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Abstract

This thesis concerning the eucharistic tradition of the Presbyterian Church of Korea (PCK) and the open table theology contributes to research of the eucharist of the PCK. The eucharist of the PCK has been influenced by Korean culture and formed by the legacy of the early Presbyterian missionaries from America. Baptism and faith as the prerequisite for the eucharist are emphasized and preaching centred worship omitting the eucharist prevails in the PCK. These eucharistic practices of the PCK have been enhanced by the traditional eucharistic understanding which recognizes the last supper as the origin of the eucharist. Theologically, the traditional eucharistic understanding has led the PCK to focus on the paschal meaning in the eucharist.

In challenging the traditional eucharistic understanding of the PCK, the thesis enlarges a number of impulses in contemporary biblical and liturgical scholarship which might be regarded as encouraging consideration of a practice of an open table. Throughout, the thesis is concerned with identifying and evaluating potential historical, biblical and theological bases for the open table. The eucharist of the early church particularly in the first two centuries was different from the last supper tradition and diverse in theology and contents. The eucharistic features of the early church offer an opportunity to rethink the traditional eucharistic understanding adhering to the last supper tradition and rediscover the eucharistic significance in the meals of Jesus. Jesus held many tables in his ministry with the vision of the kingdom of God and invited people to the tables without any discrimination. The grace, love and hospitality of God embodied in the inclusivity of the meals of Jesus are the nature of the eucharist. Jesus is the host of the eucharist and present in the eucharist. This new perspective on the eucharist diverts the attention of the church from the claim of rigidity of eucharistic regulation to the risen Christ, the primordial sacrament. At the end of the thesis, the focus is on how, liturgically and practically, a theology of the open table might be embodied and enacted in actual worship through examining the Uniting Church in Australia (UCA) practising an open table.
Keywords
Open Table, Origin of the Eucharist, Last Supper Tradition, Baptism and the Eucharist, Sacrament, Kingdom of God, Meals of Jesus, Hospitality, Inclusivity, the PCK, the UCA.
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<table>
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</thead>
<tbody>
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</tr>
<tr>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCE</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCW 1997</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCW 2008</td>
<td>Book of Common Worship 2008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BEM</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUC</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAFC</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>Common Era</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPC</td>
<td>Canadian Presbyterian Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De spec.</td>
<td>De spectaculis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. E.</td>
<td>Ecclesiastical History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRSV</td>
<td>New Revised Standard Version</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSW</td>
<td>New South Wales</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT</td>
<td>New Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OT</td>
<td>Old Testament</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCA</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church of Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCK</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church of Korea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCTS</td>
<td>Presbyterian College and Theological Seminary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCUS</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church in the United States</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCUSA</td>
<td>Presbyterian Church of USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QS</td>
<td>Qumran Scrolls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev.</td>
<td>Reverend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSUC</td>
<td>St. Stephens’ Uniting Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St.</td>
<td>Saint</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCA</td>
<td>Uniting Church in Australia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UiW</td>
<td>Uniting in Worship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UiW2</td>
<td>Uniting in Worship 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UTC</td>
<td>United Theological College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCC</td>
<td>World Council of Churches</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

1 Context and Rationale

The Presbyterian Church of Korea (PCK) has developed its worship and eucharistic tradition after a Presbyterian missionary Horace G. Underwood established the first Presbyterian church in Korea in 1887. The distinctive features of the PCK’s worship and eucharistic tradition have been described and expressed in its directories. The first directory of worship of the PCK was published in 1921 and was, in both structure and content, greatly influenced by the Directory for Worship produced by the Presbyterian Church in the United States (PCUS) in 1894.¹ Although, as time went, the directory was edited several times, regarding the concept of worship and the eucharist there were few changes for many decades. One of the characteristics of these early directories was the separation of the eucharist and worship. These directories categorized the eucharist into sacrament and included only the elements of the service of the word such as hymn, prayer and sermon in the section of worship. Although these directories did not provide an actual order of worship, the recognition of the eucharist as a sacrament not part of worship led the PCK to the so-called preaching centered worship tradition. For the theological basis of the eucharist, the PCK simply translated the Westminster Confession of Faith into Korean and used it. Following the teachings of the Westminster Confession of Faith, the PCK began to preserve the traditional eucharistic understanding which emphasizes the paschal meaning of the eucharist and requires participants to prepare baptism and faith for the eucharist. Since then, several further editions have been published, but there was no radical change in terms of either structure or content regarding worship and the eucharist for over 60 years.

Around the early 1980s the ecumenical movement began to influence the eucharistic theology of the PCK. In this process, the World Council of Churches (WCC) documents such as Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry (BEM) and the Lima Liturgy played a crucial role in broadening the PCK’s eucharistic understanding.

¹ Hyeon Woong Lee, A Study of History and Prospect of the Presbyterian Directory for Worship (Seoul: Presbyterian Theological Seminary, 2004), 229-234.
The first reflection of the ecumenical movement can be observed in the directory of worship of 1983. While the earlier directories treated the eucharist as a sacrament, the directory of worship of 1983 recognized the eucharist as part of worship. However, even as this change was made in 1983, the eucharistic theology presented in BEM failed to be expressed in the official documents of the PCK.

The first theological reflection of the ecumenical movement in the PCK’s directories is found in the Book of Common Worship (BCW) of 1997. This directory led the PCK to broaden its eucharistic theology with an introduction of the five key eucharistic understandings of BEM. More recently, in the BCW of 2008 (the latest of worship directory of the PCK), the recognition of the eucharist as part of worship came to be more clearly expressed than the BCW of 1997. In addition, regarding ecumenism, this book strengthened the relationship between the PCK and other mainline churches by including eucharistic prayers from not only Protestants but also Roman Catholic and Greek Orthodox traditions in its worship resources. One of the most significant contributions of this book to the PCK’s eucharistic understanding is an expansion of eucharistic theology. Although basically the eucharistic theology in the BCW of 2008 is still based on the last supper tradition, this book makes a new attempt to view the meal after the resurrection as a eucharist.

Between the late 20th and the early 21st century with this development of eucharistic theology there was an attempt to renew the eucharistic practice in the PCK. In 2001, the Jeonnam Synod belonging to the PCK passed the resolution of an open table which allows unbaptised people to participate in the eucharist. Furthermore, the Jeonnam Synod decided to propose the issue of the open table in the National General Assembly Meeting of the PCK. Before long, however, other synods which came to know the decision of the Jeonnam Synod expressed consistently strong opposition to the Jeonnam Synod. In turn, the Jeonnam Synod had to retract its

---

2 The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Korea, Constitution (Seoul: Publishing House PCK, 1983).
plan. The final decision of the Jeonnam Synod was to set up a committee to study a theology of the open table.6

After the incident, influential theologians in the PCK began to write editorials in newspapers and articles in journals regarding the issue of the open table. Supporters of the open table expected to broaden their eucharistic perspective with an introduction of a theology of the open table through those studies. However, contrary to their expectations, the theologians uniformly protested against the open table and maintained the justification of the traditional way of practising the eucharist. There was virtually no reflection on the open table but a simple repetition of the traditional eucharistic theology.

The thesis has emerged from this context regarding the issue of the open table in the PCK. The aim of the thesis is to examine the traditional eucharistic understanding upheld by the PCK and to suggest a shape of study of a theology of the open table. The focus thus will be on both the traditional eucharistic understanding of the PCK and key theological and practical resources which might support a practice of the open table. This will enlarge both the traditional eucharistic understanding and the open table theology, providing a broad range of data available for the study of the eucharist. This will also contribute to the renewal of worship and sacraments beyond the discussion of the open table.

2 Issues

The issue relating to the open table is not limited to the simple question, “who can participate in the eucharist?” Although the key question of the open table is necessarily involved with the matter of inclusion in the eucharist, the process of solving the question includes a wide range of historical, biblical, theological and pastoral tasks.

One of the critical issues regarding the open table is the question of the origin of the eucharist. Traditionally, most mainline churches have recognized that Jesus instituted the eucharist at the last supper. The traditional belief of the last supper as the origin of the eucharist has had a great influence on the churches' eucharistic

theology and practice. As a result, theologically, the churches have come to emphasize the paschal meaning of the eucharist. In practice, the churches have developed the so-called closed table tradition which allows only baptized members to participate in the eucharist, seeking a biblical authority for that regulation from the last supper narrative of the Synoptic Gospels and 1 Corinthians 11 where Jesus shared the meal with his twelve disciples.

However, recent studies on the origin of the eucharist challenge the traditional belief of the last supper. The first meaningful challenge to the traditional eucharistic understanding is found in the book of Smith and Taussig, *Many Tables: The Eucharist in the New Testament and Liturgy Today.* Smith and Taussig note that the last supper tradition in the New Testament is not one but many. In addition, the early Christian communities had various meal formations different from the last supper tradition. A liturgical scholar, Bradshaw suggests that the differences in the institution narratives in the Synoptic Gospels and 1 Corinthians 11, the omission of the story of the last supper from the fourth Gospel, and the diversity of eucharistic form and content in the early churches documents point to the fact that Jesus did not leave a fixed institution or commandment regarding the eucharist, and that eucharists conducted by the early churches were originated from a variety of meals of Jesus rather than the last supper as a supposed single definitive event. Bruce Chilton (a biblical, rather than liturgical, scholar) has also articulated an understanding of the early churches' eucharists as rooted in the meals shared by Jesus throughout his whole ministry, as opposed to a single “last supper.” Throughout Jesus’ ministry, Chilton argues, his meals depicted a vision of the kingdom of God as a manifestation of the feast for all peoples prophecised in Isaiah 25.

The academic achievements of these new approaches to the eucharistic origin have led churches to rethink their traditional eucharistic theology and practice, and

---

8 Ibid., 36-69.
rediscover the significance of the meals of Jesus and the eucharistic diversity of the early church. This shift of the recognition of the eucharistic origin raises the following questions: If the last supper loses its authority as the original, how can the traditional eucharistic theology and practice based on the last supper be understood and used for the eucharist today? What eucharistic theology can church today draw from the meals of Jesus? How can the eucharistic theology be connected with the open table? These questions will shape the content and direction of the thesis.

3 Method and Scope of the Study

The scope of this study has been confined to the eucharist of the PCK, and the main methodology for this study will be a theoretical approach. The study has been divided into three parts: three chapters in part one, four chapters in part two, and one chapter in part three. The focus of part one is on the traditional eucharistic understanding of the PCK. For the study of part one, historical, theological and liturgical resources relating to the eucharist of the PCK will be collected and analysed. In part two, the open table theology will be studied. The theoretical approach will be mainly used for exploring historical, biblical and theological bases for the open table. For this, the works of biblical and liturgical scholars will be collected. Then, their main theories will be analysed and used for building the open table theology. The last chapter of the thesis in part three will attempt a practical application for the open table. The focus of the last chapter will be on the eucharist of the Uniting Church in Australia (UCA). This chapter will collect and analyse historical, theological and liturgical resources regarding the eucharist of the UCA. For a more exact understanding of the open table theology and practice of the UCA, interviews with local church ministers and theologians and a case study of the eucharistic practice of three worshipping communities in the UCA will be provided.

Chapter one, as the first step of the study of the traditional eucharistic understanding of the PCK, explores cultural background and its influence on worship and the eucharist of the PCK. It also outlines the features of the main religions in Korea: Shamanism, Buddhism and Confucianism. Then it analyses how those religious features have affected the PCK’s eucharistic theology and practice.
Chapter two examines the history of the eucharist of the PCK. One of the distinctive features of the PCK’s worship is the preaching centred worship omitting the eucharist. When did the preaching centred worship begin in the PCK? How has the PCK developed the worship tradition? This chapter focuses on the missionaries’ eucharistic understanding and practice in the early period of the PCK and the process of development of the eucharist of the PCK. It also highlights the main eucharistic emphases of the PCK.

Chapter three, the last chapter of part one, deals with the main theories which have led the PCK to preserve its eucharistic understanding. The eucharistic understanding of the PCK is firmly based on the last supper tradition. What theories have influenced the PCK’s eucharistic understanding? What are the issues and main points of the theories? This chapter outlines and evaluates the theories of major scholars’ influences on the formation and development of the PCK’s eucharistic understanding.

Chapter four, using historical approach to the eucharist, studies the diversity of the eucharistic theology and practice in the early church. This chapter explores the historical evidence that the earliest eucharistic traditions were different from the last supper tradition. Why is the explanation of John of the last supper different from that of the synoptic Gospel? If the last supper is the original, why do the earliest church documents consistently neglect the last supper story? For the study, the early church documents regarding the eucharist particularly in the first and second centuries will be collected and analyzed.

Chapter five also takes a historical approach. While chapter four explores the eucharist in the first two centuries, this chapter focuses on the shift of the eucharistic theology and practice after the third century. This chapter examines the eucharistic tendency of standardization under the influence of the last supper tradition. When does the mention of the last supper appear first in church documents outside the New Testament? What affected the eucharistic standardization based on the last supper tradition? The process of development of the traditional eucharistic understanding based on the last supper tradition from the third century through the reformers to John and Charles Wesley will be focused on in this chapter.
Chapter six explores the biblical base for the open table. The results of the historical study of the eucharist in the previous chapters raise a critical question over the traditional belief that the origin of the eucharist is the last supper. If the historical evidence challenges the traditional belief of the origin of the eucharist, where was the eucharist from? This question leads this thesis to rethink the meals of Jesus including the last supper. Chapter six tries to interpret Jesus’ meal practices in the perspective of the kingdom of God and to reinterpret the last supper in the light of the open table theology. It also seeks the eucharistic significance of the meals of Jesus after the resurrection.

Chapter seven aims at providing the theological base for the open table. There have been some controversial issues in the discussion concerning the open table such as the interpretation of “discerning the body,” the relationship between the eucharist and baptism, the tension between traditional eucharistic understanding and pastoral and missional requests for the open table, and the understanding of sacraments. Chapter seven outlines these issues and explores how to build the theological base for the open table. This chapter also seeks to deepen the eucharistic theology through providing the recognition of the eucharist as a means of grace.

Chapter eight, the final chapter of the thesis, concerning a practical application, will be seeking a way as to how the open table theology might be embodied in liturgy and practice. For this, the eucharist of the UCA expressed in its official documents such as Basis of Union, the Minutes of Assembly Meeting and worship resources will be examined. The works of theologians and ministers in the UCA will also be explored. For a more exact understanding of the eucharist of the UCA, this chapter will choose three local worshipping communities and explore the actual practice of the eucharist in those communities. Then this chapter will try to evaluate the eucharist of the UCA from the perspective of the open table theology.

These eight chapters form the main body of the thesis. In conclusion, the thesis will draw out key findings of the chapters and try to synthesize them in order to enhance the open table theology. The open table theology systematized and embodied in the thesis is expected to offer a contribution to renewing not only the eucharist of the PCK but also other churches.
Part I

Reflection on Traditional Eucharistic Practice in
the Presbyterian Church of Korea (PCK)
Chapter 1

Korean Culture and Its Influence on Worship and the Eucharist of the Presbyterian Church of Korea (PCK)

Every culture has a religious basis. Religion creates culture, and at the same time culture forms the religion.¹ Before the introduction of Christianity, there were three representative religions which prevailed on the Korea peninsula: Shamanism, Buddhism and Confucianism.² These religions have created the uniqueness of Korean culture in its long history. When Protestant missionaries introduced Christian belief in Korea the unique Korean culture influenced the formation and development of worship and the eucharist of Korean church. This chapter will examine main ideas and features of the three religions. Then this chapter will explore how the Korean culture influenced worship and the eucharist of the PCK.

1 Cultural Background of the PCK

1.1 Shamanism as an Indigenous Faith

1.1.1 *Mu-gyo* (Shamanism in Korea)

*Mu-gyo* is the oldest and the indigenous religion of Korea. *Mu-gyo* is also called *Mu* or *Mu-sok.*³ Dan-gun, who is believed to be the founder of Korea’s first kingdom Gojoseon (2333-108 BCE), was a political leader and shaman. After the era of Gojoseon, Three Kingdoms (Goguryeo, Baekje and Silla) ruled Korean peninsula. Cha-cha-oong, the name of the second king of Silla (57 BCE-935 CE), also meant *Mu-dang* (shaman of *Mu-gyo*). After the fifth century, Buddhism and Confucianism

---

were introduced in Korea, and took over the throne of national religion from Mu-gyo. Nevertheless, Mu-gyo has survived right up to the present day in Korea.⁴

In Mu-gyo faith, there exist countless gods in Cheonsang-ge (category of sky), Jiha-ge (category of underground) and Ingan-ge (category of human).⁵ Mu-gyo believes that the gods control life and death, blessings and curses of human beings. However, there are some gods who are more closely connected with the life of human beings. Especially, for a community’s wealth and peace, rituals are offered to forty-three kinds of Dong-shin (gods of sky, land, the sun, the moon, stars, mountains and the like). For a family business and health, Ga-shin (god of house), Jo-sang-shin (ancestor god) and Sam-shin (three gods governing childbirth) are worshipped.⁶

In Mu-gyo, there is no concept of an absolutely good or evil god. Mu-gyo believes that even the Sonnim-shin (the god of disease who suddenly appears in the life of a human, throws the whole of life into disorder and sometimes takes away life from children) will give people fortune instead of illness when the god is well treated. Conversely, if any god is ignored or treated poorly, the god will punish people with misfortune or illness.⁷

The ritual is Mu-gyo, which is known as Gut or Pu-dak-geo-ri, is led by a Mu-dang (shaman). In Gut, only Mu-dang owns the power and right to contact with gods. Clients and other people indirectly communicate with gods through Mu-dang. Therefore, Mu-dang’s spiritual power which is able to communicate with gods is considered as being crucial in Gut.⁸ Generally Gut can be divided into two categories: communal Gut and personal Gut. Communal Gut includes various forms of Gut mainly praying for a good harvest and peace of a community. Personal Gut has three categories: 1. Gibok-je: Gut for success of family business, and health and fortune of family members. 2. Saryeong-je: Gut for consoling the soul of the dead and sending the soul to Jeo-seung (traditionally Koreans believe that when people die souls have to go to Jeo-seung, which can be translated as “beyond world”). 3.

---

⁵ Dong-sik Yu, “Religious Basis of the Korean Culture,” 118.
⁸ Dong-sik Yu, “Religious Basis of the Korean Culture,” 120.
Gubyeong-je: *Gut* for healing a patient. The contents and orders of *Gut* vary between regions but generally *Gut* comprises twelve *Geo-ri* (elements). The main themes of the twelve *Geo-ri* are the preparation of *Gut*, inviting gods, making wishes to gods, receiving *Gong-su* (answers from gods), and farewell to the gods. The main purpose of *Gut* is to solve the problems that people face and to seek happiness in the world.

### 1.1.2 *Mu-gyo*’s Understanding of Life and Death

In *Mu-gyo* faith, people live in *E-seung* (this world) while alive and after death souls go to *Jeo-seung* (beyond world). Especially, the concept of *Jeo-seung* in *Mu-gyo* is quite different from other religions. In *Mu-gyo*, *Jeo-seung* is a vacant place whereas most religions view that after death good souls go to heaven where the souls enjoy a new world. In *Jeo-seung* there is no hope or expectation of new life. There is no salvation or rest of soul. *Mu-gyo* believes that souls having unresolved earthly problems do not want to go to *Jeo-seung* as there is no savior or consoler of soul in *Jeo-seung*. Thus the souls stay in *E-seung* until all problems are resolved. The souls wander about aimlessly in *E-seung* because they do not own a body to settle earthly matters. These wandering souls in *E-seung* are named as *Won-gui* or *Won-ryeong*. *Won-gui* is generally considered a harmful ghost. Thus Koreans often connect unfortunate accidents, diseases or death with the work of *Won-gui*. The only method to escape from the affliction of *Won-gui* is to console *Won-gui* and send it to *Jeo-seung* through *Gut*. For people believing in *Mu-gyo*, *Jeo-seung* is the place where they must go but do not want to go.

This negative perspective on the afterlife is well presented in *Sangdu-sori* (a farewell song which is sung during the funeral march for a soul leaving for *Jeo-seung*). *Sangdu-sori* does not pay attention to the illustration of life in *Jeo-seung*. The sorrow of parting dominates the song. In the song, the bereaved family cries and pleads

---

10 Dong-sik Yu, “Religious Basis of the Korean Culture,” 118.
12 The general concept of heaven and hell in Korea began to be formed after the introduction of Buddhism and Confucianism. See the sections 1.2 Buddhism and 1.3 Confucianism in this chapter.
with the dead to not leave them. On the other hand, the song describes the mind of
the dead person who does not want to depart from the loved ones but has to go:

Now if you go, when will you come back?
Please tell me when you will come back. …
Poor and pitiful
The dead is pitiful. …
Live well. Live well.
Live well. Don’t remember me. …
Going, going, I am going.
I have finished this world. I am going. …

All souls have to go to Jeo-seung due to death but there is nothing for the soul to do.
In the song, the view of Mu-gyo of the world after life as a barren land rather than
paradise is observed. This concept of Jeo-seung leads Koreans to be more obsessed
with E-seung, that is, the life of this world. The attachment to the realities of this
world is the notable feature of Korean indigenous faith.

1.2 Buddhism

1.2.1 From the Royal Family to the People

Buddhism in Korea was introduced from China about 372 CE and grew as the
national religion in the period of the Three Kingdoms (about 100 BCE-668 CE),
unified Silla (668 CE-935 CE) and continuously Goryeo (918-1392 CE). For nearly
one millennium, the upper class used Buddhism for strengthening their reign. As an
example, there was Pal-gwan-hwoe (a Buddhist festival). Pal-gwan-hwoe was
originally a religious-leaning festival centred at Buddhist temples but as time passed
it was transformed into a social and national festival. The dynasties of Silla and
Goryeo used Pal-gwan-hwoe to enhance bondage between people, especially to raise
the status of royal family and ruling class, and to secure the justification of reign.

The Joseon dynasty (1392-1897 CE) was founded after Goryeo around the late 14th
century. In Joseon, Confucianism was the governing ideology and so Buddhism
was suppressed. In the early stage of Joseon, according to the policy of Soong-yu-eok-
bul (venerate Confucianism and restrain Buddhism), temples and Buddhist lands

---

were forfeited. Buddhist monks were banned from entering cities. They had no choice but to escape deep into the mountains. Although there were some kings such as Se-jo (1455-1468 CE) and Myeong-jong (1545-1567 CE) who tried to revive Buddhism with the policy of Heung-bul (revive Buddhism), the basic governing ideology of Joseon was Confucianism. In such a process, Buddhism in Joseon stepped down from the throne and permeated the life of the people, seeking ways to survive.

1.2.2 Dae-seung Buddhism (Mahayana)

Between the 6th and 4th centuries BCE, Buddhism was established in India based on the teachings of Siddhartha Gautama generally known as the Buddha. Since then, Buddhism has grown with various branches such as the ancient original Buddhism, So-seung (Hinayana), Dae-seung (Mahayana), Mil-gyo (Vajrayana) and so forth. The branch of Buddhism introduced through China into Korea was Dae-seung. The early Buddhism verged on So-seung, which pursued personal enlightenment through asceticism, but later the faith of Dae-seung, focused on deliverance of others and interest in matters of human life, began to emerge.16

In So-seung Buddha means Siddhartha Gautama (Sakyamuni) who was enlightened and entered into nirvana (the state of complete absence of sensation). However, Dae-seung believes that there exist innumerable Buddhas who are enlightened and Bosals (Bodhisattvas) who pursue enlightenment to become Buddha. Bosals never seek nirvana for their own sake. They act for helping Jung-saeng (all living creatures) struggling in this world. Also Buddha is not a god who resides only in heaven but is a being who lives for Jung-saeng with Bosals to establish Jeong-to (the world of Buddha where there is no agony, pain and anxiety). In Dae-seung, there are various Bodhisattvas such as Mun-su bosal (god of wisdom), Bo-hyun bosal (god of practice) and so forth. Among them, Gwan-se-um bosal (god of mercy) presents well the spirit of Dae-seung. Gwan-se-um bosal can “see” the voice of anxiety in the world. The gender of Gwan-se-um bosal is neutral. The face is masculine but the body is feminine. The womanish body symbolizes mercy and maternal love. Gwan-se-um bosal rushes to the scene of anguish with mercy and love. Dae-seung Buddhism

16 Ja-kyeong Han, Context of Korean Philosophy (Seoul: Ewha Womans University Press, 2008), 68.
enters deep into the human world and tries to solve the matters of life while the interest of So-seung is on Hae-tal (Buddhist deliverance, that is, emancipation from the world).  

1.2.3 Miruk (Maitreya) Faith in Korea

Miruk is a Bodhisattva of Dae-seung Buddhism. Miruk, as a successor of Gautama Buddha, is the future Buddha who will save human beings. Miruk was taught by Gautama and was an intellectually and spiritually outstanding disciple. In answering the questions of disciples, Gautama prophesized that Miruk would die but he would return to earth to save the world as the future Buddha. According to Seong Bul Gyeong which is one of Buddhist scriptures, 5,670 million years after the death of Gautama, Miruk will be reincarnated in a figure of a man in his thirties. He will give people sermons three times. While the first Buddha Gautama could not save many human beings, at the first sermon of Miruk 9,600 million people will be enlightened, then 9,400 million and lastly 9,200 million. The fabulous number of people delivered by Miruk seems to be a symbol of hope rather than have a literal meaning, and a completion of the unfinished work of Gautama through which only a few people who were enlightened could enter nirvana.

In Yongwha Segye (the new world ruled by Miruk), there is no agony or anxiety. The world is full of gold and diamond and everyone enjoys plenty of food. There is no pain, sickness, aging or death. Here, it would be worth noting that Yongwha Segye is situated not in heaven but on earth. Although the Yongwha Segye will come in the future, people who are oppressed strongly anticipate that the new age will arrive in their life time. In the early history of Buddhism in Korea, the faith in Miruk was often embodied into attempts of transforming the current world. Gyeon-Hweon (867-936) who was born as the son of a poor peasant dreamed of a new kingdom. He gathered his allies to establish Yongwha Segye, and claimed himself to be Miruk. His revolution was successful but the lives of people under his rule did not improve.

18 Ik-gu Yeo, The World of Miruk Gyeong (Seoul: Jiyangsa, 1986), 182.
19 Ibid., 110.
same time, Gung-Ye (861-918) was born between Hun-An, a king of Silla, and a concubine. In power struggles, he was pushed out to a temple and became a monk. He joined rebels led by General Yang-Gil against the Silla kingdom and attained fame winning several wars. Finally he established the later Goguryeo kingdom asking his people to believe him as Miruk. However, in actual life, he was a tyrannical leader rather than Miruk. 21 Some rulers used the Miruk faith for their political purposes, but it is also a sign that Miruk faith had a huge influence on people. On the other hand, in the period of Joseon when Buddhism was restrained, Miruk faith continuously influenced the lives of people by blending with shamanism.

The poet Eun Goh tries to connect the Miruk faith with the context of people who are oppressed, comparing this to Sakyamuni (Gautama) Buddhism. He gives an interpretation that Sakyamuni is the Buddha for the upper classes in feudal eras but Miruk symbolizes the liberation and deliverance of Minjung (the mass of the people who are politically oppressed and economically exploited). 22 So Miruk is the Buddha for the Minjung. 23 The Miruk faith means the popularization of Buddhism and at the same time the embodiment of the Minjung’s will of establishing an ideal world in their real life. Thus Miruk faith flourished especially at the times of social turmoil when the Minjung’s suffering was worst. Miruk faith consoled the socially oppressed who found little hope in Sakyamuni Buddhism. 24

The difference between Sakyamuni Buddhism and Miruk faith is revealed in Buddhist statues. The Sakyamuni Buddhist statue is set on the highest place in a worship room. The statue is generally of gilt bronze and presents a magnificent and dignified appearance. However, permission to enter the worship room was given to only the royal family and the nobility. The Minjung needed the Buddha for their own sake. Thus the Minjung put up Dolbucheo (a Buddhist statue made of a stone of Miruk) in fields and streets where they were not excluded instead of the luxuriously gilded statue for the ruling classes. 25 The figure of Dolbucheo was far from being

21 Ibid., 396 – 401.
22 For more details on the concept of Minjung, see the section “The Influence of Mugyo and Miruk Faith on the Eucharist in Minjung Theology” of this chapter.
24 Ibid., 226.
delicate or splendid. Many of these statues were worn away by years of wind and rain. Yet, the pitiful figure of Miruk was the symbol of the life of Minjung and symbolised consolation and hope for them.

1.3 Confucianism

1.3.1 The Social System of Joseon (1392-1897 CE)

Socially Joseon had the Yang-cheon system. The term “Yang” in Yang-cheon means Yang-in (middle class) and “Cheon” means Cheon-min (lower class). Under the Yang-cheon system, only Yang-in could take Gwa-geo (civil service exam) and become government officials. The leading figures of the establishment of Joseon, Sinjinsadaebu (newly rising scholar-bureaucrats), implemented drastically the policy of expanding the number of Yang-in to secure a justification of the foundation of Joseon. Legally there was only a distinction of two classes, Yang-in and Cheon-min. However in actual life there existed four classes, which are Yang-ban, Jung-in, Yang-in and Cheon-min, and there was a very strict distinction between four classes.

Yang-ban politically monopolized the high positions of government. Socially they belonged to the highest class. The society of the Joseon Dynasty was led by Yang-ban bureaucracy. Literally Yang-ban means Yang (two) and Ban (branches) of government officials. The government system of Joseon was divided into two parts: Mun-ban (civil administrator) and Mu-ban (martial office holder). However, the real power of the controlling government was concentrated in Mun-ban. The central government comprised of Yang-ban dissolved the private army and controlled landed proprietors by sending local governors to each district. Also Yang-ban became the main body managing Joseon and checking the abuse of royal powers.26

In the early years of Joseon the original meaning of Yang-ban was men who were qualified to become bureaucrats but later the meaning of Yang-ban was expanded to include all family members and their descendants. Economically almost all Yang-ban were rich landlords having many slaves. Yang-ban intensified the exclusivity and discriminated against Seo-eol (children of the second wife) and Hyang-ri (lower level local officials) in order to keep their political, economic and social privileges.

---

Socially Seo-eol and Hyang-ri were blocked to enter high positions of government. Jung-in was the class between Yang-ban and Yang-in. Jung-in were engaged in entry level administrative positions or as technical civil servants. Jung-in were discriminated by Yang-ban but they played an important role for the maintenance of the Yang-ban system by having close connections with Yang-ban and by ruling the classes of Yang-in and Cheon-min. Generally Yang-in were occupied mainly with agriculture and commerce. They were given a huge burden of tax by the ruling class. Although ostensibly the door of becoming Yang-ban was open to all through Gwageo exam, it was quite difficult for the lower classes like Yang-in except Yang-ban families to possess enough time and financial support to pass the exam. Cheon-min was the lowest class of Joseon and basically No-bi (slaves) comprised Cheon-min. For example, a butcher, prostitute, musician, Mu-dang and the like were legally Yang-in but actually were treated as Cheon-min. They did not have any rights as a human being and were seen as possessions to trade and inherit. The ordinary life of Yang-ban class was basically run by the No-bi system. No-bi as the hands and feet of Yang-ban did everything for their lord’s family. Thus No-bi was recognized as essential with land for the upkeep of the life of Yang-ban.

The national ideology of Joseon was Seong-ri-hak which is one of the main theories of Confucianism. Seong-ri-hak tries to explain the origin and movement of human beings, society and the universe through the concept of Li and Gi. As the origin of the whole universe, Li which is immanent within all human beings is naturally good and equal. Due to Li all human beings have a natural morality. When considering only Li, all humans are equal and are beings of dignity. On the other hand, as an essential element of the whole creature there is Gi within all human beings. Unlike Li, each Gi, which has a material cause, has different size. As a result of the dissimilarity of Gi, humans are divided into the wise and the fool. The ruling class of Joseon, Yang-ban, used the theory of Li and Gi as an instrumental tool for explaining their superiority in social position and justifying the oppression of the lower classes.

---

27 Ibid., 30.
28 Ibid., 30-31.
30 Shin, and Lee, A New Understanding of the History of Korea, 32.
1.3.2 Distinctions between Men and Women

Almost all teachings as to the differences between men and women in Joseon were based on Ye-gi, one of five classics of the Confucian canon. According to chapter twelve Nae-chik in Ye-gi, a man and a woman are distinguished from birth. When a baby boy is born a bow is to be on the left side of a door and for a baby girl a towel is to be on the right side of a door. In addition, Ye-gi says that Chil-nyeon nam-yeo budong-seok bu-dong-sik. It means that by seven, a boy and a girl should not sit and eat together.31 Yutae Lee’s book, Jung-hun, reflecting the thought of Ye-gi, gives instruction about how men and women should behave. Even with family, men should not visit freely the rooms of women. Men fifteen years old and over should not sit or play with their sisters. Even making a joke between them was banned. Sexual distinction was applied to the manner of using public places. Men should not use a well or toilet with women. This rule applied to No-bi as well. When No-bi broke the rule they were punished by being whipped on the calf.32

Nam-jon-yeo-bi thought prevailed in Joseon’s patriarchal society. This term means that the rights and position of men were superior to that of women. The term itself is not from Confucian books but the thought can be easily found in Korean Confucianism. It would be worth observing an excerpt from the books, Nae-Hun and Ge-Nyeo-Seo, which were used for teaching women Confucian ideology in Joseon:

The only one thing that a woman has to wish for one hundred years is her husband and to serve him. A woman has to allow her husband to do what he wants to do except one thing that cannot be accepted by the world because it is extremely wrong. Do not ignore even a word of your husband. The most outstanding service that a woman can do for her husband is to not be jealous. If your husband keeps one hundred concubines, overlook his deed. Although your husband loves too much his concubine, respect more him, and do not be offended by his deed.33

Sam-jong-ji-do (three principles that women have to keep) was also a widespread thought in Joseon society. The core of the thought is that women have to obey men because women’s inferiority is determined by the law of nature. Three principles are

31 Jae-hee Ji, Ye-Gi (Seoul: Jayu Mungo, 2000), 123-170.
32 Hay-soon Lee et al., eds. Yeh-hak Philosophy and Everyday Culture in the Middle of Joseon: focused on Ju-ja-ga-rye (Seoul: Ewha Womans University Press, 2008), 123-124.
33 Queen So-heon Han, Shin-Wan-Yeok Nae-Hun, Ge-Nyeo-Seo, ed. Si-yeol Song, and Jong-kwon Kim (Seoul: Myeongmundang, 1987), 200 - 201.
to obey your father before a marriage, your husband after marriage, and then your son after the death of husband.\textsuperscript{34}

The core of Dae-hak and Jung-yong, the representative books of Confucianism for men, is Su-sin je-ga chi-guk pyeong-cheon-ha. It means that the goal of life for a man is to cultivate himself, to regulate family, to govern state, and to make the entire world peaceful. While the level of the goals of men’s lives presented in the books is quite high, Yeo-gye, one of the Confucian books for women, compels women to expect a quite low level for life goals. Yeo-gye has as its premise that women are by nature weak and humble. Thus the social position of women is low. Women should not try to gain a reputation by good works. Women have to bear a shame and tolerate disgrace. Women have to live as if they were afraid of something.\textsuperscript{35}

Likewise, the patriarchal social system based on Confucian ideology undermined the dignity and values of women. Especially in the period of Joseon women lost most of the freedom that they enjoyed before, and came to have a restricted sphere of activity. In Goryeo men and women were free to communicate each other and there was not a strict regulation concerning women’s travelling. However, in Joseon, women’s sphere was limited to the inside of the house, and they were banned from visiting a temple or Mu-dang’s shrine which had been permitted among women in the former period. When a woman wanted to go out of her house, she had to wear Jang-ot (a long hood with which she covered her face). Around the turn into the 17\textsuperscript{th} century women’s right to own property was considerably weakened. Until the 16\textsuperscript{th} century, sons and daughters inherited equal properties but in the middle of the 17\textsuperscript{th} century the discrimination between men and women became worse and then women’s property rights were remarkably diminished. Thus financially women became more reliant on men.\textsuperscript{36}

\textsuperscript{35} Ewha Institute for the Humanities, The Landscape of Gender and Post/Boundary (Seoul: Ewha Womans University Press, 2009), 208-215.
\textsuperscript{36} Ok-pyo Mun, “The Change of Women’s Position in Family,” 62-64.
1.3.3 Confucian Understanding of Children in Joseon

In the West, the recognition of childhood started being formed from the 16th century. The understanding of childhood among people from all levels of society became widespread in the 19th century which echoed the end of the feudal era and the beginning of the modern capitalism. However the 19th century Joseon was still under the dominant patriarchal feudal system. In the feudal Joseon, people should obey their king, and wives and children should obey their husband and father who was the ruler of the family.37

Most of the opportunities to study were given to the children of Yang-ban families. In the agricultural society of Joseon, many children had to participate in economic activities and take care of their little siblings. With regard to the opportunity of education, girls were more discriminated against than boys. Almost all the parents recognized that it was useless to educate their daughters. The parents’ only wish for their daughters was that they meet a good husband, serve well him and raise healthy children. One of the worst systems for girls in Joseon was early marriage. Early marriage was still widespread even in the early 20th century in Korea. Giyeon Kim gives an illustration of the life of girls who were married early, criticizing the system:

At such an early age to grow, girls are separated from their parents and sweet home, and have to work in a strange kitchen of their husband who they have never met with. They cannot enjoy life and wear good clothes. They suffer from maltreatment by husband’s family.38

Children’s disobedience to the adults’ will was considered as destructive to the order of society. One of the Confucian ethics, Jang-yu-yu-seo39 developed into the thought that young people should obey and respect the will of old people. In the period of Joseon which stressed hierarchical order, children were recognized as a being lower than an adult, and as just a family member rather than an independent being.

39 Originally it means that brothers should respect each other. But this term was literally interpreted and applied in Joseon society as the meaning that there is an order between adults and children.
2 Cultural Influences on Worship and the Eucharist of the PCK

2.1 Mu-gyo’s Influence on Worship and the Eucharist

Mu-gyo, as the indigenous religion, has affected many aspects of worship and the eucharist of the PCK. First of all, the passion and devotion for religious life found in not only the PCK but also other Korean churches seem to be influenced by Mu-gyo faith. In Mu-gyo, women were used to praying at dawn every day or during a certain period for their family or private wishes. They believed that a god would be impressed by their prayers which were fervently and repeatedly conducted and would lead to their wishes being fulfilled. Religious commitment and sincerity were the crucial values in Mu-gyo. Similarly, almost all Korean churches hold early morning prayers every day. On Friday late at night, Cheol-ya Gido (a prayer meeting at night) is held for about two hours. Also, there is Jak-jeong Gido (a planned prayer).

For this prayer, many Korean Christians decide to pray for one month or 1000 days for a certain purpose. During Geum-sik Gido (fasting and prayer) people do not have food and sometimes even water. As well as prayer, in the early period of Korean Christianity, many Christians used to decide to offer their time for voluntary preaching in a heathen village. In 1905, Rev. Carl E. Kearns reports:

We were very much surprised to see 625 days subscribed in a few minutes and a considerable number of additional subscriptions came in after the service closed. To distinguish this service from the daily witnessing to our believers which each Christian does as a matter of course, the terms of subscription required that the volunteer preacher leave home and spend the specified number of days at this own expense in a heathen village. Subscriptions were for five or ten days, or a week or a fortnight, to be fulfilled within six weeks after the class closed. One man who subscribed 150 days had to have this time limit extended. ... Personally I know of about 3,000 days of volunteer preaching that has been done in all parts of the province.

The religious passion has led the PCK to tighten up its traditional eucharistic regulation. One of the PCK’s traditional eucharistic understandings is that the eucharist is the “holy” sacrament. In order to keep the eucharist holy, the PCK allows only those who are baptized and over fifteen years old to participate in the eucharist. In the PCK, it is not a strange experience of hearing an announcement

42 For more details on the PCK’s eucharistic understanding, see chapter two of this thesis.
that the eucharist will be held on the next Sunday service, therefore participants should prepare for the eucharist during weekdays with prayer and a holy life. The PCK’s enthusiasm for keeping the eucharist holy contributes spontaneously to the emphasis on the participants’ qualification for the eucharist.

Another effect of Mu-gyo on worship and the eucharist of the PCK can be found in Sa-kyeong-hoe (a revival meeting or Bible study meeting).43 Sa-kyeong-hoe has been one of the core growth engines of the PCK and other Korean churches. Sa-kyeong-hoe consists mainly of hymn, prayer and preaching without the eucharist. Originally Sa-kyeong-hoe was a special meeting different from Sunday service.44 However, gradually the Sa-kyeong-hoe style of worship came to prevail in Korean churches. As a result, the recognition of the eucharist as a sacrament different from worship began to be rooted in the PCK. In the process, Mu-gyo faith contributed to the spread of Sa-kyeong-hoe style of worship.

Harvey Cox, exploring the reason for the growth of Pentecostalism in Korea, notes that many features of the worship in Pentecostal churches reflect "huge chunks of indigenous Korean shamanism,"45 Mu-gyo. Although his focus is on Pentecostal church, he finds for a fact that other churches growing fast in Korea also have similar styles of worship to the Pentecostal church.46 The shamanic features in the worship of those churches observed by Cox are the main elements of Sa-kyeong-hoe. Thus it is not difficult to find shamanic features in Sa-kyeong-hoe. One of the similarities between Sa-kyeong-hoe and shamanic practices is that participants seek personal benefits such as physical health, material blessings and peace of mind. The climax of Gut of Mu-gyo is invocation and ecstasy through which Mu-dang invites and make contact with a god respectively. There is a general faith in Mu-gyo that Mu-dang takes an ability to heal those who suffer from illness through making contact with a god in ecstasy.47 People share certain feelings of happiness and freedom from worries with Mu-dang in ecstasy, albeit temporally. Similarly, in Sa-kyeong-hoe, the main theme of participants’ prayers is earthly blessings. Also, with

43 In Korea, Sa-kyeong-hoe is also called Bu-heung Sa-kyeong-hoe or Bu-heung-hoe.
44 For more details on the origin and development of Sa-kyeong-hoe in the PCK, see the section of “John L. Nevius’ Mission Methods” in chapter two of this thesis.
46 Ibid., 222.
mystical experiences such as speaking in tongues, prophecy and healing in Sa-
kyeong-hoe, they feel spiritual satisfaction and freedom from life’s worries and pain.\(^{48}\)

The attraction of the consolation gained from Sa-kyeong-hoe led the PCK to pursue a
more emotional and enthusiastic style of worship rather than liturgical worship
including the eucharist.

2.2 The Influence of 
Mugyo and Miruk Faith on the Eucharist in Minjung

Theology

Minjung theology emerged in the 1970s with a theological reflection on “the
oppressed in the Korean political situation.”\(^{49}\) Literally, Minjung can be translated
as “the mass of the people.”\(^{50}\) However, Byung Mu Ahn who is considered the
father of Minjung theology found the ὄχλος (crowd) in the Gospel according to
Mark. Ahn determined five characteristics of the ὄχλος:

1 Wherever Jesus went, there were always people who gathered around
him. … 2 These people were the so-called sinners, who stood condemned in
their society. … 3 There are cases where they (the ochlos) are differentiated
from the disciples. … 4 The ochlos are contrasted with the ruling class from
Jerusalem who attack and criticize Jesus as their enemy. … 5 Because the
ochlos were against the rulers, the rulers were afraid of them and tried not to
arouse their anger.\(^{51}\)

Furthermore, Ahn distinguished the ὄχλος (crowd) in Mark from the λαος (people)
their sins and are baptized, but the the ὄχλος in Mark “belong to a class of society
which has been marginalized and abandoned.”\(^{52}\) Then, Ahn identified the ὄχλος
with Minjung in Korea who were suppressed by an exploitative class. Ahn insisted
that “God’s will is to side with the Minjung completely and unconditionally.”\(^{53}\) In
the 1980s, a goal of Minjung theology was the liberation of Minjung from the
oppression of a dictatorial regime. Now, the Minjung theology of Korea, leading a

\(^{48}\) Joon-sik Choi suggests a possibility that there would be the connection between the ritual of Mu-
gyo and Bu-heung-hoe. See Choi, Korea’s Customs People’s Faith, 49-51.

\(^{49}\) David Kwang-sun Suh, “Minjung and Theology in Korea: A Biographical Sketch of an Asian
Theological Consultation,” in Yong Bok Kim, ed., Minjung Theology: People as the Subjects of History

\(^{50}\) Ibid., 17.

\(^{51}\) Byung Mu Ahn, “Jesus and the Minjung in the Gospel of Mark,” in ibid., 138-139.

\(^{52}\) Ibid., 149.

\(^{53}\) Ibid., 150.
social transformation movement, has developed into a representative theology of the Third World along with Liberation theology in Latin America.⁵⁴

One of the key understandings of Minjung theology concerning the eucharist is the recognition of the eucharist as an act of sharing a meal with Minjung rather than simply a ritual. According to Byung Mu Ahn, Jesus’ meal sharing with Minjung was an act of realizing the kingdom of God in this unequal world.⁵⁵ Minjung is a politically and economically oppressed class. The upper class extorts money and food from Minjung. As a result, the poor and hungry Minjung comes to be poorer and their starvation is worse. Minjung theology views that the salvation of Minjung includes not only spiritual but also political and economical liberation. For the salvation of Minjung, Jesus invited Minjung to his table and provided them with food. Also, in the eucharist, Jesus becomes the food for Minjung. Through the eucharist, the meal sharing with Minjung, Jesus presented a way of delivering Minjung and restoring the kingdom of God.⁵⁶

The equality of human beings, one of the foundations of Minjung theology, is found in Mugyo. Historically, Mugyo was the religion for Minjung. Especially in Joseon which made a severe discrimination according to class and sex, Mugyo was instrumental in consoling a weary body and soul of lower people especially women. Generally, in most religions a priest is male but the priest of Mugyo, Mu-dang, is female. In Mugyo, of course, there are male shamans but they are called as Baksu Mu-dang and the number of Baksu Mu-dang is remarkably lower than Mu-dang. In addition, in Gut, the role of the male is mainly a helper, playing musical instruments such as Buk (drum) and Jing (gong) while Mu-dang leads the ritual practice.⁵⁷

---

⁵⁵ Byung Mu Ahn, Galilee Jesus (Seoul: Han Gil Sa, 1993), 146.
⁵⁶ Jae-soon Park, Jesus Movement and Table Community (Seoul: Cheon Ji, 1988), 248-265.
⁵⁷ In-hoe Kim, Study on Shamanism of Korea (Seoul: Jib Mun Dang, 1987), 16.
The Minjung-oriented religious character is also presented in Miruk faith of Dae-seung Buddhism. Those who have Miruk faith prayed Dolbucheo58 for their family business and health. Sometimes, they plotted to overthrow the government, believing in Miruk who would build the new world, Yongwha Segye.59 Lee names the Minjung-oriented religious basis found in the Miruk faith as “the millennial hope.”60 The millennial hope, “a source for bringing change,”61 has been embodied in the history of Korea through several attempts to resist or subvert the ruling power. It would be a formidable task to prove the direct connection between Minjung theology and Mu-gyo and Miruk faith. Nevertheless, there is a meaningful finding in that the basis of Korean traditional culture, the seed of Minjung theology was imbued long before the birth of Minjung theology in the name of the equality of human beings and sometimes of millenarianism.

Some churches in the PCK have tried to participate in activities for Minjung according to Minjung theology. Almost all the churches are founded in industrial areas and slums and the main members of the churches are the poor and labourers who were politically oppressed and socially marginalized. During Sunday services, the churches more often conducted the eucharist than other protestant churches. In addition, they used to celebrate the eucharist before participating in an antigovernment campaign or a meeting for human right of labourers. For them, participation in the eucharist meant a union of participants and Jesus' body and blood. It, also, meant the participants’ decision to join the way of suffering and to live for Minjung in history and society following Jesus.62 Another reason why they conducted the eucharist before participating in the meetings for Minjung is that doing so is to follow what Jesus did at the last supper. After the eucharist, they participated in the meeting. The hostile government kept an eye on them. During or after the meetings, there was the participants’ suffering such as forcibly being taken to the police station or imprisonment. Thus, just like Jesus who was arrested and

58 Dolbucheo means Buddhist statue made of stone of Miruk.
60 Sang Taek Lee, Religion and Social Formation in Korea, 7.
61 Ibid., 172.
suffered after the eucharist they joined the life of Jesus through the eucharist.\textsuperscript{63} The more frequent celebrations of the eucharist in the Sunday service and active participation in social and political matters for \textit{Minjung} through the eucharist offered a meaningful challenge to the PCK’s traditional understanding of the eucharist which is appreciated as just a sacrament and not part of worship. However, this new approach to the eucharist attempted by \textit{Minjung} theology failed to be widely accepted by the PCK.

2.3 The Influence of Confucianism on the Eucharist

Confucianism has had the most direct and greatest influence on the eucharist of the PCK. In Korea, the area of the pulpit and the table for the eucharist is recognized as a sanctuary. The area is separated by the height or the colour of the carpet from the seats of the congregation. The eucharist begins and the minister and committee of the eucharist stand in the sanctuary. The order of taking the eucharistic elements is the minister first, then the committee and lastly congregation.\textsuperscript{64} Generally the eucharist is led by the senior pastor of the church, and the committee comprises presbyters and assistant pastors. In the case of a small church which has no presbyter, anointed deacons are included in the committee. This hierarchical order is closely related with the church’s installation system. In the PCK, in order to be ordained as a \textit{Jangro} (an ordained presbyter),\textsuperscript{65} the laity has to go through the process as follows:

\begin{itemize}
  \item[\textsuperscript{63}] Seong-won Park, \textit{Worship in the Presbyterian Church in Korea: Its History and Implications} (New York, NY: Peter Lang, 2001), 131.
  \item[\textsuperscript{64}] See Committee on the Book of Common Worship, \textit{The Book of Common Worship} (Seoul: Publishing House PCK, 2008), 56, 59, 80, 205. Also see Committee on the Book of Common Worship, \textit{The Book of Common Worship} (Seoul: Publishing House PCK, 1997), 55, 60, 84, 123.
  \item[\textsuperscript{65}] \textit{Jangro} means an ordained presbyter.
\end{itemize}
In nature, the installation system never means a hierarchy. However, in the actual life of the congregation the system is recognized as a hierarchy. This hierarchical recognition of the church seems to echo the character of Korean society based on the ideas of Confucianism. In Korea, even though the legally hierarchical system is an extinct custom, Confucianism which was the soil for class consciousness in Joseon is still predominant. Thus Koreans try to enter the higher classes through education in society. In church, lay members try to enter Dang-hoe, the supreme decision making body which comprises pastors and presbyters, by becoming a presbyter.\(^\text{66}\)

In the eucharist of the PCK, the lay class is again divided into the baptized and the non-baptized. The person who is not baptized is strictly banned from taking bread.

and the cup. It is true that such a eucharistic practice is not the special eucharistic characteristic of the PCK. Many mainstream churches in the world keep this eucharistic tradition. However, when comparing with the eucharistic understandings of other Protestant denominations which had contributed to the formation of the PCK, its strong adherence to the eucharistic regulation of “baptism before the eucharist” can be regarded as the PCK’s distinctive eucharistic feature.

There were four denominations which had influenced the formation of the PCK: the Presbyterian Church in USA, the Presbyterian Church in US, the Presbyterian Church of Australia (PCA) and the Canadian Presbyterian Church (CPC). In these denominations today, the open table practice, which allows the non-baptized to take part in the eucharist, is widespread. In contrast, the PCK keeps the traditional eucharistic regulation, which opens the eucharist to only the baptized, and repeatedly expresses a strong aversion to the open table. Compared to the western churches’ perception of the open table, the PCK’s robust inflexible response to the open table seems to be considerably influenced by Confucian thought.

Until the early part of the 20th century, there were strong distinctions between men and women in churches in Korea. This also can be thought of as a Confucian influence on Korean churches. Many churches during worship divided men and women into different seats. Geumsan Church in Gimje and Dudong Church in Iksan which are preserved as historical relics show clearly the circumstances of that time’s worship and culture. Both churches have a special design of the worship place in an “L” shape. Men sit in A, women sit in B, and a preacher stands on C. This design of building is that men and women cannot see each other but a preacher can see all.

---

68 In 1998 and 2004, regularizing the open table practice was proposed to the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of USA (PCUSA) but the bills remain unresolved. As to the recent discussions on the open table in the PCUSA, see David L. Stubbs, The Open Table: What Gospel Do We Practice?: Theology and Worship Occasional Paper No. 22 (Louisville, KY: Presbyterian Church (U. S. A), 2009), 9-24. However, in practice, the PCUSA holds the open table policy. See Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), Invitation to Christ: A Guide to Sacramental Practices (KY, Louisville: Office of Theology and Worship, 2006). For more details on the open table policy of the UCA and the CPC, see footnote 3 in chapter 8 of this study.
Ostensibly the distinction between men and women in a place seems not a big issue, but there were many cases, where the distinction led to a number of serious instances of discrimination against women in church policy. Today, some Protestant denominations in Korea such as Hapdong and Gosin ban women from becoming an ordained presbyter or minister. It was not until the 1990s that the PCK allowed the ordination of women. As a result, in the eucharist of the PCK, the roles of the minister and the committee for the eucharist came to be occupied by men. The duties for women are mainly to prepare bread and wine before the eucharist, to become a receiver of bread and the cup from men during the eucharist, and to clean bread crumbs and utensils after the eucharist.

As observed in the previous section, Jang-yu-yu-seo based on Confucianism is a representative characteristic of Korean society. Children are generally recognized as those who should follow the plan and will of their parents in a family and the rules installed by adults in society. In addition, all have to respect someone who is older than them and even between twins hierarchical order by birth time is considered as an important ethical rule to be kept. The strict boundary and division by ages is also found in the eucharist. The constitution of the PCK says that only the baptized members who are over fifteen years old have the right to participate in the eucharist. It is possible that the consideration of a certain age as a prerequisite

---

69 In 1994, the 79th Assembly of the PCK passed the bill regarding the ordination of women. In 1996, the PCK produced the first woman ordained presbyter and minister. In-soo Kim, *A Brief History of the Christian Church in Korea: for the Laity and the Church School Teachers* (Seoul: The Presbyterian Church of Korea, 1998), 257.

70 For more details on “Jang-yu-yu-seo,” see the section “Confucian Understanding on Children in Joseon” of this chapter.

for the eucharist would be to echo the reformed tradition which recognizes the significance of participants’ confession of faith and knowledge of the eucharist. However, when considering other reformed denominations in the west which allow children to participate in the eucharist, this eucharistic regulation of the PCK seems to be still influenced by Confucianism.

A typical feature of the eucharist in the PCK is moral strictness. The early missionaries transmitted their puritan faith into Korea. From the early period of mission, churches were full of Koreans visiting for various reasons, such as a curiosity for foreign people and culture, an opportunity for education provided by church, or for seeking Christian faith. The missionaries were very prudent in giving Koreans baptism and accepting them as church members. To be baptized, they had to be a catechumen for at least six months to one year. Also, for baptism, they had to stop smoking and drinking, and keeping a moral lifestyle and the Lord’s Day was essential. The early Korean churches had a rigid rule to ban those, who conducted Je-sa ancestor worship) or did not keep the Lord’s Day, from participating in the eucharist. At that time, moral purity was considered to be an essential requirement for people to come to the table. However, when considering the moralistic inclination which prevails in most Korean churches still today nearly 100 years after the missionaries transmitted the puritan understanding on the eucharist, it is hard to ignore Korean cultural peculiarity. Over 600 years Confucianism has taught Koreans Ye (morals or rules for proper behavior) as the root of Korean society. In Confucianism, the final goal of human beings is to become Goon-ja who has reached the completion of morality. Thus, the emphasis on moral purity in the eucharist might be considered as being in line with the ethical strictness of Confucianism.

---

73 Ibid., 111-112.
74 Ibid., 123.
3 Summary and Evaluation

This chapter has explored the cultural background of Korea and its cultural influence on the eucharist of the PCK. This chapter has considered the three main religions before the introduction of Protestantism into Korea: Mu-gyo (Shamanism), Buddhism and Confucianism.

Mu-gyo, as the oldest and indigenous religion of Korea, has deeply affected the lives of Koreans. In Mu-gyo, the role of Mu-dang (Shaman) is decisive. When people meet problems in life, they seek Mu-dang to solve the problems. Then, Mu-dang holds Gut (the ritual of Mu-gyo) where people pray their wishes to a god invited by Mu-dang. The main concerns of Mu-gyo are earthly blessings such as healing, exorcism, and the success of family business. Mu-gyo’s attachment to earthly happiness is caused by its negative concept of the life after death. In Mu-gyo faith, Jeo-seung (the place where after death souls have to go) is a hopeless and barren place. This faith of Mu-gyo has led Koreans to be more obsessed with the life of this world than afterlife.

Buddhism was introduced into Korea around the fourth century CE. Until the period of Goryeo (918-1392 CE), Buddhism had been mainly used for the upper class as a ruling ideology. During the Joseon era (1392-1897 CE), however, Buddhism was suppressed under the policy of Soong-yu-eok-bul (venerate Confucianism and restrain Buddhism). The Joseon Dynasty restrained Buddhist monks from coming into cities and forfeited Buddhist property. As a result, Buddhist monks had to move their temples deep into the mountains. Although politically Buddhism lost its position of the national religion, that situation came to be an opportunity to attain the position of the religion of people. In the process, Miruk (Maitreya) faith of Buddhism came to prevail particularly in the Minjung (lower class) of Joseon. Originally Miruk meant a Bodhisattva who will save the world in the future. However, Miruk faith blended with Mu-gyo faith which is closely connected with earthly life. Then, the Minjung came to equate Miruk with a god in Mu-gyo faith and pray to Miruk for their earthly blessings.

Confucianism was the national ideology of Joseon. Seong-ri-hak (one of the main theories of Confucianism) enabled Joseon to maintain its strong hierarchical social system, providing a theoretical basis for the division between the upper class and the lower class, men and women, and children and adults. Socially, there were four
classes in Joseon and the distinction between the classes was strictly kept. Many Confucian scholars argued that women are inferior to men and should obey men, trying to maintain the patriarchal system of Joseon. Moreover, in Joseon children were not considered as human beings with full human rights. The inferiority of children was supported by Confucianism.

These cultural features have affected the eucharist of the PCK. The religious passion of Mu-gyo faith influenced the attitudes of the PCK towards the eucharist. The PCK viewed that participants in the eucharist need more thoroughgoing preparations because the eucharist is more important than the ordinary Sunday service. This perspective led the PCK to keep more strictly its eucharistic regulation regarding the prerequisite for the eucharist. On the other hand, Mu-gyo’s attachment to earthly life influenced the development of Sa-kyeong-hoe style of worship, which omits the eucharist, in the PCK. Sa-kyeong-hoe which shared many similarities with Gut (the ritual of Mu-gyo) comforted participants with enthusiastic prayer and preaching. Various mystical experiences such as healing, speaking in tongues, and exorcism also helped participants forget worries and see their lives more positively. Sa-kyeong-hoe style of worship came to prevail in the PCK and spontaneously the frequency of the eucharist decreased.

Mu-gyo and Miruk faiths influenced the eucharistic understanding of Minjung theology. The similarity of Mu-gyo faith and Miruk faith is the interest in the lower class, Minjung. This feature contributed to the appearance of Minjung theology and enabled it to interpret the eucharist as a tool for the liberation of Minjung. However, the new concept of the eucharist attempted by Minjung theology failed to influence deeply the PCK’s traditional eucharistic understanding.

Confucianism has had the biggest influence on the eucharist of the PCK. The installation system of the PCK echoes the hierarchical social system of Joseon based on Confucianism. Although the installation system never means a hierarchy, hierarchical features are observed in actual eucharistic practice. Generally, the committee of the eucharist comprises ministers and presbyters who hold the highest position in the installation system of the PCK. The order of taking the eucharistic elements reflects also hierarchical features. The minister takes first the elements. Then the elements are distributed to the committee of the eucharist and lastly to congregation. Confucianism’s distinction between men and women and between
adults and children is observed in the eucharist of the PCK. While men lead the eucharist and distribute the elements, women receive and prepare for the eucharist. Children under the age of fifteen, irrespective of baptism, cannot receive the eucharistic elements. The emphasis of moral purity in the eucharist of the PCK also reflects the ethical strictness of Confucianism.

While cultural features have mainly affected the PCK’s attitudes towards the eucharist, the eucharistic tradition of the early American missionaries had a more direct impact on the formation of the eucharist of the PCK. In chapter two, this study will explore the eucharistic legacy of the missionaries and its influence on the PCK’s eucharist. Chapter two also will examine how the PCK has developed its eucharist theology, practice and particular emphases.
Chapter 2

The Formation and Development of Worship and the Eucharist of the PCK

Generally, almost all churches in the PCK celebrate the eucharist three to four times a year although recently the frequency keeps increasing. Likewise the PCK’s worship could be characterized as the worship concentrating on the service of the word omitting the eucharist. Then, when did the preaching centred worship of the PCK begin? And in about 120 years of history of Korean Protestantism, how have the PCK preserved the eucharistic tradition? This chapter will explore through historical study the process of formation and development of worship in relationship to the eucharistic tradition and focal points of the eucharistic theology of the PCK.

