

Pneumatology (Theology of the Holy Spirit) in the Liturgical Theology and Practice of Catholicism and Orthodoxy



- **But you, beloved, build yourselves up on your most holy faith; pray in the Holy Spirit; (Jude 1:20)**

INTRODUCTION

- **Alexander Schmemmann “saw the contemporary Church caught in what he termed a *eucharistic crisis*, which expresses itself in a lack of cohesion between what is accomplished in the liturgy and how it is perceived”**
- **What were the causes of this crisis?**
- **Does it still exist?**
- **Is it the same for both Western and Eastern Christianity?**
- **Can understanding the historical development of the Eucharist help resolve the crisis?**

- AS IN MANY CASES A SHARED TRADITION BETWEEN EAST AND WEST IN THE 1ST MILLENIUM BREAKS DOWN IN THE MEDIEVAL PERIOD WITH THE RISE OF SCHOLASTICISM. IN THE MODERN PERIOD'S REDISCOVERY AND APPRECIATION OF BIBLICAL AND PATRISTIC THOUGHT THERE ARISES A RENEWED SENSE OF THE COMMON HERITAGE.

THE EARLY FORMATION OF THE EUCHARISTIC CELEBRATION AND THE EPICLESIS

- In Saint Paul's First Letter to the Corinthians, there is found the oldest passage in the New Testament concerning the actual celebration of the Eucharist:
- 23 For I received from the Lord what I also handed on to you, that the Lord Jesus, on the night he was handed over, took bread, 24 and, after he had given thanks, broke it and said, "This is my body that is for you. Do this in remembrance of me." 25 In the same way also the cup, after supper, saying, "This cup is the new covenant in my blood. Do this, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of me." 26 For as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the death of the Lord until he comes.
- 27 Therefore whoever eats the bread or drinks the cup of the Lord unworthily will have to answer for the body and blood of the Lord.
- 1 Corinthians 11:23-27 New American Bible (Revised Edition/NABRE)

- **THE DEBATE OVER THE MEANING OF “EPICLESIS” IN THE BIBLICAL CHURCH**
- **J.W. TYRER, ANGLICAN SCHOLAR, IN 1917 WROTE IN HIS BOOK, *THE EUCHARISTIC EPICLESIS*; “EUCHARISTIA DEFINELY SIGNIFIES A *THANKSGIVING*; EPICLESIS EQUALLY DEFINITELY A SOLEMN *PETITION*.**
- **R.H. CONNOLLY, BRITISH BENEDICTINE AND LITURGICAL SCHOLAR TOOK A DIFFERENT APPROACH, HE WRITES IN THE *DOWNSIDE REVIEW* IN 1923. “MY THESIS IS THAT HERE THE CHARACTERISTIC USE OF THE WORDS**

- **‘INVOCATION’ ‘INVOKE,’ IS NOT TO EXPRESS THE IDEA OF PETITION, BUT TO DESIGNATE THIS OR THAT RELIGIOUS FORMULA AS ONE INVOLVING THE USE OF NAMES - WEATHER IT BE NAMES OR TITLES GIVEN TO GOD,... .”**
- **ONE OF THE LEADING CATHOLIC LITURGICAL REFORMERS, O. CASEL OF MARIA LAACH, IN 1923 HE WROTE IN *NEUE BEITRÄGE EPIKLSENFRAGE*, “RATHER, THE EPICLESIS IS A NAMING OF THE**

- **DIVINE NAME AND A CALLING DOWN
...SOMETIMES ONE COMES TO THE
FOREFRONT, SOMETIMES THE OTHER.
THE BAPTISMAL FORMULA IS,
THEREFORE, A REAL EPICLESIS
BECAUSE THE DIVINE NAME IS
PRONOUNCED OVER THE ONE BEING
BAPTIZED, EVEN THOUGH NO
'INVOCATION,' IN THE SENSES OF A
PETITION, TAKES PLACE."**

