



Trinity College, The University of Dublin
Confederal School of Religions, Peace Studies, and Theology

Mission, Liturgy, and World in Relationality:
Towards a Decentred Liturgical Theology of Mission

By Kristopher William Seaman

A dissertation submitted to the Loyola Institute
at Trinity College, the University of Dublin
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

December 2017
Dublin, Ireland

Declaration

I declare that this thesis has not been submitted as an exercise for a degree at this or any other university and it is entirely my own work.

I agree to deposit this thesis in the University's open access institutional repository or allow the Library to do so on my behalf, subject to Irish Copyright Legislation and Trinity College Library conditions of use and acknowledgement.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be 'Rash', written over a horizontal line.

Name: _____

29.12.2017

Date: _____

Permission

Acknowledgement

My gratitude and appreciation goes out to my PhD supervisor, Professor Siobhán Garrigan. Her unfailing encouragement, constant reassurance, and wise counsel are particularly appreciated. Her insights have helped me to critique and refine my own approach to liturgical theology and missiology.

I am indebted to the careful reading by my examiners, Professor Bruce T. Morrill and Dr. Andrew Pierce.

I am particularly grateful to other theological mentors without whom I would not be engaged in theological discourse. My undergraduate major changed thanks to Professor Maxwell E. Johnson and, my uncle, Don Talafous, O.S.B. Their passion, along with that of the late R. Kevin Seasoltz, O.S.B., for theology led me to cherish theological research and to continue academic theology. Above all, Stephen B. Bevans, S.V.D. has not only become a great missiological mentor and theological colleague, but a good friend. Our regular lunches and dinners together have offered encouragement, laughs, and from which I am still learning to take seriously the church's prophetic mission within the world.

During my time in Ireland, one community was instrumental in me learning about Ireland but also to learn to call Dublin home for three years. All Hallows College, Dublin, opened their accommodations to me though not a student there. All Hallows was, before their closure, imbued with hospitality beyond measure. In particular, Kelley Bermingham, Darragh Kennedy, Rowena Watters, and Luke Proctor have become lifelong friends, and whose friendships are more valuable than what I could ever have asked for or expected.

My gratitude goes beyond words to Dr. Wee Kuan Yeo, my best friend and biggest supporter, and who selflessly encouraged my education in Dublin. The difficulties of the past year have awakened me to the fact that life can change in an instant, and to appreciate the daily moments of joy, happiness, and presence. Wee Kuan died just a few days before the results of the Thesis Examination. This Thesis is dedicated to his memory.

Abstract

In this work I explore how liturgical theologies of mission construe mission in terms of the ways the church and contemporary disciples participate in mission within the liturgical ritual and within the world. Where this thesis seeks to go further than these liturgical theologies of mission is to decentre liturgy as a complete or normative site of mission. This is not to suggest either that liturgy is unnecessary or that mission does not occur within liturgical ritual, but rather to suggest that mission is central to the activity of disciples living in the world, and that liturgy supports that mission.

The approach this work adopts in order to bridge worship (on the one hand) and Christian living in the world (on the other) is first, via the concept of mission and second, via a re-construction of mission in terms of sacramentality. This thesis argues that sacramentality bridges the gap between liturgy as missionary, and society, where mission may happen. The advantage here is that the site where mission may happen is not limited to liturgy, but becomes fluid as the church and Christian disciples discern how to live in and out of mission within a particular context.

For a robust account of mission to serve this argument, I turn to contemporary, official Roman Catholic documents on the church's mission and liturgy. What I argue in response is for a more nuanced notion of liturgy and world, one that sees them not isolated in two distinct, unrelated contexts, but one in which that mission happens temporally when Christian disciples participate in Christ-like ways.

The relationship between Christology and mission in sacramental terms is articulated by exploring sacramentality in the theology of Rowan D. Williams. Williams construes mission implicitly in his theology of sacramentality, enabling this work to bridge the relationship between the points of liturgy, mission, and world.

Delores S. Williams provides this thesis with the necessary critical voice to help construct a sacramental theology of mission that addresses the liberative role of justice in mission. Mission, I suggest, is sacramental in the meeting of the Christian's participation in and imitation of Christ's life as the Christian disciple meets those most marginalised by resisting the temptation to dehumanise. In the end, then, this thesis poses a liturgical theology of mission.

Table of Contents

Declaration	ii
Permission	iii
Acknowledgement	iv
Abstract	v
Table of Contents	vi
Chapter 1: Liturgy, Mission, and World in Relationality	1
1.1 The Context: Liturgy, Mission, and World	1
1.1.1 Contemporary Liturgical Theologies of Mission	2
1.2 Contemporary Roman Catholic Documents on the Church’s Mission: A Definition	5
1.3 Mission and Sacramentality	6
1.4 Mission Decentred.....	7
1.5 The Sources:	8
1.6 Method	9
Chapter Two: Mission as Holiness: Mission in Contemporary Official Roman Catholic Mission and Liturgy Documents	12
Introduction:.....	12
1.1 The Paschal Mystery: Christ’s Love for Others	13
1.1.1 Lumen Gentium: The Call to Holiness.....	13
1.1.2 Gaudium et Spes.....	16
1.1.3 Analysis of LG and GS	18
1.1.4 Ad Gentes	19
1.1.4.1 Analysis	21
1.2 Post-Vatican II Documents on Mission.....	23
1.2.1 Evangelii Nuntiandi.....	23
1.2.1.1 Analysis:	26
1.2.2 Redemptoris Missio	27
1.2.2.1 Analysis:	29
1.2.3 Evangelii Gaudium	30
1.2.3.1 Analysis:	33
1.3 The Reign of God	35
1.3.1 Lumen Gentium	35
1.3.2 Gaudium et Spes.....	36
1.3.3 Ad Gentes	36
1.4 Post-Vatican II Documents and the Mission of the Church.....	38
1.4.1 Evangelii Nuntiandi.....	38

1.4.1.1 Analysis:.....	41
1.4.2 Redemptoris Missio.....	42
1.4.2.1 Analysis:.....	44
1.4.3 Evangelii Gaudium.....	45
1.5 Mission and Official Roman Catholic Documents on the Liturgy.....	46
1.5.1 The Paschal Mystery.....	47
1.5.1.1 Sacrosanctum Concilium.....	47
1.5.1.2 Evangelium Vitae.....	49
1.5.1.3 Ecclesia de Eucharistia.....	50
1.5.1.4 Deus Caritas Est.....	52
1.5.2 The Reign of God.....	54
1.5.2.1 Sacrosanctum Concilium.....	54
1.5.2.2 Evangelium Vitae.....	56
1.5.2.3 Ecclesia de Eucharistia.....	57
1.5.2.4 Deus Caritas Est.....	58
1.5.3 Beyond Source and Summit.....	59
Conclusion:.....	61

Chapter 3: Contemporary Liturgical Theologies of Mission 62

Introduction:	62
3.1 Liturgy: The Goal of Mission.....	62
3.1.1. Alexander Schmemmann	62
3.1.1.1 Analysis.....	66
3.1.2 Protestant Liturgical Theologies of Mission: Mission as Witness to the Reign of God.....	70
3.3 Liturgy and Mission: The Prophetic Call.....	81
3.3.1 David Noel Power.....	81
3.3.2 Bruce T. Morrill.....	87
3.3.3 Louis-Marie Chauvet	93
Conclusions	99

Chapter 4: The Sacramental Theology of Rowan D. Williams: A Missiological Reading 101

.....	101
Introduction	101
4.1 Sacramentality.....	101
4.2 The Sacramental Theology and Rowan D. Williams.....	103
4.2.1 A Pre-Sacramental State of the Human Person and the Church.....	104
4.2.2 Sacramental Dispossession	106
4.2.3 Repossession	113
4.3 Missiological Implications of Rowan Williams’s Sacramental Theology	122
Conclusion	127

Chapter 5: Ministerial Vission for Prophetic Mission: Delores S. Williams on Mission and Implications for a Sacramental View of Mission.....	129
Introduction:.....	129
5.1 Delores S. Williams: A Mission Theology from the Margins.....	130
5.1.1 An Unromanticised View of Exodus	130
5.1.2 Hagar in the Wilderness: Mission as Quality of Life	133
5.1.3 Finding God’s Vision in the Midst of Oppression	135
5.1.4 The Political and Economic Realities of Oppression: Mission as Resistance.....	136
5.1.5 Mission: Living Out Christ’s Ministerial Life.....	142
5.2 Implications of Delores S. Williams’ Theology for a Liturgical Theology of Mission	145
Conclusion	147
Chapter 6: Conclusions: Towards a Liturgical Theology of Mission	149
Bibliography.....	156

Chapter 1

Liturgy, Mission, and World in a Relationality

1.1 The Context: Liturgy, Mission, and World

In 2010, Pope Benedict XVI added two new dismissal formulas into the revised Roman Missal of the Roman Catholic Church: (1) "Go and announce the gospel of the Lord," and (2) "Go in peace, glorifying the Lord by your life". The pope's intention was to see not only the dismissal rite as "an end" of the liturgy, but also as a beginning of mission. As he states, "We are aware that this [mission] of Christ is not a static one, a kind of 'rest'; rather, it is a dynamic peace that wishes to transform the world so that it is a world of peace enlivened by the presence of the Creator and Redeemer."¹ This particular change to the official liturgical texts of the Roman Catholic Missal sought to strengthen the connection between liturgy and mission.

In other words, what Pope Benedict was doing by adding these two new dismissal rites was to make the liturgical assembly more explicitly aware of the impact that celebrating the liturgy should have not only in the life of the church but also in the society in which disciples live outside of liturgy. The pope connected the dismissal rite to the mission of the church's existence thus: "These few words [of the dismissal rite] succinctly express the missionary nature of the Church. The People of God might be helped to understand more clearly this essential dimension of the Church's life, taking the dismissal as a starting-point."² Mission that is construed liturgically, that is, "glorifying the Lord by your life" is a hermeneutic of a life lived in honouring God. Life is to be lived and interpreted liturgically. What is important in Pope Benedict's changing the dismissal rite is its reflection of a relatively new emphasis in Post-conciliar Roman Catholic theology on the connection between liturgy and mission.³ Quite intentionally, the pope adds liturgical words to reinforce and make clearer a

¹ Benedict XVI, Address at the closing lunch of the 2005 Synod on the Eucharist, 22 October 2005. Vatican website, accessed 29 August 2015, https://w2.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/speeches/2005/october/documents/hf_ben_xvi_spe_20051022_pranzo-sinodo.html.

² Benedict XVI, *Sacramentum caritatis*, Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation, Vatican website, accessed 9 September 2015, http://w2.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_ben-xvi_exh_20070222_sacramentum-caritatis.html, Sec. 51.

³ Recent works on liturgy and mission from a Post-conciliar Roman Catholic perspective include: Stephen B. Bevans and Roger P. Schroeder, "Liturgy, Prayer, and Contemplation as Prophetic Dialogue" in *Constants in Contexts: A Theology of Mission for Today* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2004), 360-368; Joyce Anne Zimmerman, *Worship with Gladness: Understanding Worship from the Heart*, Calvin Institute of Christian Worship Series (Grand Rapids, MI/Cambridge, UK: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2014), 47, 139-148; E. Byron Anderson, "Reform, Participation, and Mission: 'To Derive

ritual acknowledgement of the missionary dimension of the Church. The pope typically does not devise a new theology without it being based in official Church teaching, and therefore, what the pope was doing was trying to convey a deeper sense of mission, that is officially located in the ecclesiastical documents. And again, the desire was to convey ritually a deeper and stronger relationship between liturgy and mission. In what follows, I will examine the theology of mission within the Second Vatican Council and contemporary papal documents on the church's mission and ask: how might a liturgical theology of mission be constructed? This contemporary, official Roman Catholic theology of mission will become a theological framework for evaluating contemporary liturgical theologies of mission. But before that, has this task already been done?

1.1.1 Contemporary Liturgical Theologies of Mission

Underlying current liturgical theologies⁴ of mission is the relationship between liturgy, mission, and world.⁵ In Chapter 3, I explore how liturgical theologies of mission construe mission in terms of the ways the church participates in mission within the liturgical ritual in such a way as to delineate a distinctive claim on mission that unnecessarily limits the potential for mission outside of the church gathered for liturgy. In other words, what is important is not only to discern the relationship between liturgy and mission being implied, but also the relationship of mission and liturgy, with the world. This Chapter provides the context and the foundations for developing the present argument, namely, that the relationship between liturgy and mission in these liturgical theologies of mission, as I will demonstrate, takes as its starting point that liturgy is the pattern that communicates mission. As such, the *liturgy* is construed as the normative experience of mission, but a vital and

the True Christian Spirit”, *Worship* 88 (2014): 218-239. Recent works central to this thesis will be discussed more extensively in Chapter 3.

⁴ The notion of “liturgical theology” is a contested term. For various definitions of liturgical theology, see Dwight W Vogel, “Liturgical Theology: A Conceptual Geography,” in *Primary Sources of Liturgical Theology: A Reader* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press/Pueblo, 2005), 1-15, and Kevin Irwin, *Liturgical Theology: A Primer*, American Essays in Liturgy Series (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1990). Whilst the debate on definitions is beyond the purposes of this thesis, for our purpose, I will employ liturgical theology in a broad notion such as Irwin suggests, “Liturgical theology can mean both a theology of liturgy and theology drawn from liturgy” in *Context and Text: Methods in Liturgical Theology* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press/Pueblo, 1994), 46. In either way, what I am referring to as liturgical theologies of mission can fall anywhere on the continuum between stressing what is the source(s) for theology, doctrine and/or liturgical enactment. As Maxwell E. Johnson notes, both liturgical enactment and theology “must and do function *together* in the development of doctrine and in theological reflection, discourse, and self-interpretation of the Church Catholic” in Maxwell E. Johnson, “Liturgy and Theology,” in *Liturgy in Dialogue*, eds. Paul F. Bradshaw and Bryan Spinks (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press/Pueblo, 1993), 227.

⁵ By “world”, I mean not only the societal context in which the local church exists, but also the larger cosmos in which the church, local and universal, exists within. My use of “world” does not tend to convey that somehow the church and its liturgy is outside of the world, but rather, this term points to how the church lives beyond its confines of ecclesial practises in the broader historical context of the cosmos.

equally necessary component to mission, which will be the subject of Chapter 2, is the living out of Christ's life for the good of the world. The normative centre of mission in these liturgical theologies of mission, I will show, is the church in its liturgy. Should the liturgy be normative for mission? Or, should the world be normative for mission? What I hope to demonstrate is that both world and liturgy are normative for mission, and to over emphasise either liturgy or world (as contemporary liturgical theologies tend so to do) problematizes the purpose of mission.

There are three assumptions within some contemporary liturgical theologies of mission that I will discuss more extensively in Chapter 3, but which should be indicated at the outset: (1) a desire to claim a distinctive ecclesiology for mission and liturgy; (2) the overemphasis on liturgy as the site for mission; (3) and a negative construal of society. Underlying these theologies is not only a pessimistic view of society in general, but also an implicit notion of what liturgy itself is supposed to do. As Siobhán Garrigan suggests, "To read some introductions to Christianity, you would think that all you need is worship."⁶ To change this slightly, reading some liturgical theologies of *mission*, one "would think all you need is worship." This Chapter, therefore, probes these theologies by asking the following questions: Is subsuming mission completely or normatively under worship asking liturgy to do too much? For mission to be fruitful, does one only need worship? Discussing the relationship between worship and ethics, Garrigan reveals a hidden danger in asking worship to do too much: It "is worrying to notice how liturgy has failed to change, and might even have aided, some of the world's great unethical situations and some individuals' unethical choices or actions."⁷ What Garrigan is getting at is a too often recognisable notion that liturgy is romanticised; namely, in terms of mission, liturgy is asked to bear the complete weight of mission. Here, romanticised (or idealised – both terms are used interchangeably), connotes an overemphasis on liturgy as the site of mission. As I will show momentarily and later in Chapter 2, it is more advantageous to centralise mission as normative in two sites, liturgy and the world. By doing so, mission is broad enough to include two significant aspects of missiological discipleship: liturgical participation as well as living out mission within the world.

Yet, Chapter 3 will also engage the works of three significant liturgical theologians who have engaged liturgical theology with the role of mission within the world. My goal in engaging this second group of liturgical theologians is to extend not only the relationship between mission, liturgy, and world, but to extend the definition of mission (a related project for which I argue in Chapter 2).

⁶ Siobhán Garrigan, "Ethics" in *The Study of Liturgy and Worship: An Alcuin Guide*, eds. Juliette Day and Benjamin Gordon-Taylor (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press/Pueblo, 2013), 198.

⁷ *Ibid.*, 193.

Overall this thesis argues to decentre liturgy as the complete or normative site of mission. This is not to suggest that liturgy is either unnecessary, or that mission does not occur within liturgical ritual, but rather, to suggest that mission is central, and the liturgy supports that mission. Or as Peter C. Phan states, the “new way of being church...requires a different ecclesiology, one that decentres the church in the sense that it makes the centre of the Christian life and worship not the church but the reign of God.”⁸ Phan does this through a theology of interreligious dialogue for countries and cultures within Asia, but I want to bring this perspective to bear on the relationship between liturgy, mission, and world.

The particular way I will go about bridging worship and Christian living in the world under the concept of mission is through the construction of mission in terms of sacramentality. I agree that mission should have a liturgical interpretation, but I will take the argument further by suggesting not simply a *liturgical* interpretation (that is: how life in liturgy ought to be grasped in order to live in society), but also that mission in society is rooted in a sacramental way of life. In other words, sacramentality, I suggest, bridges the gap between liturgy as missionary, and society, where mission may happen. The advantage of such a framing is that the site where mission finds its root is not limited to liturgy, but becomes fluid as the church and Christian disciples discern how to live in and out of mission within a particular context. As Peter C. Phan points out, “new boundaries have emerged that are invisible and porous. As a result, one may not even be aware that there are boundaries at all...”⁹ Phan is discussing geographical boundaries, particularly when mission was conceived of as crossing from one country to another to seek converts to Christianity. When and where mission occurs, I will show, becomes fluid so that mission happens in *situations* (whether liturgical or not) rather than in predetermined sites or geographical locations.

For a robust account of mission, I turn to contemporary, official Roman Catholic documents on the church’s mission. These documents will not only help to define theologically what mission is, but they also help to provide a foundation (i.e., a theological framework) for the relationship between liturgy, mission, and world. Because these liturgical theologies of mission largely collapse a theological account of mission into liturgy, they can be read as to posit a competitive dialectic¹⁰ between mission and liturgy which results in a

⁸ Peter C. Phan, “Christian Mission in Asia: A New Way of Being Church,” in *In Our Own Tongues: Perspectives from Asia on Mission and Inculturation* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2003), 14.

⁹ Peter C. Phan, “Crossing Borders: A Spirituality for Mission in Our Times,” in *In Our Own Tongues: Perspectives from Asia on Mission and Inculturation* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2003), 131.

¹⁰ This is similar to Melanie Ross’s argument that the “ordo” in liturgical theology is rooted in the fundamental binary relations of Structuralism. Whereas Ross argues these as binaries of relations, I would suggest that in liturgical theologies of mission these binaries are *competitive* rather than relational – liturgy in distinctive contrast to society, and not simply that liturgy has meaning because of its relational binary to society. Melanie Ross, “Joseph’s Britches Revisited: Reflections on Method in Liturgical Theology,” *Worship* 80, no. 6 (2006): 528-550. Whereas, I suggest the dialectic is not competitive, but rather relational in such a way that mission whether within liturgy or within the world is always in relationship to and in cooperation with the good of those within society.

romantic notion of how liturgy is missionary.¹¹ At the root of this competitive dialectic, I will show, is a notion of society construed as either sinful or simply uninteresting. What I wish to argue, by contrast, is more nuanced: that liturgy and world are not simply isolated in two distinct, unrelated contexts, but that mission happens temporally when Christian disciples participate in Christ-like ways. The above-mentioned competitive dialectic will be laid out in Chapter 3. But why should the dialectic between liturgy/mission and society be so lessened?

1.2 Contemporary Roman Catholic Documents on the Church's Mission: A Definition

To answer that question, the definition of mission being employed becomes vital, because how mission is construed determines where and how it becomes manifest. Chapter 2 will explore a definition of mission from a Second Vatican Council¹² and Post-Vatican II perspective. Why now also turn to contemporary, official Roman Catholic documents on mission? For a distinction that will prove important to how my thesis is pursued later on. Stephen B. Bevans' offers two ways Catholic missiology is distinctive. First, as he states, "Catholic missiology and mission practice relies on the wealth of the Catholic Magisterium, the church's official teaching office, whether papal or episcopal [or conciliar]."¹³ In particular, in the last fifty years, Catholic missiology has been "deeply rooted in the documents...of the Second Vatican Council."¹⁴ Bevans' phrase "rooted in the documents" is important because it means that whilst these official Roman Catholic documents are significant, they do not close the discussion on the meaning of mission for today. Instead, they form the foundation of mission theology. This will become essential to my argument that liturgy and world are not simply isolated in two distinct, unrelated contexts, but that mission happens temporally when Christian disciples participate in Christ-like ways.

Bevan's perspective, as will become evident, suggests the church in general and disciples in particular should be engaged with the society in which they live as a form of mission. Whereas liturgical theologies of mission are engaged in how liturgy itself is a form of

¹¹ The adjective of mission can be denoted either "missionary", "missiological", and/or "missional". Because "missional" is often associated with the Missional Church perspective on mission, we will primarily use missionary as an adjective form, though missiological is sometimes employed as well. When missiological is employed, it is not meant to be used the way Continental university departments envisage missiology, namely, as a theological pursuit heavily developed through empirical methods, whether through anthropology, cultural studies, or sociology.

¹² I will employ "Post-conciliar" as a shorthand for the official Roman Catholic mission documents that were promulgated after the Second Vatican Council. So "Post-conciliar" refers to Post-Vatican II.

¹³ Stephen B. Bevans, "Introduction", in *A Century of Catholic Mission: Roman Catholic Missiology 1910 to the Present*, Regnum Edinburgh Centenary Series, Vol. 15, ed. Stephen B. Bevans (Oxford: Regnum Books, 2013), 3.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 4. Of the twenty-six essays within *A Century of Catholic Mission*, twenty-four are highly influenced by contemporary Roman Catholic documents on mission.

mission, this Chapter will place mission within a Vatican II and a Post-Vatican II context of a theology of mission. What becomes apparent, I contend, is that Vatican II and subsequent official documents on mission hold in balance two Christological emphases. The first is a low Christology of imitating Christ's life as lived in the scriptures. The second is that one participates in a high Christology of the Christ whose Spirit empowers human persons to become like Christ. By dispossessing one's life in this two-fold Christological dimension, one's agency is able to fulfil, however partially, the mission of God. In other words, participating in Christ not only heals sin, but it also empowers one gracefully to do mission. Imitation becomes possible only with the help of a Christology empowered by the Spirit. A robust theology of mission rooted in the Conciliar and Post-Conciliar mission documents, we argue, requires both Christologies to be kept in tension. But why is Christology essential with a theology of mission construed with a sacramental perspective?

1.3 Mission and Sacramentality

The relationship between Christology and mission will become more apparent in Chapter 4 by exploring sacramentality¹⁵ in the theology of Rowan D. Williams. Having engaged liturgical theologies of mission from a Vatican II perspective, Chapter 4 will turn to constructing a theology of mission through the sacramental theology of Williams. His theology is particularly unique in that rather than envisaging mission from a competitive dialectic, Williams, I will show, construes mission implicitly in his theology of sacramentality that helps my argument for bridging the relationship between liturgy, mission, and world. Sacrament is, for Williams, less about the efficaciousness of liturgical celebrations, than it is about the act of God taking root in human lives in order to transform human persons into images of Christ. Grace in such a perspective is wrapped up in history, in the context in which the act of God becomes manifest in human persons. Sacrament, this means, as a general concept, is rooted in the Incarnation for Williams. Christ perfectly holds in tension humanity and divinity, and human persons (sacramental beings) are to respond to God's Act, and by so doing, show forth God's mission within the cosmos. Sacramental theology is therefore set within a theology of transformation where the Incarnation is the final goal of discipleship; humanity is called to transformation according to the act of God. This will receive a fuller treatment in Chapter 4.

Mission-construed sacramentally may mean that mission is not limited to the liturgy, but that sacrament is the dispossession of the self towards the other, that the good of the other is foundational to the self-identity of the mission of the church and disciples. The dialectic at work in Williams's sacramental theology is not a competitive dialectic between liturgy/church on the one hand and society on the other, but a necessary relation of church/liturgy with society. Williams even suggests that for the church to be authentic to

¹⁵ I will use sacramental as an adjective for sacramentality. "Sacramental" is not here used formally for liturgical rituals of Sacraments.

God's purposes, society may even challenge the church to live its mission even more robustly. In particular, the margins of society may provide the greatest critique of the church in regards to how it is living in or not God's mission. In this way, mission is not wholeheartedly contra society, but rather, mission requires the church to be turned towards society, ever *engaged* with society, in such a way as to help society see its true calling which is to serve the needs of the other, that is, the needs of the world. The church too needs society to critique how mission is being lived out or not. The prophetic mission of the church can be in stark contrast to society, but there is not a wholehearted rejection of society.

1.4 Mission Decentred

Theology requires, as Rowan Williams rightly suggested, the voices from the margins in order to add a critical stance towards the mission of the church. In the hopes of decentring liturgy from mission, and to construct a theology of mission rooted in a Christological imitation, I turn to the womanist theologian, Delores S. Williams' two-fold approach to Christological mission, as I will argue, that expands mission as holiness from humanisation to include survival as well as resistance to dehumanisation. Susan Ross indicates three areas where sacramental theology can be explored through a feminist perspective. Firstly, Ross notes, sacramental theology must address the experiences of women. Williams offers not simply a voice from the African American community, but helps to provide one experience of being an African American female theologian in the church. Secondly, Ross suggests, sacramental theology is deeply tied with the Incarnation, something mentioned already in relation to Rowan D. Williams's sacramental theology. Ross contends that the experience of women will shape the role of women in the church.¹⁶ The implication here, from my perspective, is that a sacramental theology of mission will need to take into account the mission of the marginalised within the church as well as within society, and additionally, mission will need to help shape a life rooted in Christ-like living.

Thirdly, sacramental theology must take social praxis seriously. In other words, liturgy not only has something important to do within rituals, but liturgy should contribute to the good of humanity in general. In other words, a sacramental theology of mission must include the importance of justice¹⁷ – living in and from the liturgy for the good of the cosmos. Delores S. Williams will provide a critical voice in helping to construct a sacramental theology of mission that addresses (1) the experience of the marginalised; (2) the Incarnation; (3) and the role of justice in mission. Whilst Rowan D. Williams offers a sacramental theology, in order to

¹⁶ Susan Ross, "God's Embodiment and Women: Sacramental Theology," in *Freeing Theology: The Essential of Theology in Feminist Perspective*, ed. Catherine Mowry LaCugna (New York: HarperCollins, 1993): 185-210.

¹⁷ I employ the word justice as a shorthand way to refer to living out of Christ's life within the world.

extend our definition of mission as suggested in Chapter 2, we turn to survival and resistance to dehumanisation which Delores S. Williams provides.

In the end, then, this thesis poses a liturgical theology of mission. It does so by arguing that mission requires both liturgy and justice together, under the theological conception of sacramentality. My construction of a liturgical theology of mission in the coming pages will not simply focus on the distinctively ecclesiological identity of either liturgy or mission, but by reframing the relationship between liturgy, mission, and world in terms of relationality, which is to say, there is a necessary, and mutually enriching relationship between church and world. My contention, then, is that liturgy and mission should be oriented towards society, and society has a critical voice towards how the church is and is not living out its call to participate and imitate God's mission revealed in Christ Jesus.

1.5 The Sources

The primary sources for this study include contemporary official Roman Catholic Church documents on mission and liturgy as well as significant works by principal scholars of liturgical theology that engage mission. The principal scholars include: Alexander Schmemmann, Ruth A. Meyers, Thomas Schattauer, Bruce T. Morrill, David N. Power, and Louis-Marie Chauvet. In addition, the primary sources include the published work of Rowan D. Williams which focus on sacramentality, and the theological works dealing with the Cross, survival, and resistance from the published work of Delores S. Williams. The literature serves as a vital contribution to the discussion by framing the research question and in order to extend mission as holiness within contemporary liturgical theology vis-à-vis the relationship between liturgy, mission, and world. The official Roman Catholic mission and liturgy (primary) sources are broad and encompass a Roman Catholic definition of mission, though extended with the help of two Protestant theologians. Their theologies, in dialogue with Chapter 2's definition of mission, will be engaged with a Roman Catholic definition of mission and will contribute to that definition of mission. This relates to the second distinctive method of Roman Catholic missiology over the last fifty years, its ecumenical nature.

This is where Bevens' second distinction proves essential to the conception of this thesis: he states,

Catholic scholars depend greatly on the wealth of scholarship of many other Christians....Catholic missiology is unabashedly Catholic, not only in the sense that it finds expression within the parameters of Roman Catholic doctrine, but in the wider sense as well of drawing on any truth that can help deepen an understanding of the entire church's [mission].¹⁸

Whilst my thesis seeks to contribute to a Roman Catholic liturgical theology of mission, it depends on the "wealth" of ecumenical theologians, and, in its constructive piece, on two

¹⁸ Bevens, "Introduction," 3.

Protestant theologians in particular,¹⁹ in order to propose significant additions to our theological construal of mission.

1.6 Method

This thesis is multi-disciplinary in the sense that its approach includes significant aspects of liturgical theology, missiology, and ecclesiology. It is not within the scope of this thesis to provide an extensive overview of the history of and theology of missiology or Roman Catholic ecclesiology, because my purpose is to propose an adequate theology of mission from an ecumenical liturgical perspective (with a Catholic root definition of mission) and not the history of the development of Catholic missiology.