1 The Formation of Worship and the Eucharist of the PCK

1.1 Worship Communities in Manchuria and Japan

The first Korean protestant worship community began not in Korea but in Manchuria.¹ John McIntyre and John Ross were sent as the missionaries of the Scottish Bible Society into China in January and August 1872, respectively. The main region of their mission was Manchuria. When gauging the possibility of mission in Korea they met young Korean sellers in Manchuria. The missionaries tried to have a chance to introduce Christianity to those young sellers, learning Korean language from them. Eventually, in 1879, John McIntyre baptized four youths who were Eung-chan Lee, Hong-joon Baek, Sung-ha Lee and Jin-gi Kim. Although not in Korea, the baptism was a historic moment that the first protestant Koreans were baptized. Soon afterwards, John Ross baptized Sang-ryoon Suh and Chung-song Kim in the same year. The youths who were sellers travelling between Korea and China became colporteurs and helped the ministry of the missionaries.

¹ Manchuria is a historical name of a large region of Northeast China.
They not only taught the missionaries Korean language but also supported John Ross in translating the whole New Testament into Korean. Later, the young Koreans became the leaders of the first Korean worship community in Manchuria and the northern territory of Korea. In 1879 Hong-joon Baek formed the first Christian community with his son-in-law Gwan-geun Kim and Kim’s father E-ryeon Kim in Euiju of Korea and they ran a catechism class where Koreans had a simple conversation about Christianity. This community grew into a worship community that had eighteen members in 1885. On 27 April 1889, the eighteen members included thirty-three men and women who were baptized by Horace G. Underwood in the Yalu River and later became the leaders of Euiju church.²

Sang-ryoon Suh returned to his home in Euiju with his little brother Kyeong-jo Suh who later became one of the first seven ordained pastors but soon they had to flee to Sorae from their hometown’s hostility towards Christians.³ When considering that the Christian community formed by Hong-joon Baek in other regions of Euiju grew well, the receptivity to Christianity seems to have varied between villages. In 1885 the brothers began teaching about twenty seekers the Bible and catechism in their homes. It is assumed that around the end of 1886 they began to arrange a place to worship and start regular Sunday worship. Later the worship community developed into Sorae church. In 1887 three of them led by Sang-ryoon Suh were baptized by Horace G. Underwood in Seoul and soon afterwards others were baptized at Sorae church by Underwood who was invited for baptism.⁴

While in Manchuria young Korean sellers from Euiju converted to Christianity and the New Testament was translated into Korean. In Japan there was also contact between a Korean man Soo-jeong Lee and Christianity. As an unofficial secretary of Young-Hyo Park who was a member of the Korean delegation, Soo-jeong Lee arrived in Japan in September 1882. Soo-jeong Lee met Tzdasen who was a Japanese Christian and agriculturist, and learned the Bible from him. In April 1883 Soo-jeong Lee was baptized by G. W. Knox, a missionary from the United States at Noh Weol Jeong church in Tokyo. Soo-jeong Lee became the first baptized Korean protestant in Japan. In 1884 he translated the Gospel of Mark from Japanese into

Korean at the request of Rev. Henry Loomis. When Horace G. Underwood and Henry G. Appenzeller arrived at Jemoolpo of Korea in 5 April 1885, the book brought by them was the Gospel of Mark translated by Soo-jeong Lee. In 24 June 1883, Soo-jeong Lee began Sunday school where Korean students studying in Japan were taught catechism. The Sunday school grew and formed the first Korean worship community in Tokyo at the end of 1883. Soo-jeong Lee and his worship community in Japan made a contribution to the formation of the worship of Korean church in a quite different way from the church in Manchuria. Even though the Korean church in Japan was not involved directly in forming the worship of Korean church like in Manchuria, Soo-jeong Lee and his community requested churches in America to urgently dispatch missionaries for the mission of Korea by sending mail in 1883 and 1884. The repetitive appeals of Korean Christians in Japan helped move Presbyterian and Methodist Boards of Mission of the United States. As a result, Horace G. Underwood and Henry G. Appenzeller who might be called the founders of Korean Protestant church were able to come to Korea.\(^5\)

1.2 The Worship of Missionaries

The first protestant missionary was Horace N. Allen sent by the Northern Presbyterian Church of the United States. He arrived in Korea in September 1884 as a medical missionary. Then, a Presbyterian missionary, Horace G. Underwood and a Methodist missionary, Henry G. Appenzeller arrived at Jemoolpo on Easter Sunday April 5, 1885. After that, many missionaries of diverse denominational backgrounds from the United States, Canada, Australia and Europe came to Korea.\(^6\) However, at that time the missionaries’ public ministry was forbidden by the Korean government. Thus, in the early stage, missionaries had to gather for worship in their homes only with their family. The first worship of the missionaries was held in Horace Allen’s house in 28 June 1885. In spite of different worship traditions, missionaries from Methodist and Presbyterian denominations led prayer meetings and Sunday services together in an ecumenical spirit. In 11 October 1885,

\(^5\) Ibid., 157-162.
\(^6\) In-soo Kim, *Korean Church History* (Seoul: Korean Presbyterian Publishing, 2005), 91.
eleven participants who were missionaries and their families celebrated the first eucharist in Korea.\(^7\)

In 1886, Korea and France established a multi-article treaty. This treaty not only allowed Roman Catholic priests of France to stroll the street freely wearing their vestments\(^8\) but also gave protestant missionaries some leeway for mission.\(^9\) The meetings and worship of missionaries were gradually introduced to Koreans, and from January 1886 a few Koreans began to participate in a Week of Prayer and around August 1886 in Sunday service.\(^10\) However, even after the condition for the mission improved, the missionaries still conducted a simple style of worship omitting the eucharist. One reason for that situation might be found in worship tradition of the churches which the missionaries were sent from. There were four denominations as previously discussed.\(^11\) In 1900s, worship tradition of all these denominations was preaching centered worship.\(^12\) Especially in the case of the Presbyterian churches in America which had most affected the formation of the constitution and worship books of the PCK, the recognition of the eucharist as part of worship was not expressed in an official document until 1970s.\(^13\)

The first Presbyterian church in Korea was Jeongdong Church (the predecessor of Saemoonan Church) established by Horace G. Underwood in his house with fourteen men on 27 September 1887. On Christmas of the same year, the first eucharist was celebrated in Jeongdong Church. The participants of the eucharist were only seven.\(^14\) The number was small but it was a historic event that is the first Presbyterian eucharist with Koreans. A Methodist missionary Henry G. Appenzeller used his house as a worship place. On Sunday afternoon July 24, 1887, he baptized the first Korean convert, Jungsang Park. On October 2, he baptized the second Korean convert Yong-Gyeong Han and immediately the eucharist was


\(^8\) Ryu, *Early American Missionaries in Korea (1884-1910)*, 87.

\(^9\) Ibid., 220.


\(^11\) See the section “The Influence of Confucianism on the Eucharist” in chapter one of this study.

\(^12\) Although John Calvin recommended conducting the eucharist every week, most Reformed churches followed the Zwinglian tradition in terms of the frequency of the eucharist. See Lukas Vischer, ed., *Christian Worship in Reformed Churches Past and Present* (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm.B. Eerdmans, 2003), 22-23.

\(^13\) The first official recognition of the eucharist as part of worship is observed in *The Worshipbook: Services* published in 1970 by the United Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A., the Presbyterian Church in the U.S., and the Cumberland Presbyterian Church. See ibid., 136-137.

Wilbur C. Swearer evaluated the sacraments as the beginning of “the evangelistic work of the Methodist Episcopal Mission.” On 9 October 1887 Appenzeller organized the first Methodist church in his house and named it Bethel Church.

A simple form of worship is also found in Bethel Church. In the first service of Bethel Church four Koreans participated. The service was commenced with the prayer of Appenzeller and then went on to a Scripture reading from the Gospel of Mark 1. After that, without preaching, the service was concluded by the prayer of a Korean, Mr. Chang. Dr. W. B. Scranton, a medical Methodist missionary, gives a recollection of an early worship at Bethel Church:

Brother Appenzeller had bought a native house in the heart of the city ... for our first formal Christian service with the Koreans. It was put in charge of a convert. One room in its inner court had been set aside as our first Korean sanctuary. It was newly papered and cleaned, but otherwise not furnished, except for a low table, on which were neatly set the elements for our first Holy Communion with our native church. Brother Appenzeller and I, with four or five baptised Koreans, alone composed this first memorable congregation. It was Christmas morning and he preached his carefully prepared sermon in Korean, from the text he loved, ‘And thou shalt call his name Jesus, for he shall save his people from their sins.’

The simple style of worship in the early stages which was composed of prayer and Scripture readings began to have more liturgical figures with the construction of church buildings and the growth of indigenous church leaders who were not yet ordained. It would be worth observing the order of worship which was presented in *Wi Won Ip Kyo In Kyu Do (For Teaching Doctrine to the Inquirers)* of a Presbyterian missionary, Samuel Moffett. The order of worship suggested by Moffett for Korean churches was as follows: 1 Hymn; 2 Prayer; 3 Scripture Reading; 4 Prayer by one or two church members; 5 Hymn; 6 Lesson; 7 Prayer; 8 Offering; 9 Hymn. In this service, the reason for the omission of the benediction is that the liturgy was made for family worship or small size worship without an ordained minister. The early form of worship around 1890s is also found in a Christian newspaper, *Joseon-*

---

15 Man-yeol Lee, ed., *Appenzeller: The First Missionary Sent to Korea* (Seoul: Yeonsei University, 1985), 496.
17 Bethel Church is the predecessor of Jeongdong Methodist church.
Grisdoin-Hoeb (Joseon Christian Newspaper). This order of worship suggested by the World Methodist Council for Korean churches was introduced by Appenzeller. 1 Poongryu Sori (Prelude); 2 Hymn (with Hymn book congregation stands); 3 The Apostles’ Creed; 4 Prayer (Pastor and Congregation Kneel down. After the prayer chant the Lord’s Prayer); 5 Anthem; 6 Reading from the Old Testament (Responsive reading is possible in reading Psalms); 7 Doxology (Glory is to the Father and the Son, from the beginning, this time forth and forever. Amen); 8 Reading from the New Testament; 9 Offerings and Announcement; 10 Hymn (with Hymn book congregation stands); 11 Preaching; 12 Prayer (a short prayer for becoming the sermon beneficial for congregation); 13 Hymn; 14 Apostolic benediction. 21

These forms show a liturgical development when compared with the earliest form of worship. However, the distinctive character of these early forms of worship is preaching centred worship. Except for special seasons such as Christmas and Easter, ordinary Sunday services were conducted with only the service of the word omitting the eucharist.

2 Evangelization and Preaching Centred Worship

From the early stage in the history of in Korean Protestant church, the preaching centred worship was introduced by missionaries and preserved a typical worship style of the Korean protestant church. For more concrete understanding on the worship tradition of the Korean protestant church, it would be helpful to investigate the reason why the missionaries passed down the preaching centered worship to the early Korean protestant church in relation to historical context.

2.1 Missionaries’ Passion for Evangelization and Frontier Worship

In the late of 1800s the priority of protestant missionaries was to evangelize Koreans and to establish churches. For missionaries, the evangelization and church growth were believed to be the only reasons why they were sent to Korea. Although they devoted their lives to establish modern schools and hospitals in Korea, the

21 Joo, Korean Methodist Worship, 177-178.
main reason for all the exertions was to gain Korean converts. Some missionaries such as Horace G. Underwood\textsuperscript{22} and Rev. Geo. Heber Jones\textsuperscript{23} were assiduous in studying the Korean language, religions and culture, whereas there were many missionaries who concentrated on the propagation of Christianity with a recognition of Korean culture as the “pagan” custom which must be extinguished.\textsuperscript{24} The early missionaries’ lack of understanding towards the value of Korean culture, thus, used to be often criticized by many Korean theologians who value the indigenization of Christian faith.\textsuperscript{25} In addition, for the early missionaries, to introduce a theology or liturgy of the West would be considered as important but not an urgent matter. The purpose of all meetings and services at those times was to make Koreans, who firstly come to church due to curiosity about the new culture or interest in the Gospel, become Christians through Bible study classes and preaching. Horace G. Underwood gives an illustration of the early missionaries’ passion for the evangelization of Korea:

These, then, are the Protestant Churches laboring in Korea, with their territorial assignments. They differ in the statement of their faith, in forms of worship, in methods, and in Church government, but their real aim and purpose is one, the Christianization of the Nation. One in faith and hope, with one Father, one Savior, one Spirit.\textsuperscript{26}

For the worthy cause of the Christianization of Korea, missionaries did not hesitate to abandon not only their theological belief but also the liturgical tradition they had preserved. The style of worship chosen by the missionaries as a priority for the evangelization of Korea was a non-liturgical service similar to “Frontier Worship.” In the early nineteenth century, American Christians on the frontier felt the


\textsuperscript{24} Sang Taek Lee, \textit{The Kingdom of God in Korea: A Study of Korean Church History from the Perspectives of Both Conservative and Liberal} (Seoul: Yangsuh, 1988), 68-70.


necessity of a certain worship style to convert non-Christians to Christianity. Generally, “Frontier Worship” was made of three parts. The first part included song, praise and prayer. The second part was the sermon which was quite long and highly evangelistic. The third, the climax of Frontier Worship was, after the sermon, calling non-Christians to conversion and Christians to commitment. Later this style of Frontier Worship was adopted by Korean pastors and revivalists such as Sun-joo Gil (1869 - 1935) and Yong-do Lee (1901 - 1933), and led to the Revival Movement in Korea. Similarly, as Frontier Worship was planned for a special purpose in a special context, the missionaries made an order of worship to freely and pragmatically fit into a Korean context rather than persisting in their worship tradition. From this point of view, the meeting between missionaries granting priority to evangelization and preaching centering on non-liturgical worship seems to have been unavoidable.

2.2 John L. Nevius’ Mission Methods

Nevius’ mission methods developed over by his career and experience as a Presbyterian missionary to China for twenty-five years and influenced the Korean protestant church to form the preaching centered worship tradition. Nevius’ articles and his Methods of Mission Work (1886) influenced the minds of young and inexperienced missionaries such as H. G. Underwood and H. G. Appenzeller. Presbyterian missionaries in Korea continuously requested John Nevius to visit Korea. Finally in June 1890 Nevius arrived at Seoul and for two weeks he taught missionaries about his experience in China and mission methods. As a result, Presbyterian missionaries adopted Nevius’ mission methods, with a few alterations, as official Presbyterian mission policy in 1891. Soon, Methodist missionaries also did not hesitate to follow Nevius’ mission methods although they were not as active as the Presbyterians. H. G. Underwood demonstrates well the core of Nevius’ mission methods which both denominations adopted as their mission policy:

After careful and prayerful consideration, we were led, in the main, to adopt this, and it has been the policy of the Mission. First, to let each man [Christian] abide in the calling wherein he was found, teaching that each was to be an individual worker for Christ, and to live Christ in his own neighborhood, supporting himself by his trade. Second, to develop Church methods and machinery only so far as the native Church was able to take care of and manage the same. Third, as far as the Church itself was able to provide the men and the means, to set aside those who seemed the better qualified, to do evangelistic work among their neighbors. Fourth, to let the natives provide their own church buildings, which were to be native in architecture, and of such style as the local church could afford to put up.

Regarding worship, one of the main contributions of Nevius’ mission methods which might be summarized as “Self-Propagation, Self-Government and Self-Support” to the early Korean churches was to cultivate an independent spirit in order that each local church could worship in the circumstances where there was a lack of missionaries and ordained pastors. In unorganized Christian communities, a lay man led worship and ministry except baptism and the eucharist. Thus, for ordinary Sunday services, there was no choice but to worship in a quite simple order. As stated before, Samuel A. Moffett’s *Wi Won Ip Kyo In Kyu Do (For Teaching Doctrine to the Inquirers)* shows the early Korean Christian community’s order of worship which could be conducted without a missionary or an ordained pastor. Although all church members respected worship leaders, it was difficult for them to provide a subtly crafted sermon, as they did not have the necessary training or education for preaching. For worship by the local church in that situation, a lesson replaced the sermon and the service was concluded with a hymn not a benediction. Generally, local churches were able to have a chance to receive baptism and the eucharist one or two times a year when a missionary visited them. A church leader disciplined candidates for baptism in advance and on the day of the appointment a missionary officiated at baptism and the eucharist after a catechism.

Thus, for the early missionaries, itineration played a crucial role in their mission. A record of Rev. C. E. Kearns gives an illustration of what happened in the churches and villages which were visited by the missionaries:

---


A large part of the year has been spent in travelling. Except in the far north where the work has been done by Mr. Bernheisel and Mr. Blair, I have visited all the groups once and about two thirds of them a second time. With so many churches to look after, most of these visits had to be limited to a day or part of a day only, whether the church was large or small. I have sometimes held as many as 35 services in a month, preaching personally as many as 26 times. A not uncommon day’s work was a trip of varying length in the morning, examinations and consultations all afternoon, hurried sermon preparation during the evening meal, and an evening service in which might occur baptisms, reception of catechumens, the Lord’s Supper, annual election of officers, and infant baptisms. Often a wedding ceremony or two might follow at the end of a two hours’ service and then conference with the newly elected officers till far into the night. … I think I must have ridden on most of the wedding saddles and eaten my dinner in front of most of the wedding screens in that district. The visit of the pastor is turned into a holiday in most Korean villages.30

The emphasis of Nevius’ mission methods on Bible study31 also influenced the formation of Korean protestant worship. Korean Christians were well-known for their devotion in studying the Bible. Thus the missionary, Charles Deming named Koreans “student[s] of the Bible.”32 Bible study came to be adopted under the name of Sa-kyeong-hoe (a revival meeting or Bible study meeting) in the Korean church. Sa-kyeong-hoe was held in winter, the agricultural off-season, for one to two weeks. The main purpose of Sa-kyeong-hoe was Bible study but participants were taught rules for church organization and catechism as well. At most, hundreds of people gathered for Sa-kyeong-hoe from near and far. In the early stage Sa-kyeong-hoe was held at a big church in a city and the church members provided accommodation for participants from the countryside. Generally, the order of Sa-kyeong-hoe was as follows. According to accommodation, they began the day with prayer and hymns in the early morning. After breakfast, they gathered in the church building and had a time for meditation for 30 minutes, and then they studied the Bible in groups. In the afternoon, again they studied the Bible and had time to learn hymn. In the late afternoon, they visited house by house for propagation and invited people to the evening meeting. In the evening, a large scale service which had a style similar to Frontier Worship was held with all participants of Sa-kyeong-

hoe and non-Christians who were also invited. Sa-kyeong-hoe reached its peak at the meeting held at Jang Dae Hyeon church in Pyeong Yang from 6 to 15 January 1907. The climax of the Sa-kyeong-hoe was the time of prayer after sermon in the night meetings. A missionary gives a description of a scene of the prayer:

After Mr. Hunt's sermon Mr. Lee said a few words. The latter said “Let us pray,” and immediately the room full of men was filled with voices lifted to God in prayer. I am sure that most of the men in the room were praying aloud. It was wonderful! … Although there were so many voices, there was no confusion at all. It was all a subdued, perfect harmony. I cannot explain it with words. One must surely witness such to be able to understand it. There was an absence of the sensational, the “emotional” (in the sense in which the word is so often used), and there was perfect concentration in the prayer of each one.

The missionary G. Lee at the same scene portrayed the atmosphere of the night after the prayer:

After the prayer there were a few testimonies, and then the leader announced a song, asking the audience to rise and stating that all those who wished to go home could do so, as we intended to stay until morning, if there were men who wished to remain that long and confess their sins. A great many went, but between five and six hundred remained. These we gathered into one ell of the building, and then began a meeting the like of which none of us had ever seen. After prayer, confessions were called for, and immediately the Spirit of God seemed to descend on that audience. Man after man would rise, confess his sins, break down and weep, and then throw himself to the floor and beat the floor with his fists in a perfect agony of conviction.

Even though the meeting at Jang Dae Hyeon church concluded on 15 January 1907, the fever of the meeting spread throughout the whole country and gave impetus to the emergence of Revival Movement in Korea. The worship style of the revival meeting composed of hymns, prayers and sermons came to be spontaneously embedded in the worship tradition of Korean church.

33 See Ki-yeon Cho, Korean Church and Renewal of Worship (Seoul: The Christian Literature Society of Korea, 2004), 33-69.
3 The Development of Worship and the Eucharist of the PCK

3.1 The Inauguration of the PCK

In the early period of Korean church, the missionaries’ ecumenical spirit for the Christianization of Korea was much stronger than the distinctiveness of their denomination. Cooperation between missionaries was strengthened especially around the Korean New Year season, that is the period of Sa-kyeong-hoe. For, they believed that the Sa-kyeong-hoe was the most effective season for the revival of the Korean church. Transcending the denominational boundaries, they gathered all their abilities and strengths for the revival of Korea. In 1905, ahead of the Sa-kyeong-hoe, the General Council of missionaries offered a suggestion to the missionaries in Korea:

… as far as possible, during the revival season, the entire missionary body withdraw from literary work, country itineration and other lines not bearing directly on the work in hand, so that the entire thought, prayer, and effort may be directed to this one supreme end.36

However, from the early of 1900s each denomination began to found a seminary from which Korean pastors were produced. Not only the theology but also the worship style began to reflect each denomination’s colour. At the same time, the publication of constitutions or books of worship from each denomination played an important role in the development of liturgical worship.

In 1901 the PCK established the first protestant seminary in Pyeong Yang. Samuel A. Moffett began to teach two students, Jong-sup Kim and Gi-chang Bang, and the number of students increased more as time went by. In 1907, 38 missionaries and 40 Korean elders organized the Independent Korean Presbyterian Church. At the same year, seven Korean students, Sun-joo Gil, Jeon-baek Yang, Keong-jo Suh, Seok-jin Han, In-seo Song, Gi-chang Bang and Gi-poong Lee who had just graduated from Pyeong Yang Presbyterian Theological Seminary were ordained.37

1907 was the turning point regarding worship. The leader of worship came to be changed from a lay man to an ordained pastor. As a result, the style and content of worship began to develop more liturgically.

37 Allen D. Clark, History of the Korean Church (Seoul: The Christian Literature Society of Korea, 1961), 144.
3.2 The PCK’s Worship and the Eucharist in the Early 1900s

Charles Allen Clark’s Moksa Jibup (Pastoral Theology) shows the development of worship from the early simple style composed of hymn, prayer and lesson or sermon to a more liturgical one. From 1908 Clark became a professor of Preaching and Ministry at Pyeong Yang Presbyterian Seminary. In Moksa Jibup he suggests a new order of worship led by an ordained pastor. The order of worship includes Confession of Sins and Word of Pardon, which are the traditional orders of the liturgies of John Calvin and the Presbyterian Church, and urges the church to use more frequently the Psalms during worship. In addition, Clark strongly suggests using both methods of Scripture Reading which are Lectio Selecta and Lectio Continua in worship. The Apostles’ Creed and recitation of the Ten Commandment were also added to the order of worship.38

The introduction of liturgical worship by Clark in 1919 seems to not only be a pastoral and liturgical consideration but also be related to the historical context of Korea. After the Eulsa Restriction Treaty of 17 November, 1905 as a result of which Japan deprived Korea of diplomatic sovereignty, missionaries’ political stands were divided. Missionaries such as Gale and Scranton supported pro-Japanese activities. J. S. Gale argued for the justification of the Eulsa Restriction Treaty, saying that if the treaty was not agreed to Korea would have been crushed by Russia.39 Scranton dismissed the Epworth League which was the only youth organization of the Methodist church in Korea because it participated in political activities of opposing Japan’s colonial rule.40 On the contrary, missionaries such as Noble41 and Hulbert42 supported actively the independence of Korea, criticizing pro-Japanese missionaries and the United States government sympathetic to Japan’s violation of the sovereignty of Korea.

38 Charles A. Clark, Moksa Jibup (Seoul: Chosen Yesu Kyo Seohoe, 1919), 179-180. Sunday Service order suggested by Clark: Introduction (Biblical verses, prayer or hymn) - Confession of sins (Psalm 51; 32; 6; 38; 102; 130; 143 - Hymn - Scripture Reading: Lectio Selecta - The Apostles’ Creed, the Ten Commandments or the Creed of each church - Hymn - Scripture Reading – the text relating to Sermon - Prayer of Congregation - Hymn - Offering and Prayer - Announcement - Hymn - Sermon - Prayer after sermon - Hymn - Benediction - Meditation. See ibid., 195-197.
However, many missionaries moved towards a politically centrist stance upholding the division of religion and state. The main reason for the missionaries’ decision was to protect the church from Japan’s oppression. Considerable numbers of the participants in the anti-Japanese independence movement were Christians and Japan regarded churches as the base of the operation for the movement. In 1911 following the 105-Man Incident which was fabricated by Japanese government for the suppression of Korea’s independence movement, over 700 Koreans who were mostly Christians and 24 missionaries from Presbyterian and Methodist were arrested. Worship in churches and the life of missionaries were monitored by Japanese policemen. Under this situation, missionaries had to make urgent decisions for the Korean church. It seems natural that they, as missionaries, came to focus on the evangelization rather than political independence of Korea. C. A. Clark’s basic concern as a missionary would also be the growth of Korean church amid stability. On February 15, 1908 C. A. Clark insisted that the most important thing was that the church should not participate in political matters because the church was a spiritual organization. This view was developed further by Clark in 1919 with the publication of his liturgical book, *Moksa Jibup*. For, in the same year, the Samil Movement, the Korean resistance movement to Japanese colonial rule, occurred. In the process of suppression of the movement, the Japanese government persecuted severely churches as most leaders of the movement were Christians. In this situation where the survival of Christianity was threatened by persecution, Clark was worried about the future of the Korean church. He wanted to shift the attention of Christian leaders from political involvement to worship and church life. This was the intention behind the publication of his book, *Moksa Jibup*.

On the other hand, Clark, as an expert in the practical theology of the only Presbyterian seminary at that time, tried to recover the Presbyterian tradition in worship through his *Moksa Jibup* but his efforts to establish a Presbyterian worship style in Presbyterian churches seemed to be in vain. About 10 years after *Moksa Jibup* was introduced, Korean Presbyterian churches still followed Moffett’s simple

---

43 Clark, *History of the Korean Church*, 129-130.
44 Kyeong-no Yoon, *The Study on The 105-Man Incident and Sinminhoe* (Seoul: ILJISA, 1990), 6-27.
worship structure\textsuperscript{46} which was influenced by Nevius.\textsuperscript{47} The order of Andong Church’s Sunday service in 1928\textsuperscript{48} seems to basically follow the order of Moffett’s liturgy. In Andong Church’s worship, the “Hymn” is sung three times like Moffett. In addition, the order of “Offering” following the “Sermon” is the same as Moffett contrasting with Clark’s order where the ‘Offering’ is before the “Sermon.” The “Prayer” before the “Scripture Reading” is also the same pattern as Moffett. It is worth observing that in Andong Church a presbyter or deacon leads the “Prayer” like Moffett. In contrast, Clark suggests that an ordained minister takes charge of the “Prayer of Congregation”: “A pastor ought to prepare the ‘Prayer of Congregation’ because the prayer is not for his own sake but for church. This prayer of pastor will be a standard of prayer of church members.”\textsuperscript{49}

An interesting observation is the use of “Psalms” in Andong Church’s Sunday Service. The “Psalms” which is not present in Moffett, is added in Andong Church’s Sunday Service. Regarding the “Psalms,” did Andong Church follow Clark? The use of the “Psalms” was possibly influenced by the Methodist tradition rather than by Clark. For Clark emphasizes the use of the “Psalms” in worship for the “Confession of Sins,” while the early order of worship introduced by a Methodist missionary, in \textit{Joseon-Grisdoin-Hoebo (Joseon Christian Newspaper)}\textsuperscript{50} provides proof of the use of the “Psalms” in worship as in Andong Church. Furthermore, “the Lord’s Prayer” located in the first part of the worship of Andong Church also seems to echo the Methodist worship tradition. “The Lord’s Prayer” is a representative element of early Methodist worship. In the Christmas Service of 1887 held in Bethel chapel, Appenzeller gave his first Korean sermon. The order of the service was as follows: 1 Baptism (Myeong-ok Kim); 2 Hymn; 3 Prayer (in Korean, Scranton); 4 Scripture Reading (Matthew 2); 5 Scripture Reading (Luke 2, Scranton); 6 Sermon (“Give him the name Jesus,” Matthew 1:21, Appenzeller); 7


\textsuperscript{49} Clark, \textit{Moksa Jihup}, 182.

\textsuperscript{50} H. G. Appenzeller, \textit{Joseon-Grisdoin-Hoebo}, 12 January 1898.
The Lord’s Prayer; 8 Hymn; 9 Benediction. In 1910, the Methodist Church in Korea published *Daegangryeong Gwa Gyucheuk (Doctrine and Discipline)* which became a guide for the Methodist Sunday service. This book is presumed to be translated from the Discipline 1908 of the Methodist Episcopal Church. The order of “the Lord’s Prayer” introduced into the Sunday service in *Daegangryeong Gwa Gyucheuk* is after the “Prayer for Congregation.” These Methodist features found in the Andong Presbyterian Church Sunday Service order indicate an ecumenism in the early period of the Korean protestant church. At that time, there was little distinction between denominations. Churches exerted their efforts to evangelize Korea. It was never strange that Presbyterians and Methodists worshiped together. In such a cooperative atmosphere, the Methodist worship tradition which was translated into Korean at least 9 years earlier than Presbyterian worship book of Clark would spontaneously be introduced and used in the Presbyterian church.

The Saemoonan Church Sunday service on 30 October 1932 depends highly on Moffett with a few alterations in order. Regarding structure, the Saemoonan Church worship is almost the same as Moffett. The “Hymn” is offered three times and the “Offering” is placed after the “Sermon” reflecting Moffett. Like the Andong Church, the use of the “Psalms” which seems to be influenced by the Methodist tradition is presented in Saemoonan worship. A special feature is the “Announcement” placed between the “Offering” after the “Sermon” and the “Benediction.” More than 10 years after that Clark’s *Moksa Jibup* which contained the Presbyterian worship tradition was introduced in 1919, the majority of Korean Presbyterian churches still followed Moffett’s order of worship and the Methodist tradition.

---

53 Methodist Episcopal Church, *Methodist Church Doctrine and Discipline*, E. M. Cable, eds. (Kyeongseong: Yasogyo Seohoe, 1910), 52-55.
55 The order of Saemoonan Church Sunday Service held on October 30, 1932: A silent prayer - Hymn - Prayer (Presbyter or church member) - Psalms - Scripture Reading - Hymn - Sermon - Prayer - Offering - Prayer - Announcement - Hymn - Benediction. See Saemoonan Church History Committee, *Saemoonan Church History 100 years 1887-1987* (Seoul: Saemoonan Church, 1995), 239.
3.3 Publications of Directories of Worship in the Early 1900s

The first directory of worship of the PCK was included in the draft of the first constitution that C. A. Clark completed in 1919. The book was published officially in 1921. Yet, almost all the contents of the directory of worship 1921 were taken from the *Directory for Worship* of the Presbyterian Church in the United States 1894.\(^\text{56}\) The directory was edited several times and in 1934 it came to be equipped with the most similar contents to the recent editions. The directory of worship 1934\(^\text{57}\) deals with worship from chapter 2 to 6. Chapter 2 explains the preparation of worship. Chapters 3 to 6 contain an explanation of Scripture Reading, Psalms and Hymns, Prayer, and Sermons respectively. Chapters from 9 to 11 deal with the eucharist in the section on sacrament with baptism, not part of worship. Although the book did not present an actual order of Sunday service it could be inferred from the order of chapters of the book that, undoubtedly, the order of worship was the preaching centered worship composed of hymn, prayer and sermon. Since then, several further editions have been published, but there has been no conspicuous change with regard to either structure or content for over 60 years. For much of its eucharistic theology, the PCK simply translated the Westminster Confession of Faith into Korean and used that as the basis of its beliefs.

3.4 The Liturgical Movement and Its Influence on the Eucharist of the PCK

From the early 1980s the influence of the Ecumenical Movement, revealed in documents such as *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* (BEM), slowly began to be absorbed into some of the PCK’s thinking about worship. The Ecumenical Movement led Korean liturgists, focusing on the preaching centered worship, to have an interest in liturgical worship of various denominations. The Lima liturgy, a precious product of the Ecumenical Movement, laid a cornerstone for the Liturgical Movement in Korea in 1980s. Those who led the Liturgical Movement in earnest were the professors of worship and preaching at seminaries. The Liturgical Movement had strong repercussions on the protestant worship tradition in Korea that is preaching centered worship. The Liturgical Movement unfolded in various

---


\(^{57}\) The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Korea, *Constitution* (Seoul: Daehan Gidokgyo Seohoe, 1934), 218-230.
ways. One of the most notable changes was the introduction and publication of church year calendars, lectionary and worship books in protestant churches. In 1981, *Calendar for the Plan of Worship and Preaching* by Jang-bok Jung, a professor of worship and preaching at Presbyterian College and Theological Seminary, was published. In 1984 as, firstly, a similar form of worship book, *85 Handbook of Worship and Preaching* was published. After that, other denominations began to publish worship books such as *Worship and Pulpit* and the *Worship Book*. 58

Another reflection of this influence in the PCK can be seen in the directory of worship of 1983. In 1982 the 67th General Assembly had passed the revised bill so as to worship and the result came to be contained in the directory of worship included in the *Constitution* of 1983. 59 Compared to the former eucharistic theology kept from the early of 1900s to before the directory of worship of 1983, the most distinctive change observed is in the place of the eucharist in worship. While in the earlier directories, which stood firmly in a preaching-centered worship tradition, the eucharist was treated in a section of the book on “sacraments,” alongside baptism, separate from the Sunday service material, the directory of worship of 1983 began to place the eucharist as part of the Sunday service. In addition, the book gives an instruction that worship including the eucharist should be frequently conducted because worship itself consists of the Word of God and the Eucharist. In 1980s, BEM had success in changing the PCK’s recognition of the eucharist as part of worship but the theology and shape of the eucharistic service presented in BEM failed to influence the official documents of the PCK until 1990s.

3.5 The Book of Common Worship 1997

It was only with the *Book of Common Worship* (BCW) 1997 60 that more radical change, reflecting BEM, was made to the shape of the PCK’s eucharist. Whilst former worship directories had relied deeply on the teachings of the Westminster

---


Confession of Faith, the BCW 1997 enriched the content and theology of the eucharist by introducing the influence of the five key understandings\(^1\) of the eucharist articulated in the ecumenical consensus gathered in BEM. First of all, the BCW 1997 gives more clearly an understanding on the eucharist as part of worship, explaining the order of Sunday service more fully than in the former editions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic Structure</th>
<th>Orders which might be added</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Call to Worship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hymn of Praise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confession of Sins</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assurance of Pardon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song of Glory to God</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psalm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pastoral Prayer</td>
<td>Choir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Reading from the Old Testament</td>
<td>Invitation for Decision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Reading from the New Testament</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sermon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apostles’ Creed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptism</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayer of Intercession for Community</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salutation of Peace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offering</td>
<td>Special Song</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invitation to the Eucharist</td>
<td>Song for Offering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Words of Institution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Epiclesis</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Lord’s Prayer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraction of the Bread</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving of the Bread</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filling of the Cup</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving of the Cup</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayer of Thanksgiving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Song of Thanksgiving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word of Dismissal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benediction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Koinonia and Announcement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.1 Outline of Sunday Service\(^2\)

---

\(^1\) BEM contains five meanings of the Eucharist: The Eucharist as Thanksgiving to the Father; as Anamnesis or Memorial of Christ; as Invocation of the Spirit; as Communion of the Faithful; as Meal of the Kingdom. For more details, see World Council of Churches, *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry: 25th Anniversary Printing, Faith and Order Paper No. 111* (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1982), 10-15.

Furthermore, the BCW 1997 presents as a sample eight orders of Sunday service in order that the church can choose one of them according to circumstances. Among them, five are made of only the service of the Word and three, Sunday Service 6, 7, and 8, include the eucharist as part of worship. Also, as to the frequency of the eucharist, chapter 3 of the BCW 1997 urges the church to celebrate as frequently as possible the eucharist in remembrance of the death and resurrection of Jesus.

Nevertheless, there appears to be a limitation in embodying the five key understandings of BEM in actual practice of the eucharist. The samples of Sunday service including the eucharist keep preserving the former understanding of the eucharist, that emphasizes the death of Jesus and sacrificial meaning of the last supper.

A central theme penetrating the actual practice of the eucharist in the BCW 1997 is the sacrifice of Jesus. The eucharist is the place of remembering the death of Jesus and of representing the Lord’s flesh which was injured and torn and the blood which was shed from Jesus’ precious body. Concerning the emphasis on the death of Jesus, it would be worth observing the addresses for the eucharist presented in Sunday Services 6, 7, and 8 respectively:

Dear friends, this Holy Communion is, in remembrance of Christ, the rite of remembering his death and resurrection until his coming again.

Brothers and sisters who have been bought at the price of the holy blood of the Lord, Holy Communion is the rite to remember the death of the Lord in remembrance of Christ until his return.

Today’s Holy Communion given by the Lord is not just for a celebration but the place where we deeply commemorate and reenact the flesh of the Lord which was wounded and torn and the blood which was shed from the precious body for us. We must remember the scene and make a decision of the new covenant so that the Lord’s flesh becomes my flesh and the Lord’s blood flows in our veins.

The act of breaking the bread is also considered as having an important meaning in the PCK’s eucharist, because it is through the moment the death of the Lord might be dramatically shown to all participants. Through this moment, participants remember the Lord who was torn and injured for themselves. Furthermore, the
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63 Ibid., 42-74.
64 Ibid., 84.
65 Ibid., 53.
66 Ibid., 59.
67 Ibid., 70.
eucharist is recognized as the last paschal meal shared with disciples whom Jesus loved. In other words, Jesus was the paschal lamb, and the bread and wine were the flesh and blood of the lamb. Before distributing the bread and the cup, the following statement is made by the minister:

Now, when you receive the Lord’s bread, ponder upon the Lord’s flesh injured for us, and have it with thanksgiving sincerely offered to God. … Now, receive the Lord’s cup, and ponder upon the Lord’s precious blood shed to the last drop for us, and have the cup with thanksgiving sincerely offered to God.  

3.6 The Book of Common Worship 2008

3.6.1 A Broad Eucharistic Understanding

More recently, the latest worship directory of the PCK, the BCW 2008 shows a drastic change in the eucharist especially in actual practice. The BCW 2008 has entirely removed a separate category on “sacraments” and has instead included both baptism and the eucharist amongst its resources for Sunday worship. As a result, the appreciation of the eucharist as part of Sunday worship has been more deeply embedded in the worship of the PCK.

Compared with the BCW 1997, one of the most significant changes found in the BCW 2008 is an effort to contain the various meanings of the eucharist in actual practice. The eighth sample of the Sunday service includes the liturgy of the eucharist and expresses the eucharist as a feast in “Invitation to the Eucharist”:

This is a feast of joy of people of God. All peoples will come from north and south, and from east and west and sit at table of the Kingdom of God. This is the Lord’s table. Our Lord invites those who believe in him to the feast he has prepared. Let us participate in the feast of heaven the Lord has prepared for us.

Additionally, the BCW 2008 provides as a guide nine sample services for the seasons: Advent, Christmas, Epiphany, Lent, Passion/Palm Sunday, Good Friday (1), Good Friday (2), Easter Vigil Service, Day of Pentecost. All, except the services of Lent, Good Friday (1) and (2), include the eucharist. Among the six services included in the eight sample are the following:
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including the eucharist, while the service of Epiphany preserves the traditional understanding of the eucharist that is sacrifice, others express various meanings. First of all, in “Invitation to the Eucharist” of Advent the festive and communal meanings of the eucharist are well presented:

Beloved brothers and sisters, this Holy Communion is a joyful event which has been prepared by God. In the Kingdom of God, people of the Lord will come from north, south, east and west and sit at the table of the Lord. The Lord has provided this Holy Communion. Our Lord invites those who believe in him to the feast offered by him.  

The focus of the thanksgiving prayer for the eucharist is also on other reasons rather than deliverance through the sacrifice of Jesus. The reasons for thanksgiving include created in the image of God, giving life and breath, choosing us as God’s children and sending Jesus into the world. Especially, in illustrating the life of Jesus, the death on the cross is mentioned but the event of death is recognized as just a moment in the whole life of Jesus from the incarnation to the ascension. The more important theme than the death is the expectation of the second coming of Jesus:

… The Lord, following the will of God, carried the cross and was killed by people whom Jesus loved. However, we praise the Lord who resurrected from the dead, reigns over this world and now becomes the friend of sinners. When the kingdom that the Lord has promised will come, we will celebrate the victory with the Lord. In remembrance of the Lord Jesus, now we will share the bread and cup. We will convey to all people the news of your death and resurrection. Holy God, we pray that send us the Holy Spirit, make us be grafted in Christ the Lord by sharing the bread, provide us new life, and let us live as people who are his very own until we participate in the feast with the Lord in glory.

In the Christmas service, the diversity of the eucharist is well presented. The time of holding the eucharist is the day full of glory of heaven and the peace of world. Those who gather to worship after hearing the good news of the birth of Christ come to the holy table with thanks and joy. Also, in prayer of the eucharist, the focus is not the sacrifice of Jesus but Jesus Christ who came into the world through incarnation. Therefore, Jesus Christ is the gift of God given to human beings.

The Easter Vigil Service also shows a considerable development. Firstly, in the “Invitation,” the eucharist is the place of grace that the risen Lord has provided.
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More interestingly, there is a new illustration of Jesus as the bread of life. In the eucharist of Easter Vigil Service there is an attempt to view the eucharist from the perspective of the Fourth Gospel by calling Jesus the bread of life, forming a contrast to the PCK’s traditional understanding of Jesus of the last supper as the paschal lamb based on the institution narratives which are from the Synoptic Gospels and 1 Corinthians 11. The next distinctive feature is found in the “Epiclesis” of the Easter Vigil. The definition of the eucharist illustrated in the prayer is the meal after resurrection shared by Jesus with two disciples on the way to Emmaus (Luke 24), not the last supper (Matthew 26, Mark 14, Luke 22 and 1 Corinthians 11). Again, in “Lesson before Communion” the Emmaus story is mentioned:

The risen Lord first of all met his disciples at table. The risen Jesus shared a meal with the disciples on the way to Emmaus and also by the Sea of Tiberias with Peter and other disciples. The disciples realized that Jesus really rose again in participating in the same table with Jesus. Now we are across from the holy table which the risen Lord has prepared for us. The Lord today gives for us the bread and cup of the Lord. Now we will receive the bread and cup according to the will of our Lord.

### 3.6.2 Ecumenical Association

The BCW 2008 also provides a variety of eucharistic prayers which draw on sources not only in other reformed churches but also the Roman Catholic, Greek Orthodox and Lutheran traditions. First of all, the BCW 2008 uses a new type of prayer such as Litany and *Kyrie Eleison* which are very familiar to Roman Catholic or Lutheran but strange to the PCK. The BCW 2008 does not use the Greek term *Kyrie Eleison* different from the Roman Catholic Church but, instead, translates it into Korean language. In addition, *Kyrie Eleison* is not recited but sung. The lyrics of the song are as follows:

*Juyeo, Juyeo, Woorirul Bulssanghee Yeogisoseo* (Lord, Lord, have mercy on us).
*Grisdoyeo, Grisdoyeo, Woorirul Bulssanghee Yeogisoseo* (Christ, Christ, have mercy on us).
*Juyeo, Juyeo, Woorirul Bulssanghee Yeogisoseo* (Lord, Lord, have mercy on us).

---
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In chapter 1, the addition of the Creed in the order of worship could be, also, considered as an effect of ecumenical movement on the PCK worship. In mentioning the Creed, the BCW 2008 introduces the Nicene Creed (CE 325) along with the Apostles' Creed (CE 404). Traditionally, the PCK has confessed the Apostles’ Creed (CE 404) as a confession of faith. The BCW 2008 notes that not only the Apostles’ Creed (CE 404) but also the Nicene Creed (CE 325) were officially and historically chosen by church.\textsuperscript{79}

A distinctive feature of the BCW 2008 is to add the Peace as part of the order of worship. The Peace goes back to the Kiss of Peace of the early church and is found in the service of the Roman Catholic Church, Orthodox Church and some protestant churches preserving liturgical tradition as well. In the PCK worship, a simple greeting between participants is generally placed in the order of announcement after sermon has replaced the Peace.\textsuperscript{80} Seeking to shed light on the origin and meaning of the Peace, the BCW 2008 places it as a crucial part of the order of worship.

The blessing of baptismal water has been traditionally placed as a crucial element in baptism in the Eastern Orthodox and the Roman Catholic churches\textsuperscript{81} but in the reformed tradition the order had been banned by reformers due to a different theological perception of the nature of baptismal water. However, recently through conversations between denominations the PCK has been able to have a new understanding of the blessing of baptismal water and to engage with valuable meanings of this element which had been erased by the passion of reformers. The BCW 2008 gives six baptismal rites. Among them, “Thanksgiving Prayer for Baptismal Water” is placed in “Baptism for Infant and Child”\textsuperscript{82} and in “Baptism for Those Who Have A Mental Disability”\textsuperscript{83} even though the PCK’s theological appreciation of the blessing is still different from the Roman Catholic and the Eastern Orthodox churches.

\textsuperscript{79} Ibid., 34-35.

\textsuperscript{80} Ibid., 34.

\textsuperscript{81} Regarding the Eastern Orthodox and the Roman Catholic churches’ understanding of the blessing of baptismal water, see Max Thurian, and Geoffrey Wainwright, eds., \textit{Baptism and Eucharist Ecumenical Convergence in Celebration} (Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1983), 12-22.
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Renewal of Baptism was newly introduced into the Easter Vigil Service of the BCW 2008. The purpose of the Renewal of Baptism, which was conducted after baptizing candidates, is to make all church members who have already been baptized remember the meaning and promise of baptism. The minister, followed by an elder holding a baptismal font, sprinkles baptismal water on a congregation by using palm branches and proclaims the words “remember your baptism.” 84 The Renewal of Baptism presented in the BCW 2008 seems to be indebted to that of the Roman Catholic Church in terms of form and the practice of the rite being conducted in Easter Service.

While the Roman Catholic and the Pentecostal churches have treated healing as significant in worship, in the Sunday worship of the PCK healing was not a matter of grave concern. Occasionally, through sermons the message with regard to healing was proclaimed but the worship was not specially designed for healing but as a normal Sunday service. Instead, the PCK has developed services focused on healing through the Friday prayer or special meetings. The healing service introduced in the BCW 2008 is conducted as a Sunday service and is quite liturgical. The focus of the service as a whole is on healing. Songs, prayers and sermons in all the orders of worship contain the theme of healing. In particular, the service includes the eucharist. The climax of the service is a prayer with the placing of hands on the sick after the eucharist. 85 Regarding healing, chapter 8, Rite of Traditional Holidays, also contains a service of caring for patients. Notable is that the centre of the service is the eucharist. Generally, the PCK’s traditional rite for the pastor’s visitation for a patient is composed of a song, a simple lesson and prayer for healing. However, the BCW 2008 introduces the rite, focusing on the eucharist, for patients who cannot participate in Sunday service due to their illness so that the patients feel and experience that they are part of the body of Christ. 86

The clearer expression of the meal after the resurrection as central to the eucharist in the BCW 2008 is also evidence of the PCK’s active participation in the ecumenical movement. In 1995, the WCC working group made a proposal for celebrating the eucharist in ecumenical contexts. The working group based the proposal on three eucharistic texts: Luke 24:13-35, Justin Martyr’s First Apology 67
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and Eusebius’ *Ecclesiastical History* 5:24. In particular, the working group’s explanation of the first text gives a significant eucharistic perspective which is different from the last supper tradition:

… the account in Luke 24:13-35 of the risen Christ transforming two despairing disciples and sending them on mission by means of his living interpretation of the scriptures and his presence in the breaking of bread.  

It took over a decade for the PCK to express the WCC’s recognition of the meal after the resurrection as the eucharist in the BCW 2008. Moreover, the interpretation of the meal in Luke 24 as a eucharist is included only in the Easter Vigil Service in the BCW 2008. However, in spite of all these limitations, this expansion of the PCK’s eucharistic understanding indicates that the PCK keeps trying to have conversations with ecumenical partners.

### 3.6.3 Response to Pastoral Needs

The BCW 2008 also shows an effort to respond to more varied and complicated pastoral needs according to the change of pastoral circumstances. As the BCW 1997 gives eight samples of a Sunday service only for adults, the need for guidelines regarding services for various generations and communities already conducted in church has been continuously raised. For this, the BCW 2008 provides directions for “Worship for Youth,” “Modern Worship or Contemporary Worship,” “Intergenerational Corporate Worship” and “Healing Service.” First of all, “Worship for Youth” and “Modern Worship” use contemporary songs, testimony, skit drama, dance and video as materials for praise and sermons. The major participants, who are children under 15 years old and seekers, are banned from participating in the eucharist by the regulations of the PCK as they are not baptized, so the eucharist seems not to be presented in these two services.

On the other hand, “Intergenerational Corporate Worship” is designed for families in order to overcome the limitation of the recent PCK’s worship style divided by generation. One of the unique aspects of this worship is that the eucharist is
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conducted despite children who are not baptized participating in. However, even in this worship, the PCK tries to keep the principle of the eucharist by providing a guide as below:

Those who are baptized come in a row and take the bread and cup. Minister and distributors of bread and the cup receive firstly the elements. It could be possible that participants receive bread and the cup respectively, or bread dipped in wine or grape juice. For children, it is meaningful that they are in the place of Holy Communion and even may observe those who take bread and the cup, although they cannot receive the elements. For infants who cannot understand the eucharist, it would be acceptable to prepare special food for the infants.  

Regarding baptism, there have been concerns in the pastoral field about those who are marginalized because the law of church keeps silent about them. The BCW 2008 shows a theological struggle and development for the marginalized. While the BCW 1997 provides only two types of baptism, “Infant Baptism” for babies under two years old and “Adult Baptism” for those who are over fifteen years old, the BCW 2008 adds “Baptism for Children” for those who are three to fourteen years old. In addition, the BCW 2008 gives two types of baptism for the mentally disabled who can express their will, and for those who cannot.

There are many services which are not treated in the BCW 1997 but have traditionally been conducted by the PCK. The BCW 2008 contains the services such as “Sunday Service for Independent Day,” “Sunday Service for Thanksgiving Day” and “New Year’s Eve Service.” A drastic change of the BCW 2008 is found in the establishment of worship for communities beyond local churches. For this, the book provides guides of service related to General Assembly, Presbytery, institutions and chapel as well.

The BCW 2008 shows an effort in hearing the voice of the pastoral field as to not only worship but also rites. A rite for dispatch of a missionary is added in “Rites for Installation.” “Family Rites” includes “Thanksgiving Service for Birth,” “Service for Baby Dedication” which is held when a baby participates in worship for the first time, and “Service for Blessing Children” which is conducted to celebrate children’s
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entrance into a school. For marriage, considering the recent social change that international marriages have become more frequent, the BCW 2008 adds “Outline of International Marriage” and also gives a sample service for wedding anniversaries. In rites, a significant change is found in the rites of funerals. The BCW 1997 focuses on funeral rites in ordinary circumstances but the BCW 2008 provides funeral rites which might be used in various situations such as the death of a child or non believer, body donation, cremation and natural burial.

It is true that the traditional understanding of the eucharist still prevails in the PCK’s actual practice, but the number of churches, which try more often to celebrate the eucharist in the Sunday service with well balanced eucharistic theology, is gradually increasing. Crucially the PCK is demonstrating an effort to broaden the eucharistic theology and practice through the BCW 2008.

3.7 The First Step towards the Open Table

Around the turn of the 21st century, the PCK gave some expression of a desire to enlarge its traditional understanding of the eucharist. In 2001, it was resolved in a session of Yanglim Church, which belongs to the Jeonnam Synod, to practise an “open table.” This meant that the age restriction of 15 would be dropped, with its links to views about a person’s capacity or need for faith and repentance, and so would the requirement for baptism before the eucharist. The Yanglim Church proposed to bring its resolution to the Jeonnam Synod Meeting. Therefore, the 112th Meeting of the Jeonnam Synod, held from the 17th to 18th of April 2001, passed the resolution that those who are not baptized could participate in the eucharist. Furthermore, the meeting decided to introduce a bill on theology of the open table to the national General Assembly Meeting of the PCK. However, as the decision of the Jeonnam Synod became known to other Synods, strong opposition was raised from others. As a result, the Jeonnam Synod had to hold an extraordinary meeting and finally changed its plan. Its final decision was to retract
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the resolution passed and the plan to introduce the bill regarding the open table to the General Assembly Meeting, and to set up a special committee to study a theology of the open table.\textsuperscript{99} So although the bill on the open table was not introduced in the General Assembly Meeting, the decision of the Jeonnam Synod became the first official discussion on the open table in the PCK, and it also became a catalyst that made not only theologians but pastors think afresh about the theology of the eucharist.

However, contrary to a general expectation that, with the first official discussion, various studies would be conducted and theological understanding of the eucharist could be deepened and enlarged, editorials in newspapers and various published liturgical studies repeated simply the church’s traditional position on the eucharist. What were the grounds for the PCK’s traditional understanding of the eucharist? This question is the basis for a discussion in the last section of this chapter.

4 The Authority Sought by the PCK in Understanding the Eucharist

4.1 Scripture

The PCK has upheld the principle of Sola Scriptura of the Reformers. Thus, in the PCK, Scripture has become the most important authority in evaluating the eucharist. As a result, Matthew 26, Mark 14, Luke 22 and 1 Corinthians 11 (the so-called “last supper” stories) which are believed by the PCK as directly reflecting the historical Jesus’ institution of the eucharist have played a crucial role in forming the eucharistic practice and theology although recently the Easter Vigil Service of the BCW 2008 has tried to interpret the meal in the Emmaus story in Luke 24 as the eucharist after the resurrection of Jesus. The BCW 2008 fixes only the four last supper stories for “the Words of Institution” in an explanation of the order of worship.\textsuperscript{100} The PCK’s traditional understanding of the eucharist based on the last supper stories penetrates the PCK’s eucharistic theology and practice. Thus, the PCK’s eucharistic view extracted from the PCK’s worship books could be reconstructed as follows: Jesus instituted the eucharist on the night before his arrest
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(Matthew 26, Mark 14, Luke 22 and 1 Corinthians 11); Jesus gave his disciples the commandment that Jesus’ death, resurrection and coming again should be remembered through the eucharist (Luke 22 and 1 Corinthians 11); The eucharist was the paschal meal (Matthew 26, Mark 14 and Luke 22); In the eucharist, Jesus is recognized as the paschal lamb, the bread as the body, and the cup as the blood of Jesus all of which are connected with the death on the cross (Matthew 26, Mark 14 and Luke 22); The action of “the breaking of bread” is an essential part of the order of worship (Matthew 26, Mark 14, Luke 22 and 1 Corinthians 11).

4.2 Early Church Documents from the First and Second Centuries

The eucharistic directions shown in the early church documents have been accepted as reliable sources by the PCK in preserving the traditional eucharistic theology. In recognition, the PCK has offered the texts of the early church’s regulations regarding the eucharist as an evidence against challengers of the traditional eucharistic theology, which, at least in the PCK, has become quite an effective way to preserve its eucharistic tradition.

Among ancient documents only discovered recently the Didache is known as the earliest showing a primitive regional church’s life and worship. In the PCK, the Didache is recognized as inheriting historically the teachings of Jesus. Jang-bok Jung101 who has led the PCK’s worship and liturgy since the 1980s, gives an understanding on the Didache in his article as to prayer of the Korean church:

A lesson of prayer taught by apostles shows well us that the Lord’s Prayer was crucially used as a prototype of prayer in the early church. The apostles of Jesus made and used Didache as a guide of ministry with a sense of duty that the church established by them had to develop on a sound basis. This guide book, the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles, was used with an authority equivalent to the Scripture.102

Here, it would be worth noting shortly about the contents of the Didache. The Didache made up of 16 chapters demonstrates how, after Jesus’ death, resurrection and ascension, the Didache’s community in the early Jewish Christian setting

101 A professor of preaching and worship in Presbyterian College and Theological Seminary (1980-2004), and the president of Hanil University and Presbyterian Theological Seminary (2005-2012).

separated from the influence of Judaism and kept and developed not only the Christian identity but also the eucharist. In the Didache, the first instruction of the eucharist appears in chapter 9. The order of the eucharist is firstly the cup and then bread. In the prayer for both the cup and the bread, thanksgiving and glory to the Father is expressed along with the anticipation of the Parousia (the Didache 9:1-4). Then, chapter 9 adds a quite special instruction related with baptism as follows:

Let no one eat or drink of your thanksgiving [meal] save those who have been baptized in the name of the Lord, since the Lord has said concerning this, “Do not give what is holy to the dogs” (the Didache 9:5).

The Didache seems to offer part of Matthew 7:6 as a proof for supporting the fenced table: “Do not give what is holy to dogs” (Matthew 7:6, NRSV). In this text, it can be read that Didache’s community is worrying about staining the holy cup and bread by those who are not baptized. To the Didache community the non-baptized seems to be recognized as people who do not have an understanding of the meaning and value of the eucharist and, thus, are unworthy to receive the eucharist.

The Didache’s teaching as to who can receive bread and the cup has been referred to as a crucial authority to preserve the traditional understanding of the PCK on the eucharist. Around the early years of the 21st century, when there were debates on whether the non-baptized can receive bread and the cup or not, Jang-bok Jung refers to the Didache 9:5, arguing that the PCK’s eucharistic tradition which allows only the baptized to participate in the eucharist inherits the early church tradition which was from the eucharist of Jesus.

The Apostolic Tradition, generally believed to be written by Hippolytus of Rome in the PCK, has played an important role in preserving the PCK’s eucharistic tradition. Jang-bok Jung finds four values from his study on the Apostolic Tradition. Firstly, through this book, the content and reality of worship in the post-apostolic period can be discovered. The second value is a finding that the “Consecration Prayer” traditionally conducted without recognition of its root by Anglican and Roman

103 Bradshaw, Eucharistic Origin, 24.  
105 It is unsure that Didache quoted directly this verse from Matthew as the Gospel of Thomas includes also this verse. In addition, Niederwimmer suggests a possibility of a quotation from an oral tradition or an unknown apocryphal gospel. See, Niederwimmer, The Didache, 153.  
Catholic churches inherits this book. Thirdly, this book confirms the roots of Christian worship which has developed and altered as time goes on. Finally, the Apostolic Tradition is the most reliable text book for reconstructing the root of worship. Such a generous view of the Apostolic Tradition seems to be the result of neglecting the recent academic achievement in studies on the early church documents.

Jang-bok Jung finds authority for the PCK’s eucharistic tradition from the Apostolic Tradition. He insists that recently many protestant churches lost important values which can be recovered in the Apostolic Tradition because of the eucharist being wrongly conducted due to an attempt to open the table to those who are not baptized:

This teaching (of the Didache, that the eucharist should be open to the only baptized) which was given from apostles was inherited by Apostolic Fathers. Around the third century, when churches were severely persecuted, the Apostolic Tradition edited by Hippolytus teaches rigorously regarding the qualification of the participants in the eucharist that “a catechumen shall not sit at the Lord’s Supper,” preserving fully the teaching (of the Didache) received around 100 AD. The early church’s worship was divided into two parts which are the liturgy of the Word and the Eucharist. In the first part, the liturgy of the Word, everyone who wants to participate in to do so, but in the eucharist only those who are baptized conduct the eucharist letting catechumen go home. … This church tradition shows well that since the early period of church history the qualification of participant has been rigidly kept.

4.3 John Calvin (1509-1564) and the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms (1647)

The PCK uses as a doctrine the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms which reflect the reformation faith of John Calvin. The PCK contains these books in its constitution book. In addition, the Westminster Directory, which derives from the John Knox liturgy influenced by John Calvin, has been used as the most
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influential guide in the formation and development of the PCK’s directories for worship. Thus, the PCK highly depends on John Calvin and Westminster Confession of Faith, Catechisms and Directory in considering matters related to the eucharist.