- “IN 1949, F. NOTSCHER... COMPLAINS THAT CONNOLLY, TYRER, AND CASEL AND PASCHER LOOK TO THE HISTORY OF RELIGIONS, EARLY CHRISTIAN AND PROFANE GREEK AND ROMAN LITERATURE, AND HELLENISM IN GENERAL, FOR THE ORIGIN OF THE EPICLESIS. THEY SHOULD HAVE BEEN LOOKING MORE TO THE BIBLE AND ESPECIALLY THE OLD TESTAMENT FOR THE SOURCE OF THIS ELEMENT OF EARLY CHRISTIAN WORSHIP. THERE THEY WOULD FIND THAT THE IDEA OF CALLING SOMEONE’S NAME UPON A PERSON OR

- A THING IS VERY MUCH AT HOME IN THE OLD TESTAMENT. HAND AND HAND WITH THIS CALLING OR NAMING GOES A CERTAIN POSSESSION BY THE ONE NAMED OF THE PERSON OR THING UPON WHICH THE NAME IS INVOKED. THIS IN TURN IMPLIES A DEPENDENCE ON THE PERSON NAMED BUT ALSO A CONFIDENCE THAT WHEN THAT PERSON IS CALLED UPON, E.G. IN PRAYER, HE WILL RESPOND WITH HELP AND PROTECTION.” (FROM, *THE EUCHARISTIC EPICLESIS: A DETAILED HISTORY FROM THE PATRISTIC TO THE MODERN ERA*, BY JOHN H. MCKENNA, CM)

PRIOR TO NICEA, WHICH FIRST APPEARED IN 1955, J. BETZ ATTEMPTS A SYNTHESIS OF THE AFOREMENTIONED POSITIONS. ...THE EPICLESIS PRESENTS THE TRANSFER TO, OR THE TAKING OVER OF THE ELEMENTS BY, GOD. THIS TAKES PLACE THROUGH THE NAMING OF GOD'S NAME OVER THE GIFTS. THIS NAMING OF THE NAME IMPLIES A CALLING UPON GOD TO BE PRESENT HERE AND NOW AND TO TAKE THESE GIFTS INTO HIS POSSESSION, FILL THEM WITH HIS POWER AND THUS TRANSFORM THEM INTO THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST.

...

- THUS TYRER'S STRESSING OF THE APPEAL CHARACTER OF THE EPICLESIS BRINGS OUT ITS EXISTENTIAL ASPECT. CONNOLLY'S EMPHASIS ON THE NAMING OF THE NAME UNDERLINES ITS OBJECTIVE CHARACTER AND NÖTSCHER CALLS ATTENTION TO THE PURPOSE OF THE EPICLESIS. ...CASEL DESREVES CREDIT FOR HIS EFFORTS TO BALANCE BOTH THESE ASPECTS." [THE EXISTENTIAL AND THE OBJECTIVE] (FROM, *THE EUCHARISTIC EPICLESIS: A DETAILED HISTORY FROM THE PATRISTIC TO THE MODERN ERA*, BY JOHN H. MCKENNA, CM)

- Anaphora of the Apostolic Tradition/Anaphora of Hippolytus
- The dating of this anaphora is strictly related to the attribution of the [Apostolic Tradition](#) which includes it. In 1906 Eduard von der Goltz was the first to suggest that the anonymous [manuscript](#) discovered in the 19th century was the Apostolic Tradition historically attributed to [Hippolytus of Rome](#), thus dating the anaphora to the mid [3rd century AD](#) and using it in reconstructing the early worship in [Rome](#). This understanding was subsequently accepted by the great majority of scholars of the 20th century, including [Gregory Dix](#), and played a crucial role in the liturgical reforms of main mainstream Christian bodies.

- In recent scholarship, it has been suggested that the attribution to Hippolytus and suggests that the Apostolic Tradition is a composite work modified over the centuries. According to this view, the anaphora probably attained its final form around the middle of the [4th century](#) and is not related to Rome but to [West Syria](#) or even to [Egypt](#). Some scholars also suggest that the Apostolic Tradition portrays a liturgy that was never celebrated.

