

Do This in Remembrance of Me

*Is faith a narcotic dream in a world of heavily armed robbers,
or is it an awakening?*

THOMAS MERTON, O.C.S.O.
FAITH AND VIOLENCE

The nonviolent love of Jesus for both friends and enemies is historically at the heart of His passion and death, it must therefore be communicated as being ineradicably at the heart of the Eucharist. It is the nonviolent Lamb of God, who is worshipped and consumed in the Eucharist. It is the nonviolent Lamb of God, whom the Eucharist empowers us, individually and as a Church, to imitate, to become and to proclaim. The passion narrative is about the Lamb, who goes to His death rejecting violence, loving enemies, returning good for evil, praying for His persecutors—yet conquers and reigns eternal. It is not about a snake or a rat or a tiger who goes to his death with bloody fangs or claws bared. It is also not about dying of natural causes. As Bernard Häring, C.S.S.R., the most prominent Catholic moral theologian in the second half of the Twentieth Century, writes, “It is not possible to speak of Christ’s sacrifice while ignoring the role of nonviolence...Nonviolence belongs to the mystery of the Redeemer and redemption.” The sacrifice of Christ is not about salvation through mere physiological pain. It is about salvation through the nonviolent suffering love of Jesus toward all and for all, even lethal enemies. It is about revealing the true nature of Divine love, the true and authentic Face of God. As the United States’ Catholic Bishops teach in their Pastoral, *The Challenge of Peace* (1983):

In all of his suffering, as in all of his life and ministry, Jesus refused to defend himself with force or with violence. He endured violence and cruelty so that God’s love might be fully manifest and the world might be reconciled to the One from whom it had become estranged.

Atonement and redemption, sanctification and salvation are the fruits of nonviolent, unconditional love made visible at a terrible cost to Jesus from Gethsemane to Golgotha. Therefore, what is made visible in the Gospels at the spiritual and revelatory apex of the life of Jesus should be made luminously visible in the re-presentation of the passion and death of Jesus in the Eucharistic Prayer.

Encounter with God

The Eucharist is the principal means that the Church offers to the world for meeting the true God and the truth of God through Jesus Christ, as well as for overcoming evil and death in all their manifestations. The Eucharist is God’s gift of Himself through Jesus and His Church to humanity for its liberation from enslavement to any and all of the powers of darkness and for its entering into an eternal union with the Giver and Sustainer of Life.

Ultimately the grace that is given in the Eucharist is God, Jesus. To use Schillebeeckx’s phraseology, “Jesus is the sacrament of the human encounter with God.” Jesus is this because He is God incarnate. The Eucharist is not a “salvation gimmick.” It is relating to an existing person, Jesus Christ. This person, however, not only has a divine reality but also has a human identity. He has a history of thoughts, words and deeds. He has a history of acting and being acted upon. He has a history of joys and sorrows, choices and responses, all of which make Him and identify Him as the unique totally human—totally divine person that He is.

Principal Witness and Mundane Specifics

The Second Vatican Council (*Dogmatic Constitution on Divine Revelation*, 18) declares the Gospels to be, “the principal witness of the life and teaching of the incarnate Word, our Savior.” It further states that the Gospels “have a

special pre-eminence among all the Scriptures, even those of the New Testament,” and that they “faithfully hand on what Jesus Christ, while living among people, really did and taught for their eternal salvation.” Now, the Gospels leave not a scintilla of doubt that certain facts, which some would dismiss as merely the “mundane specifics” of Jesus’ life, are vital communications for knowing the Way and the work, the person and the being of Jesus and of God. Remove these so-called “mundane specifics” from His life and there is no Jesus to be known; there is no Jesus who can serve as the sacrament of the human encounter with God. The bracketing out of segments, especially major themes, of Jesus’ life results spiritually in diluting, or in some cases falsifying, the knowledge of God which is supposed to be revealed through, with and in Him. Diluted encounters with God obviously do not bear the same fruits, for the human being or for the human community, as do unmodified, unedited, unexpurgated, unsparingly truthful encounters with God through the Jesus of the New Testament. Hence, a Eucharistic Canon anemic in its remembrance of the “mundane specifics” of the historical Jesus’ passion and death, of the Way He suffered and died, must result at best in a very watered down relationship with the true God and with the truth of God. If too many of the “mundane specifics” of Jesus’ passion and death are left out of the Eucharistic Prayer, it is possible that those present at the Eucharist may hardly recognize Him “in the breaking of the bread” (LK 24:35; AC 2:42) or worse, may not recognize Him or His pertinence to their lifeworld at all.