With regard to the relationship between baptism and the eucharist, the PCK seeks authority from Calvin. For the PCK recognizes Calvin as not only the founder of the Presbyterian Church but also a reformer who recovered the early church tradition which preserved the eucharist of the historical Jesus but was misunderstood by the churches in the Middle Ages. Calvin gives a clear expression of the formula that is baptism before the eucharist in *Catechism of the Church of Geneva*:

> Baptism is for us a kind of entry into the Church. For in it we have a testimony that we, while otherwise strangers and aliens, were received into the family of God, so that we are reckoned among his household. But the Supper testifies that God himself manifests to us as Father by feeding our souls.\(^{110}\)

In order to disclose the reasons why Calvin preserves the closed table, it would be worth exploring the full range of Calvin’s eucharistic theology relating to baptism. Calvin strongly emphasizes two preparations for worthily receiving the eucharist. Firstly, participants should repent their sins.\(^{111}\) In the Roman Catholic Church, participants were led to take part in the eucharist for their forgiveness of sins but Calvin urged participants to repent their sins in order to receive the eucharist. Hence, White names Calvin’s eucharist the “penitential eucharist”\(^{112}\) because of the emphasis on the thorough preparation. Calvin’s penitence includes not only words but the whole life that is the passion for emulating Christ and desires “to cherish, defend, and assist”\(^{113}\) brethren of Christ (*Institutes of Christian Religion*, IV, 17. 40).

Secondly, participants should inspect whether their faith in the Lord Jesus Christ is true or not. The inspection of individual faith embraces self-examination. Calvin, in his *Short Treatise on the Holy Supper of our Lord Jesus Christ*, mentioned the
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qualification of participants for the eucharist, enjoining them to thoroughly prepare themselves. For this instruction, Calvin depends on Paul's teaching in 1 Corinthians 11:29: “For all who eat and drink without discerning the body, eat and drink judgment against themselves” (NRSV). For Calvin, bread and wine consecrated by the word of God are no longer ordinary food and wine but are believed as spiritually holy flesh and blood of the Lord Jesus. As eating and drinking the holy food and wine is the holiest act on earth, to participate indifferently in the eucharist is “intolerable blasphemy.”

The reason for Calvin’s emphasis on the participants’ careful preparation for the eucharist is not only that the eucharist itself is holy but that people who eat and drink unworthily are judged by God. Thus Calvin says that for the worthy participants the sacred food becomes the food nourishing their body and soul but for people who are with “a soul corrupted by malice and wickedness” the eucharist becomes “a deadly poison” (Institutes of Christian Religion, IV, 17. 40).

However, Calvin evidently recognizes the limitation of human effort. Faith begins from the realization of sins and faith is trusting in God’s great love which invites even sinners to the eucharist that is the place of grace. Calvin confesses that no matter how much humans try to be holy, they cannot escape from the being sinful:

For if it is a question of our seeking worthiness by ourselves, we are undone; only despair and deadly ruin remain to us. Although we try with all our strength, we shall make no headway, except that in the end we shall be most unworthy, after we have labored mightily in pursuit of worthiness (Institutes of Christian Religion, IV, 17. 41).

We are still unworthy and are sinners. Nevertheless, the Lord bestows the holy food by kindness on us and allows us to participate in the feast by His mercy. Calvin recognizes that the eucharist is “not for the perfect, but for weak and feeble” (Institutes of Christian Religion, IV, 17. 42). From this point of view, while Calvin emphasizes self-examination for the eucharist, at the same time he opposes the eucharist recognized as a sacrifice accompanying human’s effort. Calvin clearly notes that the subject of the sacrifice of the eucharist is God not humans. The
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eucharist is totally concerned with the sacrifice of Jesus Christ. For Calvin, it is an error that human sacrifice joins in the sacrifice of Jesus. Calvin says:

For if we do not recognise the death of the Lord Jesus, and regard it as our only sacrifice by which he has reconciled us to the Father, effacing all the faults for which we were accountable to his justice, we destroy its virtue. If we do not acknowledge Jesus Christ to be the only sacrifice, or, as we commonly call it, priest, by whose intercession we are restored to the Father's favour, we rob him of his honour and do him high injustice.\textsuperscript{119}

The sacrifice of Jesus is not repeated continuously in the eucharist. The eucharist is the “memorial” of the sacrifice which was accomplished once by Christ Jesus. Refusing papists' understanding of the eucharist as the repetitive sacrifice, Calvin maintains that the benefit from the eucharist is “not by the merit of the act, but because of the promises which are given us, provided we receive them in faith.”\textsuperscript{120}

Similarly, recognizing the limitation of human preparation, Calvin at the same time focuses on penitence and faith as the two prerequisites for the eucharist. Furthermore, in Calvin, the two prerequisites are closely linked with baptism. Baptism is a sign and seal of forgiveness of sins and a “token of confession,” (\textit{Institutes of Christian Religion}, IV, 15. 13)\textsuperscript{121} which means that the candidates for baptism can publicly confess their sins before a congregation. Moreover, baptism is a confirmation of faith. For that, Calvin gives as an explanation the story of Cornelius the centurion, in Act 10, who is baptized after receiving the Holy Spirit. The baptism he received is for “an ampler forgiveness of sins … but a surer exercise of faith” (\textit{Institutes of Christian Religion}, IV, 15. 15)\textsuperscript{122} Thus, for Calvin, baptism is a sacrament accompanying faith and repentance. In other words, baptism is the most confidential proof to confirm publicly faith and repentance. Yet, in the case of infants, Calvin allows an exception. Infants can also receive baptism without their confession of faith and sins but after growing when they reach an age to be able to confess it they should do it by the Confirmation.\textsuperscript{123}

The Westminster Confession of Faith contained in the PCK’s Constitution follows Calvin’s view on baptism. In the Westminster Shorter Catechism, baptism is a seal
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through which we are engrafted into Christ and no one can be baptized without faith and the profession of obedience to Christ.\textsuperscript{124} Calvin’s emphasis on faith and repentance is slightly changed here into faith and obedience to Christ. But, that does not mean that in the eucharistic theology of the PCK the place of repentance is weakened or neglected. Actually, all liturgies for the eucharist presented in the BCW 1997\textsuperscript{125} and the BCW 2008\textsuperscript{126} include the Confession of Sins as an essential worship order.

In the Westminster Confession, also, Christ in the eucharist is not a sacrifice offered to God the Father following Calvin. Refusing sacrificial understanding of the eucharist, the Westminster Confession states that the eucharist is the memorial of Jesus who offered himself at once on the cross.\textsuperscript{127} Here, the “memorial” is understood by the PCK as not Zwingli’s Memorialism but Calvin’s Pneumatic Presence.\textsuperscript{128}

As to the preparation for the eucharist, like Calvin, the Westminster Confession enjoins participants to “examine themselves of their knowledge to discern the Lord’s body, of their faith to feed upon him, of their repentance, love, and new obedience.”\textsuperscript{129} For, to participate in the eucharist unworthily is eating and drinking the judgment of God.\textsuperscript{130} In the Constitution of the PCK, Part 4, Worship and Ceremony, states clearly the formula that is baptism before the eucharist:

We who became a member of church by baptism proceed to the eucharist, that is, the word of God that we can see through grace. The Lord of the eucharist is Jesus Christ in the Holy Spirit.\textsuperscript{131}

Based on these theological principles, there is a special instruction in the PCK’s eucharistic tradition that the eucharist should be delivered to the baptized 15 years and over. In the case of the infant baptized, when they become 15 years old, after the Confirmation, they can participate in the eucharist.\textsuperscript{132} This means that the PCK interprets 15 years as the proper age able to discern and believe the eucharist as the
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\textsuperscript{127} The General Assembly of The Presbyterian Church of Korea, Constitution, (2001), 126.
\textsuperscript{128} Committee on the Book of Common Worship, (2008), 55.
\textsuperscript{129} The General Assembly of The Presbyterian Church of Korea, Constitution, (2001), 55.
\textsuperscript{130} Ibid., 128.
\textsuperscript{131} Ibid., 243.
\textsuperscript{132} Ibid., 172.
body and blood of Jesus. Given those facts, the PCK seems to make an effort to preserve more thoroughly the eucharist through the dual safeguard which is baptism and the age of 15, compared with Calvin who thought the ideal age as ten (Institutes of Christian Religion, IV, 19. 13). However, a development with regard to baptism is found in the most recent directory for worship, the BCW 2008. The BCW 2008 newly introduces Baptism for Children and attempts to embrace those between three to fourteen years old who had been previously excluded from baptism. Although the PCK still preserves the eucharistic principle of “the baptized 15 years and over” according to Constitution, the change in the recognition of baptism could potentially bring a change in the eucharist as well.

5 Summary and Evaluation

This chapter has studied the history and theology of the eucharist of the PCK. In the late nineteenth century, the tradition of worship passed on by the Presbyterian and Methodist missionaries was preaching centered worship. At that time, the eucharist, which was recognized as a sacrament along with baptism, was conducted three or four times a year. This tradition was preserved for over ninety years and began to change only with the influence of the ecumenical movement in the early of 1980s. The PCK’s understanding of worship slowly began to shift from preaching centered worship to the worship including the eucharist. In addition, the PCK positively accepted the five understandings of the eucharist outlined in the BEM document in the BCW 1997. The recognition of the eucharist as part of Sunday service is more enhanced in the BCW 2008. In addition, the BCW 2008 broadens the PCK’s appreciation of the eucharist by providing various eucharistic prayers from not only other Protestant churches but also the Roman Catholic and Greek Orthodox churches.

While the PCK expanded its eucharistic understanding through participating in the ecumenical movement, there was a significant challenge to the PCK’s traditional understanding of the eucharist in 2001. The Jeonnam Synod passed the resolution supporting the open table, and it was the first official discussion of the open table in the PCK. The resolution created repercussions for many churches in the PCK.

Influential theologians and church leaders in the PCK began to write articles and editorials regarding the origin of the eucharist and the PCK’s eucharistic tradition. However, most liturgists within the PCK tended to accept literally directions regarding the eucharist recorded in Calvin’s works and the liturgies of the Church of Scotland which they presumed to be in continuity with the eucharistic practice in the early church. The early church documents such as the Didache, the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus, writings of Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria and Origen and so forth were assumed by the PCK liturgists to be in continuity with Jesus’ practice. This was especially so with respect to the relationship between baptism and the eucharist, because they regarded the manuscripts’ ruling that baptism precedes the eucharist to be authoritative; they argued that the “closed table” (open only to those of a certain age, and after baptism) was the church tradition preserved since the early church.

This traditional understanding of the eucharist of the PCK has been enhanced by some influential theories such as those of Dom Gregory Dix and Joachim Jeremias. The next chapter will explore their methodologies and the main ideas which have affected the PCK’s traditional understanding of the eucharist.
Chapter 3

The Theological Basis of the PCK’s Understanding of the Eucharist:

The Last Supper as the Origin of the Eucharist

As observed in the former chapters, the PCK’s eucharistic theology and practices are based primarily on the biblical accounts especially related to the so-called last supper stories. There is a presupposition found in the PCK’s approach to the eucharist that at the last supper Jesus conducted the eucharist which is the original in a certain form, and then apostles and the early church preserved and developed it in various ways. For the PCK, thus, the diverse eucharistic orders and contents presented in the early church documents which are far different from the last supper tradition were created in the process of later ritual development. The core of this presupposition is that it is possible to reconstruct the original, even if it is not a complete reconstruction, at least in terms of basic structure or essential elements through comparing variant readings and then distinguishing “something in common” which is believed to be derived from the original from peculiarity which is generally treated as later addition or regional alteration. This study will use “traditional” as the term for such an approach to the eucharist based on the presupposition that the PCK takes. Therefore the traditional approach’s foremost issue has been to reconstruct the original form of the eucharist by which the traditional church attains the authority of its eucharistic tradition. Until even the early 20th century, almost all the studies concerning the eucharist were done on the basis of such a presupposition, and the PCK has been served by the results of the “traditional” studies. This chapter will explore some representative theories contributing to the solidity of the traditional eucharistic understanding of the PCK.

1 Seeking the Origin of the Eucharist

In the middle of 19th century, there were revolutionary discoveries of the documents of the early church. Starting with J. W. Bickell’s short treatise *The Apostolic Church*
Order in 1843, many books, introducing the early church’s discipline, worship and dogma, such as Paul de Lagarde’s Didascalia Apostolorum in 1854, Philotheos Bryennios’ Didache or Teaching of the Twelve Apostles in 1883 were published.\(^1\) The results of these studies ushered the Christian community into a new era of observing more clearly the early church worship which had been in the doldrums since the first publication of the Apostolic Constitutions in 1563.\(^2\)

The main methodology used by the 19\(^{th}\) century pioneers of liturgical study was the philological method.\(^3\) The presupposition of this method was that Jesus gave his disciples clear teachings regarding the eucharist which church had to follow. Then there was the development of the rite of the eucharist but the core of Jesus’ teachings of the eucharist was preserved in the liturgies of the early church. Based on this presupposition, scholars tried to reconstruct the prototype of the eucharist through comparison between manuscripts of the early church. The way of discerning the original from the later alteration was to find what was common to all documents. For, they believed that what was common would be the essential parts of the eucharist preserved by the early church. Even until the late of 20\(^{th}\) century, this methodology had dominated the majority of scholars searching the original eucharist.

During the early process of searching for the original eucharist, scholars focused too much on finding a single original apostolic rite which was believed to inherit the eucharist of Jesus, attributing naively those books to the author presented in the title of the documents. For example, among the discoveries of the nineteenth century, a good number of manuscripts had a strong resemblance to the Apostolic Constitutions published in 1563. One of the documents was the so-called Canons of Hippolytus, first published in 1870. Hans Achelis believed that Canons of Hippolytus was the original work of Hippolytus and Egyptian Church Order derived from it. A decisive reason of his belief was Hippolytus, the name given as the author of the book in the title.

The sudden discoveries of the early church documents which were similar with the Apostolic Constitutions led scholars to the competition for seeking the original work of Hippolytus. In 1891, Franz Xaver Funk challenged Achelis with the opposite

---

\(^1\) For a summary of the 19\(^{th}\) century’s discoveries regarding the early church orders, see Bradshaw, The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship, 73-75.

\(^2\) Ibid., 73.

\(^3\) For more details on the philological method, see ibid., 1.
order that *Apostolic Constitutions* was the original source, and *Egyptian Church Order* and then *Canons of Hippolytus* derived from it. In 1899 Ignatius Rahmani argued that the original was the *Testamentum Domini* and other manuscripts were descendents of it. An interesting fact is that at this stage there was no suggestion that *Egyptian Church Order* was the original. However, in 1906 Eduard von der Goltz firstly proposed that *Egyptian Church Order* might be the *Apostolic Tradition*, which was believed to have vanished, written by Hippolytus of Rome. This idea was developed by Eduard Schwartz in 1910 and much fully elaborated by Richard H. Connolly in 1916. Since then this recognition of *Egyptian Church Order* as the original *Apostolic Tradition*, from which other manuscripts derived, came to prevail among the majority of scholars who have led the traditional understanding of the eucharist. Suggesting that the *Apostolic Tradition* is the genuine work of Hippolytus of Rome, Burton Scott Easton argues that it dates back to 217 CE after Hippolytus' parting with Callistus. Even though standing in the same line with Easton, Gregory Dix dates it “within a year or two either way of A.D. 215.” However, a limitation of these studies is to neglect the nature of liturgy and to overestimate its historicity. These theories have been challenged by several scholars, Rudolf Lorentz in 1929, Hieronymus Engberding in 1948, Marcel Metzger in 1988, and more recently Paul Bradshaw, Maxwell Johnson and L. Edward Phillips in 2002. Bradshaw suggests:

the so-called *Apostolic Tradition* is actually an aggregation of material from different sources, quite probably arising from different geographical regions and almost certainly from different historical periods, from perhaps as early as the middle of the second century to as late as the middle of the fourth.

2 Structural Approach to the Origin of the Eucharist

Aiming to overcome the limitations found in the early philological method, in 1945, Gregory Dix (1901-1952) attempted to reconstruct the shape of the archetypal eucharist by focusing on the structure of the eucharist, through trying to find common content or patterns in the diversity of the early material. Despite some

---

5 Bradshaw, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship*, 76.
criticisms, for over a half century Dix’s eucharistic understanding and methodology have influenced many liturgists and played a role in enhancing the traditional eucharistic understanding.

Dix tried to formulate the primitive core of the liturgy. Dix’s view was that the primitive worship was originally divided into the Synaxis (literally means a meeting) and the eucharist. According to Dix, the Synaxis derived from the Jewish synagogue service but the eucharist, although he did not deny entirely a possibility of the influence of the Kiddush (the blessing with which the Sabbath or the great feasts began) or the Passover sacrifice meal, directly derived from the last supper more particularly influenced by Chaburoth (plural of a Chabura or Habura, from Chaber meaning a friend: the common meal with a devotional purpose or fellowship).  

Around the second century the Synaxis began to precede the eucharist in regular Sunday service, and since the fourth century the Synaxis and the eucharist have been considered as inseparable elements of Christian worship.

According to Dix, the original shape was the seven-action scheme inaugurated by Jesus at the last supper: (1) taking bread (2) giving thanks (3) breaking (4) distributing it with certain words (5) taking the cup (6) giving thanks (7) distributing it with certain words. Yet, the seven-action scheme, at a very early stage with disappearance of the meal divided by the cup, was transformed to fourfold action, that is, the eucharist taking bread and the cup together:

(1) The offertory; bread and wine are ‘taken and placed on the table together. (2) The prayer; the president gives thanks to God over bread and wine together. (3) The fraction; the bread is broken. (4) The communion; the bread and wine are distributed together.

Dix believed the four-action shape as “the absolutely invariable nucleus of every eucharistic rite” conducted by the early churches. Dix recognized that from the first to the third century, there existed various forms of the eucharist comprising bread and cup, bread alone, bread and salt, bread and water, or cup and bread. He argued that, although these eucharists were irregular and heretical, the universal

---

10 Dix believes that the last supper was not the Passover but the evening meal, a Chabura, twenty-four hours before the actual Passover. Thus, he trusts more the Fourth Gospel’s account than the Synoptic Gospels. For more detail on Dix’s understanding of the last supper as the Chaburoth, see Dom Gregory Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy (Westminster: Dacre Press, 3rd ed., 1947), 50-70.
11 Ibid., 37.
12 Ibid., 48.
13 Ibid., 48.
fourfold action was still kept in them. Also, regarding the account of the *Didache* concerning the cup-bread order which might have become the biggest challenge to his conviction of the fourfold action, Dix considered it an exception with his interpretation that the rite of the *Didache* was the *agape* meal not the eucharist proper.\(^{14}\)


17 Then he took a **cup**, and after giving thanks he said, ‘Take this and divide it among yourselves; 18 for I tell you that from now on I will not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God comes.’ 19 Then he took a loaf of **bread**, and when he had given thanks, he broke it and gave it to them, saying, ‘This is my body, which is given for you. Do this in remembrance of me.’ 20 And he did the same with the **cup** after supper, saying, ‘This cup that is poured out for you is the new covenant in my blood.’\(^{15}\)

For Dix, however, the first cup was a preliminary course, not the supper, and Jesus did not drink it. Then the supper began with bread taken and broken in sequence by Jesus. Next, Jesus gave thanks over it. Although the actual words of the thanksgiving were not recorded in the New Testament, Dix is convinced that the prayer was the thanksgiving of Chabura: “Blessed be Thou, O Lord our God, eternal King, Who bringest forth bread from the earth.”\(^{16}\) When Jesus distributed it to his disciples, he gave them something special which was unusual in an ordinary Chabura: “This is my body that is for you. Do this in remembrance of me.” (1 Corinthians 11: 24, NRSV). After then, there was the incident of Judas’ abrupt departure and the prophecies of betrayal and denial, when spontaneously the mood of the supper was suddenly changed into sorrow and anxiety. The meal was over and the next order of Chabura would have been the rinsing of hands. Here, Jesus changed the usual way of Chabura to his own way. Instead of washing the hands, Jesus washed the feet of the apostles from the youngest to Peter who was the eldest. After then, a long monologue of Jesus continued. As the night grew late, the time of the end of the meeting was getting close. Jesus took the cup, containing wine mixed with water.\(^{17}\) Jesus then gave thanks and distributed it to them. While the cup was being passed to all, Jesus again made an astonishing remark that, “This cup is the

---

\(^{14}\) Ibid., 48-49.

\(^{15}\) Luke 22: 17-20, NRSV.

\(^{16}\) Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (1947), 54-55.

\(^{17}\) In Chabura traditionally water was mixed with wine for drinking and thanksgiving while unmixed wine was generally recognized more suitable for washing.
new covenant in my blood. Do this, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of me.” (1 Corinthians 11: 25, NRSV). Finally Dix sets the “hymn,” which was the closing order of every Chabura, in the last part of the supper: “When they had sung the hymn, they went out to the Mount of Olives.” (Mark 14: 26, NRSV).\(^\text{18}\)

From the so-called last supper stories, Dix finds the double institution in bread and wine, and his emphasis seems to be more on the latter than the former. The reason is that in Chabura the breaking of bread was generally conducted at every meal even when a Jew ate alone, but the blessing of the cup marked a corporate occasion. Thus, while the former can be conducted in a private rite, the latter must be done only by the Christian community. Furthermore, the significance of the cup is doubled when the meaning of the cup is connected with the new covenant which is redemption through the blood of Jesus:

The institution in bread alone might have sufficed to ‘provide holy communion’ (like a priest communicating himself from the reserved sacrament when in the absence of a congregation he cannot celebrate). The association of the bread with the cup provided the basis from which would spring the whole sacrificial understanding, not only of the rite of the eucharist but of our Lord’s ‘atonement’ itself, in time to come.\(^\text{19}\)

One of the Dix’s contributions to the study on the eucharistic origin is the recognition of the eucharist, which is reconstructed on the basis of the New Testament accounts, as “the source,” not “the model, for its performance” that must be kept by church.\(^\text{20}\) Dix provides the change from the seven to the four action shape as a proof of that the early churches used the New Testament accounts as a guide not a mandatory rule for their eucharistic practice. He notes:

Evidently, liturgical practice was not understood by the primitive church to be in any way subject to the control of the N. T. documents, even when these had begun to be regarded as inspired scripture.\(^\text{21}\)

However, compared with the former methodology, while Dix made remarkable progress in the study of the original eucharist, his method did not entirely escape from the shade of the philological method but merely moved the focus from the

\(^{18}\) Ibid., 56-58.
\(^{19}\) Ibid., 59.
\(^{20}\) Ibid., 48.
\(^{21}\) Ibid., 49.
original apostolic rite to the original eucharist of Jesus. Moreover, Dix had a strong belief that it is possible to reconstruct an original shape of the eucharist by finding a general principle in the early church manuscripts, that is the exactly same presupposition of the philological method.

For the liturgical scholar the technical question resolves itself into this: Does that great variety which has been discerned in the eucharistic prayers of the early fourth century, and which seems to increase as we penetrate back into the third, does that go back all the way to a beginning in the apostolic age in a sort of liturgical anarchy? Or is there some element of truth in the discredited traditional theory of an original uniformity, by which we may find general principles which will interpret the apparent confusion of these prayers? This book has been written partly in order to shew that there is.

Dix’s idea had been challenged by the nine-fold theory of Bryan Spinks and the alteration of Richard Buxton into two major actions which are thanksgiving and reception accompanied by two minor ones, namely the offertory and the fraction. However, also, these structural approaches to the origin of the eucharist are based on the presupposition of the philological method. In the case of Dix, an important presupposition used for reconstructing the archetype was that early eucharistic types found in different geographical regions contained one original form instituted by Jesus. Then, over time churches expanded and developed and spontaneously the diversity resulted in regional characteristics, and the content and form were transformed from brevity and simplicity in the original eucharist to longevity and complexity in the later church’s eucharist. Thus, Dix believed that the archetypal shape of the eucharist could be reconstructed by removing all attachments and additions and by recognizing the brevity rather than the longevity as the original. However, as Bradshaw indicates, the diversity and irregularity of the liturgies of the early church were too broad and complex to set in a fixed framework. Eventually, Dix responded to the results contradictory to his presupposition by treating them as

---

22 According to Bradshaw, Dix revised the philological method with “the Structural Approach” rather than overcoming it. For the details, see Bradshaw, The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship, 6.
24 Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy (1947), 214.
exclusions, sometimes neglecting them, and even considering them as the creations of heretical groups.\textsuperscript{27}

3 Comparative Approach to the Origin of the Eucharist

The comparative method was originally used for the study on culture from the second half of the 19\textsuperscript{th} century. Anton Baumstark (1872-1948) borrowed this methodology and applied it in his book \textit{Vom geschichtlichen Werden der Liturgie} (On the Historical Development of Liturgy) first published in 1923 and later developed in \textit{Comparative Liturgy}.\textsuperscript{28} Compared to the philological method which is a somewhat mechanic approach to documents, the comparative method’s contribution is to recognize liturgy as a living organism. Baumstark writes that prayer which is a living activity never can “be paralysed into the rigour of an immobile and dead formalism” and in prayer which is offered to God, “the fullness of Sacramental Grace” descends on the faithful.\textsuperscript{29} For Baumstark, in liturgy, all that is unchanged is the exchange of prayer and grace. The forms of the liturgy continue to evolve.\textsuperscript{30}

With the recognition of liturgy as a living organism, Baumstark’s contribution to the understanding of liturgy is to perceive the difference between text and practice in liturgy. In other words, Baumstark recognized that there were gaps between the liturgical documents and actual worship. Although congregations follow liturgies in conducting worship the liturgies do not tell everything what worshippers would do in the worship. The best way of understanding the worship of a community is to participate in the worship but in the case of worship in the past doing so is impossible. In this sense, Baumstark says:

\begin{quote}
… genuine humility is the only ethical stance to assume before the recognition that – on any given subject – one can only know what falls within comparatively narrow parameters, which – sooner or later – will crimp the relentless pursuit of scientific knowledge.\textsuperscript{31}
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{27} Bradshaw, \textit{Eucharistic Origins}, vii.
\textsuperscript{30} Ibid., 3.
\textsuperscript{31} Baumstark, \textit{On the Historical Development of Liturgy}, 246.
Compared with the early traditional understanding of the eucharist, a stark difference of the comparative method was the alteration of viewpoint on the process of the development of liturgy. The former believed that there was a single original liturgy from which all liturgies derived and as time went on liturgies developed with variation. Thus, from this perspective, the later liturgy is the more varied and the earlier liturgy is the more unified and simple. However, Baumstark challenged this traditional view. He observed that in the course of liturgical development the earliest liturgies were the most varied but with the lapse of time liturgies had a tendency to uniformity.

Baumstark discerns two crucial meanings embedded in the final chapter's title of the book of Ferdinand Probst (1816-1899), "Una Sancta Catholica et Apostolic Liturgia" (One holy catholic and apostolic liturgy). First of all, this phrase discloses the intrinsic solemnity of the liturgy. The core value is shared with all liturgies and thus the solemnity is perpetually and invariably found in all liturgies. However, this phrase might be misunderstood with regard to the forms of liturgy. For this, Baumstark gives an explanation:

On the other hand, this phrase would be fundamentally mistaken if it implied a complexus of forms created by the apostles, which were originally uniform but then underwent a process of increasing differentiation. In actual fact, the historical development of the liturgy does not proceed from uniformity at its earliest to an increasing local diversity, but rather from local diversity to an increasing standardization.32

Here, the laws of evolution of liturgy are clearly presented by Baumstark. The originally uniform liturgy, in the earliest stage, became varied. As a reason for the suddenly varied forms in the earliest stage, Baumstark’s suggestion seems quite convincing that the way the original form was handed down from Jesus to the apostles was via oral tradition not by text.33 Continuously, he argued that in the course of time the early variety was changed into uniformity, and simplicity or brevity into richness and prolixity.

However, Baumstark’s law of evolution which is “from variety to uniformity” has a serious weakness in trying to seek the originally uniform liturgy. For, “the uniformity of the original” runs counter to the law of “from variety to uniformity.”

32 Ibid., 89.
33 Ibid., 95.
Is the uniformity in a liturgy the original or a later development? Actually, Baumstark made an opposing statement to the law of evolution of liturgy:

Moreover, we shall have to regard as primitive phenomena which are found with the same meaning, the same function, and in the same area, in all Christian Rites, or at least in a sufficiently large number of such Rites, and especially so if they have parallels in the Liturgy of the Synagogue. We shall pronounce the same verdict where anything has a Jewish parallel, even when it is limited to a few Christian Rites or it may be only to one. On the other hand, we shall consider as recent all phenomena peculiar to a single Rite or to a few Rites, but without parallel of any kind in the Synagogue. The same verdict must be pronounced on those which, although absolutely or almost universal, change their meaning, place or function from one Rite to another.  

In addition, regarding the law suggested by Baumstark, it was impossible to explain fully the variety and complexity found in the later history of liturgy. Recognizing the limitations of the law, in turn, he tried to make up for the exceptions by suggesting supplementary laws. A time went on the movement toward uniformity was continuously obstructed by the regional churches’ tendency toward variation, and the movement toward prolixity was disturbed by the later abbreviation. However, as Bradshaw correctly indicates, according to Baumstark’s laws, the variety of a liturgy cannot be simply judged as early. Conversely, a liturgy characterized by uniformity cannot be hastily concluded as late.

Although the comparative method took a major step forward compared with the philological method, indicating the diversity of the early liturgies and the uniformity in later stages, it seems to stand on a similar basis to philological method. For, the presupposition of the comparative method is that there existed a root for liturgies, that is, the originally uniform liturgy. Moreover, the provenance of the original eucharist still adheres to the last supper. Baumstark, in spite of his prudent approach to the characters of the liturgy, believed that it was possible to observe the worship in the past through his comparative method. For Baumstark, liturgies, like living creatures which have roots, were derived from the origin, Jesus, and thus the liturgies contained genetic markers identical to the origin. Through the comparative method, he was able to explore which element was contained in a certain liturgy but had disappeared in others or how a prayer developed. Yet, 

34 Baumstark, Comparative Liturgy, 31-32.
36 Baumstark, On the Historical Development of the Liturgy, 94-95.
37 Ibid., 11.
failed to give a clear answer of the origins of the eucharist. For, in nature, the comparative method needs enough material for comparison. In other words, the comparative method was nearly useless where there was a dearth of sources. For example, Baumstark’s comparative method was quite effective in studying the liturgies from the fifth to the seventh century due to there being enough material for comparison. Conversely, Baumstark’s study explained little about the original eucharistic form and elements of Jesus due to lack of source. These features of the comparative method led Baumstark to pay attention to the process of the formation or development of liturgies rather than the roots of a liturgy.38

4 Exegetical Approach to the Origin of the Eucharist

Basically, the PCK recognizes the last supper as the origin of the eucharist although the recent worship book BCW 2008 contains an effort to include the meal of Jesus after his resurrection in the eucharist.39 Such a traditional understanding of the origin of the eucharist has been supported and reaffirmed by the absolute majority of theologians. Higgins, in his work The Lord’s Supper in the New Testament, expresses clearly the last supper as the origin of the eucharist:

The Christian sacrament of the Eucharist, called in different branches of the Church by a variety of names (Holy Communion, the Lord’s Supper, the Mass) and celebrated and understood in widely different ways, is the direct descendant of the Last Supper of Jesus with his disciples.40

This close identification of the eucharist and the last supper which seems to be evidently endorsed by the accounts of the New Testament and exactly the same as the traditional church’s confession today regarding the eucharistic origin is profoundly influenced by Joachim Jeremias’ achievement, The Eucharistic Word of Jesus. As Bruce Chilton indicates, although Jeremias too easily concludes that ipsissima verba (the original words) of Jesus are to be found in the New Testament accounts especially regarding the eucharist, the data and insight brought by his study are still meaningful and predominate in the traditional churches.41

38 Ibid., 62-88.
41 Chilton, A Feast of Meanings, 2.
The belief that the origin of the eucharist is the last supper led Jeremias to be engrossed in exploring the central feature of the last supper. Jeremias asserts that the last supper as the origin of the eucharist was a Passover meal. He raises a question concerning why instead of staying in Jerusalem in the day time and going to Bethany in the evening (Mark 11:11, 19; Luke 21:37; Mark 14:3; Luke 22:39) Jesus remained in Jerusalem for the last supper. Jeremias finds an answer in Jesus’ recognition of himself as the paschal lamb. Namely, the reason why Jesus did not leave Jerusalem was that he, the Passover lamb, “must be eaten within the gates of Jerusalem.” Additionally, Jeremias finds other reasons why the last supper was a Passover meal. The last supper was held at night contrary to the custom that the main ordinary meals were held twice a day in the late morning and late afternoon. The number of participants and the action of reclining at meals recorded in the accounts of the last supper were the same as for the Passover meal. Then Jeremias focuses on wine. For, in the days of Jesus, while wine was generally used for medical purposes in everyday life, the drinking of wine was considered appropriate in the seven days of mourning, the three pilgrimage festivals (Passover, Pentecost and Tabernacles) and the meals for the sanctification and the dismissal of the Sabbath. Furthermore, Jeremias asserts that the wine used at the last supper was red wine, which signifies blood:

Jesus and his disciples drank red wine at the Last Supper. That follows clearly from the comparison between the wine and blood. In Talmudic times there was in Palestine red, white and black wine. That the red wine was the most common is questionable in view of the relative with which it is mentioned. It is therefore the more noteworthy that R. Judah (c. AD 150), the consistent representative of the older tradition, laid down the requirement that red wine must be drunk at the passover meal; according to R. Jeremiah (c. 320) the use of red wine at the passover was actually miswah, a binding prescription.

According to the Synoptic Gospels, Jesus held the last supper with his twelve disciples on Thursday night and was put to death on Friday afternoon (Matthew 27:62; Mark 15:42; Luke 23:54; John 19:31, 42). In terms of the modern way of measuring a day based on midnight (12 pm), the days of the last supper and the death of Jesus are obviously different. Yet, in the first century, through the way of

---

43 Jeremias provides fourteen reasons that the last supper was a Passover meal. For more details, see ibid., 41-62.
44 Ibid., 53.
the Jews’ calculation that a day was from sunset (6 pm) to sunset (6 pm), both incidents occurred in the same day.45 The day was the Passover (Matthew 26:17-19; Mark 14:12-16; Luke 22:7-13). However, John’s account is different from the synoptic chronology. According to John, the incidents from the last supper to the death on the cross occurred not on the Passover but the day before the festival of the Passover (John 13:1; 18:28; 19:14; 19:31-42). The discord in the four gospels has led up to considerable debates on the date of the last supper.

Jeremias insists that the chronology of the Synoptic Gospels is more reliable than John, designating the date of the last supper as the Passover. Furthermore, as to the Johannine chronology in contrast to the synoptic view, he argues that the account of John shows an inconsistency with regard to the date of the last supper.46 I. Howard Marshall who inherits a considerable eucharistic understanding from Jeremias tries to recover the reliability of the Johannine chronology which was damaged by Jeremias, while emphasizing the authenticity of the synoptic chronology. For this, Marshall is indebted to the theory of P. Billerbeck.47 Billerbeck says that in the time of Jesus the Jewish religion and society were divided into the Sadducaic and Pharisaic traditions. At that time, while Sadducees held a position of political superiority, Jews generally followed the Pharisaic tradition in ordinary life, especially regarding religious regulations. Sadducees constantly tried to achieve a dominant position in religious laws ruling the life of Jews. Billerbeck found evidence of such attempts of the Sadducees in the alteration of the date of offering of the first fruit. One of the differences between the Pharisaic and Sadducaic religious traditions was the interpretation on the day of offering of the first fruit in Leviticus 23:11: “on the day after the Sabbath the priest shall raise it” (NRSV). The Sadducees offered the first fruit on Sunday, the day after the Sabbath, interpreting the text literally but the Pharisees appreciated it as the day after the feast of the Passover and thus offered the first fruit on Nisan 16/17 regardless of days. The Sadducees had political power enough to change the calendar. The Sadducees frequently changed the calendar to keep their tradition by delaying or advancing the beginning of the month by one day. In the year of Jesus’ death,

46 Ibid., 80-81. Providing an example of “high Sabbath” in John 19.31, Jeremias insists that John wavers between the synoptic account and his own chronology.
originally Nisan 16/17 fell on Saturday, but Sadducees made Nisan 16/17 fall on Sunday by fabricating the calendar so that they could offer the first fruit on that day designated by their tradition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Thursday</th>
<th>Friday</th>
<th>Saturday/Sabbath</th>
<th>Sunday</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A daily chronology of Jesus reconstructed by Billerbeck</strong></td>
<td>The last supper</td>
<td>The death of Jesus</td>
<td>In tomb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Pharisaic calendar</strong></td>
<td>Nisan 14/15 the day of the passover meal according to the Pharisaic tradition</td>
<td>Nisan 15/16</td>
<td>Nisan 16/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The calendar altered by the Sadducees</strong></td>
<td>Nisan 13/14</td>
<td>Nisan 14/15 The day of the passover meal according to the Sadducaic tradition</td>
<td>Nisan 15/16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.1 The Chronology Reconstructed by Billerbeck

Billerbeck believed that Pharisees obviously would try to keep their tradition with an unmodified calendar. In order to avoid conflict, the Sadducees, in turn, allowed the Pharisees to have the Passover meal one day earlier than the Sadducaic calendar. Jesus and his disciples following the Pharisaic calendar had the last supper on the night of Thursday and the Synoptic Gospels reported it, while John the Sadducaic reported the incidents occurred on the same days but on different dates. Marshall, of course, recognizes that there is an element of conjecture in the theory of Billerbeck. Nevertheless, Marshall, praising the idea of Billerbeck as the most plausible among all theories, supports the chronological harmonization between the synoptic and Johannine points of view:

Since we have seen that both the Synoptic Gospels and John contain clear evidence for their respective points of view, and since there is no reason to regard either of them as being mistaken, it seems best to adopt a solution of the third type, and to allow that the Synoptic Gospels and John reflect the use of different calendars. ... Our conclusion, then, is that Jesus held a Passover meal earlier than the official Jewish date, and that he was able to do so as the result of calendar differences among the Jews.48

---

On the other hand, some scholars seek the origin of the last supper in relationship to other meals of the Jewish tradition rather than the Passover meal. G. H. Box argued that the last supper was from the Sabbath-Kiddush. With regard to formal characters, the last supper seems to be more similar to the meal of the Sabbath-Kiddush which is a meeting of preparation for the Sabbath/festival than the Passover meal. The Sabbath-Kiddush was the gathering of a small number of men, who used leavened not unleavened bread; only one cup not many cups; did not read the text relating to Exodus which is a crucial character of the Passover; held the gathering once a week not annually; and had wine mixed with water. These characteristics are all found in the last supper account. Also, William D. Maxwell provides the reasons why the last supper was the Sabbath-Kiddush:

The Last Supper is 'held to derive from a simple repast shared weekly by small groups of male Jews, very often by a rabbi and his disciples. Its purpose was to prepare for the Sabbath or a festival, and it was religious in character. It consisted of religious discussion followed by a simple meal of common bread and wine mixed with water, the cup being passed from one to another, and prayer offered. This meal was known as the Kiddush, and it was commonly observed in pious circles of the day, especially in Messianic circles. It is almost certain that our Lord and His disciples were accustomed to partake of this meal of fellowship on the eve of every Sabbath and festival: the last supper,’ therefore, was the last of these meals that they shared together.

However, the Sabbath-Kiddush theory was criticized that the Sabbath-Kiddush meal was held always on Saturday evening, but the last supper was held on Thursday evening. The weakness of the Sabbath-Kiddush theory was complemented by the Passover-Kiddush meal of W. O. E. Oesterley. According to him, the last supper was a ritual sanctification of the Passover held on the evening before the feast. However, his idea had the same deficiency with the Sabbath-Kiddush. Generally the ritual sanctification of the Passover was conducted with the opening of the Passover meal not twenty-four hours before the Passover meal. Thus,

Jeremias criticizes that the idea of a Passover-Kiddush being held “twenty-four hours before the beginning of the feast is pure fantasy.”

There were other attempts to connect the last supper with an evening meal, that is, Chaburoth (plural term of a Chaburah). As observed before, Dix insists that the last supper was a Chaburah meal held on twenty-four hours before the Passover. Dix gives an explanation of the features and purpose of a Chaburah.

The corporate meeting of a chaburah regularly took the form of a weekly supper, generally held on the eve of Sabbaths or holy days, though there was no absolute rule about this. Each member of the society usually contributed in kind towards the provision of this common meal. The purpose of the supper was chiefly mutual recreation and social intercourse, though the business of the society was also managed on these occasions. Given the special religious background of such a society, religious topics – of perpetual interest to all Jews – normally formed the staple subject of conversation at any such meal.

In respect of the composition of order, there are considerable similarities between a Chaburah and the last supper. According to Dix, both have a leader, relish (a preliminary course) which is served before the meal proper, the breaking of bread, the thanksgiving over bread and wine, and at the close of the meeting singing a psalm. This theory seems to have an advantage over the ideas related to the Kiddush in view of the fact that a Chaburah meal has no limitation on the date and time, and so it is possible to solve the riddle of twenty-four hours.

Prior to Dix, Lietzmann in his great achievement Mass and Lord’s Supper first published in 1926 insisted that the last supper was an ordinary meal, resisting the traditional understanding of the last supper as the Passover meal. Lietzmann points out that the peculiar features of the Passover meal are not at all found in the last supper:

The Passover meal has the following characteristics: (1) A lamb is eaten. - At the Lord’s Supper there is no lamb. (2) The Midrash on the Exodus from Egypt and the wanderings in the desert is recited. - This is not the case at the Lord’s Supper. (3) Only unleavened bread is eaten. - At the Lord’s Supper leavened bread is eaten. (4) It is obligatory to drink four cups. - At the Lord’s Supper there is only one cup. Thus at the Lord’s Supper all the characteristic features of the Passover are lacking, and not only those which

54 Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy (1947), 51-52.
55 For more details on Dix’s study as to the relationship between the last supper and a Chaburah, see ibid., 50-58.
might naturally be omitted when the rite was celebrated weekly, or even more frequently, instead of once a year only.  

On many occasions, Lietzmann, through the investigation of the meals recorded in the Talmudic sources, found that “the breaking of bread” and “the blessing of bread and wine” were general elements of meals in Jewish society not a peculiar distinction of the Sabbath-Kiddush. For this argument, he provides cogent proof in various sources such as the ritual for the ceremony of the “ushering in of the Sabbath,” Sabbath-Kiddush in the modern prayer-book of the German rite which is believed to be preserving the primitive form of the Sabbath-Kiddush in the Talmudic age, the Babylonian Talmud Pesachim, the Jerusalem Pesachim, the Mishnah Berakoth and Pesachim, and the Tosephta. Finally, he insists that “these Jewish table-customs represent in all points the exact prototype of the last meal of Jesus with his disciples” and the meal was a Chaburah.

Lietzmann, additionally, exploring the early churches’ documents such as the Didache, the liturgy of Serapion (from fourth-century Egypt) and the third-century Roman liturgy of Hippolytus, suggests that there are two eucharistic traditions. Firstly, he maintains that the liturgy of Serapion which was influenced by the Didache, having no mention of the death of Jesus, traces back to “the breaking of bread” in Acts. The breaking of bread, of course, traces back to the fellowship at meals of Jesus. The characteristics of this tradition are the joyful sense of the Lord’s spiritual presence and an enthusiastic anticipation of Parousia. The other tradition is the Pauline type of the eucharist. Lietzmann considers Paul as the originator of this tradition which focuses on the eucharist as a memorial of the death of Jesus and the last supper as provenance.

However, Lietzmann immediately had to face straightforward criticisms. First of all, Jeremias criticized him that the Chaburah meal was exclusively associated with obligations such as betrothal, weddings, circumcisions and funerals. Furthermore, in the Chaburah, the observance of the Torah was emphasized but there is no

---

57 Ibid., 168.
58 For more detail on the texts of the Talmudic era, see ibid., 165-170.
59 Ibid., 171.
60 Ibid., 185.
61 Ibid., 250-255.
evidence of it in the last supper, and it is, also, not sure whether Jesus and his disciples actually did “form a regular association” of a Chaburah.63

Another possible interpretation of the last supper might be sought in the communal meals of Qumran. K. G. Kuhn argued that the ritual meals of the Essenes affected two aspects of the last supper. Firstly, Kuhn pays attention to the similar way of gathering for meals between the Essenes and the early church. He insists that the Essenes came together for the meals in a certain place and the early church developed the eucharist in a communal way, echoing the Essenes’ meal practice. However, Jeremias refutes Kuhn’s theory, mentioning several differences between the two meal practices. For example, whereas at Qumran the monks had meals twice daily at eleven o’clock and in the late afternoon, the early church generally held the eucharist at evening. The participants in the communal meal of Qumran were only men but in the eucharist women joined in. Additionally, the only place of the meals at Qumran was the monastery whereas the early church came together not only in the church building but also in private houses.64 Another influence of Qumran on the eucharist of Christian community suggested by Kuhn is that the records of the last supper in Mark and Matthew which have the bread-word ahead of the wine-word during the supper are different from Lukan/Pauline accounts which insert “after supper” (Luke 22:20; 1 Corinthians 11:25, NRSV) between the bread and wine. Kuhn found evidence of the immediate sequence of the bread and wine in the meals of the Essenes.65 Furthermore, he suggests that the blessing of the priest over the bread and the drink and the phrases “the bread of life” and “the cup of blessing” recorded in 1 Qumran Scrolls (QS) 6:4-6 and the Jewish tale of Joseph and Asenath are closely connected with the last supper.66 However, such characteristics are general elements and expressions used in other Jewish meals rather than peculiar distinctions of the meals of Qumran. Thus, this evidence for the connection between the Qumran meal and the eucharist submitted by Kuhn seems to be not enough for decisive proof.67

64 Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, 31-32.
65 Ibid., 31.
66 Ibid., 32-33.
67 Bradshaw, The Search for the Origin of Christian Worship, 64
More recently, the theory of Zebah Todah (the thank-offering/sacrificial meal) has been magnified as the source of the eucharist by scholars such as Leon-Dufour, Hartmut Gese and Louis Marie Chauvet. The Zebah Todah traces back to “the sacrifice of peace” (Zebah Shelamim) recorded in chapters three and seven of Leviticus. Especially “the sacrifice of peace” in chapter seven of Leviticus is divided into three sacrifices according to various purposes, including thanksgiving (Todah), a votive offering (Neder) and a freewill offering (Nedabah). Among them, “the sacrifice of peace” for “thanksgiving” is the Zebah Todah. The emphasis on “thanksgiving,” the core of Zebah Todah, caused a development of the form of Zebah Todah, that is, the shift “from the animal victim toward the prayers.” In the time of Jesus, the Zebah Todah became more spiritualized and symbolized with criticism against the temple sacrifice in Jerusalem. In the first century the Zebah Todah pervaded not only Jerusalem but all regions under Hellenism. As evidence, Chauvet introduces the work of R. K. Yerkes. Yerkes, exploring the Hermetic literature, finds that in those sources not the “ritual sacrifice” but the “spiritual sacrifice” (logike thusia) with a pure heart and the prayer of “thanksgiving” (eucharistia) are emphasized as the only true sacrifice. He finds additional evidence of the Zebah Todah prevailing among the Hellenistic world in the writings of Philo. Philo places “the eucharistic sacrifice” (tes eucharistias thusia) at the highest position among sacrifices. Based on this evidence, Chauvet designates “the eucharistic sacrifice” of Philo as the Zebah Todah and finally maintains that the last supper and the eucharist of the early Christian community were obviously the Zebah Todah.

---

71 Ibid., 243.
72 The Hermetic literature is “a body of non-Christian texts reflecting a religious statement drawn from Greek philosophy and Near Eastern traditions. ... Much of the Hermetic literature is of an occult nature, dealing with Astrology, alchemy, and Magic, but of more importance is an array of writings which purport to teach mysteries concerning God, the universe, human nature and salvation.” Watson E. Mills et al., eds., *Mercer Dictionary of the Bible: The Mercer Commentary on the Bible Series* (Macon, GA: Mercer University Press, 1997, first published in 1990), 375.
75 Ibid., 243-244.
Given that the theological emphasis of Zebah Todah is on “thanksgiving as to the sacrifice of Jesus for deliverance,” the focal idea seems to be well described in the interpretation of Paul concerning the eucharist inserted in 1 Corinthians 11. From this point of view, Leon-Dufour asserts that the ritual proclamation of “the Lord’s death until he comes” (1 Corinthians 11:26, NRSV) corresponds exactly to the Todah.76 This theory might be useful for an explanation of the reason why the early churches preferred “thanksgiving” of the sacrifice of Christ for deliverance, that is, the hodayah/eurcharistia form to the “blessing” (berakah) form. However, just like other theories, the Todah theory seems to be insufficient because the “thanksgiving” which is believed by Kuhn and other scholars to be the defining characteristic of the Zebah Todah is found in other Jewish meals as well. Plus, the Todah theory fails to explain sufficiently for the anticipation of Parousia embedded in the early churches’ eucharistic tradition.77

From the accounts observed above, all possible attempts to connect the origin of the last supper with a certain type of Jewish meal tradition are plausible but not entirely convincing. Also, an important thing to remember is that most theories explored above are based on the traditional presupposition that the origin of the eucharist is the last supper. Although Lietzmann and some scholars regard the eucharist as being from the meals of Jesus shared with his disciples during his public life their theories have not been deliberately recognized by the PCK. If the traditional presupposition is true, the question of whether the last supper was a Passover meal or another would be crucial in considering the eucharist today. However, conversely, if the presupposition is suspicious and vulnerable, to define what the last supper was would not be the most pressing issue. This new approach towards the eucharist will be treated in the next chapters.

5 Scientific Approach to the Origin of the Eucharist

With profound insight concerning the characters of liturgy, Mazza shows an advance in scientific approach to the eucharistic origins. First of all, he raises a question about the suppositions, in which traditional theologians have blind faith, and tries to retain objectivity in his study. He criticizes traditional scholars for

76 Leon-Dufour, Sharing the Eucharistic Bread, 57.
having delusions about the Jewish documents of ancient times. For example, he indicates that the texts of the *Birkat ha-Mazon* believed to be the original source of the prayer of the last supper by traditional scholars were actually reconstructed by Finkelstein and thus have never been extant.\(^78\) Furthermore, he differentiates between eucharistic practice which was historically conducted and the eucharistic illustration coloured by theology. Such keen insight is clear from his perception of the relationship between the last supper and the Passover. Mazza accepts that paschal significance is placed in and around the last supper stories but at the same time discerns that paschal theology reflects the perspective of certain early Christian communities. He stresses that the early churches’ interpretation must be differentiated from the actual eucharistic event in order to have a clear understanding on the last supper and the Passover meal:

> In order to deal correctly with the question of the Passover character of the Last Supper we must distinguish between the theological significance of the Last Supper and its ritual and historical status. From the historical and ritual points of view, the meal taken in the upper room was not a Passover meal; the typological fulfillment of the Jewish Passover and they therefore gave it a detailed Passover character, even to the point of using a chronology that had the Last Supper being celebrated at the very moment of the Jewish Passover. There is therefore a theological purpose at work in this chronology. It is the same theological intention that is at work in the Gospel of John, who has the death of Jesus take place at the same time as the slaying of the Passover lamb.\(^79\)

In other words, redactors of the New Testament placed the last supper in the context of the Passover with theological intention but historically the last supper was not the Passover meal. Instead, Mazza suggests a Jewish festive meal, Kiddush,\(^80\) as the root of the last supper. He maintains that the Kiddush has three parts: the rite of the cup, the rite of the bread, and the rite of the cup. Then, he pays attention to the eucharistic order, “cup – bread – cup,” observed in Luke and the *Didache* which is exactly the same with the Kiddush order. From this point of view, Mazza in turn suggests that the cup – bread – cup order is closer to the primitive

---


\(^79\) Ibid., 25.

\(^80\) Mazza prefers “Qiddush” to “Kiddush” as the term for the Jewish festive meal but here for coherence the latter will be used.
eucharist than the bread – cup order which is believed as the original and proper eucharistic form by the traditional eucharistic understanding.\textsuperscript{81}

When considering the traditional scholars from Jeremias downwards who recognize the cup ahead of bread type as not the eucharist proper, one of Mazza’s contributions to the traditional eucharist understanding is to make the fixed concept of the eucharist more flexible. His extensive and careful approach to the eucharist draws on new perceptions of the traditions of the eucharist. While Jeremias argued, based on literal and linguistic inspection on the institution narratives, that the account in Mark is closer to the original than the Lukan/Pauline tradition, Mazza penetrated the complexity of liturgy which is not easily discernible between the original and later interpolation through an analysis of linguistic characters. For, the text of the eucharist is not a simply historical record but “the form of the narrative served not only the needs of the \textit{kerygma} but also its liturgical use.”\textsuperscript{82} Consistently, he maintained that in an appraisal of the historicity of liturgy the focus must be changed from the linguistic concern to the structure of the rite. From this point of view, Mazza rather insists that the account of Luke which retains more liturgical features than Mark is closer to the primitive.\textsuperscript{83} Also, regarding the perception of the course of the eucharist, Mazza enlarges the traditional point of view which was confined in the bread – cup type.

However, he is still firmly grounded in the traditional presupposition that the eucharist originated from the last supper of Jesus in the upper room. He believes that the prayers “that Jesus uttered at the supper are the origin and model of the Church’s eucharistic prayer, or anaphora.”\textsuperscript{84} In addition, Mazza’s theory does not seem to be established on thoroughly verifiable evidence, depending considerably on his own hypothesis. Mazza’s attempt to connect the tripartite presented in the Kiddush with the cup – bread – cup in Luke is praiseworthy but not convincing.

\textsuperscript{81} Ibid., 28-34.
\textsuperscript{82} Ibid., 23-24.
\textsuperscript{83} According to Mazza, the course of the eucharist evolved from more liturgical forms to simplifying and combining form. By the tendency of simplification, the order of traditions is: Kiddush – Luke (longer version) - Didache - 1 Cor 10.16-17. By the tendency of Combination, the order is: Luke - 1 Cor 11.23-25 - Mark/Matthew - Luke (Shorter version). For more details, see ibid., 32.
\textsuperscript{84} Ibid., 19.
6 Summary and Evaluation

Chapter three has focused the main theories which have supported the PCK’s traditional eucharistic understanding. Since the revolutionary discoveries in the middle of 19th century, the origin of the eucharist has been a controversial issue for many decades. Various methodologies have been used for exploring the origin of the eucharist. In the early period of the history of the study on the origin of the eucharist, most scholars used the philological method. They tended to believe naively a name in the title of a certain book as the author of the book. Overcoming the limitation of the philological method, Dix studied the origin of the eucharist through his structural approach. Baumstark tried to reconstruct the eucharistic origin with his recognition of liturgy as a living organism. Jeremias and others used an exegetical approach for searching for the origin of the eucharist. Based on these methodologies, some scholars argued that the last supper was a paschal meal. Others suggested various alternative theories such as the Kiddush, the Chabura and the Zeba Todah, with an attempt to interpret the last supper within the Jewish context.

In the history of the study of the origins of the eucharist, there was a common presupposition shared by the majority of the scholars that the eucharist originated from the last supper. Although the results of the studies were different, the common presupposition made the biggest impact on the PCK’s eucharistic theology. Among various eucharistic perspectives, the PCK focused the paschal meaning of the last supper. The eucharistic understanding of the PCK came to have a tendency to adhere to the last supper tradition and theologically interpret the last supper as being closely connected to the death of Jesus. As a result, the PCK came to strengthen its traditional eucharistic regulation which allows only baptized members over the age of fifteen to participate in the eucharist.

However, recent studies of the eucharist challenge the traditional presupposition of the origins of the eucharist. These studies focus on the diversity of the eucharistic theology and practice in the earliest period of Christianity. The more significant finding of these studies is that the eucharist in that period is not based on the last supper tradition. The early church documents do not recognize Jesus in the eucharist as a paschal lamb. Moreover, there is no description of the last supper as the temporal background of the eucharist. These findings raise a question about the
reliability of the traditional eucharistic presupposition. At the same time, these findings lead theologians to reconsider not only the origin of the eucharist but the nature of the eucharist. Why was the eucharist, which was held by the early church, different from the last supper tradition? If the actual roots of the eucharist did not derive from the last supper, where can the church seek the origins of the eucharist? If the eucharist was not instituted in the last supper, where can the church seek the theological validity of the eucharist as a sacrament? What do the answers to these questions mention regarding the open table? How can the church embody the theology of the open table in liturgy and an actual practice? These questions lead this thesis to part II.
Part II

The Theology of the Eucharistic Open Table
Chapter 4

The Historical Basis for the Theology of the Open Table (1):

The Eucharist in the First Two Centuries

There is a scholarly consensus regarding the history of the eucharist that in the earliest two centuries churches celebrated the eucharist with various forms and differences in content. The traditional point of view understands the eucharistic diversity to be the result of the evolution or development from the last supper. Also, traditionalists believe that it is possible to reconstruct the original by extracting common wordings or forms presumed to be the original from the various eucharistic expressions of the early church. However, recent scholars studying the origin of the eucharist challenge the traditional eucharistic understanding which is based on the presupposition that the eucharist originated from the last supper.

Criticizing the traditional presupposition for causing the church to embrace wrong perspectives on the origin of the eucharist, these scholars pursue actual facts in historical documents rather than presupposition. This new approach to the origin of the eucharist recognizes that there are two significant historical facts about the eucharist in the first two centuries. Firstly, the eucharist in the early church was varied in form and content. Secondly, the more important fact is that the eucharist in the early church was quite different from the last supper tradition. These two facts raise fundamental questions regarding the traditional eucharistic understanding adhering to the view that the eucharist originated from the last supper. The first question concerns the notion of one original source. The extant earliest eucharistic sources have too many variants to believe that they are from one original. The second question concerns the notion of the last supper. If the eucharist of the early church originated from the last supper why does it consistently neglect the so-called last supper stories? In order to answer these questions, this chapter will explore the eucharistic practices in the first two centuries which are different from the last supper tradition.
1 The Eucharist of the Fourth Gospel

To define the sacramentalism of the Fourth Gospel has always been a controversial issue. This controversy, especially regarding the eucharist, is amplified by unique eucharistic features in John. Firstly, the institution narrative is absent in the last supper of John 13. Secondly, there is no mention of the breaking of the bread which is recognized as a decisive criterion for the eucharist from a traditional eucharistic perspective. Thirdly, the eucharistic terminology and expressions presented in John 6 undoubtedly reflect the eucharistic sayings of Jesus or at least have a eucharistic overtone. Lastly, the temporal and spatial setting of the eucharist is the feeding of the multitude on a mountain in John 6 and not the last supper in the upper room in John 13. Similarly, such distinctive eucharistic characteristics of John, which are considerably different from the synoptic and Pauline tradition but at the same time clearly eucharistic, provide a space for some to view John as anti-sacramentalist while others view John as pro-sacramentalist.

1.1 The Case for John as an Anti-sacramentalist

Among the scholars who support the anti-sacramentalism of John, Bultmann is one of the most influential figures. He argues that the present form of the Fourth Gospel has been completed through several stages. Bultmann names the original author of the Fourth Gospel as the evangelist. The evangelist probably was a member of a Gnostic circle but finally converted into a Christian. The evangelist would have had three sources, the sign source, the revelatory discourse, and the passion and resurrection story. The evangelist completed the proto-gospel of John by using the three sources with his particular theological intention. However, the first edition of the Fourth Gospel had a weakness in chronology. According to Bultmann, the disorder between stories led the second editor, the ecclesiastical redactor, to rearrange it and make interpolations according to his theology. Bultmann believes that during the process the ecclesiastical redactor found a theological weak point, that is, the absence of sacramentalism in the former edition. This could possibly have meant that the Fourth Gospel was recognized by the early churches as docetic literature. So, in order to cover the theological weakness, the ecclesiastical redactor

---

interpolated the sacramental source throughout the whole book including in particular the eucharistic concept in John 6.\textsuperscript{2} John 6 can be divided into three parts: The feeding of the Five Thousand (John 6:1-14); Jesus Walks on Water (John 6:15-21) and Dialogue and Discourse on the Bread of Life (John 6:22-71).\textsuperscript{3} In Dialogue and Discourse on the Bread of Life (John 6:22-71), John 6:51-58 contains evident eucharistic words such as flesh and blood:

I am the living bread that came down from heaven. Whoever eats of this bread will live for ever; and the bread that I will give for the life of the world is my flesh. The Jews then disputed among themselves, saying, ‘How can this man give us his flesh to eat?’ So Jesus said to them, ‘Very truly, I tell you, unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, you have no life in you. Those who eat my flesh and drink my blood have eternal life, and I will raise them up on the last day; for my flesh is true food and my blood is true drink. Those who eat my flesh and drink my blood abide in me, and I in them. Just as the living Father sent me, and I live because of the Father, so whoever eats me will live because of me. This is the bread that came down from heaven, not like that which your ancestors ate, and they died. But the one who eats this bread will live for ever.’\textsuperscript{4}

Bultmann draws a conclusion that these verses were inserted by an ecclesiastical editor.\textsuperscript{5} Similarly, Wahlde suggests that John 6:51-58 interpolated by the third editor echoes obviously the eucharist in the New Testament.\textsuperscript{6} Do Bultmann and Wahlde view John as an anti-sacramentalist? With regard to the evangelist, the first writer of the Fourth Gospel, the answer is yes. However, at the same time, it is also true that they never denied the sacramental significance spread into the final edition of the Fourth Gospel.

\begin{footnotes}
\item[4] John 6:51-58, NRSV.
\item[6] According to Wahlde, the second editor of the Fourth Gospel intentionally undermined the material value, so as to emphasize the spiritual dimension of Jesus’ existence. After the Johannine community acknowledged the importance of the spiritual phase, the third editor felt the need to recover the significance of the materiality. Thus, the third editor inserted the material concept throughout the Fourth Gospel, including John 6:51-58. See Urban C. von Wahlde, \textit{The Gospel and Letters of John: Volume 1 Introduction, Analysis, and Reference} (Cambridge: William B. Eerdmans, 2010), 331-334.
\end{footnotes}
1.2 The Case for John as an Anti-ritualist or Pro-sacramentalist

On the other hand, some scholars argue that John was not an anti-sacramentalist but an anti-ritualist. They believe that John objects to the ritual of the sacraments but emphasizes the meanings and theology of baptism and the eucharist much more than other gospel writers. LaVerdiere expresses the view that there exists a broad range of sacramental symbols and meanings throughout John. First of all, LaVerdiere finds indirect sacramental symbols from several discourses. According to LaVerdiere, the sacramental significance emerges from the first part of John. The Word made flesh (John 1:14) emphasizing the incarnation is embodied in the eucharist when Jesus gives his flesh to people in John 6. In a wedding banquet at Cana, the water made wine (John 2:9) and the mention of the passover (John 2:13) are pregnant with the meaning of eucharist. In addition, the water shed on the cross with blood (John 19:34), the water mentioned in the dialogue with Nicodemus (John 3:3-5), and the water told to the Samaritan woman are the symbols of baptism.