Rowan D. Williams and Delores S. Williams each develop their theologies within two different Protestant faith traditions: Anglican and African American liberal theology respectively. Even though Catholics have entered into theological agreement over justification by faith with Lutherans²⁰ and Anglicans,²¹ there still remains an impasse on the possibility of human cooperation with Divine grace -- or not, as in most Protestant faith traditions. It is beyond the remit of this particular thesis to attempt to solve such a complex and important debate. This thesis will, therefore, merely re-contextualise these theologies for use within a Catholic theological anthropology. The advantage of a Catholic theological anthropology is the potential for a more optimistic construal of human agency as it concerns mission in and for the cosmos. Because I turn to the concept of sacramentality in order to accomplish this, the divide between Protestant and Catholic views may become apparent. This thesis employs an approach that recognises the unity of nature and grace, and human cooperation with grace. Thus, human agency bears witness to and participates in Christ's mission, and the reason for adopting a Catholic theological anthropology (as well as sacramentality) allows for greater weight to mission within the world outside of liturgy as well

¹⁹ Even as Roman Catholic official documents have dealt with advancing mission, three World Council of Churches' documents on the relationship of mission and liturgy have also advanced mission from an ecumenical perspective. A limitation of this thesis will be a focus on the foundational documents of a Roman Catholic theology of mission explored in official Catholic documents over the last fifty years. The ecumenical nature of this thesis is limited to the engagement with the theologies of Rowan D. Williams and Delores S. Williams due to their relevancy for advancing theological concepts to support our notion of a liturgical theology of mission.

²⁰ *The Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification*, Vatican website, Accessed 29 October 2017, http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/chrstuni/documents/rc_pc_chrstuni_doc_31101_999_cath-luth-joint-declaration_en.html.

²¹ Second Anglican/Roman Catholic International Commission, *Salvation and the Church: An Agreed Statement*, Vatican website, Accessed 29 October 2017, http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/chrstuni/angl-comm-docs/rc_pc_chrstuni_doc_19860903_salvation-church_en.html, Sec. 3-8.

as affording the response of human agency to the Divine offer of grace.²² In the examination of the sacramentality of Rowan D. Williams and the womanist theology of Delores S. Williams, I will show the new light sacramentality and resistance bear on a liturgical theology of mission. Therefore, another theological framework for approaching Rowan D. Williams and Delores S. Williams is the Catholic sacramental principle whereby grace dwells in nature yet is not reduced to nature.

Another important approach within this this rests upon a feminist approach to *kenosis*, and it gains particular significance in Chapter 5, where a womanist critique of the Cross and *kenosis* is examined. The advantage of such an approach widens the notion of mission and liturgy from the perspective of mission and liturgical theology to encompass liberation. Whilst soteriologically, liberation is a type of salvation that encompasses personal, social,²³ and ecclesial transformation of relationships with others, by adopting such an approach, both mission and sacramentality are able to be construed in terms of historicity (within the world). This serves the thesis by making mission and sacramentality integral to so-called sacred and secular dimensions of life. In addition, this helps to situate liturgy and world in relationship to mission so that mission encompasses both sites (liturgy and world).

This study will have the following Chapters. Chapter 2 will have two sections. Firstly, it will explore and provide a construal of mission rooted in the official Roman Catholic documents on mission from Vatican II as well as papal documents since. Here I will focus on the relationship of liturgy, mission, and world, as well as the theological concepts of Christological *mimesis* and Christological participation. Secondly, it will then examine the way the definition of mission is present within Vatican II and papal documents dealing with liturgy and mission. Chapter 3 will critically evaluate contemporary liturgical theologies of mission in light of the definition of mission as holiness (argued in Chapter 2). I examine two approaches to the relationship between liturgy/church, mission and world within liturgical theologies of mission in order to situate my definition of mission within liturgical theologies of mission. The second section forms the constructive portion of this study. Chapter 4 will extend mission as holiness through the concept of sacramentality, particularly in relation to the sacramental theology of Rowan D. Williams and in light of our definition of mission as holiness. Chapter 5 further extends mission as holiness through the liberationist/womanist concepts of resistance and survival from Delores S. Williams.

²² Eboni Marshall Turman, *Toward a Womanist Ethic of Incarnation: Black Bodies, the Black Church, and the Council of Chalcedon* (New York: Palgrave, 2013), 150-151.

²³ Daniel G. Groody notes liberation is concerned with personal, social, and religious dimensions of history. I have chosen to change Groody's "religious liberation" to "ecclesial" as it has the advantage of showing that liberation is part of the mission of the church itself, and not merely something that is religious. Idem., *Globalization, Spirituality, and Justice: Navigating the Path to Peace* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2007), 185-186.

Chapter Two

Mission as Holiness:

Mission in Contemporary Official Roman Catholic Mission and Liturgy Documents

Introduction:

The notion of mission itself, in contemporary Catholic mission theology, is inextricably bound up with Vatican II and subsequent official Roman Catholic documents, whether ecclesiological or missiological in perspective. This chapter explores the idea and subthemes of mission that will be taken up repeatedly in later chapters, in particular, mission as holiness, justice, conversion of the self, Divine Love for creatures, and the Reign of God. These are examined through the official Roman Catholic documents on the mission of the Church during Vatican II and the Post-Vatican II documents on mission in order to provide a theoretical framework to engage with contemporary liturgical theologies as well as to interpret sacramental theology missiologically. In particular, this chapter asks: what is the fundamental and comprehensive theological notion of mission in contemporary official Roman Catholic documents?

In order to explore a comprehensive Vatican II and Post-conciliar conception of Roman Catholic mission, I will use the two heuristic concepts²⁴ which together comprise the overarching theological emphases in Roman Catholic theology, namely the Paschal Mystery and the Reign of God. The Paschal Mystery is central to contemporary liturgical/sacrament theology; the Reign of God is central to contemporary expositions on the theology of the church's mission. In order to bring these two areas of theology into greater engagement with one another, these two heuristic concepts will structure my exploration of the church's mission within this chapter.

Firstly, I will explore both of these concepts in the following documents that concern the mission of the church: three documents of Vatican II – *Ad gentes*, *Lumen gentium*, and *Gaudium et spes* and the three major papal documents on mission since the second Vatican Council – *Evangelii nuntiandi* (Paul VI), *Redemptoris missio* (John Paul II), and most recently, *Evangelii gaudium* (Francis). Secondly, I will turn to significant documents on liturgy to distil not only the embedded theology(ies) of mission therein but also in order to suggest that the liturgy documents insufficiently address mission, at least not in the fuller way that

²⁴ By heuristic, I mean concepts I employ to get at the significance of mission for our purposes, liturgically, missiologically, and ecclesiologically. By doing so, I hope to describe a comprehensive theology of mission.

Gaudium et spes, *Evangelii nuntiandi*, and *Evangelii gaudium* do. The reason for structuring the two overarching themes by documents is to show how the notion of mission has not only evolved, but also that particular themes are highlighted or downplayed by a given pope. As will become clear, these documents do not share one model or concept of mission, but rather, portray various notions of mission.

After exploring these two theological concepts as tied to the church's mission, I will be suggesting that mission **as holiness**, which is the living in and out of Christ's life, is the overarching notion of mission from these various ecclesial documents.

1.1 The Paschal Mystery: Christ's Love for Others

1.1.1 Lumen Gentium: *The Call to Holiness*

One of the most "pervasive and particularly important"²⁵ themes of the call to Christian discipleship in the Second Vatican Council's document, *Lumen gentium* (LG),²⁶ is the call to holiness. Holiness is approached first from the work of the Triune God, as God is the sole agent and cause of sanctification within the lives of human persons. The Holy Spirit, LG notes, is the one who, as bearer of divine love, and as the immanent activity (power) of God amongst human persons, effects the sanctity of the church as a whole and the individual Christian in particular. This sanctifying power effects holiness within the church and in the depths of disciples. Whilst it is the work of this divine Spirit to guide, strengthen, empower the church as a whole, and the individual lay faithful in particular,²⁷ the Spirit, moreover, actively unites these individual members into the communal ecclesia, and deepens the bond of love between God and God's church. Specifically for LG, the Spirit effects, or "urges", three interconnected characteristics of holiness within human persons: charity, humility, and self-sacrifice.²⁸

Charity, or love, as LG sometimes refers to it, ushers forth from God who is love itself. Through the action of the Spirit, love becomes tangible through various activities of the church: through the liturgy, through prayer, through helping the poor, and through furthering peace.²⁹ In other words, if love is from God, a God envisaged as Divine Love, this love is directed *outward* in two ways. First, it is directed from the church back to God through liturgy

²⁵ John O'Malley, *What Happened at Vatican II?* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2008), 310.

²⁶ Hereafter, LG

²⁷ LG, 4, 39.

²⁸ LG, 5, 39. Feminist critiques of humility and self-sacrifice will be discussed more fully in Chapter 3.

²⁹ LG, 38.

and prayer. The church glorifies God and thanks God for the gifts of love and holiness. Secondly, it is directed outwards to others through *justice*, namely helping the poor and furthering peace. Therefore, love is not simply a *gift* for the church (or the individual) to receive, but is also a *quality* or a virtue which has socio-economic and political *implications*: love ushers in unity, that is, a peace which overcomes war, hatred and all that fragments human persons from one another.³⁰ This notion of love is framed Christologically.

How does one enact love, particularly a divine love, according to LG? In LG, divine love is understood through the revelation of God through the person of Christ Jesus. He is both the “Teacher and the model of holiness.”³¹ His life, death, and resurrection, that is, the Paschal Mystery, were inexorably connected to holiness. His actions of healing, preaching, and table fellowship showed God’s love bringing unity out of discord, that is, life from death (sin). It was because of his love for humans living with the effects of sin, death, and oppression that Christ came to lead human persons to greater holiness. Holiness, therefore, is Paschal in shape. That is, Christ Jesus as a teacher and model of holiness, in LG, is one in which love brings life out of sinful conditions, and human life should be shaped according to the Paschal Mystery in order to better reflect Christologically who Christ Jesus is.

If the Spirit empowers humans to enact love of God and love of one another, then the epistemological notion of love to be incarnated is, what we might call *mimesis* (imitation) of Christ. Though LG does not use this term, LG does use “*testimonium et exemplum*”³² to indicate the role of Christ for disciples. In Chapter 3 this concept (*mimesis*) will be discussed further, but for now it helps to understand how disciples look to Christ as an example, an example being something one imitates or copies. As we will see shortly, this Christological *mimesis* is extended by Popes John Paul II and Francis, giving a fuller and more vigorous Christological interpretation of holiness. Yet within the Vatican II documents, this theme of Divine Love is given initial theological grounding for the mission of the Church. *Mimesis* of Christ, however, is not enough; simply mimicking Christ’s activity from scripture overemphasises *human* activity apart from God’s initiative in empowering human persons to act in accord with divine justice. In other words, there needs to be a simultaneous *participation* of human persons *within* Divine Love (i.e., grace or the Holy Spirit) in order for the fruits of that love to be empowered through human activity of loving God in return as well as loving other human persons. In this way, imitation is directed toward Christ’s living out of God’s mission rather than an imitation which either distorts Christ’s mission or worse, is against God’s purposes.

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ Ibid., 40.

³² Ibid.; Translated as “witness and example”. Latin edition of LG, Vatican website, http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19641121_lumen-gentium_lt.html, Accessed 27 July 2017. Later on, *Gaudium et spes* (Sec. 22) employs imitation, thus imitation is not foreign to the documents of Vatican II.

Through the ecclesial activities of prayer (which includes liturgy) and justice, LG suggests, the Church not only imitates Christ, but *participates* in God's own holiness in an imperfect way. This sense of holiness is rooted in the image of the People of God – a church imperfectly journeying through history, seeking in the power of God's Spirit to overcome sin and evil in order to grow in charity and justice, that is, holiness.³³ LG is cautious about overinflating the “external activity” of holiness, i.e., justice, which would lead potentially to an *overemphasis* on *imitation* and an *underemphasis* on God's gift of love as that power which effects the church's activities of holiness. Therefore, LG is suggesting that holiness is *both* an interior quality, as well as enacting love externally, i.e., living out of divine love. Or, as T. Howland Sanks rightly states, “Following Christ [has] some consequences”,³⁴ and one of those consequences is to express outwardly the inner participation in Divine Love. In other words, Christological imitation flows from participation in Divine Love. Accordingly, LG cautions envisaging love as simply activities: holiness is “not [gifted] so much in the multiplying of external acts, but rather in the greater intensity of our love....”³⁵ Thus, holiness is loving one's self, others, and God more deeply as well as more robustly, as well as through activities of liturgy, prayer, and justice directed to God as the very source of Divine Love gifted to human persons. Thus, imitation is rooted in participation. How, then, is love explicitly ecclesiological?

The image of the church as the people of God, in LG, is linked inexorably to another ecclesial image, the church as sacrament.³⁶ The church is both a visible expression of God's holiness as it tries to manifest through God's Spirit the purposes of God's love, but yet, at the same time, the church is in solidarity with sinful humanity. The church itself, as well as society as a whole, LG notes, is in need of greater solidarity with God and between human persons.³⁷ God's love helps the church to overcome sin in order to grow in, as well as to be instruments of, God's love towards the world. The church images and mediates the love of God as it lives out of this love within its daily living. Particularly as a sacrament, LG insists, the church is the visible image of the Divine Love, which all human persons are called to imitate and to participate in. In other words, for LG, the human situation of existing with the results of sin is itself directed towards Divine Love as the fundamentally divine calling of all humanity to holiness. The call of the church in general and of disciples in particular, LG thus proffers, is to the holiness of Divine Love that is witnessed to and enacted in the life of Christ

³³ Ibid., 48.

³⁴ T Howland Sanks, “The Social Mission of the Church: Its Changing Context,” in *The Gift of the Church*, ed. Peter Phan (Collegeville, MN: Michael Glazier/Liturgical Press, 2000), 271.

³⁵ LG, 51.

³⁶ Ibid., 1, 9, and 48.

³⁷ Ibid., 1.

Jesus himself. The mission of the church and disciples is to grow in Divine Love (love of God) and to live out of this Divine Love in the world.

1.1.2 Gaudium et Spes

*Gaudium et spes*³⁸ builds upon this notion of the call to holiness as the principal mission of the church. LG as a whole is focused on the church *ad intra* (the church's nature), whilst GS's attention is on the church *ad extra* (the church's relationship to the world).³⁹ However, because both documents are fundamentally ecclesiological, they must be taken together in such a way as to supplement and complement one another so that a comprehensive notion of the church's mission is taken into account. Beginning with a theological anthropology, that is, it "starts with the problems of the world".⁴⁰ GS depicts holiness as the "original image" of humanity before "the Fall", when sin entered the world. God created humans in God's own image, not a pictorial image but an *eschatological* image of final holiness which, agreeing with LG, sees humanity's final destiny as one in God's holiness. In other words, the human destiny LG refers to is made more explicit in GS; the call to holiness is not simply a *final* call, but it was the original state of humanity prior to the Fall. Eschatology is thus protology, that is, human destiny is oriented towards a return to the original garden.

This image of holiness of human persons is an image, a sacrament, of Divine Love which effects and mediates holiness. In other words, *within* the human person, the current state of sinfulness (non-holiness) is met by perfect holiness (Divine Love), so that human bodies are temples where Divine Love dwells in flawed human persons; they make visible an echo of Divine Love. Moreover, there is imbued within humanity both intellect and wisdom, and these two characteristics urge humans to seek not only through the heart (through love), but also through the mind, what is "true and good."⁴¹ That is to say, the entire person, body, heart, and mind are directed from the moment of creation towards Divine Love. The Divine Love is a truth, something which must be thought about rationally and reasonably as the existential destiny of all human persons. "All this holds true", GS clarifies, "not only for Christians, but for all men [sic] of good will and in whose hearts grace works in an unseen way. For, since Christ died for all men, and since the ultimate vocation of man is in fact one,

³⁸ Hereafter, GS.

³⁹ Richard R. Gaillardetz, *The Church in the Making: Lumen Gentium, Christus Dominus, Orientalium Ecclesiarum*, Rediscovering Vatican II Series (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 2006), 14.

⁴⁰ Gilles Routhier, "Vatican II: Relevance and Future," *Theological Studies* 74 (2013), 547. Routhier suggests that this is why GS is a pastoral constitution, because it does not begin with doctrine or propositional theology, but with the pastoral problems affecting the manner in which the church exists within the contemporary world.

⁴¹ GS, 15.

and divine, we ought to believe that the Holy Spirit in a manner known only to God offers to every man the possibility of being associated with this paschal mystery."⁴²

GS explores the call to holiness Christologically – though first by beginning with Christ's human nature, rather than human *mimesis* of Jesus as in LG. Christ is not only the image of God, but he is also fully human, and therefore, like human persons, Christ images God's Divine Love (holiness) perfectly since, unlike other humans, he is free from sin.⁴³ Moreover, he is a symbol of humanity's final destiny, a totally embodied Divine Love which ushers forth in love. GS states: "For by His incarnation the Son of God has united Himself in some fashion with every man [sic]. He worked with human hands, He thought with a human mind, acted by human choice and loved with a human heart."⁴⁴ In other words, Christ's entrance into human history made use of every aspect of human nature, of the human body – hands, mind, and heart – to reveal God's holiness. GS reinforces LG in that holiness affects the entire dimension of the human person. Christ's life is a perfect sacrament of God's love, a sacrament of the destiny and call of all human persons to participate in the mystery of love.

How does the call to holiness connect to the Paschal Mystery? GS connects the above Incarnational theology to the cross:

As an innocent lamb He merited for us life by the free shedding of His own blood. In Him God reconciled us to Himself and among ourselves; from bondage to the devil and sin He delivered us, so that each one of us can say with the Apostle: The Son of God "loved me and gave Himself up for me" (Gal. 2:20). By suffering for us He not only provided us with an example for our imitation, He blazed a trail, and if we follow it, life and death are made holy and take on a new meaning.⁴⁵

Human persons who participate in divine love – as well as imitating Christ's life – *interpret* the world differently through the *lens* of the Paschal Mystery. The cross symbolises a dialectic between holiness and sin, love and self-centredness, life and death, glory and suffering. Once again, human living becomes paschal shaped, mirroring Christ's own holiness. Christ's obedience to God's love was "a battle" between human suffering and a love which offers newness of life, new meaning, as one goes through life. Christ's own self-giving life for humanity revealed the call to holiness, a God willing to suffer and die in order that human persons might find new life, resurrected life, which is a participation in the mystery of Divine Love. If this theology is connected back to LG, then the Paschal Mystery is an *inner* encounter between God's call to holiness and the sinful, imperfect existence of

⁴² Ibid., 22.

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

human nature. Furthermore, the Paschal Mystery is also an *exterior* encounter between Divine Love and those powers that oppose God's love. Society, governments, cultures, and so forth might benefit from learning from the Church what God's purposes are universally, that is, holiness.⁴⁶ This latter notion moves from being simply an existential conflict to a cosmological site of the drama of God's offer of love healing sin and evil. The cosmos is the arena where holiness and sin encounter one another in the hopes of being transformed toward God's purposes.

1.1.3 Analysis of LG and GS

Taking both LG and GS together, I suggest that the mission of the church, as well as the mission of disciples, is summed up as the conversion of the heart. Firstly, the church is to imitate Christ's acts of holiness, a holiness glimpsed in the Paschal Mystery. His life, suffering, death, resurrection makes visible God's mission given to Christ. We come to know that mission by understanding what Christ did through the scriptures. Imitation is always rooted in a prior movement of God offering God's self as Love to human persons. Authentic imitation means one must know his mission (love and justice) as well as converting one's self towards Divine Holiness. This notion of participation leading to imitation will be discussed later, suggesting that not only does imitation follow participation, but that these two Christological characteristics of mission as holiness may operate simultaneously. LG and GS tend to construe these two activities consecutively, so that mission follows participation.

Secondly, the church is to participate in God's holiness just as Christ perfectly embodied God's holiness. Mission is directed towards and fulfilled in moving away from sin towards God's holiness. Prayer and liturgy are occasions when human persons, particularly disciples, may participate in God's gift of holiness. In other words, these are occasions when Christian disciples may potentially be transformed from sinfulness towards holiness. The individual and the church are not only internally being gifted with holiness, God's mission, but they must live this mission outside of official church gatherings as a drama between God's purposes and human purposes. One must live from this transformed heart; contemplation and action are inexorably united. Mission here, particularly from a Paschal Mystery emphasis, is about the human person being redeemed from sin. Whilst the documents try to express this ecclesologically, fundamentally, mission is an *internal* activity of transforming the human person from sin to holiness.

Whilst both LG and GS understand missionary identity in terms of the transformation of the sinful aspects of humanity towards resurrected (i.e., transformed) life in God's holiness, there is an overly idealistic view of the Paschal shape of holiness (the movement from sin towards holiness), especially in regards to the transformation of *human* identity

⁴⁶ GS, 34.

towards *missionary* identity, that is, an identity of holiness which dwells in God's love as well as acting out of that love through justice. Both documents insufficiently address the *complexity of* and *difficulties in* changing identities. More exactly, the transformation of identity towards holiness is something that people may in fact try to *resist* because they are fallen.

The gift of Divine holiness is itself *dangerous* to human identity because it challenges and questions the very values and beliefs that human persons possess prior to the call and potential acceptance of a new identity. In other words, there is a "battle" (resistance) between fallen human identity during the participation in and imitation of Divine holiness, because human identity *is marked by sin*. The transformation from human identity to divine holiness will be something one will not simply adopt easily, but rather, one will resist or struggle with acquiring a new identity. This suggests that the "possession" of holiness comes by way of struggle, resistance, battling, and conflicting with Divine Love – a topic I will return to in Chapter 4. LG and GS, I suggest, do not address this struggle of identity in the very process of juxtaposing human identity and Divine Love; one is left not only with something *new* – acceptance of God's love and justice, but will also be at the same time left *bruised* and *broken* in their human identity. In other words, growth in missionary identity is not simply a one-way, consecutive movement from death to life, but rather a *simultaneous* experience of cross and re-created life. Changing identities is *itself* a cross because everything one knows about one's self is questioned – set ablaze – by Divine Love and must be dispossessed in order to be recreated towards God's holiness. In other words, not only are participation and justice seemingly consecutive Christological moments in mission in LG and GS, but also the cross – death and resurrection – are seemingly consecutive moments of the Paschal shape of mission. However, the People of God in general, and Christian disciples in particular, do not move simply from human love and Divine Love on this side of the eschaton. The experience of mission in a Paschal shape is always a simultaneous experience, I maintain, in contrast to a consecutive portrayal of mission.

1.1.4 Ad Gentes

The Vatican II document on missionary activity, *Ad gentes*, likewise, connects the ecclesial mission of imitating and participating in Divine Love as the call and destiny of human persons but through a richer theology of the Trinity. Yves Congar, one of the major drafters of AG, noted the inspiration from missiologist Lesslie Newbigin for rooting mission within the triune God.⁴⁷

⁴⁷ Stephen B. Bevans and Jeffrey Gros, *Evangelization and Religious Freedom: Ad Gentes and Dignitatis Humani*, Rediscovering Vatican II Series (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 2009), 16-17.

[Mission] flows from the 'fount-like love' or charity of God the Father who, being the 'principle without principle' from whom the Son is begotten and the Holy Spirit proceeds through the Son, freely creating us on account of His surpassing and merciful kindness and graciously calling us moreover to share with Him His life and His mercy, has generously poured out, and does not cease to pour out still, His divine goodness.⁴⁸

The Church's nature, AG articulates from this Trinitarian theology, "is missionary by...nature, since it is from the mission of the Son and the mission of the Holy Spirit that she [the Church] draws her origin, in accordance with the decree of God the Father."⁴⁹ In other words, because the First "Person" of the Godhead sends Christ and the Spirit out on mission, the church's identity is thus embodied when it is living God's mission, i.e., when the church is participating in and imitating God's love. Like LG and GS, AG roots mission in the call and action of the God of Love, a call which empowers (the Spirit) and shows (Christ's life) what Divine Love entails. In particular, AG notes that to act as Christ did, God instils "into the hearts of the faithful the same mission spirit which impelled Christ Himself."⁵⁰ Here AG is reinforcing the call to holiness, to enact love, with the symbol of the heart as where the Spirit works to convert human persons towards God's mission. In the centre and depth of the human person, human love meets Divine Love, and thus gives rise to transformation. Mission is, in other words, an inner conversion.

AG in particular connects mission as holiness to the gospel. The image of God as love means that there already exists, before even knowing or understanding Christ or the gospel, a disposition towards holiness. Interestingly, unlike LG and GS, AG does not refer to the Paschal Mystery as much as it does to love. On four occasions when it does, the primary emphasis of the Paschal Mystery is the "spiritual goods" which allow for new life (holiness) to come from suffering and death. Moving from sin towards holiness is the purpose and goal of mission. Mission is motivated by God's deep love, but also holiness orients humans to begin to understand the meaning of new life from death and sin, and so begin to grow in holiness.⁵¹ This means that the cross is "both grace and judgment."⁵² On the cross, when Jesus was suffering and all seemed lost – the end of not only his earthly life but also God's mission, a *judgment* emerged from God in the form of the resurrection. The judgment was against those forces which are opposed to "love, sincerity and a peaceful spirit", and what is judged, then, is the lack of furthering holiness because one remains tangled in the human condition, but

⁴⁸ AG, 2.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 2.

⁵⁰ Ibid., 4.

⁵¹ Ibid., 12.

⁵² Ibid., 8.

does not accept the fundamental call of God to holiness as humanity's destiny. In other words, the Paschal Mystery is understood through *conversion*, though not in the primary sense of conversion from no faith to explicit *faith*, which is secondary, than to a conversion of human persons to *holiness*.

Vatican II represents a fundamental understanding of mission from conversion to explicit faith to a broader notion of conversion centred on the common destiny of all humans: holiness. "And so," AG boldly states, "whatever good is found to be sown in the hearts and minds of men [sic], or in the rites and cultures peculiar to various peoples, not only is not lost, but is healed, uplifted, and perfected for the glory of God".⁵³ The importance of recognising good, i.e., holiness, "sown" within hearts and minds, suggests that good comes from the Sower, that is, God. Mission, being rooted in the trinity and in holiness, subverts a notion of mission as proselytism, as a change of religion. Mission, because it is from God, is larger and broader than the church itself, than even explicit faith, is something all human persons and the entire cosmos is called to imitate and to participate in. Salvation is, therefore, experienced principally as healing of the human condition – *healing* what is sinful and evil – in order that love gifted and empowered by God might dwell *within* the human heart. This is what holiness is for these three Vatican II documents. To be human is to be called, to seek, to participate in, and share a love for one another which is expressed in justice and peace. To preach the gospel as the mission of the church is primarily to live out the call to holiness, and secondarily to provide a Paschal Mystery lens that envisages the meaning of the human condition and the call to holiness. The Vatican II liturgy documents, which will be explored later, principally employ this Paschal lens for understanding the call to holiness.

1.1.4.1 Analysis

Whilst AG mentions the Paschal Mystery only a few times, and in such a way as to radically transform the theology of mission, it nevertheless focuses primarily on planting the visible (i.e., hierarchical or structural) church in a given territory (which is the evangelisation of non-Christians) in the majority of the document. Here then is a marked contrast in two different priorities of mission: One of which is marked by the universal call to holiness consistent with the theme of mission in both LG and GS, and another one which espouses an older model of mission as a conversion to explicit faith of non-Christians in a foreign land. This is not surprising as the actual creation of the text at the Second Vatican Council was marked by polarised opposition between two different views of mission: (1) bishops in Asia and Africa argued for greater dialogue between the Church and non-Christians in order to better their lives, without any motivation to convert them to Christianity, though, obviously not opposed to

⁵³ Ibid., 9.

those seeking to become Christian.⁵⁴ Nearly a third of the Council fathers came from so-called mission lands, which made the Second Vatican Council, as Aylward Shorter rightly articulated, “the first missionary council of the Church.”⁵⁵

They rightly pointed out that because the “pilgrim Church is missionary by its very nature”, the church exists fundamentally when it lives in and out of God’s mission given to the Church.⁵⁶ This simple, but direct statement, altered the very notion of mission itself—mission is not simply for clerics or women and men religious, it is something the entire church participates in, and mission, therefore, is something into which the entire church must not only respond to, but grow towards.

Because of this, many of these bishops rejected the need for a decree on missions altogether; rather, they argued, because the church’s nature is missionary, any theology of mission ought to be within the ecclesiological constitutions of the council, particularly within *Gaudium et spes*, as this ecclesiological constitution embodied the vision of the church on mission within the world.⁵⁷ Their argument was as follows: To have separate documents would not only *separate* ecclesiology and missiology, but it would betray the fact that the entire church – not merely the ordained or religious – is missionary in its very existence, and not simply something directed to foreign lands.

(2) The other perspective, mostly bishops from Europe and North America, argued for the older model of mission as church planting and the conversion to explicit faith of non-Christians. These two disparate views both ended up within the document, though the conception of mission by the bishops from Asia and Africa was severely limited, as they were more interested in the development of GS, since in their view there was no need for AG at all. The older model of mission dominated the document. Ironically, both AG with its greater treatment of the narrower view of mission, and GS with its broader view of mission, were promulgated in the very last session of Vatican II. Whilst some council fathers criticised the document, it was nevertheless rushed as the Council was closing and GS had top priority among the council fathers. Therefore, the document not only “combines two different starting

⁵⁴ Giuseppe Alberigo, *History of Vatican II, Vol 5: The Council and the Transition: The Fourth Period and the End of the Council, Sept. 1965-Dec. 1965*, Joseph A. Komonchak, English ed. (Maryknoll, NY/Louven: Orbis/Peeters, 2006), 449. AG combines “two different starting points for a theology of mission (the emphasis on the preaching of the gospel by the Münster school, and the idea of the implantation of the Church, marked by the Louvain and curial-canonical authors)...” These two notions, if thus combined, suggests that preaching the gospel leads to the planting of the church. Nevertheless, the first model is more in keeping with the fundamental call to holiness of LG and GS. This does not necessarily mean that church planting is to be abandoned, only that a more broad notion of mission is rooted in each person’s call to holiness, and not simply on expanding and growing new members of the church

⁵⁵ Aylward Shorter, *Theology of Mission*, Theology Today Series, No. 37 (Cork, Ireland: Mercier Press, 1972), 14.