A Eucharistic Canon that pushes aside the “mundane specifics” of Jesus’ passion and death, ipso facto eviscerates the power of the Eucharist by not making available to the faithful significant dimensions of the gift of Divine Love which is made visible in Jesus’ journey from the Upper Room to Golgotha. Bernard Lonergan, S.J., who has been called the Apostle of the Specific, again and again throughout his writings makes the following point: “[T]o know the concrete in its concreteness is to know all there is to be known about each thing. To know all there is to be known about each thing is, precisely, to know being.” This may sound a bit esoteric but what Lonergan is communicating is that human beings encounter the real via the concrete and the specific of existence. It is therefore spiritually and theologically impermissible to bypass or downplay, as being of little or no significance, the nonviolent love of friends and enemies that permeates the entire drama of Jesus’ preaching, passion and death for the salvation of the world. As the renowned biblical scholar and the first Catholic ever to be elected president of The Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, the Rev. John L. McKenzie, states with maximal scholarly authority:

If Jesus did not reject any type of violence for any purpose, then we know nothing of him.

No Toleration of Ambiguity

It is sheer spiritual folly to believe that one can minimize the historical humanity of Jesus and thereby arrive at a deeper experience of the Christ of faith or the Second Person of the Holy Trinity or God. Nothing in the Eucharistic Celebration must allow in the least for such a spiritually destructive misinterpretation of Christian faith and prayer. As Lonergan notes, “[V]ague verbal claims that help us ignore the specifics of the particulars in which we are enmeshed” serve to assist people in their flight from understanding and from commitment. “The Eucharist,” proclaims John Paul II in *Ecclesia de Eucharistia*, “is too great a gift to tolerate ambiguity and depreciation.” But, is not the Eucharist pastorally depreciated and rendered precariously ambiguous when the nonviolent love of friends and enemies, that Jesus steadfastly adheres to throughout his passion and death, is treated as so minor as to merit only disregard?

It is left to the Church to orchestrate the re-presentation of the salvific gift of Christ-God in the Eucharist to the world. It is the Church that is responsible for making the Eucharist pastorally available in the fullness of its truth and power so that humanity can reap all the benefits of this wholly holy sacrifice of love. This pastoral process of re-presenting Christ’s saving passion and death to humanity involves human judgment, evaluation, creativity, learning and discernment in order to insure that there is no discrepancy between Word and Sacrament. No contradiction can objectively exist between the Jesus of the New Testament, who teaches and lives unto death on the cross a Way of nonviolent love of friends and enemies, and the Jesus encountered in the Eucharist. Christians have a Baptismal birthright to worship in the presence of this consistency of Word and Sacrament and to be straight-

forwardly apprised of it by their pastors. Word and Sacrament must be conspicuously one in the Church because Word and Sacrament are one in reality, in God. So whether a disciple looks upon Jesus in the Gospels or looks upon Jesus in the Eucharist, he or she must see, indeed has an unqualified right to vividly see, the same Jesus. That Jesus is a Jesus, who in obedience to the will of the Father, teaches by word and deed a Way of nonviolent love of friends and enemies—even when in direct confrontation with lethal enmity and violence.

It requires the exercise of pastoral acumen by the Shepherds of Jesus' flock to ensure that the gift of the Holy Eucharist is seen, is accepted and is used for the purposes for which it is created. We all know how fear or ignorance or arrogance can be the cause of the most precious gift being rejected. We likewise are aware that the most benign and salubrious gift can be misused to the point of becoming an agent of destruction e.g., the gift of a car that is then operated by a driver under the influence of drugs. All this then immediately poses two questions. First, in the context of a human community ravaged by an unprecedented and ever-escalating firestorm of violence and enmity, what pastoral dynamic does the Eucharist intrinsically possess to confront and to conquer this satanic eruption fueled by the reckless squandering of human life and resources on the technology of destruction? Second, what is the proper, most effective way of offering this gift, this grace, to the world so that it will be a divinely efficacious means for subduing and binding the diabolical spirits of violence and enmity across cultures and nations, time and space?

Virulent Plague

It is not being an alarmist or a self-righteous prophet of doom to recognize and to call to the attention of others that science, technology and money today are, above all else, at the service of the evils of violence and enmity. Science and technology represent power over nature. Power over nature can be an avenue to power over people, since the human being is body, as well as, soul and spirit. Science and technology can heal or hurt. The arms industry, which is premeditatedly organized to deliver pain and destruction efficiently for a profit, is by far the single largest and most profitable business on the planet at this time and it is completely at the service of enmity and violence. Trillions of dollars a year are spent on creating, manufacturing and distributing the raw instrumentality by which human lives are made subject to unspeakable levels of pain and unfathomable levels of destruction, whether or not the weapons are ever actually employed. Hundreds of billions of dollars more are invested annually in devising and implementing ever new schemes and methodologies for nurturing, promoting and sustaining the spirits, the mindstyles, the ideologies and the value systems that make these weapons and the tidal waves of misery to which they continuously doom the "*anawim*," appear not only desirable but necessary, not only praiseworthy but of God! Yet, as Pope Paul VI says in 1976 in his statement on disarmament to the United Nations: "The armaments race is to be condemned unreservedly...It is in itself an act of aggression which amounts to a crime, for even when they are not used, by their cost alone, armaments kill the poor by causing them to starve." In such a world as this—where the evils of violence and enmity are so normalized—the Second Vatican Council's (*Gaudium et Spes*, 81) solemn warning is many times more dire and urgent today than when issued: "[T]he arms race is a virulent plague" (*gravissimam plagam*).