- Epiclesis from the Apostolic Tradition:
- And we pray that you would send your Holy Spirit
- to the oblation of your Holy Church.
- In their gathering together,
- give to all those who partake of your holy mysteries the fullness of the Holy Spirit,
- toward the strengthening of the faith in truth,

THE CLEMENTINE LITURGY OF THE

- The Apostolic Constitutions include the six books of the Didascalia plus two additional books that appeared about 380, probably of Syrian origin or possibly from Constantinople. They include a detailed description of a liturgy, Antiochene in character but (very likely incorrectly) attributed to Pope Saint Clement of Rome and the Apostles. This sort of attribution was common in religious work of the ancient world, meaning not so much that the liturgy came from the Apostles, but that the writer feels that it comes from a high quality source.

THE EPICLESIS IN THE CLEMENTINE LITURGY

- And do Thou accept them, to the honour of Thy Christ, and send down upon this sacrifice Thine Holy Spirit, the Witness of the Lord Jesus' sufferings, that He may show this bread to be the body of Thy Christ, and the cup to be the blood of Thy Christ, that those who are partakers thereof may be strengthened for piety, may obtain the remission of their sins, may be delivered from the devil and his deceit, may be filled with the Holy Ghost, may be made worthy of Thy Christ, and may obtain eternal, life upon Thy reconciliation to them, O Lord Almighty.

- **THE ANAPHORA IS ADDRESSED TO GOD THE FATHER THROUGHOUT. THE FATHER IS ASKED TO SEND THE HOLY SPIRIT UPON THE SACRIFICE SO THAT HE MAY SHOW OR DECLARE THE BREAD AND WINE TO BE THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST.**

- the Epiclesis SYRIAN ANAPHORA OF THE
APOSTLES ADDAI AND MARI
- And may there come, o my Lord, thine Holy Spirit and rest upon this offering of thy servants and bless it and hallow it that it be to us, o my Lord, for the pardon of offences and the remission of sins and for the great hope of resurrection from the dead and for new life in the kingdom of heaven with all those who have been wellpleasing in thy sight.

- While the Eastern and Oriental Orthodox Churches generally deny even the validity of the apostolic succession of the Church of the East, and thus the validity of its priesthood, the Catholic Church has always recognized its validity. Still some Catholics questioned the validity of the consecration in the absence of the Words of Institution because the Council of Florence had declared that the words (in Catholic theology, the "form") of the sacrament of the Eucharist are "the words of the Savior with which he effected this sacrament", words that the same council indicated as "This is my body" and "This is the chalice of my blood".

- Nevertheless, the Catholic Church never officially contested the validity of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari. In the closing decades of the 20th century, ecumenical rapprochement with the Assyrian Church of the East and the situation of the by then widely scattered Assyrian and Chaldean Christians who lacked a priest of their own Church made more acute the issue of the validity of the Eucharistic consecration of the form of the Anaphora of Addai and Mari that did not include the Words of Institution, as used by the Assyrian Christians, while the [Eastern Catholic Churches](#) that use the East Syriac Rite include in their versions of this liturgy the Institution narrative, with its [Words of Institution](#). Accordingly, on 20 July 2001 the [Holy See](#) declared that the Anaphora of Addai and Mari can be considered valid. Three reasons were given for this judgment. First, the Anaphora of Addai and Mari dates back to the [early Church](#). Secondly, the [Church of the East](#) has otherwise preserved the orthodox faith in regard to the [Eucharist](#) and [Holy Orders](#). And finally, though the Words of Institution are not spoken expressly, their meaning is present: "The words of Eucharistic Institution are indeed present in the Anaphora of Addai and Mari, not in a coherent narrative way and ad litteram, but rather in a dispersed euchological way, that is, integrated in successive prayers of thanksgiving, praise and intercession"