⁵⁶ Ibid.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 15.

points for a theology of mission”,⁵⁸ but also allows for the older model to dominate within the document, and thus the potential for a robustly contemporary document was plagued from the start with a seemingly “out of date” theology of mission, with a few echoes of a deeper, richer view of mission consistent with LG and GS. Moreover, this dominant theology of mission is less in harmony with the notion of mission I explored in LG and GS.

1.2 Post-Vatican II Documents on Mission

1.2.1 *Evangelii Nuntiandi*

Ten years after the close of the Second Vatican Council, Pope Paul VI issued his apostolic exhortation, *Evangelii nuntiandi*. This exhortation took up the theme of the mission of the church from Vatican II, but did so from a specific perspective, that of *evangelisation*. Whilst, as argued above, the Second Vatican Council emphasised the call to holiness, in EN, Paul VI takes this for granted, and really does not specifically address this theme until the conclusion. Here he states, as if to tie together both Vatican II’s emphasis on holiness as well as his specific interest in evangelisation as parts or aspects of the one mission of the church: The church is “called to holiness. It is to this holiness that they [the universal church] bear witness.”⁵⁹ By universal church, he means both lay and ordained in this divine call to holiness.

What does he mean by holiness of life? Whilst he does not define this phrase outright, he does suggest characteristics of it: “The world calls for and expects from us simplicity of life, the spirit of prayer, charity towards all, especially towards the lowly and the poor, obedience and humility, detachment and sacrifice. Without this mark of holiness, our word will have difficulty in touching the heart of modern man [sic].”⁶⁰ Strikingly, Paul VI frames “this mark of holiness” to refer to its characteristics. In other words, holiness is not simply praying or charity or humility, but the *totality* of these characteristics, and they mark, that is, they show forth the inner quality of holiness. Here he expands upon LG and GS so that these are not merely *various* ways or perhaps distinct opportunities to participate in holiness, but rather they are interdependent to what mission and therefore holiness is. Holiness is, therefore not only rooted in a Vatican II notion of charity and justice, but keeps a more holistic approach to it.

How does evangelisation, since this is the major point of his exhortation, connect to the mission of the church? Evangelisation, as Paul VI defines it, is the proclamation “of the

⁵⁸ Alberigo, 449. Note: this does not even emphasize the overly hierarchical nature of mission in AG. Who does mission? For AG it is the priests, but ultimately, it is the responsibility of bishops to oversee and instruct missions within his diocese.

⁵⁹ *Evangelii nuntiandi* (8 December 1975), 69; Hereafter EN.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 76.

Good News of Jesus Christ – the Good News proclaimed in two fundamental commands: ‘Put on the new self’ and ‘Be reconciled to God.’”⁶¹ In other words, to be a messenger of the Gospel is to be an evangeliser, yet, this is not a form of proselytism, whereby Christians try to manipulate persons of other faiths or religions into joining the Catholic Church, nor is it fundamentally about increasing the number of Catholics (church growth). His “two fundamental commands” are concerned about the *disciple* himself/herself who *already* is a member of the Church -- who in baptism has received the new self, a new identity into Christ of the Gospels, and moreover, is being reconciled to God. Nothing here suggests proselytism or church growth.

Paul VI discusses the connection between evangelisation and the mission of Jesus, by acknowledging that to preach the gospel “sums up the mission of Jesus.”⁶² In fact, EN links God’s mission to evangelisation quite closely: Christ “Jesus Himself, the Good News of God, was the very first and the greatest evangelizer; he was so through and through: to perfection and to the point of the sacrifice of His earthly life.”⁶³ In other words, if God’s mission is evangelisation, and Jesus himself is the incarnation of God’s Good News, then Jesus is himself the embodiment of God’s mission. What LG, GS, and AG alluded to, EN explicitly states: Christ incarnates the Divine Mission. His perfect nature meant that he could perfectly fulfil God’s mission because sin did not limit living God’s mission.

If mission is proclaiming the gospel, then how does the Paschal Mystery relate to the gospel in EN? The definitive accomplishment of salvation in EN is the Paschal Mystery. In particular, it is the death and resurrection of Christ Jesus that is “the kernel and center of the Good News” and “this [is] great gift of God” which efficaciously liberates human persons from “everything that oppresses us but which is above all [something which] liberates [us] from sin and the Evil One....”⁶⁴ The Paschal Mystery, therefore, as this kernel or central theological aspect of salvation, is implicit when disciples live God’s holiness, which EN now envisages as *liberation* from sin, that which prevents the destiny of human persons from being lived out. But how does this liberation come about, and what is liberation in EN?

Liberation is conversion; it is “a total interior renewal” which changes the destiny of humanity.⁶⁵ In particular, it is conversion to the gospel. This interior change is the changing of the heart, rooted in the Paschal Mystery. The Cross represents Jesus giving his life completely over to God out of love for humanity and for God. The Cross can be summed up,

⁶¹ Ibid., 1.

⁶² Ibid., 6.

⁶³ Ibid.

⁶⁴ Ibid., 9.

⁶⁵ Ibid., 10.

EN suggests, as “the love of God”, or “the new commandment” to love God and neighbour.⁶⁶ Christ, in the act of dying, showed God’s deepest love for humanity and for humanity’s complete well-being. Here EN picks up AG’s notion of mission as the very nature of the Church, which participates in God’s very nature, namely love. But specifically, love is envisaged as self-giving, flowing from the depths (interior) of the human person, but which was first a gift of God’s very self as love to human persons. Not accepting and participating in liberation is to remain with the “inclination of the human heart” which is not “made whole” by God’s purifying love. This love “does not generate but purifies and elevates ‘natural life’”⁶⁷

What is striking is that by using the image of the human heart, Paul VI has understood that the human person as an anthropological, existential being, is already graced with holiness, or “seeds of the Word.” The gospel, or Jesus Christ, is already working, already active within human hearts, it is a question of reinterpreting the world apart from God, but through a self-sacrificing love. Mission is to make people purified, or “more” human. Yet, the phrase “inclination of the human heart” suggests that the human heart is predisposed towards sin rather than holiness, or even mission. Though the human heart need liberation, it is not completely contrary to God’s love, but rather has the potentiality to respond to God’s love, and thus seek and encounter Divine Love. As he notes, “the very heart of this contemporary world” is secularism which he defines as “doing without God.”⁶⁸ He does not disparage the world, nor does he envisage the church retreating from the world, rather the world already has “a heart” – again employing this symbol – which needs to be purified and elevated. There already is an *implicit* holiness, which is in need of finding its true destiny, which is communion with and participation in Divine Mystery, with the God of love, as well as greater bonds with other human persons.

The world will come to know this Divine Love, its true destiny, by authentic Christian witness. “It is primarily by her conduct and by her life that the Church will evangelise the world, in other words, by her living witness of fidelity to the Lord Jesus—the witness of poverty and detachment, of freedom in the face of the powers of the world, in short, the witness of sanctity.”⁶⁹ Consequently, proclamation of the Gospel is not literally preaching to non-Christians, but rather, the vulnerability of the human person, who is to become a witness—a sacrament-- that is to live in and live out, God’s love as known not through an image or concept of God, but in the embodiment of God in the person of Christ, the gospel.

⁶⁶ Ibid., 11-13.

⁶⁷ Ibid., 36, 47.

⁶⁸ Ibid., 57.

⁶⁹ Ibid., 41.

EN understands the witness of the individual Christian disciple as “an ecclesial act.”

EN states quite directly that when a person

preaches the Gospel...even alone, he [sic] is carrying out an ecclesial act, and his action is certainly attached to the evangelizing activity of the whole Church by institutional relationships, but also by profound invisible links in the order of grace. This presupposes that he acts not in virtue of a mission which he attributes to himself or by a personal inspiration, but in union with the mission of the Church and in her name.⁷⁰

In other words, mission is ecclesial because of the work of holiness already taking place *explicitly* within the human heart, something that happens and is nourished liturgically, but is lived in and lived out from a heart touched by, imbued with Divine Love. It is because the Holy Spirit “enlightens the heart of man [sic]” that the person is following the call to holiness. Through the witness of the church and of disciples to the Gospel, the Holy Spirit “penetrates to the heart of the world”, that is, the Spirit is transforming human hearts in order that the entire world, or better, the entire cosmos may be transformed. Overcoming oppression through love has the potential in the mission of the Church, to call the world more directly into its final purpose, union with God’s fullness of love. Missionary identity, therefore, is construed as an individual transformation within an ecclesial context.

1.2.1.1 Analysis:

The concept of mission in EN, much like the previous documents, is rooted in the call to holiness, but expanded in its relationship to evangelisation. Whilst mission is tied even more clearly to preaching the gospel message, EN advances beyond AG, but adopting an LG and GS lens to view mission. Mission is not simply church growth, but a deeper living in God’s love as well as entering more deeply into the call of the gospel. One must first attend to one’s own embodiment of the gospel before one tries to liberate others. Mission as witness is the dialogue between the world and the ecclesial act – the message of the gospel challenges society to live towards its destiny, but yet, recognises that liberation is from sin. The church is to witness to the change that liberates in order for the world to become more human. This model of mission is one which sees mission as humanisation, that is, of furthering the call of humanity towards its final destiny. EN, therefore, advances the *broader* view of mission, which was present only in a brief manner in AG.

The image of the heart occurs 22 times in EN, and stresses the *interior* conversion of the person towards the destiny of all human persons: holiness. Not only is the heart the centre of the human person, and thus evokes holiness as the central goal of human living, but it is also the place from which humans love. There is a sense that mission is empathy for other humans who are suffering dehumanisation and are in need of liberation. The church is

⁷⁰ Ibid., 60.

called to witness to the gift of Love God has already given, the totality of love for the poor and lowly and showing forth the inner qualities of holiness. Yet, EN shares the same perspective as LG, GS, and AG, that idealistically views the conversion from human identity towards what we might call “missionary identity” as a movement from death to new life. It does not adequately see the adoption of a new identity as itself the simultaneous experience of life and death, of the Cross. If Divine Love is the human destiny that liberates, then one will have to give up human identity marked and distorted by sin for one which is directed to God’s ways of holiness. Purification, therefore, is an experience of losing one’s identity – what one holds most dear, one’s values and beliefs, for an identity which is not known. This missionary identity is eschatological, because one cannot possibly know what it may look like or be like. In this sense, one is invited to give up, lay down, one’s identity for something new, unexperienced and unknown, a missionary identity rooted in God’s holiness. In this mission, one will experience the simultaneous loss of the old identity as it slowly gives way to moments of imitation and participation in Divine holiness.

1.2.2 Redemptoris Missio

This encyclical by Pope John Paul II, *Redemptoris missio*, appeared twenty-five years following the Second Vatican Council and fifteen years after EN. This document is directed at a rejuvenation of mission *Ad gentes* (“to the nations”) which had seen decreasing emphasis due to the waning of colonialism. While this document is generally directed to *foreign* missions, that is, the older notion of mission, there is much here that builds upon the Second Vatican Council and EN, as well as other theological shifts which retreat away from the advances of EN in particular and the broader notion of mission.

In terms of the Paschal Mystery, RM understands mission as salvation effected by the Paschal Mystery. The primary mission of the Church, RM proffers, is the “supreme duty to proclaim Christ to all peoples.”⁷¹ The shift is away from the Gospel, as EN and Vatican II emphasised, to a very specific *interpretation* of the Gospel, the person of Christ Jesus. One preaches not theological *meaning*, i.e., how to interpret the world in a meaningful and truly liberative way, but a person. Christ as the Gospel is the “fullness of truth,”⁷² and the life of human persons is directed to and *instructed* by the truth of Christ. Whereas the previous documents rooted human existence in seeking love and justice, i.e., holiness, which then potentially leads to truth, RM shifts this around so that *truth* precedes holiness. RM states, “...all [human persons] are impelled by their own nature and are bound by a moral obligation

⁷¹ John Paul II, *Redemptoris missio*, Encyclical Letter, Vatican website, Accessed 7 November 2014, http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_07121990_redemptoris-missio.html, Sec. 3; hereafter RM.

⁷² Ibid, 5.

to seek truth, above all religious truth."⁷³ The fear underlying RM is that too often the church's mission is conceived as an anthropological humanisation divorced from an explicit assent to salvation in Christ Jesus. Without this assent, there would be, RM argues, no need for the church, and the church's mission is, therefore, undermined because the church is no longer concerned for the *explicit* salvation of those outside of the church. In other words, the church is needed by human persons in order to more fully participate in the saving Cross of Christ.

The method of mission in RM is principally conceived as the proclamation of Christ: "Proclamation is the permanent priority of mission."⁷⁴ This proclamation of Christ is connected to the previous official documents on ecclesial mission:

The subject of proclamation is Christ who was crucified, died and is risen: through him is accomplished our full and authentic liberation from evil, sin and death; through him God bestows 'new life' that is divine and eternal. This is the 'Good News' which changes man and his history, and which all peoples have a right to hear. This proclamation is to be made within the context of the lives of the individuals and peoples who receive it.⁷⁵

It is to be made with an attitude of love and esteem toward those who hear it, in language which is practical and adapted to the situation. In this proclamation the Spirit is at work and establishes a communion between the missionary and his/her hearers, a communion which is possible inasmuch as both enter into communion with God the Father through Christ.

In particular, RM situates the church's mission in an explicitly Paschal mode, namely the explicit preaching of Christ's death and resurrection. The Paschal Mystery effected liberation as Christ destroyed sin and death, and the way to communion with God, a new life, is possible through the priority of one of the five human senses: hearing. Unlike the previous documents, not only is Christology central, but also one *mode* of proclamation, a one-way preaching towards "the other." EN envisages mission as witness – living out of the already transformed human life as gifted in the call to holiness, whereas RM understands mission as the explicit teaching of the truth of Christ's salvation effected on the Cross. Whilst previous documents stressed the unity of human existence in the ability to operate out of a God-given ability to love as well as humanity's shared destiny, RM rather begins with the distinctively Christian Christological truth as that which will draw human existence to its true purpose, into Christ's death and resurrection. "In proclaiming Christ to non-Christians, the missionary is convinced that, through the working of the Spirit, there already exists in individuals and peoples an expectation, even if an unconscious one, of knowing the truth about God, about

⁷³ Ibid., 8.

⁷⁴ Ibid., 44.

⁷⁵ Ibid.

man, and about how we are to be set free from sin and death.”⁷⁶ Interestingly, it is rational truth about God, humanity and liberation, a kind of propositional knowledge which will attract persons to salvation. The dialogical nature between church and world, experience and knowledge, of the previous documents is switched with a preaching of Christological truth, which is how human persons are liberated from sin to newness of life. The same general theology of the Paschal Mystery is present (salvation as liberation), but the priorities and the theological accent has radically changed from imitating Christ’s actions to teaching about (doctrine) Christ to non-Christians.

Moreover, the understanding of conversion has also narrowed in RM: “Conversion means accepting, by a personal decision, the saving sovereignty of Christ and becoming his disciple.”⁷⁷ In the previous documents, conversion is the gradual growing according to the demands of God’s own self as Love which bears fruit in the human living out of justice. Rather than Divine Love as the destiny of humanity, RM links proclamation of Christ’s Paschal Mystery to *explicit* faith. “The Lord is always calling us to come out of ourselves and to share with others the goods we possess, starting with the most precious gift of all - our faith.”⁷⁸ What is important is explicit faith in Christ’s Paschal Mystery. This follows because the very notion of mission is direct proclamation to the outsiders of Christ’s act of salvation. Mission is entering into a new life not only in the church through baptism, but in personal faith. This does not deny nor contradict the previous documents, but it does significantly shift the emphasis and manner in which the church engages in mission.

1.2.2.1 Analysis:

The strength of the LG, GS, AD, and EN is in the dialogical nature of the church in mission with the world in order to help the entire cosmos grow in love and justice – the call to holiness – and potentially as a result of mutual cooperation, some may decide to join the church. Mission in these documents is not only a common concern of the church and the world, but a mutual journeying together towards their final destiny. Because RM adopts a stricter form of conversion, as an explicit assent to faith in Christ, one which is rooted in a method of preaching at “the other”, verbal propositions subvert the more expansive perspective of mission as growing in love and acting out of this love. This means that there is a significant tension between the two notions of mission. Whilst EN adopted the broader notion of mission, RM subverts that shift by linking mission to conversion to explicit faith.

Whilst the other documents privilege mission as a matter of the heart, as growth in holiness which makes one more human, RM privileges the preaching explicitly to non-

⁷⁶ Ibid., 45.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 46.

⁷⁸ Ibid., 49.

Christians the content of the gospel, the death and life of Christ. Rather than the human person transforming more closely towards the Divine Love (from sinfulness towards holiness) in the encounter between Divine Love and human sinfulness, RM, I suggest, emphasises the head, particularly the ears of those non-Christians and the mouths of Christian disciples. The more holistic notion of mission in previous documents focused on mission as living out of an already transforming heart, a heart which, because it pumps vital blood to every part of the body, is infused with Divine Love. It is from this embodiment of Divine Love one begins to witness to this transformation through justice, a constitutive and consecutive aspect of holiness. RM, rather, shifts the focus from embodied (i.e., sacramental) love to knowledge of doctrine, i.e., propositional knowledge of who Christ is.

This very narrow and limited view of mission has the effect of reducing mission to education: teaching others intellectually who Christ is and what he did. At root are two contrasting views of soteriology; one propositional whilst the other is living like Christ. RM proffers salvation as teaching non-Christians the Truth of Christ in order to be saved, whereas the earlier documents recognise a fundamental call of all humanity towards holiness, whether explicitly in the church or implicitly within living out of holiness. The strengths of LG, GS, AD, and EN were their prioritising of fundamental qualities of the Gospel that all may potentially share in: holiness as love and justice, and even more so, a desire to transform sin into a love that liberates.

1.2.3 *Evangelii Gaudium*

This apostolic exhortation by Pope Francis, *Evangelii gaudium*,⁷⁹ is principally concerned with the mission of the church. It appeared forty-eight years after the close of the Second Vatican Council, which means that RM marks nearly the midpoint between Vatican II and EG, and its inclusion is due to the fact that it has been nearly twenty-five years since a document on mission was promulgated by a pope. Therefore, EG represents the most up-to-date papal document on mission. Moreover, this document is important, I suggest, because it returns mission to the broader scope as the priority of Church as well as for individual disciples, yet it has its own particular contributions to missionary identity. More specifically, it shifts mission back to the conversion towards Divine Love rather than the explicit teaching of Christological doctrine.

This document begins with the *effect* of the Gospel, joy, on human persons. Joy is not only experienced daily, but is “a response to the loving invitation of God our Father”,⁸⁰ a God known not only in joy and love, but revealed in Christ as the Gospel. The centre of the

⁷⁹ Francis, *Evangelii gaudium*, Apostolic Exhortation, Vatican website, Accessed 10 April 2015, http://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/apost_exhortations/documents/papa-francesco_esortazione-ap_20131124_evangelii-gaudium.html. Hereafter, EG.

⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 5.

Gospel is a “joy [which] flow[s] from the infinite love of God, who has revealed himself to us in Jesus Christ.”⁸¹ In experiencing and encountering Divine Love, “we are liberated from our narrowness and self-absorption. We become fully human when we become more than human, when we let God bring us beyond ourselves in order to attain the fullest truth of our being. Here we find the source and inspiration of all our efforts at evangelization.”⁸² The existential state of humans, EG suggests, is one of isolation experienced in various ways, particularly in the marginalisation of the poor,⁸³ the refusal to show compassion to others, as well as in participating in any actions which lead to violence or death.⁸⁴ Sin is construed as marginalisation, a selfish act to limit another’s humanity. Whilst all human persons are prone to being selfish, love is key to overturning isolation. This human existence is life lived on the Cross, one of isolation, marginalisation, selfishness, which, as EG argues, were all experiences Jesus felt on the Cross, articulated by Jesus’ own words: seemingly abandoned by God, Jesus felt isolation whilst also feeling marginalised as he was crucified for following God’s purposes in history. In sum, the Cross is a symbol of the deep flaws of human living without God, a crippled heart.⁸⁵ What EG stresses is that crippled hearts crucify or wound others. What, then, is the remedy for such an isolated situation?

Whilst the Cross is an experience of isolation, despair, and loneliness, it is the Resurrection which remedies human persons crippled by isolation and marginalisation. EG maintains a dialectic between death and life, between Cross and Resurrection. In particular, the Cross is an encounter between “the sins of the world and the Father’s mercy.”⁸⁶ The limitation of human existence is juxtaposed by God’s deep love for Jesus in particular, and the whole of creation in general, so much so, that God seeks the very well-being of all creation. This well-being, that is, this experience of God’s deep and compassionate love, is a victory over sin, isolation, marginalisation, injustice, and hopelessness.⁸⁷ This is not only a liberation from sin of the self, but is a liberation which must bear fruit in daily living and especially in showing love and inclusion towards those on the peripheries of societies and communities. Whilst this notion of the Paschal Mystery is very similar to LG, GS, and EN, EG adds two distinctive concepts to a theology of mission, namely mercy and joy, and in

⁸¹ Ibid., 7.

⁸² Ibid., 8.

⁸³ Ibid., 52.

⁸⁴ Ibid., 58, 59.

⁸⁵ Ibid., 89.

⁸⁶ Ibid., 285.

⁸⁷ Ibid., 24, 85.

addition, focuses on marginalisation and isolation as distinct modes of not living in and out of God's mission.

Specifically in EG, mission may be defined as living God's mercy which effects joy within one's life. EG takes Luke 6.36-38 as the indispensable "message of salvation and love" of being a "missionary disciple": "Be merciful, just as your Father is merciful. Do not judge, and you will not be judged; do not condemn, and you will not be condemned. Forgive, and you will be forgiven; give, and it will be given to you... For the measure you give will be the measure you get back."⁸⁸ What is interesting is that even though EG begins with the purpose of mission as "The Great Commission", namely as seeking to baptise non-Christians into the Christian religion⁸⁹—the older view of mission, it is, rather the above passage from Luke which gives a particularly unique definition, or characteristic at least, of mission in EG. In other words, the task of mission is not necessarily to baptise others (to save souls or a church growth movement), but rather to embody God's own form of mercy which does not judge nor does it condemn, but rather it forgives and gives from its very self to the needs of others. This results in not simply reconciliation, but inclusion of those marginalised. This is, perhaps, best summed up in EG's definition of mercy itself: "Works of love directed to one's neighbour are the most perfect external manifestation of the interior grace of the Spirit...."⁹⁰ Mercy, then, is the living out of an internal experience of God's love, whilst simultaneously directed outwards to others who are in most need of experiencing God's liberative love. This mercy is a contemplative and active living of God's love. Mercy is both something the individual experiences personally, but also has, moreover, social and communitarian implications: to pursue mercy is, as we have seen in LG, GS, and EN, to "seek the good of others."⁹¹

⁸⁸ Cited in EG, 179.

⁸⁹ The older form of mission was construed *geographically*; a practise whereby a missionary travelled to foreign soil in the hopes of converting pagans to Christ and to the church. Moreover, the practice of "ransoming pagan babies" was a way to galvanize Catholics back in the United States to prayer for the salvation of "the pagans" on distant shores. The assumption within this understanding of mission was rooted in the Augustinian doctrine of original sin. Salvation, as it was at least popularly viewed, was guaranteed only by the cleansing of original sin through the sacrament of baptism, and consequently, entrance into the Church which would lead the new Christian eventually to heaven.⁸⁹ Thus, the image of salvation in this theology of mission was construed as an *individual's* entrance into the heavenly – i.e., *otherworldly* – afterlife (See Peter C. Phan, "Women and the Last Things: A Feminist Eschatology," in *In the Embrace of God: Feminist Theological Approaches to Theological Anthropology*, ed. Ann O'Hara Graff [Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1998/2008]: 206-227); hence, salvation was not popularly viewed as both an ecclesial (i.e., corporate) and an individual person's participation in the healing act and presence of Christ in the here and now – however distant the fullness of that salvation is. For a brief history of nineteenth century Catholic mission theology see Stephen B. Bevans and Roger P. Schroeder, *Constants in Context: A Theology of Mission for Today* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2004), 207-208, 22-227.

⁹⁰ EG, 37.

⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 39.

How is showing mercy something rooted in the Paschal Mystery? Jesus' mission climaxes in the Cross, EG notes, and all of Jesus' activities in fulfilling God's mission, even his time on the cross, is a revelation of love. In particular all of Jesus' activities were directed out of his love for God, and he showed mercy towards all persons in need, particularly the marginalised. This activity of mercy, this seeking to cultivate and liberate, fundamentally "enter[ing] into other's lives",⁹² the lives of people in need, led to the Cross. Jesus is killed for his works of mercy. His boundless love, ironically, for all people, elicits fear from those closed off to God's love, and the Cross is a symbol of God's boundless love, a love which reaches and "ennobles each human being."⁹³ The resurrection allows the previously limited encounters between persons and the historical Jesus, to widen so that at all times and in all places human persons are capable of being open to encountering God's mercy Incarnated in Christ Jesus. The Resurrection offers universal mercy, the opportunity to seek goodness, justice, and an end to cruelty. Mission is, therefore, the encounter between Cross and Resurrection, between human existence and Divine Love, between limitation and possibility. Thus, the Paschal Mystery brings good out of evil, and instils joy in those who experience God's mercy. Joy awakens from experiencing mercy in the encounter between death and resurrection. Experiencing the victory of mercy over sin elicits joy, a joy which others find attractive. Consequently, if a non-Christian who experiences this mercy wants to become Christian, it is not only the mercy they received which attracts them to Christianity, but the joy of those who live the Paschal Mystery.

Out of living mercy, joy is the sign, EG proffers, of the response to the liberative encounter with mercy. In other words, in the encounter between humanity's experience of the Cross (death and sin), and God's mercy (Resurrection), not only is the human person liberated towards God's love for one's self and others, but also is awakened to joy. What non-disciples will find attractive about Christianity is the joy which Christians who live out mission exude.

1.2.3.1 Analysis:

This understanding of mission is more closely associated with LG, GS, and EN, than it is with RM. Whilst LG, GS, and EN, as I noted earlier, prefer the concept of holiness (love and justice), RM argues for the explicit proclamation of Christ Jesus' Paschal Mystery, and therefore, privileges both preaching to and teaching of others. EG shifts the notion of mission back to LG, GS, and EN, whilst also going forward by adding mercy and joy as essential dimensions of mission, and therefore, adds an aesthetic dimension to mission, namely the living in and out of mission will be something attractive and beautiful with which human

⁹² Ibid., 270.

⁹³ Ibid., 178.

persons will want to be aligned, whether explicitly or implicitly. Much like the previous documents, there are two problems.

Firstly, this is an idealistic view of Christian mission. In other words, it neglects the difficulty and resistance human hearts often convey in the encounter with Divine Holiness. Whilst EG acknowledges that all human persons live life under the Cross, the heightened emphasis on the Resurrection suggests that living in and living out of mission is something that is easy, something so attractive people will offer little resistance to mission. However, if human existence is indeed marked by the Cross, a life lived with the effects of sin, how can there *not* be resistance to the Resurrection, to mercy? The Cross is fundamentally about loss, not only a loss of Christ's life, but that sin itself is a *loss* within people's lives, as mentioned earlier, a loss of one's present identity. Therefore, the gradual transfiguring of that identity to that of a missionary identity rooted in God's mercy will entail trial, resistance, pain, and risk. What I am arguing is that the change of identity according to a missiological notion of the Paschal Mystery will entail the *simultaneous* death and Resurrection that God's love, mercy, and justice brings about in the reformation of identity, and not merely a movement from death *to* life. Giving up one's identity, one's way of life, will entail embracing loss and the unknown future which the Cross symbolises. The encounter is not simply a transformation from death into life, but rather, the simultaneous experience of losing one's self (death) in the encounter with God's mercy (life). In other words, the loss of prior identity does not simply disappear in the gradual acquisition of a new way of life. They are both present in the gradual possibility of living towards God's mission, and often times, the human identity (rooted in the human resistance to Divine Holiness) will resist the call to mission. This means that conversion to God's mission always entails an experience of both the loss of identity (Cross) as well as growth in a new missionary identity. Therefore, conversion is both joy and loss, hope and risk, because one is choosing a future identity which remains unknown and mysterious to present identity. Later, I will also suggest the limitations of focusing mission as holiness simply on the Cross and Resurrection of Christ without including his ministerial life, something intimated in GS, but will need fuller Christological exploration.

In addition, this focus on conversion is not simply on the individual's conversion, but also the transformation that happens when mission encounters socio-political forces that seek to dehumanise persons. Chapter 5 will focus on mission as resistance to socio-political forces that will extend our definition of mission as humanisation. Before that, however, it will be necessary to explore a second important theological concept for a Roman Catholic theology of mission, the Reign of God.

1.3 The Reign of God

If the mission of the church is principally *mimesis* and participation in holiness or the explicit proclamation of Christ to non-Christians rooted in the Paschal Mystery, then what role does the Reign of God have within the ecclesial act of mission? The mission of the church in contemporary theologies of mission is rooted in Jesus' proclamation of the Reign of God.⁹⁴ Moreover, how do Vatican II and Post-Vatican II mission documents understand the notion of the Reign of God? In addition, how the Paschal Mystery and the Reign of God function together in the ecclesial mission is also explored.