Power Made Visible

So, is it possible that in a little piece of Consecrated Bread and in a little cup of Sanctified Wine there exists a power, indeed the only power, that is able to extricate Christians and all humanity from the ever tightening iron grip of that spirit that induced Cain's enmity toward and destruction of his brother? Faith answers this question with an emphatic, "Yes!" Even in the face of all evidence to the contrary—including the stranglehold that the arms industry has on governments, economies and media worldwide—faith in Christ firmly proclaims that in the Eucharist abides the power (MT 28:18) to prevail over the most deeply-rooted, most extensively-organized and most highly-financed manifestations of evil.

The Eucharist has an innate and indelible, temporal and eternal solidarity with the nonviolent Jesus—the victim of violence and enmity in His passion and death and the victor over violence and enmity in His resurrection. Indeed the Eucharist, among other things, would seem to be purposely created by Intelligent Design to free human-

ity from the wickedness and snares of that spirit that was behind the destruction of Abel and Jesus and is behind every expression of enmity and homicidal violence in history—from Cain to this very hour. But, this inherent dimension of the Eucharistic Sacrifice must be made visible by the pastoral decision of those who are chosen by Jesus Christ to be overseers of His Church’s sacramental life and to be pastors of His people’s moral life.

Universal Public Education

Remember, 250,000 years ago the human brain possessed, because of God’s graceful design, everything necessary in order to read. However, it was not until a mere 200 years ago, when humanity began to organize itself in a way that made universal public education available, that universal literacy began to take hold country after country. By the gift and grace of God the capacity to be literate objectively existed for hundreds of millennia, but until human beings chose to do what was necessary in order to access it, it remained in the realm of almost pure potentiality. Prior to universal public education releasing this God-given endowment, only a miniscule number of human beings were able to become what they had the capability of becoming, i.e., literate.

So also is the case in the Church today and by extension in humanity today in relationship to the objectively present but latent power of the Eucharist to conquer violence and enmity and to release humanity from the diabolical trap of the normalized reciprocal destruction of human beings by human beings in which it is ensnared. A Eucharistic Prayer in the model suggested below would be the human decision for the spiritual equivalent of “universal public education” in the Way of Jesus. It would be a manifestation of a Gospel-grounded liturgical catechesis that would expand forever not only the Christian’s but also all humanity’s consciousness of the true nature of the true God and hence of the truth of God’s Way—the only Way of vanquishing violence and enmity. In the context of what has just been said, a historically, theologically, liturgically and pastorally accurate addition to the institution narrative-anamnesis of the Eucharistic Canons could read as follows:

On the night before He went forth to His eternally memorable and life-giving death, like a Lamb led to the slaughter, rejecting violence, loving His enemies, praying for His persecutors, He bestowed upon His disciples the gift of a New Commandment:

“Love one another. As I have loved you so you also should love one another.”

Then He took bread into His holy hands, and looking up to You, almighty God, He gave thanks, blessed it, broke it, gave it to His disciples and said:

*“Take this, all of you, and eat it:
this is my body which will be given up for you.”*

Likewise, when the Supper was ended, He took the cup. Again He gave You thanks and praise, gave the cup to His disciples and said:

*“Take this, all of you, and drink from it:
this is the cup of my blood, the blood of the new and everlasting covenant.
It will be shed for you and for all so that sins may be forgiven.”*

“Do this in memory of me.”

Obedient, therefore, to this precept of salvation, we call to mind and reverence His passion where He lived to the fullest the precepts which He taught for our sanctification. We remember His suffering at the hands of a fallen humanity filled with the spirit of violence and enmity. But, we remember also that He endured this humiliation with a love free of retaliation, revenge and retribution. We recall His execution on the cross. But, we recall also that He died loving enemies, praying for persecutors, forgiving, and being superabundantly merciful to those for whom justice would have demanded justice. Finally, we celebrate the memory of the fruits of His trustful obedience to thy will, O

God: the resurrection on the third day, the ascension into heaven, the enthronement at the right hand, the second and glorious coming. Therefore we offer You your own, from what is your own, in all and for the sake of all...

This simple, short, incisive addition to the Eucharistic Prayer would release power that would dwarf in history the power released by the splitting of the atom. The Jesus of history, the Christ of faith, the Jesus of Gethsemane, the Christ of Calvary, the Jesus of the Gospels—the only Jesus Christ there is, was or ever will be—explicitly confronts the diabolical spirits of enmity and homicidal violence in all their fury at the very hour of His passion and death. By His words and deeds during this New Passover event He teaches humanity how to conquer these evils, while at the same time revealing once and for all the true face of God—a Father “who is rich in mercy,” who “lets His rain fall on the wicked and the righteous,” who “lets His sun rise on the good and the evil,” who forgives limitlessly and in whom “violence and cruelty can have no part” (*Roman Missal, The Sacramentary, Mass for Peace and Justice*).