- **IN THE LATER WESTERN TRADITION THE ROMAN CANON, THE GALLICAN RITE, AND THE MOZARABIC RITE PRESENT PROBLEMS AS TO IF THERE IS AN EXPLICIT EPICLESIS, AND IF SO WHICH PRAYER IS IT. FOR EXAMPLE IN THE ROMAN CANON IS IT THE *QUAM OBLATIONEM* OR THE *SUPPLICES* OR IS THERE ONE?**

THE RISE OF THE MOMENT OF CONSECRATION QUESTION

- **THERE WAS NO DISPUTE OVER THE VALUE OF THE EPICLESIS IN THE CONSECRATION UNTIL THE QUESTION OF THE “MOMENT OF CONSECRATION” BECAME A MAJOR QUESTION.**

- ST. JOHN OF DAMASCUS (DAMASCENE) died 749, TOOK THE POSITION OF A CONSECRATORY EPICLESIS , BUT ALSO SAID THE WORDS OF INSTITUTION WAS THE CONDITION WITHOUT QUESTION FOR THE TRANSFORMATION OF THE GIFTS.
- DEACON EPIPHANIUS USED THE THOUGHT OF THE DAMASCENE AT THE SECOND COUNCIL OF NICEA (737) TO ATTACK THE ICONOCLASTS, AND DEFEND THE REAL PRESENCE OF CHRIST IN THE EUCHARIST.

- THE QUESTION OF “MOMENT OF CONSECRATION” TAKES PLACE WITH THE RISE OF SCHOLASTICISM IN THE WEST, WITH ITS NEED FOR RATIONAL SPECULATION AND PRECISION.
- THE MAKE-UP OF ALL THE SACRAMENTS OR MYSTERIES HAD TO BE EXPLAINED WITHIN THE CONTEXT OF THE HYLOMORPHIC THEORY - THAT BEING “MATTER” AND “FORM”.

- THE PROBLEM IS THAT IF PRIORITY IS GIVEN TO THE PURELY PHYSICAL ORDER OVER THE REDEEMING ACTIVITY OF THE HOLY TRINITY AND WITHIN THAT THE HOLY SPIRIT IS REPLACED BY A STATIC CONCEPT OF THE EUCHARIST.
- THIS BECAME EVIDENT IN THE PNEUMATOLOGY, LITURGY AND ASSOCIATED SPIRITUALITY OF THE EUCHARIST IN THE WEST. FOR EXAMPLE THE ELEVATION OF THE HOST SHOWS THE SHIFTING MENTALITY OF THE TIME.

SAINT THOMAS AQUINAS, d.1274

- **SAINT THOMAS WROTES IN THE *SUMMA*:
“WHENCE IT MUST BE SAID THAT IF THE
PRIEST UTTERS ONLY THE
AFOREMENTIONED WORDS [HOC EST
CORPUS MEUM] WITH THE INTENTION OF
CONFECTING THIS SACRAMENT, THIS
SACRAMENT WILL BE EFFECTED;
BECAUSE THE INTENTION CAUSES THESE
WORDS TO BE UNDERSTOOD AS THOUGH
THEY WERE OFFERED IN CHRIST’S
PERSON, EVEN IF THE WORDS PRECEDING
THIS ARE NOT SAID.”**

- HOWEVER, ALTHOUGH SAINT THOMAS MAY NOT HAVE APPRECIATED THE ROLE OF THE EPICLESIS , HE DID CLEARLY TEACH THE ROLE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE CONSECRATION.
- EVEN AT THE ATTEMPT OF REUNION BETWEEN EAST AND WEST AT THE COUNCIL OF LYON IN 1274 THERE WAS NO MAJOR DISPUTE OVER THE CONSECRATORY VALUE OF THE EPICLESIS.
- THE DISPUTE COMES TO THE FOREFRONT IN THE 14TH CENTURY AND THE USE OF THE TERM “TRANSUBSTANTIATION ”

- TRANSUBSTANTIATION = THE INSTANTANEOUS REPLACING OF ONE SUBSTANCE WITH ANOTHER.
- WHEN THE QUESTION OF “FORM” IS ADDED TO THAT OF “MATTER” (BREAD AND WINE), THE INSTANTANEOUS MOMENT THAT CHANGES THE “FORM” INTO THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST BECAME THE *WORDS OF INSTITUTION*.