1.3.1 Lumen Gentium

From the beginning of the Second Vatican Council until now, there has been a growing nuance and prominence concerning the concept of the Reign of God, particularly in its relationship to the church's mission.⁹⁵ In LG, the Reign of God, or as it refers to it, "the kingdom of *Christ*" is the Church. This is confirmed when LG states: "The Church, or, *in other words*, the kingdom of Christ now present in mystery, grows visible through the power of God in the world."⁹⁶ The church is a mysterious presence of the Reign of Christ, yet there is much ambiguity in that statement: does the Reign of Christ mean a differentiation between the church and perhaps a more global Reign of God? Or, is this a holdover from a prior notion of the church identified as the Reign of God? Is there a difference, even, between the Reign of God and the Reign of Christ? Unfortunately, this ambiguity does not go away within LG. In article 5, the church is called to spread the Reign of Christ throughout the world. Does this mean the Reign of Christ grows by planting the church, that is, by extending the visible

⁹⁴ See Donald Senior and Carrol Stuhlmueller, *The Biblical Foundations for Mission* (London, SCM, 1983), 144-160; Elisabeth Schussler Fiorenza, *Discipleship of Equals: A Critical Feminist Ecclesial-ology of Liberation* (London, SCM, 1993), who argues that the central mission of the Church is the *basileia* (she uses the Greek in order to avoid patriarchal/masculine language which the English word *Kingdom* of God evokes) which "cannot be adequately proclaimed and realized in a patriarchal church. Rather, such a vision can be actualized and affirmed only in a space where women attain full spiritual autonomy, power, self-determination, and liberation. Consequently, Christian feminists must first reclaim the ecclesia as our own community, heritage, theology, and spirituality before we are able to name the divine differently. The vision of a different world of justice makes us dreamers" (12). In other words, before trying to change the church structures in order to be equal within the church itself, Fiorenza argues that the imagination of the biblical vision of the *basileia* spurs must be the foundational mission of women in particular, as well as, eventually when women and men are equal within the church, the church in general. Richard Gaillardetz and Catherine E. Clifford, *Keys to the Council: Unlocking the Teaching of Vatican II* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2012), 101; Jon Sobrino, "Central Position of the Reign of God in Liberation Theology, in *Systematic Theology: Perspectives from Liberation Theology*, eds Jon Sobrino and Ignacio Ellacuría (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1993/1996): 38-74; Jacques Dupuis, *Who Do You Say That I Am?* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1994), 42.

⁹⁵ See John Fuellenbach, *Church: Community for the Kingdom* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2002) and Idem., *The Kingdom of God: The Message of Jesus Today* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1995). Fuellenbach has been the most in-depth in terms of relating the theological concept of the Kingdom of God to the Church's mission.

⁹⁶ LG, 1.

(hierarchical) structures of the church into a new geographical area? Consequently, there is a paucity of detail in order to fully understand what exactly LG means by the Reign of Christ.

1.3.2 Gaudium et Spes

One year after LG, GS is promulgated; the notion of the Reign of God receives very little mention, only in a few articles. So for example, GS explores the eschatological and present Kingdom of God: “On this earth that Kingdom is already present in mystery. When the Lord returns it will be brought into full flower.”⁹⁷ But, GS never states the relationship between the Reign of God, the church, and the world, but it is indeed implied. The Reign of God is an *eschatological* fulfilment of God’s purposes at the end times, however, the tangible quality of this mysterious Reign is either ecclesial or worldly. Therefore, I suggest, the future, eschatological quality of the Reign is what the church already participates in, but the church is not identified with the Reign, as it is sinful and still on pilgrimage towards the future fullness of that Reign. The inherent eschatology implies that the church does not fully participate in the final Reign of God, but Christ’s return will allow the Reign to grow deeper. As we will see later, this theological concept is addressed more fully in Post-Vatican II ecclesial documents.

What is particularly noteworthy is that the scope of the Reign of God is conceived of very broadly as the destiny of not simply the church but the entire world: “United in Christ, they are led by the Holy Spirit in their journey to the Kingdom of their Father and they have welcomed the news of salvation which is meant for every man [sic].”⁹⁸ Therefore, the church is not the Reign of God, but rather, a mysterious “presencing” or sacrament of the Reign within the present time. The Reign of God is broader than the church itself, and the Reign is the final destiny for all human persons.

1.3.3 Ad Gentes

AG, by far, treats the Reign of God concept deeper than either LG or GS. In a bold statement AG states that “healing” itself is “a sign of the kingdom.”⁹⁹ This statement is found within a paragraph that links God’s deep love for humanity as the inspiration of human persons’ charity towards one another and to God. True charity “extends to all” and “without distinction.”¹⁰⁰ Because this love is universal, the church’s mission “cannot be considered foreign anywhere or to anybody.”¹⁰¹ Mission is not, at least in some parts of AG, a foreign

⁹⁷ GS, 39.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 1.

⁹⁹ AG, 21.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 8.

expansion of the church, but an embodying and living in and acting out of God's deep love for the cosmos. By following the two great commandments, to love God and to love human persons, one is recreated or renewed in their createdness, and consequently they reveal God's love.¹⁰² In other words, mission is a sacrament of who God is and what God does, a God deeply immersed in human history, within human lives and actions, in order to heal all that is contrary to the Gospel. In the first place, then, mission is a type of salvation – *salvus* (healing) – that is made tangible in human history as well as a transfiguring process of persons and of events deeper into God's mysterious love. This suggests then, the *telos* of mission is the Reign of God, glimpsed momentarily in actions, particularly in the nature of the church called and commissioned to be a sacrament of holiness in the world. Holiness enacted, therefore, is a glimpse in the present of God's final eschatological Reign.

AG notes that there are three components to the church's mission: (1) to preach the gospel; (2) to plant churches; and to (3) "proclaim and establish" the Kingdom of God.¹⁰³ Whilst the healing aspect of the Reign of God is briefly mentioned, and alludes to my prior discussion of how the church's mission is one of holiness – which is linked inexorably to charity and justice, it is not explicitly linked to either of these tasks. What does find ample discussion is the Church's external mission to extend itself into other parts of the world, particularly where the Church itself has not been planted. Out of this fundamental mission comes the possibility that those outside of the church may find acceptance of the Gospel and incorporation into the church through the sacraments of Baptism, Confirmation, and Eucharist. AG stresses the importance of liturgy and mission:

By means of this activity, the Mystical Body of Christ unceasingly gathers and directs its forces toward its own growth (cf. Eph. 4:11-16). The members of the Church are impelled to carry on such missionary activity by reason of the love with which they love God and by which they desire to share with all men [sic] the spiritual goods of both its life and the life to come.¹⁰⁴

The Church is necessary for salvation, and when a person learns of Christian faith, he/she will potentially seek initiation. And this is linked inexorably with conversion to Christian faith within the Church, but in such a fashion as to suggest that outside of the Church is darkness, and Christianity frees one from sin, error, and so forth.

Then, when the sacraments of Christian initiation have freed them from the power of darkness (cf. Col. 1:13),(5) having died with Christ been buried with Him and risen together with Him (cf. Rom. 6:4-11; Col. 2:12-13; 1 Peter 3:21-22; Mark 16:16), they receive the Spirit (cf. 1 Thess. 3:5-7; Acts 8:14-17) of adoption of sons and celebrate the remembrance of the Lord's death and resurrection together with the whole People of God.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰² Ibid., 13.

¹⁰³ Ibid., 1.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 7.

Whilst this paragraph from AG suggests the Paschal Mystery as a freeing from sin and incorporation into Christ's death and Resurrection, it also is in the context of a section on the world as a sinful place in need of salvation in the hopes of making "a man [sic] realize that he has been snatched away from sin and led into the mystery of God's love, who called him to enter into a personal relationship with Him in Christ."¹⁰⁶ Though the helpful inclusion of renewal and reform of the Catechumenate seeks to acknowledge conversion in the Paschal Mystery, the overall sense of AG is saving those from personal (original) sin and the darkness of society, to the neglect of humanisation.

What is unique is that whilst the threefold missionary task of the church includes proclaiming the Reign of God, this concept is virtually ignored, whereas planting the church and preaching the Gospel are widespread. This lacuna is picked up more deeply in the Post-Vatican II document, EN. Yet, when the document discusses the Paschal Mystery, a deeper, broader, and richer notion of mission is envisioned which prioritises holiness rather than church planting or preaching the Gospel.

1.4 Post-Vatican II Documents and the Mission of the Church

1.4.1 Evangelii Nuntiandi

EN, more than any prior or subsequent ecclesiastical document, emphasised the theological concept of the Reign of God. Paul VI builds upon AG, but from a GS perspective. Vatican II historians have noted that even though both AG and GS were both promulgated in the final session of Vatican II, they are remarkably different.¹⁰⁷ GS, as we have seen, emphasises the relationship of the church which is mutually in dialogue with the world, in the hopes that charity and justice will become more widespread as part of God's purposes for the world. AG is marked by two contrasting images of mission. The first was an older model of mission in which the task of the ecclesiastical hierarchy is to "save souls" by incorporating non-Christians (or even those Christians outside of the Catholic Church, so-called "heathens") into the church as the Reign of God.¹⁰⁸ This older model understood salvation exclusively as

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 14.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., 13.

¹⁰⁷ Alberigo, *The History of Vatican II*, Vol. 5, 386-390.

¹⁰⁸ Thomas Rausch, *Towards a Truly Catholic Church: An Ecclesiology for the Third Millennium* (Collegeville, MN: Michael Glazier/Liturgical Press, 2005), 23.

explicit adherence to Christ within the Church (specifically the Roman Catholic Church), a Church which is itself salvation in the Reign of God, i.e., a perfect society in a world of sin and evil.¹⁰⁹ The liturgy was a symbol and manifestation of the perfect society since liturgy represents “the fully redeemed life”.¹¹⁰ Entrance into the Church through Baptism is an entrance into the symbol of saved life, the Church. Holiness in such a conception means representing perfection or an idealised notion of mission and life.

Many of the bishops from primarily “mission lands”, e.g., India, Asia, and parts of Africa, participating in Vatican II argued for a new understanding of mission, one which was more consistent with the other Vatican II documents as well as their own experiences of living with those of other religious backgrounds. Their emphasis was directed towards that of an inner conversion of the self and humanisation, rather than proselytising “the other”. These two contrasting notions of mission both found their ways into AG, even contradicting, as I highlighted above, the ecclesiological documents of Vatican II, in which the call to holiness is a call to inner transformation (participation in liturgy and prayer) and external acts of charity (imitation of Christ in forms of justice and peace). Unfortunately, it was the older model of mission which dominated the substance of AG.

In EN, Paul VI, takes up the newer understanding of mission and subverts the older notion by envisaging mission not only in terms of the Paschal Mystery, a concept deeply connected to soteriology, but by associating mission with the Reign of God. The importance of EN lies not only in its rich theology of the Reign of God, but also in the fact that it lends further weight to the newer model of mission which is more consistent with both LG and GS, and likewise lessens the tension between these two contrasting models of mission. This is why Robert Schreiter is able to state that “*Evangelii Nuntiandi* is the document that *Ad Gentes* was intended to have been.”¹¹¹

EN significantly accentuates the importance of the Reign of God within Jesus’ own mission. “Christ first of all proclaims a kingdom, the kingdom of God; and this is so important that, by comparison, everything else becomes ‘the rest’.”¹¹² This does not mean that anything not connected to the Reign of God is superfluous, but rather, the *hermeneutical lens* for understanding the Gospel—the mission of Christ Jesus, is the Reign of God. What I suggest, is that EN connects both the Paschal Mystery and the Reign of God in such a way that the Paschal Mystery is the Cross, as shown earlier, and the Reign of God is the rest of Jesus’ historical mission on earth. Jesus’s earthly mission, prior to his Crucifixion is preaching and

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 24.

¹¹⁰ Dom Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, (London/New York: Bloomsbury, 1945/2005), xi.

¹¹¹ Robert J. Schreiter, “Changes in Roman Catholic Attitudes toward Proselytism and Mission,” in *New Directions in Mission and Evangelization*, Vol. 2, eds. James A. Scherer and Stephen B. Bevans (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1994), 122.

¹¹² EN, 8.

living the Reign of God. He is showing what the final eschatological Reign of God will be like. Granted, the Paschal Mystery is part of Jesus's earthly mission, and the two concepts are inexorably linked, particularly looked at through the lens of LG and GS, so that mission as holiness is participation in Christ in liturgy and prayer.

The interconnectedness of the Paschal Mystery and the Reign of God is conceived existentially. EN states, "...adherence to the Kingdom, that is to say, to the 'new world,' to the new state of things, to a new manner of being, of loving, of living in community, where the Gospel inaugurates us."¹¹³ This is a very telling statement. Firstly, one "adheres" to the Reign of God may mean "cling to" the transformed world, or it may mean to "believe in" the transformation taking place. Either way, this suggests one turns towards the demands of the Gospel, which as I discussed above is the call to holiness. One's allegiance changes to that of God's Reign, of God's mission. The phrase, the Gospel "inaugurates us" suggests that our very being and identity are directed towards the image of the Reign as Christ proclaimed. Identity is that of the content of Christ's earthly life, his showing and making tangible the Reign of God through words and deeds, from Incarnation through Resurrected life.

This entire theme is connected to the image of the heart, whereby the Kingdom is not only an internal transformation of the self, of the heart, but also a living *from* the heart, a love for God and for the neighbour. This is liberation, which EN acknowledges is not solely the Cross, but "[a]ll of this [liberation] began during the life of Christ and definitively accomplished by his death and resurrection."¹¹⁴ The Reign of God extends over the entire earthly life of Jesus as acts or events of liberation, leading up to and foreshadowing the Christ's redemptive act on the Cross. Since, as shown earlier, liberation is an internal conversion of the self, the Reign of God is a *fruit* of conversion, a living from the transformation towards holiness within the human person. Thus, EN can state that the ecclesial act includes human persons "seek[ing] together the kingdom, build[ing] it up and liv[ing] it."¹¹⁵ This is the call to holiness, or as EN states, it "constitutes the essential mission of the Church", and is "her deepest identity."¹¹⁶ The Church is called to holiness, but not for its own sake, but for self-giving love to the entire cosmos. While the Cross is what Christ did for humanity out of love, the way human persons can live out a Paschal love is not mimicking a literal death on the cross, but by internalising love (the love of God for the salvation of human persons) and by living out that love through *mimesis* of Christ's historical life, that is, the Reign of God.

EN provides the following concrete ways the Reign of God is lived out: people are loved; they are momentarily freed from the shackles of oppression. When Christian disciples

¹¹³ Ibid., 22.

¹¹⁴ Ibid., 9.

¹¹⁵ Ibid., 13.

¹¹⁶ Ibid.

live out of the gift of holiness the Reign of God becomes visible as an ecclesial act. Because the person is living this out, the person becomes “a sign...of a new presence of Jesus” Christ, a sacrament of Christ acting in the world. The Reign of God, therefore, as it emerges from human hearts imbued with Divine Love, and who act out of this Spirit-filled Love, influence and transform “humanity from within and [make] it new.”¹¹⁷ In some respects, EN envisages the renewal of hearts that lead to loving actions. Just as Jesus’s Reign is the image for disciples to follow, the world in turn, as people’s own hearts are transformed not only by being *imbued* with love or even having been the recipients of ecclesial love, but moreover because they may potentially begin to act out of the love they received in the encounter with Christians.

Acting out of Divine Love mirrors Christ’s own mission given by God. This is why at the end of EN, it states directly that “*The world calls for and expects from us* simplicity of life, the spirit of prayer, charity towards all, especially towards the lowly and the poor, obedience and humility, detachment and sacrifice. Without this mark of holiness, our word [i.e., proclamation of the Reign of God] will have difficulty in touching the heart of modern man [sic].”¹¹⁸ In other words, because of EN’s anthropological notion of the destiny of humanity leading towards union with God’s love, without the church’s witness to Divine Love, to how Christ acted out God’s mission in scripture, humanity will not come to know their true destiny, and they will not be renewed in their own hearts to love others. The world is dependent on a credible witness to God’s mission by the Church. Therefore, the Reign of God is not merely the mimesis of Christ’s own historical life, but an eschatological participation in what the entire cosmos is directed towards: the fullness of God’s Divine Love. In this way, holiness and the Reign of God are inexorably linked to presently living in and acting towards the telos of the cosmos: Divine Love which liberates or humanises persons.

1.4.1.1 Analysis:

EN represents a deepening of the ecclesial mission towards a holiness which is characterised by inner conversion to God’s deep love as well as living from one’s very heart (having been imbued with Divine Love) through acts of justice, that is, witnessing to the Reign of God. EN most certainly extends and deepens Vatican II, whilst likewise prioritising how Christ lived God’s mission by proclaiming and accomplishing the Reign of God during his historical life. By participating in the ecclesial mission, Christian disciples are transformed as well as called to transform the world in accord with God’s love. EN, I have suggested, roots the call to holiness as a matter of the heart, where Divine Love and human love encounter one another and human love begins to transform closer to Divine Love both in the

¹¹⁷ Ibid., 18.

¹¹⁸ Ibid., 76; emphasis added.

self as well as in encounters with others in daily life. While EN provides a rich theology of the church's mission rooted in the Reign of God, it does seem to prioritise an overly idealistic view of transformation towards the Reign of God. EN does not take into account the deep, existential loss one undergoes in being transformed towards the Reign of God. Whilst it roots mission in Christ's life, it seems to negate that humans as still sinful may resist the message and mission of Christ. It insufficiently takes into account the *simultaneous* loss and gain which happens in this process: the gradual loss of one's deep identity as it slowly transforms potentially towards God's purposes. Being (re-)oriented towards God's Reign is to experience *both simultaneously* the cross and the resurrection, both loss of an old identity as well as the gradual adoption of a new.

A deeper problem emerges, however. So much of these documents focus extensively on the Paschal shape of mission as holiness, that EN's slight expansion of *mimesis* of Christ's ministerial life is still underdeveloped. This means that not only is participation in Divine Love over-emphasised to the insufficiently developed ministerial life of Christ in acts of justice, they are portrayed consecutively. Justice emerges from someone who has already participated in Divine Love, but can this pattern be turned around, to envisage, rather, these two characteristics of mission as a simultaneous ecclesial act. Cannot imitation of Jesus's ministerial life be a simultaneous participation in Divine Love. In other words, the unification of the ecclesial act bridges a bifurcation between participation and *mimesis*. This will be discussed later, particularly in discussion of decentring mission from church at liturgy, to mission in a broader construal.

1.4.2 Redemptoris Missio

As we saw earlier, RM marked a contrasting shift in the theological accent as well as the principal method of ecclesial mission, along with a narrow view of conversion, and this may presume that a theological dichotomy between the Paschal Mystery and the Reign of God may cause RM to neglect addressing the Reign of God. In actuality, however, RM provides a deep engagement with the theological concept of the Reign of God and its connection to the ecclesial mission.

How is the church's mission linked to the Reign of God in RM? RM states: The proclamation and establishment of God's kingdom are the purpose of his mission.... But this is not all. Jesus himself is the 'Good News,'.... Since the 'Good News' is Christ, there is an identity between the message and the messenger, between saying, doing and being. His power, the secret of the effectiveness of his actions, lies in his total identification with the message he announces: he proclaims the 'Good News' not just by what he says or does, but by what he is.¹¹⁹

¹¹⁹ RM, 13.

In other words, Christ is not merely one who proclaims the presence of the Reign of God, but he is the very embodiment of that Reign. In everything he is, does, and says reveal something about the Reign of God.

RM connects who and what Jesus did in his earthly life to the Reign of God and salvation. In preaching, healing, caring for the sick, raising from the dead, multiplying food, and so forth, Jesus overcame the powers of sin, and through people's participation in these various activities, they were liberated from the oppression of sin. In that liberative *act*, human persons experienced freedom from sin. RM is explicit in drawing a hard distinction between liberation and salvation. "By performing acts of healing, he invites people to faith, conversion and the desire for forgiveness (cf. Lk 5:24). Once there is faith, healing is an encouragement to go further: it leads to salvation (cf. Lk 18:42-43)."¹²⁰ These signs of the Reign Jesus performed did not simply liberate one from oppression/sin, but they are also an invitation, RM suggests, to faith, which is understood as an explicit assent to Christ, and this Christological assent is what is salvific for RM. In these liberative acts, Christ is revealed as the one who liberates and saves, and Christ himself is the principal sign of the presence of the Reign of God in the present as conversion and salvation become tangible.

Because the emphasis in RM is on proclamation and assent in faith to Christ, liberation is a precursor to salvation, since, as I noted earlier, salvation is hearing and acquiring Christological doctrine of who Christ is, but a preliminary stage towards it. Moreover, because these liberating acts are done by and through Christ, they are efficacious, they do actually liberate, and therefore they are tangible signs of God's Reign in the here and now. As RM states, "Building the kingdom means working for liberation from evil in all its forms. In a word, the kingdom of God is the manifestation and the realization of God's plan of salvation in all its fullness."¹²¹ Liberation is mission because it builds God's Reign and overcomes evil, however, RM nuances and suggests that salvation as the fullness of the Reign is eschatological.

What is the connection, then, between the Reign of God and the Paschal Mystery in RM? Firstly, the Paschal Mystery makes possible the presence of the Reign of God. The resurrection of Christ has made the presence of his person, and hence the Reign of God, available to all times and to all places. RM notes that this universal presence of Christ/Reign can "take flesh" in the depths of human persons as well as in the world.¹²² That is to say, any time liberation is experienced, the Reign of God is breaking into time and history, but not nearly as salvific without the truth of Christological doctrine. Moreover, "The Church is effectively and concretely at the service of the kingdom. This is seen especially in her

¹²⁰ Ibid., 14.

¹²¹ Ibid., 15.

¹²² Ibid., 16.

preaching, which is a call to conversion. *Preaching* constitutes the Church's first and fundamental way of serving the coming of the kingdom in individuals and in human society. Eschatological salvation begins even now in newness of life in Christ..." This first aspect underscores the historical participation of persons and the world in the liberating death of Christ. In other words, the resurrection makes possible the effects of salvation in the present, namely the Reign of God, that is, liberation. These are anticipations of the final fulfilment of salvation in Christ's Resurrection (the Resurrection of the Dead). The ecclesial mission is preaching the Reign of God in order to awaken persons to explicit faith in Christ.

The second connection, namely, the priority of preaching conversion of persons to the Paschal Mystery means preaching about Christ's actual death and resurrection as the principal means of salvation. Liberation is secondary to this form of preaching in RM. Therefore, RM reprioritises the older view of mission instead of the broader notion of mission from LG, GS, and EN.

1.4.2.1 Analysis:

Though EN adopted the newer model of mission from Vatican II, RM redirects mission back to the older model of mission as conversion of non-Christians into the Church. Rather than Christians living out mission – conversion of the self -- which may or may not attract others to the Church, RM prioritises conversion of the "other." This is done methodologically not by living from a transformed heart but through preaching to non-Christians. David Bosch notes that there is a fundamental misunderstanding of mission in RM. As he argues: "Mission is more than and different from recruitment to one branch of religion; it is alerting people to the universal reign of God."¹²³ He advocates, rightly, for the more Vatican II and EN notion of mission as living out of the Reign of God in daily living. He rightly cites and advocates for Charles Wist's definition of mission: "We can wade into the human struggle with our gospel of hope, side with victims, find ways to confront, influence, modify and make responsible the powers around us, suggest structures of greater justice and human compassion, and above all, let others know who the Lord of the struggle is. This, too, is a form of mission to our culture."¹²⁴

Whilst RM has an older notion of mission, it likewise shares in an overly idealistic notion of mission. It lacks a more *apophatic* notion of mission, one which sees the loss of human identity for a new Christian identity as something that does not entail loss in and of itself. In particular, the overly rational preaching of the Paschal Mystery and the Reign of God does not take into account the resistance to the message from those not already formed in

¹²³ David J. Bosch, *Believing in the Future*, 33.

¹²⁴ Cited in *Ibid*, Charles C. Wist, "Gospel for American Culture: Variations on a Theme by Newbigin," *Missiology* 19 (1991), 431.

the new identity. Not only that, RM moves away from the starting point that all humanity (and EG would add all creation) shares the same state (sin) and goal, holiness to a theology based in preaching Christological doctrine, and thus proffers an older style of mission. But I want, in contrast, to argue that adoption of missionary identity is simultaneously both loss (Cross) and hope (Resurrection). Gradually adapting to a missionary identity means that one will both resist the Reign of God as a trial which may not evoke a passionate response as these documents suggest, but will be a time of trial as the old identity slowly adapts to the new identity. Not only is the new identity about acquiring new doctrine formulations, as RM overemphasises, but it also requires a pilgrimage towards the future Reign of God, a future yet unknown. In the process of acquiring a new, missional identity, one will be resistant to being attached to the Reign of God. This transformation will include both a resistance to God's unknown future, but yet at the same time, the very human heart will resist, struggle, and be in conflict with the future Reign of God. Therefore, there will be a deep questioning of who one is as he/she encounters God's Reign, and to have one's heart transfigured more closely to the Love of God will be one of deeply questioning one's very self in the face of the Other, one which is, presently, unknown. This transfiguration will question the very security of self-identity, making one insecure, and less willing to change identity towards God's mission of holiness. It is in this struggle that the whole person, their beliefs and their values will need to adjust towards the Reign of God.

1.4.3 Evangelii Gaudium

EG builds upon the prior documents in its conception of the Reign of God. The "essence" of the Gospel message is the Reign of God.¹²⁵ In particular, the Reign of God breaks into history, when human persons place themselves under the rule of the God of Love. The reign is experienced internally in EG: "To the extent that he [God] reigns within us, the life of society will be a setting for universal fraternity, justice, peace and dignity. Both Christian preaching and life, then, are meant to have an impact on society. We are seeking God's kingdom..."¹²⁶ In other words, the Reign of God becomes tangible when human persons respond to God's love and bear fruit of that love by actively showing mercy to those marginalised and isolated in society. The internal quality of the Reign of God is consistent with the notion that love and mercy are fruits from the encounter with God's own love and mercy. The internal person is transformed to God's love, one is gradually placing one's self under God's rule. Therefore, mission in EG is construed as the Incarnation of the Reign of God taking place both internally as well as in actively living from that encounter (activity). In particular, the breaking in of this Reign of God is an eschatological image of mercy.

¹²⁵ EG, 180.

¹²⁶ Ibid.

Specifically, EG uses the image of the banquet table for the eschatological and eucharistic image of communion for those who accept God's love and mercy. The table is the place of encounter as well as the image of the Reign of God which overturns isolation, division, selfishness towards all sharing equally in the gifts of God's mercy.¹²⁷ The liturgy, then, shows forth God's lavish inclusion of those isolated and marginalised. God's mercy overturns sin that would isolate and marginalise others, and the liturgy is a sign of God's abundant mercy being made tangible in the liturgy of the fullness of God's mercy in the Reign of God. This not only images the Reign of God, but also invites transformation of those who participate to envisage inclusion and communion more deeply.

Transformation of society, economics, political structures when they are influenced by the Reign of God dwelling within human persons, occurs when disciples live from this envisaged, Eucharistic act of inclusion. These structures do not, and cannot, EG notes, make present the Reign of God as that would associate the Reign of God with ideologies. The Reign of God is beyond ideologies, and critiques them, but from the place of the converting human persons.

Whilst EG does not explore the image of the Reign of God nearly as much as the EN or RM, it does connect the Reign of God to the Paschal Mystery. In particular, the Reign of God is a present experience of the final resurrection. In the experience of God's love and mercy, that is, an experience of the Reign of God, one is experiencing a moment of both "limitation" as well as "fullness." The limitation of the here and now, the way of sin in human existence, is met with the fullness of God's infinite and boundless mercy and love in a given place and time. Though the resurrection, as noted earlier, permeates all of creation, moments of recognising or participation in the resurrection is an experience of the Reign of God. This experience is "a seed of the resurrection",¹²⁸ a momentary remedy to human existence and sin.¹²⁹ However, this is not simply an individual or personal experience of the Reign of God, as this experience is manifested when one lives in and out of mercy towards other human persons as well as society. In other words, mercy, or mission, is an echo of the Reign of God.

1.5 Mission and Official Roman Catholic Documents on the Liturgy

The theological concepts of the Paschal Mystery and the Reign of God, explored within the Second Vatican Council's and Post-Conciliar mission documents, allowed me to define mission as holiness, which, I argued, consists of an imitation of Christ as well as the act of contemplating Christ. In the following section of this Chapter, I turn to representative liturgical

¹²⁷ Ibid., 52.

¹²⁸ Ibid., 278.

¹²⁹ Ibid., 278.

documents in order to ascertain how this definition of mission relates to Conciliar (Vatican II) and Post-Conciliar liturgy documents. As before, this section will heuristically organise and discuss separately the Paschal Mystery and the Reign of God.

1.5.1 *The Paschal Mystery*

1.5.1.1 *Sacrosanctum Concilium*

The first chapter of *Sacrosanctum concilium* highlights the importance of the Paschal Mystery to the liturgical participation of the church in redemption: Christ's redemption of humankind was "achieved...principally by the paschal mystery of His blessed passion, resurrection from the dead, and the glorious ascension, whereby 'dying, he destroyed our death and, rising, he restored our life'."¹³⁰ Entrance into the Paschal Mystery begins in baptism because one is immersed into Christ's death and rises with Christ, and continual participation and proclamation of this mystery by disciples occurs in the Eucharist.¹³¹ In SC the mystery of redemption is inexorably tied to Christ's presence, not only in terms of participation in that mystery, but also in how the mystery is itself present.