With these indirect sacramental references, John also directly mentions the eucharist in three events. Firstly, the miraculous feeding story in chapter 6 is a clear indication of the eucharist. Although there is no mention of the breaking of the bread, John’s focus is on the distribution of Jesus not the act of the breaking. Secondly, chapter 13 of John does not record the institution narrative but the setting echoes evidently the eucharist at the last supper. LaVerdiere recognizes the supper illustrated in John 13 as “a homiletic reflection” on the eucharist described in the Synoptic Gospels and 1 Corinthians 11. In other words, John’s interest is not in teaching the Johannine community the ritual of the eucharist but in the application of the eucharistic meanings. Lastly, the breakfast after the resurrection in chapter 21 also reflects the eucharist. The act of Jesus’ giving bread and fish at
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8 LaVerdiere assumes that the Gospel of John would have been written between the late 90s and the early part of the second century when the Johannine community was theologically challenged by proto-Gnosticism that undermined the incarnation and humanity of Jesus. According to him, in the process of responding to the docetic tendency the Johannine community developed the theology of the Word made flesh (John 1:14) and the eucharist that is eating the flesh of the Son of Man and drinking his blood (John 6:53). For more details on the relationship between the Johannine community and the docetic challenges, see ibid., 117-118.
9 Ibid., 114.
10 Ibid., 115.
11 Ibid., 116.
the breakfast acts as a reminder of the feeding on the mountain in chapter 6. In addition, after the two eucharistic meals in chapters 6 and 13, a discourse or dialogue always follows them and the same pattern is observed in the chapter 21. Thus, LaVerdiere recognizes the breakfast as the eucharist.

Cullmann further attempts to connect in a sophisticated way all the main miracles and stories recorded in John with baptism and the eucharist. The living water in the conversation with the Samaritan woman (John 4:1-30) and the pool by the sheep gate (John 5:1-19) indicate baptism. In addition, when considering one of the eucharistic emphases of John is the nourishment by Christ, the transformation of water into wine at the wedding feast at Cana and the multiplication of the loaves on a mountain are enough to be recognized as the eucharist. Interestingly Cullmann uncovers both eucharistic and baptismal meanings in John 13. He suggests that the last supper is clearly the eucharist and the washing of the feet alludes to baptism. Not only the act of washing but also the conversation between Jesus and Peter concerning bathing imply baptism. Cullmann gives a plausible comment on this passage:

Verses 9-10 make clear allusion to Baptism. Peter asks Jesus to wash all of him, not only his feet and Jesus answers; no, he that is once (completely) washed does not require to have more than his feet washed. These words can surely have only this meaning; he who has received Baptism, even when he sins afresh, needs no second Baptism, for one cannot be twice baptized. The reference of the word ‘bathed’ to Baptism is the more convincing that Baptism in early Christianity did actually consist of dipping the whole body in the water.

Until now, this study has briefly explored diverse understandings on John’s position of the sacraments. Some scholars argue that John was an anti-sacramentalist, suggesting that the sacramental features in John were interpolated by later redactors. In contrast, others view that John was a pro-sacramentalist, insisting that the sacramental features should be ascribed to the evangelist. Nevertheless, there is a convergence between the two extremes that the Fourth Gospel, regardless of
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12 After the miraculous feeding (6:1-15), the long discourse of the eucharist (6:22-71) follows it, at the last supper Jesus’ farewell discourse (14:1-17:26) is placed after the meal (13:1-38), and at the first breakfast by the Sea of Tiberias Jesus’ dialogue with Simon Peter follows it. For more details, see Ibid., 116, 122.
14 For more details on Cullmann’s exposition as to the miracle at the marriage at Cana, see ibid., 66-71. With regard to the feeding miracle, see ibid., 93-102.
15 Ibid., 108.
whether it was written by the evangelist or the ecclesiastical redactor, expresses its intent to claim the significance of the sacraments.

1.3 The Reason Why John Places the Eucharist in Chapter Six rather than Chapter Thirteen

The fact that John contains the sacramental features leads us to the next puzzle. While Paul and the Synoptic Gospels describe that Jesus instituted the eucharist at the last supper, the Fourth Gospel places the origin of the eucharist in the miraculous feeding event in chapter 6. In addition, when the Fourth Gospel gives an explanation of the last supper in its chapter 13, there is no mention of the institution narrative. The simple phrase, “during supper,” is all the explanation concerning the last supper the Fourth Gospel gives. The focus of the Fourth Gospel in its chapter 13 is Jesus who washed his disciples’ feet not the last supper. Many scholars have tried to solve the puzzle. Jeremias argues that John intended to hide the sacred ritual from the heathen by moving the eucharist from the last supper in chapter 13 to chapter 6. From a somewhat different point of view, Morris proposes that John was not an anti-sacramentalist but just concerned about overemphasizing the participation in the eucharist. Carson provides a more plausible answer based on an assumption that at that time superstitious beliefs in the eucharist prevailed in the Johannine community and also they believed that the eucharistic ritual gave salvation. In such a situation, in order to correct the wrong beliefs and remind them that the centre of the eucharist is Jesus not the ritual, John would probably remove the eucharist in the chapter 13. Similarly, Leon-Dufour’s view is that John highlights the meanings of the eucharist by diminishing ritual characters of the eucharist in chapter 13. The reason why John omits the institution narrative in the chapter 13 is the “fulfillment” of the eucharist presented by the Synoptic Gospels. At that time, the eucharist of the Pauline and synoptic tradition prevailed in the Johannine community. Yet slowly the mystical and magical perception of the eucharist began to permeate into the community. Such a
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16 For more details, see Jeremias, The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, 73.
19 Leon-Dufour, Sharing the Eucharistic Bread, 251.
phenomenon was against the true meaning of the eucharist. The main purpose of
the eucharist for John was “to intensify in this world that fraternal love which is
divine in its origin.” While in the eucharist of the Synoptic Gospels participants
experienced only the love of God, in John 13 through the washing of feet they not
only encounter Jesus but practise love. For this reason, John decided to insert Jesus’
washing his disciples’ feet not the institution narrative in the last supper. All the
attempts are plausible but as Morris concludes quite correctly, “there is no evidence,
and all this is conjecture.”

A limitation found in the explanations above is that they recognize the eucharist in
the Synoptic Gospels as the original style of the eucharist and that of John is an
alteration or evolution from the original. There remains still another possibility in
understanding the eucharist in John 6. For that to happen, a different perspective is
needed. It means that we consider a possibility that John’s eucharist based on the
miraculous feeding in chapter 6 is not an adaptation from the synoptic tradition to
the Johannine community but an independent tradition. Anderson, although he
acknowledges a possibility of John as influenced by pre-Markan oral tradition,
insists on the independence of the Johannine tradition from the Synoptic Gospels,
noting the clear differences between John 6 and Mark 6 and 8:

One of the astounding things discovered when analyzing the parallels
between John 6 and Mark 6 and 8 is that we really do have three
independent accounts (although in Mark 6 and 8 the interpreted
significance of the feeding is similar - Jesus has power over nature to
perform miracles if he chooses) representing individuated traditions with
their own independent histories. Whereas P. Gardner-Smith discussed four
major differences between John 6 and Mark 6, one can actually identify at
least 24 similarities and differences between John 6 and Mark 6, and 21
similarities and differences between John 6 and Mark 8.

Brown pays attention to John’s use of the eucharistic term σάρξ (flesh) different
from the synoptic and Pauline choice of σῶμα (body). Noting that Hebrew or
Aramaic language has no terminology corresponding to the word σῶμα, he suggests
that the original wording of Jesus at the last supper could possibly be that “This is
my flesh” which is near to Aramaic expression. For this, Brown finds additional

20 Ibid., 251.
21 Ibid., 252.
evidence from the earliest Christian writers Ignatius of Antioch and Justin Martyr. If it is true that the term σάρξ was derived from the Aramaic linguistic root, the eucharistic tradition of John has two possibilities. One is that it might be older than the synoptic eucharist. Another is that John could have received the eucharistic tradition differently to the synoptic one. From this point of view, Bradshaw further suggests that the eucharistic tradition of John could be an independent tradition which acknowledged only flesh and blood as the eucharistic terminology rather than the “developments or reinterpretations of the classic supper tradition.”

Stringer, also, recognizing the value and distinctiveness of the Johannine eucharistic tradition, says:

What is important for this analysis is the idea that the Johannine community could represent a distinct strand within early Christian thought that, from a relatively early date, followed a different path from the kind of Christian development that has been seen in the Passion narrative of Mark and the works of Luke or Paul. It will have originated in Judaea, had possible links with non-mainstream elements of Jewish thought and practice, including perhaps the Essene community in Jerusalem and the Samaritan tradition, and it possibly moved, over time, from Judaea to Syria or northern Palestine, and ultimately to Asia Minor.

If the Johannine eucharistic features which are different from the synoptic tradition are nowhere to be found except in John, it is quite possible that the Johannine eucharist developed from the synoptic tradition. However, if such features are found in other places, it possibly means that there existed independent eucharistic traditions different from the synoptic tradition. The proof of the independent eucharistic tradition found in the early church literature will be explored in more detail in the later part of this chapter.

1.4 The Cores of the Johannine Eucharistic Theology

One of the most important criteria in interpreting the meals of John 6 and 13 is the significance of time. Paul and the Synoptic Gospels place the eucharist on the night

---

24 Brown, The Gospel According to John, I-XII, 285. For the study on the early Christian writers’ use of the term σάρξ instead of σῶμα, see also Ignatius of Antioch and Justin Martyr explored later in this chapter.


26 Jonathan Schwiebert, Knowledge and the Coming Kingdom: The Didache’s Meal Ritual and Its Place in Early Christianity (New York, NY: T&T Clark, 2008), 49.

Jesus was betrayed. The temporal setting of the night leads participants to commemorate spontaneously the saving death of Jesus. In contrast, John places the eucharist in chapter 6 which is in the midst of Jesus' “earthly ministry.”28 Here Jesus is still with them, healing them, and providing food for their body and soul.

John M. Perry suggests that the main themes of the Johannine eucharist were the presence of Christ, the joyfulness caused by encountering the risen Lord, and the eschatological expectation. In the earliest Johannine community’s eucharist, “the bread symbolized Jesus’ life-giving word and the wine symbolized the joy-causing Spirit mediated to those who received the word with faith.”29 He finds further evidence of the earliest churches’ eucharistic features from the Didache which has no mention in terms of the last supper.30 Similarly, Cullmann advocates that the main ideas of the earliest eucharist had nothing to do with the death of Jesus, seeing the Didache as an earliest eucharistic form. According to him, before the introduction of the Pauline eucharistic tradition, the eucharist was filled with joy realized by encountering the risen Lord and Maranatha, the eschatological expectation.31 Perry consistently maintains that in later stage the Johannine community decided to accept the Pauline eucharistic tradition and then the eucharistic bread and wine became slowly the symbols of “the crucified body and blood of Jesus.”32 In that process, Perry assumes that the verses John 6:51-58 were interpolated. However, contrary to Perry’s interpretation as to the verses, Cullmann gives a more reasonable exposition of the verses John 6:48-65.33 According to him, the main emphasis in these verses is on “the material side”34 so that participants acknowledge that the Word is truly made flesh and that the risen Christ is present in the eucharist.
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30 Ibid., 41-44, 88.
33 Cullmann divides John 6:27-65 into two parts, 27-47 and 48-65 and thinks that both are connected with the eucharist. Cullmann views that, although the first part also says Jesus as the bread of life, the second part reflects more directly the eucharist. Cullmann, *Early Christian Worship*, 95.
34 See Ibid., 99. Cullmann does not at all neglect the significance of the death of Jesus with regard to the sacraments, baptism and the eucharist. However, the focal point of his exposition of these verses is obviously the presence of Christ as σάρξ (flesh). For more details, see ibid., 97-100.
In the Johannine eucharistic tradition, crucially, the bread is recognized as σάρξ (flesh) of Jesus. The Fourth Gospel starts with a proclamation that λόγος (the Word) became the σάρξ (flesh) of Jesus and lived among us (John 1:14). In chapter 6, Jesus is “the bread of life” (John 6:48) and the bread that “I will give for the life of the world is my flesh” (John 6:51, NRSV). Thus when considering John’s usage of the term flesh, he seems to use it to emphasize the historicity of the incarnation of Jesus and his real presence as the bread which gives the eternal life in the eucharist. In addition, the flesh means that Jesus was a true human being. Furthermore, John proceeds to mention the significance of the blood in the eucharist. Not only the flesh but the blood of Jesus should be taken for the eternal life (John 6:54). When considering the flow of this discourse, the mention of the blood seems unnatural. The main topic of John 6 is the bread. In that chapter, Jesus feeds the multitude with bread and fish. However, as Cullmann suggests, if we approach not just chapter 6 but also the Fourth Gospel as a whole from a eucharistic perspective, it is not unusual that John mentions both bread and blood in the eucharistic sense. The whole book of John is sacramental and so it is not difficult to find the symbols of the eucharistic elements. Moreover, John has already dealt with wine, at the marriage at Cana in John 2, which is identified with the blood in the eucharist. From this point of view, the eucharistic combination of flesh and blood in John 6 seems natural rather than strange.

On the other hand, the term “flesh and blood” was appreciated in terms of the whole human in the Hebraic tradition. Thus the commandment of receiving both the flesh and blood of Jesus in the eucharist might be understood as taking the whole Christ. This perception provided the basis for the Reformers’ biblical authority for receiving both eucharistic elements against the medieval church’s doctrine of the Holy communion with the bread alone. Moreover, Cullmann views that John employed “flesh” instead of “body” so as to emphasize the material phase of incarnation. He further finds that John intentionally sets special terms in significant places so that participants realize more vividly not only the spiritual but
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the material presence of Jesus. John uses the verb τρώγω (crunch) in John 6: 54, 56 and 57 which is the climax of Jesus eucharistic instruction instead of ἐσθίω (eat, in John 6: 49, 58).

According to Moloney, ἐσθίω is a term related to the general word “eating” but τρώγω is “a more physical word, describing the process of munching or crunching, and often used for animals.” Why did John use this somewhat coarse language instead of ἐσθίω which seems to be more appropriate to explain the eucharist? Cullmann says:

We understand this only when we consider that the main thing ... is to stress that the life element which has come down from heaven is the completely incarnate Christ, whose father and mother the Jews know (v. 42). ... It is a matter of importance for him from the beginning to show that Christ worked in a real body and not in the semblance of a body, that the Logos did really appear in the flesh.

Through this special terminology, the Johannine community would not only recognize but also experience the risen Christ who is present in the eucharist. Thus the eucharist of John is practical rather than liturgical, and an empirical activity rather than one of speculative metaphysics. From this point of view, Bruner says:

He not only wants to make an impression on our hearts and minds, but he wants to reach our bodies, “to fill up our senses, like a rain in the forest” (John Denver). He wants himself even more accessible to our trusting “comings” to him (v. 35), to make our comings to him in our Communion as earthy as and physical as his historical coming was to us in his Incarnation, so that our trust remains not just a soul matter but becomes a body matter as well. The sacraments are not a second way of salvation; they are simply Jesus’ one way of salvation scaled down, physicalized, individualized, simplified, and concretized, from heart to hands, from soul to body, from group to individual.

1.5 A Reflection on the Eucharistic Theology of John

As explored in the previous chapters, generally the traditional eucharistic understanding based on the last supper tradition seems to conform to the following eucharistic statements. The significance of the eucharist is closely connected with

41 Cullmann, Early Christian Worship, 99-100.
the passion and death of Jesus. The eucharistic elements, bread and the cup, spontaneously remind participants of the body which was torn and the blood which was shed on the cross for their salvation. Just as receiving the bread and the cup means participating in the precious body and blood of Christ, so all participants then recognize what they will receive and believe its efficacy before conducting the eucharist. If some receive the eucharistic elements without preparation or acknowledgement, the eucharist is ineffective and leads them to accumulate sins. As a result, the traditional eucharistic regulations allow only baptized people to partake of the eucharist. Sometimes, more strictly, participants' faith and good deeds are recognized as a prerequisite for the eucharist. From this traditional point of view, the eucharist is the commemoration of the sacrifice of Christ and baptism, faith, and good deed are required to conduct the eucharist properly.

However, like John's eucharistic understanding, when Jesus' feeding miracle of the multitude occurred on a mountain is recognized as the eucharist, our churches will enjoy a deeper eucharistic theology and a much wider eucharistic practice than any eucharist we have experienced. In the eucharist on the mountain, our Lord called not only a small number of the holy baptized but all who want to join, including even sinners. There was no prerequisite and no barrier of sex, age, race, religion or social class. For Jesus, whether or not they knew the meaning of the meal was not the most urgent issue. Jesus fed those who hungered with fish and bread and they could eat as much as they wanted. Even so, Jesus did not seem to recognize the eucharist as simply filling their empty stomachs or taking fellowship. After the meal, Jesus taught them the real meaning of the eucharist (John 6:26-58). This eucharistic approach would broaden the passage of grace and enable churches to relish abundantly the feast of the kingdom of God beyond the traditional perspective of the last supper.

2 The Eucharist in the Didache

Interestingly, it is not so hard to find evidence of the eucharist presumed to be ascribed to Jesus’ other meals rather than the last supper in a good number of early churches’ manuscripts. The first candidate of that must be the Didache. It is presumed that the Didache would have been written between 50 CE and 150 CE in
southern Syria or northern Palestine. Since Bryennios published the Didache in 1883, there has been a long debate on the eucharistic identity of the prayers in the chapters 9 and 10 of the Didache. The main question is whether the text of the Didache expresses agape or the eucharist. Betz sorts out the attempts of many scholars from Dix and Jeremias onwards to interpret the meaning of the Didache 9-10. The range of options presented by Betz is as follows:

It is sometimes seen as a) a simple, even though sacral, meal (agape); b) a sacramental eucharistic meal; c) both in one, so that the enjoyment of a meal in the community is also experienced as a sacramental eucharist. d) A more nuanced exegesis rightly finds in the cultic meal of Didache 9-10 a combination of a fellowship meal (9:1-10:5) with the sacramental Lord’s Supper (10:6), and indeed in the order of agape-eucharist (9:2-4; 10:6) followed by agape (10:1-5). f) Finally the opinion has also been expressed that the texts as we have them in Didache 9-10 today, are simply table prayers utilized in ascetic circles, although reworked out of originally eucharistic prayers.

Betz concludes that “this large number of interpretations shows the uncertainty of the state of the research, the hypothetical character of the explanations and the difficulty of the question.” As Betz accurately indicates, a wrong presupposition inevitably leads to distortions of resulting study. For, a wrong presupposition makes for flawed criteria, and then assessing the Didache with flawed criteria produces wrong results. As Bradshaw notes, in all the early church manuscripts, “the whole concept of the agape is a very dubious one.” Thus it is difficult to make a clear distinction between agape and the eucharist. Moreover, it is not certain that the early churches conducted their eucharists with a clear distinction between agape and the eucharist as recent scholars suggest.

The first eucharistic characteristic of the Didache is found in the order of the eucharist of chapter 9. The texts are as follows:

9.1 Regarding the Eucharist, give thanks as follows.
9.2 First for the cup: “We give you thanks, our Father, for the holy vine of David, your servant, whom you have revealed to us through Jesus, your servant. Glory be to you forever.”

---

43. Stringer, Rethinking the Origins of the Eucharist, 110.
45. Ibid., 247.
46. Bradshaw, Eucharistic Origins, 29. For more details on the discussion of the agape and the eucharist, see the section “The Eucharist of Ignatius of Antioch” in this chapter.
9.3 Then for the broken bread: “We give you thanks, our Father, for the life and the knowledge which you have given us through Jesus, your servant. Glory be to you forever.

9.4 As this broken bread, scattered over the mountains, was gathered together to be one, so may your Church be gathered together in the same manner from the ends of the earth into your kingdom; for to you are the glory and the power through Jesus Christ forever.”

First of all, the sequence of the eucharist of the Didache is the cup and then the bread whereas Matthew, Mark and 1 Corinthians 11 show the opposite, the bread first followed by the cup. The cup is presumed to be grape wine rather than water when considering “the holy vine of David” (9:2). Rordorf argues that the wine recalls “the hidden meaning of which has been revealed in the passion of Christ.”

However, paying attention too much to the association between red wine and the blood which is shed on the cross has the risk of blurring the main themes of the eucharist contained in the Didache. From this point of view, Bradshaw says as follows:

It is to be noted, however, that this material does not associate the meal with the Last Supper or with Jesus’ death in any way. Instead, the prayers speak of Jesus as bringing life, knowledge, and eternal life - themes that are also characteristic of the Fourth Gospel.

Clearly, there is no attempt to connect the eucharist with the passion and death of Jesus in the eucharist of the Didache. The bread and the cup in the Didache are not expressed as the body or flesh and blood of Jesus in the New Testament but simply as “spiritual food and drink” (10:3). This characteristic suggests that the Didache community would possibly inherit an independent different from the last supper tradition held by Pauline and the synoptic communities.

Furthermore, in the eucharist of the Didache, God bestows through Jesus “eternal life” (10:3) upon his children. This view of Jesus as a mediator of the eternal life given from God corresponds to one of the John’s eucharistic characteristics presented in chapter 6. As a proof of the close relationship between the Didache and the Johannine eucharistic tradition, Betz provides a considerable number of
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49 Bradshaw, Reconstructing Early Christian Worship, 5.
50 “Do not work for the food that perishes, but for the food that endures for eternal life, which the Son of Man will give you” (John 6.27f, RSV).
eucharistic words that commonly employed in both documents. From the list Betz provides, Bradshaw focuses on the fact that John and the Didache together use, as the term for the bread, κλάσμα (broken piece or fragment, John 6:12) instead of ἄρτος (a loaf of bread) which is chosen by the Synoptic Gospels and 1 Corinthians 11, says that the eucharist of the Didache would be influenced by the Johannine eucharistic tradition based on the feeding miracle discerned from the last supper origination.

On the contrary, Niederwimmer supports the theory that the Didache used the source of Matthean tradition and insists that κλάσμα must be changed into ἄρτος as the former is a later interpolation:

The problem appears again in 9.4, where H [tradition] gives us touto klasma, and the parallels from later liturgies have artos in the analogous location. Peterson has pointed out that klasma is a technical term in the eucharistic language of Egypt; it refers to the particle of the host. The expression would then have entered the text of the Didache at a secondary stage. According to Vööbus also, klasma is secondary. The original text may have had artou. This emendation is probably correct. The secondary klasma instead of artos could also be an indication of the Egyptian character of the H tradition.

If Niederwimmer’s argument is true, the passage of 9:4 in the Didache should be corrected as follows: As this loaf of bread, scattered over the mountains, was gathered together to be one, so may your Church be gathered together in the same manner from the ends of the earth into your kingdom. However, as Aaron Milavec indicates, to scatter a loaf of bread rather than fragments of bread seems irrational. Moreover, Milavec focuses on the eschatological significance embedded in κλάσμα:

Above all, the Eucharist of the Didache was profoundly forward looking: Those whose lives were nourished on the broken loaf were earmarked for the final ingathering - for just as the grains forming the loaf were once “scattered over the hills” (9:4) and only later were kneaded and baked into one loaf, so those who ate the fragments of this loaf were also assured that the Father would one day harvest them “from the ends of the earth” so as

51 According to Betz’s study, seven words used in chapter 6 in John are found in Didache and the number of words increases when examples of other chapters are counted: eukaristein (11), klasma (12), zoe (35, 48), emplesthenai (12), gnosis kai pistis (69), zoe aionios (54) and pneumatike trope (63). For more details, see Johannes Betz, “The Eucharist in the Didache,” in Jonathan A. Draper, ed., The Didache in Modern Research (New York, NY: E. J. Brill, 1996), 255.
52 Bradshaw, Reconstructing Early Christian Worship, 5.
53 Niederwimmer, The Didache, 148.
to gather them into his kingdom. Those who ate, therefore, tasted the future and collective promise the “one loaf” signified.\textsuperscript{55}

From this point of view, the term κλάσμα possibly shows the uniqueness of the eucharist conducted by the Didache community, and in turn as a whole the eucharist of the \textit{Didache} is not a modification or development from the tradition of ἄρτος but an independent tradition formed by the Didache community.

The main members of the Didache community are known to have been Jewish Christians. The identity of the Didache community would have had an influence on the development of the eucharistic tradition of the community. On one hand, the Didache community would reflect the Jewish tradition and, on the other hand, inherit the eucharist of Jesus. First of all, regarding the Jewish influence on the eucharist, many scholars from Louis Finkelstein onwards argue that the eucharistic prayer in chapter 10 of the \textit{Didache} is closely connected with a Jewish prayer after the meal, “Birkat ha-Mazon.”\textsuperscript{56} The chapter 10 of the \textit{Didache} begins with “When your hunger has been satisfied [emplesthenai], give thanks thus …” (10:1).\textsuperscript{57} Here, Mazza, paying attention to the verb emplesthenai (to satisfy fully), insists that the word exactly corresponds to the “Birkat ha-Mazon.” Furthermore, in structure, both the \textit{Didache} and the “Birkat ha-Mazon” are divided into three strophes, and the themes of the first two strophes are in concordance with each other although there is a little difference in content. For this reason, he views the prayer of the \textit{Didache} as “a sort of Christian Birkat ha-Mazon.”\textsuperscript{58} Meanwhile, the \textit{Didache} contains “a Christocentric character commemorating Christ’s work”\textsuperscript{59} and “the idea of the gathering of the Church into the kingdom of God.”\textsuperscript{60} These ideas are unique Christian characteristics of the \textit{Didache} different from the Jewish tradition.

From this point of view, the eucharistic regulation of the \textit{Didache} needs to be considered in the light of the identity of the Didache community. The \textit{Didache} 9:5 has been one of the most influential eucharistic directions in forming the traditional

\textsuperscript{55} Ibid., 68-69.
\textsuperscript{57} These words are translated by Mazza. See ibid., 16.
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\textsuperscript{59} Ibid., 26.
\textsuperscript{60} Ibid., 27.
eucharistic regulations. It is presumed that the eucharistic regulation of restricting those who are not baptized from participating in the eucharist would become standard in the Didache community. The Didache 9:5 would be a useful clue through which one might imagine the eucharistic theology and regulation of the Didache community. However, it seems unreasonable to identify the Didache 9:5 with the eucharistic regulation of Jesus. In contrast to the Jewish meal practice which deliberately made a distinction between Jews and gentiles and between the righteous and sinners, in the meal practices of Jesus such laws of distinction and discrimination were no longer valid. Even at the last supper, Jesus allowed those who were betrayers and sinners to have his meal. In terms of biblical authority regarding the eucharistic regulation of banning the unbaptised from participating in the eucharist, the Didache 9:5 seems to depend on Matthew 7:6: “Do not give what is holy to dogs” (NRSV). In this case, Matthew 7:6 is irrelevant to the eucharist of Jesus. Thus it is unreasonable to assume that Jesus would say Matthew 7:6 during his meal practices. Furthermore, Niederwimmer suggests that the Didache 9:5 would possibly be a later interpolation of redactor. If Niederwimmer’s assumption is considered, it is probable that the eucharistic practice of the Didache community in the early stage would be conducted in a different way from the regulation of the Didache 9:5.

Rordorf gives a more reasonable suggestion regarding the question how the Didache community developed its eucharistic regulation depicted in the Didache 9:5. The focus of Rordorf is on the Jewish characteristic of the community. Referring to Audet’s study of the Didache, Rordorf suggests that the regulation in the Didache 9:5 would be influenced by the Jewish tradition which did not share the meal of the sacrifice with gentiles:

In Mt. 7.6 this saying occurs without any clear context. In the Didache the situation is quite precise: only the baptized have the right to take part in the eucharistic meal. J.-P. Audet pointed out that in this passage the Didache

62 As to the meal practice of Jesus in his ministry, see chapter six of this study.
63 As to the disciples’ understanding of the eucharist at the last supper and those who Jesus accepted in his eucharist, see chapter seven of this study.
64 Niederwimmer, The Didache, 139.
stands close to the original Jewish context of the temple-offering, which might not be given to dogs, that is, Gentiles.\textsuperscript{65}

To sum up, it is presumed that the \textit{sitz im leben} of the Didache community was based on the Jewish culture and religion. The eucharistic tradition which the \textit{Didache} received is evidently different from the last supper tradition. The linguistic similarity found in John and the \textit{Didache} shows a possibility that they share the same eucharistic tradition. The \textit{Didache} was probably influenced by John, even if it is true the Didache community did not merely follow the Johannine tradition. For, the \textit{Didache} contains various distinctive eucharistic elements from the eucharist of John. As an example, the \textit{Didache} does not employ the term “flesh” which is a decisive eucharistic feature of John’s language. Also, the eucharistic sequence, which is the cup and then the bread, is characteristic. Conversely, there is also the possibility that John was influenced by the \textit{Didache}. However, there is no convincing evidence that one precedes the other. The more probable suggestion would be that the \textit{Didache} received the proto-eucharistic source ascribed to the miraculous feeding which in turn formed the Johannine eucharistic tradition, and the Didache community would develop the eucharist for their own community in their unique \textit{sitz im leben}.

3 The Eucharist of Ignatius of Antioch

According to the early church historian Eusebius, Ignatius of Antioch was famous as the second bishop of Antioch succeeding to the first bishop Peter.\textsuperscript{66} It is presumed that he was born a little later than Jesus’ death and resurrection and martyred in the reign of Emperor Trajan (98-117).\textsuperscript{67} On the way to martyrdom, he wrote seven letters to the churches of Ephesus, Magnesia, Tralles, Rome, Philadelphia and Smyrna, and to the bishop Polycarp.\textsuperscript{68} Among the letters, the Greek \textit{eucharist} or \textit{eucharistia} is presented four times in \textit{Ephesians} 13, \textit{Philadelphians} 4,

\textsuperscript{66} Paul L. Maier, \textit{Eusebius: The Church History} (Grand Rapids, MI: Kregel Publications, 2007), 108.
\textsuperscript{68} Ibid., 49.
and chapters 7 and 8 of Smyrnaeans though in some of them there are still debates on whether the exact meaning of the term is the eucharist or just linguistic thanksgiving. And, the eucharistic terms and meanings are shown in all the letters.

The matter of the relationship between the eucharist of Ignatius and the last supper tradition is still debated. Schwiebert argues that Ignatius reflected on the last supper tradition although there is no direct mention of it in the writings of Ignatius. Schwiebert repeatedly insists that especially “ἐνα ἄρτον κλάντες” (breaking one bread) in the Ephesians 20 echoes not only “τὸν ἄρτον ὃν κλώμεν” (the bread which we break) in 1 Corinthians 10:16 and “ἐκ τοῦ ἐνός ἄρτου μετέχομεν” (form on bread we partake) in 1 Corinthians 10:17 but “λαβὼν ἄρτον εὐλογησάς ἔκλασεν” (taking bread, having blessed, he broke it) in Mark 14:22. In addition, the phrase “Take care, therefore, to participate in one Eucharist for there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup which leads to unity through his blood; there is one altar, just as there is one bishop” in Philadelphians 4 is not reciting but alluding to the last supper tradition as 1 Corinthians 10.16 does. However, as Schwiebert also recognizes, there is no direct account or quotation of the institution narratives based on the last supper in the source related to the eucharist in the letters of Ignatius. Rather, objective linguistic evidence suggests that Ignatius retains the Johannine eucharistic tradition not the last supper.

One of the significant instances of the evidence that the eucharistic tradition of Ignatius was different from the last supper tradition, might be the use of the Greek σάρξ (flesh) in explaining the eucharist:

Ephesians 20
… gather together in the same faith and in Jesus Christ who descended from David according to the flesh, Son of Man and Son of god ...

Magnesians 6

---

70 As an example, as to “eis eucharistian” (to give thanks) in Ephesians 13 Stringer argues that the term means just thanksgiving prayer. See Stringer, Rethinking the Origins of the Eucharist, 133. However, Cummings views it as the eucharist because Ignatius seems to support strongly gathering for the eucharist frequently. See Cummings, Eucharistic Doctors, 12.
71 LaVerdiere argues the six letters except the letter to Polycarp contain the source regarding the eucharist. See LaVerdiere, The Eucharist in the New Testament and the Early Church, 152. However, even in the letter to Polycarp there is an obviously eucharistic reflection on the Johannine eucharistic tradition. For more details of that, see the section “Bread of God” in this chapter.
72 Schwiebert, Knowledge and the Coming Kingdom, 46.
Follow God’s ways, all of you; respect one another; do not regard your neighbor according to the flesh; but always love one another in Jesus Christ.

Philadelphians 4
Take care, then, to participate in the one Eucharist, for there is only one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and only one cup to unite us with his blood, and one altar, just as there is one bishop with the presbyterate and the deacons, my fellow servants. And so whatever you do, do in the name of God.

Smyrnians 7
They abstain from the Eucharist and from prayer because they do not confess that the Eucharist is the flesh of our Savior Jesus Christ, the flesh which suffered for our sins and which the Father in his goodness has raised from the dead.

Polycarp 7
I desire not corruptible food, nor the delights of this life; what I desire is the “bread of God,” which is the flesh of Jesus Christ who was of the seed of David; and for drink I desire his blood, which is incorruptible love.

As to the reason why Ignatius uses the term “flesh” rather than “body,” Schiebert gives an answer that Ignatius responds to heretics who deny Jesus’ incarnation and his real presence in the eucharist. However, as in the case of John, Schiebert’s interpretation might be effective in understanding the milieu of Ignatius’ community but it still does not seem enough to explain why Ignatius does not mention the last supper which is a temporally crucial setting in understanding the eucharist. Agreeing with Schiebert’s suggestion of the historical context of Ignatius’s community challenged by docetic heresy, Bradshaw provides a more plausible answer of the puzzle by connecting Ignatius’ eucharistic tradition with John:

The author’s choice of the word ‘flesh’ (sax) here rather than ‘body’ (soma) reveals a greater affinity with the eucharistic thought of the Fourth Gospel than that of the Synoptics or Paul, which he shows no sign of knowing: ‘The bread that I shall give for the life of the world is my flesh …. Unless you eat of the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, you have no life in you’ (John 6.51, 53). Thus Ignatius is stressing both the reality of Christ’s incarnation and the reality of that same presence in the Eucharist.

The eucharist as the medicine of immortality is one of the well-known eucharistic understandings of Ignatius. According to Cummings, the term “the medicine of

---

73 Johnson, Worship in the Early Church, 48-52.
74 Schiebert, Knowledge and the Coming Kingdom, 47.
75 Bradshaw, Eucharistic Origins, 87.
76 “... you gather out of obedience to the bishop and to the presbyterate, in perfect unity, breaking the same bread which is the medicine of immortality, an antidote so that one does not die but lives forever in Jesus Christ” (Ephesians 20). See Johnson, Worship in the Early Church, 49.
immortality” was a technical term used by physicians in the ancient world. In Ephesians 7, Ignatius illustrates Jesus as our one ἰατρός (physician). Although linguistically the term seems to be disconnected with the account of the New Testament, semantically the idea corresponds to the bread of life of John 6. In Ignatius, the participants of the eucharist are offered immortality in Jesus. In John, Jesus says, “Whoever eats of this bread will live forever; and the bread that I will give for the life of the world is my flesh” (John 6:51, NRSV). This creative imagery of Ignatius as to the everlasting life further develops into “incorruptible love” in the seventh chapter of Romans:78

The Letter to the Romans 7
I desire not corruptible food nor the delights of this life; what I desire is the bread of God, which is the flesh of Jesus Christ who was of the seed of David; and for drink I desire his blood, which is incorruptible love.79

Like the term “the medicine of immortality,” this term “incorruptible love” is also related to the idea expressed in John 6. Here, the eucharistic blood is incorruptible love like the bread which is the medicine of immortality. As well as the idea of the eternal life, John and Ignatius share the method of containing the idea within the eucharist. John, explaining the eternal life offered through the eucharist in Jesus, employs various eucharistic phrases such as bread of God, bread of life, flesh of Christ and blood of Christ. Similarly, Ignatius also endeavors to express the incorruptible love in the same way with John and, in the process, Ignatius borrows a considerable number of eucharistic phrases from John.

The term “the bread of God” in the letter to the Romans 7 and Ephesians 5 is decisive evidence of showing the connection between John and Ignatius. For, the term “the bread of God” employed by Ignatius is found only once in John 6:33 throughout the whole New Testament.80 Moreover, in the same passage, the term “the seed of David” is recorded in John 7:42 although it is observed in Romans 1:3 of the New Testament as well.81

Ignatius believes that the eucharist must be led by the bishop in the Catholic Church. In Smyrnians 8, he teaches that if any eucharist is not led by the bishop the

77 Cummings, Eucharistic Doctors, 16.
78 Ibid., 17.
79 Johnson, Worship in the Early Church, 52.
81 Johnson, Worship in the Early Church, 52.
eucharist will lose its legitimacy. However, while teaching the eucharist, he uses a special term “agape”:

**Smyrnians 8**
All of you are to follow the bishop just as Jesus Christ follows his Father, and you are to follow the presbyterate as you would the apostles; regarding the deacons, respect them as you would God’s law. ... Without the bishop’s permission it is not allowed to baptize or to hold an agape, but whatever he approves is also pleasing to God. Thus all that you do will be sure and steadfast.\(^8\)

Was the agape the same as the eucharist or a meal practice for fellowship? Dix argues that the agape of Ignatius was a Christian common meal (*Chaburah*) different from the eucharist (*Berakah*).\(^8\) From a sociological perspective, Smith gives his suggestion of the development of the eucharist. According to him, the original meal conducted by Jesus and his disciples was the messianic banquet. As times went, however, when the place of worship was changed from house room to meeting hall to basilica, the meal practice was moved from a meal sharing with symposium discussion to liturgically well-organized rites. In the process, two types of the communal meal which are the agape or love feast and the eucharist came to develop separately. He assumes that the separation of the two communal meals was completed around the end of the first century CE. Thus, Smith views that the agape recorded in the letter to the *Smyrnians* 8 is a different meal from the eucharist.\(^8\)

However, to define what exactly the term “agape” meant is not an easy task. As Bradshaw indicates, there is no clear evidence that the early churches conducted both the eucharist and the agape.\(^8\) Luke Timothy Johnson, questioning the assumption that the agape was different from the eucharist in the early church, says:

My complaint about the dissections of Lietzmann, Mack, and Chilton is not the premise of a plurality of practice – which makes good sense, given the circumstances of Christianity’s expansion – but the pretense that (1) these strands can now adequately be distinguished, and that (2) the diversity represented fundamental disagreement among the parties. There is simply no basis in the sources for either premise.\(^8\)

\(^8\) Ibid., 51.
\(^8\) Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy: NEW EDITION*, 99.
\(^8\) Bradshaw, *Eucharistic Origins*, 29.
In the third century CE, it seems likely that the community of Tertullian celebrated both eucharistic meals (Apology 39). However even in the case of Tertullian, it is still possible that the agape was one of the synonyms for the eucharist especially held at evening, as Tertullian in his other writings calls the evening eucharistic meal as “the Lord’s Supper” in De spec. 13, “the Lord’s banquet” in Ad uxor. 2.4 and “God’s banquet” in Ad uxor. 2.8. Furthermore, the agape included all characteristics of earlier Christian eucharistic meals such as prayer, the singing to God, moderate eating and drinking. Based on this analysis, Bradshaw identifies the agape as an “act of religious duty.” Then, he concludes that Ignatius employs the term the agape in the Smyrnians recognizing it as a synonym of the eucharist.

4 The Eucharist of Justin Martyr

Justin, one of the most crucial apologists of the early church, was born in Flavia Neapolis, whose biblical name was Shechem. Before his conversion, he pursued religious and philosophical truth, learning from various teachers such as the Stoics, Peripatetics, Pythagoreans and the Platonists. However, the place where he found the truth was the Old Testament covenant and its fulfillment in Jesus. After his conversion, he endeavored to introduce and vindicate the truth of Christianity. He was a prolific writer but unfortunately only three of his writings survive which are two apologies and Dialogue with Trypho. Due to his refusal to sacrifice to the gods, he was tried by Rusticus, the prefect of Rome, and then beheaded with his six disciples probably in 165 CE.

Justin’s writings reveal a similar linguistic usage to Ignatius of Antioch which in turn shows a close relationship with John’s eucharistic tradition. First of all, in the First Apology 66, Justin describes the eucharistic bread as the flesh of Jesus given for the salvation and nourishment of Christians:

First Apology 66
We call this food the “Eucharist.” No one is permitted to partake of it except those who believe that the things we teach are true and who have

---

87 See the section “The Eucharist of Tertullian” in chapter five of this study.
88 Ibid., 99.
89 Ibid., 30.
90 Cummings, Eucharistic Doctors, 19-21.
91 Johnson, Worship in the Early Church, 65.
been washed in the bath for the forgiveness of sins and unto rebirth and who live as Christ has directed. We do not receive these as if they were ordinary bread and ordinary drink, but just as Jesus our Savior was made of flesh through God’s word and assumed flesh and blood for our salvation, so also the food over which the thanksgiving has been said becomes the flesh and blood of Jesus who was made flesh, doing so to nourish and transform our own flesh and blood. ... 

Furthermore, in the First Apology 66 and Dialogue with Trypho, the additional evidence of the connection with John is found:

**First Apology 66.3**
Jesus took bread and gave thanks and said, “Do this in remembrance of me, this is my Body.” Likewise (ὁμοίως) taking the cup and giving thanks, he said, “This is my blood,” and gave it to the apostles alone.\(^93\)

**Dialogue with Trypho 41**
... that is to say the bread of the eucharist, and likewise (ὁμοίως) the cup of the eucharist.\(^94\)

In the passage above, Justin, in introducing the cup, chooses the term ὁμοίως (likewise) which is recorded in John 6:11 rather than the term ὡσαίτως (likewise) of Paul and Luke echoing the last supper tradition. Richardson, refuting Benoit who argues that the term ὁμοίως of Justin corresponds with the term ὡσαίτως in Luke 22:20 and 1 Corinthians 11:25, correctly maintains that “Justin’s ὁμοίως is not ὡσαίτως, and we shall presently suggest that it reflects a source other than Luke or Paul.”\(^95\) Richardson repeatedly provides further evidence of Justin’s dependence on John that in Justin’s institution narrative Jesus takes the bread and gives thanks without the action of the breaking of the bread just as in John 6:11. In the last supper tradition, by contrast, the action of the breaking of bread is treated as crucial.\(^96\) Bradshaw, also, suggests that the eucharistic tradition of Justin echoes that of John which has the feeding of five thousand as the setting for the institution:

\(^92\) Ibid., 68.
\(^93\) Ibid., 68. The Greek “ὁμοίως” in bracket is my interpolation for this study.
\(^95\) Richardson, “A Further Inquiry” 238.
\(^96\) From Dix’s great work, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, onward, many believe that the action of the breaking of the bread was an essential eucharistic order in the sevenfold shape of the last supper and later, also, in the fourfold shape of the early churches. Simon Jones argues that the first clear example of the fourfold shape of the eucharist is Justin Martyr, and after him the four eucharistic actions “can be clearly discerned in the majority of eucharistic rites in east and west.” Dom Gregory Dix, (2007), xiii. However, there is no reference to the breaking of bread as a eucharistic order in Justin’s works.
This is not to suggest that Justin was familiar with this part of John’s Gospel as such but rather that the tradition he had received about the bread and cup being the flesh and blood of Christ may have been linked to the same feeding story as in John, and that knowledge of this story may perhaps have had some influence on the way in which the sayings about body and blood were also recounted.\(^97\)

If this was so, did Justin never know the last supper tradition? Evidently Justin, according to his works, knew the existence of certain sources called “Gospels” written by apostles and which also followed the eucharistic teachings of the documents. Yet, it is worth noting the wording of Jesus which Justin quotes from the Gospels in illustrating the eucharist: “Do this in my remembrance; this is my body” (First Apology 66:3). The term “remembrance” from the Gospels which Justin used would probably have been from the Lukan or Pauline tradition. For, there is no mention of the commandment of memorial in Matthew and Mark. On the other hand, regarding the cup Justin seems to reflect Matthew or Mark rather than Luke or Paul due to his direct mention of “blood” instead of the cup of covenant.\(^98\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Luke 22</th>
<th>1 Corinthians 11</th>
<th>First Apology 66</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14 When the hour came, he took his place at the table, and the apostles with him. 15 He said to them, ‘I have eagerly desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer; 16 for I tell you, I will not eat it until it is fulfilled in the kingdom of God.’ 17 Then he took a cup, and after giving thanks he said, ‘Take this and divide it among yourselves; 18 for I tell you that from now on I will not drink of the fruit of the vine until the kingdom of God comes.’ 19 Then he took a loaf of bread, and when he had given thanks, he broke it and gave it to them, saying, ‘This is my body, which is given for you. Do this in remembrance of me.’ 20 And he did the same with the cup after supper, saying, ‘This cup that is poured out for you is the new covenant in my blood.’ (NRSV)</td>
<td>23 For I received from the Lord what I also handed on to you, that the Lord Jesus on the night when he was betrayed took a loaf of bread, 24 and when he had given thanks, he broke it and said, ‘This is my body that is for you. Do this in remembrance of me.’ 25 In the same way he took the cup also, after supper, saying, ‘This cup is the new covenant in my blood. Do this, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of me.’ (NRSV)</td>
<td>3 the apostles in the memoirs composed by them, which are called Gospels, have handed down what was commanded them: that Jesus having taken bread, having given thanks, said, “Do this in my remembrance; this is my body”; and similarly having taken the cup and having given thanks, said, “This is my blood”; and gave to them alone.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.1 The Eucharistic Wording in Three Texts

\(^{97}\) Bradshaw, *Eucharistic Origins*, 90.

\(^{98}\) Maurice Jourjon, “Justin,” in *The Eucharist of the Early Christians*, 76.
An interesting observation from the table above is that the eucharistic wording of Jesus in *First Apology* 66:3 is similar to Luke and Paul but not exactly the same as theirs. Uniquely, Justin places first the commandment of remembrance and then “this is my body.” In addition, there is no additional theological interpretation of the bread and the cup such as “which is given for you” and “the new covenant” of the Lukan and Pauline traditions.

As an answer to the question of the difference, Justin did not quote the eucharistic source from the Gospels but reconstructed the wording according to his theological intention. Also, it is probable that Justin would depend on his memory of the account of the Gospels rather than written sources. From this point of view, with a strong belief in the close relationship between Justin and the last supper tradition, Schwiebert argues that Justin’s account is a finely honed rehearsal of the Last Supper tradition, employing virtually all of the key terms and little else within the structure.\(^99\)

There is still a question, however, as to why there is no mention of the action of the breaking of the bread and a depiction of the night before the death of Jesus which are essentially treated in the synoptic and Pauline eucharistic traditions. In relation to this, Bradshaw assumes that the Gospels from which Justin quoted would have been different from the present form of the Gospels. He further suggests that the Gospels used by Justin would possibly have been a collection of the sayings of Jesus with a simple form before theological meanings and interpretation were added by later communities.\(^100\) Moreover, the phrase, “the suffering of Jesus” explained in *Dialogue with Trypho* 41, which is often referred by scholars who maintain the relationship between Justin and the last supper tradition, seems to mean the suffering due to the incarnation not the death on the cross. In *Dialogue with Trypho* 70, when Justin adds an explanation of the bread and the cup, his interpretation of the eucharistic bread and cup as the incarnation not the suffering from the cross is further clarified. Finally, Richardson gives an exposition of the passage:

Plainly, it is not the Passion of Christ which is remembered in Justin’s eucharist but - if we must use the terms of a developed theology - the

---

\(^99\) Schwiebert, *Knowledge and the Coming Kingdom*, 52.

\(^100\) From this point of view, it is presumed that at the time of Justin churches did not have fully completed gospels, and thus the eucharistic practice and theology contained in the earliest gospels would possibly be different from today. For more details, see Bradshaw, *Reconstructing Early Christian Worship*, 6-7.
Incarnation. The bread is a reminder of his being embodied for our redemption; and in this context the remembrance of “his blood” must refer to blood as belonging to the reality of his body.  

Justin's illustration of the eucharistic elements in his work, *First Apology*, shows an additional example that in at least Justin’s community the eucharist was conducted in a way that was different from the last supper tradition:

65.2 Having ended the prayers, we greet one another with a kiss.  
65.3 Then are brought to the president of the brethren bread and a cup of water and of wine-mixed-with-water, and he, having taken, sends up praise and glory to the Father of all through the name of the Son and of the Holy Spirit, and makes thanksgiving at length for (our) having been deemed worthy of these things from him. When he has finished the prayer and the thanksgiving, all the people present assent, saying, ‘Amen.’  
67.5 Then we all stand up together and send up prayers; and as we said before, when we have finished the prayer, bread and wine and water are brought …

Schwiebert, paying attention too much to the terms, “bread” and “cup” (*First Apology* 65:3), argues that Justin follows the Pauline and Markan versions which use “bread” and “cup” as the eucharistic elements. However it should be noted that the eucharistic elements employed by Justin of bread, wine and wine-mixed-with-water are evidently dissimilar from the last supper tradition with bread and wine. In *First Apology* 65:3, the term ὕδατος καὶ κρόματος can be literally translated into “water and wine-mixed-with-water.” Furthermore, Harnack, paying attention to the fact that the term και κρόματος is absent from one of the manuscripts containing the passage above, the *Codex Ottobianus*, suggests that the term και κρόματος might be an interpolation of a later editor who thought the wineless eucharist of Justin as oddity. The eucharistic usage of the wine-mixed-with-water is also found in Cyprian’s letter to Bishop Caecilius of Biltha. Here, Cyprian claims that the element to be contained in the cup is neither water nor wine but the wine-mixed-with-water (*The Epistles of Cyprian* 62:13). This record gives

---

103 Schwiebert, *Knowledge and the Coming Kingdom*, 50.  
105 Ibid., 76-77.  
106 “Thus the cup of the Lord is not indeed water alone, nor wine alone, unless each be mingled with the other; just as, on the other hand, the body of the Lord cannot be flour alone or water alone, unless both should be united and joined together and compacted in the mass of one bread; in which very sacrament our people are shown to be made one, so that in like manner as many grains, collected, and ground, and mixed together into one mass, make one bread; so in Christ, who is the heavenly bread, we may know that there is one body, with which our number is joined and united.”
information that around the third century at least the churches of Carthage within Cyprian’s parish celebrated the eucharist with bread and the wine-mixed-with-water.

Concerning the elements for the cup, why did Justin choose water and the wine-mixed-with-water rather than wine only? Regarding the wine-mixed-with-water, it is probable that at that time mixing wine with water might have been the normal custom in Justin’s community. Yet, this assumption cannot solve the more important question of water. Regarding this, Cummings adds a plausible answer that the mixing custom would echo “the desire to counter pagan gossip about drunkenness among Christians.”\(^\text{107}\) McGowan gives a more reasonable answer for this riddle with concrete proof from early church documents. Going further than merely being conscious of how they tried to look pagan, McGowan tries to seek the answer that the early Christians employed water rather than wine in the eucharist in order to discern their eucharistic elements from the pagan’s sacrificial elements, meat and wine, and to practise asceticism with an aversion to drunkenness.\(^\text{108}\)

However, the tendency of abstaining from wine due to asceticism or rejection of the pagan sacrifice goes beyond the peculiarity of the churches at the only time of Justin. Much more earlier than Justin, the tendency is observed in the New Testament as well. First of all, Paul’s teaching of food is found in the letters to Corinthians\(^\text{109}\) and Romans.\(^\text{110}\) He believes that in Jesus Christ there is nothing unclean. Yet, the conclusion of his exhortation on food is to refrain from meat and wine. The reason is not because he changes his mind about the nature of food but because the action of having meat and wine would cause the ruin of other weak believers. In the time of Paul, almost all the meats were offered at the pagan’s sacrificial ceremony and a libation to gods before drinking wine in meetings or banquets began to occur as a normal custom. Given that Paul’s letters were read with an apostolic authority, the recipients would make an effort to abstain from meats and wine in their ordinary life and the discipline would possibly affect the eucharistic elements. In addition, Colossians 2:16-23 and 1 Timothy 5:23 show

\(^{\text{107}}\) Cummings, Eucharistic Doctors, 24.

\(^{\text{108}}\) McGowan observes that many early eucharistic sources contain quite different foodstuffs from the general assumption that the early eucharistic elements were bread and wine. For more details, see Andrew McGowan, Ascetic Eucharists: Food and Drink in Early Christian Ritual Meals, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1999), 95-191.

\(^{\text{109}}\) 1 Corinthians 8:10-13.

\(^{\text{110}}\) Romans 14:13-21.
indirectly the early Christians’ attitudes towards wine.\textsuperscript{111} This is especially so with the latter: “No longer drink only water, but take a little wine for the sake of your stomach and your frequent ailments” (1 Timothy 5:23, NRSV). This text connotes that not a few Christians at that time practised the abstinence from wine.\textsuperscript{112} McGowan, focusing on the eucharistic imageries “living water” in John 4 and “bread of life” in John 6, attempts to find the possibility that Johannine community would have practised the eucharist with bread and water.\textsuperscript{113} The cases observed above show that water alone, and sometimes with wine, was recognized as a meaningful eucharistic element by the early churches.

5 The Eucharist of Irenaeus

Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons, who is presumed to have died at the end of the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century or the beginning of the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century, was also a prolific writer.\textsuperscript{114} However, among his writings, most of the information concerning the eucharist he gives is in his main work, \textit{Adversus haereses (Against the Heresies)}.

Irenaeus seems to own a good number of the books of the New Testament. Although he does not depict in detail a list of books in the Bible, it is possible to infer a quite complete list from his citation. It is presumed that Irenaeus would have used almost all the New Testament except Philemon and 3 John, although James, Jude and 2 Peter are still controversial.\textsuperscript{115} For the first time he reports the existence of the four Gospels as follows: “the Word ... gave us the fourfold Gospel” (\textit{Adv. haer.} 3.11.8),\textsuperscript{116} and attacks some groups which disagree with the four (\textit{Adv. haer.} 3.11.9).\textsuperscript{117} If this is the case, how much eucharistic theology and content does he borrow from the four Gospels?

First of all, Irenaeus seems to pay more attention to John than the Synoptic Gospels. For example, Irenaeus mentions John by name approximately 60 times, in contrast

\begin{footnotes}
\item[111] McGowan, \textit{Asecetic Eucharists}, 220.
\item[112] Bradshaw, \textit{Eucharistic Origins}, 51.
\item[113] McGowan, \textit{Asecetic Eucharists}, 236-237.
\item[116] Irenaeus, \textit{St. Irenaeus of Lyons: Against the Heresies}, 8.
\end{footnotes}
to a total of 54 times regarding the synoptic authors.\textsuperscript{118} However, he emphasizes the harmony of the four gospels, that is, a single gospel which is “given under four aspects, but bound together by one Spirit” (\textit{Adv. haer.} 3.11.8).\textsuperscript{119} \textit{Adv. haer.} 3.11.1-6 contains the core of John’s theology which is the incarnation, the Word of God made flesh.\textsuperscript{120} One of the most interesting things is that in \textit{Adv. haer.} 3.11.5 Irenaeus enlarges the eucharistic theology of John based on the miraculous feeding (John 6), by interpreting the miracle in Cana (John 2) with a eucharistic perspective:

This wine was good, which the vine of God produced in accordance with the laws of creation and which the guests drank first at the wedding feast of Cana. ... Although the Lord could have served wine and fed the hungry without using any preexistent matter, he did not do so. On the contrary, he took the loaves produced by the earth and gave thanks over them; so too did he change water into wine. Thus he fed those who were eating, and quenched the thirst of the wedding guests (\textit{Adv. haer.} 3.11.5).\textsuperscript{121}

It should be noted that Irenaeus evidently echoes John’ theology but he never follows the same path of John. Rather, he develops and modifies it to his milieu. As a result, Irenaeus does not employ the term “flesh” which is one of the most significant characteristics of the Johannine eucharistic tradition although he does it in mentioning the flesh of human beings which is nourished by the body of Christ. Regarding the eucharist, was Irenaeus influenced by the synoptic or Pauline tradition more than the Johannine one? Irenaeus employs the term “body” rather than “flesh” in depicting the eucharist and the words, “This is my body” in \textit{Adv. haer.} 4.17.5, seem to echo Matthew 26:26. For, in \textit{Adv. haer.} 5.33.1 Irenaeus seems to cite the passages of Matthew 26:27-29.\textsuperscript{122} It would be worth observing the passage containing the term “body” in the works of Irenaeus:

\textit{Adv. haer.} 4.17.5
He directed his disciples to offer God the first fruits of his creation, not as if God needed them but so they themselves would not be unfruitful or ungrateful. He took the bread, which is created, and gave thanks, saying, “This is my body.”\textsuperscript{123}
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Adv. haer. 5.2.3
When the mixed cup and the baked bread receive the word of God and become the Eucharist, namely, the blood and body of Christ, ... Which is eternal life - the flesh nourished by Christ’s body and blood, and which is his member, as the blessed apostle says in his Letter to the Ephesians, “We are members of his body,” formed of his flesh and bones? ... It is this very organism that is nourished by the cup which is Christ’s Blood and that is strengthened by the bread that is his body. ... the Eucharist, namely, Christ’s body and blood ...  

It seems very clear now that Irenaeus cites the texts of Matthew. However, in treating the eucharist, with regard to the last supper as a temporal background he does not mention the action of “the breaking of bread” and any additional interpretation of the meaning of the body of Jesus. In other words, his focal point of the body and blood of Christ is the nourishment for human flesh and the hope of resurrection to eternal life rather than the sacrifice of Jesus on the cross for human salvation.  

What is more interesting is found in his illustration of the cup in Adv. haer. 5.33.1:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Matthew 26.27-29</th>
<th>Adv. Haer. 5.33.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>And having taken a cup and having given thanks, he gave (it) to them, saying, ‘Drink of it, all (of you); for this is my blood of the [new] covenant, which (is) poured out for many for forgiveness of sins. I say to you, henceforth I shall not drink again of this fruit of the vine until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father’s kingdom.’</td>
<td>When he had given thanks over the cup, and had drunk of it, and given it to the disciples, he said to them: ‘Drink of it, all (of you): this is my blood of the new covenant, which will be poured out for many for forgiveness of sins. But I tell you, I will not drink henceforth of the fruit of this vine until that day when I will drink it new with you in my Father’s kingdom.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.2 The Comparison of the Eucharistic Traditions of Matthew and Irenaeus

As seen above, Irenaeus seems to closely follow the Matthean tradition. However, the illustration of Jesus’ drinking the cup is a unique characteristic of Irenaeus which is different from the account of Matthew. Moreover, treating the eucharistic sources which are presumed to derive from the synoptic or Pauline tradition, Irenaeus does not merely follow it but reinterprets it.

If Irenaeus did not follow exactly the synoptic and Pauline traditions which are based on the last supper context nor the Johannine tradition using the term “flesh,” how can the eucharist of Irenaeus be defined? A possible answer would be to
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124 Ibid., 81.
125 Bradshaw, Reconstructing Early Christian Worship, 8.
126 This text has been translated by Paul Bradshaw. See Bradshaw, Eucharistic Origins, 4.
127 This text has been translated by Paul Bradshaw. See ibid., 17.
suggest an independent eucharistic tradition. Irenaeus’ community possibly was already conducting their own eucharist relying on the sources they received, although we do not know exactly what it was, even before they owned the whole books of the New Testament. In other words, as was stated in examining Justin, it is presumed that Irenaeus used the proto-Gospels or the composition of Jesus’ sayings which would have been different from the completed New Testament today.