THE EASTERN RESPONSE OF SAINT NICHOLAS CABASILAS, d.1392

- “For God himself has said that he answers prayer and grants the Holy Spirit to those who ask, and nothing is impossible to those who pray in faith, and his assurance cannot be untrue. It is nowhere stated that this will happen to those who simply speak this or that word. It is the tradition of the Fathers who received this teaching from the Apostles and from their successors, that the sacraments are rendered effective through prayer; all the sacraments, as I have said, and particularly the Holy Eucharist.”

COUNCIL OF FLORENCE, 1439

- **THE ATTEMPT AT UNIFICATION WITH THE COUNCIL OF FLORENCE WAS INFLUENCED GREATLY BY THE POLITICAL CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE BYZANTINE EMPEROR AND THE EMPIRE ITSELF AS IT WAS NEARING ITS END WITH THE ONSLAUGHT OF THE TURKS.**
- **ALSO POPE EUGENE IV REALIZED THE POLITICAL CIRCUMSTANCES COULD LEND ITSELF TO THE UNIFICATION OF EAST AND WEST HE SO DESIRED.**

PRELATES WERE DIVIDED ON THEIR ACCEPTANCE OR REJECTION OF WESTERN SCHOLASTIC INTERPRETATIONS OF VARIOUS ISSUES, INCLUDING THE EPICLESIS

- **FOR EXAMPLE CARDINAL BESSARION, METROPOLITAN OF NICEA ATTEMPTED TO ARGUE THAT SAINT JOHN CHRYSOSTOM SUPPORTED THE WORDS OF INSTITUTION AS THAT WHICH EFFECTS THE TRANSUBSTANTIATION.**
- **MARK EUGENICUS, METROPOLITAN OF EPHESUS, TOOK THE POSITION THAT THE WORDS OF INSTITUTION NEEDED THE**

**THE CONTRIBUTION OF
ALEXANDER SCHMEMANN
(1921-1983)**

- **THROUGH HIS (NEO-PATRISTIC) LITURGICAL THEOLOGY, SCHMEMANN IN MANY WAYS REPRESENTS AN ECUMENICAL SYNTHESIS OF THE HISTORICAL DATA CONCERNING THE EPICLESIS AND THEREFORE THE ACTION OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE EUCHARISTIC LITURGY.**

- **THE INFLUENCES UPON SCHMEMANN'S THOUGHT WERE MANY AND VARIED; KARTASHEV, FLOROVSKY, KERN, DANIÉLOU, BOUYER, MEYENDORFF, AND AFANASSIEV.**

- What does it mean to say that Schmemmann developed a theology of the liturgy? The foundational response to this question is found in Schmemmann's reflections on the Pauline text of I Corinthians 11:18, in his book *The Eucharist – Sacrament of the Kingdom* he gives the following interpretation:
- “WHEN YOU ASSEMBLE AS A CHURCH...” writes the apostle Paul to the Corinthians. For him, as for all the early Christians these words refer not to a temple but to the nature and purpose of the gathering. As is well known, the very word “church” – Ecclesia means “a gathering” or “an assembly,” and to “assemble as a church” meant, in the minds of early Christians, to constitute a gathering whose purpose is to reveal, to realize, the Church.