The "full, active, and conscious participation"¹³² of all the faithful is a major value of liturgical reform, and "[n]o value is voiced with greater frequency"¹³³ than this participation. Mark Searle notes three types of levels of participation at work generally within liturgy: (1) at the level of liturgical ritual, (2) at the level of church "as the work of Christ", and (3) in "the life of God."¹³⁴ Whilst participation in the ritual itself is important, Searle notes that for liturgy "to become the prayer of Christ"¹³⁵ the other two levels of participation are required. Searle himself discusses participation in liturgy more generally but all three levels of participation are found within SC itself. At the ritual level is the reform of the liturgy itself in order to make the church's liturgy more comprehensible to the faithful: Both "texts and rites should be drawn up so that they express more clearly the holy things which they signify; the Christian

¹³⁰ Second Vatican Council, "*Sacrosanctum concilium*: Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy" (hereafter SC), Vatican website, Accessed 3 September 2017, http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19631204_sacrosanctum-concilium_en.html, Sec. 5. SC cites the Easter Preface of the Roman Missal.

¹³¹ Ibid., 6.

¹³² Ibid., 14.

¹³³ Rita Ferrone, *Liturgy: Sacrosanctum Concilium, Rediscovering Vatican II Series* (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 2007), 29. Ferrone notes that this phrase is mentioned at least fourteen times explicitly, and even more times implicitly.

¹³⁴ For a fuller discussion of these levels of participation see Mark Searle, *Called to Participate: Theological, Ritual, and Social Perspectives*, eds. Barbara Searle and Anne Y. Koester (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2006), 15-45.

¹³⁵ Ibid., 38 and 66.

people, so far as possible, should be enabled to understand them with ease and to take part in them fully, actively, and as befits a community.”¹³⁶ In this way, disciples will be able to participate *externally* in ritual (singing, hearing the readings in the vernacular, and so forth) but also participate *internally* so as to “be sanctified” by Christ’s redeeming mystery.¹³⁷ Therefore, liturgical participation is to engage the entire person, body, mind, and spirit so as to be transformed in and by the mystery of Christ. The purpose of ritual is to participate in Christ’s mission of Redemption, that is, to make holy (sanctify) and is consistent with LG and GS regarding the principal role of mission as holiness. How this relates to imitation and contemplation of Christ leads to Searle’s other two levels of participation.

Searle’s second level of participation (the church participating in Christ’s works) can be gleaned from SC is explored in terms of Christ empowering the very words, gestures, symbols, and so forth: “By His [Christ’s] power He is present in the sacraments, so that when a man [sic] baptizes it is really Christ himself who baptizes. He is present in His word, since it is He Himself who speaks when the holy scriptures are read in the Church.”¹³⁸ This is possible, SC states, because the liturgical ritual is done “in Christ Jesus...[and] through the power of the Holy Spirit.”¹³⁹ This participation in liturgical ritual allows disciples to dwell in the presence of Christ. This participation is not simply the individual disciple dwelling in Christ’s presence, but it is a corporate participation that potentially leads to sanctifying and uniting disciples together as Christ’s church. This participation means that disciples are “filled with the ‘paschal sacraments,’ to be ‘one in holiness.’”¹⁴⁰ Here, then, the contemplative dimension of liturgy, one part of our definition of mission as holiness, comes to the fore in SC. Holiness is what Christ does, and holiness is empowered by the Spirit and gifted by Christ to those gathered in liturgy.

Holiness consists not only of dwelling in Christ’s place as a form of contemplation, but this also means that liturgy is itself an imitation – by standing in Christ’s place, hearing Christ, taking to heart (i.e., internalising) Christ’s word and receiving Christ’s Body and Blood is itself doing what he did and what he does presently since the liturgy is empowered by the Spirit of Christ. In this way, then, liturgy itself in SC unites contemplation and imitation of Christ

¹³⁶ SC 21.

¹³⁷ The full and active participation is construed internally and externally in SC: “With zeal and patience, pastors of souls must promote the liturgical instruction of the faithful, and also their active participation in the liturgy both internally and externally....” (Ibid., 19).

¹³⁸ Ibid., 7

¹³⁹ Ibid., 6

¹⁴⁰ Ibid., 10. SC quotes the Post-communion Prayer from Easter Sunday of the Roman Missal.

together at the level of liturgical ritual. Mission as holiness is consistent with LG and GS; the role of humanisation will be discussed in greater depth below.

Before moving on to the concern of justice, it ought to be mentioned that whilst SC mentions the *phrase* Paschal Mystery extensively, especially in Chapter 1, it does not go into great depth regarding a specific theology of the Paschal Mystery, unlike LG, GS, and AG, which went into discussing how participation in Christ's Paschal Mystery is internalised and performed, i.e., kenotically. However, later papal documents on liturgy, discussed below, draw on a theology of the Paschal Mystery; though each, as I will show, emphasise different aspects of the Paschal Mystery.

1.5.1.2 *Evangelium Vitae*

Though *Evangelium vitae* is not an encyclical devoted specifically to liturgy, it does relate the liturgy to the mission of the church. In particular, John Paul II explicitly draws on the interconnectedness of liturgy and contemplation. In particular, he wants disciples to develop “a contemplative outlook” that allows one to look at other human persons and realise they are not only created by God but are “wonders”, that is, they are expressions of God's beauty.¹⁴¹ The liturgy is a site, the pope argues, where “the evocative power of its gestures, symbols and rites, should become a precious and significant setting in which the beauty and grandeur of this Gospel is handed on.”¹⁴² One way this beauty and wonder comes to the fore in EV is through the pope's reflections on the Eucharistic species. “Precisely by contemplating the precious blood of Christ, the sign of his self-giving love (cf. Jn 13:1), the believer learns to recognize and appreciate the almost divine dignity of every human being....”¹⁴³ Rather than focusing on the Body of Christ, the pope emphasises the beauty of Christ's Blood, which is analogous to the beauty of human blood in everyone. His turn to the symbolism of blood is tied intimately to the Paschal Mystery, and especially to the notion of (self-)sacrifice. Christ's sacrifice on the Cross, the pope teaches, resulted in the “sprinkling of blood” that saved humankind and brought life.¹⁴⁴ Christ gave his blood for the salvation of humanity so that from his death, humanity might find life. He gave “the sincere gift of self” for others and brought about communion between humanity and Christ. Therefore to drink Christ's Blood within Eucharist is not only a participation in Christ Jesus, but also those who participate are potentially “drawn into the dynamism of his love and [the] gift of life....”¹⁴⁵ Yet

¹⁴¹ John Paul II, *Evangelium vitae*, Encyclical Letter, Vatican website, Accessed 21 July 2017, http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_25031995_evangelium-vitae.html, Sec. 83; hereafter, EV.

¹⁴² *Ibid.*, 83.

¹⁴³ *Ibid.*, 25.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*

¹⁴⁵ *Ibid.*

the response to Christ's gift on the Cross and the sharing of this gift with disciples in the liturgy is not to be responded to with sorrow, but alternately liturgical participants should find joy, because, the pope insists, that God's life out ways any sorrow or suffering in the act of self-sacrifice. Each person is a reflection of God's creating activity, the pope proffers and the liturgy "will provide spiritual strength necessary to experience life, suffering and death in their fullest meaning."¹⁴⁶ This Christic Blood, for the pope, therefore, brings life from death, and allows the pope to connect the aesthetic contemplation of the "beauty and wonder" of Christ's sacrifice to mission.

To contemplate and participate in the liturgy is to bestow a commitment on disciples to follow mission, and for the pope, that means disciples are formed themselves in an image of Christ, a particular image, namely, the bloody Christ on the Cross. This image leads to a commitment to giving one's own blood for others in imitation of Christ. This is a very stark accent on the Paschal Mystery. The pope can be read as to suggest that mission entails not merely self-sacrifice, but a more appreciative aesthetic quality to death and blood. There is then, an *uneven* Christology. The focus on the beauty of giving one's own blood to the exclusion of the body focuses almost exclusively on a self-sacrificing kenosis and leads away from the analogy of likeness between Christ and people based on the Incarnation itself. Must mission always be construed through sorrow and suffering? Can mission be construed in an alternative way whereby life is valued but mission is not inexorably tied to suffering and sorrow as necessary ways through which God's mission is enacted and lived out?

Focusing on "blood relations" to Christ, the pope not only gives a direr task of living out mission – one that would necessarily mean self-sacrificing¹⁴⁷, but it also limits other Christic analogies for living in and out of mission. Why not focus on Christ's incarnation as the analogy for the dignity of humanity? Why not focus on his blood and body in ways that do not seem to suggest the necessary shedding of one's own blood (which suggests that mission will necessarily hurt) to live in and out of mission? As I will explore in the next Chapter, the theological concept of *kenosis* is not without its problems. Yet, the virtually exclusive analogy of *kenosis* on the Cross does not address the ministerial life of Christ as an imitation and participation of disciples in Christ's mission, something I will return to in Chapter 5.

1.5.1.3 Ecclesia de Eucharistia

The next encyclical letter by Pope John Paul II is devoted principally to the Eucharist as the source of the church's life. The church finds its "entire spiritual wealth" in the "source and

¹⁴⁶ Ibid., 84.

¹⁴⁷ In Chapters 3 and 5 the potentially problematic characteristics of mission as kenosis will be discussed further.

summit of the Christian life.”¹⁴⁸ Drawing on SC’s language, the Eucharist is the centre of not only the liturgy, but it is “the centre of the Church’s life.”¹⁴⁹ What is the power of the church’s life as envisaged by EE?

The Paschal Mystery is the source of redemption for Christian disciples, because, as EE argues, the Cross on Good Friday is the moment when God brought about redemption for humankind. It is *the* “holy hour, the hour of the redemption of the world.”¹⁵⁰ In similar, though less evocative language as EV, EE insists that Christ Jesus’ blood spilling on the Cross is the reason Jesus is called the Saviour.¹⁵¹ This redemptive mystery, a mystery the church is called to contemplate and proclaim, reveals the nature and mission of the church itself: “the mystery of his passion...also reveals her [the church’s] own mystery.”¹⁵² The grace of the Cross is “made present” in the Eucharist, and from this participation in the mystery of redemption the church grows in God’s love (shown forth on the Cross as Christ gives his very life for the world), and is united together in this act of love as the church receives the Eucharist in the reception of Communion. Mission is thus construed in terms of Christ’s redemption on the Cross, and in keeping with EV, EE accents the death of Christ as the act, or better, *moment* of redemption. Is Christ’s death the only moment of redemption? EV, like EE, does not sufficiently address the *ministerial* life of Christ before his death.

The church is sustained in God’s love through its reception of Eucharist, where the act of Christ’s redemption continues to have an effect on disciples. Rather than turning to the Incarnation as the model for Communion – the unity of humanity and divinity in the person of Jesus – the pope employs the role of Mary. The Annunciation is the image of Communion for the pope. Mary “offered her virginal womb for the Incarnation of God’s Word.... At the Annunciation Mary conceived the Son of God in the physical reality of his body and blood, thus anticipating within herself what to some degree happens sacramentally in every believer who receives, under the signs of bread and wine, the Lord’s body and blood.”¹⁵³ This embodied act of receiving Christ by the power of the Spirit is the image of the transubstantiated Bread and Wine at the Eucharist. Whilst invisible inside her, Mary is the “tabernacle” of Christ’s presence during her pregnancy.¹⁵⁴ She is the principal image of

¹⁴⁸ John Paul II, *Ecclesia de eucharistia*, Encyclical Letter, 2003, Vatican website, http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/special_features/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_20030417_ecclesia_eucharistia_en.html. Accessed 26 July 2017; Sec. 1. Hereafter, EE.

¹⁴⁹ Ibid., 3.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid., 4.

¹⁵¹ Ibid.

¹⁵² Ibid., 5.

¹⁵³ Ibid., 55.

God's love, because of her love for the baby Jesus, and this, the pope argues, "should inspire us every time we receive" Communion.¹⁵⁵ In stark contrast to all of the other official church documents discussed above, the image for mission is not only an imitation of Christ himself, but of Mary as well. Her presence at the Cross is also a model for the contemplation of God's mission. In this way, she not only models divine love by dwelling in Christ's presence at the Cross (as well as obedience to God's commands at the Annunciation), but she is also the example for Christian disciples.

The pope spends far greater attention in the encyclical on Mary as the model for mission than he does on any biblical role of Christ, though as noted above, Christ's act of redemption is key to the pope's construal of mission. Rather than contemplating Christ's ministerial life, the dominant image of mission is contemplation on *Mary's* role in Christ's life. In one way, this creates a Marian image of mission that not only may potentially overshadow *Christ's* living in and out of God's mission during his earthly life (in addition to the Cross), but it also means that disciples are more focused on imitating *Mary* than Christ Jesus himself. This not only modifies the previous documents on liturgy and mission but it overshadows the previous document's emphasis on what *Christ* does and the church's role of contemplating and imitating him. This is not to suggest that Mary does not have a role in the life of the church or that imitating and contemplating her would yield an inauthentic mission, but rather, that the accent on Mary insufficiently attends to the role of mission in Christ's entire life (in addition to the Cross), and may potentially overshadow Christ's life of mission.

1.5.1.4 Deus Caritas Est

Two years following EE, Pope Benedict issued his encyclical letter on the love of God, a theme that AG, GS, and EN have highlighted in the role of mission. EE, however, focuses more extensively on God's love, which has implications for mission. God's love is manifested through the "path...[that] leads through the Cross to the Resurrection"¹⁵⁶ which is the source of love for the church. Like EE and EV, DCE links God's love on the Cross to Eucharistic participation, though unlike EE and EV, DCE appeals to the *desire* for this Divine Love. Participation in the Eucharist is a participation in God's love, which nourishes disciples because this self-giving Love of God on the Cross is now available to disciples in the Eucharist, in food that nourishes and unites disciples in his Body and Blood.¹⁵⁷ Participation in Eucharist not only unites the church in God's love, but it should also bring about an *erotic*

¹⁵⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵⁵ Ibid.

¹⁵⁶ Benedict XVI, *Deus caritas est*, Encyclical Letter, Vatican Website, http://w2.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_ben-xvi_enc_20051225_deus-caritas-est.html; Accessed 27 July 2017; Sec. 6. Hereafter DCE.

¹⁵⁷ Ibid., 13.

love (*eros*), that is, a greater *desire* for God's love – having “tasted” it in the liturgy. Desire is linked to the Cross for the pope.

Contemplation, the pope argues, ought to be primarily focused on the Cross. “By contemplating the pierced side of Christ...we can understand the starting point...that this truth can be contemplated. It is from there that our definition of love must begin.”¹⁵⁸ Like previous documents, the central construal of Divine love is the self-sacrifice of Christ Jesus on the Cross. Redemption is the key to knowing, contemplating, and imitating God's love. The contemplation and act of love is liturgical for Pope Benedict. Because Eucharist itself is God's love for humanity, within the liturgy, humanity, through its participation in God's loving act of Eucharistic Communion, leads to a desire to be like Christ in loving those present at the Eucharist. “Communion draws me out of myself towards him [Christ], and thus also towards unity with all Christians....’Worship’ itself, Eucharistic communion includes the reality both of being loved and of loving others in turn. A Eucharist which does not pass over into the concrete practice of love is intrinsically fragmented.”¹⁵⁹ Mission, therefore, is firstly a contemplation of and participation in God's love made manifest in and through the Eucharist received by disciples. Mission rooted in the Paschal Mystery is lived and enacted within the liturgy. But this mission is Christological not only because it is Paschal but because mission is oriented towards self-emptying love towards others in the way Christ did on the Cross. Mission is therefore kenotic, and is consistent with LG, GS, AG, RM, EG, EE, and EV, though, in addition, the pope extends these documents by insisting that this mission is both attractive and desirable because God sacrificed Christ Jesus for the good of humanity. Each document thus deepens and strengthens the mission as a kenotic activity of Christ to which disciples ought to be drawn to participate in (redemption) and to live out Christologically as a self-sacrifice.

Mission as living in and out of Divine Love within DCE is also oriented towards the neighbour outside of the Church community. DCE especially emphasises that loving one's neighbour ought to be “organised” by the local community. The reason for this is ecclesiological – laity and priest together explore and organise how the church is called to live in and out of Divine Love glimpsed in liturgy, but extended to society around itself. In particular, DCE envisages this mission as the principal work (that of organisation) by the ordained. Deacons are not only theologically “meant to provide”¹⁶⁰ service but also ecclesologically because their vocation is to extend the service of the Church in an organised manner. In other words, the administration of service is entrusted to deacons who are part of the institutional Church. Thus mission as Divine Love is focused nearly exclusively

¹⁵⁸ Ibid.

¹⁵⁹ Ibid., 14.

¹⁶⁰ Ibid., 21.

in terms of the task of the institutional Church itself. Whilst the advantage here is the full awareness of the need of the Church itself to enact love, it does unnecessarily limit this notion of mission to the institutional Church. As noted earlier, EN and EG both broaden the notion of mission as an ecclesial act, but not always something done by the institutional (that is, ordained) members of the Church, but those who act, the laity included, with the intention of God's mission entrusted to the Church. AG even acknowledged that those of other religions and those without religion have "seeds" of the gospel which means that grace and Divine Love are not solely institutionally bound, but may be experienced outside of the church. Therefore, lay members, as noted, are called to live in and out of mission not only in the liturgy but also in the world. This would be a task the entire church is called to do, because as shown earlier, the very nature of the church is missionary, which means that mission is not only institutional but also implies a daily vocation of disciples.

What is noteworthy about this encyclical is that the love at issue in DCE is Christian love, a love that Christians have a mission to *teach* the world. Gerard Mannion notes that DCE "implies the *superior* nature of *Christian* love."¹⁶¹ The implication of Mannion's critique is important for our own notion of mission. In similar vein to RM, if mission is construed in terms of teaching, then the role of church and disciples living in and out of mission in daily life will be one of teacher to student (those not Christian). There is fundamentally a notion of superiority inherent in such a construal of the relationship between the church's mission and the world. The role of dialogue between church and world is not equal and mutual; it necessitates a one-way relationship between church and world. As Chapter 4 will discuss, the world can be a prophetic challenge to the church to live its mission more faithfully.

1.5.2 *The Reign of God*

1.5.2.1 Sacrosanctum Concilium

Unlike the emphasis of the Paschal Mystery underlying SC, the role of the Reign of God and justice are not very prevalent at all. Rather, the liturgy dominates the document. The role of the liturgy is made the central role and mission of the church itself. This is evidenced in the liturgy being the "source" and "summit" of the church's life.¹⁶² The importance of this phrase has had a major impact on contemporary liturgical theology, both Roman Catholic and Protestant. I will come back to the importance of this phrase below as well as in Chapter 3. Before that, though, there are a few places within SC where the life of the church is not focused only on the liturgy itself.

¹⁶¹ Gerard Mannion, "Charity Begins at Home...an Ecclesiological Assessment of Pope Benedict's First Encyclical," *New Blackfriars* 88, Issue 1018 (November 2007), 655.

¹⁶² See SC, 10.

The importance of catechesis and works of charity are mentioned in SC. “To believers also the Church must ever preach faith and penance, she must prepare them for the sacraments, teach them to observe all that Christ has commanded, and invite them to all the works of charity, piety, and the apostolate.”¹⁶³ A few lines before this acknowledgement of the Church’s mission in the world SC states: “The sacred liturgy does not exhaust the entire activity of the Church.”¹⁶⁴ Or again, SC notes that prayer is sometimes done within other contexts than the liturgical ritual: “The spiritual life, however, is not limited solely to participation in the liturgy. The Christian is indeed called to prayer with his brethren [sic], but he must also enter into his chamber to pray to the Father, in secret....”¹⁶⁵ Finally, devotions may also be of spiritual benefit to disciples yet these devotions “must (be so drawn up that they harmonize with the liturgical season, accord with the sacred liturgy, are in some fashion derived from it, and lead the people to it, since, in fact, the liturgy by its very nature far surpasses any of them.”¹⁶⁶ There is, then, a hierarchy of descending – as from a summit or from a water source – priorities of prayer and practises that help the spiritual life. Part of the original context of this hierarchy was due to the extensive devotions prayed during many pre-Vatican II Sunday Eucharistic liturgies, which gave rise to the often heard phrase, “People prayed at mass, but they did not pray the mass.”¹⁶⁷ The drafters of SC sought to make the liturgy the central source of the spiritual life, and whilst not revoking devotions, it did require that they somehow be connected to the liturgy. Yet, with little attention to the Reign of God and to justice, SC, when read by itself, may give the impression that the source and summit of mission is the liturgy. Yet, LG, GS, AG, EN, RM, and EG all acknowledge the importance of the Reign of God and justice within the lives of disciples. Part of this is due to the fact that SC was the first document to gain approval and was promulgated at the Second Vatican Council, whereas, AG and GS were promulgated at the very last session of the Council.¹⁶⁸

¹⁶³ SC, 9.

¹⁶⁴ Ibid.

¹⁶⁵ Ibid., 12.

¹⁶⁶ Ibid., 13.

¹⁶⁷ This phrase was uttered a lot in my studies in liturgy at Saint John’s University (Collegeville, MN) and at Catholic Theological Union (Chicago). I have yet to find the original source of this phrase.

¹⁶⁸ What is surprising is the absence of justice within SC. The precursor to SC, the Liturgical Movement, not only promoted the reform and renewal of the liturgy, also the role of justice within the world. Two influential Liturgical Movement voices, Godfrey Diekmann and Frederick R. McManus, at the Council have expressed their regret on the lack of attention to justice within SC. See Frederick R. McManus, “Foreword” in Kathleen Hughes, *The Monk’s Tale: A Biography of Godfrey Diekmann, O.S.B.* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991), xii. Robert L. Tuzik states, “They [leaders of the Liturgical Movement] wanted to reform the way people lived as church. They came to understand the liturgy as a celebration of what it means to be, to become and to build up the church. They wanted to rescue popular piety from its preoccupation with worship before the tabernacle to a style of worship

Therefore, a balanced notion of mission as holiness means that SC must be read alongside the other documents on the church's mission. Granted, these references are focused on the spiritual contexts of disciples but the role of justice remains insufficiently attended to.

1.5.2.2 Evangelium Vitae

The role of charity and heroic action are two important ways that EV construes the relationship between liturgy and the action of justice. Charity, a theme explored already in the documents above, is a "self-giving love for others."¹⁶⁹ But rather than construing charity as a humble act for others, EV argues that "in this context, [i.e., living from God's self-giving love] so humanly rich and filled with love, that heroic actions too are born."¹⁷⁰ This is a higher form of love and one that shares "in the mystery of the Cross" and yet, this heroism "is an everyday heroism" because it is "made up of gestures of sharing, big or small, which build up an authentic culture of life."¹⁷¹ The example used is organ donation, a literal giving up of one's body or a part of one's body so that someone else might live and survive. The implied heroic act is that one suffers so another human person might live. Here then, the Paschal Mystery is central to what it means to live in and out of Divine Love, a kenotic mode of charity. Whereas SC placed almost a sole emphasis on the liturgy, EV broadens ecclesiological the nature of mission.

The household/family is "a domestic church" because it is, as EV argues, "summoned to proclaim, celebrate and serve the Gospel of life."¹⁷² The mission of the church is prayed and lived out in the domestic church due to the potentiality of parents cultivating within their children "respect for others, a sense of justice, cordial openness, dialogue, generous service, solidarity and all the other values which help people to live life as a gift [of *kenosis*]."¹⁷³ In other words, the domestic church not only teaches charity but also discerns how it might live kenotically for others in daily life. It is also the context where prayer is taught and proclaimed. In particular, EV notes that the family is where life itself as embodied in children and in one's spouse is respected and loved. Here, then, is a broadening of charity from a liturgical or even ecclesiological concern to a household/family concern. Charity and prayer are still

that would related the liturgy to life. They wanted the liturgy to become the source of the life of the church, the source of the lay apostolate." Robert L. Tuzik, "Introduction: Whence the Liturgical Movement?" in *How Firm a Foundation: Leaders of the Liturgical Movement* (Chicago: Liturgy Training Publications, 1990), 3. See also, Paul B. Marx, *Virgil Michel and the Liturgical Movement* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1957), 179-209.

¹⁶⁹ *Evangelium vitae*, 86.

¹⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

¹⁷¹ *Ibid.*

¹⁷² *Ibid.*, 92.

¹⁷³ *Ibid.*

communal, and one's life is to be lived kenotically for others, whether in the household, in the church, or for others outside of either of those two contexts.

In EV, then, imitation of Christ Jesus is through the Cross, construed in terms of *kenosis*. The Paschal Mystery dominates as death and suffering leads to acts of love for the other. The broadening of mission from the sites of liturgical ecclesial gatherings to the domestic sphere helps to situate a spirituality of mission that disciples may live out in greater depth in daily life. Imitation of Christ's *kenosis* on the Cross is expressed intimately within the family/household, with persons one knows and with whom one has daily interactions. Where this model still limits mission is not only in a construal of *kenosis* of the Cross but also because mission is envisaged in an ecclesial setting.

What is implied in this form of mission, in this site of the domestic church, is a family already committed to Christianity, whether through daily prayer and kenotic spiritual practises or in the teaching in preparation for sacramental celebrations of Baptism, Confirmation, and Eucharist. Mission is modelled on a practise of an *idealised* household/family. But not all families are quite that functional or that self-giving to one another. Even the use of "heroism" implies a kind of idealised self-giving that thinks not of one's self, but of others. In Chapters 3 and 5 I will discuss feminist critiques of kenotic spiritualities. What I will attempt to construct is a notion of mission that is broader than the liturgy and broader than the domestic church. The other disadvantage of this image is that not all disciples have families or are married or are married with children. This model excludes single disciples, some of whom may not have family members left (death, run-aways, homeless, and so forth). EN's advantage of ecclesial intention allows for a broader notion of mission that all disciples may potentially live in and live out, without it being construed domestically. This will serve to acknowledge that there are at least three sites of mission within these documents: (1) the liturgy, (2) the domestic church, and (3) daily life. I intend to construct a liturgical theology of mission that does not privilege one of these sites over and above the other, rather, acknowledging that mission is broader than these three sites.

1.5.2.3 Ecclesia de Eucharistia

Picking up SC's "source and summit" language, the liturgy becomes the central site of mission. At least five times, EE directly refers to SC 10.¹⁷⁴ The liturgy is the central site of the mission of the church, and this is directly expressed when EE argues that "The Eucharist thus appears as both the source and the summit of all evangelization [i.e., mission], since its goal is the communion of mankind [sic] with Christ and in him with the Father and the Holy Spirit."¹⁷⁵ This is a particular construal of mission, one consistent with Pope John Paul's

¹⁷⁴ See EE, 1, 3, 18, 22, and 31.

¹⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 22.

articulation of mission in RM that seeks to convert others to Christianity. Mission is the “incorporation into Christ”¹⁷⁶ that “is at the centre of the process of the Church’s growth.”¹⁷⁷ Consistent in RM, EV, and EE is the emphasis that mission is not only living kenotically but also is a proclamation of Christ himself that seeks to grow numerically the church. Whilst EV focused on the role of kenotic charity modelled on the Cross, EE employs a form of mission that not only sees church growth as the goal of mission, but its *telos* is participation in the Eucharistic Communion of the church. In the end, EE, like RM, has a narrower view and an older conception of mission. The role of the liturgy is central to people’s participation in mission as well as the “source and summit” not only of the *spiritual* life but of *mission* itself. This means that EE focuses in a more limited way on justice and the Reign of God of the other documents, especially RM, GS, AG, and EN.

1.5.2.4 Deus Caritas Est

Unlike the prior encyclicals, EV and EE, DCE devotes a section to charity and justice, and clarifies the difference between these two concepts. Interestingly, DCE argues that the church’s mission is concerned with charity whilst political, civic governments ought to be concerned for justice. Justice “must be a fundamental of the State”¹⁷⁸, and justice “is both the aim and the intrinsic criterion of all politics. Politics is more than a mere mechanism for defining the rules of public life: its origins and its goal are found in justice, which by its very nature has to do with ethics.”¹⁷⁹ Thus the role of governments is to assure that all human persons are treated ethically, because ultimately governments ought to be following norms of justice. For this to happen, DCE argues, governments require the church to “purify” its ability to reason on behalf of justice. In this way, the church, empowered by the Gospel and by the liturgy, teaches the government(s) true love in order that citizens may attain justice. Yet, it is not the church’s task to work for justice; it is the government’s task to assure justice; the church simply teaches the role of Christ’s love to the state. What then is the role of the church if not justice? It is charity.

The church’s mission is to those who suffer. The church is to provide “loving personal concern.”¹⁸⁰ DCE envisages this phrase to mean that the church does not simply provide material resources, but rather, “refreshment and care for their [those suffering] souls, something which often is even more necessary than material support.”¹⁸¹ This is consistent

¹⁷⁶ Ibid., 23.

¹⁷⁷ Ibid., 21

¹⁷⁸ DCE, 26.

¹⁷⁹ Ibid., 28.

¹⁸⁰ Ibid.

with RM, and the earlier discussion above regarding the church's mission to teach Christian love to the world. Inexorably tied to this form of teaching in RM and DCE is teaching Christ's love.

Mission in this document remains fundamentally consistent with the above documents. Mission is construed kenotically. The liturgy participates in Christ's redemption on the Cross and the lay faithful are to live in and out of this love in imitation of Christ for the good of others. DCE does go one step beyond by clarifying the role of the church in politics and charity, thus acknowledging the separation of church and state. The Cross is central to all of these documents, and within the liturgical documents especially, the liturgy is central to participation in mission as Divine Love in order to live in and out of the Divine Love in daily living. But is the model of "source and summit" the best way to envisage the role of liturgy within mission?