The Eucharist is the mind-changing, converting, healing, empowering, life-saving Divine gift given to a humanity being shredded by evil presenting itself as inevitable and inescapable violence and enmity. However, the Eucharist can only be this transforming Presence if it is made fully visible and available to Christians and through Christians to the world. Made available, that is, in a ritual atmosphere that permeates the senses and the consciousness, the will and the heart, the soul and the conscience of Christian after Christian, person after person, generation after generation with the specific Gospel details of the nonviolent love and the Nonviolent Lover who saves.

Re-membrance, Reductionism and the Acting Person

Is it not the liturgical absence of the nonviolent Way in which Jesus lives the Paschal Triduum that is the “missing piece” pastorally in contemporary Eucharistic anaphoras? Is there not a pastoral oversight of Gospel and Eucharistic truth here, to which the Overseers of the Divine Liturgy should respond? Is not the willingness to overlook self-evident elements of truth in a situation in which we are absorbed perilous at any level of existence? Bernard Lonergan has shown in his work, *Insight*, that when human activity settles down into routines of partial, vague or ambiguous truths, unconcerned with concrete specifics, then “initiative becomes the privilege of violence.” Habituation to a patterned blind spot results in the tragic—and not just for the person or persons missing the indisputably present reality. John Paul II states in *Ecclesia de Eucharistia*: “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.” What is indelible can never be erased, but it can be concealed, rendered invisible or ignored, thereby assuring that it will never be stored in the heart.

The act of remembering requires that an event has already taken place in history before the moment of remembrance. Prior to a person reasonably interpreting an event, or deriving meaning from it, or determining why it took place, the person must re-member—put back together—what took place. The definitive documents that tell humanity what took place from the Cenacle to Calvary are unquestionably the Gospels. To re-member the Last Supper, which “is indelibly marked by His passion and death,” is to re-member the Gospels’ accounts of these events; for these accounts, as Vatican II (*Dei Verbum*, 18) tells us, are of “apostolic origin,” are “the foundation of faith” and are “what the apostles preach in fulfillment of the commission of Christ.” To re-member the “Me,” who is to be remembered, only as one who “suffers and dies” but not to re-member the Way the “Me” suffers and dies—rejecting violence, loving enemies, forgiving superabundantly, returning good for evil, praying for persecutors—is not to re-member. It is to dis-member or barely re-member. It is reductionism. It is the narrowing of the remembrance of what took place, which in turn narrows the interpretation of why it took place and how people are to respond to it. The Altar of Calvary is an Altar of Agapé, not merely an altar of raw mammalian pain. Identification with Jesus’ suffering is identification with Jesus’ loving as God loves and as God desires His sons and daughters to love (JN 13:34). The kind of love with which Jesus loves throughout His passion and death is not incidental to a truth full re-membrance, to the proper fulfillment of His Eucharistic precept: *Do this in remembrance of me*.

Eucharistic reductionism pastorally weakens the revelation to, as well as, the call to the Eucharistic assembly from God through Jesus “to become what you behold, worship and consume.” This liturgical reductionism in the Eucharistic Prayer leads to a telling experiential rupture between Gospel content and anamnesis content. It is as if these two exist side by side divested of any demonstrable connections except for the most attenuated of cognitive bridges: the words “suffers,” “passion,” “dies for us.” The whole Way that Jesus suffers and dies in His passion is made all but invisible in one Eucharistic Prayer after another. This is in contra-distinction to the Gospels, which give a detailed and absolutely consistent presentation of the Way that Jesus confronted evil, enmity and homicidal violence. Why reductionist liturgists would consider the Way of nonviolent love of friends and enemies that Jesus chose as His Way during His passion to be unworthy of illumination in the Eucharistic Prayer is difficult to fathom. Indeed, why reductionist liturgists would not consider this as a pastorally crucial dimension of all Eucharistic Prayers is puzzling. Certainly, they must be aware that ambiguity in language is resolved in the definitiveness of the human act. It is the acting Person that the institution narrative-anamnesis is primarily supposed to assist the Christian and the Christian Community in encountering. It is the acting Jesus in the “mundane specifics” of His passion and death who gives flesh and blood, body and soul—and divinity—to such open-ended words as “suffers,” “dies” and “passion.”

Harmfulness of Reductionism

What is not difficult to comprehend and to prove is the harmfulness of this pared-down reductionist approach to the Eucharistic Prayer, institution narrative-anamnesis. In what does this harmfulness consist? It consists in this. It has shown itself over and over again of being completely capable of allowing people to attend Eucharistic Liturgy and then leave the Eucharistic assembly by the millions to go and pledge allegiance with enthusiasm to *der Führer* of the hour. This is a known fact, here stated in its most benign form. It is this fact that moved Bernard Häring to write that, “At this juncture in history, to neglect the message and practice of [Christ’s] nonviolence could easily make the Church and Her teaching seem irrelevant.” This is a fact that would now seem to compel more than pastoral inertness or complacency.

Do not Christians, leadership and laity, liturgists and theologians, have to be extremely careful not to do with the Eucharistic Jesus what the Hebrews and Romans did with the historical Jesus—remove Him and His Way from their midst in order to avoid the truth of God, which His full presence would mightily proclaim and beckon others to follow? A nonviolent historical and Eucharistic Jesus who is kept out of sight is a nonviolent Jesus who is kept out of mind. But what is the cost to the Church and to humanity, yesterday, today and tomorrow, for liturgically enshrining the absence of such critical Paschal memory?