- **This gathering is *eucharistic* – its end and fulfillment lies in it being the setting wherein the “Lord’s supper” is accomplished, wherein the Eucharistic “breaking of the bread” takes place. In the same epistle St. Paul reproaches the Corinthians for partaking of a meal other than the Lord’s supper in their gathering, or assembling for a purpose other than the Eucharistic breaking of bread (11:20-22ff). Thus, from the very beginning we can see an obvious, undoubted triunity of the *assembly*, the *eucharistic* and the *Church*, to which the whole early tradition of the Church, following St. Paul, unanimously testifies. The fundamental task of liturgical theology consists therefore in uncovering the meaning and essence of this unity”**

- In his book *For the Life of the World*, Schmemmann explains the problem posed by Scholasticism:
- What is “sacrament”? In answering this question the post-patristic Western and “westernizing” theology places itself within a mental context deeply, if not radically, different from that of the early Church.
- Externally or formally this change consisted, first of all, in a new approach by sacramental theology to the very object of its study. In the early Church, in the writings of the Fathers, sacraments, inasmuch as they are given any systematic interpretation, are always explained in the context of their actual liturgical celebration, the explanation being, in fact, an exegesis of the liturgy itself in all its ritual complexity and concreteness. The medieval *De Sacramentis*, however, tends from its very inception to isolate the “sacrament” from its liturgical context, to find and define in terms as precise as possible its essence, i.e., that which distinguishes it from the “non-sacrament.” Sacrament in a way begins to be opposed to liturgy.

- What has occurred is a mental shift from that of time of the Fathers, a change of focus and intent. The focus of theology is no longer the totality of the Church, revealed in the sacraments, but rather 'objects' seen in isolation of each other. The intent of theology is not ascendancy to the Holy Trinity and the Kingdom, but rather the justification of divine power in the sacraments, clerical power in governing the Church and 'canon law' to validate both, creating an ecclesiology more concerned with the visible community of the Church on earth, than the 'life of the world to come'.

- **What was at the heart of this change in western theology, which would later influence the East, was a loss of the sense of *symbolism* as manifesting and participating in that which is *real*. In this way of thinking, liturgy, which was so important to the Fathers in understanding the sacraments, became seen as symbolic and secondary. The matter of the sacraments, bread and wine in the case of eucharist and, after the Eucharistic prayer, the body and blood of Christ, became the objects and moment of theological concern. Observation of language bears this point out, for the term Eucharist which once meant the whole sacramental action, now became identified only with the consecrated gifts**

- Schmemmann says in *For the Life of the World*, that the dispute over the ‘moment’ of change, lead to the disappearance of the understanding, that the “Eucharist {is the} one organic, all-embracing and all-transforming act of the whole Church... .”
- Even while not accepting the Scholastic approach of the West, Schmemmann felt the Orthodox has allowed themselves to draw into this dispute of “moment” and words of institution or epiclesis.

- Schmemmann noted that this was not question for the Fathers of the Church, who understood the total liturgical celebration as being eucharistic in nature.
- He felt that when the West lost its understanding of the relationship between “reality” and “symbol” - it also lost the primitive and patristic experience of the total celebration of the sacrament as being the Eucharist.

- Schmemmann in *The Eucharist - Sacrament of the Kingdom* addresses the Orthodox situation in this way:
- “I am convinced, however, that the time has come to *recognize* this change and to understand that we are speaking here not of secondary details but of something infinitely essential for the Church and for our Christian life. For the Orthodox, the basis for the interpretations of the Eucharist forever remains the words of St. Irenaeus of Lyons: “our teaching is

- in accordance with the Eucharist, and the Eucharist, in turn, confirms our teaching.” Everything pertaining to the Eucharist pertains to the Church, and everything pertaining to the Church pertains to the Eucharist and is tested by this interdependence.
- It was within the context of his research of the “lex orandi” of the early Church, that Schmemmann developed his Liturgical Theology.

- It became apparent to him that the existential experience of liturgical worship was not a secondary topic, but the key to uncovering the sources of the faith. For primitive and patristic Christianity the “lex orandi” was the foundation of dogma, by quoting St. Irenaeus, Schmemmann discloses this fact that the Eucharist was the point where the “lex credendi” was tested, formed, and proclaimed. The eucharistic celebration was not something divided up into ‘moments’ and ‘objects’ of grace, rather in its totality it is the *moment* of the Church in its fullness.