1.5.3 Beyond Source and Summit

The phrase "source and summit" appears multiple times in the above liturgical documents. Based on the discussion above, the role of the liturgy is paramount to mission. Even though acknowledgment is made of other sites of mission, namely the domestic church and EN's notion of "ecclesial intention", there remains an implicit construal of mission as liturgically centred. My exploration of the above documents showed various ways of construing mission. AG, RM, and EE employ the older, church growth model of mission from the days of colonialism. GS, EN, and EG have a principal concern for humanisation, the newer form of mission. SC is devoted almost exclusively on participation in the Paschal Mystery in the liturgy to such an extent that humanisation and charity are virtually absent. The result is three different ways to privilege the site of mission: (1) the liturgy, (2) humanisation, (3) the domestic church. Which document should one take as the guiding choice for prioritising mission? Even more to the point of this Chapter is that, if read on its own, SC may potentially distort the fact that there are various sites of mission in addition to the liturgy. Because these liturgical documents employ "source" and "summit" language from SC, I turn to Peter C. Phan's critique of this language in order to serve my purpose of articulating a comprehensive notion of mission in the site of liturgy as well as in acts of humanisation.

Phan argues against SC's use of "source and summit" since this image "suggests a mountain or a pyramid and ...underlies the one-way relation between the original source and the [mountain or] body of water that flows out of it"¹⁸² The implied result of this image "sets up

¹⁸¹ Ibid.

¹⁸² Peter C. Phan, "The Liturgy of Life as the 'Summit and Source' of the Eucharistic Liturgy: Church Worship as Symbolization of the Liturgy of Life?," in *Incongruities: Who We Are and How We Pray*, eds. Timothy Fitzgerald and David A. Lysik (Chicago: Liturgy Training Publications, 2000), 11-12. Also published in Phan's *Being Religiously Interreligiously: Asian Perspectives on Interfaith Dialogue in Postmodernity* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2004): 257-278.

a scale of values”¹⁸³ between liturgy and all other activities whether ecclesial or not. Liturgy, therefore, is valued greater than other activities, like mission, that may flow from it. Moreover, this image also implies a one way relationship: “However small is the source and however large is the river flowing down from it, there is only one way in which the two are related to one another, and that is from the top to the bottom, and never from the bottom to the top.”¹⁸⁴ This critique of SC’s language of “source and summit”, as employed significantly by the papal documents explored above (EE and DCE) then, makes apparent that liturgy itself is central to the life of the church, and from my own perspective, this language of “source and summit” reinforces that the church’s mission is principally liturgical. Mission, therefore, is centred within liturgy.

The world, as Phan evocatively argues, remains “parched” until those nourished by the liturgy “flood it [the world] and makes it fertile.”¹⁸⁵ Whilst Phan does not relate his critique explicitly to a mission theology, the implication of “source and summit” language retains an older, colonial notion of mission; mission as conversion of non-Christians, that is, those who have participated liturgically in God’s mission. This language, therefore, centralises the liturgy in the life of the church, but mission apart from liturgy (as humanisation) remains either marginal or of less value than the liturgy itself. This language may be why the liturgical documents (SC, DCE, and EE) have less to say on dehumanisation than the mission documents, especially GS and EN. The two contrasting modes of mission are present within these official Roman Catholic documents, but the liturgical documents employ the older notion of mission, due to the use of SC’s “source and summit” language, whilst GS, EN and parts of AG employ humanisation as the newer mode of mission. In the next Chapter, the language of source and summit has influenced Roman Catholic liturgical theologies of mission, and yet, as I will show, there is also a growing concern for the new mode of mission as humanisation.

¹⁸³ Ibid., 11.

¹⁸⁴ Ibid., 12.

¹⁸⁵ Ibid., 13. Phan takes this argument further by suggesting that SC’s “source and summit” language retains a dichotomy between the sacred (liturgy where grace is made available) and the secular (where grace appears when those nourished by the waters of the liturgy sprinkle the world with sacred actions. Picking up on this critique, Ricky Manalo, *The Interrelationship of Sunday Eucharist and Everyday Worship Practices* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press/Pueblo, 2014), 83-94, employs Phan’s argument to argue for the value of prayer practices of disciples apart from the liturgy. Whilst Phan and Manalo turn to Karl Rahner’s supernatural existential to argue that grace is always and everywhere present to human persons: According to Rahner, because “of the permeation of the [entire] world by God’s grace, Christians are called to be ‘mystics’ in the world, that is, to be attuned to the presence of God during everyday moments that would otherwise go unnoticed. Experiences of God are not rare but are available to everyone at all places and at all times. Where Rahner calls these mystical encounters with God ‘the liturgy of the world’ . . . , Phan, for his part, encapsulates these terms in his own, ‘the liturgy of life’” (Manalo, 90-91). My thesis turns not to Rahner but to Rowan D. Williams and Delores S. Williams to delineate how mission is not only important to daily activities of disciples, but also to explore how disciples can perform mission daily.

Conclusion:

I have been arguing that, despite various emphases, the overall theology of mission from these official Roman Catholic documents on mission is holiness. Holiness, it was suggested, is rooted in Christological living, that is (1) a contemplative participation in Christ through prayer and liturgy, as well as (2) a *mimesis* of Christ Jesus's earthly ministerial life. From the above, it is clear that mission as holiness is principally construed as participation in Divine Love, thus accentuating this aspect of mission as holiness over the *mimesis* of Christ's ministerial life. What this means, then, is that there is an underdeveloped *mimesis* in the construal of mission. This will be developed in Chapter 5.

The ecclesial act of mission is construed as participation in Divine Love, but can this participation theology of mission be extended beyond liturgy and prayer to the daily ecclesial acts of mission in the world? In other words, rather than centring mission in participation with potential subsequent acts of justice, can mission be decentred so that ecclesial acts of mission as justice simultaneously participate, however minimally, in Divine Love? These Post-conciliar documents, especially those concerning the liturgy, allude to this through a spirituality of living in and out of Divine Love, but as the above evidence suggests, only after one has participated in Divine Love (in liturgy) may one then live this out in life. This suggests a bifurcation between participation and *mimesis*. In the second half of this thesis, I will construct a bridge between participation and *mimesis* through the language of sacramentality, and by developing further a Christological *mimesis* of Christ's earthly ministerial life. As such, then, a liturgical theology of mission may be constructed based upon a theology of mission as holiness.

This initial understanding of the dynamics of adopting a missionary identity needs to be expanded and deepened. In the next Chapter, I turn to contemporary liturgical theologies of mission, in order to analyse them through the lens of mission as holiness.

Chapter 3

Contemporary Liturgical Theologies of Mission

Introduction:

In the previous Chapter, mission was explored in contemporary official Roman Catholic documents. I argued, that, in these documents, a primary notion of mission is construed broadly as holiness – a call by God to live in (a contemplative or interior love) and live out (the active or exterior love as justice) God's mission embodied and shown forth in the person of Christ Jesus. This schema allows a definition of “mission as holiness” as living in and living out God's love for the world as exemplified and taught by Christ. This exploration of contemporary official Roman Catholic mission now demands that I engage with contemporary liturgical theologies of mission in order to build on these foundational insights in such a way as to address my purpose of decentring liturgy in order to centralise mission.

This Chapter thus serves as a targeted literature review. Firstly, I will begin with the shared notions of the relationship of liturgy and mission, which is to insist broadly that liturgy itself is a form of mission, within contemporary liturgical theologies of mission. Whilst the various liturgical theologians in question share the same goal, their accounts are distinctive. After identifying these shared goals, I will turn to the definition of mission as holiness, both in terms of Christic participation and by way of Christic *mimesis*.

Then, I will turn to the question of the relationship between liturgy and “world” within important liturgical theologians who construe the relationship of liturgy, mission and world vis-à-vis eschatology. I will begin by asking how participation in liturgical mission in these theologies leads disciples to living in and out of mission within the world, and these theologians will provide a foundation on which to construct a liturgical theology of mission.

3.1 Liturgy: The Goal of Mission

3.1.1. Alexander Schmemmann¹⁸⁶

How do liturgical theologies construe mission, and how do they construe the relationship between liturgy, mission, and society? The antecedents begin with Alexander Schmemmann, who noted that some Western Christian churches regarded Orthodoxy as being uninterested in the missionary enterprise because the chief aims of Orthodoxy are “sacramental, liturgical

¹⁸⁶ This thesis will be limited to Schmemmann's explicitly mission-oriented works, and it will not deal with his entire corpus. For fuller treatments of Schmemmann's liturgical theology, see David W. Fagerberg, *Theologia Prima: What Is Liturgical Theology?* 2nd ed., (Chicago: Liturgy Training Publications, 2012); Bruce T. Morrill, *Anamnesis as Dangerous Memory: Political and Liturgical Theology in Dialogue* (Collegetown, MN: Liturgical Press/Pueblo, 2000).

and mystical.”¹⁸⁷ In other words, what Schmemmann is alluding to is that Christian Orthodoxy seems more interested in the internal ecclesial practices – sacraments, liturgy, and mystical union with God – than with the external society in which Orthodox churches find themselves. In *For the Life of the World* he begins with two short but important essays on mission and liturgy in Orthodoxy,¹⁸⁸ and then sets about incorporating mission into a liturgical theology, or more precisely, giving a *liturgical perspective to mission*. This latter move, as will be shown later in this Chapter, has had significant impact on the relationship between mission and liturgy in liturgical theology.

The principal goal of mission, as envisaged by Schmemmann, is the communion of the world with God, which is found sacramentally within the church at prayer.¹⁸⁹ The church in its liturgy is a confluence of four interrelated characteristics of the divine purpose for the Church, and by extension, the world’s own goals dictated by the divine purpose: to grow in “faith and love, knowledge and *koinonia*.”¹⁹⁰ This four-fold divine purpose is contrary to the purposes of the world, wherein the human person is ordered by “demonic powers”, that is, the work of sin and evil, both of which prevent the divine purpose from becoming tangible.¹⁹¹ The Church is the remedy for the sin and evil existing within human persons, and participation within the Church allows one’s participation in the divine purpose. How does this divine purpose relate specifically to the liturgy for Schmemmann?

For Schmemmann, it is the liturgy that communicates, realises, and mediates God’s holiness, a holiness merely glimpsed during liturgy; it constitutes a foretaste of the fulfilment of the Reign of God.¹⁹² The liturgy, therefore, makes present the eschatological anticipation of the Reign of God to which humanity is directed. Not only is the Reign of God a “unity with God” for disciples within the liturgy, but it is also “the content of the Christian faith—the goal, the meaning and the content of the Christian life.”¹⁹³ Because the *liturgy* is an experience of

¹⁸⁷ Alexander Schmemmann, “The Missionary Imperative,” in Idem., *Church, World, Mission: Reflections on Orthodoxy in the West* (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1979), 209, 210.

¹⁸⁸ See “The Missionary Imperative,” 209-216 and “The World as Sacrament” in Idem., *Church World, Mission*, 217-227

¹⁸⁹ For Schmemmann, the symbolic nature (symbol from the Greek means to unite) is to unite human persons to Christ so that the human is the visible whilst Christ is the invisible. Though being human, this participation in Christ “is always partial, always imperfect....” See Alexander Schmemmann, *The Eucharist: Sacrament of the Kingdom*, trans. Paul Kachur (Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir’s Seminary Press, 1988), 39.

¹⁹⁰ Schmemmann, “The Missionary Imperative,” 213.

¹⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 212.

¹⁹² *Ibid.*, 211.

¹⁹³ Schmemmann, *The Eucharist*, 40.

the Reign of God, the Church becomes constituted by its participation in God's gift of God's own Reign—the confluence of the four-fold divine purpose. In other words, liturgy is where the Church is imbued with faith, love, knowledge, and bounded in *koinonia*.

In particular, in Schmemmann's account, in celebrating the sacraments, especially the Eucharist, the Church receives divine grace which leads to the Church being gifted with faith, love, knowledge and communion with God. In other words, the Church, through its participation in liturgy, is being re-ordered according to God's purpose but also is growing deeper in its reliance on God and God's grace. Liturgy, as the glimpse of the Reign of God, is the time when the grace of divine love builds communion and reconciliation between alienated humanity and God. This experience also communicates knowledge of the cosmos' true destiny – communion with God, as well as divine love, which redirects the Church towards God's ends. The reason the Church exists, therefore, is to be united together with God, and to be an anticipated image of God's reign. Schmemmann illustrates this participation of the Church in the four-fold divine purpose via two movements. The first movement is "ascension toward the throne of God, toward the Kingdom"¹⁹⁴, as it continues to exist in this world though within the liturgy. It is within the liturgy that humanity "see[s] the heavenly character of the"¹⁹⁵ Reign of God. Because the Church exists between two worlds – a heavenly reign and world of human sinfulness – God gives the church a mission, to bring the world into the glory of God. Or, as Schmemmann states, the Church's mission is "directed toward[s] the world with the aim of converting it to Christ..."¹⁹⁶ Liturgical participation, therefore, is a journey to embody the divine purposes, and a form of mission. Liturgy is thus central to Schmemmann's notion of mission.

For Schmemmann there is a (high) Christological foundation to his two-movement approach to liturgy and the goal of the Church. The Church is like Christ – both human and divine – mediating between human and God, sin and sanctification. The first movement is Christological in the sense that human persons in and through the Church are pilgrimaging to embody God's purpose as Christ did. The liturgy principally mediates the divine and human. God's presence becomes efficacious through the human Church, leading it towards the divine purpose. In this sense, then, the Church is becoming more Christ-like as it embodies or incarnates the divine purpose. But because the Church is also part of the world, it must be healed of its sinful condition. The divine purpose is what heals sin, and begins to restore the Church to its Christological goal, the Reign of God. What was Christ's mission for Schmemmann?

¹⁹⁴ Schmemmann, "The Missionary Imperative," 211.

¹⁹⁵ Schmemmann, *The Eucharist*, 59.

¹⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 87.

The liturgy is an ecclesial participation in Christ's victory over sin and death – the Reign of God. The second movement entails the moving out *from* the eschatological fullness of the divine purpose, where the Church encounters sin and evil in the world, in order not to reject the world, but to witness to the cosmos's true destiny in communion with God. In other words, the Church embodies what it celebrates – the victory of life over death – and becomes a sacrament to the world, a visible sign of where the cosmos ought to be headed. It is important to note that Schmemmann does not simply limit the goal of mission to humanity, but because Christ died to destroy all sin and death in the *cosmos*, the Reign of God will be a final victory not only for humans, but also for the cosmos.¹⁹⁷ This is brought into the liturgy through an incarnational or sacramental dimension to the material elements themselves: bread and wine are cosmic elements that are brought together in the context of the Eucharist for two purposes: God's and the world's.

The *defining* feature of sacraments, in Schmemmann's theology, is also their very goal, *telos*: the reconciliation of the creature and the Creator into a bond of unity through the power of God's very presence.¹⁹⁸ Reception of the transformed cosmic elements of bread and wine, now the Body and the Blood of Christ, the Church *meets* Christ in and through the elements as well as when the Church celebrates the liturgy. The Church, transformed into Christ, is also a meeting between the divine and human, where Christ's own victory becomes glimpsed and realised within the Church's liturgy, and indeed, within the very sacramental elements themselves. This meeting, however, is within the depths of the person himself/herself as he/she participates within the communal liturgy of the Church. Schmemmann highlights that the "Kingdom of Christ is accepted by faith and is hidden 'within us'."¹⁹⁹ The throne, which the Church pilgrimages to and from which it leaves to go out to the world, is the altar-table itself. God's mission, as Schmemmann explains, is highly incarnational: the power of Christ's incarnation within the sacramental elements as well as within the Church which receives these elements, and the ascended Christ himself in the glory of his throne, foreshadows what the cosmos is to become. Christ is thus on the altar-table (the elements), around the altar-table (the Church), as well as in his fullness in the future reign to which everything is directed. In other words, the transformation the humanity and the cosmos is called to is to be a sacrament of the Incarnation; sin is healed, and Christ dwells therein.

This high Christology is the basis of Schmemmann's liturgical notion of mission. The Church leaves the liturgy as a sacrament of God's divine mission in order to mediate the grace God has already bestowed on the Church in and through the liturgy. Like the sacramental elements, the Church becomes through its reception of the consecrated bread

¹⁹⁷ Schmemmann, "The World as Sacrament," 222-223.

¹⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 224-225.

¹⁹⁹ Schmemmann, *The Eucharist*, 41.

and blood a sacramental element itself of Christ's reconciled presence to the world. In this way, the Church's mission is to reflect what took place at the altar-table of liturgy: It is to be sign of the eschatological reconciliation of God and the created universe.

It is important to note that Schmemmann suggests that God's mission is mediated and effective within the liturgy itself, embodied in the ecclesial body of Christ, and then subsequently, this Christological identity is witnessed to in the world. Mission is, therefore in Schmemmann's important work, a movement from God to Christ to the sacramental elements to the church, and then subsequently to the world. In addition, the world *enters* the Church's liturgy in the gifts as well as in the people themselves in order to participate in the Divine purposes around the throne. Therefore, the goal of mission is participation in the eschatological banquet of the Reign of God, and the world comes to this, not only by glimpsing the Church's expression of Christ's presence, but more so, through participation in the Church's sacramental activity of ascending to the throne of God.

In other words, in Schmemmann's work, there is a primary participation in mission and a secondary participation in mission. The primary participation is humanity being healed within the liturgy. The secondary participation is sinful humanity in the world seeing the Church transformed like the Eucharistic elements. Complete transformation will only happen at the eschaton; until then, the primary way to participate in God's mission is in and through the liturgy, to witness, even partially, God's Reign.

3.1.1.1 Analysis

This giant of liturgical scholarship made two notable contributions to a liturgical perspective on mission. Firstly, he shifted the focus of God's mission from the world (society that is apart from liturgical ritual) to the liturgical ecclesial act itself. Mission is the movement *to* God's throne, embodied in what the Church does and in the Church's nature as a worshipping community. Liturgy is the goal of mission. Yet, the focus displays the necessary movement of the Church to bring the cosmos to reconciliation, primarily as it journeys to the altar-table of God. In this regard, therefore, church, liturgy, and mission are construed tightly together.

Secondly, he explored a theology of mission from a liturgical perspective. His Christology, as noted above, is inherently aligned with a deep connection to the sacramental elements and the Church's participation in *receiving* those elements. Mission is to *become* the sacramental Body and Blood of Christ – imbued with God's presence, gifted with faith, healed from sin, but yet always anticipating the final victory over sin and death – is the call for those outside of the Church to become members of the Church. In much the same way as the official Roman Catholic documents on mission contend, holiness for Schmemmann is inherently part of mission. Whereas the Roman Catholic documents focused on holiness being present primarily in the Church and subsequently in the world, Schmemmann makes a sharper break between Church and world. Humanity is sinful, and to grow in sanctity, it must

participate in the liturgical elements themselves; thus, Schmemmann seems to imply, holiness would not be possible within the world apart from the Church at liturgy. In this approach, then, worship “nurtures” the individual in order to proclaim the gospel in secular culture. Worship is experienced as an *individual’s* relationship to God, so that the person is healed of sin, and experienced God’s reconciling grace in worship. Worship, therefore, is primarily about personal salvation. In turn, mission is the proclamation of the gospel *outside* of the liturgical event to secular society, and the goal of mission is the hope of attaining new persons interested in the gospel through the gathering for liturgy.

Schmemmann’s work began a trend in liturgical theologies of mission, something we will see shortly, namely that liturgy becomes a central site of mission. In Schmemmann this is particularly acute: God’s mission is the call for disciples to bring the world (those not members of the Church) to God’s throne, the altar-table. Because mission is subsumed into a liturgical as well as ecclesial perspective is to indicate that mission is basically church growth; bringing people into the Church in order to ascend to the four-fold purposes. The disadvantage of Schmemmann’s approach is the lack of a prophetic mission of the church into the world in order to *serve* the needs of the world, apart from the world’s need to come to the throne of God. This is due, in part, because mission is *spiritualised* to such an extent that there are few implications for the way in which the Church is to serve the world, which God created. The Church, therefore, lacks any responsibility for the goodness and holiness present within the world. Whilst Schmemmann shares with the Roman Catholic documents on mission a common theme that mission is to sanctify human persons, they differ considerably in where that holiness is mediated.

This is due to the fact that Schmemmann locates the Reign of God *within* the Church during and at liturgical prayer. Bruce T. Morrill states how prevalent this conception is for Schmemmann, “The assembled, worshipping church’s ‘ascension’ has *already* ‘led’ its participants into the kingdom of God. Throughout his writings Schmemmann never tires of, indeed, he clearly revels in, asserting that the Eucharistic liturgy is the actual experience of the parousia”.²⁰⁰ The cosmos *comes to* the Reign of God, only through participation in the liturgy. This is in contradistinction to the theology of the Reign of God explored in Chapter 2, above. The church, to recall from that Chapter, is part of the Reign of God, but the church itself is neither collapsed into the Reign of God, nor is the church as the Reign of God the fulfilment of mission. Why does this distinction matter? To equate the church, or its liturgy, with the Reign of God leads “in the direction of triumphalism.”²⁰¹ Rather, the Reign of God, of which the church is a sign and instrument, is the goal of the cosmos, not the church itself. This is a significant distinction. If the mission is the living in and out of the Reign of God, then

²⁰⁰ Morrill, *Anamnesis as Dangerous Memory*, 103.

²⁰¹ Richard P. McBrien, *The Church: The Evolution of Catholicism* (New York: HarperOne, 2008), 4.

it is not that the church has a mission, but “the mission has a church”.²⁰² In other words, the church is *decentred* from the Reign of God, and the world is centred as the site of where the Reign of God is active, present, and potentially liberating. The cosmos participates in the Reign of God when it resists sin. Saint Augustine gets to the heart of this distinction when he maintained, “Many whom God has, the Church does not have; and many whom the Church has, God does not have.”²⁰³ This will be explored more extensively in Chapters 4 and 5, what is important, however, is that Schmemmann restricts the Reign of God to the liturgy, and therefore restricts mission to the liturgy.

The Church in the world is simply a sign of the reconciliation Christ achieves, but divorced from any implications for serving the needs of the world as a site of the Reign of God. This is evidenced in Schmemmann’s construal of ecclesial mission: “the Church in herself has no other ‘business’ than the incessant acquisition of the Holy Spirit and growth into the fullness of Christ, who lives in her.”²⁰⁴ Here then, Schmemmann principally emphasises the participatory dynamic of life in Christ found within the liturgy, which is, to recall, an ascension to Christ’s throne. Because he restricts the Reign of God to liturgical enactment, the world outside of liturgy is not a place to participate in God’s Reign. In stark contrast to the notion of official Roman Catholic mission explored in Chapter 2, Schmemmann eschews the world apart from liturgy by boldly proffering that “Christ is not outside the Church....”²⁰⁵ Christ is restricted to the Church itself and to the movement of Ascension to the throne. Schmemmann’s harsh view of contemporary society not only comes through his polemical prose, but seems to suggest that disciples ought to be uninterested in the world outside of ecclesial gatherings: “And I do believe, as the Church has always believed, that this upward journey [to the throne] begins with the ‘laying aside of all earthly cares,’ with leaving this adulterous and sinful world. No ideological fuss and bother, but a gift from heaven—such is the vocation of the Church in the world, the source of her service.”²⁰⁶ He further rejects any notion of a liberation theology because this type of theology, he states, is concerned with issues

relating to economics, politics and psychology [which] have replaced a Christian vision of the world at the service of God. Theologians, clergy and other

²⁰² Stephen B. Bevans, “The Mission Has a Church: An Invitation to the Dance”, *Australian eJournal of Theology*, Australian Catholic University, accessed 10 June 2016, https://www.google.ie/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0ahUKEwIaqbaGwcTSAhWBC8AKHTZPCTMQFggbMAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.acu.edu.au%2F_data%2Fassets%2Fpdf_file%2F0004%2F197644%2FBevans_Mission_Has_Church.pdf&usg=AFQjCNFU0gzil9Wf2LH8v6T69aQVXGYT7Q, 10.

²⁰³ Augustine, *De Baptismo*, 5.38, quoted in Richard P. McBrien, *The Church: The Evolution of Catholicism* (New York: HarperOne, 2008), 51.

²⁰⁴ Schmemmann, *The Eucharist*, 90.

²⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 91.

²⁰⁶ *Ibid.*, 10.

professional 'religious' run busily around the world defending—from God?—this or that 'right,' however perverse, and all this in the name of peace, unity and brotherhood. Yet in fact, the peace, unity and brotherhood that they invoke are not peace, unity and brotherhood that has been brought to us by our Lord Jesus Christ.²⁰⁷

Taking these passages together suggests that Schmemmann rejects societal concerns as a mode of improper religious service because only within the liturgy may disciples be capable of receiving the Spirit and participating in Christ. Bluntly stated, Schmemmann's mission theology does not allow one to be concerned with *both* liturgy/ecclesia and the world. To be missiological in this model is not only to reject the world outside of the Church's assembly, but to refuse to participate in humanisation, part of our definition of mission explored in Chapter 2. If this perspective is seen in light of his notion of Ascension to the throne and descending way from the throne, then Morrill exposes two different accents of this movement for Schmemmann: "The polemical quality..., nonetheless, so opposes liturgical ascension to the descent (might we say, kenosis?) into political action and social advocacy that the subtlety of Schmemmann's theology of the eucharistic liturgy is lost."²⁰⁸

Even more appropriate to my purposes regarding Schmemmann's missiological perspective on liturgical theology, Morrill highlights the crucial dimensions that liturgical theology ought to have if it is going to be politically engaged: "The problem that nonetheless remains is Schmemmann's obstinate refusal to consider more carefully the oppressive conditions experienced by other peoples in the world—those, for example, in the southern hemisphere who endure relentless social, economic, and political oppression. Christian love for those peoples requires attention to the systematic conditions of their oppression, as theologians of liberation have shown. The liturgy, in its content and shape, is clearly not capable of being the sole authoritative source for Christians' ongoing conversion—in this case, Father Alexander's."²⁰⁹ Morrill rightly notes the need for liturgical theology to be engaged with modes of oppression, and, to this end, in Chapter 5 I will turn to a notion of resistance within a womanist perspective to propose a liturgical theology of mission precisely from the perspective of those who are oppressed.

²⁰⁷ Ibid. Morrill notes that Schmemmann did not refrain from politics totally. "In the light of the often painful history of the Orthodox churches in the twentieth century, Schmemmann confronted theologically and pastorally a serious threat to the viability of Orthodoxy: ethnic nationalism" (Morrill, *Anamnesis as Dangerous Memory*, 128). Morrill continues, "He perceived how such divisions [amongst ethnic Orthodox churches] hindered Orthodoxy's viability and impact in Western societies" (Ibid.). Schmemmann's teaching and published works sought to overcome these ethnic divisions in order for Orthodoxy as a whole to be in deeper unity amongst themselves. Yet, this political dimension is within the Church itself, where, I showed above, Christ is present, but this is not necessarily a political theology concerned with economic, political, and social concerns outside of the Church itself.

²⁰⁸ Morrill, *Anamnesis as Dangerous Memory*, 125.

²⁰⁹ Ibid., 129.

Moreover, Schmemmann's high Christology also makes it nearly impossible to envisage mission as imitating the historical Christ who served those in need in his day. Rather than an equal balance of incarnating the Divine Christ which empowers living like Christ, not only the Christ exalted in heaven, but also the Christ who lived historically. Therefore, there is an imbalanced Christology assumed in this liturgical theology of mission which fails to underlie justice and service.

This high Christology also assumes that those who participate in liturgy are highly Christic in their own abilities to be symbols themselves of the eschatological Reign of God. The purpose of being a symbol, for Schmemmann, is to testify to the world its need to approach God's throne, to become holy. This presupposes one is highly imbued with the *divinity* of Christ, to overcome the human propensity to not follow God's mission, a divinity found within liturgy but yet seemingly absent within the world apart from liturgy. But this is a particular Christological mission, one which views bringing people to the liturgy, and fails to address that *mimesis* of the scriptural Christ is itself a part of God's very mission as well. That is, mission is also service to the world in justice. For instance, by focusing on the transformation of sacramental elements, one may neglect the scriptural aspects of the liturgy, for instance in the scriptural readings, the scriptural overtones of the collects and Eucharistic prayer, where Christ is actively teaching and modelling holiness as shown in his earthly life.

3.1.2 Protestant Liturgical Theologies of Mission: Mission as Witness to the Reign of God

Schmemmann's contribution to a liturgical theology of mission was picked up by a good few Protestant liturgical theologians of mission. Their reliance on Schmemmann differs in the manner they seek to extend Schmemmann's initial steps connecting liturgy, mission, and the Reign of God. In the following section, I will explore the ways in which these liturgical theologians of mission understand the relationship of church, liturgy, mission and world in order to highlight how the liturgy becomes a site of mission in addition to mission as witness within the world. In particular, I will show that the relationship is unidirectional from the church praying the liturgy which is then subsequently witnessed to in the world so that liturgical ritual is the central site of participating in the Reign of God.

J.G. Davies, just a few years after the first printing of *For the Life of the World*, employs Schmemmann's task to give mission a liturgical shape, but Davies also does something distinct: he argues that mission *needs* the liturgy to provide an authentic, corrective dimension *to* mission. Like Schmemmann, Davies roots the principal mission of the Church in the Church's liturgical participation in the Paschal Mystery: the act of Christ Jesus's own self-sacrificing love in order to save the world. This participation occurs when the church gives glory and praise to God (liturgy for Davies), and the church leaves in

mission to witness to this experience of God's Reign within the liturgy.²¹⁰ Mission, for him, does not enact the Reign of God within the world because participation in God's Reign is liturgical. The cross, then, defines and gives meaning to the act of mission.²¹¹ Unlike Schmemmann, Davies roots the final goal of mission not in the victory of the cross (the Reign of God), but in the self-sacrifice, the perfect expression of God's divine love that gives itself for the sake of others.²¹² The cross represents the overcoming of human selfishness, and the bestowal of divine selflessness. If Schmemmann's high Christology focused on the incarnation of Christ through symbol and person, Davies' low Christology is principally encapsulated in *mimesis*, the imitation of *what* Christ did on the cross, self-sacrifice, gifted within liturgy and witnessed to in daily living.

