principle Manifestation of the Church (SC 41)." In *Vatican II: Assessment and Perspectives*, edited by René Latourelle, Vol. 2, 3-26. Mahwah, New York: Paulist Press, 1989.

- Rosato, Philip J. "Priesthood of the Baptized and Priesthood of the Ordained." *Gregorianum* 68 (1987): 215-266.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Spirit Christology: Ambiguity and Promise." *Theological Studies* 38 (1977): 423-449.
- Ryan, Seamus. "Episcopal Consecration: The Fullness of the Sacrament of Orders." *Irish Theological Quarterly* 32 (1965): 295-324.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Episcopal Consecration: The Legacy of Schoolmen." *Irish Theological Quarterly* 33 (1966): 295-334.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Vatican II: The Re-Discovery of the Episcopate." *Irish Theological Quarterly* 33 (1966): 208-241.
- Sanders, Peter C. "Pneumatology in the Sacramental Theologies of Geoffrey Wainwright, Jean Corbon and Edward Kilmartin." *Worship* 68 (1994): 332-352.
- Schaefer, Mary M. "Twelfth Century Latin Commentaries on the Mass: Christological and Ecclesiological Dimension." Ph.D. diss., University of Notre Dame, 1983.
- Scheeben, Matthias Joseph, *The Mysteries of Christianity*. Translated by Cyril Vollert. St. Louis, Missouri: B. Herder Book Co., 1946.
- Schillebeeckx, Edward. *Christ the Sacrament of the Encounter with God*. Translated by Paul Barrett. New York: Rowman and Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1963.
- Schoonenberg, Piet. "Spirit Christology and Logos Christology." *Bijdragen* 38 (1977): 350-375.
- Scotus, John Duns. *God and Creatures: The Quodlibetal Questions*. Translated by Felix Alluntis and Allan B. Wolter. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1975.
- Searle, Mark. *Called to Participate: Theological, Ritual, and Social Perspectives*. Edited by Barbara Searle and Anne Y. Koester. Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 2006.
- Seasoltz, R. Kevin. "Monsignor Frederick R. McManus 8 February 1923-27 November 2005." *Worship* 80 (2006): 98-101.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The New Liturgy: A Documentation, 1903-1965*. New York: Herder and Herder, 1966.

- Serra, Dominic E. "Baptism and Confirmation: Distinct Sacraments, One Liturgy." *Liturgical Ministry* 9 (2000): 63-71.
- Staniloae, Dumitru. "The Procession of the Holy Spirit from the Father and His Relation to the Son, as the Basis of our Deification and Adoption." In *Spirit of God, Spirit of Christ: Ecumenical Reflections on the Filioque Controversy*, edited by Lukas Fischer, 174-186. London: SPCK and WCC, 1981.
- Söhngen, Gottlieb. "Christi Gegenwart in uns durch den Glauben (Eph 3, 17): Ein vergessener Gegenstand unserer Verkündigung von der Messe." In *Die Messe in der Glaubensverkündigung*, edited by Franz Xaver Arnold and Balthasar Fischer, 14-28. Freiburg: Herder, 1953.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Der wesensaufbau des Mysteriums*, Grenzfragen zwischen Theologie und Philosophie 6. Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1938.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *Das sakramentale Wesen des Messopfers*. Essen: Augustin Wibbelt, 1946.
- Taille, Maurice de la. "Created Actuation by Uncreated Act." In *The Hypostatic Union and Created Actuation by Uncreated Act*, translated by Cyril Vollert, 29-41. West Baden Springs, Indiana: West Baden College, 1952.
- Tillmanus, F. "The Sacraments as Symbolical Reality of Faith." In *Fides sacramenti sacramentum Fidei*, edited by H. J. Auf der Maur et al., 253-276. Assen, the Netherlands: Van Gorcum, 1981.
- Tillard, J. M. R. *The Bishop of Rome*. Translated by Jonh de Stag . *Theology and Life* 5. Wilmington, Delaware: Glazier, 1983.
- \_\_\_\_\_. *The Eucharist: Pasch of God's People*. Translated by Dennis L. Wienk. Staten Island, New York: Alba House, 1967.
- Vagaggini, Cipriano. *The Canon of the Mass and Liturgical Reform*. Translated by Peter Coughlan. Staten Island, New York: Alba House, 1967.
- Vogel, Cyrille. *Medieval Liturgy: An Introduction to the Sources*. Translated by Willian G. Storey and Niels Krogh Rasmussen. Washington, District of Columbia: The Pastoral Press, 1986.
- Vondey, Wolfgang. *Heribert M hlen: His Theology and Praxis: A New Profile on the Church*. New York: University Press of America, 2004.
- Vonier, Dom Anscar. *A Key to the Doctrine of the Eucharist*. Eugene, Oregon: Wipf and Stock Publishers, 1925.



- Wainwright, Geoffrey. "Theology of Worship." In *The New Westminster Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship*, edited by Paul Bradshaw, 454-457. Louisville, London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2002.
- Weakland, Rambert. "Images of the Church: From 'Perfect Society' to 'God's People on Pilgrimage'." In *Unfinished Journey: The Church 40 Year After Vatican II*, ed. Austen Ivereigh, 78-90. London: Continuum, 2003.
- White, James F. *Roman Catholic Worship: Trent to Today*. Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 2003.
- Williams, A. N. "Congar's Theology of the Laity." In *Yves Congar: Theologian of the Church*, edited by Gabriel Flynn, 135-159. Louvain: Peeters Press, 2005.
- Willis, Kimberly Anne. "Odo Casel: Reclaiming the Mystery in Liturgy." In *Primary Sources of Liturgical Theology: A Reader*, edited by Dwight W. Vogel, 16-17. Collegeville, Minnesota: The Liturgical Press, 2000.
- Witczak, Michael G. "The Manifold Presence of Christ in the Liturgy," *Theological Studies* 59 (1998): 680-702.
- Wood, Susan. "A Liturgical Theology of the Episcopacy." In *Unfailing Patience and Sound Teaching: Reflections on Episcopal Ministry in Honor of Rembert G. Weakland, O.S.B.*, edited by David A. Stosur, 31-44. Collegeville, Minnesota: Liturgical Press, 2003.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "The Sacramentality of Episcopal Consecration." *Theological Studies* 51 (1990): 479-496.
- Zizioulas, John D. *Being as Communion: Studies in Personhood and the Church*. With a foreword by John Meyendorff. Crestwood, New York: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 2002.