- Schmemmann points out that the unity of belief and worship became lost in non-eucharistic theology; the fracturing between dogma, ecclesiology, and the Eucharist.
- The tenets of faith are seen in isolation from the reality of the Church and these are seen together as something separate from the Eucharist.

- Theology is left standing in a paradox, because it has destroyed that which was its gift - unity. The gift of the Holy Spirit which is 'communion' on the level of ontological reality, between the members of the Church and the Church with the triune God - this 'mystery of faith' suffers when its theological expression becomes handicapped by the creation of 'divisions' within it.

- The Church is not a library of doctrines that have been neatly catalogued into individual classifications, neither is it in the strict sense of the word a teacher of religious truths, rather it is an 'epiphany' of God's final and total revelation to humanity.
- In the following passage from *Of Water and the Spirit*, Schmemmann explains how this non-eucharistic theology has distorted ecclesiology:

- “In the early tradition Baptism, Chrismation and Eucharist “belong together,” If many people seem not to understand this sacramental *interdependence* - if they do not understand why, for the Fathers, Eucharist was “the sacrament of all sacraments,” the self-evident fulfillment of each of them - it is because, influenced by a certain theology, they do not understand the real meaning of the Eucharist for the Church and her life. For them, Eucharist is precisely one of the sacraments, one “means of grace” among many, and like all the others, aimed at the personal sanctification of the faithful. What they do not understand is the truly unique meaning of the Eucharist as the

- **SCHMEMANN'S REFLECTIONS HERE ARE GROUNDED IN A STUDY OF THE LIVED EXPERIENCE OF THE EARLY CHURCH, AS EXPRESSED IN THE 'UNITY' OF THE SACRAMENTS OF INITIATION - BAPTISM, CHRISMATION (CONFIRMATION), AND EUCHARIST. NON-EUCHARISTIC THEOLOGY DESTROYED THIS SACRAMENTAL MOVEMENT; BAPTISM BECAME THE SOLE SACRAMENT OF INITIATION, CHRISMATION (CONFIRMATION) LOST ALL MEANING IN THE WEST AND BECAME A MOMENT OF ADULT RATIONAL ACCEPTANCE OF THE FAITH, AND THE EUCHARIST BECAME ANOTHER MOMENT OF GRACE MEANS OF INDIVIDUAL PIETY**

- **SCHMEMANN POINTS OUT IN MANY OF HIS WORKS THAT WHAT IS LOST:**
- **THE CHURCH'S VISION OF THE TRIUNE GOD**
- **THE CHURCH'S KNOWLEDGE OF THE KINGDOM OF GOD AND REALIZED ESCHATOLOGY**
- **THE EUCHARIST HAS BEEN REPLACED BY CANON LAW AS THAT WHICH VALIDATES AND ORDERS THE CHURCH.**

- In “The Idea of Primacy in Orthodox Ecclesiology”, *The Primacy of Peter*. Schmemmann writes,
- “The life of the Church came to be expressed in juridical terms,... The ‘mystery of the Church’ was neither denied nor forgotten. It simply ceased to be understood as the only law...”.
- With the replacement of liturgy with law, the Church begins to resemble other human institutions and its concerns become less and less those things of the Kingdom and more and more how it can sustain itself in the world.

- While speaking the following to the Orthodox faithful in *The Eucharist - Sacrament of the Kingdom*, his words are just as important for Catholics and all Christians:
- “It is not reform, adjustments and modernization that are needed so much as a return to that vision and experience that from the beginning constituted the very life of the Church.”