Liturgy is where scripture and the Eucharist builds bonds of communion between God and the church, offers knowledge of who Christ Jesus is, and invites the church to conform itself to Christ. Like Schmemmann, the goal of mission is reconciliation of the church to God at the end of the world. The ends of both Christologies are the same: Divine love on the cross forgave human sin, and also liberated them to grow in deeper communion with God.²¹³ Because of the highly conceptual nature of Davies' Christology, one needs to ask how does one imitate Christ's divine self-sacrifice, particularly from a missiological perspective?

The effects of this transformation are to be lived out by the church within the world; for service and witness to the communion the church has already participated in during worship.²¹⁴ Here the Christological dimension is picked up by Davies again: Because the church has participated in Christ's activity of self-offering in the liturgy, the church is able to itself be self-offered in imitation of Christ because the self-offering of Christ in the liturgy is the pattern for Christian living.²¹⁵ Therefore, in particular, "the eucharist is...the heart of worship and mission [i.e., witness]."²¹⁶ As such, the church is obliged to live out its mission in the world as a witness to Christ's own self-sacrifice on the cross glimpsed during liturgical ritual.

Davies, whilst indebted to Schmemmann for connecting liturgy and mission, contrasts with Schmemmann in that mission is conceived not as a fourfold divine purpose nor is mission

²¹⁰ J.G. Davies, *Worship and Mission* (London: SCM Press, 1966), 71.

²¹¹ *Ibid.*, 36.

²¹² *Ibid.*, 31, 35.

²¹³ *Ibid.*, 28.

²¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 137-8.

²¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 85.

²¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 103. Davies notes that Eucharist is "refreshment" to the church at liturgical prayer in order to fulfil the command of Jesus to make disciples (Matt. 28.18ff), *Ibid.*, 27, 104, 140-141.

construed with an Incarnational *telos*, as Schmemmann contends, but in a narrower Christological focus: imitating Christ's self-offering exemplified on the cross, and glimpsed in liturgy.²¹⁷ The advantage to this project of Davies focusing on the cross, particularly the death of Christ, where Christ showed forth self-sacrificing love for humanity, is that mission may have a justice aspect, namely, mission is service in and to the world. Mission, in other words, is for the *church* to be a gift to the world, and therefore, to live mission within the world. However, Davies limits mission within the world to the Great Commission, that is, to bringing non-believers into the church. The liturgy, therefore, serves as the central pattern and glimpse of God's reign.

Schmemmann emphasises the *victory* of the cross of Christ, the transformation effected in liturgy, whilst Davies shifts the focus to the *death* of Christ, as the kenotic giving up of one's self for the Divine Mission. If Schmemmann overemphasises the eschatological end of creation transformed, then Davies does the opposite, that is, one must give up one's life for the other. Davies draws out a kenotic spirituality of mission for the good of the world, but by limiting mission to a *kenosis* of Christ's death on the cross, there is a sense that the mission of disciples in the world can lack a true engagement with the social and political dimensions of society. In particular, certain feminist theologians are wary of over emphasising the cross, such as we will see in Chapter 6 when discussing the implications of Delores S. Williams's theology for mission. *Kenosis* theology based in the cross can lead to women being subservient in cultures where women are socialised that their place is to be subservient (self-emptying) of themselves to such an extent that they not only lose themselves (who they are). "...[W]omen were exhorted to model themselves after the sacrifice and obedience of Christ and to internalize passive and resigned endurance of their own pain and suffering."²¹⁸ Moreover, a *kenosis* theology of the cross may also be a social sin since women may lose their agency in service to oppression. The social sin results in placing the other, whether human person or structure, as an idol, thereby reducing one's own worth to the needs of the other in such a way that women's own humanity is diminished as

²¹⁷ This kenotic approach is adopted by Frank Senn, *The Witness of the Worshipping Community* (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1993). Picking up on the Schmemmann's liturgical theology of the "ordo", Senn notes that the Sunday liturgy provides a pattern (an image) for which the Christian is to live his/her life. This pattern is a participation in the Paschal Mystery, Christ's death and resurrection as signified in Word and Eucharist. Participation heals sin, and witness in the world is patterning one's life on Christ's own death and resurrection. This healing builds up the disciples into the ecclesia, thus unifying them in Christ himself. Self-emptying one's self is a practice of witness and mission signified and participated within the liturgy.

²¹⁸ Pui-lan Kwok, "Feminist Theology, Southern" in *The Blackwell Companion to Political Theology*, eds. Peter Scott and William T. Cavanaugh (Oxford, UK/London: Wiley and Sons, 2004), 204.

their needs are less important than the needs they are required to serve.²¹⁹ Such a theology can potentially disempower women (or anyone found within the margins of society, church, and family life) from actively living mission in the world. This problematic will be developed in greater depth in Chapter 5.

Rather than a theology of *kenosis* based on the death of Christ, as Davies suggests, that has the potential to disempower some disciples (in certain marginal circumstances) from living out mission, the entire life of Christ, as I discussed in Chapter 2, is both a model and a source for mission for Christian disciples. Divine Love was not simply demonstrated on the cross, but was also shown forth in Christ's very acts throughout his earthly ministry. As I will highlight in Chapter 5, Jesus' earthly ministry becomes a model and a teacher of mission but also empowers human agency to live in and live out Christ's mission against dehumanisation.

The relationship of liturgy and mission becomes, after Davies and Schmemmann, one of the principal concerns of liturgical theologians engaging with mission theology. Thomas H. Schattauer approaches the relationship of liturgy and mission from the perspective of a distinctive ecclesiology.²²⁰ Schattauer argues for a particular way in which liturgy and mission ought to be linked together, and he terms this approach: "inside out." "The focus is on God's mission toward the world, to which the church witnesses and into which it is drawn, rather than on specific activities of the church undertaken in response to the divine saving initiative."²²¹ For Schattauer, God's action of saving and healing human persons is the mission of God made tangible by Christ Jesus and the power of the Holy Spirit within the church that gathers for worship.²²² Liturgy manifests and enacts God's mission. As he states,

The liturgical assembly is the *visible locus* of God's reconciling mission toward the world. The seemingly most internal activities, the church's worship, is ultimately directed outward to the world.... Like a reversible jacket, the liturgy can be turned and worn inside out, and by so doing we see the relationship between worship and mission—inside out.²²³

²¹⁹ Sally Ann McReynolds and Ann O'Hara Graff, "Sin: When Women are the Context," in *In the Embrace of God: Feminist Approaches to Theological Anthropology*, ed. Ann O'Hara Graff (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1995/2005): 161-172.

²²⁰ Schattauer is not the only liturgical theologian of mission that takes this approach to linking liturgy and mission. See Alan Kreider and Eleanor Kreider, *Worship and Mission After Christendom* (Harrisonburg, VA: Herald Press, 2011). They also take this approach, though they argue that a distinctive ecclesiology of mission has the purpose of forming an ecclesial culture that takes precedence over all other types of cultures and groups. As they states: "The missional task of the church...is less one of outreach than that of inreach [sic] that produces 'clearheaded and devoted apprentices of Jesus'" (Ibid., 139). They envisage the world apart from liturgy and the church to be "inhospitable (Ibid., 146), which means that the relationship of liturgy/church and the world is conceived in terms of a sharp, opposition relationship.

²²¹ Ibid., 3.

²²² Ibid.

²²³ Ibid.

For Schattauer, therefore, liturgy *is* the sacrament of God's mission, a mission of reconciliation embodied in liturgy, where the liturgy envisages mission for Christians in order for them to witness to the reconciliation mediated in worship for the good of the world. Worship is the eschatological vision of God's final goal for all of the cosmos: the reconciliation of the entire cosmos to God. The Eucharistic prayer, Schattauer notes, is a prime example of God's intention for mission. The Eucharistic prayer gathers people together on a common purpose: to thank God, and this thanksgiving unites the persons together into an ecclesial communion.²²⁴ The church at worship thus makes tangible God's mission and is affected by the experience and presence of God's mission.

Through the *memory* of Jesus Christ—his coming in the flesh, his life, death, and resurrection—our lives are directed in *hope* to the kingdom of God that Jesus proclaimed and to God's ultimate purposes for us and our world, just as we enjoy even now Christ's life—giving *presence* in the assembly of the faithful through word and sacrament by the power of the Holy Spirit.²²⁵

The vision, therefore, that liturgy offers is a glimpse of the Reign of God, which is a future destiny, but directs the present actions of the Church community to live out the Paschal Mystery. In similar vein to Schmemmann, the liturgy is the site of God's Reign, and therefore, mission is a distinctive participation in that Reign in and during liturgy. Liturgy itself is the distinctive witness to this Reign in the world, and for the relationship to the world, like Schmemmann noted above, is for the world to enter into the liturgy.

This leads to another contrast (in addition to those noted above concerning Schmemmann and Davies) with our definition of mission from Chapter 2. Mission was not simply reduced to a liturgical ecclesiology when the church becomes the Body of Christ in the Eucharistic liturgy; instead, there was a dual concern that: (1) mission was not only the church in its participation in Christ, most especially as the Body of Christ at liturgy; but also (2) when disciples live in imitation of Christ's life for the good of the world. Schmemmann and Schattauer assume that church is visible only when it is at worship, thus seemingly restricting a fuller and more robust notion of the church active in the world acting for the good of society.

Because of this lacuna, there is need for greater attention to the implications of how the ecclesial community lives out mission in the world. Moreover, these three theologians' notions of mission can be read as creating a sharp dialectic between church/mission/liturgy over-and-against the hostile world, and thereby, these theologies can seem to over-identify the church with divinity (holiness) at the expense of sinfulness (the world), and thus, from our

²²⁴ *Ibid.*, 10.

²²⁵ *Ibid.*, 12.

perspective, they proffer not only a different notion of ecclesiology, but also their notion of mission is contrasted with my definition of mission from Chapter 2.

Both Schmemmann and Schattauteur seem to define mission as increasing membership in the church. Liturgy serves God's mission because it visibly expresses God's Reign, but how does mission become visible within the world, apart from liturgy? Mission within the world apart from its coming to be revealed in liturgy, seems nearly impossible, and that is because mission is envisaged as the world entering into the liturgy to participate in God's mission, and indeed, explicit participation through what we call contemplation in Christic participation is essential for disciples, but the second, and mutually important aspect of mission as participation in and imitation of Christ's life within the world, is not drawn out sufficiently for our purposes.

Whilst Schattauteur and Schmemmann and Davies all agree that liturgy is mission,²²⁶ they do not view what disciples do in the world (beyond liturgy) as either an ecclesial act nor as equally as important as what transpires within worship, because for Schmemmann and Schattauteur in particular, the world is hostile to God's mission due to sin. With such a negative, sinful view of the world, there is a potential and an urgency for the church to engage with society, socially and politically, to resist sin, but these two theologies, rather, do not draw out these implications of the church's mission in and with the world. The result, it seems, is an implied disjunction between mission in the liturgy and mission in the world. Rather than liturgy and world as different contexts where God's mission is lived out, they seem opposed. As I will show in Chapters 4 and 5, the world is not simply sinful, and the liturgy is not simply holy, but rather, sin and holiness are found in both contexts. Before that, though, one further version of a fundamentally Schmemmannian liturgical theology of mission needs to be considered in order to highlight the role of liturgy as a site of mission.

Ruth A. Meyers' contribution to the field of liturgy and mission has been the advancement of a new approach to the interconnectedness of liturgy and mission, which she calls 'missional liturgy.' She broadly defines missional liturgy as liturgy that "proclaim[s] and celebrate[s] God's reconciling love for the world."²²⁷ Whilst her broad definition does not explicitly describe her new conception of missional liturgy, as this is similar to the definition we glimpsed in Davies' liturgical theology of mission, it is her *approach* to mission which provides a fuller meaning to her notion of "missional liturgy", as well as what makes her theology distinctive.

²²⁶ In addition to these liturgical theologians of mission, Simon Chan also argues for a notion of liturgy as mission. He re-contextualises Schmemmann's liturgical theology to build an evangelical ecclesiology shaped by God's Reign expressed in liturgical ritual. See Simon Chan, *Liturgical Theology: The Church as Worship Community* (Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2006), 38.

²²⁷ Ruth A. Meyers, "Missional Church, Missional Liturgy," *Theology Today*, 67 (2010), 36, 44.

She derives her approach from missiology itself, and therefore, she engages the most deeply of all these authors in the two areas of liturgy and missiology. “Missional liturgy” is connected to and modified from the early 1990’s mission group, the Missional Church Movement, a group founded by Craig van Gelder and others due to a significant influence by the missiologist Lesslie Newbigin. Newbigin turned to the scriptures for a biblical basis in which to critique contemporary culture, a culture he viewed primarily in negative terms.²²⁸ Newbigin focused on witnessing to the truth of Christ, and the Reign of God Jesus proclaimed in the scriptures, and mission is the proclamation of this Reign.

The Missional Church Movement whilst influenced by Newbigin, particularly his focus on the negative features of contemporary culture and the importance of the Reign of God, built on Newbigin by extending the relationship between ecclesiology and mission. The phrase “missional church” within this movement means that the ecclesial community is a distinctive body which operates first and foremost in the presence of and for the goals of the *missio Dei*²²⁹ whilst at the same time operating in contrast to secular society. These scholars, therefore, work to articulate what makes the ecclesial community distinctive to secular society, how and in what ways the *missio Dei* is embodied in the church, and how the unique identity of this church confronts society and the culture(s) at large.²³⁰ What this means, is that the Missional Church Movement is concerned less with the activities of mission – techniques or practicalities of doing mission – and more focused on the ontology of the church as it is called by God to being a missionary church. Like Schattauer, Meyers is already working from a perspective of distinguishing an ecclesial mission in liturgy in contrast to the world.

This approach dominates Meyer’s own proposal for missional liturgy (though she does not seek to call this approach to a liturgical theology of mission a movement). As Meyer notes, “mission is rooted in the Trinitarian nature of God and is a matter of identity rather than an activity or program of the church.”²³¹ What the church is, therefore, its ontology, is constituted as it lives out who God is within the liturgy. In other words, as previous liturgical theologians above emphasised, mission is ontological, and therefore ecclesial in nature. Or

²²⁸ For a treatment of Lesslie Newbigin, see his *The Open Secret: Introduction to the Theology of Mission*, 2nd rev. ed. (London, SPCK Press, 1995), and Idem., *The Gospel in a Pluralist Society* (London, SPCK Press, 1989).

²²⁹ This is historically due to the challenge missions had after colonialism. In colonialism, mission was to convert the other, often working with colonial powers to subjugate or exploit indigenous populations. After colonialism, missionaries were at a loss concerning what mission might mean in postcolony. They turned to a theology of the *missio Dei* in order to highlight that the missionary task is always God’s initiative and work. For a fuller treatment of the history of *missio Dei*, see John G. Flett, *The Witness of God: The Trinity, Missio Dei, Karl Barth, and the Nature of Christian Community* (Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2010).

²³⁰ See Craig van Gelder and Dwight J. Zscheile, eds., *The Mission Church in Perspective: Mapping Trends and Shaping the Conversation* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2011).

²³¹ Meyers, “Missional Church, Missional Liturgy,” *Theology Today* 67 (2010), 42.

as Meyers emphasises, “mission is...about *being* rather than *doing*.”²³² In particular, missional liturgy is the site where this ecclesial ontology comes to fruition, because it is where the ecclesial assembly participates in Christ’s Paschal Mystery, and the church’s nature is defined. Thus, for her, liturgy is the “primary experience of God’s mission.”²³³

Like Schmemmann and Schattauer, Meyers provides less a *liturgical* perspective to the church’s mission, than the opposite: she provides a *missiological* perspective to the liturgy. However, unlike Schmemmann, she begins not with a theology of the Paschal Mystery, but with the *definition* of liturgy. Meyers’s concern rests with modern notions of liturgy as “work of the people,” particularly because it suggests that liturgy is a work, or an activity, that human persons do, rather than an identity, or an ontology, shaped by God’s own activity. As she states:

When liturgy is ‘public service,’ an act performed for the sake of the world, Christ is the one true liturgy and the liturgist par excellence. Christians participate in Christ’s own liturgy, caught up in the paschal mystery of Jesus’ dying and rising, offering ourselves with him for the sake of the whole world. In our liturgical celebrations we can perceive the reign of God, as we glimpse both God’s judgment and God’s mercy.²³⁴

This helps to understand her definition of “missional liturgy.” Like Schmemmann, Meyers articulates that the liturgy is the sacramental glimpse of the final Reign of God, and the goal of and purpose not only for liturgy but also for mission. In the liturgy where the church participates in God’s mission, the reconciling love of God is the experience of judgment and mercy in and through the church at prayer, liturgy.²³⁵ To know God’s mission, one must participate in liturgy, as that is where God’s reconciling love is communicated and effected.²³⁶ The “liturgy of the gathered assembly is also work done for the common good. Whether the assembly is sent forth with a blessing or a dismissal or both the text and the action will propel members of the assembly into the world, like the energy flowing out of the center of a

²³² Ruther A. Meyers, *Missional Worship, Worshipful Mission: Gathering as God’s People, Going Out in God’s Name* (Grand Rapids, MI/Cambridge, UK: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2014), 4.

²³³ *Ibid.*, 8.

²³⁴ *Ibid.*, 47.

²³⁵ Meyers states, The “...Eucharistic prayer remembers the in-breaking of the reign of God through the life, death, and resurrection of Jesus, and it anticipates the fulfilment of God’s promises, the new creation in which all are reconciled to God and to one another. The assembly thus offers its Eucharistic prayer through Christ and in the power of the Spirit for the life of the world, and in so doing, the assembly bears witness to and participates in God’s mission” (*Missional Worship, Worshipful Mission*, 169). The Reign of God, Meyers argues using C.H. Dodd’s work, is the future anticipation in the liturgical assembly, and yet it is also not simply a remembrance of the Last Supper, but a return to the upper room, to Golgotha, to the empty tomb (*Ibid.*, 167). As I will explore eschatological memory down below, Meyers’ perspective is less a remembrance of the past for a future hope in the present, it is rather, a more literal going back to the past than a re-contextualisation of the past for the present context of the church. This will be explored more fully below.

²³⁶ Meyers, *Missional Worship, Worshipful Mission*, 180. See also, *Ibid.*, 134, 149, 154, 163.

spinning top.”²³⁷ Liturgy is not only an awakening to this Divine judgment, but it is also a call to change one’s self, and those who participate are “energised” for daily life. Yet, she insists, “Christians do not themselves effect reconciliation; rather, they offer God’s reconciling love and thereby participate in God’s mission.”²³⁸ Or similarly, though drawing on Karl Barth, Meyers suggests that mission is not human acts of witness and service, but rather, it is God’s Trinitarian missions of Son and Spirit that define what mission is.²³⁹ Rather, daily life is a showing forth of adoration to God’s self-gift of reconciling love.²⁴⁰

The distinctive advantage of Meyers’s missional liturgy approach is that she engages deeply with missiology. Yet, she sets out this task through the particular approach of the Missional Church Movement, which assumes the same viewpoint of the relationship between world and liturgy/church. The overemphasis on a distinctive liturgical ecclesiology of mission such as these approaches (Schmemmann, Schattatuer, and Meyers) propose, set up a rather sharp distinction between liturgy/mission and world that do not help completely with our construal of mission. Though Meyers is more nuanced in her approach than Schmemmann and Schattatuer, by suggesting an ecclesiology not simply rooted in liturgical worship. She rightly argues that mission is broader than simply participation in liturgy. She states that missional “liturgy cannot be isolated from the entirety of congregational life. Rather, missional liturgy takes place in a missional congregation, one that is ‘shaped’ by participation in God’s mission” and allows mission to “permeate” all that the church does.²⁴¹ What activities beyond liturgy constitute the church in mission? She suggests, witness and the catechumenal process as two examples.²⁴² Whilst Meyers, Schmemmann and Schattatuer, and envisage liturgy as the *distinctive* site of God’s mission being manifested and known, Meyers does not wish to conflate liturgy and mission. They all, however, espouse the same distinctive ecclesiology: the being of the church will be distinctive to secular society, calling it to the liturgy, and to the ecclesial life, in order to be judged and reconciled by God. Mission, in these perspectives, is the world entering into God’s mission at liturgy, to become church. Nevertheless, Meyers, if not Schmemmann and Schattatuer as well, seem to conflate mission and *church*, if not mission and liturgy. Mission is God’s action, embodied and manifested in the ecclesial life *distinct* from secular culture. In other words, there is a clear separation between the mission/church on one side, and secular culture on the other. Our notion of

²³⁷ Ibid., 195.

²³⁸ Ibid., 130.

²³⁹ Ibid., 18.

²⁴⁰ Ibid., 24.

²⁴¹ Ibid., 168.

²⁴² Ibid.

mission from Chapter 2 highlights not only a different ecclesiology (that disciples outside of liturgy can act ecclesially) but mission is not exclusive to the church, though the church as a sacramental community as well, has a deeper, more intimate knowledge of and participation in God's mission, which bears a responsibility for the good of the world.

There is embedded in these liturgical theologies of mission, an emphasis on liturgy as the site of mission, thus suggesting a priority of the site of mission, namely the liturgy as the site of mission. Are not the liturgy and the church deeply situated in the particular cultural context in which they are found: language, customs, worldviews and so forth, so that the world is already part of the liturgy? As William T. Cavanaugh states, "the church [and its liturgy] is full of the world."²⁴³ Indeed, Schmemmann was the most eloquent on this point, noting that the world will be transformed as the Eucharistic elements are on the altar-table. It is the theology or approach to mission that this thesis wishes to make a distinctive contribution to liturgical theologies of mission, not by requiring the world to exclusively enter the liturgy to see God's mission at work, but to expand the notion of mission *Christologically*, rather than ecclesologically. All of these liturgical theologies of mission have been concerned to show that liturgy is mission, and to do this they set their respective liturgical theologies of mission into distinctive ecclesiologies over-and-against secular society. By doing so, they do not begin where *Gaudium et spes* began, with the shared cosmos that humanity dwells in, and mission from a Vatican II and post-Vatican II perspective, as I highlighted in Chapter 2, is concerned not only for contemplative participation in Christ's offer of grace within the church and its liturgy, but also in living out Christic mission in the world by engaging with society of which the church is a part in order for society to grow more holy, and less constrained by sin, evil, and oppression.

Developing the relationship of liturgy and mission, E. Byron Anderson, construes mission as "seeking holiness of heart and life, Christian perfection", and he equates this Christian perfection with the *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy's* phrase, as liturgy's principal enablement of "the true Christian spirit."²⁴⁴ Liturgical participation is not simply the height of mission, but also leads to "service to God and God's saving and sanctifying work in the world."²⁴⁵ Rather than simply adopting missional liturgy, Anderson moves Schattauer's and Meyers's approaches one step further by arguing for "missional *participation*." In this sense, mission is participation in God's mission as mediated and known within the liturgical event as well as in service to the world. This, he suggests, is glimpsed at "in the gathering and the

²⁴³ William T Cavanaugh, "Church" in *The Blackwell Companion to Political Theology*, Peter Scott and William T. Cavanaugh, eds. (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing 2005), 405.

²⁴⁴ E Byron Anderson, "Reform, Participation, and Mission: 'To Derive the True Christian Spirit'," *Worship*, vol. 88, no. 3 (May 2014), 236. Published later in Idem., *Common Worship: Tradition, Formation, Mission* (Nashville, TN: The General Board of Higher Education and Ministry, 2017): 121-140. Anderson cites *Sacosanctum concilium*, 14.

²⁴⁵ Ibid.

sending – the greeting, final blessing, and dismissal – that ‘bookend’ the liturgy of Word and Table.”²⁴⁶ In these two moments of the liturgy, the texts relate the sharing of God’s grace with the assembly, and subsequently, the assembly responds to God’s grace. These “liturgical texts are signs of and means for our participation in God’s mission.”²⁴⁷ What Anderson is highlighting is the fact that *grace* precedes holiness or sanctity, and Christian disciples must return, that is, respond, to that grace in order to be sent forth as bearers of that holiness. To participate in the liturgy, is to participate in the Divine Life, a God who now dwells within Christian disciples. Anderson emphasises the participation in the Triune God’s mission as follows:

This Three-One God has come into the world in grace and love, has been sent to us and dwells among us, is and speaks the word of grace to the world, and sends us with a similar words. Just as there is no separation between God’s being and act, so there can be no separation between the being and acting of those joined to Christ or between our work of prayer for the world and our work of mercy in the world.²⁴⁸

The unity of liturgy and service, then, is one of grace, that is, participation in the Triune God, a God effective and active in the graced church. Anderson, therefore, roots his approach in a Trinitarian theology of mission.

Like Power, Anderson goes one step beyond previous authors by situating mission as both sanctity and service. As he states: “Mission is first and foremost God’s action in and for the world, action that is entrusted to the church and that the church joins when men and women are joined to Christ in baptism and nurtured in eucharistic celebrations.”²⁴⁹ Missional participation, then, is the “‘full, conscious and active participation’ in the liturgy [which] is [a] participation in and [a] service to God and God’s saving and sanctifying work in the world.”²⁵⁰ Moreover, this liturgical participation joins “one another” and sends the church out “to the world.”²⁵¹

Whilst Anderson acknowledges service as a constitutive marker of missional participation, how exactly service is practically lived out in daily life is not fully considered. Our concern is, rather, for the necessary – from our perspective which will be discussed more fully in Chapters 4 and 5 – voices of the marginalised to judge the mission of the church, thus taking seriously not only the societal context in which the church finds itself, but

²⁴⁶ Ibid.

²⁴⁷ Ibid., 237.

²⁴⁸ Ibid., 238.

²⁴⁹ Ibid., 234.

²⁵⁰ Ibid., 236. Anderson cites *Sacrosanctum concilium*, 14.

²⁵¹ Ibid., 237.

also by asking how might a theology shaped by the world experience of marginalisation impact a construction of a liturgical theology of mission?

3.3 Liturgy and Mission: The Prophetic Call

The next three liturgical theologians, David Noel Power, Bruce T. Morrill, and Louis-Marie Chauvet, engage the mission of the church, are closer in their construal of the relationship of liturgy, mission, church with the world than the above theologians. What follows in terms of analysis, is limited to their overall construal of the relationship of mission, liturgy and world, but also how this thesis makes its own contribution to a liturgical theology of mission. In particular, the three liturgical theologians offer an eschatological memory of Christ which is connected to mission. These theologians have more dynamic approaches to conceiving of the relationship of mission, liturgy, and world that will help to highlight a more fruitful notion of this relationship. In particular, these theologians will help in forming a liturgical notion of Christic participation and *mimesis* (my definition of mission as holiness) as one component for my constructive proposal.

3.3.1 David N. Power

David N. Power brings together liturgy and mission with a particular focus on sacramental *kenosis* and justice that flows from the self-gifting of the church, a church where both the laity and the ordained engage together in mission to those marginalised beyond the Church community. Examining Power's theology will bring clarity to the process of liturgical shaping of mission in terms of relating Christ's memory with human memory in such a way as to clarify how liturgy is not only a participation in mission, as explored above, but also a Christic *mimesis*.

Liturgical/sacramental theology in Power's project is composed of four interrelated components, all of which connect liturgical remembering to mission: communal remembrance, liturgical enactment, Eucharistic ethics, and Eucharistic doctrine.²⁵² Another way of reiterating this fourfold project is in terms of liturgy and doctrine. The first two parts take place within liturgy itself. Communal remembrance—a common component within much of Power's published works²⁵³—consists of remembering, representing, and imitating.²⁵⁴ Remembering entails two parts: the Paschal Mystery of Christ, particularly his death and

²⁵² David N. Power, *Eucharistic Mystery: Revitalizing the Tradition* (New York: Crossroad, 1992), 14.

²⁵³ See Power, *Eucharistic Mystery*, 304—327; Power's later works pick up and re-inforce these ideas. See David N. Power, *Sacrament: The Language of God's Giving* (New York: Crossroad, 1999), 91-93 and 176-177; David N. Power, "Foundations for Pluralism in Sacramental Expression: Keeping Memory," *Worship 75* (2001): 194-209; David N. Power and Michael Downey, *Living the Justice of the Triune God* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press/Michael Glazier, 2012), 120-123.

²⁵⁴ Power, *Eucharistic Mystery*, 304.

resurrection and the memory of the world that human persons bring to the liturgy. During liturgy these two memories engage one another in such a way that the past and the present engage one another. Past and present encapsulates both the memory of Christ's Pasch but also the memory of human persons up until this moment of liturgical enactment. In the present, these two pasts converge so that potentially human persons are transformed according to the Pasch. This convergence of memories—Christ's and human persons—is the third part of communal remembrance. Namely, the memories of individuals are transformed by Christ's Pasch in order that disciples may live Christ's memory of hope in the present. This correlation of memories is what Power terms Eucharistic ethics in his liturgical theology.

Therefore, liturgical enactment is a sacramental or eschatological memory of Christ's Pasch engaged by human memories brought to the liturgy in order that these human memories may be transformed by appropriating a new Paschal memory. This encounter of human and divine memories form a new identity within the church because by opening up to Christ's memories, the church seeks to belong to and in Christ, that is, defined by Christ's memories. Potentially, this appropriation of Christic memories may impact the future lives of disciples and society by living from new memories of what it means to belong to Christ. This suggests, then, that mission is a dialogical engagement between Christ's Pasch and human living where (human) memories are created. But to appropriate this memory of the Pasch, and therefore, to participate in mission, how exactly does Power construe the notion of the Pasch of Christ Jesus?