Evasion and Reductionism

Might this not be an ecclesial spiritual problem of the highest order? Human beings, even the most saintly, must constantly struggle against the temptation to evade unwanted truth. Is there not more than ample evidence available to permit with moral certainty the rational deduction that a Christian Community, whose historical record is entangled in nationalistic and ethnic enmity and violence, could very, very easily not want to honestly and to continually face the theological, spiritual, ethical and cognitive dissonance between its past and/or present and the nonviolent Jesus of the Gospels and the Eucharist?

In other words does not a continuous *de minimis* Eucharistic Prayer, institution narrative-anamnesis, serve the purpose of promoting an equally continuous *de minimis* call to repentance (metanoia)? Does not this reductionist approach to Eucharistic Prayers interfere with Christians “more copiously receiving His grace” (*Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 33) at the Eucharistic celebration? Note the issue here is not that the Church *qua* Church has failed in Her mission. Indeed in Her Vatican II Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy (*Sacrosanctum Concilium*) She could not have been more forthright and open, when She declares that, “The Council desires that where necessary the rites be carefully and thoroughly revised in the light of sound tradition, and that they be given new vigor to meet the

circumstances and needs of modern times” (*Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 4). She is equally transparent in Article 33 of *Sacrosanctum Concilium* that the sacred liturgy is supposed to “contain abundant instruction for the faithful.”

John Paul II accurately portrays the God-given, intrinsic structure of human consciousness when he states that “All human beings desire to know...[no one is] genuinely indifferent to the question of whether what they know is true or not.” Granting then that the desire to know truth is indelibly impressed in the human person by God, does it not now have to be assiduously communicated by those responsible for the health of souls in the Church, that it is theologically, spiritually, pastorally and liturgically indisputable that a Jesus who would be engaging in defensive or retaliatory homicidal violence, hating enemies, taking an eye for an eye and cursing persecutors would be a Jesus engaging in his passion and death in a way that is radically different from the Way of the Jesus of the Gospels? Does it also not now have to be said that the knowledge of God that such a Jesus would communicate about the kind of God God is and what God expects of people would be radically different from what is received in the Gospels and what should be received through every Eucharistic Prayer? Certainly this matter is now exposed as serious enough, as axial enough, as pastorally urgent enough in its implications to warrant immediate attention. The generalized terms “suffers,” “dies,” “passion” have a distinct and definite meaning in relationship to Jesus. Their reduction via emaciated re-membrance to vagueness or nebulosity, contrary to Gospel specificity, does not seem to be fitting or right any longer. Indeed, if one takes seriously the phenomenon of concupiscence in human life, then it is almost self-evident that anything less than well-defined, straight-forward, unmistakable Gospel-fixed language in the institution narrative-anamnesis invites false understandings. Abstruseness, ambivalence or equivocalness at the apogee of Christian worship is dangerous. For, as Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger has said, “[C]ontradictory things cannot be means to salvation. The truth and the lie cannot be ways of salvation in the same sense.”

Is there not unseen, yet immense tragedy, operating in the “forgetfulness” of Eucharistic Prayers on this critically and historically incontrovertible dimension of Jesus’ passion and death? If the Divine Liturgy is meant to instruct, as it is, then how is it possible to know the Way of the Father in order to “keep the ways of Yahweh” (PR 119; WS 6:18; IS 26:8; JN 13:34; 15:10), if in the crowning revelatory moment of the Father’s Way in the passion and death of Jesus, the Father’s Way is all but hidden behind the veil of a minimalist institution narrative-anamnesis? The issue here is not Eucharistic validity. But, as the Second Vatican Council states: “[W]hen the Liturgy is celebrated, more is required than the mere observance of the laws governing validity” (*Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 11). The issue here is allowing the Eucharist to be the fountain of grace and the empowering source of those copious fruits that a humanity, chronically living in a wasteland of enmity and violence, absolutely requires. For ordinary people to be able to see and to encounter with ease the Eucharistic sacrifice of Jesus on Golgotha as a sacrifice on the Altar of Nonviolent Unconditional Love for All—friends and enemies—would seem to be vital. It would therefore also seem to be a given that those chosen to oversee such matters accept responsibility for revising whatever must be revised in order to insure that wholesale “forgetfulness” of the Way of Sacrifice will no longer be fueled under the reductionist rubric of “sufficient remembrance for sacramental validity.”