- In many ways the following quote from *Of Water and the Spirit*, sums up the entire theological calling:
- “If we do not believe that the Holy Spirit guides the Church today as He guided her yesterday and shall guide her until the end of the world, that Christ is ‘the same yesterday, and today, and forever’ (Hebrews 13:8), then obviously we do not believe in the Church, and she is either a precious ‘cultural heritage’ to be preserved or an archaic past to be discarded.
- If however, we believe in the Church, then the study of her past has only one goal: to find, and to make ours again and again, that which in her teachings and

- life is truly *eternal*, i.e. which precisely transcends the categories of past, present, and future and has the power to transform our lives in all ages and situations.”
- The Church is not lead by us, but by the Spirit of Truth. If the Church is a mere human construction, then like all other artifacts, it can be shelved or even discarded once its service is done. However, if we believe that the Church is the ‘access’ to the Kingdom; renewal is merely to allow the essentials to shine more clearly in the life and teachings of the ecclesial community.

'SACRAMENT OF SACRAMENTS', IT IS THE
'EPIPHANY' OF THE CHURCH. THE
EUCCHARIST MAKES THE CHURCH BECAUSE
IT IS ITS ACCESS TO HEAVEN AND IN ITS
CELEBRATION ALL THAT IS ASSEMBLED,
REMEMBERED AND OFFERED IS
TRANSFORMED AND FULFILLED AT THE
MESSIANIC BANQUET OF THE KINGDOM.
THE EUCCHARIST IS THE DEEPEST REALITY
OF THE CHURCH, BECAUSE IN IT THE
POWER OF THE HOLY SPIRIT
ACCOMPLISHES ALL THAT IS GIVEN BY THE
FATHER, THROUGH THE SON. IN THE
EUCCHARIST THE HOLY SPIRIT
CONTINUALLY IS

- THE EPICLESIS AS CULMINATION OF THE ANAPHORA SAVES US FROM 'RATIONALIZING THE EUCHARIST' AND FROM EXCLUDING ANY PART OF THE LITURGY IN THIS ASCENT TO THE KINGDOM; "FOR THE WHOLE CHURCH, WITH THE MOTHER OF GOD AND ALL THE SAINTS AT HER HEAD, IS GATHERED ON THE DISKOS (PATEN) AND WITH THE BREAD AND WINE ARE TRANSFORMED AND MADE WORTHY.

- SCHMEMANN DIRECTS OUR ATTENTION IN HIS BOOK, *THE EUCHARIST - SACRAMENT OF THE KINGDOM*, TO WHAT 'LOVE' MEANS FOR THE CHURCH:
- "LOVE IS THE ESSENCE OF THE HOLINESS OF THE CHURCH, FOR IT 'HAS BEEN Poured INTO OUR HEARTS THROUGH THE HOLY SPIRIT'; THE ESSENCE OF THE 'UNITY' OF THE CHURCH, WHICH 'UPBUILDS ITSELF IN LOVE' (EPHESIANS 4:16); AND FINALLY, THE ESSENCE OF 'APOSTOLICITY' AND 'CATHOLICITY' FOR THE CHURCH IS EVERYWHERE AND ALWAYS THE SAME SINGLE

- APOSTOLIC UNION, 'JOINED WITH THE YOKE OF LOVE.'
- THE ONTOLOGICAL CHARACTER OF THE CHURCH, IS THE SAME REALITY THAT IS GIVEN TO EACH MEMBER OF THE ASSEMBLY AT THEIR RECEPTION OF THE SACRAMENTS OF INITIATION - LOVE. IT IS THIS LOVE WHICH CHARACTERIZES THE HOLINESS OF THE ECCLESIAL BODY, GIVEN TO IT BY THE OUTPOURING OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

- ONLY BY THE 'EPICLESIS' OF THE HOLY SPIRIT, CAN WE EXPERIENCE AND BECOME THAT 'UNITY', WHICH IS THE 'MYSTERY OF CHRIST'S LOVE - UNITING US TO THE WORLD, CREATING THE BOND OF CHARITY WHICH IS THE CHURCH AND ESTABLISHING OUR COMMUNION WITH GOD.
- "THE EUCHARIST IS THE SACRAMENT OF UNITY AND THE *MOMENT OF TRUTH... .*"
(SCHMEMMANN, *FOR THE LIFE OF THE WORLD*)