6 Summary and Evaluation

This chapter has explored the earliest two centuries’ manuscripts which contain information about the eucharist of the Johannine community, the Didache community, Ignatius of Antioch, Justin Martyr and Irenaeus.

Regarding the sacramentalism of the Fourth Gospel, some scholars have argued that John was the anti-sacramentalist. One of the most important reasons for their arguments is that chapter 13 in John replaces the eucharist with the washing of feet of disciples. Moreover, the Fourth Gospel does not contain the typical eucharistic features of the last supper, which are commonly presented in the Synoptic Gospels and 1 Corinthians 11. However, recent scholars suggest that John contains evidently a eucharistic tradition which is different from the last supper tradition. The context of John’s eucharist is not the last supper in chapter 13 in John but the miraculous feeding in its chapter 6. Moreover, John uses the term σάρξ (flesh) in indicating the eucharistic bread whereas the synoptic and Pauline traditions choose the term σῶμα (body).

The Didache also provides evidence that the eucharist of the Didache community was different from the last supper tradition. The eucharistic sequence of the Didache is the cup and then bread whereas bread comes first in the synoptic and Pauline traditions except Luke. In addition, the Didache does not connect the eucharist with the passion of Jesus. Furthermore, the Didache does not use the representative eucharistic phrase “this is my body; this is my blood.”

One of the second century church fathers, Ignatius of Antioch uses the term σάρξ (flesh) rather than the term σῶμα (body) of the last supper tradition. Ignatius’ interpretation of the eucharist as “the medicine of immortality,” “incorruptible love”
and “the bread of God” is identical with the eucharistic understanding of the Fourth Gospel.

Justin Martyr also shows a close relationship with the Johannine eucharistic tradition rather than the last supper tradition. Justin explains the eucharistic bread as the σάρξ (flesh) of Jesus. In addition, for the adverb connecting the sentences of bread and the cup, Justin uses the term ὁμοίως (likewise) recorded in John 6:11 rather than the term ὡσαύτως (likewise) of Paul and Luke.

There is reasonable evidence to suggest that Irenaeus’ eucharistic understanding was influenced by the Johannine eucharistic tradition. Irenaeus attempts to interpret the miracle in Cana (John 2) with a eucharistic perspective. At the same time, Irenaeus knows clearly the last supper tradition. In describing the eucharist, Irenaeus uses the term σῶμα (body). Moreover he cites accurately from much of the text regarding the last supper in Matthew 26. However, Irenaeus does not follow exactly the last supper tradition. There is no action of Jesus’ breaking of bread which is regarded as an essential element by the last supper tradition.

If the last supper was the original through which Jesus left certain regulations to be followed by church, why is it hard to find the significant features of the last supper in the eucharistic practices in the first two centuries? Even in the case of Irenaeus who had known the last supper tradition, why did not he follow the last supper tradition? In particular, regarding the temporal background of the eucharist, all the documents above do not mention the time of the last supper believed to be the original from the traditional viewpoint. In other words, there is no illustration of the time, that is, the night before Jesus was arrested, which is the core element of the last supper tradition expressed in the Synoptic Gospels and 1 Corinthians 11. Also, regarding the style and content of the eucharist, it is difficult to find something common to all the early eucharistic practices.

The evidence that the earliest two century churches’ eucharistic traditions were not the same as the last supper tradition raises these questions. What made the early eucharistic diversity disappear in church history? When did churches begin to recognize the last supper tradition as the proper eucharist? These questions will be explored in the next chapter.
Chapter 5

The Historical Basis for the Theology of the Open Table (2):

The Eucharist after the Third Century

1 The Emergence of the Last Supper Tradition with Canonization

As observed in the previous chapter, even though the first and second century church fathers seemed to know a considerable number of books of the New Testament, the assumption that they would use these as sources is evidenced by not direct textual citations but almost by allusion. Why is it we can scarcely find biblical citations exactly the same as the present text of the New Testament in the earliest church fathers’ works? There is a scholarly consensus that they would have depended on their memory of the sayings of Jesus, and even if they had written sources the texts would possibly be different from the closed-biblical texts of today.¹

This might bring us to the next question, concerning the process of canonization in that period. What was the churches’ concept of the canon in the second century?

The scope of the canon for Clement at the last half of the second century seems to have been somewhat flexible. Farmer suggests that, except for James, 3 John and 2 Peter, Clement possibly recognized and used, as the canon of the New Testament (NT), most of the present books of the NT which are the four gospels, Acts of the Apostles, Fourteen letters of Paul including Hebrews, 1 Peter, 1 and 2 John, and the Revelation of John. In addition, he included in the canon the Gospel of the Hebrews, the Gospel of the Egyptians and the Acts of Mattathias, 1 Clement, Barnabas, the Preaching of Peter, the Revelation of Peter, the Didache, and the Shepherd of Hermas. Indeed, he referred to more books such as the Protoevangelius

¹ According to Bradshaw, from the earliest period of Christian history, there were the attempts to associate the eucharistic sayings of Jesus with the last supper narrative. He argues that the sayings of Jesus in the so-called last supper stories are later interpolation. Such an attempt is firstly found in Paul’s letter to Corinthians although he would not be the founder of the tradition. Then, the last supper tradition would be introduced to Mark, and he would add the sayings of Jesus into his already existing last supper narrative. However, as Bradshaw observes, this last supper tradition did not have substantial influence on the actual eucharistic practice at least until the early of the third century. For more details, see Bradshaw, Reconstructing Early Christian Worship, 19.
of James, the Acts of John and the Acts of Paul, although it is not clear whether he recognized them as canonical. Such a generous view of the canon of the NT in the time of Clement is evidenced by his contemporary Christian writer Irenaeus. According to Theissen, Irenaeus also used most of the books of the present NT, except Philemon, 3 John, Jude and probably 2 Peter. Beyond the present canon, he referred the *Shepherd of Hermas* and 1 Clement. Regarding the four gospels, he seems to have a firm conviction concerning the canon. He probably had almost all the Pauline letters but he never commented on their completeness. In addition, regarding the non-Pauline letters, he seems to have had a somewhat open perspective.

However, from the third century on, the perception of the canon of the churches entered a new phase. Origen of Alexandria (185-254 CE), travelling widely and visiting many churches, acquired information about which books were recognized as constituting canon by those churches. Although he did not make a formal list of the canon, he made profuse comments about the biblical authority of the early Christian literature. In *Ecclesiastical History* (*H. E.*), Eusebius summarized Origen’s research on the churches’ views of the canon of the New Testament at that time. Origen divided all the Christian documents used by churches at that time into three groups. The first group included the books which were recognized as canonical by the whole church: the four gospels, the thirteen Pauline letters, 1 Peter, 1 John, Acts, Revelation. The second group contained disputed books: 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, Hebrews, due to a literary style which seems not to be Paul’s (*H. E.* 6.25.11-14), James and Jude. He clearly rejected the third group: The Gospel of the Egyptians, the Gospel of Thomas, the Gospel of Matthias, the Acts of Paul. In his early period of ministry, he accepted as canonical the Didache, the Shepherd of Hermas, and the Epistle of Barnabas, but he changed his thinking in a short space of time.

---

Regarding Hebrews, Origen tried to defend its apostolic character even though he recognized the possibility that Hebrews might be a pseudo-Pauline literature.\(^6\)

Compared with Clement and Irenaeus, Origen’s canonical categorization of the canon seems to some extent to have been conservative. What would have influenced Origen to be more conservative in terms of defining the boundary of the canon than his predecessors? Farmer attempts to draw the reason for Origen’s conservative tendency from the fierce persecution of Christian communities and martyrdom at that time.\(^7\) Rowan Greer gives an illustration of the time of Origen in these words: “a list of imperial murders, civil wars, and their disastrous consequences in social and economic life.”\(^8\) During the persecution, Origen witnessed the death of many martyrs including his father. This experience and social context would lead Origen to develop more conservative theology and views on the canon.\(^9\) Farmer gives an explanation about the influence of martyrdom on the formation of Origen’s theology as follows:

The imitation of Christ through martyrdom was essential to Origen’s theology. That meant that he could readily agree to the leaner “undisputed” canon common to the Church in Alexandria and the Church at Rome. This was a canon which focused on martyrdom better than the less well-defined and more inclusive canon of his teacher Clement.\(^10\)

Hippolytus (170-235) in the west, Origen’s near contemporary, shows similar canonical categorization to Origen. He believed the canon to be twenty-two books which are the four Gospels, Paul’s thirteen letters, Acts, 1 Peter, 1 and 2 John, and Revelation. The only difference between Origen and Hippolytus is that the latter adds 2 John. Regarding Hebrews, although Hippolytus did not regard it as the Scripture, he made frequent quotations from it. He esteemed James, Jude and 2 Peter and also the first and second century Christian writings such as the Shepherd of Hermas, the Apocalypse of Peter and the Acts of Paul to be valuable.\(^11\) When considering Hippolytus’ perceptions of the canon, we cannot neglect the historical situation in which he was placed. Callistus, the theological opponent of Hippolytus,

\(^7\) Ibid., 14.
\(^10\) Ibid., 26.
believed in “two-Gods-ism, ditheism.”

Callistus’ belief that “the Father was the name for the divine Spirit indwelling the Son” was never accepted by Hippolytus due to his Trinitarian sense. Moreover, they had different opinions on the qualification of the participants in the eucharist. Callistus gave permission for even sinners to receive the eucharist as long as the sinners sincerely repented of their sins but Hippolytus excommunicated them until they finished completely the whole process of penitence regardless of their confession or faith.

It seems to be clear that Hippolytus’ rigorism found in his writings is not irrelevant at all to the theological conflict with Callistus. This historical context would possibly have affected the whole process of Hippolytus’ canonization.

Later, in the fourth century, Eusebius (260-340) divided Christian literature into three groups. His canonical categorization was similar to Origen and Hippolytus. Firstly, in *homologoumena* (recognized books) he included twenty-two books which are the four gospels, Acts, the 14 letters of Paul, 1 John, 1 Peter and possibly Revelation. Secondly, in *antilegomena* (disputed, but accepted as an authentic by the majority, books), he set James, Jude, 2 Peter, 2 and 3 John, and in *notha* (spurious and hardly authentic books) he placed the Acts of Paul, the Shepherd of Hermas, Apocalypse of Peter, the Acts of Barnabas, and the Didache, Gospel of the Hebrews and probably Revelation. Lastly, he considered the Gospels of Peter, the Acts of Thomas, the Acts of Andrew and Matthias, Acts of John, and other Acts of apostles to be heretical writings.

The twenty-seven books of the NT were mentioned as canonical for the first time in the thirty-ninth Easter letter of Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria, written in 367. However, region by region, the views on the canon varied. For example, even until the early fifth century the Syrian church accepted only twenty-two books as canonical. In the west, the Council of Hippo (393) and the Council of Carthage (397) both adopted the twenty seven writings as the canon of the NT.

To sum up, various Christian documents were cited with a considerable authority in the church fathers’ writings until the second century. However, at the turn of the

---

13 Ibid., 29.
third century, the churches began to fix the number of the New Testament canon from as few as twenty-two books to as many as twenty-seven books which is the same as today. In the process of the canonization, churches faced many changes of situation and it affected the churches’ decision in terms of choosing particular books as part of the canon. In the time of Origen when churches suffered from severe persecution, whether the theology of martyrdom was contained in or not was a crucial criterion as to whether to categorize a book as canonical. In case of Hippolytus, the rigorism formed through theological argument with Callistus would influence his concept of the canon. As we explored in the former chapter, if the eucharistic texts contained in the New Testament existed in the first and second centuries were different from today, the modification of the old texts would possibly have occurred along with this period of canonization. In this period, a radical change is found in the eucharist. As Stephen Burns notes, the canon, that is, “the Bible was formed in the context of Christian worship,” and after canonization churches’ worship began to be formed following the theology and directions of the Bible. During this process, the varied expressions of the eucharist of the early churches would have gradually disappeared and evolved into the canonized style of the eucharist which was authorized by the Synoptic Gospels and the Pauline tradition.

2 The Eucharist of Tertullian

Tertullian (155-220) provides useful but limited information of the eucharist at Carthage. He is the first writer who places the eucharist in the setting of the last supper outside the New Testament. He mentions the last supper narrative in the treatise, Against Marcion 4. 40:

When He so earnestly expressed His desire to eat the passover, He considered it His own feast; for it would have been unworthy of God to desire to partake of what was not His own. Then, having taken the bread and given it to His disciples, He made it His own body, by saying, “This is my body,” that is, the figure of my body. ... He likewise, when mentioning

---

19 Bradshaw, Reconstructing Early Christian Worship, 8-9. See also Mazza, The Celebration of the Eucharist, 117.
the cup and making the new testament to be sealed “in His blood,” affirms the reality of His body. For, no blood can belong to a body which is not a body of flesh. ... Thus, from the evidence of the flesh, we get a proof of the body and a proof of the flesh from the evidence of the blood.  

As observed above, for Tertullian, the last supper was clearly the passover meal. Tertullian emphasizes the paschal significance by directly connecting Jesus’ desire to participate in the passover meal with the action of taking the bread. However, even though it is true that Tertullian’s paschal understanding of the eucharist is clearly presented in this passage, the practice of this eucharist is not the same as that of the Synoptic Gospels or Paul. First of all, there is no mention of the breaking of bread and thanksgiving. In addition, the explanation of the bread and cup also does not follow the so-called last supper story. Here, Tertullian’s focus is on the incarnation of Jesus or his real presence in the elements rather than the new covenant or salvation through the sacrifice on the cross. From this point of view, it is uncertain whether this passage contains information of the actual eucharistic practice of Tertullian’s community or that his exposition of the so-called last supper story recorded in Matthew 26 was in order to refute Marcion.  

Thus, Bradshaw suggests that the purpose of Tertullian’s treating the eucharist in this passage would “more probably be accounted for by his desire to combat the docetism of his opponent than by adherence to an independent catechetical tradition.”

Elsewhere, Tertullian attempts to interpret the meaning of bread in the Lord’s Prayer from a spiritual and eucharistic perspective. In *De oratione* 6.2 which was probably written between 200 and 206, Tertullian echoes the Fourth Gospel’s eucharistic tradition:

This petition ‘Give us today our daily bread’ we understand rather in a spiritual sense, for Christ is our bread because he is life and bread of life. ‘I am the bread of life,’ he says, and, a little earlier, ‘The bread is the word of the living God that has come down from heaven.’ In addition, his body is a kind of bread: ‘This is my body.’ Consequently, in asking for daily bread, we are asking to live forever in Christ and never to be separated from his body.

---


21 In this passage, Tertullian seems to follow the story line of Matthew 26 including Jesus’ prediction of Judas’ betrayal and, additionally, he directly mentions the words “as narrated in the Gospel of Matthew” (*Against Marcion* 4.40).


23 Saxer, “Tertullian,” 141.
It can be observed that a Christian meal practice is illustrated in his *Apology* 39. Here Tertullian depicts quite different styles of communal meals from the eucharist based on the last supper tradition:

… Our feast explains itself by its name. The Greeks call it *agape*, i.e., affection. ... The participants, before reclining, taste first of prayer to God. As much is eaten as satisfies the cravings of hunger; as much is drunk as befits the chaste. They say it is enough, as those who remember that even during the night they have to worship God; they talk as those who know that the Lord is one of their auditors. After manual ablution, and the bringing in of lights, each is asked to stand forth and sing, as he can, a hymn to God, either one from the holy Scriptures or one of his own composing,--a proof of the measure of our drinking. As the feast commenced with prayer, so with prayer it is closed. 24

Even today, many scholars reach the conclusion that this passage is not about the eucharist but agape. However, as explored in the previous chapter, in the earliest Christian literature the terms, the eucharist and agape, are employed without distinction. Also it is hard to find evidence that the early church conducted two different types of eucharist. 25 Additionally, Tertullian expresses the eucharist with various names such as “*Cena domini*” (the supper of God) in *De spec.* 13, “*Convivium Dei*” (the banquet of God) in *Ad uxor.* 2.8, or “*Convivium dominicum*” (the banquet of the Lord) in *Ad uxor.* 2.4. 26

### 3 The Eucharist of Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage

Cyprian (200-257 CE) demonstrated quite a different perception of the eucharist from his predecessors. Cyprian’s eucharist reflected the Pauline and synoptic eucharistic traditions in quite an exact way from the accounts of the last supper. Before exploring in detail his eucharistic theology, it would be worth noting briefly his career. Cyprian was converted about the year 245. After his election as bishop by the people of Carthage in 248 or 249, he underwent unceasing difficulties with intolerable persecution and attacks from heretics. In the period of persecution, Christians responded in two ways, with fidelity and defection, that is, as martyrs and apostates. In this situation, Cyprian had to do something for the churches in

---

25 See the section of “The Eucharist of Ignatius of Antioch” in chapter four of this study.
26 Saxer, “Tertullian,” 133, 152.
Carthage, and all his efforts are contained in his writings. During persecution, following the passion of Christ through martyrdom was recognized as an explicit way to verify true discipleship. As observed in the previous chapter, Ignatius of Antioch also expressed his longing for martyrdom in a similar situation. For the Cyprian community too, to live as a Christian meant an imitation of the passion of Christ. When we consider the significance of the eucharist in Christian life and worship in those times, it is not difficult to imagine the church fathers’ belief that “the Eucharist too is an imitation of the passion.” Because of the period of persecution, the connection between the passion of Christ and the eucharist came to be stronger. However, there have been persecutions against Christians since the beginning of Christianity. If so, why was the clear connection between the death of Jesus and the eucharist expressed for the first time in the writings of Cyprian in the middle of the third century? The persecution itself is not sufficient for the answer. We need to look further into the process of canonization. In the middle of the third century, the Pauline letters and the gospels were coming to be recognized as canonical with apostolic authority while other books, containing different eucharistic traditions from the Pauline and synoptic, were excluded from the canon. Spontaneously, eucharistic theology and practice based on the Pauline and Synoptic Gospels became mainstream. Then, the link between the eucharist and the passion of Christ became more robust.

Cyprian’s letter to Bishop Caecilius of Biltha probably written in 253 is the most important source containing his eucharistic understanding. This letter titled as “On the Sacrament of the Cup of the Lord” is exclusively focused on the eucharist. In this letter, he cites Matthew 26:28-29, teaching the eucharistic cup with an explanation of the setting of the last supper:

“For, taking the cup on the eve of His passion, He blessed it, and gave it to His disciples, saying, “Drink all of this; for this is my blood of the New Testament, which shall be shed for many, for the remission of sins. I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day in which I shall drink new wine with you in the kingdom of my Father.”

---

29 Ibid., 125.
Cyprian constantly provides the eucharistic model that church has to follow, citing 1 Corinthians 11:23-26 with an emphasis on Paul’s authority as an apostle:

Moreover, the blessed Apostle Paul, chosen and sent by the Lord, and appointed a preacher of the Gospel truth, lays down these very things in his epistle, saying, “The Lord Jesus, the same night in which He was betrayed, took bread; and when He had given thanks, He broke it, and said, This is my body, which shall be given for ye: do this in remembrance of me. After the same manner also He took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as you eat this bread and drink this cup, ye shall show forth the Lord’s death until He come.”

His letter indicates indirectly the eucharistic practice around the middle of the third century. Cyprian claimed that churches should preserve the tradition delivered from Matthew and Paul, believing firmly that the proper eucharistic practice was to follow what Jesus did at the last supper. The reason why he emphasized the last supper tradition in this letter was that the recipients conducted the eucharist differently from the last supper tradition. In the church, “aquarianism, the practice of using water alone, instead of wine mixed with water, for the celebration of the eucharist” was common. Thus, Cyprian insisted that the wine representing Christ’s blood and the water representing baptism are to be mixed for the eucharist. Yet, even though Cyprian tried to conduct the eucharist in the same way as the last supper, full restoration of it was impossible. His community celebrated the eucharist in the morning but not in the evening. He tried to defend the morning eucharist:

It behooved Christ to offer about the evening of the day, that the very hour of sacrifice might show the setting and the evening of the world; as it is written in Exodus, “And all the people of the synagogue of the children of Israel shall kill it in the evening.” Exodus 12:6 And again in the Psalms, “Let the lifting up of my hands be an evening sacrifice.” But we celebrate the resurrection of the Lord in the morning.

From Cyprian’s eucharistic sources, we might make three assumptions. Firstly, around the third century, Cyprian’s community had the Pauline letters and Synoptic Gospels and recognized those books as authoritative and canonical. Secondly, the eucharistic understanding based on the last supper story

---

31 The Epistles of Cyprian 62.10. Ibid., 361.
spontaneously began to influence the development of the eucharistic theology and practice of the community of Cyprian. Thirdly, nevertheless, the Pauline and synoptic eucharistic traditions based on the last supper story were not recognized as an absolute principle for the eucharist. Thus, in practice, Cyprian’s community preserved their regional tradition differently from the last supper tradition.

4 The Institution Narrative in the Anaphora since the Fourth Century

With the Edict of Milan in 313, the persecutions against Christians came to an end. In 380, Emperor Theodosius declared Christianity as the only state religion. This caused not only the expansion of converts but also the transformation of Christians’ life and worship. The property of church was secured by the imperial administration and bishops came to have more influence on society, having jurisdiction.34 During this period, a distinctive characteristic of eucharistic liturgies was the introduction of the institution narrative into the eucharistic prayers.35 The institution narrative would lead participants to be reminded of the death of Christ at the moment of taking the body and blood of Jesus. Finally the institution narrative became the centre of the anaphora of Christian liturgy.36

In the mid-fourth-century the anaphora of Serapion (or Sarapion), or more accurately Pseudo-Serapion,37 showed clearly the recognition of the eucharist as doing what Jesus at the last supper foresaw regarding his death on the cross:

To you have we offered this bread, the likeness of the body of the only-begotten. This bread is the likeness of the holy body. For the Lord Jesus Christ, in the night when he was betrayed, took bread, broke it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, ‘Take and eat; this is my body which is broken for you for forgiveness of sins.’ ... We have offered also the cup, the likeness of the blood: for the Lord Jesus Christ, taking a cup after supper, said to his disciples, ‘Take, drink; this is the new covenant, which is my blood, which is shed for you for the forgiveness of sins.’ Therefore we have offered the cup also, presenting the likeness of the blood.38

34 Marcel Metzger, History of the Liturgy: The Major Stages (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 1997), 64.
35 Bradshaw, Eucharistic Origins, 140.
37 Mazza, The Celebration of the Eucharist, 139.
In the west, in the latter half of the fourth century, Ambrose of Milan employed the institution narrative in his treatise *De Sacramentis*:

> Make for us this offering approved, reasonable, acceptable, because it is the figure of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ; who, the day before he suffered, took bread in his holy hands, looked up to heaven to you, holy Father almighty, eternal God, gave thanks, blessed, and broke it, and handed it to his apostles and disciples, saying, ‘Take and eat from this, all of you; for this is my body, which will be broken for many.’ Notice this. Likewise also after supper, the day before he suffered, he took the cup, looked up to heaven to you, holy Father, almighty, eternal God, gave thanks, blessed, and handed it to his apostles and disciples, saying, ‘Take and drink from this, all of you; for this is my blood.’

At the same period, in the east, the liturgy of John Chrysostom which had become the principal rite of the Greek Orthodox Church also placed the institution narrative in the centre of the anaphora:

> When he had come and fulfilled all the dispensation for us, on the night in which he handed himself over, he took bread in his holy and undefiled and blameless hands, gave thanks, blessed, broke and gave it to his holy disciples and apostles, saying, (aloud) ‘Take, eat; this is my body, which is [broken] for you [for forgiveness of sins].’ People: Amen. Likewise the cup also after supper, saying, (aloud) ‘Drink from this, all of you; this is my blood of the new covenant, which is shed for you and for many for the forgiveness of sins.’

From these three cases, all the biblical citations for bread seemed to echo the account of Matthew. The phrase “for forgiveness of sins” for “the bread” in the anaphoras of Serapion and Chrysostom was probably an intentional interpolation as there is no biblical account mentioning this phrase for bread. Yet the words for “the cup” seem to be from the account of Luke. Through this combination of Matthew and Luke, they attempted to realize a unified and harmonized eucharist. Here it would be worth observing the composition of the words for the two elements. First of all, the symmetry was found in Jesus’ commandment. While biblical accounts of the institution narrative used the word “take” only in the words for the bread, Serapion and Ambrose applied it to the cup in order to parallel both elements. Furthermore, the parallelism completed by inserting the phrase “for forgiveness of sins” in the word of the bread, in the light of a ritual, would provide
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“a well-balanced audible performance”\textsuperscript{41} to participants. An interesting point is that the phrase for the bread “which is broken for you for forgiveness of sins” had been absent in the Roman Canon manuscripts since the eighth century.\textsuperscript{42} This phenomenon seemed to echo the churches’ efforts to follow the text of the Scripture.\textsuperscript{43}

However, the institution narrative which was emerging as the essential part of the anaphora around the late of the fourth century did not rule over the whole church at that time. Evidence of this is found in the anaphora of Addai and Mari, representing the east Syrian eucharistic tradition. This liturgy is presumed to have been written from as early as the second century and the fourth century as it retains the Semitic character and the Syrian churches were comparatively isolated from other churches.\textsuperscript{44} According to Jones, although his assumption is questionable, the liturgy of Addai and Mari dates from the seventh century.\textsuperscript{45} Yet, interestingly, this liturgy does not contain an institution narrative.\textsuperscript{46} Among various extant manuscripts from the twelfth century to the twentieth century, there are only three extant versions which contain an institution narrative, but they were published in 1890, 1901 and 1936 for the editors’ liturgical or theological purposes.\textsuperscript{47} This means that the institution narrative is the editor’s interpolation. From this point of view, this liturgy possibly echoes the eucharistic practice of the east Syrian churches not only in the fourth century when canonization was nearly completed but much more lately. The original part of the anaphora of Addai and Mari in which several editors attempt to insert an institution narrative is as follows:

\begin{quote}
And the priest recites quietly: And with these heavenly powers we give thanks to you, O Lord, even we, your lowly, weak and miserable servants, because you have effected in us a great grace which cannot be repaid, in that you put on our humanity so as to quicken us by your divinity. And you lifted up our poor estate, and righted our fall. And you raised up our mortality. And you forgave our debts. You justified our sinfulness and you
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{43} Jungmann, \textit{The Mass of the Roman Rite}, 195.
\textsuperscript{44} Bradshaw, \textit{The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship}, 111.
\textsuperscript{47} Ibid., 5.
enlightened our understanding. And you, our Lord and our God, vanquished our enemies and made triumphant the lowliness of our weak nature through the abounding compassion of your grace. Qanona (Doxology). And for all. And they reply: Amen. And the deacon says: In your minds. And the priest recites quietly: You, O Lord, in your unspakeable mercies make a gracious remembrance for all the upright and just fathers who have been pleasing before you in the commemoration of the body and blood of your Christ which we offer to you upon the pure and holy altar as you have taught us. And grant us your tranquility and your peace all the days of the world. Repeat. And they reply: Amen.  

During the Middle Age, the role of the institution narrative became much more crucial and essential in the anaphora even though this phenomenon was not universal as seen in the case of Addai and Mari. Spontaneously, the institution narrative, that is, what Jesus did at the last supper became the sole ground to judge the authenticity of the eucharist of the church. After fixation concerning the eucharistic origins of the last supper, eucharistic theology developed with discussions of the operation and efficacy of the eucharist. In the medieval controversies around this, the core was the presence of Christ in the eucharist. There were two theologians who provided theoretical foundations for later controversies of the presence of Christ: Ambrose and Augustine. Although these two theologians might not expect that their names were connected to these two extremes, the realists who supported the real presence of Christ in the eucharist found the evidence for their argument in the former, and the symbolists who supported the spiritual or symbolic presence of Christ regarded the latter as the representative of the symbolists.  

Ambrose believed the real presence of Christ to be in the eucharist. After consecration, the ordinary bread is changed into the body of Christ although the appearance is still bread. Ambrose believed that what changed was not a matter of appearance but substance. Similarly, the substance of wine is changed into the blood of Christ after the consecration. Thus, the consecration which changes the elements into the body and blood of Christ by divine power is crucial in the eucharistic understanding of Ambrose.  
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Augustine viewed the eucharist as a communal event. Christ is the head of the church and the church is the body of Christ. In the eucharist Christ bestows the bread which is his body upon the church which is also his body. Therefore, if someone who does not belong to the body of Christ receives the eucharistic elements, the bread and wine are no longer the body and blood of Christ.\(^{51}\)

Augustine, in his *Treatise on the Gospel of St. John, XXVI*, notes the communal significance of the eucharist:

He explains how it is that what He speaks of happens, and the meaning of eating His Body and drinking His blood. “He that eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood abideth in Me, and I in Him” [John 6:56]. This then is to eat that food and to drink that drink, to abide in Christ, and to have Him abiding in oneself. And in this way he who does not abide in Christ, and in whom Christ does not abide, without doubt neither eats His flesh nor drinks His blood, but rather to His own judgement eats and drinks the Sacrament of so great a thing.\(^{52}\)

As to the presence of Christ in the eucharist, Augustine was in agreement with Ambrose. Also, he believed that even after the consecration, there is no change in the appearance of the elements which was the same as the position of Ambrose. In explaining the change of the eucharistic elements, he used the concepts of *signum* (sign) and *res* (reality). For him, the eucharistic elements are the visible *signum* (sign) and the body and blood of Christ are the invisible *res* (reality). During the eucharist, it is the reality that is changed not the sign.\(^{53}\)

However, regarding the interpretation of the way of understanding the presence of Christ in the eucharist, there is a difference between them. While Ambrose believed that the consecrated elements are the real body and blood of Christ, the focus of Augustine was on the spiritual meaning of the presence of Christ and the faith of partakers. Augustine developed his appreciation of the eucharistic presence of Christ in the exposition of John 12:8: “You always have the poor with you, but you do not always have me” (NRSV). In this verse, Augustine focuses on the fact that church cannot have Jesus’ physical body because he will ascend into heaven after the resurrection. Therefore, the presence of Christ in the eucharist can be experienced spiritually through the participants’ faith:
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It may be also understood in this way: “The poor ye will have always with you, but me ye will not have always.” … And why? Because in respect of His bodily presence He associated for forty days with His disciples, and then, having brought them forth for the purpose of beholding and not of following Him, He ascended into heaven, and is no longer here. … In this respect the Church enjoyed His presence only for a few days: now it possesses Him by faith, without seeing Him with the eyes. In whichever way, then, it was said, “But me ye will not have always,” it can no longer, I suppose, after this twofold solution, remain as a subject of doubt.54

In the ninth century, an important debate of the presence of Christ in the eucharist was led by Radbertus and his pupil Ratramnus. Both of them confirmed that Jesus is present in the eucharist. Yet, Radbertus identified the eucharistic elements with the body and blood of the historical Jesus in the same way as Ambrose, whereas Ratramnus, echoing Augustine, discerned the sacramental body of Christ as different from the historical body of Christ which was crucified and buried.55

By the eleventh century, the controversy of the eucharistic presence intensified more. For Berengar, the change of substance was not reasonable. First of all, philosophically, it was impossible that the flesh of Christ could be changed into bread in terms of the laws of nature. In addition, Berengar used the biblical foundation to verify the substantial difference between Christ’s real body and the eucharistic bread. Christ has already overcome the power of death, now sits at the right hand of God and in the future will come again. Berengar thought that it was unimaginable that the glorified body of Christ became the bread which was broken by the hands of priests and eaten by human beings.56 However, his idea of interpreting spiritually the presence of Christ in turn was judged as heretical by the mainline church. Lanfranc, an orthodox opponent of Berengar, refuted all thoughts of Berengar, and emphasized the substantial presence of Christ in the eucharistic elements. For Lanfranc, if the bread and wine were not changed into the body and blood of Christ, the eucharist could no longer be effective.57 The term “transubstantiation,” which echoed the idea of Lanfranc, came into fashion from the early thirteenth century onwards.58 There are still debates on who first used the

56 Ibid., 80-83.
57 Ibid., 83-84.
exact term “transubstantiation” (Latin = transubstantiatis).\textsuperscript{59} However, more important is the fact that the concept of “transubstantiation” already prevailed at that time. In 1215, the fourth Lateran Council affirmed that the process of transubstantiation was the orthodox churches’ official position concerning the issue of the presence of Christ in the eucharist:

There is truly one universal Church of the faithful, beyond which no one at all is saved. In it Jesus himself is both priest and sacrifice, whose body and blood are truly contained in the sacrament of the altar under the species of bread and wine by the transubstantiation [transsubstantiatis] of bread into body and wine into blood through divine power: that through the perfecting of the mystery of unity we receive of him from himself, that which he received from us.\textsuperscript{60}

After the fourth Lateran Council’s affirmation of the doctrine of the transubstantiation, the idea of the substantial presence of Christ in the elements received much more robust and sophisticated expression by Thomas Aquinas. His ideas are well described in Questions 75-77 of Summa Theologica, Part III.\textsuperscript{61} He believed that after consecration the substance of bread and wine is changed into the real body and blood of Christ (Question 75: Article 2). The substantial conversion does not follow the laws of nature but is completed by the power of God in mystery:

And this is done by Divine power in this sacrament; for the whole substance of the bread is changed into the whole substance of Christ’s body, and the whole substance of the wine into the whole substance of Christ’s blood. Hence this is not a formal, but a substantial conversion; nor is it a kind of natural movement: but, with a name of its own, it can be called transubstantiation … (Question 75: Article. 4).\textsuperscript{62}

At the same time, Aquinas tried to make harmony with the Augustinian eucharistic approach from which later scholars attained their theoretical foundations for the spiritual understanding of the Christ’s eucharistic presence. As Augustine explained, the eucharistic presence of Christ was described through the terms signum (sign) and res (reality). Aquinas also employed the terms “accidents” and “substance,” which

\textsuperscript{59} According to Cummings, Robert Pullen (1080-1146) first used the term transubstantio although it was not the term transsubstantiates. See Cummings, Eucharistic Doctors, 117. On the other hand, Osborne argues that “the first usage of the term transubstantiation itself can be found about a half century later in the writings of Magister Roland (c. 1150), Stephen of Tournai (c. 1160), and Peter Comestor (c. 1170).” See Kenan B. Osborne, The Christian Sacraments of Initiation: Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1987), 191.

\textsuperscript{60} Johnson, Sacraments and Worship, 225-226.

\textsuperscript{61} Jones, Christ’s Eucharistic Presence, 93.

\textsuperscript{62} Johnson, Sacraments and Worship, 226.
were borrowed from Aristotelian philosophy. The “accidents,” that is, the appearance of bread and wine, are not changed even after consecration, but the “substance” of the elements is entirely transformed into the body and blood of Christ when the word “institution” is mentioned by a priest (Question 76: Article 1). He further explained that participants could understand the eucharistic bread and wine as the true flesh and blood of Christ not through our human senses but only through faith:

We could never know by our senses that the real body of Christ and his blood are in this sacrament, but only by our faith which is based on the authority of God. … this sacrament … really contains Christ himself … the fulfillment of all the other sacraments. … he has not left us without his bodily presence in this our pilgrimage, but he joins us to himself in this sacrament in the reality of his body and blood (Questions 75: Article 1).

The emphasis on the transubstantiation spontaneously underscores the meaning of the passion and sacrifice of Christ in the eucharist. Is Christ sacrificed in every eucharist? Regarding this question, Aquinas gives two answers in respect of the sacrifice and passion of Christ. Firstly, the sacrifice of Christ was once offered on the cross and the same sacrifice is repeatedly offered in the eucharist. Secondly, the passion of Christ is connected with the salvation of sinners. Receiving the eucharist means participation in the passion of Christ and, as a result, the partakers experience the enactment of salvation in the eucharist. However, such understanding of the eucharist includes two conflicting ideas. The sacrifice for the salvation was historically once offered by Jesus on the cross, but the saving sacrifice is equally offered in every eucharist. In order to harmonize these two conflicting ideas, Aquinas employs a decisive image. How is the coexistence of the two extremes possible? Aquinas’ answer is expressed in this way: “the celebration of this sacrament is an image representing Christ’ Passion, which is His true sacrifice” (Questions 83: Article 1).

While Aquinas led the medieval church’s eucharistic theology with his elaborate and astute perception of transubstantiation, various other theologians, recognizing the weak points of the doctrine of the transubstantiation, opened the door to the
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reformation. Among them, John Duns Scotus (1265/66-1308) and William of Occam, or Ockham, (1288-1348) put forward the view that consubstantiation was more logical than transubstantiation. While Aquinas insisted that the substance of bread is changed into the body of Christ, they deemed that the substance of the body of Christ coexists with the substance of the bread. They believed that God’s divine power enables two substances to exist in one place. John Wyclif (1330-1384) more directly attacks the doctrine of the transubstantiation. His critical point was that transubstantiation has little scriptural and rational base. Wyclif insists that physically the body of Christ is in heaven but sacramentally and symbolically the body and blood of Christ are in the eucharistic elements. Scotus’ perspective was reflected later by Martin Luther and Wyclif’s idea was found in the theological ideas of Zwingli and Calvin. Jan Hus (1369-1415) of Czech was partly influenced by Wyclif’s view that after consecration the substance of bread and wine remains with the substance of the body of Christ. Moreover, he proposed that lay Christians should receive not only bread but the cup contrasting at that time with the medieval church tradition that only bread is delivered to the laity. However, the medieval church accused him of propagating a heretical idea of the eucharist and subsequently burnt him at the stake.

5 The Dominant Position of the Institution Narrative in the Reformers’ Eucharistic Understanding

After the death of Hus, the doctrine of transubstantiation dominated the medieval churches for nearly one hundred years until the advent of one of the most influential protestant reformers, Martin Luther. With regard to the real presence of Christ in the eucharist, Luther agreed with the medieval doctrine. However, Luther rejected the idea of transubstantiation. Luther suggested that Christ is ubiquitous in the eucharist. The belief about transubstantiation focused on substance of the
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eucharistic elements being totally changed into the body and blood of Christ, whereas Luther’s view was that the two substances, the bread and the body of Christ are mingled and coexist. Just as Jesus is God and a human, the body of Christ is seated at the right hand of God and at the same time is present in the eucharistic elements. For Luther, to understand the real presence of Christ in the eucharist was not a matter of human reason. Thus he proposed, “Even though philosophy cannot grasp this, faith grasps it nonetheless.”

Luther insists that both eucharistic elements must be given to the laity, criticizing the medieval eucharistic system of withholding the cup from the laity as “the tyranny of Rome.” In addition, Luther suggested that the word of institution of the eucharist is more important than the external eucharistic factors such as vestments and ornaments. “For in that word, and in that word alone, reside the power, the nature, and the whole substance of the mass.”

Luther’s emphasis on the word in the eucharist made the position of the institution narrative, based on 1 Corinthians 11 and the Synoptic Gospels, absolute. He maintained that John 6 is irrelevant to the eucharist as Jesus instituted the eucharist at the last supper (John 13) not on the mountain (John 6). He suggested that the theme of John 6 is the word made flesh rather than the eucharist.

Zwingli proposed a symbolical interpretation of the presence of Christ in the eucharist, refusing both the ideas of medieval transubstantiation and Luther’s idea of consubstantiation. Zwingli suggested that Christ is in heaven and it is impossible that his physical body is present in the eucharist. Therefore, the body of Christ which is present in the eucharist is not his physical body but the Holy Spirit. At this point, when he commented on the text “this is my body” he suggested that the verb “is” should be understood symbolically not literally. According to Zwingli, the eucharist reminds participants of the body and blood of Christ which were once sacrificed on the cross. Eating and drinking the eucharistic elements are symbolic acts through which they commemorate Jesus who offered his body for them. From this point of view, Jesus says, “Do this in remembrance of me” in the word of
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In addition, differently from Luther’s dissociation of John 6 and the eucharist, Zwingli found the eucharistic meaning in John 6. However, the texts in which he found the meaning of the eucharist were not the miraculous feeding of Jesus (John 6:3-13) but the teaching of Jesus regarding the bread of life (John 6:26-63). Zwingli did not recognize Jesus’ feeding on the mountain as signifying the eucharist. Zwingli’s focus was on John 6:63: “It is the spirit that gives life; the flesh is useless” (NRSV). This verse effectively contrasts the spirit with the flesh, downplaying the meaning of the latter. Zwingli employs this verse as a scriptural root for his eucharistic thought that Christ is present spiritually not physically in the eucharist.

However, Zwingli emphasizes the symbolic meaning of the eucharist too much. He treats the eucharist as a means of support to affirm the participants’ faith and devotion. In other words, the eucharist does not have an independent role as a means of grace. Such perceptions of the eucharist led to the practice of infrequent eucharists, “four yearly celebrations of the eucharist,” and affected later protestant churches’ decision as to how often they conducted the eucharist.

As a second generation of the reformation, Calvin tried to establish a harmonized eucharistic theology arbitrating between Luther and Zwingli. Calvin, following Zwingli, suggested that the whole universe is full of the divinity of Christ but his human body is in heaven. Physically, Jesus was born through the Virgin Mary. He suffered, was dead, rose again, and then ascended to heaven. His physical body is not here but he is seated at the right hand of God (Institutes of Christian Religion, IV, 17.26). Therefore, Christ cannot be present physically in the eucharist. However, it is true that Christ is always with his children. In the eucharist, the body of Christ is taken by participants and his blood is absorbed in their body and spirit. At this point, Calvin agrees with Luther. In understanding Calvin’s eucharistic theology, the key is the role of the Holy Spirit in the eucharist. By the secret power of the
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Holy Spirit, the body of Christ in heaven is given to the partakers in the eucharist (*Institutes of the Christian Religion*, IV, 17.10).

Like Zwingli, Calvin finds some eucharistic undertones in John 6 rather than a direct relationship with the eucharist. In John 6, Calvin, in interpreting “bread” as “the spiritual food” and “eating” as “faith,” corroborates the motto of the reformation, “justification by faith.” In addition, Calvin uses the texts of John 6 in explaining that Christ is present in the eucharist beyond the limitation of time and space by the divine power of the Holy Spirit:

Moreover, I am not satisfied with those persons who, recognizing that we have some communion with Christ, when they would show what it is, make us partakers of the Spirit only, omitting mention of flesh and blood. As though all these things were said in vain: that his flesh is truly food, that his blood is truly drink [John 6:55]; that none have life except those who eat his flesh and drink his blood [John 6:53]; and other passages pertaining to the same thing (*Institutes of the Christian Religion*, IV, 17.7).

He declares his flesh the food of my soul, his blood its drink [John 6:53ff]. I offer my soul to him to be fed with such food. In his Sacred Supper he bids me take, eat, and drink his body and blood under the symbols of bread and wine. I do not doubt that he himself truly presents them, and that I receive them (*Institutes of the Christian Religion*, IV, 17.32).

The reformers are thought of as having contributed to the recovery of the eucharist from the medieval abuses in terms of a spiritual approach towards the presence of Christ, with the emphasis on communal significance rather than rite by a priest, and the balance between the word of God and the sacrament. In spite of the difference between the reformers and the medieval church, as observed above, they agreed with the view that the eucharist was instituted by Jesus at the last supper. Like the teachings of the medieval church, the reformers use basically the institution narrative in their eucharistic theology and practice. Especially, the temporal significance of the “last” supper led the reformers to focus on Calvary in the whole life of Jesus. Obviously, the reformers discovered the meaning of the eucharist as a feast and thanksgiving moving away from the medieval doctrine, the repeated
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sacrifice. Yet, they failed to prevent the eucharist from being ruled by “the tone of melancholy, penitence, and humiliation.” The main reason for this might be found in the reformers’ persistent belief in the origin of the eucharist, the last supper. A good example of this is shown in Calvin’s thought. Criticizing the view that the meanings of the eucharist are undermined by the medieval sacrificial understanding of the eucharist, Calvin viewed the essential meaning of the eucharist to be recovered as Christ’s passion, death and benefit which partakers can experience through pondering the saving death on the cross (Institutes of the Christian Religion, IV, 18.5-6).

The reformers’ recovery of the eucharist enabled the churches to rethink the medieval eucharistic system which paid too much attention to external actions and elements. Instead, in emphasizing the faith and preparation for the eucharist, the churches were immersed in keeping the eucharist holy. As an illustration, Calvin focused on the worthy celebration of the eucharist through the “self-examination” of participants. As seen in chapter three of this study, this self-examination included repentance and faith. In that eucharistic understanding, the most important aspect is the preservation of the holiness in conducting the eucharist rather than the experience of the grace of God. To achieve that goal, churches have developed their eucharistic theology and practice, reinforcing the prerequisites for the eucharist such as baptism, faith, morality and age.

6 The Eucharistic Understanding of John and Charles Wesley

In the eighteenth century a new approach to the eucharist was found in the Wesley brothers’ ideas. Their eucharistic emphasis was on the grace of God through the eucharist rather than in keeping the eucharist holy by the inspection of partakers’ qualifications. In 1747, Charles Wesley showed the crucial value of Methodist teachings concerning the eucharist in the first stanza of a hymn, the Gospel Feast.

88 Ibid., 25.
91 For more details on how Calvin and his descendents developed their eucharistic principles, see the section “John Calvin (1509-1564) and the Westminster Confession of Faith and Catechisms (1647)” in chapter two of this study.
“Come, sinners, to the Gospel feast; Let every soul be Jesus’ guest.”

Literally, this hymn teaches that there is no restriction or prerequisite to come to the table. Whether they have been properly churched or not, whether baptized or not, all are welcome to participate in the eucharist. While it is true that John Wesley did not conduct an open table on the same level as that of his heirs today, we can observe the foundational principles of the open table in the eucharist of Wesley. Wesley recognized the eucharist as a means of grace in his sermon, *The Means of Grace*, in 1746. The means of grace was “the ordinary channels” through which human receives the grace of justification and sanctification of God. His concept of the means of grace came to be clear in debates with the Moravians. They argued that only those who experienced justification were able to receive the means of grace like the eucharist. However, conversely, Wesley viewed that through the means of grace sinners could reach the true faith. For Wesley, the eucharist is not only the “confirming ordinance” in which believers can participate but the “converting ordinance” through which weak believers can be stronger and even non-believers can experience the grace of God. At this point, Wesley says:

The falsehood of the other assertion appears both from Scripture precept and example. Our Lord commanded those very men who were then unconverted, who had not yet “received the Holy Ghost,” who (in the full sense of the word) were not believers, to “do this in remembrance of him.” Here the precept is clear. And to these he delivered the elements with his own hands. ... [T]he Lord’s Supper was ordained by God to be “a means” of conveying to men either preventing or justifying or sanctifying grace, according to their several necessities.

However, even in Wesley brothers’ eucharistic understanding, the last supper still played a crucial role just like the reformers and the medieval church. For them, the eucharist was instituted at the last supper. The sacrificial languages and meanings contained in Jesus’ sayings at the last supper came to be essential materials for their
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eucharistic theology. Such a eucharistic focus on the passion and death of Jesus is consistently expressed in their hymns:

**Hymn 761**
… Our hearts we open wide,
To make the Savior room;
An lo! The Lamb, the Crucified,
The sinner’s Friend, is come.

**Hymn 765**
Come, Thou everlasting Spirit,
Bring to every thankful mind
All the Saviour’s dying merit
All His sufferings for mankind
True Recorder of His passion
Now the living faith impart,
Now reveal His great salvation
Preach His gospel to our heart.

**Hymn 771**
Victim divine, Thy grace we claim.
While thus Thy precious death we show
Once offered up, a spotless Lamb.⁹⁹

With regard to the issue of the sacrifice of Jesus in the eucharist, they followed the reformers not the medieval church’s position. While the medieval church viewed the eucharist as “a repetition of the unique sacrifice of Christ on the cross,”¹⁰⁰ the reformers taught that in the eucharist participants commemorated Christ who once suffered for the salvation of sinners and experienced his real presence. Nevertheless, although the Wesley brothers did not recognize the eucharist as a repetition of the sacrifice, the passion of Christ was the central theme of their eucharistic theology because their eucharistic understanding was firmly based on the last supper tradition.

### 7 Summary and Evaluation

In the course of the third century, eucharistic theology and practice took a new turn. Eucharistic teachings based on the last supper tradition and direct quotations from the institution narratives began to appear more frequently in Christian literature.
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¹⁰⁰ Cummings, *Eucharistic Doctors*, 221.
Among the early church fathers, Tertullian, in the third century, described first the eucharist in the setting of the last supper. In his view, the eucharist was the passover meal. Around the middle of the third century, Cyprian of Carthage argued that church had to follow the eucharistic model described in 1 Corinthians 11:23-26 because the eucharistic teaching was from Paul, an apostle of Jesus. After the fourth century, the institution narrative has begun to play an essential role in the eucharistic prayers although that phenomenon was not universal. By the late fourth century when the canonization was completed, the last supper tradition engrafted in the institution narratives of 1 Corinthians 11 and the Synoptic Gospels came to be recognized as the proper eucharist and prevail in churches. Spontaneously, the style of the eucharist evolved from the early churches’ diversity to unity affirmed by the canon. When we consider the reciprocal relationship between the Bible and worship, these phenomena were a natural consequence.

During the middle ages, the eucharistic theology developed with the controversies of the presence of Christ in the eucharist. Yet, the medieval church’s excessive emphasis on the transubstantiation caused several problems in conducting the eucharist. The reformers made an effort to rectify the medieval eucharistic abuses and a contribution to recovering the eucharist. The Wesley brothers broadened the eucharistic understanding with their new insight for the eucharist, that is, the means of grace. However, from the medieval church through the reformers to the Wesley brothers, although there were various eucharistic theologies and practices, there was always a solid common ground that Jesus instituted the eucharist at the last supper. The passion and death of Christ was always at the heart of their eucharistic perception. As a result of that, today most mainline churches have the traditional eucharistic understanding based on the last supper tradition, following their ancestors.

The result of the study on the history of the eucharist leads us to rethink the traditional eucharistic presupposition that the last supper was the origin of the eucharist, and to focus on the eucharistic significance of the meals of Jesus. The next chapter will explore the meals of Jesus in the light of the eucharist, seeking the biblical base for the open table.
Chapter 6

The Biblical Basis for the Theology of the Open Table

So far, in the preceding two chapters, this study has explored the development of the eucharist from the early churches through the medieval era to the reformers and the Wesley brothers which altogether provide the foundations of eucharistic practice and theology for their heirs. In the history of the eucharist, there was a turning point between the second and third centuries. At the turn of the third century, the last supper tradition supported by most modern mainline churches began to be clearly observed. Around that time, with the process of the canonization, the early varied eucharistic theologies and practices came to dissipate and be unified into the last supper tradition attested to by the Synoptic Gospels and the Pauline tradition. In contrast, during the first two centuries the eucharist was celebrated in various ways by regional Christian communities without any mention of the last supper. The diversity was caused by the unique eucharistic perspectives formed by the distinctive features of each local community. The features of a community would be described with questions such as the following. Who were the main members of the church? Were they Jews, gentiles or multiracial? Where did they live, Jerusalem, Rome or Syria? What was their historical, cultural, and social context? Were their religious traits conservative, radical, or moderate? More importantly, which eucharistic tradition did they inherit? What kind of memory of the eucharist of Jesus did they have? Each community would have its own answers to these questions, and the uniqueness of the answers reflecting the identity of the community would form and develop its own eucharistic tradition. This led to a rich diversity of the early church eucharistic practice.

These findings in the history of the eucharist have caused us to rethink the traditional eucharistic understanding that the eucharist was instituted by Jesus “at the last supper.” Did Jesus institute the eucharist at the last supper? Did Jesus command churches to do, in the same way, what he did at the last supper? From an analysis of the eucharists of the first two centuries, the answer is likely to be
cautious one. Furthermore, the results of the analysis indicate clearly that the origin of the eucharist is not the last supper but the meals of Jesus. Thus, this chapter will explore the role of the meals of Jesus in his ministry in terms of the kingdom of God and attempt to derive the eucharistic significance from the meals of Jesus.

1 The Meals of Jesus and the Kingdom of God

Mark and Matthew begin the public life of Jesus with the proclamation: “The kingdom of God has come near” (Mark 1:15; cf. Matthew 4:17). Luke connects the kingdom of God with the life of Jesus, quoting a messianic prophesy from Isaiah 61. In the kingdom of God, Jesus will preach good news to the poor, proclaim freedom to the captivities, heal the blind, and do justice to the oppressed (Luke 4:18). The kingdom of God is the central message of the public life of Jesus.¹ According to Wright, the principal motive of the ministry of Jesus was the embodiment of the kingdom of God. For Jesus, the miracles of healing were not just a manifestation of his mercy but a way to teach the kingdom of God. His sermons and parables were not to reveal a mysterious wisdom of heaven but to proclaim the kingdom of God.² The fulfillment of the kingdom of God was the ultimate goal of the whole ministry of Jesus.

According to the gospels, Jesus performed a large number of miracles including seventeen healings and six exorcisms. He healed the blind, the deaf and the lame. He healed those who suffered from an infectious skin disease, bleeding, and palsy. Children, women and men were freed from demonic possession by Jesus’ exorcism. Why did Jesus perform those miracles? Jesus did not do it as a physician or magician. Wealth or fame was not the goal of his ministry. His actions contained a transformational message, that is, the coming of the kingdom of God.

On the one hand, the transformational message is that the kingdom of God will be fulfilled in the future. On the other hand, the transformational message is also that the kingdom has already come in the ministry of Jesus. When one considers the latter perspective, the kingdom of God which has arrived with Jesus is closely connected with the existence of this earthly world. Dominic Crossan tries to

interpret the kingdom of God envisaged by Jesus from a socio-political perspective. According to Crossan, to be in Palestine at that time, and to be possessed by a demon was not a simple mental or spiritual problem. He views that being possessed by a demon was closely related to a socio-political dimension not a psychological one. In the first century, people who lived in Palestine were oppressed both economically and politically by the Roman Empire and the Jewish authorities. In this situation, some revolutionaries attempted to overthrow the government, insisting that they were the messiah. However, the only thing almost all ordinary people were able to do was to endure the oppression and to wait for the messiah. The harsh reality of life led some people to lose their minds. In this way, they were thought to be possessed by a demon. For Crossan, the identity of the demon driving people insane was in fact due to the rule of the Roman imperialism. Those who were possessed with the imperialistic demon came to lose the power to resist their oppressors and so stopped criticizing their rulers. In such a social context, the exorcism of Jesus has a special meaning beyond a mental dimension. Freedom from being possessed by demons would have enabled them to face again the reality of being oppressed by their colonial rulers. It seems to be true that exorcism itself has a much lesser political effect than a physical revolution. However, when one considers that those who were freed from the control of imperialism had the potential to join in an actual revolution in the future, the rulers would possibly have recognized Jesus’ repetitive actions of exorcism as a prelude to a political revolution. 

Crossan observes, also, the healing miracle of Jesus from a socio-political perspective. At the time of Jesus, generally most diseases occurred due to insanitary surroundings which were closely related to economic conditions. The poor lived in poor living conditions. In addition, they would have had a weak immune system due to starvation and malnutrition. As a result, the poor would have been exposed to the risk of diseases more than the rich. Although the poor tried to emerge from poverty, imposing heavy taxes made the poor poorer. In such a social system, the main reason for disease was the rulers’ oppression and heavy taxes. However, the ruling class and religious leaders were sympathetic to the imperialist view that the
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poor’s diseases were caused by their own sin.\(^4\) Even if sick people were healed by spending a lot of time and money, they were still isolated and recognized as sinners in Jewish society. In order to rejoin in society, they had to see the temple authorities and receive confirmation that they were clean and forgiven. For that process, they had to pay additional costs to the temple. In such a situation, Jesus again healed sick people and proclaimed the forgiveness of sins in the street for nothing. Indeed, he did not expect any reward from them. Such transformational and radical acts of Jesus would have scandalized the Jewish authorities and especially the temple priests who derived the most benefits from the temple system. Perrin gives an explanation of the meaning of Jesus’ healing in the Jewish society which was operated by the temple system:\(^5\)

That the itinerant Jesus attained his fame primarily through his therapeutic abilities, together with the fact that the temple was the primary venue for healing within Judaism, makes it altogether plausible that Jesus’ healing ministry, which he apparently shared with his disciples (Matt. 10.1; Mark 3.15), was meant to mark off the movement as the mobile embodiment of the temple.\(^6\)

As Crossan asserts, the miracles of Jesus’ healing “challenged not the medical monopoly of the doctors but the religious monopoly of the priests.”\(^7\) In light of that point, it seems to be natural that the chief priests were looking for some ways to kill Jesus (John 5:18; Mark 11:18; Mark 14:11; Luke 22:2; Mark 3:6; Matthew 12:14).

The place and time that Jesus lived were not somewhere apart from this world. If one tries to remove social and political meanings and effects from the ministry of Jesus, it becomes an act of distorting the life of Jesus. However, in order to understand the ultimate destination of the ministry of Jesus, something beyond a socio-political perspective is needed; this is to observe the ministry of Jesus from the perspective of the kingdom of God. Clearly, Jesus, attested by the gospels, was not an ordinary political revolutionary, magician or philanthropist. He did everything with the self-consciousness of a messiah. As the messiah he anticipated the kingdom of God which was still to come. However, he did not simply wait for the kingdom. He showed the kingdom in this world through his teachings, healing and

---

\(^4\) Crossan, *The Historical Jesus*, 324.

\(^5\) As to the role of the temple system in the Jewish society, see the section, “The cleansing of the temple” in this chapter.

\(^6\) Nicholas Perrin, *Jesus the Temple* (Grand Rapids, MI: SPCK, 2010), 154.

\(^7\) Crossan, *The Historical Jesus*, 324.
exorcisms. When the disciples of John the Baptist asked Jesus whether he was the messiah or not, Jesus responded to them with a quotation from Isaiah's prophesy about the messiah: “the blind receive their sight, the lame walk, the lepers are cleansed, the deaf hear, the dead are raised, the poor have good news brought to them” (Luke 7:22, NRSV). Another prophet proclaimed that when the kingdom of God would come, the messiah would remove the unclean spirit from the land (Zechariah 13:2). The kingdom of God which was prophesized in the Old Testament had been established in the exorcisms of Jesus. The kingdom of God embodied by Jesus was an eschatological and already realized kingdom. The healing of diseases, the freedom of souls from demonic possession and the recovery of social relationships were the evident fruits of the kingdom of God. These miracles were the “manifestations of God’s power” in the kingdom of God which had already come with Jesus, the messiah.

For Jesus, meals were “the privileged place” for the teaching of the kingdom of God. In the gospels, the act of eating is frequently described in the ministry of Jesus. In his parables, meals played an instrumental role in explaining the kingdom of God. In his actual life, Jesus shared many meals with various kinds of people. Jesus went into the houses of sinners and tax collectors such as Zacchaeus and Levi and ate with them (Matthew 9:9-13; Mark 2:13-17; Luke 5:27-32; Luke 19:1-9). Jesus stayed in the home of Simon the leper (Matthew 26:6; Mark 14:3; cf. Luke 7:36) and possibly ate a meal with him. Jesus did not keep away from the Pharisees who were against him, and shared meals with them (Luke 11:37-54, 14:1-24). Jesus fed thousands of his followers who were hungry. Among them, there would be women, children and gentiles (Matthew 14:13-21; Mark 6:30-44; Luke 9:10-17; John 6:1-14; Matthew 15:32-39; Mark 8:1-10). The Fourth Gospel provides more clearly evidence of Jesus eating with gentiles. Jesus was invited by the Samaritans and must have eaten with them (John 4:39-42).
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9 Ibid., 109.
11 Foley views that not only John 4 but also Mark 8:1-9 contain the meal of Jesus with gentiles. He presumes that the large crowd fed by Jesus in Mark 8:1-9 was the gentiles who lived in a town on the east side of the Sea of Galilee. Edward Foley, “Eucharist, Postcolonial Theory and Developmental Disabilities: A Practical Theologian Revisits the Jesus Table,” *International Journal of Practical Theology*, vol. 15 (2011): 61.
Was there any prerequisite in the meals of Jesus? The primary principle found in the meals of Jesus is that of “unconditionality.” Jesus shared his meals with sinners and outcasts. Did Jesus allow them to participate in his table because they believed in Jesus Christ and made a commitment to dedicate themselves to the kingdom of God? Jesus did not offer his meals to them as a reward for their beliefs and dedication. Rather, through the fellowship of the meal Jesus led them to the mission for the kingdom of God. “This dynamic of God’s prevenient outreach” evoked a hope for the kingdom of God from the sinners.

2 The Meals of Jesus as the Messianic Banquet

Some Jews’ criticism of Jesus as being “a glutton and a drunkard” (Matthew 11:19; Luke 7:34) hints how importantly Jesus treated meals in his ministry. It would be an excessive inference that Jesus regarded all his ordinary meals as the eucharist. However, the gospels attest that a good number of meals of Jesus were not simply an act of eating but “a prophetic sign.” Chilton suggests that Jesus attempted to symbolically connect his table fellowship with the banquet in the kingdom of God. The teaching of Jesus through a practice of a meal would effectively lead participants to foretaste the feast of the kingdom of God more than any other parables and sermons through speeches. Chilton writes:

To join in his meals consciously was, in effect, to anticipate the kingdom in a certain manner, the manner delineated by Jesus. Each meal was a proleptic celebration of God’s kingdom; the promise of the next was also an assurance of the kingdom. … Within Jesus’ movement, the bread which sustains us and the wine which rejoices us are taken as a foretaste and a warrant of the kingdom which transform us.