Way and Purpose

The Way Jesus suffers and dies is as much a part of the eternal unchanging essence of His Passion as is the Purpose of His suffering and death. Indeed, as noted above, His Way is intrinsic to His Purpose and vice versa. This being the case, both Way and Purpose should be re-membered, re-presented, celebrated and given thanks for in the Eucharistic Prayer. Is it not incumbent upon all at a Eucharistic assembly to pay attention to what is in fact in front of them? Therefore, and again, does not the love of Christ compel those, whose duty it is to see to it that the Eucharist is all that it is supposed to be for the Christian Community, to make sure that matter and form are so arranged that the average person can with reasonable effort be attentive to what he or she is objectively in the presence of? And, should not this duty always include assuring attentiveness not only to the objective fact that Jesus suffers and dies for us, but also should it not foster attentiveness to the objective fact of the Way He suffers and dies for us, namely, rejecting violence, forgiving and loving His lethal enemies? Are not Way and Purpose historically and objectively,

physically and metaphysically, theologically and spiritually, forever inseparable from each other? How then can a pastorally integral Eucharistic Prayer not honestly and self-evidently include both Way and Purpose?

Knower and Known

Without intending to embark upon an area that is outside the focus of these reflections on the Eucharist Prayer, I nevertheless think it appropriate to here point out that the Eucharist, like the Gospels, originates in a predominantly oral culture. Therefore the memory or remembrance that the original Apostolic tradition would have been preserving, narrating and passing on would have been an oral memory. Walter Ong, S.J., in his magisterial work, *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the Word* (1982) demonstrates that

For an oral culture learning or knowing means achieving close, empathetic, communal identification with the known; writing (however) separates the knower from the known and thus sets up conditions for 'objectivity,' in the sense of personal disengagement or distancing... Writing fosters abstractions that disengage knowledge from the arena where human beings struggle. By keeping knowledge embedded in the human lifeworld, orality situates knowledge within the context of struggle.

It is difficult and may even be dangerous to try to love a text-based abstract concept, even if it is theological. It is, of course, possible to be grateful for a written abstraction. Most people are grateful for $E = mc^2$ or for the poet writing:

*The brain is wider than the sky,
For put them side by side
The one the other will contain
With ease, and you besides.*

But, the kind and degree of gratitude that flows from love for a person is beyond the ability of expository writing to elicit. Written narrative, however, can partially overcome the disengaged distance and depersonalization that exist between knower and known in expository discourse, and can evoke levels of identification between knower and known that open the door to a deeper and more grateful person-centered love. The Eucharistic Prayer, institution narrative-anamnesis, in the primitive, oral Christian Community, obviously calls forth wholehearted love between the knower and the Known and obviously should call it forth in the contemporary literate Christian Community. But, does it?

The Preface for Christmas exaltingly explains and proclaims: "In Him we see our God made visible and so are caught up in love of the God we cannot see." How probable is it that a reductionist Eucharistic Prayer with a minimalist institution narrative-anamnesis can generate and nurture a love of God in which the Community will be "caught up" in love and gratitude? Must not the Eucharistic Community see and hear more of the nonviolent, long-suffering, forgiving love of friends and enemies "made visible" by the Incarnate Word at the supreme moment of the manifestation of such love, before it can be "caught up in love of the God we cannot see"?

Ong writes: "Oral cultures must conceptualize and verbalize all their knowledge with more or less close reference to the human lifeworld. A chirographic (writing) culture and even more so a typographic (print) culture can distance and in a way denature even the human." The Second Vatican Council states: "Liturgical services are not private functions, but are celebrations of the Church" (*Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 26). This is important because while it is true that the facticity of human existence requires that each person encounter reality uniquely to some degree, it is nevertheless clear that encountering reality alone in one's room by the process of reading a printed page is not the same as encountering reality as a full participant in a celebrating-thanking faith Community that is struggling to know and love and serve God through His Incarnate Word. Reductionist Eucharistic Prayer, that contracts the entire Gospel narrative of God's great deed of love in Jesus' passion and death into a few minimally descriptive printed words, which are then recited to the Community, simply cannot be evaluated as pastorally sound for a Eucharistic Community longing for and struggling for a deeper "closer, empathetic identification with the Known." Certainly introducing into the institution narrative-anamnesis of the Eucharistic Prayer awareness of specifics of

the Way of nonviolent love of friends and enemies that the Incarnate Word enfleshed throughout His passion and death is as important and as needed a revision today as at another time was the revision that made the public presentation of the Eucharistic Prayer in the vernacular normal.