What was the banquet of the kingdom of God which Jesus embodied in his meal practices? The eschatological expectancy of the messianic banquet had often appeared through the Jewish literature since the period of exile. Although Israel had returned from the Babylonian exile to the land God promised, they still lived
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15 Chilton, A Feast of Meanings, 38-39.
16 Ibid., 39.
under pagan rule. The eschatological restoration of Israel which they had anticipated was “liberation from slavery to oppressive pagan rule as well as return from exile.”

God transmitted the message of the salvation and restoration through the prophets to Israel who was in despair. Israel longed for the kingdom established by the messiah and dreamed of the eschatological banquet which would be held on the last day of salvation. What is interesting is that the main guest of the banquet is not only Israel. In the banquet prepared by God, all nations and people along with Israel will be nourished and consoled. This is how the scene of the messianic banquet is described vividly in Isaiah:

On this mountain the Lord of hosts will make for all peoples a feast of rich food, a feast of well-matured wines, of rich food filled with marrow, of well-matured wines strained clear. And he will destroy on this mountain the shroud that is cast over all peoples, the sheet that is spread over all nations; he will swallow up death for ever. Then the Lord God will wipe away the tears from all faces, and the disgrace of his people he will take away from all the earth, for the Lord has spoken.

Echoing the eschatological banquet, Jesus said that “many will come from east and west and will eat with Abraham and Isaac and Jacob in the kingdom of heaven” (Matthew 8:11, NRSV, cf. Luke 13:29). Furthermore, he practised the messianic banquet through the meals shared with sinners and gentiles who were excluded by Jews.

The openness of the banquet of the kingdom is a crucial theme in the parables of Jesus. In Luke 14:15-24, Christ, the host, invites many people to his great banquet. However, those who are invited make excuses and refuse the invitation. Then, the host becomes angry and orders his servant: “Go out at once into the streets and lanes of the town and bring in the poor, the crippled, the blind, and the lame” (Luke 14:21, NRSV). There is still room and the host orders again the servant: “Go out into the roads and lanes, and compel people to come in, so that my house may be filled” (Luke 14:23, NRSV). There are no boundaries for the banquet. Here, Jesus “aggressively gathers a table full of guests, none of whom seems to belong.”

Crossan compares three texts (Luke 14:15-24; Matthew 22:1-14; The Gospel of

18 Paul Fike Stutzman, Recovering the Love Feast: Broadening Our Eucharistic Celebrations (Eugene, OR: WIPE & STOCK, 2011), 27.
19 Isaiah 25:6-8, NRSV.
Thomas 64) containing the parable of the great banquet and insists that all three communities interpreted and altered the original parable according to their own theology and situation. In spite of the differences between the three perspectives, Crossan discovers the common and main theme shared by the three communities, which is “the random and open commensality.”

Similarly, Hultgren explores the three texts and suggests four structures in common:

1. Each has a banquet setting to which persons have been invited previously (according to typical Near Eastern custom).
2. The host sends a slave/slaves to announce to the guests that the banquet is ready (again, according to typical Near Eastern custom).
3. The invited guests reject the invitation.
4. The slave/slaves are sent by the host to bring in replacements from the streets without regard for their social, economic, and religious standing.

Here, also, the openness of the banquet of the kingdom is observed. Especially in section four above, Hultgren provides a more concrete description of the guests who will ultimately participate in the banquet. The final participants go far beyond the expectations of the old Israel. Fabian notes:

The presence of genuinely wrong and unacceptable people at the table was essential for Jesus’ sign. It fits his teaching perfectly. The outstanding heroes of his authentic parables are criminals and pushy women. Jesus’ criminals are real criminals: not to be rehabilitated by our ‘understanding’ how they grew up oppressed or in dysfunctional families; not to be welcomed into our company in hopes they will change their ways. In Jesus’ parables they never change their ways.

Also, Luke 15:11-32, which is generally known for the story of the prodigal son, implies the banquet of the kingdom of God. The epitome of the parable is as follows: The younger son leaves his father with his inheritance. Not long after that, he wastes his wealth with prostitutes. He has to live as the bottom abandoned by everyone. He decides to return to his father. At last, the prodigal son is embraced by his gracious father who has been looking forward to the return of his son. The father holds a grand banquet with a fattened calf although the banquet causes the elder son to complain. This is the last parable among three parables presented in Luke 15. The classical title, the prodigal son, seems to be insufficient to cover the whole story. Vinson, trying not to lose all the three main characters, the father and
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21 Crossan, The Historical Jesus, 262.
23 Fabian, “The Scandalous Table,” 144-145.
the two sons, suggests the title “The Man and His Two Sons.” However, the more we reflect on this set of three parables regarding a lost sheep, coin and son, the clearer it becomes that the main character of the third parable is not the prodigal son or his elder brother but their father. More exactly, the third parable focuses on the father’s love and forgiveness of sinners rather than the two sons’ sin and repentance. Bock gives us a plausible commentary on the three parables:

Jesus’ commitment to the lost, like tax collectors and sinners, is pictured in the parables of the lost sheep, the lost coin, and the prodigal son. Heaven rejoices and welcomes all sinners who return, so Jesus is taking the initiative to find them. Unlike the older brother of the prodigal who complains when his lost brother is restored, we should welcome all who were lost but are now found.

Jesus who loves sinners and waits their return is the host of the banquet of the kingdom of God. For those, supporting the closed table, a principle can be derived from the story that the person who participated in the feast was not an outsider but a son of the host despite his profligacy. For, the son-ship might be interpreted as symbolic of baptism and church membership. However, as Stamm properly notes, “the parable is theological poetry and not a church order filled with rubrics.” Thus, from the parable, what one can expect to gain is not a dogmatic regulation but the knowledge of who God is. When one ponders over Jesus’ motive for the third parable, it is possible that the true message Jesus wanted to transmit through the parable might be more clearly revealed. In Luke 15:1-2, the Pharisees and the scribes blamed Jesus for welcoming and sharing meals with tax collectors and sinners. Then Jesus began to give the three parables to them in response to their criticism. Penetrating the main theme of the third parable, Wright states:

From the moment he generously gives the younger son what he wanted, through to the wonderful homecoming welcome, we have as vivid a picture as anywhere in Jesus’ teaching of what God’s love is like, and of what Jesus himself took as the model for his own ministry of welcome to the outcast and the sinner.

The openness of the banquet to the kingdom of God and the nature of the host of the banquet, that is, God’s love forgiving even sinners, are revealed in the parables.
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26 Stamm, *Let Every Soul Be Jesus’ Guest*, 44.
Jesus taught the essence of the banquet in the kingdom of God through the parables which in turn was realized in his table fellowship.

However, it should be noted that the passages relating to the banquet do not simply describe God as the host full of love and grace. The eschatological banquet is not a joyful celebration for all human beings. The banquet is not the place where God forgives his opponents unconditionally. The sound of the trumpet announcing the beginning of the banquet will be good news for the righteous but a prelude to punishment for the unrighteous. On the day, the unrighteous will be doomed to slaughter (Isaiah 34:1-6). The day will be the day of punishment for the foes of God (Jeremiah 46:10). On the day the Lord will punish all who wear foreign attire except his consecrated guests (Zephaniah 1:7-9).  

Nevertheless, these three passages of the prophets are not to be used as providing biblical reasons for refuting the open table. We need to remember who the host of the banquet is. A human cannot be the host but just a guest. Who does decide who can come to the feast? The sole right to judge whether a guest is righteous or unrighteous is held in the hands of God not in the laws and tradition of church. The Pharisees and the scribes believed that those who were able to come to the feast of God were the righteous in terms of the law. In contrast, Jesus had the table fellowship with sinners and gentiles who were far from the righteous as understood in the Jewish tradition. Through the table fellowship, Jesus recovered the righteousness in the kingdom of God, demolishing all the boundaries which made judgments between the righteous and the sinner under Jewish law. The Jews would have viewed Jesus as a lawbreaker. For Jesus, however, following the word of God was more important than keeping the Jewish tradition. As Fabian notes, Jesus is “loyal to biblical tradition” but “his opponents are the wrongheaded innovators.”

The church’s responsibility is to invite all people to the feast of God. That is the purpose of the God’s calling toward church. Indeed, God is inviting all the people who thirst and hunger.  
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29 Fabian, “The Scandalous Table,” 146.
30 “Ho, everyone who thirsts, come to the waters; and you that have no money, come, buy and eat! Come, buy wine and milk without money and without price. Why do you spend your money for that which is not bread, and your labour for that which does not satisfy? Listen carefully to me, and eat what is good, and delight yourselves in rich food. Incline your ear, and come to me; listen, so that you may live. I will make with you an everlasting covenant, my steadfast, sure love for David.
to the world. Anyone who hears the voice of God’s invitation can come to the table and all participants deserve to relish the rich food prepared by God. The only one who can close the door of the banquet is God. Here, it would be worth hearing Fabian’s insightful comment on the church’s hesitation in conducting the open table:

How remarkable, then, that later Jewish usage followed Jesus’ example better than his Church did! Rabbis soon shifted their focus from the purity of the diners, to the purity of their dinner foods – and the kosher kitchen was born. Today all but ultra-orthodox Jews welcome non-Jews to their tables, while Christians cannot agree formally to eat with each other; instead, we mimic Jesus’ opponents, with their various chaburoth for diners variously purified.  

3 The Cleansing of the Temple

The Synoptic Gospels place the cleansing of the temple in the passion narratives (Matthew 21; Mark 11; Luke 19) but according to John the incident occurs in the early period of Jesus’ public life (John 2). Although the time of the cleansing of the temple is different, the four gospels agree that Jesus entered the temple area and overturned the tables of the money changers and the chairs of the merchants. He expelled them and obstructed anyone carrying merchandise through the temple. What was Jesus’ intention in this action? In order to solve this question, it is necessary to explore the role of the temple system in the Jewish society.

Jewish society was ruled by the purity laws grounded on the Torah. Leviticus expresses the demand that Israel live under the purity system: “You shall be holy, for I am holy” (Leviticus 11:45; 19:2; 20:7, NRSV). In the Jewish purity system, everything in life was classified into “clean” and “unclean.” The purity system controlled Jewish society, categorizing all human acts, regulations, races, sects and even foods into those of purity and impurity. The pursuit of the purity laws ended in religious and social sectarianism with strict boundaries. Countryman gives an
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See, I made him a witness to the peoples, a leader and commander for the peoples. See, you shall call nations that you do not know, and nations that do not know you shall run to you, because of the Lord your God, the Holy One of Israel, for he has glorified you” (Isaiah 55:1-5, NRSV).

31 Fabian, “The Scandalous Table,” 147.

explanation of the significant role of the purity laws and its influence in the Jewish society:

For the Hellenistic Jew of the Diaspora, purity continued to function almost entirely as a way of distinguishing Jew from Gentile … In Palestine, by contrast, the purity code was, to a large extent, simply the way of life of the dominant population group. It served … as a daily reminder of Israelite identity. Of more importance, however, was that particular interpretations of the purity code, especially those of the Essenes and Pharisees, became ways of distinguishing one Jew from another, both in terms of their understanding of the code and in terms of their devotion to the keeping of it. In both cases, the code was still serving its intrinsic function of establishing and keeping boundaries; the boundaries thus guarded, however – ethnic in one case, sectarian in the other- were significantly different.33

A crucial way that Israel came to be holy was to keep purity with the commitment to eat what was clean (cf. Leviticus 11:46, 47).34 In Jews’ ordinary life, a meal was the place where they had to keep the purity laws and where their identity as the chosen people was able to be confirmed. In other words, the matter of what they ate and whom they ate with is a statement of who they are. Indeed, for the Jews, “deciding who could eat with whom was a life-and-death matter.”35 Jewish sectarians showed their identity and doctrine through the meal practice. The Pharisees, the Sadducees and the Essenes all had their own dietary regulations. The Pharisees seemed to have more strictly kept the purity laws in the meal practice than others. They were reluctant to eat food with other Jewish sectarians and, needless to say, declined to eat with gentiles.36

The core of the purity system in the Jewish society was the temple sacrifice. For Jews, the temple was the place where God dwelt. Jews offered God sacrifices in the temple and their sins were forgiven.37 All the offerings were to be without defect and all worshippers also were to be clean. The pursuit of cleanliness in the Temple sacrifice was extended into the ordinary life of Jews. Thus, everything within Israel related not only to sacrifice but every person and every action had to be pure.38 Indeed, the temple was the heart of the religion and the life of Jews. In addition, the

33 Ibid., 64-65.
34 Bruce Chilton, Jesus’ Prayer and Jesus’ Eucharist: His Personal Practice of Spirituality (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1997), 16.
37 Wright, The Challenge of Jesus, 63.
38 Chilton, Jesus’ Prayer and Jesus’ Eucharist, 16.
temple played an important role as a political symbol. Historically, many kings of Israel and political leaders sought the validity of their leadership through cleansing the temple or rebuilding it. In the first century, Menahem, Simon bar-Giora, Bar-Kochba and others used the temple for claiming themselves that each was a messiah and a new king of Israel.\(^{39}\) In other words, for the present ruling powers, the temple was used for reinforcing their regime but the challengers to the leadership insisted that they were the true kings through cleansing the temple. In the temple, Jesus acted quite aggressively with overturning tables of merchants and hindering commercial activities. What was the aim of the actions of Jesus?

According to Wright, the cleansing of the temple was Jesus’ symbolic action that the temple sacrifice would be ended. When Jesus stopped people carrying merchandise necessary for the sacrifice in the temple, spontaneously, the temple sacrifice stopped.\(^{40}\) Similarly, Crossan views that the incident of Jesus in the temple was “a symbolic destruction”\(^{41}\) of the temple system. Crossan focuses on Mark’s intentional positioning of Jesus’ curse on a fig tree between his visitation in the temple and the cleansing of the temple in Mark 11. In Mark 11:11, Jesus enters the temple and observes everything that happens there and goes out to Bethany. The next day, on the way from Bethany to the temple, Jesus curses a fig tree which has no fruit but leaves: “May no one ever eat fruit from you again” (Mark 11:14, NRSV). Then Jesus enters the temple again and cleanse it. The next morning, Jesus and his disciples see the fig tree withered from the roots (Mark 11:20). When considering the plot of these episodes, Mark understands the cleansing of the temple as Jesus’ symbolic action to announce that the temple system has already been destroyed or at least would be soon.\(^{42}\)

On the other hand, Chilton insists that Jesus’ occupation of the temple means not the fulfillment of the prophecy of the destruction of the temple system but a cleansing for the recovery of true temple sacrifice.\(^{43}\) According to Chilton, the target of Jesus’ critique was not the temple sacrifice but the distorted temple

\(^{39}\) Wright, *The Challenge of Jesus*, 63.

\(^{40}\) Ibid., 67.

\(^{41}\) Crossan, *The Historical Jesus*, 357.

\(^{42}\) Ibid., 357-358.

sacrifice by Caiaphas’ innovation of introducing traders into the temple.44 Also, Bond views that Jesus’ occupation of the temple was not against the temple sacrifice or the temple itself. However, in different way from Chilton, Bond insists that the purpose of the action of Jesus in the temple was not against the commercialism or corruption of the temple. She relates the actions of Jesus in the temple to the teachings of prophets in the Old Testament:

The image which Jesus’ actions would most have evoked in his contemporaries, however, was that of the prophets of old – Amos, Micah, Isaiah, Hosea and Jeremiah. Each of these spoke out against the Temple; it was not that they were against sacrifice or festivals, but they clearly saw that these were not the most important things. What God really wanted was obedience, kindness, morality and justice.45

Was the purpose of Jesus’ occupation of the temple a prophetic action related to the destruction of the temple and its sacrificial system? Was the occupation intended for the recovery of the temple sacrifice through criticizing commercialism and the corruption of the priests? Or, was his action in the temple intended for teaching that worship pleasing God is not concerned with burnt offerings but with the moral life of worshippers? Discovering the purpose of Jesus’ occupation of the temple is not a simple problem. Information about the historical Jesus is limited and, further, even the little information might be interpreted in various ways as observed above.

However, despite a sharp contrast between these opinions, there is common ground that Jesus was not satisfied with the temple at this time. We observe Jesus and his disciples kept meeting, teaching and praying in the temple (Mark 12:35; 14:49; Acts 2:46; 3:1; 5:42; 22:17), and this implies that Jesus would probably have regarded the temple as a means of grace. At least, he does not seem to insist that the temple and sacrifice should be immediately demolished. Nevertheless, for Jesus, the temple was not the best place to meet God and the temple sacrifice was not the best way to be forgiven. Jesus disclosed in his messages and actions that the final day of the temple was coming and after that day people would worship God in a new way in a new temple (John 4:21; Matthew 27:51; Mark 15:38; Luke 23:45).

44 Originally, the market for the sacrificial animals was located on the Mount of Olives not in the temple. However, Caiaphas installed vendors in the porticos of the temple and expelled the Pharisees and teachers who taught the laws and supervised the temple sacrifice from that place. For more detail, see Chilton, Jesus’ Prayer and Jesus’ Eucharist, 59-70.

45 Bond, The Historical Jesus, 142.
Moreover, the day of the new temple is not only about the future but also embraces the past and the present. Jesus had already shown through his ministry what worshippers had to do in this form of worship in the era of the new temple. Wright finds the meaning of the kingdom of God which has already come in Jesus’ explanation of the time of a fast in Mark 2:18-22. Some people asked Jesus why his disciples did not fast but the Pharisees and the disciples of John the Baptist did so. Jesus said to them that guests cannot fast while the bridegroom is with them. That is to say, there is no reason for a fast because the bridegroom Jesus is in the banquet. According to Wright, for Jews, a fast was not a simple religious discipline. Since the period of exile, Jews had fasted in waiting for the restoration of the temple. They would stop fasting when Yahweh recovered the temple. Zechariah prophesized that the days of the fast would be seasons of joy and gladness and happy festivals (Zechariah 8:19). About five hundred years after the prophecy of Zechariah, Jews were still living the period of exile. Geographically they returned to their ancestors’ land and temporally the Babylonian exile period was over. However, they were still ruled by the laws of the Roman Empire. Pious Jews continuously conducted fasts, anticipating the day that God would rebuild the new temple. In contrast to the belief of the Jews, Jesus said that now was not the time to fast. In Jesus’ words, the wedding banquet has been already held and the bridegroom is here with us. The new temple promised by God has been recovered. Now is the time to enjoy the great banquet with Jesus the messiah.

The cleansing of the temple of Jesus was part of Jesus’ movement towards the kingdom of God. In the light of the kingdom of God, Jesus’ action in the temple was not an accidental incident. The kingdom of God was the essence of the ministry of Jesus which was proclaimed by preaching, taught in the parables, experienced in miracles and embodied in table fellowship. The temple envisaged by Jesus in the light of the kingdom of God was the place where the feast promised by the prophet Isaiah (25:6-8) for all nations and peoples was to be held. However, temple sacrifice at that time was hindering the banquet of the kingdom of God. The temple which had to be a house of prayer for all nations was used as a den of robbers (Matthew 21:13; Mark 11:17; Luke 19:46). The temple was no longer the house that God dwelt in and the holy place that God met with his people.

46 Wright, The Challenge of Jesus, 70.
47 Ibid., 71.
temple was just a building which had lost its function and meaning. According to Wright, Jesus recognized clearly the limitation of the old temple system and believed that the new temple had to be restored.48 Jesus says to a Samaritan woman that in the time of the new temple people will worship God in a new way with a new concept of worship place not the old temple (John 4:21). If not in the temple, where will be the place YHWH dwells in? Where can we worship God and meet him? If we cannot be forgiven through temple sacrifice any longer, where and how can we receive the forgiveness of sins?

4 Jesus is the New Temple

In the New Testament, both views of anti-temple and pro-temple coexist. First of all, the pro-temple perspective is clearly present in Luke-Acts. Perrin provides the following evidence:

It is in the temple that John's birth is announced (Luke 1.5-25) and that Jesus is circumcised (2.21-40); it is to the temple the young boy Jesus returns, insisting on his need to be at his 'Father's house' (2.49). Later, Jesus sends those he heals to the temple priests (17.14), enjoins temple prayer (18.9-14), and commends temple giving (21.1-4). In Acts, following Pentecost, the Christians continue to meet in the temple (Acts 2.46; 3.11; 5.12), while the leaders of the movement maintain established hours of temple prayer (3.1). In this context, the temple grounds serve as the primary venue for the Jerusalemite Christians’ proclamation (5.17-42). Further on in the narrative, Paul shaves his head as part of a vow that can only be discharged through the temple (18.18); he also pays for the offering of his four companions, as the culmination of purification rites (21.17-26).49

Also, in other gospels one can find a description of Jesus who does not seem to argue that the temple sacrifice should end immediately. Nevertheless, all four gospels agree that Jesus prophesied that the old temple would be destroyed and the new temple would be rebuilt. According to Walker, the focus of Mark is not the Jerusalem temple but Jesus who will recover the new temple made without hands after the destruction of the old temple (Mark 14:58).50 Similarly Watts, finding a

49 Perrin, Jesus the Temple, 61-62.
crucial role for the four Davidic Psalms (2, 118, 110, and 22) which are used by Mark in his understanding of the relationship between Jesus and the temple, notes:

[Mark] presents Jesus as both Israel’s Davidic Messiah (Pss. 2, 118) and the temple’s Lord (Ps. 110) who, coming to purge Jerusalem but rejected by the temple authorities, announces the present structure’s destruction and, through his death and vindication (Ps. 22), its replacement with a new people-temple centered on himself.51

Matthew recognizes Jesus as “something greater than the temple” (Matthew 12:6, NRSV). The presence of God is experienced not in the temple but when two or three people pray Jesus is with them (Matthew 18:19-20).52 It is unclear whether Luke understands Jesus as the new temple or not. However, it is obvious that Luke illustrates Jesus as the new high priest. For this, Perrin provides as evidence: “Jesus’ touching a leper without incurring uncleanness (Luke 5:12-16), his forgiving sins (Luke 5:17-26), [and] his assumption of Davidic priestly status (Luke 6:1-10).”53 In addition, Luke records that Jesus prophesized the destruction of the temple (Luke 21:5-6); at the moment of the death of Jesus the veil of the temple was torn in two from top to bottom (Luke 23:45); not in Jerusalem where the temple stood but in Bethany, Jesus blessed his people and they worshipped him before his ascension (Luke 24:50-52).54 These texts can be interpreted as Luke’s anti-temple perspective, and, at the very least, as Luke’s expectation of the new temple.

While Luke views Jesus as the high priest and Matthew and Mark allude to the understanding of Jesus as the new temple, John declares clearly that Jesus is the new temple. Kerr finds from the account of John that “Jesus replaces and fulfils the Jerusalem Temple and its cultic activity.”55 Carson, also, analyzing John 2:19-21,56 remarks:

John explains that what Jesus was really referring to (in v. 19) was his own body, that body in which the Word became flesh (1:14). The Father and the incarnate Son enjoy unique mutual indwelling (14:10-11). Therefore it is the human body of Jesus that uniquely manifests the Father, and becomes the

---

52 Walker, Jesus and the Holy City, 302.
53 Perrin, Jesus the Temple, 62.
54 Ibid., 62-63.
56 “Jesus answered them, ‘Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up.’ The Jews then said, ‘This temple has been under construction for forty-six years, and will you raise it up in three days?’ But he was speaking of the temple of his body” (John 2:19-21, NRSV).
focal point of the manifestation of God to man, the living abode of God on earth, the fulfillment of all the temple meant, and the centre of all true worship (over against all other claims of ‘holy space,’ 4:20-24). In this ‘temple’ the ultimate sacrifice would take place; within three days of death and burial, Jesus Christ, the true temple, would rise from the dead.  

Further, the conversation between Jesus and a Samaritan woman by a well in Sychar demonstrates that Jesus embodies not only the new temple but also the new place of worship. The woman asks Jesus regarding the place of worship, as her ancestors worshipped on the mountain in Samaria but Jews adhered to worshipping in Jerusalem. In a contrasting way to her interest in the place of worship, Jesus answers that what pleases God is not the holiness of the place of worship but those who worship in spirit and truth.  

In the time of the Old Testament, the place of sacrifice, that is, the temple was considered to be crucial. However, the Fourth Gospel gives a new approach to worship that what is important in the worship of the kingdom of God is not a matter of place. For, the only place of worship is Jesus. Jesus is the new temple, the new place of worship in the kingdom of God. Carson connects the new concept of worship presented in John 4 and the new Jerusalem in Revelation 21, and suggests that John has a clear understanding of Jesus as the object and the place of worship in new Jerusalem, the kingdom of God. John sees the new Jerusalem in a vision: “I saw no temple in the city, for its temple is the Lord God the Almighty and the Lamb” (Revelation 21:22, NRSV). In the worship of the kingdom of God, a single sanctuary, that is, the temple and sacrificial offerings are no longer necessary. Jesus is the holiest temple and the eternal lamb. In addition, John 7 shows the recognition of Jesus as the eschatological new temple. Walker suggests that John 7:37-38 echo the image of the eschatological temple prophesized in Ezekiel 47:9. Here, Ezekiel prophesizes that wherever the water from the temple, the salt water will become fresh and everything will live. Likewise, “[Jesus] cried out, ‘Let anyone who is thirsty come to me, and let the one who believes in me drink. As the

58 “Jesus said to her, ‘Woman, believe me, the hour is coming when you will worship the Father neither on this mountain nor in Jerusalem. You worship what you do not know; we worship what we know, for salvation is from the Jews’” (John 4:21-22, NRSV).
61 Walker, Jesus and the Holy City, 302.
scripture has said, Out of the believer’s heart shall flow rivers of living water’” (John 7:37-38, NRSV).

In John, the time of the new worship is also a crucial theme. When will the kingdom of God, the new Jerusalem, which brings about a genuine transformation in worship come? In John 4, Jesus has a clear recognition of the eschatological time to worship God in an entirely different way. For Jesus, the time of the new worship is the future which is “coming” and at the same time the present which is “now here.”

It is not certain whether Jesus said that the temple worship must be ended immediately. However, there is no doubt that Jesus had said that the kingdom of God had already come with him and now was the time to worship in a new way. The eschatological time of the new worship definitely embraces the present. The distinctive nature of eschatological time, “already and not yet,” is a crucial theme consistently found in John: “Very truly, I tell you, the hour is coming, and is now here, when the dead will hear the voice of the Son of God, and those who hear will live” (John 5:25, NRSV):

In John, the “last things” (eschatology) are not solely defined by the progression of time; believers do not have to wait until some distant future to experience the “last things,” the fullness of God’s kingdom. Johannine eschatology holds present hopes and future expectations together through the incarnate presence of God in Jesus. In the Word-made-flesh, the “last things” are already under way. Worship in “the hour” will be worship not defined by a particular place, but will be worship “in spirit and in truth,” worship shaped by God’s own character.

When considering Jesus who had an innovative concept of worship and the temple, Jesus’ attempt to cleanse the temple would have become a sufficient reason for the Jewish authorities to execute him (Matthew 21:15, 46; Mark 21:18; Luke 20:47). For, the temple system had played an important role in Jewish society and for Rome’s effective rule over that region as well. Despite his opponents’ threats, Jesus went about his ministry unceasingly for the kingdom of God through teaching and

---

62 “But the hour is coming, and is now here, when the true worshippers will worship the Father in spirit and truth, for the Father seeks such as these to worship him. God is spirit, and those who worship him must worship in spirit and truth” (John 4:21-22, NRSV).

63 O’Day, and Hylen, John, 54.
meal practices. Jewish authorities began to plan more thoroughly to execute Jesus. About that time, Jesus knew that the time of his death was near.64

5 Researching the Last Supper

Jesus shared the last supper with his disciples before the death on the cross. The Synoptic Gospels attest that Jesus instituted the first eucharist at the last supper. However, the studies of the eucharist of John and the early church documents referred to in former chapters suggest that the origin of the eucharist is not the last supper but Jesus' meal practices reflecting the anticipation of the kingdom of God. In other words, the last supper is part of the eucharist not the origin of eucharist. Thus, an attempt to derive a ritual regulation or eucharistic model from the last supper would lead to diminishing or distorting the meaning of the eucharist. In order to understand more exactly what the last supper was, one needs to observe the meal from the perspective of the kingdom of God.

According to Smith, the last supper was one of Greco-Roman meals.65 On the other hand, Chilton finds various features of Jewish meals such as Haburah, Kiddush and Todah from the last supper.66 However, defining the type of the meal is important but does not seem to be a decisive factor in understanding the nature of the eucharist. For the type of the meal is just an instrumental tool used by Jesus to embody the kingdom of God which is the essence of his meal practices. As Chilton correctly recognizes, in the expectation of the banquet of the kingdom of God, Jesus was not at all limited to a fixed type of meal.67 In the massive eucharistic banquets of the feedings of the five thousand and the four thousand and the meals


65 Smith insists that the meals of Jesus including the last supper reflect the Greco-Roman banquet or symposium tradition. He says, "These include such features as reclining (Mark 2:15; 6:39; 8:6; 14:3; 14:18 [and synoptic parallels]; Luke 7:36; 11:37; 14:7; 24:30), washing of the feet prior to reclining (Luke 7:44; John 13:3-5), anointing the head with perfumes (Mark 14:3), saying prayers before the deipnon [the main meal of the day, interpreted and interpolated by this writer] (Mark 6:41; 8:6-7; 14:22), ranking at the table (Luke 14:7) and at the symposium (Mark 14:23), sharing a wine libation around the table (Mark 14:23), discourse on appropriate themes during the symposium (Luke 14:7-24), ending the meal with a hymn (Mark 14:26). ... These and other motifs in the Jesus meal tradition derive from Greco-Roman meal customs as associated especially with the archetype of the formal meal, the banquet." See, Smith, From Symposium to Eucharist, 222-223.

66 Chilton, Jesus' Prayer and Jesus' Eucharist, 56-57.

67 Ibid., 57.
shared with sinners, tax collectors and gentiles, Jesus opened a new paradigm of the meal fellowship of the kingdom of God beyond the boundaries strictly drawn by the Jewish laws. Thus Chilton reckons the distinctive feature of the new meal fellowship in the kingdom to be one of “inclusiveness.”

If the last supper was part of Jesus’ meal practice of the kingdom of God, did the last supper reflect inclusiveness? Rather, did not the synoptic accounts regarding the last supper imply a symbol of exclusiveness? For, the Synoptic Gospels suggested that the last supper was the meal of Jesus which was shared with his twelve male disciples. Even though the Fourth Gospel does not specify the number and sex of the disciples participating in the last supper, when one considers the nature of the “last” supper of Jesus with his disciples before death, it is presumable that Jesus would have eaten the last meal with his twelve disciples. Yet, the problem is that the membership of the disciples at the last supper is used for the argument that the eucharist should be open to only baptized members. Farwell, for example, regards that there were two different meal practices of Jesus - the meals before the last supper and also the last supper. Each meal practice had its own purpose, form and audience. In the former Jesus opened his table to all, but in the latter, that is the eucharist, only disciples who had already committed themselves to the vision of Jesus participated. Thus, he insists that only those who dedicate themselves to the kingdom of God can participate in the eucharist. From this point of view, Farwell writes:

Such a practice is not inhospitable, but simply focused for a certain “audience”: the eucharistic meal is the place where the disciples continue to gather in intimate communion with Jesus Christ and from which they are empowered to move out into wider ministries of evangelism and service, including a ministry of eating and drinking in contexts beyond the bounds of this ritual practice.

However, even if the twelve disciples participated in the last supper, the significance of the inclusiveness of the eucharist cannot be diminished when one raises these questions: Were the twelve disciples “truly” the disciples of Jesus? Did they “truly” believe and “fully” understand who Jesus was? The four gospels seem to agree that all the twelve disciples are not of perfect character. According to John (1:35-51) and

---

68 Ibid., 58.
Mark (1:16-20), when Jesus called the disciples, they seem to have followed Jesus instantly but in Luke (5:1-11) they followed Jesus after experiencing the miracle of the catching of fish. The actions of James and John, the two sons of Zebedee who claimed a glorious seat beside Jesus (Mark 10:37), in following Jesus seem to be largely political rather than arising from a pure heart. At a certain moment, they express their strong belief in Jesus but suddenly change their minds. Peter, who pledged his loyalty to Jesus, denied him three times (Matthew 26:69-75; Mark 14:66-72; Luke 22:56-62; John 18:17, 25-27). Other disciples, also, deserted Jesus when they faced the threat of personal safety (Matthew 26:56; Mark 14:50). Most of all, it is remarkable that the disciples showed a lack of understanding about what they were doing at the last supper (Luke 22:24). When Jesus washes his disciples' feet at the last supper, Peter's question reveals the mind of other disciples: “Lord, are you going to wash my feet?” (John 13:6, NRSV). Jesus responds: “You do not know now what I am doing, but later you will understand” (John 13:7, NRSV). Jesus’ answer connotes that the disciples will understand what they are doing in the future but currently they do not know it. Decisively, Jesus did not prohibit even Judas who was possessed with Satan (John 13:27) from sitting at the table of the kingdom of God. Although it is considerably unlikely that his seat in the kingdom would be eternal, Jesus, apparently, allowed the betrayer to participate in the last supper. The vulnerability of the disciples did not change even after the resurrection of Jesus. Thomas did not believe in the resurrection of Jesus until the risen Lord appeared before him (John 20:24-25). The two disciples going to Emmaus did not recognize the risen Lord even after they spent a considerable time with him (Luke 24:16). These stories reveal who the disciples really were. Nevertheless, Jesus invited them to the banquet of the kingdom of God. Jesus accepted them as they were. The banquet of the kingdom of God was controlled under the laws of grace and inclusiveness that it is indeed hard for human beings to imagine. If one has to draw a eucharistic principle from the last supper, the focus needs to be on “Jesus’ practices of eating with sinners and filling the bellies of all comers” rather than membership.

71 Jeffrey A. Trumbower, Born from Above (Tubingen: J. C. B. Mohr, 1992), 129-130.
One of the difficult issues in understanding the last supper is the interpretation of the sayings of Jesus: “This is my body; this is my blood.” According to the synoptic accounts, Jesus mentioned these words first at the last supper. If the words were exclusively connected to the last supper, it seems to be natural that the focus of the words is on the broken body and the blood shed on the cross as is the traditional eucharistic understanding. For, the last supper was the last and most crucial event to occur before the death on the cross.

Recently, however, Chilton has given a convincing interpretation of the words that is different from the traditional one. While Chilton recognizes the words as being firstly instituted at the last supper, at the same time he does not directly connect the bread and the cup with the death of Jesus on the cross. Here, he attempts to interpret the words in relation to Jesus' cleansing of the temple rather than the death of Jesus. He suggests that when considering Jesus’ attempts to reform the temple sacrifice, the most natural meaning of the terms blood and body would be the replacement of the blood and flesh of an animal sacrificed in the temple. Chilton writes:

As he shared wine, he referred to it as the equivalent of the blood of an animal, shed in sacrifice; When he shared bread, he claimed its value was as that of sacrificial flesh. Such offerings were purer, more readily accepted by God, than what was sacrificed in a Temple which had become corrupt.

Chilton’s interpretation of the sayings of Jesus at the last supper is plausible in terms of the separation of the eucharistic elements from a direct connection with Jesus’ death. He views that the wine and bread were not Jesus’ personal blood and body, which would be shed and broken on the cross as a sacrifice, but new sacrificial offerings replacing the temple sacrifices. The new sacrificial offerings pleasing God were in the form of ordinary food such as bread and wine which were offered and owned by ordinary people not by the temple priests. Jesus’ meals with bread and wine were “a better sacrifice than what was offered in the Temple.”

---

74 Chilton, *Jesus’ Prayer and Jesus’ Eucharist*, 72.
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77 He views that the connection between the wine and bread and Jesus’ personal body and blood is a theological development of later church. See Chilton, *Jesus’ Prayer and Jesus’ Eucharist*, 72-73.
78 Chilton, *A Feast of Meaning*, 66-68.
79 Chilton, *Jesus’ Prayer and Jesus’ Eucharist*, 73.
Furthermore, the Fourth Gospel records that right after the miraculous feeding of the five thousand Jesus mentioned the words in teaching Jews in the synagogue in Capernaum (John 6:59). As we observed in chapter four of this study, not only the Fourth Gospel but also the early church documents attest that the sayings of Jesus in the eucharist originated in his other meal practices not the last supper. When considering Jesus who consistently embodied the kingdom of God and the words “my body and blood” in his whole ministry, the real meanings of the words cannot be restricted to the theology of Good Friday.

Jesus was really flogged, crucified, and killed. The crucifixion is a decisive event in the redemptive ministry of Christ. Nevertheless, when we focus too much on the death of Christ on the cross, other precious eucharistic themes which must be tasted in the feast of the kingdom of God disappear into the darkness. During the eucharist which is immersed in the death of Christ, the words “my body and blood” remind participants of Jesus who was sacrificed on the cross. Yet, in the experience of the eucharist as a banquet of the kingdom of God the focus of the words is entirely changed. Jesus who was killed in the past is now present in the eucharist. The consciousness of the presence of Jesus induces a shift in interpretation regarding “my body and blood.” If Jesus is already present in the eucharist, the eucharistic elements of bread and cup do not necessarily mean the personal body and blood of Jesus.

In this new perspective of the eucharist as the banquet of the kingdom, the words “my body and blood” become the food of life provided by Jesus who is the host of the banquet. With the bread and wine, the food of life, Jesus feeds the bodies and souls of his guests. To have eternal life by taking sacred foods was an important motif of the Jewish messianic banquet at the time of Jesus. This motif is found in much Jewish literature. Smith writes of the motif of sacred foods as a feature of the messianic banquet. In *Joseph and Aseneth*, all who eat a honeycomb, which is the food of angels, gain “immortality” (16:8-9). In *Odes of Solomon*, “the living water” of eternity delivers the souls from the death (6:8-18). Jesus would have understood

---

80 The bread and wine as the food of life or spiritual food were a crucial theme in the eucharistic understandings of the Fourth Gospel, the *Didache*, Ignatius of Antioch, Justin Martyr and Irenaeus. For more details, see chapter four of this study.
81 Smith, *From Symposium to Eucharist*, 166.
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undoubtedly the motif of the messianic banquet in the Jewish tradition involving the Old Testament:

The Lord spoke to Moses, saying: Speak to the people of Israel and say to them: These are the appointed festivals of the Lord that you shall proclaim as holy convocations, my appointed festivals.\(^{83}\)

The presence of the Lord and his feeding of his followers with the food of life becomes the core of the eucharist of both the Old and New testaments. Wainwright writes:

[T]he eucharist is rightly, and \textit{adequately}, set into relation with the final kingdom if it is viewed as an (anticipatory) feeding with Christ, at His table, on the fruits of the new creation. This view would undoubtedly be true to a strong, indeed the strongest, strand in biblical and dominical teaching on the relation between the eucharist and the final messianic feasting; for not only does it stand in line with the Old Testament notions of eating and drinking in the presence of the Lord and of being fed at the Lord’s hand …, but also it stands in line with Jesus’ meal activity throughout His earthly ministry, and with the eschatological prospect He opened up at the Last Supper.\(^{84}\)

With the vision of the messianic banquet, Jesus shared his meals with his people. The motif of the sacred food of the messianic banquet found in the Jewish tradition is clearly observed in John’s illustration of Jesus. Jesus is \(\text{ὅ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς}\) (the bread of life, John 6:48). Whoever eats of the bread of life will have \(\text{ζωὴν αἰώνιον}\) (eternal life, John 6:54). Whoever drinks of the water given by Jesus will never be thirsty, as the water is \(\text{ὕδωρ ζωήν}\) (the living water, John 4:10).\(^{85}\)

The consciousness of the presence of Jesus in the eucharist, also, influences the mood of the eucharist. At the last supper, Jesus says: “Truly I tell you, I will never again drink of the fruit of the vine …” (Mark 14:25, NRSV). “[A] prophetic symbol of his imminent death”\(^{86}\) is clearly expressed in this passage. However, the allusion to the death was not the end of the sayings of Jesus. The gloomy atmosphere is rapidly changed into a positive expectation involving a desire for the feast of the kingdom of God: “… until that day when I drink it new in the kingdom of God.”\(^{87}\)

\(^{83}\) Leviticus 23:1-2, NRSV. See also Isaiah 25:6-8.


\(^{85}\) Smith, \textit{From Symposium to Eucharist}, 167.


Bieler and Schottroff give a remarkable interpretation of this passage in terms of eschatological banquet:

These words of Jesus express hope for the messianic meal, something Jesus shared with many Jewish people. Again and again, in ever new ways, they indicated that, when heaven and earth are made new, God will invite the people of God, or all nations, to a great banquet. All will eat and drink equally well in God’s reign. For Jesus, God’s future is in his words, the messianic banquet, a future that is already tangible as he eats with his own.88

The kingdom of God as the present event was consistently pursued in the ministry of Jesus, and also was found in the last supper. Although the death of Jesus was at hand, the disciples were participating in the supper with Jesus the bridegroom. It should be noted that the mention of a fast was a vow of Jesus, not a command which was given to his disciples. At the last supper, where the feast of the kingdom of God was held, the bridegroom was with his guests. Thus, what the guests had to do was not a fast but the enjoyment of the feast of the kingdom of God. The eucharist is a mysterious event that the future becomes the present when the church eats the bread and drinks the cup in anticipation of the kingdom of God. Focusing on the eucharist described in Mark 14:25 and Luke 22:15-16, Jenson gives a notable understanding of the eucharist as the eschatological banquet:

These texts display the eschatological joy of the primal church’s meals and give the narrative content of the cry that is the core of all Christian worship, Maranatha, “Come Lord.” When the Eucharist is celebrated, Christ’s promises of the Kingdom and of his presence in it are in fact fulfilled: even though the Kingdom is still future so long as we are not risen, each celebration is already a wedding feast.89

The last supper was not the origin of the eucharist but one of the eucharists held by Jesus in his ministry with the vision of the kingdom of God. Jesus shared the last supper with his twelve disciples. However, the focus should be not on the membership of twelve male disciples but on Jesus who allowed even Judas the betrayer to participate in his meal. The recognition of the last supper as part of Jesus’ meal practices leads the church to broaden its eucharistic understanding from the theology of Good Friday to the presence of Jesus. When the church focuses the presence of Jesus, the eucharistic elements can be the food provided by Jesus who is

present in the eucharist. The eucharist is also the messianic banquet where participants are fed with sacred food and receive eternal life. The eucharist is also the eschatological banquet. In the eucharist, participants experience the kingdom of God and at the same time look forward to the coming of the kingdom.

6 The Meals of Jesus after the Resurrection

Now, the focus of the last part of this chapter will be on the meals of Jesus after the resurrection. According to Luke, the last meal of Jesus on the earth was not the last supper. The risen Jesus visited the two disciples, Cleopas and his companion who were on the road to Emmaus in a state of despair. The two disciples seem to have been surprised by Jesus’ marvelous explanation of all the scriptures. They urged Jesus to stay with them. Jesus accepted their request and shared a meal with them. Here, Luke describes the scene using special language: “When he was at the table with them, he took bread, blessed and broke it, and gave it to them” (Luke 24:30, NRSV). The four-fold action⁹⁰ used in this verse is also observed in the illustrations of the eucharist of Luke 9 and 22 and Acts 27. Through the use of technical language indicating the eucharist, Luke reveals that the meal in Emmaus was the eucharist not an ordinary meal.⁹¹ Furthermore, focusing on the languages of the four-fold action found in the main Lukan accounts of the eucharist, LaVerdiere suggests that the meal at Emmaus echoes liturgically the actual eucharist which would have been conducted by the Lukan community better than other eucharistic texts:

Taking the bread, blessing, breaking and giving it to the disciples refers to the breaking of bread, the eucharist, just as it did when Jesus hosted the 5,000 at Bethsaida and the Twelve at the Last Supper. ... At Emmaus, the liturgical statement is more refined literarily than it was at Bethsaida and at the Last Supper. At Bethsaida, all the elements were there - taking, blessing, breaking and giving - but were adapted to the needs of the story with its five loaves and two fish, as in Mark 6:41. At the Last Supper, roughly the same elements remained very close to the liturgical text in use at Antioch, with two participles – “taking” and “giving thanks” - followed by two verbs in the indicative – “broke” and “gave.” Liturgically this is fine because of its

---

⁹⁰ Taking – blessing - breaking – giving. According to Dix, these four actions are essential elements of every eucharistic rite. Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy (1947), 48.
relation to the rite, but literarily it is somewhat clumsy: “and taking bread, having given thanks, he broke and gave to them” (22:19). At Emmaus we have two parallel clauses, each with a participle and a verb in the indicative: “taking the bread, he blessed, and breaking, he gave to them,” showing how well Luke could retain the liturgical flavor of a text while using it in a story. 92

The Emmaus story affirms that Jesus is the host of the banquet of the kingdom of God. At first, the two disciples provided hospitality to Jesus with a dwelling place and food. However, the situation was radically changed when the eucharist began. The two disciples became guests and the former guest, Jesus, became the host. 93 It was not the disciples but Jesus who took the bread and gave it to them (Luke 24:30). The true meaning of the hospitality which has to be given in the eucharist can be more exactly apprehended when one ponders the time that the two disciples recognized Jesus. Not before, but during or after, they received the bread from Jesus, they recognized him (Luke 24:31). The two disciples did not understand the meaning of the bread and did not even recognize Jesus. In a sense, they were passive betrayers of Jesus. When Jesus was arrested and suffered all the disciples deserted him and fled (Matthew 26:56; Mark 14:50). They were still foolish and unbelievers (Luke 24:25). When they heard the news of Jesus’ resurrection from a woman, they regarded it as nonsense (Luke 24:11). Nevertheless, Jesus did not hesitate to give them the bread. After the hospitality of Jesus was given to the unenlightened disciples, an important change happened in them. Their eyes were opened and they were able to recognize Jesus, the risen Lord. The eucharist at Emmaus was a means of grace which enabled the betrayers and unbelievers to be transformed into true disciples and the faithful.

The meal at Emmaus was not the only meal after the resurrection. Jesus presented himself before his disciples in Jerusalem when they shared a meal (Luke 24:36; cf Mark 16:14). On the shore of the Sea of Tiberius, the risen Lord prepared bread and fish for his disciples (John 21:1-13). As Joncas notes, after the resurrection, Jesus seems to have shared his meals with only his disciples. 94 However, when we observe those meals in the light of the kingdom of God we can realize that the purpose of the stories is not to give a regulation regarding eucharistic boundaries.

92 LaVerdiere, _Dining in the Kingdom of God_, 170.
94 Joncas, “Tasting the Kingdom of God,” 351.
The main theme of the meals after the resurrection is that “[t]he risen, living Lord eats and drinks with his disciples.” The eucharist after the resurrection was not a remembrance of the death of Jesus but a vivid experience of the presence of the living Lord. In addition, when we ponder over the spiritual condition of the disciples it becomes obvious that these texts related to the meals after the resurrection cannot be used as a biblical proof for supporting the closed table. The participants in the eucharist are rebuked by the risen Lord due to their unbelief and doubtfulness (Mark 16:14; cf Luke 24:37-38). Although it was early in the morning, the seven disciples did not realize it was Jesus who stood on the shore (John 21:4). In addition, even after they had a conversation with Jesus, they did not realize it was him (John 21:5-7). Nevertheless, for such disciples, the risen Lord prepared food (John 21:12). If the meals after the resurrection were indeed the eucharist, and if one can draw eucharistic principles from those meals, Jesus’ hospitality, forgiveness and inclusiveness can be included.

7 Summary and Evaluation

This chapter has focused on the meal practice of Jesus. The meals of Jesus went beyond ordinary food which filled those who hungered. The meals of Jesus were the most powerful symbol of the banquet of the kingdom of God. Through the meals Jesus showed to the world what the banquet of the kingdom of God really is.

The act of eating in the meals of Jesus was not only a foretaste of the banquet of the kingdom of God, but also an effective way to teach the laws of the kingdom. At the time of Jesus, Jewish society was ruled by the purity laws which had been secured and retained by the temple system. The distinctive character of the temple system was exclusiveness. However, the exclusiveness was challenged by the inclusiveness of Jesus’ meal practices shared with tax collectors and sinners who were excluded by the purity laws. More exactly, as Joncas states: “It wasn’t simply that Jesus ate with objectionable persons - outcasts and sinners - but that he ate with anyone,

---

Jesus shared unceasingly inclusive meals with anyone who wanted to come to his table.

The traditional eucharistic understanding used to draw the biblical authority from the last supper stories in order to support its eucharistic regulation, that is, the so-called closed table. For, the Synoptic Gospels describe that Jesus shared the last supper with only his twelve male disciples. However, even in the last supper the inclusiveness of Jesus’ meal practice is not diminished. All four Gospels describe the participants in the last supper as those who have a vulnerable faith in Jesus and a lack of understanding of the eucharist. Moreover, among the participants, there was Judas the betrayer. Nevertheless, Jesus did not prohibit them from participating in the eucharist.

The supreme laws in Jesus' meal practice were generosity and hospitality. In the banquet of the kingdom of God ruled by these laws, the exclusiveness dividing between the people of God became obsolete. There was no boundary, nor discrimination in participating in the meals of Jesus. Chilton gives an explanation of the prerequisite for the meals of Jesus with fascinating expressions:

A sufficient condition for eating in his company and for entry into the kingdom [was] a readiness to accept the hospitality, ... [and] a willingness to provide for the meals, ... to join in the fellowship ... [and] to forgive and to be forgiven.97

Through the meals, Jesus both envisaged and embodied the kingdom of God. This eucharistic perspective of the meals of Jesus challenges the church to renew its eucharistic theology. The next chapter will examine the main issues of traditional eucharistic theology and respond to each issue, in order to seek the theological base for the theology of the open table.

---

96 Joncas, “Tasting the Kingdom of God,” 350
97 Chilton, A Feast of Meanings, 146. Brackets are added by this author.
Chapter 7

The Theological Basis for the Theology of the Open Table

Since the third century, mainline churches have developed their eucharistic practices on the basis of traditional eucharistic theology adhering to the last supper tradition. Traditional eucharistic theology has been embodied in the churches’ eucharistic regulations. In the case of the PCK, traditional eucharistic theology has led the church to develop its eucharistic regulation which allows only baptized people who are the age of fifteen and over to participate in the eucharist. However, around the end of the twentieth century, the open table began to be introduced to the church. Those who upheld the eucharistic regulation of “baptism before the eucharist” would be upset when they heard about the open table. They considered the open table as a serious challenge to the church tradition which had been preserved since the early church. At the same time, the introduction of the open table caused theological controversies in the PCK. This chapter will explore the main theological issues raised by scholars supporting traditional eucharistic understanding and suggest the theological basis for the open table.

1 Reconsideration of Discerning the Body

In the early period of the church in Korea, the traditional eucharistic regulations were strictly observed. The church allowed only those who were baptized adult members to partake in the eucharist. In order to be baptized, people needed to complete the catechumenate. However, even an admission to the catechumenate was not easy. The candidate for the catechumenate had to attend regularly all formal services for at least three months. The final gateway to the catechumenate was to pass a catechetical examination:

Why do you want to become a Christian? What were some of the sins you needed to have forgiven? Have you been forgiven, and what proof have you that you have been forgiven? Through whom? Who is Jesus? Where was He born? Who was His mother? Who was His father? (Ans. “God” is
required.) Who is Jesus in His relation to you? How did He become your Savior? Was He a sinner? Why did He die as one guilty? Did He absolutely perish? Where is He now? Will He return to the world? When, and for what? Where does the Christian go at death? Where does the non-Christian go at death? If you were to die to-night, where would you go and why? Can you recite the ten commandments and the Lord’s Prayer? Do you pray daily? How often each day? In whose name do you pray? Have you given up all worship of spirits? Do you read your Bible daily? How much have you read consecutively? Have you done any personal work, told anyone about Jesus? 1

After completing this course, candidates began the life of a catechumen for six months. In this period, catechumens should prepare not only catechetical but also ascetical examination. They had to refrain from all immoral acts and pagan customs. The contents of “Baptismal Examination” in the early of 20th century show the early Korean Christians’ thinking about being a Christian through baptism:

Since you became a catechumen, have you found joy in believing? Why? Have you kept the Sabbath? Tell how you have observed it. Do you have family worship? Do you drink sool (beer) and have it in the home? Do you give it to the day laborers who work for you? Is it right for a man to have two wives? Is it right to marry an unbeliever? Are you a sinner? Can anything sinful enter Heaven? Then how do you expect to get there? Is there any other way than by the Cross of Christ? Are the spirits to be feared? Why not? What are the ordinances of the church? What is the meaning of baptism? Who administers it and in whose name? With what does he administer it? Is baptism necessary for salvation? Then why do you seek baptism? What is the purpose of the Lord’s Supper? What does the bread signify? The wine? Who should partake of the sacrament? In what spirit should one partake of the Lord’s Supper? Have you led anyone to Christ? 2

The eucharist, which only those who passed such a strict discipline process were able to partake of, was recognized as something holier than normal services by the early Korean Christians. The church gave notice for several weeks before the eucharist in order that church members could prepare themselves for it. If there was a baptized member who acted wrongly, morally or socially, the church banned that person from receiving the eucharistic elements. In a sense, the eucharist was a privilege given to those who were baptized and lived morally, and a kind of compensation for their devotion and loyalty to God. Recently, however, the article

---

1 Anabel Major Nisbet, *Day In and Day Out in Korea* (Richmond, VA: Presbyterian Committee of Publication, 1919), 67-68.
2 Ibid., 68-69.
regarding excommunication in the constitution has become virtually an anachronism, but there is a consensus in the PCK that baptism and a moral life are appropriate preconditions for the eucharist. Traditionally, the PCK finds biblical authority for such eucharistic regulations from Paul’s teaching of the Lord’s supper in 1 Corinthians 11:28-29. In these verses, Paul writes of an attitude that the participants in the eucharist should maintain. The PCK interprets these verses to suggest that all participants should examine their individual acts and beliefs before partaking in the eucharist.

However, one needs to ponder on what these verses actually mean. Do these verses teach us that self-examination is a prerequisite for the eucharist? Is it an appropriate interpretation that the terms “discerning the body” mean an examination of personal spirituality and morality? For a more correct understanding of the texts, it would be worth exploring the context of the Corinthian church at that time. It is presumed that the Corinthian church consisted of a few rich people and a great number of the poor. Socially, people from various levels would gather together at the Corinthian church. A rough outline of the social composition of the Corinthian church can be observed in 1 Corinthians 1:26. Here, Paul describes three categories of class: σοφοὶ (wise), δυνατοί (powerful), and εὐγενεῖς (noble birth). According to Theissen, such language should be understood in a sociological sense. In the Corinthian church, although there were not many who were wise, powerful and of noble birth, the minority from the upper class was “the most active and important members of the congregation.” As observed in descriptions of early church worship (cf. Acts 1:13; 2:1; Romans 16:5, 23), the place of worship and the eucharist of the Corinthian church would be a private house provided by one of the wealthiest members. The eucharist would be conducted with worship on Sunday.

---

3 The “Rules of Discipline” (1.5.1) in the constitution of the PCK records that church might punish those who break church laws by censure, excommunication and expulsion from church. The General Assembly of The Presbyterian Church of Korea, Constitution, 2nd ed. (Seoul: Publishing House PCK, 2001), 204.

4 “Examine yourselves, and only then eat of the bread and drink of the cup. For all who eat and drink without discerning the body, eat and drink judgement against themselves” (NRSV).

5 For more details, see chapter two of this study.

6 “Consider your own call, brothers and sisters: not many of you were wise by human standards, not many were powerful, not many were of noble birth” (NRSV).


8 Ibid., 105.

evening (1 Corinthians 16:2). Yet, in the first century CE, Sunday was not a holiday in every region of the Roman Empire. Thus, the majority of church members who were poor would work on Sunday and some of them who had to work until late that afternoon would be often late for the eucharist.\footnote{Joseph A. Fitzmyer, \textit{First Corinthians: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary} (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008), 428.} According to Murphy-O’Connor, the private house which the Corinthian church gathered in would have a triclinium (a dining room with couches) and an atrium. The house owner and the rich who had plenty of free time would come early and recline on couches in the triclinium, but late comers who were generally poor, because there was no vacancy in the triclinium, spontaneously would be guided to the atrium and sit there.\footnote{Jerome Murphy-O’Connor, \textit{St. Paul’s Corinth: Text and Archaeology} (Collegeville, MN: The Liturgical Press, 2002), 183-184.}

However, Paul’s criticism of the Corinthian church was based on the fact that there was immoral discrimination in the eucharist rather than simply a physical division according to small gathering spaces. In 1 Corinthians 11:17-34, Paul was concerned about a small number of people who were excluded from having a eucharistic meal. For the occasion of the eucharist, it seemed each member would bring food and offer it. However, when the eucharist began, those who offered food did not hesitate to go ahead and enjoy it but the poor who were not able to bring food had to wait until somebody shared food with them. Some members got drunk but others remained hungry (1 Corinthians 11: 21). According to Winter, a series of events which had occurred in the eucharist of the Corinthian church demonstrates that they followed a typical type of dinner in the secular world at that time.\footnote{For more details on a range of dinners in the ancient world, see Bruce W. Winter, \textit{After Paul Left Corinth: The Influence of Secular Ethics and Social Change} (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2001), 154-155.} The dinner was called \textit{Asumbolon deipnon} (a private dinner) where participants brought their own food and ate it themselves.\footnote{Ibid., 155.} Moreover, one of the hallmarks of \textit{Asumbolon deipnon} was drunkenness which Paul mentions in 1 Corinthians 11:21.\footnote{Ibid., 158.}

In this situation, it was natural that Paul chastised the Corinthian church for their indulgence and humiliating the poor in the eucharist.\footnote{“What! Do you not have homes to eat and drink in? Or do you show contempt for the church of God and humiliate those who have nothing? What should I say to you? Should I commend you? In this matter I do not commend you!” (1 Corinthians 11:22, NRSV).} For, such behavior...
identified with *Asumbolon deipnon* and contrasted with what Jesus taught through his dinner. Winter says:

> [A]t the Lord’s Dinner they acted on their own behalf by consuming their own food, but the example of Jesus taught that Christians were obligated to act likewise for others, especially in the very dinner which recorded his self-giving sacrifice for its participants.\(^{16}\)

Then, Paul gives them a teaching of the eucharist: “Whoever, therefore, eats the bread or drinks the cup of the Lord in an unworthy manner will be answerable for the body and blood of the Lord” (1 Corinthians 11:27, NRSV). When considering the whole situation, one can get a clearer meaning of the phrase “discerning the body.” Traditionally, the church has interpreted these terms that participants should examine their personal body or have a clear knowledge of the eucharistic body distributed to them. Yet, what Paul wants to say through these texts is not about a eucharistic regulation, the last supper as the origin of the eucharist, or theological interpretation of the eucharistic elements, but about how to eat the eucharist with others without discrimination and humiliation. Paul’s main idea in these texts is that the eucharist is not an individual but a communal act.\(^{17}\)

In 1 Corinthians 11:29, the body, which the Corinthian church would discern, is the body of Christ, the whole people gathering for the eucharist. Thus, “discerning the body” means the church waiting until all members come and eat the eucharist together (1 Corinthians 11:33-34). Stookey gives a plausible interpretation of the terms “discerning the body”:

> What Paul is saying in verse 29 to these folks is: “You do not understand what it means to be the body of Christ. Your selfish acts stand in judgment over you. If you truly discerned what it means to be Christ’s body, you would wait for all to arrive before beginning to eat. Then there would be an equal sharing rather than discrimination against fellow believers.” This rebuke is carefully sandwiched between a strong assertion that the Eucharist is characterized by sharing (10:16-18) and an extended discussion of the interdependence of the parts in Christ’s body (12:4-26).\(^{18}\)

At this point, in 1 Corinthians 11:28, Paul’s instruction, “examine yourselves,” cannot be simply interpreted as a self-examination of a personal dimension. Why should participants examine themselves? For Paul, the ultimate goal of the

---

\(^{16}\) Winter, *After Paul Left Corinth*, 154. A Bracket is added by this author.


examination is not to be personally justified by God but to recognize all church members, regardless of social class and whether they are rich or poor, as people who are united with God in “the new covenant established by Christ’s body and blood.”\textsuperscript{19} Ciampa and Rosner elaborate:

To examine oneself means to examine one’s compliance with the covenant as reflected in their ways of relating to other members of the community and to discern the body of Christ must include recognizing that those other members of the community represent Christ himself (since they have also been united with him) and must be treated as people for whom Christ chose to give up his life and to shed his blood.\textsuperscript{20}

This study leads us to reconsider the traditional approach which tries to draw eucharistic regulations based on self-examination from 1 Corinthians 11:28-29. This study encourages us to recognize the eucharist as a communal act.\textsuperscript{21} Through 1 Corinthians 10 and 11, Paul emphasizes that the eucharist should be the place that the unity of a community becomes realized. The unity in the eucharist involves overcoming “divisions caused by social and economic disparity in the community.”\textsuperscript{22} In the eucharist, all participants are holy in Christ and are people of God. They have an equal opportunity to take bread and the cup from the Lord’s table. If there is an instruction regarding the eucharist to be gained from 1 Corinthians 11:28-29, it would be not as a regulation that discerns the personal body and excludes those who are disqualified but as an encouragement that discerns the body of Christ, members of the whole church, so that all can eat together the eucharist.

2 Reconsideration of Baptism and Confirmation

One of the problems with the traditional understanding of the eucharist is that the open table which welcomes untested people without baptism and confirmation could damage the meaning and holiness of the eucharist. Thus, generally, the

\textsuperscript{19} Roy E. Ciampa, and Brian S. Rosner, The First Letter to the Corinthians (Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2010), 555.
\textsuperscript{20} Ibid., 555.
\textsuperscript{21} Paul’s recognition of the eucharist as a communal act is exactly identical with the eucharistic perspective of the early Christian communities. See Smith, and Taussig, Many Tables, 21-69.
traditional eucharistic understanding believes that church should have two safeguards for keeping the eucharist holy: baptism and confirmation.

First of all, let us explore the relationship between baptism and the eucharist. For the PCK, based on the eucharistic theology of Calvin, baptism is the first official gateway to Christian life and through baptism outsiders can obtain membership of the church. The eucharist is the food to nourish only those who have already begun the journey of Christian life and have membership. Thus, the PCK does not allow those who are not baptized, because they are not a member of the church, to receive the eucharistic elements.

However, it is important to rethink the meaning and efficacy of baptism which the PCK confesses as a doctrine. The Westminster Confession of Faith, which is edited by the PCK and contained in the PCK’s constitution, gives the following definition of baptism:

Baptism is a sacrament of the New Testament, instituted by Jesus Christ (Matthew 28:19). It is not only for the solemn admission of the party baptized into the visible Church (1 Corinthians 12:13), but also to be unto him a sign and seal of the covenant of grace (Romans 4:11; Colossians 2:11-12), or his ingrafting into Christ (Galatians 3:27; Romans 6:5), of regeneration (Titus 3:5), of remission of sins (Mark 1:4), and of his giving up unto God, through Jesus Christ, to walk in newness of life (Romans 6:3-4): which sacrament is, by Christ’s own appointment, to be continued in his church until the end of the world (Matthew 28:19-20).

Here, it is worth focusing on the words “sign” and “seal” which indicate baptism. The PCK recognizes baptism as a sign and seal of becoming a Christian. Within the PCK’s theology regarding sacraments, baptism is crucial and meaningful as a rite of initiation into Christian life. However, baptism does not have the actual power of forgiveness or salvation. It is expressed this way in Westminster Confession of Faith:

Although it be a great sin to contemn or neglect this ordinance (Luke 7:30; Exodus 4:24-26), yet grace and salvation are not so inseparably annexed unto it as that no person can be regenerated or saved without it (Romans

---

23 Calvin, in his *Catechism of the Church of Geneva*, says: “Baptism is for us a kind of entry into the Church.” See Reid, *Calvin*, 133.


Furthermore, the PCK supports the statement of BEM regarding the role of the Holy Spirit in the life of believers that “the Holy Spirit is at work in the lives of people before, in and after their baptism” (Baptism II.C.5). If the PCK confesses that through the eucharist the people of God are spiritually nourished and grow in Christ, there is no reason to oppose the idea that the recipient of the eucharistic grace should be the whole people of God including those who are not baptized.

Secondly, along with baptism, confirmation is emphasized by the PCK as a prerequisite for the eucharist. Confirmation involves an intellectual capacity to confess sins and to appreciate what the eucharist means. For this, the PCK defines the age of fifteen as a precondition for participation in the eucharist. Regarding cognitive ability as a precondition of the eucharist, it is important to turn our eyes from doctrinal instruction to the eucharist of Jesus. Who were those invited by Jesus into his table? Did they understand fully what they ate? The gospel accounts suggest that all the participants in the eucharistic meals of Jesus did not have to be the kind of people who passed a difficult catechetical examination. At the last supper, the disciples did not know what they were doing. The two disciples on the road to Emmaus did not realize that the man who had spent quite a lot of time with them was in fact Jesus until they received the eucharistic bread. Although the disciples swore loyalty to Jesus, what happened at the last supper was the disciples’ drastic betrayal of the hospitality of Jesus. In all cases, a clear lesson of the eucharist for the participants was that “their lives depended on God’s fidelity to them rather than on the inadequacies of their commitment to God.” In the light of the traditional eucharistic regulation, they were all unworthy to come to the table of

---

26 “Of Baptism” 28:5. Ibid., 125.
28 See the section “Of the Lord’s Supper” 29:1 in The Presbyterian Church of Korea, Constitution, 2nd ed. (2001), 125.
29 For more details, see chapter two of this study.
30 For more details on what the qualification of the participants in the last supper and the meals of Jesus after the resurrection, see chapter six of this study.
Jesus. Nevertheless, Jesus, the host, invited them to his gracious table. The table of Jesus calls the church to have a humble mind. This humbleness helps us realize that “we” who are baptized and confirmed are not different from “them” who are excluded by the eucharistic regulations. It would be worth noting Fabian’s insight into human beings standing before the table of Christ:

Today when we watch people whom we think unworthy join our eucharistic gathering, instead of our telling ourselves we were mistaken about these folks, and should reconsider how they deserve inclusion – we had rather think: these are real, nasty, active sinners, and God sees no difference between them and me. I am just like them. So I hereby abandon my desire to be separate from them.

3 Pastoral and Missiological Requests for the Open Table

Our modern pluralistic social and religious context ceaselessly challenges the church to rethink the traditional eucharistic regulation which recognizes baptism and confession of faith as essential preconditions for the eucharist. Today, church leaders face various pastoral and missiological challenges when they conduct the eucharist:

[I]n some cultural and religious contexts, families have disowned members who receive Christian baptism. As a bishop of the Mar Thoma Church once asked me quite pointedly, “Should a Hindu man or woman drawn to Christ be forced to choose between family and church?” In order to avoid such problems, should such persons be admitted to the Eucharist without benefit of baptism? … On a less urgent plane stands the church’s call to exercise hospitality with seekers that come from secular culture. If we do not invite these people to the table, will they become offended and never return? Once alienated from the church, will they care about our vision of radical inclusivity, regardless of its theological foundation?

The biggest challenge is linked to the question of the inclusion of children, people from other denominations, people living with mental disabilities and seekers from

32 Mick says: “Before we come to the table, we acknowledge our unworthiness (‘Lord, I am not worthy ...’) and rejoice in the fact that God does not require us to be worthy but heals us by the divine word. This Jesus who gives himself to us is the same Jesus who scandalized the religious leaders of his time by sharing meals with sinners. He continues to do the same today. None of us are worthy of this meal; we share in it by God’s gracious invitation.” See Lawrence E. Mick, Eucharist: Understanding the Sacraments (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2007), 20.

33 Fabian, The Scandalous Table, 150.

non-Christian backgrounds in the eucharist. It would be worth observing several examples which might cause ministers and missionaries uneasy feelings:

Not long ago I visited a congregation in my diocese full of young families with children, and was enjoying all the small outstretched hands at the altar rail. So I was slightly taken aback by the following incident. I was approaching a woman who is very involved in the diocese – let’s call her Bea – and I supposed, rightly, that the two little girls kneeling beside her were her grandchildren (whom I had not met before). I got to them before I got to her, and like all the other children they thrust out their cupped hands. The instant they did, their grandmother reached her arm in front of theirs and drew them back. “They don’t receive?” I asked her. She responded firmly, “No.” They looked at me somewhat wild-eyed as I proceeded to bless them. At the coffee hour I found Bea and asked, as casually as I could, why her grand-daughters didn’t receive communion. She said, “Well, they’re not baptized. Their mother is Jewish, and they’re bringing them up as both until they can make their own decision.” “But they seemed to expect to receive …” After a pause, Bea replied, “They usually do receive. Some of the old-timers had a problem with it, but most everyone said they should be able to join in with the other kids. But since you were coming, and we know it is against the rules, we told them not to receive. They just forgot.”

Such situations are challenging for many church leaders. It is easy to simply follow the traditional eucharistic regulation. Yet, the reason why they are embarrassed is that they know that blindly following church laws does not guarantee the best result in all situations of ministry. Is the best way to keep church tradition regardless of individual ministry situations? This question leads us to look again at the eucharist of Jesus and his attitudes towards human beings. In the light of the eucharist of Jesus, the church is requested to bear a moral responsibility for humanity beyond denominational doctrines and church traditions. For, Jesus’ moral sense was embodied in welcoming sinners who were consistently excluded in Jewish society and in providing them hospitality at his eucharistic table. A special eucharist which Galbraith shared with an Alzheimer patient is a good example that a moral response to a humanity can be a better way to experience the kingdom of God in the eucharist than is an attempt to observe the dogmatic eucharistic regulation:

On a recent visit to an Alzheimer patient, we wondered if this individual would understand or even participate in the sharing of the Communion elements. The patient was wandering the halls of the nursing home, but we were eventually able to gather this individual, [his] spouse, and a friend. As

---

36 Ibid., 143-144.
we said the prayer and gave the bread and juice, the individual’s blank eyes began to focus on the elements. This person, who moments before had seemed totally unaware of the surroundings, seemed to participate actively in the Sacrament. As he received the body and blood of Christ, without prompting, the patient’s eyes began to twinkle.  

4 The Open Table as a Means of Grace

The main focus of the eucharist of Jesus was not on the righteousness of the participants but on the grace of God through inclusion and hospitality. In the eucharist, the place of grace, sinners met Jesus and renounced their old pattern of life. If we come closer to the nature of the eucharist of Jesus, we might divert our attention from an attempt to preserve the holiness of the eucharist by keeping strictly to the eucharistic regulation concerning the immensity of God’s grace and its power of transforming human beings. The understanding of the eucharist as a means of grace is prominent in the theology of Wesley brothers. They recognized that among church’s sacramental ways the eucharist is “the chief means of grace” as follows:

Of these blessings CHRIST from above is pleased to bestow sometimes more, sometimes less, in the several ordinances of His Church, which, as the stars in heaven, differ from each other in glory. Fasting, prayer, hearing His word, are all good vessels to draw water from this well of salvation; but they are not all equal. The Holy Communion, when well used, exceeds as much in blessing as it exceeds in danger of a curse, when wickedly and irreverently taken (IV:6).  

Although the PCK does not recognize the eucharist as the chief means of grace, it holds the view that through the eucharist Christians can see and experience the grace of God. It is true that the PCK still holds the eucharistic regulation that baptism and confirmation are the preconditions of the eucharist. However, if the PCK is fully aware that the eucharist is completed by God’s acceptance of sinners and hospitality based on the immensity of the divine grace not by human effort and
preparation, that awareness will mature the PCK’s eucharistic theology and lead to
the heart of the eucharist.

In the eucharist, the grace of God urges sinners to turn from evil and live as the
people of God. Jesus’ embracing sinners in his table does not mean that he allows
sin. The purpose of Jesus’ inclusivity was the transformation of the life of sinners. 41
Bretherton notes:

Jesus relates hospitality and holiness by inverting their relations: hospitality
becomes the means of holiness. Instead of having to be set apart from or
exclude pagans in order to maintain holiness, it is in Jesus’ hospitality of
pagans, the unclean, and sinners that his own holiness is shown forth.
Instead of sin and impurity infecting him, it seems Jesus’ purity and
righteousness somehow ‘infects’ the impure, sinners and the Gentiles. 42

It is a misunderstanding that the open table theology is not concerned with
conversion or spiritual growth. The only thing that is different between the
traditional eucharistic understanding and the open table is the position of
conversion in the journey of Christian life. While the former places the conversion
of participants before the eucharist as a prerequisite, 43 the latter recognizes the
eucharist as a converting ordinance. 44 In other words, the open table, like Wesley’s
eucharistic understanding, focuses on a possibility that in the eucharist a sinner
experiences the grace of salvation, that is the eucharist as a means of grace for
conversion. 45

Bexley Uniting Church (BUC) was preparing the 111th Anniversary Sunday
Service. 46 Jeffrey Liu, who was a High School student and not a Christian, inquired
of his school teacher Jane, who was a church member of BUC, whether he could
sing “The Prayer” in the service of BUC as a rehearsal for his HSC examination.

43 Opposing the open table theology, Farwell insists that in the last supper stories and 1 Corinthians
11 all participants were committed and informed and emphasizes the significance of the preparation
of the participants in the eucharist. For more details, see Farwell, “Baptism, Eucharist, and the
Hospitality of Jesus,” 221-222.
44 For more details on the converting ordinance, see the section “The Eucharistic understanding of
John and Charles Wesley” in chapter five.
45 See David Kennedy, Eucharistic Sacramentality in an Ecumenical Context: The Anglican Epiclesis
46 Bexley Uniting Church (BUC) is located in 29 Gladstone Street, Bexley NSW 2207, Australia.
Jane gave him advice about how to contact a church leader of BUC. Jeffrey sent an e-mail to Jim, Chairman of the Congregation:

Hello Jim,
I am Jane’s student Jeffrey and I was asked by her to make a brief introduction about myself to you. First of all I would like to say that I am really honoured to perform at the Church on Sunday. Although I am not Christian, I am agnostic and open minded so I will gladly sing as a prayer to the lord. I am currently a Year 12 student, about to graduate soon and attending North Sydney Boys High School. This year I played the lead Chris in the school musical “Miss Saigon.” I also do music as a subject at school and am singing The Prayer as one of my songs for my HSC examination, so hopefully I will learn a lot from this experience. Are there any formalities I should know about a church Sunday service? As I am not very experienced.

Sincerely,
Jeffrey Liu

Church leaders had a meeting regarding Jeffrey’s singing in worship and his participation in the eucharist. Their decision was to welcome the non-Christian stranger and give him an opportunity to not only sing a solo but also take part in the eucharist. Jim sent him good news with a careful description of what they would do on Sunday:

Dear Jeffrey,
Thank you for contacting me and thank you for your honesty. I am sure you will honour the words you are singing. I imagine you will be sitting with Jane. Our Minister is Rev Dr Sang Taek Lee, who will be leading this Service for our 111th Anniversary. Our speaker is Rev Dr Dean Drayton, who has been the President of the Uniting church in Australia – the Church’s most senior position.
Attached is the Order of Service and other material which the people will be singing and saying. At the time of your contribution you will be invited to move to the front behind the Communion Rail where the people kneel later to receive the elements of bread and wine (actually grape juice) Holy Communion is one of the church’s two sacraments in which we remember and relate to the death of Jesus Christ and His resurrection (the bread – His body broken on the Cross; the juice – His blood shed on the Cross – the price Jesus, the Son of God, paid for humanity’s redemption. (The other sacrament is Baptism which is the ‘doorway’ to becoming a member of the Christian Church, which is the ‘Body of Christ’ on earth.) The Uniting Church has an ‘open communion table’ which means all who genuinely wish to acknowledge the death and resurrection of Jesus are welcome. No one, however, should feel s/he must move forward, out of courtesy, or embarrassment. It is a personal decision, Jeffrey, which will be accepted. Unless otherwise stated, we stand for the congregational singing and sit otherwise.
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Every element of the Service is a part of worshipping God, including your solo. It is not a concert where one might acknowledge the pianist and bow. The people may clap your contribution. If so, just pause a moment and return to your seat. I understand you are providing your own recorded music. We will arrange that at 9am, the time Jane said you would be arriving. We look forward to it very much, Jeffrey.

Blessings, (Dr) JN Pendlebury OAM
Chairman of the Congregation

On that Sunday, Jeffrey participated in the eucharist. After the service he expressed how amazing it was to have the eucharistic elements for the first time and his decision to believe in Christ Jesus. Jeffrey’s family also participated in worship and the eucharist. Although their main goal was to encourage Jeffrey, after the service they said that they were moved by the hospitality of church and their recognition of Christianity had changed. The 111th Anniversary of BUC could have been a party for members only but through the open table it became a joyful banquet which the grace of God opened and touched all participants’ hearts. In the eucharist, the divine grace not only gives devoted disciples a power to embody their beliefs in their ministry but also leads those, who are not prepared to be a Christian, to meet the risen Christ and begin a new journey as a disciple. The grace of God, the justification and the sanctification of the participants are woven together in the eucharist. Can only those who are perfectly prepared with baptism, confession of faith and the knowledge of the eucharist participate in the eucharist? When we realize the immensity of God’s grace, we cannot ignore the transforming grace of God which may mean that through the eucharist sinners can be led to baptism, a strong belief in Jesus Christ and a deeper knowledge of the eucharist. Before, during and after the eucharist, all participants receive the grace of justification and sanctification from God.

5 Reconsideration of the Traditional Understanding of Sacramentality

One of the problems of traditional churches regarding the open table is a perception that opening the eucharist to all undercuts the meaning of the sacraments. For thousands of years of church history, the number of the sacraments has been a
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48 Jim Pendlebury, e-mail message to Jeffrey Liu, August 8, 2013.
49 Sang Taek Lee, Interview by author, Concord, NSW, August 22, 2013.
50 Edmondson points out that “baptism is seen not as a requirement for access to the grace of fellowship, but as a movement toward the blossoming of this grace in the lives of those who have experienced it.” See Edmondson, “Opening the Table,” 219.
crucial issue. As a result, the Roman Catholic Church has seven sacraments, and the PCK following the reformers recognizes baptism and the eucharist as the sacraments. Recently, however, the focus of discussions regarding the sacraments has moved from determining the number of the sacraments to a new understanding of sacramentality through reconsidering the meaning of the sacraments.

Traditionally, the meaning of the sacraments has been closely related to ritual actions such as baptism, the eucharist and the like. Based on that perception, churches have believed that human beings can receive divine grace through certain ritual actions. A challenge of the traditional understanding of the sacraments began with modern Christians’ empirical recognition of various ways through which they experience the sacramentality not only in the sacraments but also in other elements of worship and even in their ordinary life. As Irwin notes, the sacraments are “signs of the way the divine is manifested in the human, of the sacred in our secular world.” God shows his love and reveals his will through the way which humans can perceive in history. If there is some means through which humans meet God and receive the divine grace, it is the sacrament. Thus, sacramentality cannot be confined in several ritual ceremonies.

This raises a question: if anything in the world can be a sacrament, is there any reason why we have to conduct the sacraments? This radical approach to the sacraments could cause a vague understanding of the sacraments and perhaps even lead to an abuse of the term “sacrament.” From this point of view, churches need to listen to Macquarrie’s warning: “If we stretch any term, including the term ‘sacrament,’ too far and apply it to a great number of rather diverse things, that term begins to lose definition.” However, on the other hand, the shift of the understanding of the sacramentality enables churches to ponder on the essence of the sacraments. Why do churches need the sacraments? What can churches gain from conducting the sacraments? What must the church recognize through the sacraments? These questions lead us to the sole answer, that is, we must focus
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through the sacraments, Jesus Christ. According to Schillebeeckx, Christ is “the one and only saving primordial sacrament.”Jesus Christ is the source and content of the sacraments.

Regarding sacramentality in the eucharist, another important point is that Christ is present when the church gathers for the communion. The meeting of these two points, which are the sacramental perception that Christ is the primordial sacrament and the Christian belief in the presence of Christ, provides a new perspective on the eucharist. When bread and the cup are distributed, Christ, who is risen, is present in the eucharist and with his people. Christ is the host of the banquet and provides his people with spiritual and physical food. While traditional eucharistic theology has been concerned about the eucharistic regulations focusing on human conduct, the open table emphasizes Christ who is present in the eucharist. It is true that bread and the cup and the eucharistic liturgy itself can be a sacrament through which humans receive the divine grace. However, if participants experience directly the risen Christ who is the primordial sacrament, any further medium is unnecessary. At this point Loades says:

[T]he presence of Christ requires no mediation through ceremony or other persons, and is manifested in the transformed lives of disciples in private devotion, gathered meetings for worship in which silence is a most important practice, and the practice of the open table at a full meal not only with other disciples but with any in need of food or companionship.

When practising the open table in a church based on the traditional eucharistic theology, what one should be careful about is theological conflict. For example, traditional eucharistic theology proponents might think that the open table threatens church tradition. This sense of crisis can lead to a dispute and division between church members. That is by no means a desirable consequence. The goal of the open table is not to make a distinction between right and wrong but to bind different eucharistic traditions with a rope of the banquet of the kingdom of God.

Proponents of traditional eucharistic understanding have easy access to authority through church tradition and doctrine. However, in order to practise the open table in a traditional church and minimize destructive debates, not only strong biblical
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and theological foundations but also profound understanding of human beings and the contexts of ministry and mission are essential. Thus, in order to conduct the open table in a church, enough time to study and share the open table theology with all church members is needed. In this process, one should make sure that the study of the eucharist will not turn into debates about the doctrine of the eucharist. For, the open table is the place of unity and joyful banquet.

6 Summary and Evaluation

The focus of the eucharist of Jesus was on inclusivity and hospitality. Regarding the forms of the eucharist, the early church enjoyed their communal meals in various ways. However, the traditional eucharistic understanding has developed its eucharistic regulations, emphasizing membership and individual preparation for keeping the eucharist holy. In that process, Paul’s teaching on the eucharist regarding “discerning the body” in 1 Corinthians 11:28-29 has been used as the biblical evidence for the validity of the traditional eucharistic regulation. However, the focus of Paul’s teaching in the text is not on self-examination but the eucharist as a communal act.

The traditional eucharistic understanding has believed that the open table practice would weaken the relationship between baptism and the eucharist and finally undermine the meaning of the sacraments. It is true that the traditional order of the sacraments of “baptism before the eucharist” is challenged when a church practises the open table. However, the alteration of the order of the sacraments does not necessarily mean the destruction of the sacraments. The open table theology does not argue that baptism is useless. Rather, the open table theology seeks a way of strengthening the sacraments by focusing on the significance of the sacraments rather than the order of the sacraments.

The open table theology can be an effective response to various missional questions raised in our modern complex and pluralistic society. In the past, when church leaders faced difficult situations in the eucharist, following church laws was the best answer. Today, however, they recognize the complexity of the situations and the limitations of church laws. In the past church drew eucharistic regulations from the last supper but now the open table theology leads the church to focus on Jesus’ love.
towards a human being and his respect for a little one in the meals of Jesus. The generosity of Jesus makes the eucharist a place of grace and transformation. When people experience the immensity of the grace of God in the eucharist, their sinful and corrupted natures are transformed into the people of God. In this sense, the eucharist is a means of grace. In the open table theology, the church finds the primordial sacrament, Jesus Christ. This new recognition of sacramentality leads church to focus Jesus who present in the eucharist not the eucharistic elements or regulations.

The open table theology helps us to reassess the value of the eucharist preserved in the non-mainstream church. As both Jagessar and Burns note, including the eucharistic theology and practice of the non-mainstream church is not at all about undermining church tradition but rather “the rediscovery of varied richness”\(^\text{59}\) of Christian traditions. Furthermore, the open table leads church to the heart of the eucharist of Jesus, and its inclusivity and hospitality. The purpose of the open table is not to persuade church to renounce traditional eucharistic practice but to rediscover significant values of the eucharist which traditional eucharistic understanding has lost or neglected so that church might enjoy theologically and practically the richness of eucharistic diversity.

These theological perspectives based on the meals of Jesus have been accepted and embodied in some modern churches’ eucharistic theology and practice. In the next chapter this study will research the eucharist of the Uniting Church in Australia which is one of the most representative denominations having an open table policy.

Part III

A Model of Application of the Open Table Theology in the Uniting Church in Australia (UCA)
Chapter 8

The Way of the Open Table:

The Eucharist of the Uniting Church in Australia (UCA) as a Model

In recent decades, the number of mainstream churches having an open table policy keeps increasing. This situation is conspicuous in Protestant churches. In particular, as observed in part one of this study, when considering the relationship with the PCK, there are four main denominations which have had a significant influence in its formation and development: the Presbyterian Church in USA, the Presbyterian Church in US, the Presbyterian Church of Australia (PCA)¹ and the Canadian Presbyterian Church (CPC). An interesting fact is that today all of the three (four in the past)² denominations which contributed to the PCK’s worship and theology have an open table policy whereas the PCK keeps conducting a closed table. Although the PCUSA, the UCA and the CPC neither promote the open table as an official doctrine nor practise it universally they recognize the open table as the way of the eucharist.³
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¹ Some Presbyterian churches along with Methodist and Congregational Churches joined the Uniting Church when it was formed; there is still a Presbyterian Church in Australia independent of the UCA.
² In the early period of the history of the PCK, there were four denominations which had an influence in the formation of the PCK. However, among the four denominations, in 1983 the Presbyterian Church in USA and the Presbyterian Church in US were united into the PCUSA. Thus, from now on this study will write “three” instead of “four.” See R. Douglas Brackenridge, The Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.) Foundation: A Bicentennial History, 1799-1999 (Louisville, KY: Geneva Press, 1999), xii.
³ For more details on the open table policy of the PCUSA, see Presbyterian Church (U.S.A.), Invitation to Christ: A Guide to Sacramental Practices (KY, Louisville: Office of Theology and Worship, 2006). Also, see the section “The Influence of Confucianism on the Eucharist” in chapter one of this study. Regarding the UCA’s open table policy, see the section “Basis of Union and the Eucharist” in this chapter. While the PCUSA and the UCA have an open table policy which allows those who are not baptised in the eucharist, the focus of the PCC regarding the open table is on the inclusion of children in the eucharist. In 1987, the General Assembly of the PCC recognized that “Children are capable of the same childlike faith that Jesus required of adults; the faith of children may be nurtured by participation in the Lord’s Supper; the participation of children affirms their place in the fellowship we share as a spiritual family at the Lord’s Table.” The Presbyterian Church in Canada, “Worship and the Sacraments.” Accessed January 15, 2014. http://presbyterian.ca/about/more/#worship-and-the-sacraments.
This study has explored a theoretical basis of the open table through the previous chapters. This chapter will investigate the practical implications of how the open table theology might be embodied in liturgy and worship. Out of the three denominations, the eucharist of the UCA will be the focus of this chapter. There are several reasons why this study has selected the eucharist of the UCA. Firstly, the UCA has had a good relationship with the PCK since the very early period of the history of the PCK. The relationship between the UCA and the PCK commenced in 1889 when J. H. Davis, the first Australian missionary from the Presbyterian Church of Victoria, began his mission in Korea. In 1977, when the PCA united with Congregational Union of Australia and the Methodist Church of Australasia about one third of the PCA did not join the union. However, all the international and Aboriginal mission programs were handed over to the UCA. Thus, the mission partnership of the former PCA with the PCK was spontaneously transferred to the UCA. Since 1889, over 120 missionaries from the UCA (the PCA between 1901 and 1976) have devoted their lives to mission in Korea. Recently, the partnership between the UCA and the PCK has deepened not only through theological exchanges but also through cooperation in mission in Ra Son region in North Korea. Furthermore, the UCA is a union of three denominations. In other words, the open table of the UCA means a theological agreement has been reached by three different denominations with different theological perspectives. At this point, especially in terms of ecumenism, the open table of the UCA is expected to make a contribution to the PCK’s study of the open table.

The UCA, a union of three denominations, was inaugurated in 1977. In the process of union, basic and important issues which the three denominations had agreed upon were formulated in Basis of Union. Since then, the Basis of Union has been recognized as “a document enabling three churches to unite but also a document
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4 Among 1437 Presbyterian churches, 521 churches (about 36%) decided to remain Presbyterian. See John Harrison, Baptism of Fire: The First Ten Years of the Uniting Church in Australia (Melbourne: Uniting Church Press, 1986), 20-21.
with continuing authority for the faith and order” of the UCA. In the Basis of Union the UCA expresses the view that the eucharist is the sacrament of baptised people. However, at the same time in actual practice the UCA has an open table policy which allows unbaptised people to participate in the eucharist. How can these two extremes coexist in the one church? An answer might be found in the history of discussion of the open table in the UCA. There are various sources which show the UCA’s journey to the open table. First of all, the Basis of Union and historical documents related to this issue will be explored in this chapter. In addition, the results of these discussions are reflected in the UCA’s worship resources and embodied in local churches’ practice of the eucharist. By analysing these worship resources and investigating the actual eucharistic practice of several congregations in the UCA, this chapter will examine how the open table theology might be embodied in a Christian community. After then, this study will evaluate the open table of the UCA.

1 Basis of Union and the Eucharist

1.1 The Relationship between Baptism and the Eucharist in the Basis of Union

Regarding the relationship between baptism and the eucharist, the Basis of Union of the UCA declares that in the eucharist “the risen Lord feeds his baptized people on their way to the final inheritance of the Kingdom.” This statement expresses a strong connection between baptism and the eucharist. As Bos and Thompson recognize, one possible interpretation is that this statement does not necessarily mean that “the unbaptised are to be barred from the sacrament.” However, given that the framers of the Basis of Union intended to preserve the Reformed and Methodist traditions and to reflect ecumenical perspectives, this statement would...
have meant that the eucharist is a sacrament which baptised people participate in. Furthermore, in a strict sense, the open table which allows the unbaptised to participate in the eucharist was not an issue at the time of the formation of the UCA. According to Davis McCaughey, there were discussions of the relationship between baptism and the eucharist when the Basis of Union was drafted. However, the main issue did not consider the open table but whether the baptised children might participate in the eucharist before confirmation or not. Although the framers of the Basis of Union recognized the benefit of confirmation, regarding the eucharist, their emphasis was more on the significance of baptism than confirmation. The strong relationship between baptism and the eucharist which is expressed in paragraph 8 of the Basis of Union is reemphasized in the last sentence of paragraph 12:

To this end the Uniting Church commits itself to undertake, with other Christians, to explore and develop the relation of baptism to confirmation and to participation in the Holy Communion.

For several years after union, the UCA was mainly involved in political issues such as Aboriginal land rights, homosexuality and racism. Around the early 1980s, the UCA began to focus on the internal issues of the UCA. Concerning the debate regarding infant baptism and adult baptism which already existed at the time of the inauguration of the UCA, the issue of including baptised children in the eucharist was officially raised in 1982.

1.2 Admission of Baptised Children to the Eucharist

In a broader sense, the open table policy of the UCA might be considered in two respects: inclusion of baptised children and those who are not baptised. In the early stage, the open table of the UCA was mainly related to the issue of whether to include baptised children in the eucharist. It is worth observing the context in which
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the issue was raised. In the UCA there were different views on the minimum age considered appropriate to participate in the eucharist. Some churches included baptised children in the eucharist but others excluded them. In 1982, the Third Assembly requested the Standing Committee to study the issue and provide a direction to bridge the disparity within the UCA. After the resolution of the Third Assembly, three agencies in the Assembly began to explore the issue and then completed a remarkable report, “Children and Holy Communion.” The decision of the Fourth Assembly 1985, which has guided the UCA’s present open table policy, was deeply influenced by the report.

At this point, it seems worth exploring part of the report containing the issue of including baptised children in the eucharist. First of all, the strong relationship of baptism with membership and also with the eucharist which is specified in paragraphs 8 and 12 of the Basis of Union is reaffirmed by the report:

To deny the baptised a place at the Lord’s table calls into question the validity and meaning of their Baptism.

This recognition helps the church interpret that regardless of age, if children are baptised, baptism gives them a divine authority to participate in the eucharist. This baptismal understanding of the UCA is not based on a superstitious belief in the baptismal rite. The focus of the UCA’s theology of baptism is not on the baptismal rite but the grace of God manifested through the rite:

When we baptise a child we commit ourselves to provide the sort of loving Church family in which the love and grace of God might be offered to the child, long before this little one is even able to utter the word “God” or begin to understand what the word “God” means. Such is God’s grace that works in us and around us before ever we say “Lord, I believe. Help my unbelief.”

The grace of God has been provided to his children long before they realize what it is. The children of God experience divine grace before they understand what they do and confess what they believe in. The UCA’s recognition of the nature of the grace of God turns the attention to how children experience or sense the presence of

16 “It was resolved that the Assembly ... request the Standing Committee, on the advice of the Doctrine Commission, to provide guidance to the Uniting Church with respect to the participation of children in celebrations of Holy Communion.” See Assembly Minutes 82.53.16.b.
17 The Commission on Doctrine, the Commission on Liturgy and the Joint Board of Christian Education.
18 See section 3.1 Baptism and Membership. Bos & Thompson, Theology for Pilgrims, 488.
19 See ibid., 489.
God in worship rather than how much they know about God. It does not mean that the UCA views the church’s educational program for baptism and the eucharist as not necessary. While traditional eucharistic understanding teaches that participants in the eucharist are to be prepared with a certain level of knowledge and faith before participation, the UCA recognizes that through participating in the eucharist participants can deepen their understanding of the eucharist and faith. This recognition of the UCA echoes the theology of John Wesley who understood the eucharist as a means of grace. The report, Children and Holy Communion, expresses this idea in this way:

We affirm that children can learn the gospel fundamentals at their level by participation in this celebration; the experience of belonging can deepen faith and confirm their place as members; and the traditional Christian education programs can build on what is learned experientially.

The UCA recognizes that through baptism the baptised person is united in one family of God. The membership of the UCA is “open to all who are baptized into the Holy Catholic Church” regardless of age. Through the eucharist, the people of God grow together into Christ. And through the experience of participating in the eucharist their knowledge and faith are strengthened by the Holy Spirit. Based on these understandings, the report announces a clear position regarding the issue of including baptised children in the eucharist:

The participation of baptised children in Holy Communion is not merely an option the Council of Elders may consider. It is appropriate and desirable in light of our Church’s understanding as reflected in the Basis of Union.

Likewise, the debate on the issue of including baptised children in the eucharist, which existed before the inauguration of the UCA and was heated around the early 1980s, ended with the reemphasis on the significance of baptism. Paragraphs 7 and 8 of the Basis of Union especially were used for supporting the participation of baptised children in the eucharist as a crucial evidence. In the process, the UCA reasserted that baptism gives children the right to participate in the eucharist.
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For more details on “means of grace” in John Wesley, see the section “The Eucharistic Understanding of John and Charles Wesley” in chapter five of this study.

See section 3.3 Understanding and participation. Bos & Thompson, Theology for Pilgrims, 492.


See paragraph 12 “Membership” of the Basis of Union. Ibid., 24.

See paragraph 8 “Holy Communion” of the Basis of Union. Ibid., 23.

See section 5 Proposals for action by the Assembly. Bos & Thompson, Theology for Pilgrims, 496.
1.3 Doctrinal Interpretation of Baptism and the Eucharist under the Basis of Union

The Working Group on Doctrine of the UCA has provided authoritative resources based on the Basis of Union to guide the journey of the UCA. The order of baptism before the eucharist is reaffirmed in the work of the Working Group on Doctrine:

Who participates?
All baptised Christians are welcome to share the meal (Basis of Union Para. 8), but not all may be permitted by the laws of their Church to receive communion with the Uniting Church. This needs to be respected as we continue to pursue the unity to which Christ calls us.  

This statement is quite similar to traditional eucharistic understanding. Baptism is recognized as a prerequisite for the eucharist. Here, paragraph 8 of the Basis of Union is noted to explain the necessity of baptism for the eucharist. However, at the same time, this statement recognizes that there are some churches with church laws admitting only baptism which is conducted within their churches as a valid ordinance.

One of the most recent works of the Assembly Working Groups on Doctrine and Worship, Building on the Basis, was published in 2012. The section “How do we understand Baptism?” clarifies the UCA’s doctrinal stance towards the relationship between baptism and the eucharist. This section consists of 24 questions related to baptism. Among them, the nineteenth question asks: “What is the relationship of baptism to the Lord’s supper?” For an answer of this question, the Working Group emphasizes the significance of the eucharist which is different from other ordinary meals. Then, the eucharistic practice of the early church, which excluded the unbaptised from the eucharist, is introduced. Finally, this traditional order of baptism before the eucharist is confirmed by the Basis of Union and the decision of the Assembly of the UCA:

The Basis of Union therefore says: “In this sacrament of his broken body and outpoured blood the risen Lord feeds his baptized people …” (par 8).

The Fourth Assembly of the Uniting Church in 1985 recognised this close

link between baptism and the Lord’s supper when it said that baptised children could receive communion.  

2 The UCA’s Open Table Policy

2.1 Two Types of Open Table in the UCA

In the previous section, the eucharistic understanding of the UCA based on the Basis of Union was explored. Apparently, as a doctrinal principle, the UCA has expressed the view that the eucharist is a sacrament of baptised people. However, in actual practice, the UCA has an open table policy. “Rituals in the Uniting Church” includes one of the most explicit statements disclosing the open table policy of the UCA:

The Uniting Church practises an “open table policy.” This means that an open invitation is usually extended to “all who love the Lord” to share in Holy Communion. Christians from other denominations, or from no denomination, are welcome to participate in the celebration of Holy Communion at a Uniting Church. In contrast to some denominations, it is not necessary to be a confirmed member or even a baptised member to participate in Holy Communion, though it is seen as appropriate that the person or child has been baptised.

This statement writes clearly that the UCA practises an open table. Ostensibly, according to this statement the UCA seems to promote actively the open table including unbaptised persons in the eucharist. However, this statement does not fully explain why the UCA has an open table policy and how the open table might be practised. For a clear understanding of the open table policy of the UCA, a more careful look at the context in which the issue of the open table began to rise in the UCA is needed.

As stated previously, the issue of the open table might be considered in two categories: The first category is related to the question of admission of baptised children to the eucharist. The second category is the question whether church might allow unbaptised people to participate in the eucharist or not. Regarding the first question, the UCA’s position is clear. In a doctrinal sense, the UCA recognizes the
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open table as the eucharistic practice including baptised children in Holy Communion:

The Uniting Church is very ecumenical. We are part of one Holy Catholic church. The understanding of the eucharist is on the line with *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* of WCC. In terms of the open table, we are very much affirmed that baptism is the basis on which one participates in the eucharist. Also in 1985 the UCA took the decision like the Orthodox that if children are baptised they should be able to participate in communion. The open table of the UCA is related to that.  

Regarding the first type of open table, the UCA’s eucharistic practice is the same as the eucharistic principles based on the Basis of Union. In other words, the UCA’s eucharistic practice of including baptised children is dogmatically and practically supported. However, the UCA tends to take a cautious approach to the second issue. There are few official and doctrinal documents supporting the reason why the UCA has to practise the second type of open table. Nevertheless, the open table which includes unbaptised persons in the eucharist is a widespread practice in the UCA. How is it possible? An answer might be found in the UCA’s understanding of the reason why the church of God exists.

2.2 The UCA’s Missional Vision Reflected in the Open Table Policy

The UCA recognizes the nature of Jesus’ meal practice in which Jesus accepted and welcomed those who were not prepared and even sinners. Moreover, the UCA recognizes the eucharist as a means of grace. These understandings of the eucharist might form the theoretical basis for practising the open table. Yet, there is a significant reason for the UCA’s practice of the open table in that the UCA views the eucharist in central to the light of mission. The union of three churches in 1977 was motivated by missional vision. The passion for the missional vision enabled the three denominations to be united into one church overcoming doctrinal differences. Although officially the Basis of Union has played a role of a doctrine of the UCA, it is not recognized as a doctrine in a traditional sense. In other words, the UCA does not hold a legalistic approach to the traditional eucharistic order of  
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30 Chris Walker, an interview, January 21, 2014. Rev. Dr. Chris Walker is currently serving in the Assembly of the UCA as National Consultant for theology, doctrine and worship.
31 Andrew Dutney, “Why does the Church Exist?,” in *Swimming between the Flags*, 60-61.
baptism before the eucharist. Borrowing from the terms Norman Young used, Dutney describes the Basis of Union as “the charter under which we agree to go on mission together.” The missional vision involves a pastoral approach to those who want to participate in the eucharist. Thornley says:

In the Basis of Union it is the baptised that receive communion. However, you do not have to produce evidence of baptism. In a missional sense the church would not prevent people from coming forward for communion and ministers are aware that some coming forward may not be baptised. An example would be a 50 year old woman in one of the congregations where I was a minister started to attend worship and participated in the communion. After a year she asked to be baptised as a member of the church. Her comment was that if she had not been included in communion she would have been isolated and would probably not have stayed at the church. If you do not wish to take communion, especially little children, you can go forward and ask for a blessing. This is not unusual.

2.3 The Open Table Based on Ecclesiology: A Pilgrim People.

Paragraph 3 of the Basis of Union contains a crucial reason why the church exists. The ultimate purpose of God is the renewal and reconciliation of the whole creation. For the final purpose, God calls the church. The Basis of Union expresses consistently that the promised day on which the final goal of God will be accomplished is coming. Regarding the promised end, the mission of God will be completed. “The church is a pilgrim people, always on the way towards” the end of the mission of God. God washes and feeds his people through the sacraments until they finish the pilgrimage to the promised end. Through the nourishment, the people grow to be disciples who participate in the mission of God. This recognition of a pilgrim people helps the church realize the vulnerability of human beings. The people of God who are on the way to the end are not perfect. The pilgrim people are beings who need care and support. According to this perspective, the priority of the church is not to investigate their qualification for the eucharist but to support
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32 Walker, Building on the Basis, 193.
34 Carolyn Thornley, e-mail message to author, December 9, 2013. Carolyn Thornley is Vice Principal and Dean of Candidates at United Theological College which is constituted within the New South Wales Synod of the UCA.
35 Paragraphs 1, 3, 8, 17 and 18 in the Basis of Union.
them so that they may keep going on to the promised end and live their lives as disciples.

The recognition of the church as a pilgrim people reveals that the main body of mission is not the church but God. During the second half of the 20th century, there has been a crucial awareness of mission as the *missio Dei.* Since then, churches have begun to change their focus from the traditional goal of mission which is to increase the number of a certain denomination to how God works in the world for his mission. In the light of the *missio Dei* even a missional work which was thought to be successful or unsuccessful in the past is reevaluated. That comes from a realization that God has been working for his mission in other ways. The *missio Dei* requests the church to broaden its perspective of mission. As the Lutheran World Federation writes, “God’s own mission is larger than the mission of the church.” Likewise, the UCA recognizes that “all of God’s actions relate to mission.” God created the whole world in his plan. The whole creation moves to the promised end.

The scope of the mission of God encompasses not only the church but also the world. The vastness of the *missio Dei* leads the church to realize the limitations the church has. The UCA recognizes that all decisions the church makes have limitations. At this point, there is no perfect church law “since law is received by human beings and framed by them.” Furthermore, the law by which the whole world has been led towards the promised end is not the law of a church but the law of grace and love overflowing from the heart of God. This perspective helps the UCA depend more on the law of God’s grace than the eucharistic law of the church:

The emphasis should be to proclaim the undeserved grace of God in encouraging the unbaptised to seek Baptism, and to encompass them in the love and nurture of the Congregation as they are prepared for and invited to participate in the sacrament. The guiding principle is that the sacraments are a means of grace – they do not limit grace. This principle will allow us with integrity to accept that there are situations in the life of the Church in which unbaptised people may participate in Holy Communion.

---
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3 The UCA’s Perspective of Worship and the Eucharist: The Pattern of Worship

One of the UCA’s official resources for the eucharist, *Holy Communion*, which was published in 1980, provides three orders of the eucharist. All three orders follow the fourfold pattern of worship: The preparation, the service of the word, the service of the eucharist, and the dismissal. This fourfold pattern reveals the UCA’s basic understanding of worship that word and the eucharist are central in worship.

Eleven years after the inauguration of the UCA, the first worship book *Uniting in Worship* (UiW) was published in 1988. The second and latest worship book, *Uniting in Worship 2* (UiW2), was introduced in 2005, but UiW is still being employed as a useful worship resource for local churches. UiW notes that Christian worship, basically, has a fourfold pattern: The Gathering of the People of God, the Service of the Word, the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, and the Sending Forth of the People of God. Since New Testament times, the Lord’s people have gathered at the Lord’s table on the Lord’s day. This is to remember Christ’s death and resurrection and to celebrate the sacraments as signs of the last day, the day of consummation. Through the ages the basic structure of Christian worship has remained the same. In Reformed practice, despite variations for historical reasons, this pattern has been maintained.

Regarding the structure of worship, UiW2 follows the fourfold pattern of its predecessor: “The Service of the Lord’s Day has four parts, which could be briefly characterised as: gathering, hearing, being fed and being sent.” Yet, in explaining Sunday worship, UiW differs slightly from UiW2. As observed in the excerpt above, the former focuses on the eucharist, as the basis of Christian worship, rather than the service of word. On the other hand, the latter tries to balance word and the eucharist which are two central pillars of worship:

The pattern of worship from New Testament times has been for Christians to gather to hear God’s word and to break bread together on the first day of each week, on Sunday, ‘the Lord’s Day.’ ... In many historical variations,

---

45 Ibid., 76.
46 The Uniting Church in Australia, *Uniting in Worship 2*, ed. Paul Walton (Sydney: The Assembly of the Uniting Church in Australia, 2005), 132.
the fundamental order of Christian worship - word and sacrament together - can be recognised.47

There are a few differences in describing the nature of worship between UiW and UiW2. Yet, there is a clear consensus in both books that the eucharist is an essential element in worship. In defining the theology of the UCA, Bos and Thompson write: “… worship in which the Lord’s Supper is celebrated should be understood as the norm rather than the exception.”48 This UCA’s perception of the eucharist is identical with that of the World Council of Churches. Different from Roman Catholic and Greek Orthodox traditions, Protestants, having been influenced by Zwingli who emphasized the eucharist as a memory and reformers who fought against the misuse of the eucharist by the medieval church, began to develop the so-called preaching-centred worship. Recently, however, there has been an ecumenical convergence with a remarkable academic achievement of the origin of worship that the celebration of the eucharist “continues as the central act of the Church’s worship”49 from the earliest period of church history. Likewise, this eucharistic perception has inherited the early church tradition. The recognition of the eucharist as the central part of worship was firmly entrenched in the early church. One of the earliest Christian literatures, the Didache 14:1, depicts the eucharist as an essential part of Sunday worship: “Assembling on every Sunday of the Lord, break bread and give thanks, confessing your faults beforehand, so that your sacrifice may be pure.”50 In addition, the liturgical outline of Sunday service recorded in chapter 67 of First Apology of Justin Martyr (100-165 CE) shows the place of the eucharist in worship: Gathering - Scripture reading - Exhortation - Prayer - Offering of the eucharistic elements - Thanksgiving prayer – Sharing of the eucharist - Collection & Dismissal.51 The Doctrine and Worship working group of the UCA writes:

In the Uniting Church the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper is not always included and monthly is the practice in many churches. Nevertheless, it is important to recognise that it is not an extra. Rather, worship without Holy Communion is less than the fullness of worship.52

47 Ibid., 138.
48 See Bos & Thompson, Theology for Pilgrims, 429.
49 See World Council of Churches, Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry, 10.
50 Niederwimmer, The Didache, 194.
51 For more details on the order of Sunday service of Justin Martyr, see Johnson, Worship in the Early Church, 68-69.
52 Walker, Building on the Basis, 231.
4 A Reflection on the Structure of the Eucharist of the UCA

As observed above, the UCA holds up four categories as the basic pattern of worship. However, regarding the composition of each category the UCA provides many options in worship resources so that local churches can freely express their worship within the basic pattern according to various occasions. This “freedom that lies within the form of the Service” is one of the most important values to be found in the UCA’s understanding of worship. Based on the fourfold pattern of worship and the freedom in worship order, the UCA provides rich and various resources regarding the eucharist.

The first and second orders in *Holy Communion* present a full liturgy for an ordinary worship in a church, and the third one is designed for the eucharist in small groups and in ministering to the sick. An outline of the three orders is as follows:

---

53 Anita Monro, and Gerard Moore, *Exploring Worship* (Unley, SA: MediaCom Education, 2010), 5. Introducing the UCA’s worship, Monro and Moore place a deep value on the diversity of ways of worship and meaning of worship elements. For example, regarding the eucharist, they give readers instructions: “Think about some of the different meanings given to the words bread and wine, e.g. bread can signify food generally.” Ibid., 17. And they indicate: “Find different forms of greetings used around the world. For example, in Korea, people bow to one another.” Ibid., 18. Moreover, regarding the origin of the eucharist, they broaden the eucharistic understanding of the UCA through introducing the institution narrative and the Emmaus story in the Service of the Eucharist. See ibid., 20, 22.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Holy Communion One</th>
<th>Holy Communion Two</th>
<th>Holy Communion Three</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Preparation</strong></td>
<td><strong>The Preparation</strong></td>
<td><strong>The Preparation</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greeting</td>
<td>Greeting</td>
<td>Greeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Call to worship</td>
<td>Call to worship</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hymn</td>
<td>Hymn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayer of preparation</td>
<td>Confession</td>
<td>Confession</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The commandments</td>
<td>Declaration of forgiveness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declaration of forgiveness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glory to God in the highest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collect for the day</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Service of the Word</strong></td>
<td><strong>The Service of the Word</strong></td>
<td><strong>The Service of the Word</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction to the theme of the day</td>
<td>Introduction to the theme of the day</td>
<td>Introduction to the theme of the day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First reading</td>
<td>Prayer for illumination</td>
<td>Scripture reading</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psalm</td>
<td>First reading</td>
<td>Meditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second reading</td>
<td>Psalm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anthem</td>
<td>Second reading</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gospel</td>
<td>Hymn or Anthem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Gospel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hymn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preaching of the word</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nicene creed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Announcements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayers of intercession</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Service of the Eucharist</strong></td>
<td><strong>The Service of the Eucharist</strong></td>
<td><strong>The Service of the Eucharist</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The peace</td>
<td>The peace</td>
<td>The peace</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offertory Hymn</td>
<td>Invitation</td>
<td>Invitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offertory</td>
<td>Hymn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Grace</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The great thanksgiving</td>
<td>The great thanksgiving</td>
<td>The great thanksgiving</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invocation of the Holy Spirit</td>
<td>The great thanksgiving and prayer of consecration</td>
<td>The great thanksgiving and prayer of consecration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The institution of the Lord’s supper</td>
<td>The Lord’s Prayer</td>
<td>The Lord’s Prayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The great thanksgiving and prayer of consecration</td>
<td>Breaking of the bread</td>
<td>Breaking of the bread</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lamb of God</td>
<td>Lamb of God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The distribution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The Dismissal</strong></td>
<td><strong>The Dismissal</strong></td>
<td><strong>The Dismissal</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prayer of thanksgiving</td>
<td>The peace and final prayer</td>
<td>Final prayer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hymn</td>
<td>Hymn</td>
<td>Blessing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blessing</td>
<td>Blessing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dismissal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8.1 An Outline of Three Orders in *Holy Communion*
These three orders of Holy Communion reflect the UCA’s perspective of worship and the eucharist. As observed in the figure above, the UCA recognizes that Holy Communion does not begin at the Service of the Eucharist. Moreover, the eucharist does not begin merely at the breaking of the bread or invitation to the table. The starting point of the eucharist is the same as that of worship. When the congregation gathers to worship, the eucharist begins. In other words, the eucharist is not a special ritual distinct from an ordinary Sunday service but a different name for worship:

There are many names for worship. When we call it the Service of the Lord’s Day, we remember that Christians began to worship together on the day of Christ’s resurrection: Sunday. When we call it liturgy, we are saying that this is our service to God. The word “liturgy” comes from a Greek word meaning “public service”: leitourgia. When we call it Holy Communion, we highlight our communion in Jesus. When we call it the Lord’s Supper, we recall that what we do has its beginnings in the words and actions of Jesus at the Last Supper. When we call it the Eucharist, we focus on our thanksgiving for all that the Triune God has done for our world and us. We remember especially God’s work in Jesus and the Holy Spirit. The word “Eucharist” is Greek for “thanksgiving”!

However, at the same time, worship can be categorised functionally. That is why the figure above divides worship into four categories. In this section, this study will focus on the main components of the Service of the Eucharist.

4.1 The Peace

First of all, a notable part of the Service of the Eucharist is the passing of the peace. In Holy Communion One and Three, the peace appears as the first order:

The peace of the Lord be always with you.
*And also with you.*

The first written account of the peace as an order of the eucharist is found in Justin Martyr’s *First Apology*: “Having ended the prayers, we greet one another with a kiss” (65.2). According to Dix, in the Pre-Nicene period, the greeting words for the kiss of peace would possibly be “peace be with you” like Jesus’ greeting in John 20:19. Around the fourth century, the simple words developed into a more

---

56 Ibid., 9, 31.
elaborate formula: “The peace of God be with you all (in Syria), or The peace of Lord be always with you (in the West).”\textsuperscript{58} The UCA follows the western tradition for the peace as observed above.\textsuperscript{59} The ways of the peace in the UCA are varied according to local churches’ customs. The peace may be shared one another with a sign of peace such as a handshake or hug including greeting words. Regarding the practice of the peace, it would be worth observing a direction that “the manner of the greeting and the words to be used”\textsuperscript{60} for the peace should be notified to the congregation. This direction seemingly aims to prevent the peace from being in disorder or tarnishing its meaning. For, the UCA recognizes that the peace “is primarily about reconciliation in Christ rather than personal greeting.”\textsuperscript{61}

4.2 Offertory

In Holy Communion One and Two, the offertory is placed between the end of the service of the word and the prayer of consecration. This position of the offertory embraces significant meanings. For some protestants who are based on the preaching-centred worship tradition, the offertory is generally appreciated as a thanksgiving and response to the word. For example, in the first service of the Lord’s day of UiW2, the position of the offering is within the service of the word independent from the eucharist.\textsuperscript{62} Thus, the offering as a response to the word is emphasized. On the other hand, when considering the offertory placed within the eucharist, the offertory’s meaning is beyond its relationship with the word. One of the crucial actions of the offertory is to bring the eucharistic elements, bread and wine, to the communion table.\textsuperscript{63}

The eucharistic bread and wine include a meaning of a remembrance of Christ’s saving act as the last supper tradition preserves. Yet, the significance of the

\textsuperscript{58} Dix, \textit{The Shape of the Liturgy: NEW EDITION}, 103.
\textsuperscript{59} The Uniting Church in Australia, \textit{Holy Communion}, 9, 31. See also The Uniting Church in Australia, \textit{Uniting in Worship} 2, 162, 209.
\textsuperscript{60} The Uniting Church in Australia, \textit{Holy Communion}, 3.
\textsuperscript{61} The Uniting Church in Australia, \textit{Uniting in Worship} 2, 136.
\textsuperscript{63} The UCA has two ways of presenting the offertory. One is that the elements may be brought to the table by members of the congregation during the offertory. Another way is to place the elements on the table and cover them with a white cloth before the service. In this case, the action of bringing the elements is replaced by removing the white cloth. Ibid., 142, 162.
eucharistic bread and wine cannot be confined to the sacrificial meaning, expressed as the body and blood. First of all, bread and wine are the products of human efforts. At the same time, fundamentally, everything is from God the Creator. Thus worshippers bring the offerings not with arrogance but with thanksgiving and humbleness. Offertory prayers of the UCA express clearly this point:

Blessed are you, Lord, God of all creation.
Through your goodness
we have this bread to offer,
which earth has given
and human hands have made.
It will become for us the bread of life.
Blessed are you, Lord, God of all creation.
Through your goodness
we have this wine offer,
fruit of the vine and work of human hands.
It will become for us our spiritual drink.
Blessed be God for ever.  

Almighty Father,
We are unworthy to celebrate this sacrament,
but in your Son Jesus Christ
you have drawn near to us.
It is in his name that we draw near to you.
In obedience to his command
we offer this bread and this cup.
All that we have comes from you
and what we give you is your own.
Amen.  

Regarding the offertory, another important eucharistic understanding is that bread and wine are food. According to McGowan, the early church offered more varied foods for the offertory such as oil, cheese, vegetables, olives, salt, milk, and honey along with the main eucharistic elements, bread and wine. Some of them were possibly used with an ascetic purpose and others seem to be used for suggesting certain theological symbolism: Salt symbolizes unity and commensality, and milk and honey are depicted in the Scripture as “the sense of growing in faith ... and God’s free invitation to abundant life.” Above all, it should be noted that these

64 The Uniting Church in Australia, Holy Communion, 9.
65 Ibid., 23.
66 For more details on the varied foods for the eucharist of the early church, see McGowan, Ascetic Eucharists, 95-127.
67 See chapter four of this study.
68 McGowan, Ascetic Eucharists, 124.
69 Stephen Burns, Pilgrim People: An Invitation to Worship in the Uniting Church (Unley, SA: Mediacom Education, 2012), 144.
varied eucharistic elements were used for a meal by the early church. God
nourishes his people with the food not only spiritually but physically. The two
dimensions of spirit and physical body are inseparable in the eucharist.

However, since the ritualization of the eucharist, the physical aspect of the
eucharist as food has been gradually weakened. The act of eating and drinking in
the eucharist has become a symbolic ritual. The richness of food provided in the
early eucharistic practices has been replaced by a small cup and a coin size wafer.
Since the inauguration of Christianity, for a long time, the bread at the eucharist
and the bread used for ordinary meals at home had not been different. Yet, around
the ninth century, the church confirmed the use of unleavened bread for the
eucharist. Moreover, the way of distribution of the bread was changed from putting
it in hands to on tongues. As a result, the type of the bread became flat and round.
Spontaneously, the size of the bread became smaller. By the eleventh century, the
custom of baking the eucharistic bread in a small size for lay communicants
prevailed in the west. The significance of the physical aspect of the food has gone
beyond filling participants' stomach with food or sharing equally the food between
participants in the eucharist. In the early church, the food in the eucharist was not
only enjoyed by participants but also sent to the absent members, and more
importantly, the elements offered on the table were used as daily bread for the poor.
Focusing on the relationship between the eucharist and offerings, which were
brought by rich members, depicted in First Apology 67, Bradshaw says:

The connection of the Eucharist with giving to those in need continued to
be maintained in later Christian tradition, thus reinforcing the intimate
relationship that was understood to exist between the shared meal and the
mutual love expected of the participants – the failure of which was the very
basis of Paul’s criticism of the Corinthians (1 Cor. 11).

The recovery of the physical aspect of eucharistic food helps Christians to turn their
attention to those who need the food. In the early church period, the varied foods
which were offered and then sent to the poor, orphans and strangers (First Apology

70 It is uncertain when the ritualization began in church history. Yet, according to Murphy-
O’Conner, the increase of the number of a congregation would possibly cause the change of the
eucharist from full meal to the current form of the eucharist. Jerome Murphy-O’Conner, St. Paul’s
71 See Edward Foley, From Age to Age: How Christians Have Celebrated the Eucharist (Chicago, IL:
72 Justin Martyr, First Apology 67:5. See Rordorf, The Eucharist of the Early Christians, 73.
73 Bradshaw, Eucharistic Origins, 68.
67:6) were the fruits of their labour. Today, foods still might be a good offering. Yet, when considering the nature of the offertory, foods are not necessarily confined to an object for the offertory. In the 21st century, for people living in urban areas and even rural areas, money is recognized as the fruits of their labour. As Kavanagh notes, money “is one of the strongest symbols in an industrial and consumer oriented culture.”74 The second service of the Lord’s day in UiW2 echoes clearly this perspective on the offertory. Here, the offering of money is placed at the end of the service of the word but definitely connected with the offertory of bread and wine: “A Scripture sentence may be used before the gifts of money are collected. They may be brought forward with the bread and wine.”75

4.3 The Dismissal

Ultimately this eucharistic understanding of the offertory is connected with the mission of the dismissal and extended to people outside the church building. As McMichael declares, the offering is “not confined to the liturgy.”76 The eucharist brings Christian communities into the world. To participate in the eucharist is to join the prayer of Jesus: “Your kingdom come. Your will be done, on earth as it is in heaven” (Matthew 6:10, NRSV). The kingdom of God coming on earth engages inevitably in the earthly matters. To share the eucharist is an act of desiring the realization of “the Son’s triumph over the political, economic and social powers which dominate the earth.”77 At this point, as the last part of the eucharist, the dismissal needs to include more detailed descriptions to determine where the eucharistic community should reach and what the community should do. The dismissal below helps participants be reminded of the mission:

**Closing Sentences**

We must not stay here.
Our purpose is among those who cry out for peace.
Our place is alongside those who search for justice.
Let us go with trembling hearts and joyful spirits,

---

75 The Uniting Church in Australia, *Uniting in Worship 2*, 208. Also see The Uniting Church in Australia, *Holy Communion*, 9 and 22.
to sow the seeds of God’s kingdom.\(^78\)

The words for a dismissal do not necessarily contain long instructions or lessons to enlighten congregations. A simple expression often becomes more effective than long sentences. The following dismissal is simple but powerful to lead participants to focus on what they should engage in after the eucharist:

**Sending Out**

Go in peace. Remember the poor.
In the name of Christ. Amen.\(^79\)

On the contrary, the UCA’s “The Dismissal” mainly consists of a blessing towards congregation and closing sentences in which the main theme is a command to serve the Lord. It is interesting to observe that there is no mention of the specific place and object of the mission. In the dismissal of Holy Communion One, after Prayer of Thanksgiving, the minister gives these blessing and sending out words:

**32 Blessing**

May almighty God bless you, the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit.
*Amen.*

**33 Dismissal**

Go in peace to love and serve the Lord.
In the name of Christ. *Amen.*\(^80\)

In “The Sending Forth of the People of God” of UiW2, the themes of the sending words are strengthening congregation with blessing and a command to live of glorifying God in the world:

Go in peace to love and serve the Lord.
In the name of Christ. Amen.
*or*  
Go in peace refreshed and renewed in the eternal love of God.
In the name of Christ. Amen
*or*  
Go in peace; may you carry God’s Wisdom, speak forth God’s Word,
and embody God’s Presence wherever you are.
In the name of Christ. Amen.\footnote{The Uniting Church in Australia, \textit{Uniting in Worship 2}, 224. In the first liturgy of the Sunday Service, these themes are repeated. See, ibid., 185.}

The command, “serve the Lord” includes, indeed, everything which the eucharistic community should do. For, to love God embraces to love our neighbours. As John says, those who do not love a brother or sister cannot love God (1 John 4:20). Yet, as observed above, when the dismissal includes more detailed and specified words describing the mission of church into the world the significance of the dismissal might be strengthened.