Mandatum for Change

Vatican II teaches: “The liturgy is made up of unchangeable elements divinely instituted and elements subject to change. The latter not only may but ought to be changed with the passing of time, if features have by chance crept in which are less harmonious with the intimate nature of the liturgy or if existing elements have grown less functional” (*Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 21). The mandatum for the change being suggested in this essay is therefore contained in the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy. However, Vatican II’s mandatum is intrinsically and perpetually tied to the *novum mandatum*, “new commandment,” spoken by Our Lord at the Last Supper and proclaimed by the Catholic Church to “contain the entire Law of the Gospel” (*Catechism of the Catholic Church*, ¶1970): “I give you a new commandment: love one another. As I have loved you, so you also should love one another” (JN 13:34). Without an explicit and constant re-presentation of how Jesus loves, how is it possible for His new “mandatum” to be followed? Since the Eucharistic re-presentation of the passion and death of Jesus is ordained to action, to life, to the renewal of life, a faithful re-remembrance is a *sine qua non* for fidelity to “the ways of Yahweh”—for fidelity to the *novum mandatum*. In the Christian life a faithful re-remembrance of the past is an indispensable condition for a correct orientation for the future. Beyond this, if as St. Augustine rightly states in the *City of God*, “[In the Eucharist] the Church itself is offered in what is offered” then does it not have to be made explicit what the nature and content of this Christ/Church offering is? Is it not the total offering of Community and self in, with and through Christ to unconditionally do the will of the Father, regardless of the sacrifice that may be required? But, it is the *novum mandatum* that “expresses the Father’s entire will” (*Catechism of the Catholic Church*, ¶2822, 1970). So, how can the Eucharistic Community reasonably be expected to be “caught up in love of the God we cannot see,” and with full awareness and commitment make the offering it is called to make, if the love and truth of God “made visible” in Jesus’ passion and death is not “made visible” in the Eucharistic re-presentation of His passion and death—except for a compressed re-remembrance devoid of any mention of the Way of sacrifice. Indeed, what does the petition to the Father to send down His Holy Spirit so that those who take part in the Eucharist may “become one body, one spirit in Christ” (Eucharistic *epiclesis*) mean, if it is not a request to empower the Eucharistic Community to live the *novum mandatum*? Surely, a truncated institution narrative-anamnesis is an “existing element” that can now be seen as “less functional” than other options, and hence “ought to be changed.”

Again, the validity of an abruptly concise, emotionally insulated, ethically colorless Eucharistic Prayer, institution narrative-anamnesis, is not the question. The issue is pastoral, which should not be taken to mean it is any less significant than the issue of validity (*Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 11). The issue is what does a Eucharistic Prayer do which concerns itself in only a most cursory fashion with the Way of nonviolent suffering love of friends and enemies that Jesus undertook for the salvation of all? Does it help or hinder the intensity and the quality of the relationship between the knower and the Known? Does a terse institution narrative-anamnesis help or hinder the individual Christian and the Eucharistic Community in following the “new commandment” of love “as I have loved” that is embedded in the Eucharist *in aeternum*? Does it help or hinder the reconciliation of people with each other, which is incontestably the will of God? Does it help or hinder our love for Jesus whom we can see, and through Him our love for “the God we cannot see?” Does it help or hinder growth in gratitude to the Father for all that has been done for us in love and out of love?

Eucharist: The Arena of Struggle

Pope John Paul II in his 2004 World Day of Peace Message writes that, “Christians know that love is the reason for God’s entering into relationship with man. And it is love he awaits as man’s response.” This is incontestable truth. The issue is how deeply do Christians grasp this, and how much more profoundly could they realize it with a Eucharistic Prayer that daily and weekly enunciated the “mundane specifics” of the Way Jesus chose in obedience to the will of the God who is love (1 JN 4:16). Surely, a deeper, “closer, empathetic identification” with the Known

(Jesus) would be established by a more fulsome institution narrative-anamnesis simply because it would generate new bonds of solidarity between knower and Known. It would bring the passion of Jesus into the very lifeworld of the Christian, “the arena where human beings struggle” against the very same spirits of evil with which Jesus contended in Gethsemane and on Calvary. It would bring to mind for the Christian, through the acting Person-Jesus—possibilities that are easily forgotten in this world. This in turn would open doors in “the arena where human beings struggle” to alternatives that would never otherwise be considered.

The Civilization of Love and the Banality of Evil

Enmity, violence and the lies, personal and systematic, which support these satanic realities, are the powers against which people struggle in their lifeworlds, personally and socially. Hannah Arendt, in her writing on the trial of Adolph Eichmann, *Eichmann in Jerusalem*, coined the now famous phrase—“the banality of evil.” In what did this banality consist? It consisted in a vast machine of ordinary people engaged in brutal enmity and violence without any explicit intention to do evil and without any pressing conscious awareness that evil was being done. When Bernard Häring writes, “The good news of peace and nonviolence plays a central role in Jesus’ proclamation of salvation...Redemption can no longer be treated without particular attention to the therapeutic and liberating power of nonviolence, as embodied and revealed by Jesus,” he is pleading that the Way of love “embodied and revealed by Jesus” be raised up before the world with persistence and clarity in order that “the murderous reign of hatred, violence and lies” be unmasked and denied allegiance. Where better to raise it up than in the Eucharistic Prayer, which is the very re-presentation of the unmasking of the diabolicalness of normalized enmity and violence, as well as the revelation of the power of the Way and the Person who unmasked and conquered it.

Does a Gospel oriented mind need do any more than be in contact with the daily fare of news and entertainment via local and globalized mass media to be aware of the manner in which and the degree to which sanitized and sweetened enmity and violence are daily fed into the spiritual bloodstream of ordinary people in order to anesthetize them to what they are making of their own souls and the lives of others? The Church cannot match the powers of this world, mass-media minute for mass-media minute, in order to counteract this ceaseless input of utterly destructive images, mythologies and ideologies. But, the Church has a nonpareil power that is omnipotently superior to anything that mass media and well-financed propaganda on behalf of the spirits of enmity and violence have available to them.

As an antidote to the poisonous parade of enemies that is manufactured almost daily through mass-media propaganda by governments, militaries and weapons-related industries, the Church has the Eucharist. The Church has the sacramental re-presentation of the passion, death and resurrection of Jesus. The Church has the Mass-medium of Jesus choosing a Way of nonviolent suffering and forgiving love of friends and enemies all the way to resurrection. The Church has a historical and Eucharistic Jesus who unmask all forms of violence and enmity, for the ugly, sordid, anti-human, anti-God realities that they are. The Church has the Mass which can re-present daily to the peoples of the world the one and only Way to that vision of a “civilization of love” that Pope John Paul II—despite the disparaging reception he receives on this matter from the devotees of the realpolitik of enmity and violence—so vigorously insists must reign if humanity is to enjoy authentic and lasting peace. In the last paragraph of his 2004 World Day of Peace Message, the Pope offers an alternative vision of truth and hope to the narcotic glories of enmity and violence into which people are daily dragged and drugged:

At the beginning of a new year I wish to repeat to women and men of every language, religion and culture the ancient maxim: ‘Love conquers all.’ Yes, dear brothers and sisters throughout the world, in the end love will be victorious.

The love of which the Successor of Peter is speaking and to which he is calling human beings to awaken, is the love “embodied and revealed by Christ”—and no other. It is the love made visible in Gethsemane and on Calvary. It is the love that should be made readily visible, indeed magnified, at the Eucharist.

A Priority Task

Perhaps it should be considered a priority task by those in authority in each Church to pastorally act so as to give the Eucharistic Prayer “new vigor to meet the circumstances and needs of modern times” (*Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 4). This can be done by a simple Gospel addition to the Eucharistic Canon. This addition would insure that the nonviolent Spirit of the Holy, which guided and guarded Jesus through the violence and enmity of Gethsemane and Golgotha to His resurrection, is easily accessible through the Eucharist to all those human beings who in solidarity with Jesus, long for peace and eternal life now and forever—but who are daily bedeviled by the cunning, ferocious and well-financed spirits of enmity and violence. In presenting to the Church at this hour in history a Eucharistic Canon that is specific about the nonviolent love of friends and enemies—which Jesus lives in conformity with the will of the Father from the start to the finish of His passion and death—Church leaders need have no fear that they are introducing something that is historically, biblically, spiritually or liturgically out of place. On the contrary all that is being done here is the pastoral “fleshing out,” via the presentation of incontestable Gospel specifics, truth that is already present in embryonic form in every Eucharist. As no less a liturgical authority than Msgr. Frederick McManus, Emeritus Professor at The Catholic University of America and one of the most influential and learned Catholic liturgists of the Twentieth Century, has written:

The centrality of the mission of peace and nonviolence in the Gospels needs to be acknowledged in the confession of the great deeds of God in the Lord Jesus, and the Christian people need to see this essential dimension of Eucharistic peace in the prayer which they confirm and ratify with their Amen.

The Catalytic Factor

Allowed by the decisions of those responsible in the Churches for seeing to it that the Eucharist confers upon lacerated and imprisoned humanity all that it was designed by its Creator to bestow, the Eucharist can be the nonviolent Exodus event for which not only Christians, but also humanity itself, will give thanks forever to the Father of all (EP 4:6). The addition of a minimal catalytic factor can oftentimes alter an entire reality. A poisonous toxin can be neutralized by the introduction of a small catalytic agent. A gene on the DNA, that otherwise would be transcribed incorrectly or not at all, is transcribed correctly by the action of an integral catalytic factor. The presence of the proper catalyst has the potential for producing outcomes that are unrealizable otherwise. Catalysts, by their very nature, facilitate harmonious interactions between substrates, which ultimately make the impossible possible. A Eucharistic Prayer—candidly incorporating the nonviolent love that Jesus deliberately embraces throughout His passion and death—is the catalytic factor that will facilitate a union with the Divine that will provide the way out of the “virulent plague” of ceaseless, reciprocal homicidal enmity and the preparation for ceaseless, reciprocal homicidal enmity. It is the Way out because Jesus is the Way. And, Jesus is the Way because Jesus is God, Emmanuel, “God with us” in the flesh, showing us the Way beyond enmity and violence, evil and death by the concrete “mundane specifics” of His words and deeds. Indeed, the Way He reveals to us, the Way in which we are to “pick up our crosses” daily, leads ultimately to participation in the fullness of Life Eternal. The Banquet of the Lamb therefore must not only empower the Church on earth to live and to love in the Way of Jesus, but it must also reveal that Way of salvation and its Source without blemish or distortion, confusion or equivocation. To reiterate Pope John Paul II’s admonition,

The Eucharist is too great a gift to tolerate ambiguity and depreciation.

FEAST OF THE THEOPHANY
JANUARY 6, 2004

(REV.) EMMANUEL CHARLES MCCARTHY

CENTER FOR CHRISTIAN NONVIOLENCE

167 Fairhill Drive • Wilmington, DE 19808-4312

Phone: 302-235-2925 • Fax: 302-235-2926

E-mail: jjcarmody@comcast.net

Website: centerforchristiannonviolence.org