\subsection*{4.4 Thanksgiving Prayer}

Since the earliest period of Christian history, the thanksgiving prayer has been a dominant element in the eucharist. Thanksgiving prayer mainly consists of thanksgiving and praise. In the \textit{Didache}, thanksgiving is the main theme penetrating the eucharist. In the prayer, the Didache community gives thanks to God for “the holy vine of David” (9:2), and “the life and knowledge” (9:3).\footnote{For the texts of chapter 9 of the \textit{Didache}, see Niederwimmer, \textit{The Didache}, 144.} In chapter ten of the \textit{Didache}, the reason of thanksgiving continues as follows: “your holy name” (10:2), “the knowledge and faith and immortality” (10:2), and giving “food and drink” (10:3) through Jesus. The last reason of thanksgiving in the \textit{Didache} is that “you are powerful” (10:4).\footnote{For the texts of chapter 10 of the \textit{Didache}, see ibid., 155.} The reasons of thanksgiving of the Didache community are closely connected with the work of God for salvation. Another crucial theme in the eucharistic prayer of the \textit{Didache} is praise to God. Most verses in the eucharist of the \textit{Didache} are full of words of praise and glory towards God: “To you be glory forever”\footnote{Ibid., 144.} (9:2; cf. 9:3, 4, 10:2, 4, 5 and 6). In the thanksgiving prayer of the \textit{Didache}, the image of God as the Creator and Saviour is highlighted. God the Creator is worthy to receive glory and praise (10:3f).\footnote{“You, almighty Lord, created all things for the sake of your name, and you gave food and drink to human beings for enjoyment, so that they would thank you.” Ibid., 155.} Then, worshippers give thanks to God who gives them eternal life (10:3ff).\footnote{“But you graced us with spiritual food and drink and eternal life through <Jesus> your servant.” Ibid., 155.} Besides the \textit{Didache}, another important resource regarding the eucharistic prayer of the early church is
the so-called *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus. Although the title of this material has the name of Hippolytus of Rome, there has been recently a general recognition that it is a later collection from various sources arising from diverse regions. Nevertheless, there is a consensus that this document contains liturgical sources dating from the second to the fourth century CE. The theme of the eucharistic prayer in the *Apostolic Tradition* is slightly different from the *Didache*. In the *Apostolic Tradition*, the whole life of Jesus from his birth to resurrection is described (4-8), and then followed by an illustration of the last supper (9-11), invocation (12) and praise to the triune God (13). Yet, there is no mention of God the Creator. Regarding the contents of the eucharistic prayer, the UCA follows the *Didache* rather than the *Apostolic Tradition*. The two main themes of the *Didache*, which are praise to God the Creator and thanks for salvation, are observed in the UCA’s “The Great Thanksgiving” prayer. Regarding the first theme, Holy Communion One offers praise as follows:

We praise you
that through your eternal Word
you brought the universe into image.
You have given us this earth
to care for and delight in
and with its bounty you preserve our life.

The second service of the Lord's Day in UiW2 develops this theme in the Australian context:

We bless you for this wide, red land,
for its rugged beauty,
its changing seasons,
for its diverse peoples,
and for all that lives upon this fragile earth.
You have called us to be the Church in this place,
to give voice to every creature under heaven.
We rejoice with all that you have made,
as we join the company of heaven in their song.

Secondly, the focus of thanksgiving is on the saving work of God through Jesus. In the thanksgiving prayer of UiW2, the whole life of Jesus is described as in the *Didache* and the *Apostolic Tradition*. In order to save the world, God sent his only son

---

89 The Uniting Church in Australia, *Holy Communion*, 10.
90 The Uniting Church in Australia, *Uniting in Worship 2*, 212.
to the lowliest part of the earth. During his life, Jesus showed the world what love was. The suffering and death on the cross is remembered in the prayer. Then the anticipation of the second coming of Jesus appears in the prayer.\textsuperscript{91} UiW2 provides an acclamation which might be said or sung by the congregation as part of the thanksgiving prayer. Here one can observe three sentences which condense the life of Jesus:

\begin{quote}
Christ has died.
Christ is risen.
Christ will come again.\textsuperscript{92}
\end{quote}

In this acclamation, the vision of worshippers does not stay only in the memory of Jesus. They give thanks to Jesus who is present among them and at the same time anticipate his second coming. This eschatological sense leads worshippers to have “a real encounter with the Christ who actively works our salvation.”\textsuperscript{93}

On the other hand, the thanksgiving prayer needs to be reflected in the light of justice. The eucharist is not only a matter of how to share equally the meal in church. It involves justice in much broader dimensions than simply the church.\textsuperscript{94} When considering the whole process through which the eucharistic ingredients are produced from the soil and set on the table, it is not difficult to find that there is a widespread injustice based on social, political and economic oppression.\textsuperscript{95} Also, in terms of ecology the production of the eucharistic elements might cause injustice. As Moore indicates, deforestation, agricultural chemicals and wastes which are caused in the process of the production of bread and wine contaminate soil and rivers.\textsuperscript{96} As a result, the ecosystem is endangered and flora and fauna in such areas are at risk of extinction. At this point, to neglect these unjust situations in the eucharistic prayer would be to evade the responsibility of the church as provided by God. The thanksgiving prayer should confront the injustice and embrace the voices

\textsuperscript{91} See The Uniting Church in Australia, \textit{Holy Communion}, 10, 26.
\textsuperscript{92} See The Uniting Church in Australia, \textit{Uniting in Worship 2}, 179, 214, 315, and 319.
\textsuperscript{95} Ibid., 865.
of suffering in the world. It is worth observing Moore’s indication of the thanksgiving prayer which does not fully embody the essence\textsuperscript{97} of thanksgiving:

> Christian thanksgiving, like the psalms, involves lament. It is the relationship of thanksgiving to lament that ensures that our praise is not simply an escape from taking responsibility through flight into “mystery.” Without lament we ignore the pain and suffering of the world, God’s world. Conveniently, we also overlook our part in that injustice, whether it is played out as a hunger for food, rights, medicine, education, resources or priority in scientific research. Our prayer becomes just another form of forgetfulness. Without lament, has our faith stood by the cross, whether that of Jesus or one of his many suffering brothers and sisters?\textsuperscript{98}

### 4.5 Invocation or Epiclesis

From the very early stages of Christian history, invocation or epiclesis has been offered in the eucharistic prayer. Although there is no mention of the terms, “through/by the Holy Spirit” or “Come Holy Spirit,” which are characteristics of the epiclesis observed in the present form of the eucharistic prayer, the Didache contains a “forerunner”\textsuperscript{99} of epiclesis: “As this broken bread, scattered over the mountains, was gathered together to be one, so may your Church be gathered together in the same manner from the ends of the earth into your kingdom” (9:4).\textsuperscript{100} This petition of gathering God’s people in the Didache might have developed into the idea of “sanctifying the congregation and, further on, to a Spirit-epiclesis.”\textsuperscript{101} More clearly, the Didache prays for the divine presence: “May grace come, and may this world pass away. ... Maranatha” (10:6).\textsuperscript{102} This petition does not specify the Holy Spirit as the divinity who is asked to come. Moreover, “Maranatha” in the early church was used as an acclamation in worship anticipating the second coming

\textsuperscript{97} Christian thanksgiving is not based on only the moment of success and happiness. The essence of Christian thanksgiving is to give thanks and praise to God even in the midst of suffering (cf. Rome 5:3).

\textsuperscript{98} Moore, “The Justice Dimension in the Eucharist,” 83.

\textsuperscript{99} McKenna recognizes a possibility that the eucharistic prayer of the Didache might contain a forerunner of epiclesis. However, he has been reluctant to ensure it. For, he is not confident that chapters 9 and 10 of the Didache are the eucharist rather than an agape meal. See John H. McKenna, The Eucharistic Epiclesis: A Detailed History from the Patristic to the Modern Era, Second Edition (Chicago, IL: Liturgy Training Publications, 2009, first published in 1975), 7. On the other hand, Bradshaw views that there is “the most likely antecedent for an early Christian use of a direct invocation” in the Didache. See Bradshaw, Eucharistic Origins, 126.

\textsuperscript{100} This is translated by W. Rordorf and A. Tuilier. See Johnson, Worship in the Early Church, 37.


\textsuperscript{102} Johnson, Worship in the Early Church, 38.
of Christ rather than the Holy Spirit (1 Corinthians 16:22; Revelation 22:20). However, when considering that a clear concept regarding the roles of the trinity had not yet developed in the first two centuries, this early form of the petition for the divine presence might have possibly evolved into the epiclesis later. Like the Didache, Justin’s First Apology apparently contains the concept of invocation without a direct use of the terms related to the Holy Spirit: “… through the word of prayer that comes from him the food over which the thanksgiving has been spoken becomes the flesh and blood of the incarnate Jesus, in order to nourish and transform our flesh and blood” (66:2).

However, the early third century Christian literature in Syria, known as the Didascalia Apostolorum, embraces the eucharistic theology of consecration by the Holy Spirit: “The eucharist is accepted and sanctified through the Holy Spirit” (6:21). Around the same time, in the west, the Apostolic Tradition also expresses a well developed version of epiclesis with the term of the Holy Spirit:

And we ask that you would send your Holy Spirit upon the offering of your holy Church; that, gathering them into one, you would grant to all who partake of the holy things (to partake) for the fullness of the Holy Spirit for the confirmation of faith in truth (4:12).

This epiclesis includes two objects which will be transformed by the presence of the Holy Spirit: the eucharistic elements and participants. Since the third century, this basic structure of the epiclesis has pervaded the west and the east. This structure is also observed in the epiclesis of the liturgies of the UCA:

Father,  
let your Spirit come upon your holy people,  
and may he sanctify these gifts of bread and wine.  
As we share these holy things,  
may we be nourished and grow in grace to your honour and glory;  
through Jesus Christ our Lord.

In Holy Communion Two, the title of Invocation of the Holy Spirit is changed to Prayer of Consecration. Here, the two structural components of the epiclesis are more clearly expressed:

103 See Fitzmyer, First Corinthians, 630-631.  
104 Bradshaw, Eucharistic Origins, 127.  
107 Jasper & Cumming, Prayers of the Eucharist, 23.  
108 The Uniting Church in Australia, Holy Communion, 11.
O God, by your Word and Spirit
bless and sanctify this bread and this wine,
that they may be for us
the communion of the body and blood
of our Saviour Jesus Christ,
and that he may ever live in us
and we in him.

Father, accept us,
as we offer and present ourselves,
our souls and bodies,
to be a holy and living sacrifice,
through Jesus Christ our Lord,
to whom with you and the Holy Spirit
be all honour and glory,
now and for ever.

Amen. ¹⁰⁹

4.6 The Lord’s Prayer

The New Testament has two versions of the Lord’s Prayer in Matthew 6:9-13 and Luke 11:2-3. The earliest literal source containing the full text of the Lord’s Prayer outside the Scripture is the Didache 8:2-3. Matthew and the Didache share many similarities rather than Luke, but definite differences exist even in them. According to Betz, the textual variation indicates that the Lord’s Prayer was written down through the oral tradition. He suggests that there would have been more varied versions of the Lord’s Prayer in the early church. ¹¹⁰ In spite of the variation, the early church believed that the Lord’s Prayer had come from Jesus. So it is clear that the Lord’s Prayer has had a great influence on worship and life throughout Christian history. Besides the three earliest prayers, there are several documents proving that the early Christians had recognized the Lord’s Prayer to be crucial in their religious lives. In the second century, Tatian’s Diatessaron includes the full text of the Lord’s Prayer which is presumed to be the version of Matthew with a few alterations. In the third century, the Lord’s Prayer appears more broadly in Tertullian’s On Prayer, Cyprian’s On the Lord’s Prayer and Origen’s On Prayer. ¹¹¹

¹⁰⁹ See ibid., 26. UiW2, also, follows this pattern of the epiclesis. See The Uniting Church in Australia, Uniting in Worship 2, 179, 215-216.
However, it is an interesting fact that the first three centuries’ texts containing the Lord’s Prayer were written for mainly a catechetical rather than liturgical purpose. The earliest textual proof that the Lord’s Prayer was used in a liturgical context is the twenty-fourth Catechetical Lecture of Cyril of Jerusalem in the fourth century. Although some scholars view that the variation of the Lord’s Prayer in the Scripture was the consequence of liturgical use of it,\textsuperscript{112} there is little textual evidence that the Lord’s Prayer had been used in the eucharist prior to Cyril. Thus, it is assumed that the use of the Lord’s Prayer in communal service might possibly be a liturgical development by the later church whereas there is obvious evidence that the Lord’s Prayer was used as a model for individual prayer and taught in catechetical instruction.

The position of the Lord’s Prayer in the lecture of Cyril comes between the prayer of intercession and the communion.\textsuperscript{113} Similarly, in the fifth century, Jerome placed the Lord’s Prayer immediately before receiving the communion. His theological point was that all participants need to be forgiven through the petition for forgiveness of the Lord’s Prayer:

Next comes, “Forgive us our debts, as we also forgive our debtors.” No sooner do they rise from the baptismal font, and by being born again and incorporated into our Lord and Saviour thus fulfil what is written of them, “Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven and whose sins are covered,” than at the first communion of the body of Christ they say, “Forgive us our

\textsuperscript{112} Jeremias argues that the shorter version of Luke is nearer to the original and Matthew expanded it for liturgical use. For more details on his comparison between the versions of Matthew and Luke, see Joachim Jeremias, \textit{The Prayers of Jesus} (Norwich: SCM Press, 1976, first published in 1967), 90-91. In contrast, Charlesworth, providing literal evidence of abbreviations made by later religious communities, suggests that Luke’s version would be abbreviated for liturgical purposes. James H. Charlesworth, “A Caveat on Textual Transmission and the Meaning of \textit{ABBA}: A Study of the Lord’s Prayer,” in \textit{The Lord’s Prayer and Other Prayer Texts from the Greco-Roman Era}, ed. James H. Charlesworth, Mark Harding, and Mark Kiley (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International, 1994), 1-5. Also, Willy Rordorf contends that the Lord’s Prayer is essentially connected with communal worship in which the word of God is proclaimed and the sacraments are conducted. Willy Rordorf, “The Lord’s Prayer in the Light of Its Liturgical Use in the Early Church,” \textit{Studia Liturgica}, vol. 14, no. 1 (1980-1981): 2-3. Mazza insists a close relationship between the Lord’s Prayer and the eucharist with a hypothesis that Jesus offered two prayers at the last supper: the Lord’s Prayer and thanksgiving prayer. However, his idea is highly dependent on his hypothesis without any evidence. See Mazza, \textit{The Eucharistic Prayers of the Roman Rite}, 250-280. Based on the \textit{Didache} 10:5, Luz argues that the Lord’s Prayer was offered with a doxology in early Greek Christina communities. However, although the clause of the \textit{Didache} 10:5 is identified with the last clause of the Lord’s Prayer, there is no evidence that the \textit{Didache} 10:5 was from the Lord’s Prayer. See Ulrich Luz, \textit{Matthew 1-7: A Commentary} (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1989), 385.

\textsuperscript{113} Jeremias, \textit{The Prayers of Jesus}, 82-83.
debts,” through these debts had been forgiven them at their confession of Christ (Dialogus adversus Pelagianos 3:15). Since Gregory the Great (590-604), in the Roman Mass, the Lord’s Prayer has been moved from right before receiving communion to before the rite of Peace, Breaking of the Bread and Communion and after Canon including Sanctus, Anamnesis, Epiclesis and Doxology. This alteration of placement enhances the previous theological focus on forgiveness, and plays a role of completing the Canon.

On the other hand, since the Reformation, Protestants have developed theological meanings of the Lord’s Prayer in worship. Generally, in Protestant traditions, the Lord’s Prayer is placed after the Sermon and Intercession Prayer and before the Service of the Eucharist. Luther gives an instruction of the order of the Lord’s Prayer in the Sunday Service: “After the sermon shall follow a public paraphrase of the Lord’s Prayer, with an exhortation to those who are minded to come to the Sacrament.” Regarding the position of the Lord’s Prayer, Worship orders of Calvin’s The Form of Church Prayers 1542, Knox’s The Form of Prayers 1556 and the Westminster Directory for the Public Worship of God 1664 are similar to that of Luther. In the period after the Reformation, the Lord’s Prayer in the Protestant tradition seems to play the role of completing the service of the word and the intercession prayer. On the other hand, when it comes to the eucharist, congregations through the Lord’s Prayer are allowed to participate in the eucharist. In this case, the theology of forgiveness in the Lord’s Prayer is emphasized. Before long, however, Protestants began to develop freely worship orders according to their denominational theologies. One interesting position concerning the Lord’s Prayer is observed in American Book of Common Prayer 1790-1979: Opening Dialogue – Proper Preface – Sanctus – Prayer of Humble Access – Anamnesis with Verba and Manual Acts – Epiclesis – Oblation – Distribution – Lord’s Prayer. In this case, the Lord’s Prayer might be interpreted as concluding the whole worship.

115 Adam, The Eucharistic Celebration, 96-97.
117 For more details on their worship orders, see Committee on the Book of Common Worship, The Book of Common Worship (2008), 111-113.
118 See Byars, Lift Your Hearts on High, 38.
In the resources of the eucharist of the UCA, the Lord’s Prayer is placed between the eucharistic prayer, which includes epiclesis and thanksgiving, and the Breaking of the Bread which is followed by Lamb of God, Invitation and Distribution. Historically, as observed above, this position of the Lord’s Prayer is similar to that of Cyril. This position is, also, found in various contemporary liturgies of denominations engaged in the ecumenical movement such as the Roman Catholic, the Lutheran Church of Australia, the United Methodist, the PCUSA and the PCK. Moreover, the Lima liturgy which is a symbolic icon of the liturgical movement expresses this placement. Theologically, the focus of this position is on completing the eucharistic prayer and signifies God’s acceptance and forgiveness.

On the other hand, regarding the text of the Lord’s Prayer, the UCA uses Matthew’s version. There is an interesting fact that the UCA encourages the church to use a variety of forms of language in saying the Lord’s Prayer: “Members of the congregation may say the Lord’s Prayer in a language of their choice. It shows the commitment of the UCA to embrace people who are familiar with languages other than English in worship.

4.7 The Institution Narrative

In the history of eucharistic liturgies, one of the most interesting topics is the institution narrative. Traditionally, the institution narrative has been recognized as informing the church on the origin of the eucharist: Jesus instituted the eucharist at the last supper before he was arrested (Matthew 26, Mark 14, Luke 22, and 1 Corinthians 11). This perspective on the origin of the eucharist based on the so-called last supper tradition, which is closely connected with the death of Jesus, has formed the mainline churches’ eucharistic theology and practice. However, as observed in the previous chapters of five and six of this study, in the first two centuries’ Christian literature, there is no textual evidence advocating the traditional understanding of the eucharist.

---

119 For more details on the position of the Lord’s Prayer in the liturgies of the UCA, see The Uniting Church in Australia, *Holy Communion*, 12-13, 26-27. Also, see The Uniting Church in Australia, *Uniting in Worship* 2, 180, 217.

120 The recent worship book of the PCK gives four examples for the Sunday service including the eucharist (6, 7, 8 and 9). Among them, last two examples place the Lord’s Prayer between the eucharistic prayer and the breaking of the bread. See Committee on the Book of Common Worship, *The Book of Common Worship* (2008), 79, 83.

121 The Uniting Church in Australia, *Uniting in Worship* 2, 180. Also see ibid., 334-344.
The first interpretation of the eucharist within the last supper milieu is found in Tertullian’s *Against Marcion* (4.40) in the early third century. However, his teaching of the eucharist in *Against Marcion* seems to be a commentary on the last supper story aiming at refuting Marcionism rather than a depiction of an actual eucharistic practice in his community. A little later, in the middle of the third century, Cyprian of Carthage gives a eucharistic instruction that church should conduct the eucharist according to the last supper tradition (*The Epistles of Cyprian* 62). Although it is evident that in his eucharistic understanding there is a strong connection between the eucharist and the suffering of Jesus, at the same time Cyprian reveals indirectly that the actual practices of the churches in his time were different from the last supper tradition.

The first textual evidence, that the institution narrative was used in the eucharistic liturgy, is found in the anaphora of Serapion in the mid-fourth century. Then, in the late fourth century, Ambrose of Milan’s *De Sacramentis* and John Chrysostom’s liturgy placed the institution in the eucharist. However, the use of the institution narrative in the eucharist was not a universal feature in the fourth century. For example, in the anaphora of *Addai and Mari*, which is presumed to be used around the fourth century in the east Syria, there is no mention of the institution narrative. Nevertheless, since the fourth century, the institution narrative has become firmly established in the eucharist of the east and the west.

In the UCA’s eucharist, the institution narrative is an essential order. The institution narrative is generally placed before the prayer of thanksgiving as an independent order but it is also possible to be read this “as part of The Great Prayer of Thanksgiving.” The eucharistic understanding based on the institution narrative spontaneously connects the eucharist with the suffering and death of Jesus. In other words, the use of the institution narrative in the eucharist emphasises the point that the UCA recognizes the origin of the eucharist as the last supper.

---

122 For more details on the actual eucharistic practice of Tertullian’s community, see chapter five of this study.
123 For more details on the eucharistic understanding of Cyprian, see chapter five of this study.
124 For more details on the use of the institution narrative in the eucharist of Serapion, Ambrose, Chrysostom and *Addai and Mari*, see chapter five of this study.
125 The Uniting Church in Australia, *Uniting in Worship* 2, 215.
4.8 The Lamb of God

This strong connection between the eucharist and the last supper is reaffirmed in the Lamb of God, *Agnus Dei* in Latin. The Lamb of God is known to have been first introduced in the eucharist by Pope Sergius I (687-701).126 This special term of Christ, however, is not an invention of Sergius I but is already found in the New Testament. John the Baptist sees Jesus and calls him: “the Lamb of God” (John 1:29, 36). In Revelation, Jesus is called the Lamb (5:6; 19:9). Also, Paul and Peter recognize Jesus as the paschal Lamb (1 Corinthians 5:7; 1 Peter 1:19). Moreover, the Old Testament prophet Isaiah describes Messiah as a Lamb that is led to slaughter (53:7). The UCA recognizes the Lamb of God as a crucial element in the eucharist. The three orders in *Holy Communion* and *UiW2* place the Lamb of God after the Breaking of the Bread.127 The Lamb of God who takes away the sin of the world is a repetition of the image of Jesus who offers himself for the salvation of the world at the last supper. The Lamb of God which is placed right before receiving the eucharistic elements has important theological meanings. Firstly, it reminds participants of the significance of the death of Christ in the history of redemption. Secondly, the recognition that Jesus was sacrificed as the paschal Lamb for sinners leads people to face the nature of human beings as they are. Eventually, they have to say: “Jesus, Lamb of God, have mercy on us.”128 Lastly, humility based on this recognition of sin impels the church to recognize that all are equal before the table of Jesus. No one can dare come to the table of Jesus because all are sinners. Yet, through his grace, all are invited to his merciful table. The third order of *Holy Communion* expresses this theology of humility. After the breaking of the bread, the minister says:

Jesus is the Lamb of God,  
who takes away the sin of the world.  
Happy are those who are called to his supper.  
Lord, I am not worthy to receive you,  
But only say the word and I shall be whole.129

---

127 See The Uniting Church in Australia, *Holy Communion*, 13, 27-28, 34. See also The Uniting Church in Australia, *Uniting in Worship 2*, 181, 220.
128 The Uniting Church in Australia, *Uniting in Worship 2*, 181, 220.
129 The Uniting Church in Australia, *Holy Communion*, 34.
4.9 The Invitation

The Invitation in the UCA’s eucharist is placed before receiving the communion in the first order or after the Offertory in the second and third orders. The position of the Invitation in UiW2 follows the latter. The Invitation is a place through which the open table policy of the UCA is disclosed. In the first and second orders of Holy Communion, the Invitation emphasizes participants’ faith and knowledge of Christ who was sacrificed for salvation. However, there is no mention of baptism as a prerequisite for the eucharist. On the other hand, in the third order of Holy Communion the open table theology is clearly reflected:

Friends,
this is the table of the Lord
and he calls us to this sacred feast.
Come, not because you are strong,
but because you are weak;
come, not because of any goodness of your own,
but because you need mercy and help;
come, because you love the Lord a little
and would like to love him more;
come, because he loves you
and gave himself for you.132

UiW and UiW2, also, provide rich examples of the Invitation. In UiW2 there are five examples of the Invitation. Two examples are included in Service of the Lord’s Day One and Two, and the others are added in Resources for the Service of the Lord’s Day. Among them, only one example expresses baptism with regard to the eucharist. Two examples in Service of the Lord’s Day contain the terms “repent of their sin” but the focus is not on repentance as a requirement for the eucharist but, rather, that they are unworthy sinners who need the mercy of God. In UiW, there are eight additional examples of the Invitation. Among them, the third and last three Invitations are based on the last supper tradition and its emphasis is on participants’ confession and repentance. However, there is no mention of baptism except in the seventh Invitation. On the other hand, the first two and the fourth and

130 Ibid., 14, 23, 31.
131 See The Uniting Church in Australia, Uniting in Worship 2, 162, 209.
132 The Uniting Church in Australia, Holy Communion, 31. See also The Uniting Church in Australia, Uniting in Worship 2, 307.
133 This Invitation is based on the statement of the eucharist in Basis of Union. The Uniting Church in Australia, Uniting in Worship 2, 307.
134 Ibid., 162, 209.
fifth examples express Jesus’ hospitality and the openness of the table.\textsuperscript{136} It is interesting that these four Invitations are not confined to the traditional understanding of the origin of the eucharist, that is, the last supper. The words for Invitation are from Matthew 11, John 6 and Luke 13 in which Jesus is described as the gracious provider and the host of the banquet of the kingdom of God.\textsuperscript{137} Moreover, it is notable that the second Invitation illustrates the Emmaus story in Luke 24 as the eucharist:

According to Luke, when our risen Lord was sharing an evening meal with two friends in a home at Emmaus, Jesus took the bread, and blessed and broke it, And gave it to them Then their eyes were opened and they recognized him. \textit{Luke 24:30, 31}.\textsuperscript{138}

The open table theology sheds light on Jesus who is present and provides “for all peoples a feast of rich food, a feast of well-matured wines, of rich food filled with marrow, of well-matured wines strained clear” (Isaiah 25:6, NRSV). In the light of the open table theology, Jesus’ meal practice was not a mere act of eating. At the table of Jesus, unacceptable people and sinners became children of God. Moreover, the open table theology gives a new meaning to the last supper. At the supper, the twelve participants did not know what they were doing (Luke 22:24). Among them, there was even Judas who was a slave of Satan (John 13:27). Nevertheless, Jesus welcomed all to his table. In this sense, the Invitation is to be a place through which Jesus’ hospitality and openness are revealed:

This is the joyful feast of Jesus; bread for beloved children; a meal for those expecting scraps; and a banquet for last-minute guests! Come, your place is at the table. Here Christ meets you and calls you God’s own.\textsuperscript{139}

\textsuperscript{136} For more details on eight examples of Invitation, see \textit{Uniting in Worship}, 649-652.
\textsuperscript{137} Ibid., 649.
\textsuperscript{138} Ibid., 650.
\textsuperscript{139} The Uniting Church in Australia, \textit{Uniting in Worship 2}, 209.
5 Ways of Celebrating the Open Table in the UCA

5.1 Strathfield-Homebush Uniting Church (Carrington Avenue Faith Community)\textsuperscript{140}

Carrington Avenue Faith Community (CAFC) was established in 1908 at Carrington Avenue in North Strathfield, NSW. CAFC had belonged to Methodist Church originally but in the process of amalgamation there was a considerable influx of Presbyterians and other denominations. The size of the congregation is about fifty to sixty consisting of approximately 50% of Anglo-Celtic Australians and 50% of ethnic groups from Sri Lanka, Pakistan, India, Malaysia and South Korea. This congregation has been led by Rev. Leonie Findlay since March, 2013.

The eucharist of CAFC demonstrates in a general way how a local church in the UCA conducts the eucharist. The eucharist is celebrated on the first Sunday morning of each month. The eucharistic elements are prepared by elders who are in charge of the eucharist of the month. For the eucharistic bread, leavened bread is sliced in a size of two cubic centimetres and placed on plates. For the cup, grape juice is filled in small cups. The eucharistic elements are set on the table before worship and covered with a white cloth.

\textsuperscript{140} This case study is based on an interview with Rev. Leonie Findlay on November 24, 2013.
The service of the eucharist begins after the service of the word. Regarding the structure of the service of the eucharist, Rev. Leonie Findlay refers to the formats of UiW or UiW2 but reconstructs the order and contents, particularly in terms of the prayers and the Invitation, of the eucharist according to the context of the congregation. While the congregation sits on pews, the service of the eucharist begins with her warm invitation. For the Invitation, she refers to resources of UiW and UiW2 and also other denominations’ worship books. She recognizes that, in receiving the communion, participants’ baptism, beliefs and confession of sins are crucial but not mandatory requirements. Thus, she tries to make the words of the Invitation more inclusive so that all may participate in the eucharist. During the eucharist an organist plays a hymn. The mood of the music is solemn so that participants may ponder on the meaning of the eucharist. Two elders firstly deliver bread to all participants including children. After checking that all have received the bread, they eat it at the same time. Then, the cup is delivered and drunk in the same way. The eucharist of CAFC is based on the last supper tradition. The last supper story and the meaning of the sacrifice of Jesus for salvation are explained in the eucharist. On the other hand, in terms of the tradition of the open table, the minister tries to avoid deliberately exclusive language especially such as “baptised people” and “church members.” Moreover, the elders, when they deliver the
elements to the congregation, do not ask whether the participants have been baptised or not. The eucharist at CAFC concludes with a hymn and the minister’s benediction.

5.2 St. Stephens’ Uniting Church

St. Stephens' Uniting Church (SSUC) which began with twenty two members in 1842 grew consistently and dedicated its present building on Macquarie Street, Sydney in 1935. SSUC was originally a Presbyterian Church which joined the UCA in 1977. The average number of Sunday service participants is approximately eighty. Since May 2011, Rev. Ockert Meyer has served the congregation.

Figure 8.4 The Eucharistic Table

Similar to other Uniting Churches, the eucharist of SSUC is held on the first Sunday morning of each month. For the eucharistic elements, leavened bread and grape juice are used. Bread is thinly sliced and put on plates. Grape juice is filled in

141 This case study is based on an interview with Rev. Ockert Meyer and the Chair of Church Council Rosalie Ramsay on December 2, 2013.
small cups. The eucharistic elements are set on the table before worship and covered with white cloth. The minister generally uses resources from UiW and UiW2 for the eucharist. The worship including the eucharist is quite liturgical. The whole worship order and most of the contents are printed and distributed to the congregation so that even visitors follow the order of worship with ease.

![Figure 8.5 Distribution](image)

After the service of the word, the congregation stands and the service of the eucharist begins with the minister’s invitation. The focus of the invitation is that the eucharist is a place in which participants experience God’s provision for his people in the vision of the promised land which flows with abundant milk and honey. Then the minister invites everyone to Great Prayer of Thanksgiving. In the eucharist, not only Jesus’ death but also his resurrection and second coming are remembered. SSUC’s tradition of distribution is that the bread and the cup are simultaneously distributed to the congregation. During the distribution, the choir

---

sings a musical offering with an appropriate theme and tune fitting for the occasion. Participants retain the eucharistic elements until all receive it so that they eat and drink together. It is worth observing the position of the Affirmation of Faith in the eucharist of SSUC. In terms of the open table theology, locating the Affirmation of Faith after the communion echoes the recognition of the eucharist as a means of grace. The eucharist of SSUC is concluded with a series of strong requests for dedication.¹⁴³

5.3 United Theological College¹⁴⁴

United Theological College (UTC) was established in Enfield in 1974 by a resolution of the Congregational, Methodist and Presbyterian Churches and moved to its present position in North Parramatta, NSW in 1987. Since the union of the three denominations in 1977, UTC, as the theological college of the NSW Synod of the UCA, has provided theological education and ministerial formation.

During semesters, worship including the eucharist is held from 11:30 am each Wednesday in the Chapel of St Andrew which is located at the centre of the main building of UTC. Students, Faculty and Uniting Mission and Education (UME) staff of the Centre for Ministry (CFM) are the main participants and their families and visitors are welcome to join the worship. Groups made up of candidates, Faculty and Adjunct Lecturers plan worship in UTC. The groups take turns to design and prepare worship each week with a presider of the eucharist. The persons presiding the eucharist are generally a minister of the UCA and sometimes a minister from other denominations who has been given permission to preside at the eucharist at UTC. The content of the eucharist and the way of celebrating it are mainly prepared by the presider of the week.

At 11:30 am on Wednesday October 2, 2013, at the sound of a gong people who have been talking together in the atrium begin to enter the Chapel. The space of the Chapel reflects the worship theology of the UTC community. When they enter the

¹⁴³ The liturgy of the first Advent Sunday Service places Offering and Dedication after the communion. Then, the minister blesses the congregation and Dismissal follows it: “Go in peace to love and serve the Lord. In the name of Christ.” St. Stephens’ Uniting Church, Sunday Service Order: Advent 1 (December 1, 2013, printed), 15.
¹⁴⁴ This case study is based on an interview with Rev. Carolyn Thornley, who is Vice Principal and Dean of Candidates at UTC, on December 13, 2013.
chapel the first thing which welcomes them is a baptismal font moderately filled with water: this is symbolic of where a Christian life begins. A lectern, where the word of God is read and preached, stands on the opposite place of the baptismal font. Between the font and the lectern, in the centre of the worship space, there is the eucharistic table where the people of God are nourished.

In a circular configuration, pews for the congregation surround the font, the table and the lectern. There is no special chair for worship leaders. They arise from the pews of congregation. This arrangement reminds worshippers of the nature of Christian life and the identity of the worshipping community. In explaining the worship space, Rev. Carolyn Thornley says:

The focus of our community is that we are the people of God together. We need to be looking at each other. ... The circle is inclusive of all people. There are no sharp edges. It is about gathering community. It is about how we share with one another. We share our vulnerability and fragility in this place. But we support each other. And pastorally we care for each other.145

---

145 Carolyn Thornley, Interview by author, UTC, North Parramatta, NSW, December 13, 2013.
Following the UCA’s theology of worship, UTC’s worship contains four parts: the Gathering of the People of God, the Service of the Word, the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper and the sending Forth of the People of God. After the Service of the Word, the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper begins with the Offertory which is followed by Great Prayer of Thanksgiving. The institution narrative is placed at the end of the prayer. Then, participants gather around the table for sharing the Peace. For the eucharistic bread, a loaf of bread and some wafers are used. One loaf of bread symbolizes one community. Sharing one loaf of bread symbolizes that they participate in and share one loaf of bread together. For the cup, a cup of wine and a cup of grape juice are separately prepared so that children and those who do not want wine choose grape juice. On this particular children’s day communion took place so that the bread was firstly passed to the children. The children, by themselves or with the help of their parents, broke the bread in a proper size and ate it after dipping it in the cup. Adult participants break the bread by themselves and ate it after dipping it in the cup. After the communion, the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper is completed by the Lord’s Prayer and then the whole worship comes to an end with the Sending Forth of the People of God.147

146 Wafers are prepared for people who need a gluten free diet.
147 The order of the service held at 11:30 am on October 2, 2013 was as follows: 1 The Gathering of the People of God (Call to Worship – Prayers – Song); 2 The Service of the Word (Readings –
Sermon – Silence – Song – Affirmation of Faith – Prayers of Intercession); 3 The Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper (Great Prayer of Thanksgiving – Sharing of Peace – Breaking of Bread – Communion – Prayer after Communion – The Lord’s Prayer); 4 The Sending Forth of the People of God (Song – Blessing - Dismissal).
6 Reflection of the Eucharistic Theology and Practice of the UCA

6.1 The Pursuit of Balance of the Word and the Eucharist in Worship

The UCA recognizes that the eucharist is an essential element in worship. However, in practice celebrating the eucharist on Sunday service is not a compulsory regulation in the UCA. Thus, most churches in the UCA celebrate the eucharist once a month. 148 UiW and UiW2 give directions for worship without the eucharist: “when the section entitled ‘The Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper’ is omitted, other acts of thanksgiving and dedication are used.” 149 In this statement, the UCA does not seem to use thanksgiving and dedication as a mere substitute for the eucharist. Such an interpretation might lead the church to rationalize their worship omitting the eucharist. Also, that consequence is contrary to the UCA’s understanding of worship as observed in section 3 of this chapter. Rather, it would be a more appropriate interpretation of the statement that even in worship omitting the eucharist in which there are no eucharistic elements and actions, worshippers can still embody the nature of the eucharist through acts of thanksgiving and dedication. In this sense, it is worth noting the significance of thanksgiving and dedication in the eucharist. The term “eucharist” which derives from the Greek “eucharistia” might be best translated as “thanksgiving.” In the New Testament, all of the precursors of the eucharist contain the term “thanksgiving” or its synonym “blessing.” 150 The Didache and the early church fathers such as Justin Martyr, Ignatius, Irenaeus, Clement and Origen recognized thanksgiving as the central part of the eucharist. 151 This early church’s eucharistic tradition has been preserved in an ecumenical document of contemporary churches, BEM:

[The eucharist ] is the great thanksgiving to the Father for everything accomplished in creation, redemption and sanctification, for everything accomplished by God now in the Church and in the world in spite of the sins of human beings, for everything that God will accomplish in bringing the Kingdom to fulfilment. Thus the eucharist is the benediction (berakah) by which the Church expresses its thankfulness for all God’s benefits. 152

---

149 The Uniting Church in Australia, Uniting in Worship 2, 138. See also The Uniting Church in Australia, Uniting in Worship, 76.
151 For more details on the use of the term eucharist in the early church documents, see Ibid., 24-25.
152 World Council of Churches, Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry, 10.
The eucharist is the place where the reciprocal offerings between God and his people occur. In the eucharist Jesus the host provides the food of life and the people of God receive the gifts of grace. The eucharist is based on the initiating offering of God. At the same time, however, in the eucharist the recipients are called to respond to God with thanksgiving, praise and offering themselves to be a living sacrifice. After the eucharist, the people of God are sent into the world where they are to dedicate themselves. Thus, the idea of dedication, that is human offering, occupies an important place in the eucharist. At this point, the UCA tries to respect the meaning of the eucharist through thanksgiving and dedication in worship omitting the service of the eucharist. In a recent study on UiW2, Pilgrim People, Burns says:

In the vision of Uniting in Worship 2, worship should therefore always have a eucharistic aspect: expressing thanksgiving and offering, as much when the meal of holy communion is not part of what happens as when it is.\textsuperscript{154}

6.2 The Pursuit of Diversity

The second paragraph of the Basis of Union declares that “The Uniting Church recognises that it is related to other Churches.”\textsuperscript{155} The UCA’s passion for ecumenism goes beyond such a simple statement. The ecumenism asks the UCA to learn from other WCC churches and to pursue a strong relationship with them. In explaining this paragraph of the Basis of Union, Andrew Dutney insists that a sign of the true church is to involve the diversity of church traditions.\textsuperscript{156} The diversity based on the UCA’s pursuit of ecumenism is embodied in its worship resources and practice. The UCA introduces rich sources of the eucharist from various church traditions in UiW2. In the preface in UiW2, there is a statement:

It has been open to new insights in studies in Scripture, theology, liturgy and ritual, including ecumenical learning, new perspectives on our liturgical inheritance and denominational histories, and a widespread debate about

\textsuperscript{153} McMichael, determining the meaning of the sacrificial nature of the eucharist, says: “The full participation of Christians in Christ’s priesthood and sacrifice permits the understanding that an offering of Christ takes place in the Eucharist; there is a mutuality between Christ offering us and we offering him.” McMichael, Eucharist, 74.
\textsuperscript{154} Burns, Pilgrim People, 40.
theological and liturgical language. It uses material from beyond our shores, as part of a generous exchange with overseas Churches, as well as much original material.\textsuperscript{157}

The diversity is also found regarding methods of distribution of the eucharist. The UCA recognizes the value of diverse eucharistic traditions which local churches preserve. There is no one way of distribution preferred in the UCA. Some churches in the UCA practise the Methodist tradition having altar rails at which participants receive the elements. Others follow the Presbyterian style that elders distribute the elements to the congregation sitting on pews. In enhancing the meaning of personal participation and experience in the eucharist some churches lead the participants to directly take the elements at the table. This eucharistic policy of the UCA is well described in UiW2:

It is the responsibility of the minister with the church council to determine whether the bread used is leavened or unleavened, pre-cut or an unbroken loaf; and whether the wine used is fermented or unfermented, offered in individual cups or in a common cup. They also decide how the elements are to be distributed during the service, and how the elements remaining after the service are to be disposed, whether by eating and drinking or some other reverent means. Respect for these means of grace, as well as sensitivity to ecumenical visitors, requires this care.\textsuperscript{158}

Regarding the diversity in worship of the UCA, “Ordered Liberty” which is the UCA’s particular policy for worship needs to be mentioned. UiW2 gives an explanation of “Ordered Liberty”:

Our approach [to worship] has great freedom, which is exercised within a broad framework. In some places, the freedoms will be emphasised over the framework; in others, the people will find that an ordered style enables them to be free before God.\textsuperscript{159}

What is the framework for worship in the UCA? According to the Doctrine and Worship Groups, the basic framework consists of four parts: Gathering as God’s People, Receiving God’s Word, Celebrating the Lord’s Supper and Being Sent on God’s Mission.\textsuperscript{160} Within this framework, local churches can freely develop a worship service “to focus on God.”\textsuperscript{161} In designing the eucharist, the UCA recognizes that there are essential orders in the eucharist such as the Great Prayer

\textsuperscript{157} The Uniting Church in Australia, \textit{Uniting in Worship 2}, 7.
\textsuperscript{158} The Uniting Church in Australia, \textit{Uniting in Worship 2}, 143.
\textsuperscript{159} Ibid., 13.
\textsuperscript{160} Walker, \textit{Building on the Basis}, 230.
\textsuperscript{161} Ibid., 231.
of Thanksgiving, the institution narrative and the breaking of the bread.\textsuperscript{162} However, in organizing the eucharist, also, “Ordered Liberty” is applied:

Even with the core elements there is liberty in relation to how they are performed or expressed or lived out. Creative worship in whatever form or style can make use of drama, video, photography, music, silence, and symbols. Those devising the worship can decide how the space is set up and how people are to be invited to participate.\textsuperscript{163}

The pursuit of diversity involves an effort to embrace various ethnic languages and cultures in the UCA. In 1985 the Fourth Assembly of the UCA adopted “the statement ‘The Uniting Church is a Multicultural Church’ as a declaration of the intention and nature of the Uniting Church in Australia.”\textsuperscript{164} Seongja Yoo-Crowe comments that “this was an historic, bold commitment to respond to a new reality.”\textsuperscript{165} Through this statement, ethnic worshipping communities came to have a new identity in the UCA and confirm that they are members of the UCA.\textsuperscript{166} Since then, there has been concern for the embodiment of multiculturalism in the UCA. Sang Taek Lee indicates that egalitarianism has played a crucial role in the course of the UCA’s declaration of its multicultural identity.\textsuperscript{167} Egalitarianism is not upheld to assimilate non-mainstream cultures to the mainstream but in order that cultural minorities are equally recognized and the value of diversity is enhanced.

On the basis of egalitarianism, the UCA has developed some meaningful implications of multiculturalism in worship. The UCA’s worship policy ‘Ordered Liberty’ contains the statement that “Worship will be offered in a variety of tongues, and in a variety of styles.”\textsuperscript{168} In UiW2, one of the most prominent multicultural implications is found in the Lord’s Prayer in the eucharist. For the Lord’s Prayer, UiW2 provides four indigenous languages in Australia and nine languages other than English. The Lord’s Prayer in UiW2 contains a guide that a congregation may choose a language to use.\textsuperscript{169} The pursuit of cultural diversity in worship includes

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{162} Ibid., 231.
\item \textsuperscript{163} Ibid., 231.
\item \textsuperscript{164} Minutes of the Fourth Assembly, 85.89.1.
\item \textsuperscript{165} Seongja Yoo-Crowe, “Life with Members of Different Cultural Traditions during the Twenty Years since Union,” in \textit{Marking Twenty Years}, 106.
\item \textsuperscript{166} Lee, \textit{New Church New Land}, 176.
\item \textsuperscript{167} Sang Taek Lee, “Multiculturalism Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow in the Uniting Church,” in \textit{Marking Twenty Years}, 120.
\item \textsuperscript{168} The Uniting Church in Australia, \textit{Uniting in Worship} 2, 13.
\item \textsuperscript{169} Ibid., 180.
\end{itemize}
not only languages but also liturgical sources and styles. The Assembly Working Groups on Doctrine and Worship recognizes that multiculturalism in worship as not only an aspect of the UCA today but also something to be proud of:

The Uniting Church has become increasingly culturally and linguistically diverse so that worship is now conducted in many languages and forms, from Korean to Pacific Island worship. Special worship events are making use of their contribution to the richness of worship.

6.3 The UCA’s Open Table Policy Strengthening the Sacraments

In the UCA which practises widely the open table, there is an anxiety about whether the open table might weaken the relationship between baptism and the eucharist and diminish the significance of the two sacraments. Bos indicates:

Many ministers now found it difficult to deny unbaptised children Holy Communion, whilst welcoming baptized children. An unintended consequence of the decision was that, increasingly, unbaptised persons received the Lord’s Supper, thus weakening the historical and theological link between the sacraments.

At the same time, the National Working Groups on Doctrine and Worship also indicated that the admission of unbaptised children to the eucharist “weakened even further the nexus between baptism and the Lord’s supper.” In a sense, the traditional order of “baptism before the eucharist” might be regarded as being undermined by the open table. However, the alteration of the order of the sacraments does not necessarily imply a diminishing relationship between baptism and the eucharist or a weakening of the significance of the sacraments. Rather, the open table theology of the UCA enhances the significance of baptism. The PCK’s eucharistic regulation prohibits children under fifteen years old from receiving communion although they have received infant baptism. Conversely, in the eucharist of the UCA, all baptised children are encouraged to receive the communion. For this, UiW2, referring to a resolution resolved in the Fourth

---

170 See Assembly Minutes 85.99.1 “To encourage ethnic ministers and their congregations where appropriate to maintain their relationships with their church of origin while exercising membership in the Uniting Church.” Also see Assembly Minutes 85.99.2 “To encourage ethnic congregations to use liturgies familiar to them.”

171 Walker, Building on the Basis, 232.


173 Walker, Building on the Basis, 193.

174 For more details on the PCK’s eucharistic regulation, see part one of this study.
Assembly, introduces a new direction encouraging the church to allow baptised children to receive the eucharist. While children in the PCK, in spite of being baptised, cannot receive the communion until the age of fifteen, children in the UCA can be part of the eucharist because of baptism.

In addition, even in the case that the UCA allows those who are not baptised to receive communion, the eucharist is not dissociated from baptism. The UCA does not argue that baptism is an unnecessary sacrament for a Christian life or irrelevant to the eucharist. UiW2 gives a direction regarding the issue of allowing those who are not baptised to participate in the eucharist:

> People not receiving the bread and wine may come forward a blessing. Children and adults who wish to receive the bread and wine, but are not yet baptised, should be encouraged to prepare for baptism (Article 19).

This article reflects clearly the eucharistic perspective of the UCA. Based on the Basis of Union, because it clarifies literally that in the eucharist “the risen Lord feeds his baptised people,” it would mean that people should be baptised before receiving the eucharist. Such an interpretation is identical to other mainstream churches’ eucharistic understanding. However, at the same time, the UCA does not have a legalistic approach to church laws and more importantly missional perspective plays a decisive role in the UCA’s worship and life. In the light of the UCA’s missional perspective, the article would mean that church would not prohibit unbaptised people from participating in the eucharist but would encourage them to be baptised. This means that the relationship between baptism and the eucharist is not disconnected.

7. Summary and Evaluation

The UCA’s eucharistic theology and practice suggest a moderate way through which a Christian community might practise the open table in preserving the traditional eucharistic understanding and at the same time in responding to pastoral needs for the open table on the basis of a missional perspective. In the eighth paragraph of the Basis of Union, the UCA defines that the eucharist is a sacrament

---

175 The Uniting Church in Australia, *Uniting in Worship* 2, 143.
176 Ibid., 143.
177 The Uniting Church in Australia, *Constitution and Regulations*, 23.
of baptised members. Although, as observed before, recently some scholars have
attempted to interpret paragraph 8 of the Basis of Union as not opposing the open
table, this statement literally reflects an ecumenical consensus on “baptism before
the eucharist.” This eucharistic understanding invests the UCA with a doctrinal
orthodoxy. As a result, that understanding leads the UCA to keep conversing with
other mainline churches. On the other hand, in practice, the UCA follows the open
table policy so that a local church might conduct the open table according to diverse
situations in ministry. This open table theology is based on the recognition of the
eucharist as a means of grace, and the UCA’s mission-oriented identity. This two-
dimensional approach to the eucharist enables the UCA, on one hand, to secure its
orthodox status and, on the other hand, to respond to its missional task.

However, the UCA’s open table theology still has a weakness in terms of the
authority of the open table which includes unbaptised people in the eucharist.
Besides the missional emphasis, where can a church find the authority for practising
the open table? Regarding this question, the answer of the UCA’s open table
theology seems to be less than satisfactory. In the previous chapters, this study has
explored historical, biblical and theological grounds for the open table. This study
has found that there is substantial and reliable evidence supporting the open table
especially in the meal practices of Jesus and the early churches’ eucharist in the first
two centuries CE.

Moreover, in terms of the origin of the eucharist, the UCA emphasizes the last
supper. However, as Norman Young indicates, the eucharistic theology immersed
in the last supper might lead the eucharist to be confined in the death of Jesus. 178
As a result, the eucharist based on the last supper might hinder the church from
experiencing the eucharist as not only the joyful banquet of the kingdom of God
with the risen Lord but also the meal shared with the poor, gentiles, strangers and
sinners as Jesus did during his public life.

The UCA’s eucharistic theology and practice would be a challenge to those who try
to adhere to the traditional eucharistic order, “baptism before the eucharist.”
Conversely, for those who want to practise more actively the open table, the UCA’s

178 Norman Young, “Sacrament, Sign, and Unity: An Australian Reflection,” in Ecumenical Theology
in Worship, Doctrine, and Life: Essays Presented to Geoffrey Wainwright on His Sixtieth Birthday, ed. David
S. Cunningham, Ralph Del Colle, and Lucas Lamadrid (New York, NY: Oxford University Press,
1999), 99.
approach to the eucharist seems to be somewhat passive. However, the UCA’s approach to the eucharist would, also, be a good guide for those who have a vision of the open table while recognizing the significance of both baptism and the eucharist in the life of a Christian and the value of church tradition.
Conclusion

The study has set out to explore the PCK’s eucharistic tradition and to research the shape of study of the open table. The PCK has developed its unique eucharistic tradition over about 120 years in Korea. In the process of development, the PCK has come to demonstrate some eucharistic features: (1) The PCK has kept strictly a eucharistic regulation which allows only baptized members who are over fifteen years old to participate in the eucharist; (2) even though recently some churches in the PCK try to hold the eucharist more often, the eucharistic frequency of the majority is still four times a year; (3) theologically, the eucharist of the PCK is based on the last supper tradition. Thus, the meaning of the death of Jesus is emphasized in the eucharist. In addition, the words of the institution from the Synoptic Gospels and 1 Corinthians 11 which are based on the last supper tradition play an essential role in the eucharist of the PCK.

There were several factors which affected the formation and development of the PCK’s eucharistic tradition. Firstly, the PCK’s eucharistic tradition was formed under the influence of Korean culture. When Protestantism was introduced in Korea at the end of the nineteenth century, there were three representative religions: Shamanism, Buddhism and Confucianism. Out of these, the society of Korea was mainly controlled by Confucianism. As a result, Confucianism made a bigger impact on the formation of the PCK’s eucharistic tradition than the others. One of the effects of Confucianism on the eucharist of the PCK is the distinction between baptized members and the unbaptized. In the Confucian tradition of Korea, the division between men and women, adults and children, and social classes was a crucial principle supporting the social system of Korea. The PCK’s eucharistic regulation which gave permission for the eucharist to only baptized members who were over fifteen years old was easily accepted and reconciled with the cultural feature of division.

Secondly, the frequency of the eucharist in the PCK was influenced by the worship tradition of the early American missionaries. The worship tradition introduced by the missionaries to the PCK was preaching centred worship omitting the eucharist. According to the worship tradition, the eucharist was recognized as not part of
ordinary Sunday service but a sacrament. As a result, the eucharist was held three or four times a year. This worship recognition had been preserved for many decades. However, from the end of the twentieth century the PCK began to express that the eucharist is part of worship and needs to be held more frequently. The change of the PCK’s recognition of the eucharist came as the PCK began to participate actively in the ecumenical movement. BCW 1997 and BCW 2008, the recent worship books of the PCK, reflected the eucharistic theology contained in WCC documents such as BEM and the Lima liturgy, and expanded its theological horizons of the eucharist.

Thirdly, in spite of the theological expansion of the PCK in recent years, the eucharistic understanding of the PCK depends highly on the last supper tradition. When the Jeonnam Synod made a decision in its regular meeting in 2001 that unbaptized people can participate in the eucharist, other synods of the PCK viewed the decision as a challenge to the PCK’s eucharistic tradition. Soon, influential theologians in the PCK began to write editorials and essays concerning the issue of the open table. However, almost all the studies were a reassertion of the PCK’s traditional eucharistic understanding rather than a study of the open table. The PCK’s traditional eucharistic understanding reaffirmed in the studies was closely connected with its perception of the eucharistic origin. The PCK has had a strong belief that the origin of the eucharist is the last supper. The PCK’s adherence to the last supper tradition has been further reinforced with some international scholars. Dix tried to seek the origin of the eucharist through his structural approach. Baumstark sought to reconstruct the origin of the eucharist by comparing eucharistic liturgies. Jeremias and many other scholars attempted to explore the theological meanings and the prototype of the eucharist through an exegetical approach. Although their methodologies and the results of the studies were different, there was a common presupposition that the eucharist was instituted by Jesus at the last supper. These studies led the PCK to stand firmly in the last supper tradition. As a consequence, the PCK came to emphasize theologically the paschal meaning of the eucharist.

Recent studies, however, have challenged the belief of the traditional eucharistic understanding that the origin of the eucharist is the last supper, leading to new understandings of the eucharist. There is a scholarly consensus that the early church conducted the eucharist with a variety of content and in different ways. The traditional eucharistic understanding has tried to explain that the eucharistic
diversity of the early church was a development from the last supper. However, if the last supper is the origin of the eucharist, why did the eucharistic documents of the early church exclude consistently the critical features of the last supper tradition? Except for the Synoptic Gospels and 1 Corinthians 11 which are based on the last supper tradition, all the early church eucharistic documents, especially estimated to be from the first two centuries, do not mention the time and context of the last supper. In addition, the theological foci in these early eucharistic documents are thanksgiving, the presence of Christ and the kingdom of God rather than the paschal interpretation of the eucharist which is emphasized in the last supper tradition. An interesting fact is that even the biblical texts based on the last supper tradition fail to illustrate the same last supper in terms of the eucharistic words and ways. Furthermore, there is no mention of the institution narrative and the breaking of the bread in the Fourth Gospel’s illustration of the last supper (John 13). Instead, the Fourth Gospel locates the eucharistic sayings of Jesus in its chapter 6 where Jesus feeds the multitude on a mountain.

The first attempt to explain the eucharist in the context of the last supper is observed in Against Marcion written by Tertullian in the third century. Before long, around the middle of the third century, Cyprian introduced the last supper tradition as the proper way of conducting the eucharist into his community. These documents have two significant meanings. Firstly, around the third century the last supper tradition began to be introduced and recognized as the proper eucharist in the communities of Tertullian and Cyprian. Secondly, before the introduction of the last supper tradition as the proper form, the actual practice of the eucharist in their communities was still different from the last supper tradition. The influence of the last supper tradition began to rapidly expand in the fourth century. Around the late of the fourth century, the institution narrative based on the last supper tradition came to be an essential part of the anaphora even though the anaphora of Addai and Mari, presumed to be used by the east Syrian churches even after the fourth century, does not contain the institution narrative. In the process, the early eucharistic diversity disappeared gradually and the last supper tradition became widespread. According to the church tradition in the middle age, Reformers also recognized the last supper tradition as the proper eucharist. As a result, most mainline churches today have a traditional eucharistic understanding based on the last supper tradition.
This historical approach to the eucharistic origin leads the church to rethink the traditional eucharistic understanding adhering to the last supper. The uncertainty of the traditional presupposition that Jesus instituted the eucharist at the last supper demands church to ponder on the significance of Jesus’ meal practice towards the kingdom of God. Jesus’ meal practice was a symbolic action beyond an ordinary meal. With the vision of the kingdom of God, Jesus invited all people to his table. There was no discrimination in the banquet of the kingdom of God realized by Jesus. There was no prerequisite to be prepared by participants. In the table of Jesus, children and women came to be valuable, gentiles be his people, and sinners be forgiven. There was only the hospitality and love of Jesus, the host of the banquet. The value pursued by the open table theology is the inclusivity based on the generous love of Jesus rather than exclusivity based on rigid eucharistic regulation. Even in the last supper, the open table theology lays theological emphasis on the love of Jesus who willingly allowed Judas the betrayer to come to the table rather than drawing on certain eucharistic principles of exclusion.

The purpose of the open table theology is not to destroy the traditional way of the eucharist and build a new tradition. Rather, the open table theology analyzes the context of the traditional eucharistic understanding and explores the reason why a church developed such traditional eucharistic regulations. The results of the studies would help the church possess a deeper knowledge of its eucharistic tradition and expand its understanding of other eucharistic traditions, through providing a reinterpretation of the last supper and emphasizing the eucharistic value of other meals of Jesus. The reflection of the meals of Jesus would lead church to come closer to the teaching and example of Jesus for the eucharist.

The open table theology teaches church that the focus of the eucharist is on the risen Christ. The eucharist is the place that all participants experience the presence of Christ and his abundant grace. The encounter with the risen Christ in the eucharist strengthens participants’ faith and spirituality. The growth of personal faith will refresh worship and revitalize church ministry. Also, the centrality of the presence of the risen Christ renews the meaning of sacramentality. In the debates in the past on “how Christ is present in the eucharistic elements,” the focus was on the eucharistic elements rather than Christ. In the debates on the number of sacraments, also, the focus was not on Christ but rituals. However, in the eucharist based on the open table theology the risen Christ cannot be confined to bread or the cup. The
risen Christ the host is among people and provides them with spiritual and physical food. In the eucharist participants meet the risen Christ the primordial sacrament.

By highlighting the inclusivity of the meals of Jesus and the diversity of the early Christian eucharistic traditions, it is hoped this thesis can contribute to enhancing the ecumenical movement towards Christian unity. Although the ecumenical movement has made considerable progress in finding common eucharistic theology and practice in various eucharistic traditions, there is a limitation. When churches maintain the distinctive features of their eucharistic traditions to be more important than the common eucharistic features, it will continue to hinder the goal of the ecumenical movement. Conversely, the open table theology views eucharistic diversity and inclusivity as fundamental features. If there has been a common feature in the history of the eucharist, it is the risen Christ not certain eucharistic elements or orders. The risen Christ is the sole authority of the eucharist beyond every doctrine and tradition made by human beings. When the church meets truly the risen Christ in the eucharist and views eucharistic diversity as the divine gift, that experience will enable the church to overcome its long history of separation and enjoy the richness of eucharistic diversity.
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