The answer is found in how Power understands the Eucharistic altar-table. The altar-table represents two overarching theological motifs, for Power, liberation and self-giving. Firstly, Power acknowledges that the altar-table around which the liturgical assembly is gathered is a memorial of the Exodus and the Cross of Christ.²⁵⁵ These two past historical narratives, Power argues, are related to the liberation God brought in history to those elected by God. In the Exodus event, Power explains, God brought about the liberation of the Israelites from slavery in order to a live within a new Promised Land of freedom from oppression. In each of these two narratives (Exodus and Cross), Power proffers, liberation was connected to sacrifice – lambs were sacrificed in the Exodus event and Christ, the Paschal Lamb, was sacrificed on the Cross. Where these two events overlap, however, is the Eucharistic altar-table. He notes that the foundations of Christian Eucharist lay in the Last Supper being a Seder meal.²⁵⁶ It was this Seder meal that links the Old Testament and the Christian notions of liberation and salvation. The Christian community finds liberation in and through the death of Christ on the Cross. God's presence, like the Exodus event but now in

²⁵⁵ Power, "Eucharistic Justice," 868-869.

²⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 869; Power, *The Eucharistic Mystery*, 43.

the person of Christ Jesus, is manifested in human history, in the midst of suffering (suffering of oppression for Israel and perhaps for some Christians and suffering Christ Jesus experienced on the instrument of torture and death, the Cross), to show forth God's love for God's people. Power, therefore, interprets Eucharistic practise in terms of Philippians 2.5-11:

Let the same mind be in you that was in Christ Jesus, who, though he was in the form of God, did not regard equality with God as something to be exploited, but emptied himself, taking the form of a slave, being born in human likeness. And being found in human form, he humbled himself and became obedient to the point of death—even death on a cross. Therefore, God also highly exalted him and gave him the name that is above every name, so that at the name of Jesus every knee should bend, in heaven and on earth and under the earth, and every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.

In terms of mission, Power connects liturgy to *kenosis*, table to cross, Eucharist to the Last Supper, and in so doing, he does not only offer a self-emptying spirituality of mission as the principal construal of such a mission, but connects kenotic mission to *anamnesis* in such a way that takes into consideration human memories along with Christic memories. Liturgical memory is dialogical; it renews and recreates new memories for disciples in order to live like Christ. But is kenotic spirituality the only way to envisage mission? As noted above, this can be a problematic method of construing mission. Power, however, implicitly connects eucharistic spirituality, or mission, to the cross. As noted in Chapter 2, self-emptying theologies have been critiqued by feminist theologians because they can lead women to be subservient towards those who oppress them. Whilst self-emptying theologies may be helpful for those who do or are prone to oppress, those on the margins may have nothing to empty from their selves. I will offer a complementary image of mission in addition to *kenosis* in Chapters 5 and 6 in order to expand upon a liturgical theology in order to envisage mission as resistance to oppression.

Power, particularly, ties *kenosis* to Christ's becoming a slave. This hermeneutical lens is the "culmination" of and the requisite appropriation by disciples is not simply the coming of Christ in human form, but the kenotic death of Christ.²⁵⁷ The significance of this Christological concept for Power resides in its emphasis on Christ becoming a slave. Christ, Power notes, became "a criminal, the lowliest of human society."²⁵⁸ His obedience to God brought him in solidarity with the "lowliest of human society" in his death. At the Eucharistic altar-table, this kenotic identification by disciples is construed through the giving up of earthly power, self-emptying one's self in a liturgical ritual "where there is no distinction or discrimination among participants".²⁵⁹ In other words, the Cross brings about communion. This is evidenced in Power's shifting the centre of the Eucharistic liturgy from away from either the Word

²⁵⁷ Power, *Justice of the Triune God*, 90.

²⁵⁸ Power, "Eucharistic Justice," 863.

²⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 863.

(Churches of the Reformation) or the Eucharistic Prayer (Roman Catholic; the reliance on the Institution narrative to dominate discourse on Christ's substantial presence under the forms of Bread and Wine) to the giving of Christ's self to those who share around Christ's Eucharistic altar-table. "It is because all eat and drink of the Lord's body and blood that they are themselves one body and one covenant people, and it is from within this communion that they proclaim his [Christ's] death in word and in witness."²⁶⁰ Power does not suggest that the proclamation of the Scriptures or the act of praying the Eucharistic Prayer or praying the other parts of the liturgy (e.g., the collects, blessings, and so forth) are incidental, but rather, they culminate in "the communal action."²⁶¹ As I will explore more fully in Chapter 5, the image of slavery from a womanist perspective is not without its problems, and this will have ramifications for how mission is envisaged later on as a remembrance and enactment of Christ.

At this Eucharistic altar-table Christian disciples have an ethical task, that is, they have a mission. Having remembered Christ's past death and vindication by God through the resurrection, Christian disciples are to be like Christ himself who was himself "in obedience and submission to the Father."²⁶² This memory of the past in the present leads to the potentiality of a transformed future rooted and guided by this appropriated memory of Christ in the present circumstances of the community and world in which one lives. This future-directed, that is hope-filled, memory is the ethical dimension for Power. The liturgy awakens, potentially, within the liturgical assembly, the need to enact justice that is in continuity with Christ's self-gift on the Cross. Around the Eucharistic altar-table, Christian disciples through their reception of Word and Eucharist enter communion with Christ by the power of the Holy Spirit. The Holy Spirit makes possible the ethical enactment of the Eucharistic liturgy. As Christian disciples were nourished with Christ's Body and Blood, they now may nourish the world by "offering his [Christ's] own self as life's nourishment."²⁶³ Liturgy, therefore, offers a model of mission for the world. The ability to live out this mission in the world is limited by the present.

The resurrection, Power argues, is eschatological in that it points towards the future hope of equality and equity amongst all human persons, that is, true communion.²⁶⁴ Yet,

²⁶⁰ Power, *The Eucharistic Mystery*, 293.

²⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 293.

²⁶² Power, *The Justice of the Triune God*, 126.

²⁶³ Power, *The Eucharistic Mystery*, 295.

²⁶⁴ Power acknowledges that one of the major hurdles to this image of eschatological communion is ecumenical divisions. He states, current divisions have "made it difficult for both Catholic church and Reformation churches to find ways in which the common celebration of the Eucharist can express the church's identity within society and the relation that their members have to the public domain" (*Ibid.*, 297).

“[t]hough the self-gift of Christ is total, it is mediated through limiting symbols and rites that cannot capture the totality of gift. It is not only the devotion of the faithful that limits the measure of the gift, but it is the mode of giving.”²⁶⁵ The memory of Christ’s self-giving, even though empowered by the Spirit in Christian disciples, is always impartial and ever awaits fulfilment in the promised future.²⁶⁶ Nevertheless, though limited, the church is called to give itself, however limited and partial, to those most in need of liberation. The Spirit makes possible participation not only in Christ’s presence as self-gift, but empowers transformed memory according to the Cross in order to act in a transformed manner. This suggests that communion is for Power always a gift from God, and mission, therefore, is directed at self-emptying one’s self in order to grow in communion with Christ and others. *Anamnesis* is rooted in participation – liturgical and pneumatological.

Power’s liturgical theology moves from liturgical memory enacted in the liturgical rite (*lex orandi*) to the appropriation of an ethical (or missionary) horizon (though Power doesn’t employ this term, what he is discussing is in reality a *lex vivendi*²⁶⁷, and the *lex vivendi* not only emerges from the *lex orandi* but is itself found within the *lex orandi* of the rite itself) and this not only leads to a eucharistic doctrine (*lex credendi*) but also doctrine impacts the liturgical rite. This approach by Power is evidenced in how he construes mission from a Vatican II perspective.

One of his main concerns with mission is in terms of liturgical ecclesiology. As noted above, many liturgical theologians of mission proffered distinctive liturgical ecclesiologies in order to situate mission apart from the world. Power does not want to create such a distinction, nor does he want to reinforce a pre-Vatican II distinction (or, for that matter, the way *Ad gentes* clericalised mission as discussed in Chapter 2) between the laity having a

²⁶⁵ Ibid., 299.

²⁶⁶ Ibid.

²⁶⁷ This is the term Kevin W. Irwin employs and means the “law of living”. Irwin states, “a proper understanding of sacraments comes from both what we pray (*orandi*) and from what we believe as derived from the liturgy (*credendi*). Together these should shape how, sustained by the sacraments, we lead lives ever more fully converted to the gospel of Jesus Christ (*vivendi*)” in *The Sacraments: Historical Foundations and Liturgical Theology* (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 2016), 4. For a fuller treatment of Irwin’s *lex orandi*, *lex credendi*, *lex vivendi*, see his *Contexts and Texts: Method in Liturgical Theology* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press/Pueblo, 1994), 311-346. In other words, for Irwin, the *lex vivendi* is reached when one conforms one’s self to the liturgy. Whilst Irwin prefers *lex vivendi* for a broader spiritual conversion to Christ that is not simply ethical, Don E. Saliers, and Martha L. Moore-Keish who adopts Saliers’ term, has employed *lex agenda* or the adoption of the liturgical intention of the rite for action. See Saliers, *Worship as Theology: Foretaste of Glory Divine* (Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1994), 187. Moore-Keish in her book, *Do This In Remembrance of Me: A Ritual Approach to Reformed Eucharistic Theology* (Grand Rapids, MI/Cambridge, UK: William B. Eerdmans, 2008), removes any ethical implications of the word to focus on how liturgy itself, the *lex orandi*, is itself the *agendi*, i.e., “is about doing...both ours and God’s” (87). Power, here, is closer to Saliers’ notion of *lex agendi* having ethical actions grounded in liturgical intentions.

mission in secular society whilst the clergy have a mission within the internal church itself.²⁶⁸ His own proposal is to unite these two seemingly distinct missionary dimensions of the church vis-à-vis the eucharistic liturgy itself, where both laity and ordained visibly manifest the church. The liturgy thus not only envisages mission, but the relations of laity and ordained therein are called to unite together with Christ to serve God's mission.

Eucharist is not simply an event within the inner life of the church, where ordained and laity together give thanks and praise to the Triune God, but it also serves the mission of the church in forming "ambassadors of Christ in the world, a living presence for all of Christ and Spirit."²⁶⁹ Power emphasises that Eucharist is not simply an event where clergy and laity learn faith in general and the mission of the church in particular. It is also where they are called to become faithful teachers to the nations. Unlike the previous liturgical theologians of mission, Power suggests that the church's mission is directed to the world through justice, a principal way of teaching Christ's memory in and to the world. He displays this contrasting notion of mission as "the promotion of justice, peace, reconciliation (and one would now add, the care of the earth)."²⁷⁰ This mission – for both clergy and laity – is specifically tied in with his conception of *kenosis* seen above; mission is the self-emptying of the church for the promotion of justice. Power's notion of kenotic mission, therefore, goes one step beyond the above liturgical theologies of mission. Mission is neither simply liturgical, nor it is a witness to God's Reign by the individual in order to recruit new members. Rather, mission is a church called to be Christ by emptying one's self for the good of the world. Mission requires ethical practice, and this further ties to our definition of mission in Chapter 2, but in particular, Power's eschatological model of *anamnesis* makes more explicit the power of the Spirit to augment the disciple's memories for the good of the world. I will expand upon this to see mission not only as *kenosis*, but as an active resistance of the self towards oppression for the good of the world.

The primary notion of mission, then, for Power is not in terms of the sanctity of the human person's participation in the sacramental representation of God's mission present in the church's liturgy, but rather, the effects of the Eucharist as a call to live justly in the world. Both liturgy and mission embody as well as consecrate the church to enact God's vision of justice and peace within the world. Like the post-conciliar documents, Power envisages the liturgy as the central participation in God's mission, whilst justice flows from liturgy into the world. The implication of this, unlike the prior models of the relationship between liturgy and mission, is that mission is intimately concerned about the context in which it finds itself; the church remembers the Pasch in its present world-context, in order to discern how God's

²⁶⁸ Power, *Mission, Ministry, Order*, 81-91.

²⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 93.

²⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 85.

mission of justice and peace might become manifest in the present context. The church, therefore, has to be immersed in the world in which it finds itself. Power brings a unique perspective to the relationship between liturgy and mission, one that is, actually, the opposite of conceiving the mission of the church to the world. For Power, mission is authentically living the Eucharist for the good of the world, and this is due to the fact he, like my own proposal, is tied to the documents of the Second Vatican Council, so there is, already, an implicit assumption that the church has a contribution to make for the good of the world.

3.3.2 Bruce T. Morrill

The notion of *anamnesis* is picked up even further in Bruce T. Morrill's liturgical-political theology, and connects the relationship between liturgical participation and mission in late modernity. Much like Power, *anamnesis* bears a particular role in living mission for the world, and indeed, it is the link in the relationship between liturgy and world for Morrill.

Under the designation "mysticism", Morrill places prayer in general and liturgy in particular as the sites where disciples may "step outside of the evolutionary stream of progress" in order "to step into an experience of the world and history which is not adequately served by language that is technical, instrumental, controlling, and, therefore hopeless."²⁷¹ Morrill, influenced by Metz, critiques an enlightenment worldview which would instrumentalise reason and persons.²⁷² Prayer interrupts the givenness of this worldview by the narrative of God's Paschal Mystery, or what Morrill calls a "dangerous memory."²⁷³ Thus prayer (including liturgy) allows for one to participate in a worldview that offers a differing narrative of hope. What is dangerous is the challenge by those who experience the Paschal Mystery in a life situated in suffering of the contemporary worldview as well as a call to "social-political action."²⁷⁴ Morrill highlights that this memory is not simply that of the individual's inner transformation within liturgy itself,²⁷⁵ instead he links memory to ecclesial knowledge and action. To do this he constructs the concept of dangerous memory in terms of *anamnesis*. Here, then, Morrill employs dangerous memory of the Paschal Mystery in such a way that it challenges suffering in the world. This means that already embedded in his political-liturgical theology is a political theology driven by the Paschal Mystery. How this becomes practical will be discussed further below, and, in addition, I explore how Morrill conceives of this theology in such a way as the Paschal Mystery does not eschew the world

²⁷¹ Morrill, *Anamnesis as Dangerous Memory*, 50

²⁷² See *Ibid.*, 19-72 for a detailed summary of and engagement with Metz's political theology.

²⁷³ *Ibid.*, 30. Morrill references this terminology not only to Metz, but also to the work of Walter Benjamin, "Theses on the Philosophy of History," *Illuminations*, ed. Hannah Arendt (New York: Harcourt, Brace, and World, 1968), 257.

²⁷⁴ *Ibid.*

²⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 136.

but is called to be lived out. This complements Paul VI's concept of ecclesial intention, and when conceived along with humanisation, means that a dangerous memory impacts the socio-political society beyond the liturgy by the church. Mission is not simply what an individual does, mission is ecclesial and for the good of the society.

In particular, the liturgy offers, that is, narrates, the Paschal Mystery in such a way that this past historical memory is brought to bear on the memories of those present within the liturgy. In other words, like Power previously, Morrill envisages the liturgy's enactment of the Christ event as a memory that is appropriated not simply by individuals but by the church gathered to remember who Christ is and what Christ did for the salvation of the world. The church is gifted with new memories of Christ that renew their own memories of suffering in the present which open up new possibilities for social-political action. Morrill indicates that "the pattern of worship and prayer wherein the community's remembrance of God, now the remembrance of Christ, occurs through forms of narrative and ritual performance that intrinsically carry implications for the way the people are to live."²⁷⁶ Less a proclamation of the Paschal Mystery, Morrill emphasises that the Paschal Mystery is something lived out as a recollection of Christ.²⁷⁷ In other words, Morrill argues that mysticism – that is, liturgical participation in the Paschal Mystery (though included in mysticism are other sites of remembrance of Christ, such as, devotions, prayer, meditation and so forth) – brings about (re)newed memories (knowledge) of Christ and the world in such a way that disciples are called to act for those in need. This memory is communal because, Morrill suggests, it brings or effects a *shared* memory among the individuals gathered within liturgy. How does Morrill envisage the Paschal Mystery as the imitation of Christ? In other words, how are these new Christic memories lived within the world?

This dangerous memory is not simply one's own individual contemplation of Christ's Paschal Mystery that would benefit soteriologically an individual solely, but alternatively consists of a Christological imitation of Christ's kenotic death and life. Turning to the narrative within the Eucharistic Prayer of the Institutional Narrative, Morrill supports a *liturgical* rendering of the imitation of Christ by emphasising the words of Christ, "Do this in remembrance of me" – scriptural words²⁷⁸ embedded within the Eucharistic Prayer. What Morrill substantiates here is that it is, firstly, Christ himself who is remembered, and secondly, it (this Christic remembrance) is an act liturgical participants "do" because of this Christic command. Because this narrative was proclaimed on the night before Jesus died, it is simultaneously a remembrance of Christ, and the night in which he faced death, as well as

²⁷⁶ Ibid., 163.

²⁷⁷ Ibid., 160.

²⁷⁸ 1 Corinthians 11.24; Mark 14.22; Matthew 26.26; Luke 22.19;

an imitation by disciples who face a crisis of death (suffering) themselves.²⁷⁹ Christ gives himself as bread and wine and thereby identifies himself and his mission as passing from death to life. What gets Jesus killed is his utter fidelity to God, and therefore, because it is Christ himself given – embodied memory – in the gifts of bread and wine themselves and in the act of remembrance, it is a memory of God’s mission that is bestowed on those who participate in the Christic narratives of Word and in the reception of the gifts of bread and wine.²⁸⁰ These individual bodies are united, therefore, not simply around Word and Sacrament as the church, but are embodied with a renewed memory of Christ himself, a memory they first imitate within the liturgy, and secondly imitate in service to those in need. Morrill explains the connection of imitation and memory by stating that here

we find something of the mystery that makes the Eucharist the source and summit of the entire Christian life as a following or imitation of Christ. The invitation to imitation comes in the invitation to share at the Lord’s table, to an intimate communion in the very person (body) of the crucified but risen Jesus encountered with joyous thanksgiving in the meal of the covenant (in his blood).²⁸¹

Therefore, this dangerous memory is manifested and effected in the communion of disciples around Word and the Eucharistic altar-table and in prophetic action within the world.

This prophetic action, Morrill explains, is kenotic. Because God and Jesus were faithful to one another, God raised Christ Jesus from death. This, he suggests, highlights God’s faithfulness and love in a service of emptying out of one’s life for the world. In particular, Morrill, as the above implies, emphasises that this prophetic, kenotic action for others always mirrors the communion manifested and enacted in liturgy.²⁸² Prophetic action, therefore, is to enter into solidarity with those suffering in the world, and always keeping in mind the eschatological fulfilment of the resurrection – that is, the fullness of the Reign of God where there will be no suffering. Morrill has an embedded dialectic within his liturgical-political theology. It is a dialectic between death/suffering and resurrection/liberation from suffering.²⁸³ There is, thus, a practical component between mysticism and social-political action. This use of the term mysticism expands the range of possibilities of sites where Christ’s Paschal Mystery might be remembered beyond the confines of liturgy, and thus offers a more expansive view of how Christic remembrance is appropriated than found in Power’s liturgical theology. The liturgical memory of Christ is not simply enacted in liturgical/mystical²⁸⁴ participation, but is also enacted within the world as a form of solidarity

²⁷⁹ Morrill, *Anamnesis as Dangerous Memory*, 180.

²⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 182.

²⁸¹ *Ibid.*, 183.

²⁸² *Ibid.*, 186 and 189.

²⁸³ *Ibid.*, 48.

with those who suffer within the world so as to interrupt suffering with acts of justice. Past (the narrative of Christ) and present (renewed memories in and by the Body of Christ) is anticipated, therefore, in the present, both within liturgy and in prophetic actions in the hopes that God's future might be made tangible amidst suffering.

Morrill, much like Power, previously discussed above, connects ecclesial mission to liturgy and prophetic action through the concepts of eschatology, memory, and imitation. Morrill, however, deepens and strengthens the notion of Christic memory not only by employing the adjective "dangerous", since the Paschal Mystery is a challenging memory to present life, but also by rendering this memory as the bridge between liturgy and world. Equally concerned with the suffering of the world as Power is, Morrill likewise supports that mission as prophetic action leads to a notion of solidarity or communion with the suffering of the world as experienced and envisaged within liturgy. Their use of a Christic kenosis of the Cross leads to a notion of imitation of Christ in service for those suffering in the hopes that this solidarity between the church and those suffering would lead to certain alleviations of suffering. Both theologians envisage the goal of mission as communion – the church in solidarity with the poor and the marginalised, a theme highlighted in Chapter 2 where the official Roman Catholic documents on liturgy and mission were discussed, though now expanded through the use of anamnesis as the bridge to unite in relationship liturgy/mysticism and world.

One of Morrill's unique contributions is how he deliberately connects liturgical memory and ecclesiology. Whereas Power could be read as emphasising the individual's transformation within liturgy leading to kenotic service, Morrill explicitly and firmly places mission within the ecclesiological notion of a shared memory. This is evidenced in his own critique of Schmemmann: "Schmemmann, however, consistently presents the Church's mission in terms of individual effort and inclination."²⁸⁵ Moreover, Morrill proffers, "Once renewed and reinvigorated by the liturgy, the Church's members scatter into individual lives of ethical agency united only on the transcendent plane of 'communion in the Holy Spirit.'"²⁸⁶ The implication here is that mission as prophetic action is not something less worthy than the liturgy itself, nor that it is something simply an individual does following liturgy, instead, the church itself is called to prophetic action within the world. This action, due to the principle of solidarity, is for Morrill, communal. The advantage here is that prophetic action is equally an important action in addition to ritual liturgy; they require one another for mission to be authentic.

²⁸⁴ It should be noted that mystical does not mean an individual's personal and ecstatic experience of union with God. This type of experience is too limiting, rather, Morrill, as already noted, employs mysticism as liturgical and other practices of praying with and in Christ so as to embody memories of life within suffering.

²⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 131.

²⁸⁶ *Ibid.*

The question this raises is what does ecclesial solidarity with the suffering entail? As shown in Chapter 2, *Evangelii gaudium* notes that the agency of individuals is indeed ecclesial when done with the intention of the church's mission. Another way to state this is to say that mission by an individual is ecclesial when it is in imitation of Christ. Nevertheless, both Morrill and Power move beyond mission as a liturgical enactment (in Schmemmann, Meyers, Schattauer, Anderson) with a subsequent *witnessing* to (or *expressing* of) the Reign of God glimpsed in liturgy, and in contrast, Morrill and Power construe prophetic action as *service* for the poor and marginalised, and this is tied to a particular theology of *kenosis*. This notion of service does not only express mission but is itself mission as a construction, or better perhaps, participation in Christ's memory of challenging suffering within the world.

Further, the goal of these two contrasting notions of the relationship of liturgy, mission, and world is evident in how mission is defined. Schmemmann, Meyers, Schattauer and Anderson envisage mission as liturgy itself, as a participation in God's gracious activity that is construed with an implicit (or explicitly for Schmemmann) dichotomy between liturgy/mission and world. Mission is about church growth in these theologies, which was the older form of mission that was slowly being becoming less influential in the Vatican II documents on mission. Power and Morrill, on the other hand, offer a notion of mission that is more in keeping with the Vatican II documents explored in Chapter 2, especially *Gaudium et spes* and *Evangelii nuntiandi*. The use of anamnesis is in keeping with this perspective of mission and the approach to the world encapsulated by these two documents. Because anamnesis connects the past and the future in the present, a present where suffering seeks liberation, the present circumstances of suffering within the world in general, and in the lives of persons in particular, begins not only with this present condition of suffering within the world, but also emphasises that need for solidarity between church and society in order to liberate suffering lives.

Service, on the other hand, as shown in Morrill and Power, is employed as the mission of the church for those who are poor and suffering in the world. In other words, Morrill and Power thus provide support for my proposed definition of mission because they begin with the present needs of those marginalised, not with any desire to convert others, which may or may not arise from disciples performing service rooted in Christic participation.

Both Power and Morrill construe service in terms of *kenosis* as death and life. Prophetic action is service which remembers death, that is, the suffering of the world in order that redeeming action, rooted in Christic imitation, might spur action or at least commitment to "the needy."²⁸⁷ However, as I hope to argue, such a construal of *kenosis*, whilst not necessarily problematic in all contexts and in all circumstances, may lead to self-effacement for those women who are socialised into serving others to the detriment of one's self. Whilst Power's and Morrill's notion of *kenosis* could be understood as a challenge to hegemonic

²⁸⁷ Ibid., 147 and 190.

powers – one serves the Gospel and not those powers who subjugate others, there is still a universal construal of *kenosis* that does not take into account those who are not simply suffering (which Morrill and Power take seriously as shown above), but those who would not be liberated by the theological notions of self-emptying and service. For example, Black women who possess a deep memory of slavery and indentured service may find the idea of self-emptying not liberating or empowering but restrictive to liberation. This notion will be picked up even further in Chapter 5 in what I will argue is not necessarily a competing notion of liberation, but additional concepts of survival and resistance.

In addition, both Power and Morrill employ the language of Vatican II and post-conciliar documents that the liturgy is the “source and summit” whereby disciples appropriate mission. Whilst both liturgical theologians emphasise the constitutive dimension of liturgical memory being enacted in and through prophetic action, both construe the liturgy as the “source and summit” of prophetic action, which is why the pattern of liturgy empowers prophetic action. Morrill states, “The council’s vision of the liturgy as the source and summit of the Church’s life can only become a reality if the liturgy is the source and summit of the lives of actual Christians.”²⁸⁸ By using *Sacrosanctum concilium*’s language for the incorporation of liturgy as the site where a renewed memory is appropriated, it does reinforce that liturgy is the *central* site of mission, and, Power and Morrill could be read to imply that prophetic action is secondarily important despite Morrill and Power both giving far greater attention and weight to prophetic action. There is, then, still a descending patterning of mission: Mission is remembered within liturgy²⁸⁹ and subsequently enacted in prophetic action. But if mission is to become central, something which liturgy supports, and in the hopes of decentring the liturgy as the “source and summit” of mission, then this leaves room here for mission to be construed not only as an obligation of kenotic service, but in addition, as an openness to service and the possibility of mission as resistance for the self-preservation of one’s life. To do this, therefore, I will turn in Chapter 5 to a womanist theology of Christological imitation to expand upon these two themes of imitation and service vis-à-vis the concepts of sacramentality and resistance.

²⁸⁸ Ibid., 19, 183, and 193.

²⁸⁹ See Susan A. Ross, *Extravagant Affections: A Feminist Sacramental Theology* (New York: Continuum, 1996), 160-170. Ross notes the marginalisation that happens *within* liturgy by women excluded from liturgical leadership and from participation within liturgy itself. She draws on psychoanalytic theory to draw upon family as a model for taking into account the role of women within the church’s liturgy. What I will show in Chapter 5 is the need not simply to take the marginalisation of women into account, but also the ethnic, social, and economic aspects of marginalisation into account through dialogue with a womanist theologian in order to construct a liturgical theology of mission.

3.3.3 Louis-Marie Chauvet

The theological notion of *anamnesis* is further elaborated upon by Louis-Marie Chauvet, though he situates *anamnesis* more specifically within Christian identity. To remember is a corporeal identification of disciples who are gradually becoming believers so as to grow deeper as those who are “from God in Christ.”²⁹⁰ I will draw on Chauvet’s notion of memory and will then connect this to his construal of gift/grace in order to show how his sacramental theology is intimately tied to the relations between church, liturgy, mission, and world. Finally, I will focus on how Chauvet’s theology of sacramental embodiment contributes to constructing a liturgical theology of mission. What I argue is what makes mission distinctively Christian is not limited to participation within the Reign of God within liturgy, but in the construction of Christic identity.

Chauvet links liturgy, the Reign of God, and the world from the perspective of a sacramental ecclesiology. If the church is a sacrament of Christ, it is also, as Chauvet extrapolates, an image of the Reign of God “in and for the world.”²⁹¹ Like Vatican II and the Post-Conciliar documents, Chauvet contends the Reign of God is “larger than the Church”²⁹² and this means that God’s activity is boundless; i.e., God indeed acts in and through the church but God also may act beyond the church. For Chauvet, the sacramental rituals of the church are sites where salvation is “recognised” (which Chauvet means as confessed since salvation is a matter of faith), but salvation, like the Reign of God, is available outside the church. The church, as the sacrament of the Reign of God, means that the church is to live according to the Reign of God.²⁹³ In terms of mission, this means that the church serves the Reign of God and the Reign of God is not reduced to liturgical ritual. Ecclesologically, then, the world outside of liturgy may glimpse the Reign of God, or God’s mission, apart from liturgical ritual.

The Sacraments “are the summits of Christian life, the revealing expression of the actions of God’s grace in the life of human beings....”²⁹⁴ In this way, whilst God’s action is

²⁹⁰ Louis-Marie Chauvet, *Symbol and Sacrament: A Sacramental Reinterpretation of Christian Existence*, trans. Patrick Madigan and Madeleine Beaumont (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press/Pueblo, 1987/1995), 140.

²⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 413.

²⁹² *Ibid.*, 415.

²⁹³ Louis-Marie Chauvet, *The Sacraments: The Word of God at the Mercy of the Body* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press/Pueblo, 2001), xxii. Chauvet cites GS 22 and LG 16 to root his theology within the documents of the Second Vatican Council: “Besides, it is important to underline that Vatican II is the first council which officially declared (although many theologians had said so for a long time) that ‘the holy Spirit offers to all the possibility of being made partners, in a way known to God, in the paschal mystery’ and that those who ‘seek God with a sincere heart and, moved by grace, try in their actions to do his will...may attain eternal salvation’” (*Ibid.*, xxi-xxii).

²⁹⁴ Chauvet, *Symbol and Sacrament*, 415.

available always and everywhere in the world, it is manifested in liturgy in a particular way. Christian identity, as I will show, for Chauvet, is the construction of identity in serving the mission of God's Reign. Sacraments both reveal God's identity (because it is the confession of who God is for God's people) and manifest the activity of God so that what is revealed is effected in and for the church.²⁹⁵ Yet, for Chauvet, it is not only *God's* identity that is revealed within liturgical enactment, for, as he clarifies, it reveals "our own identity as sons and daughters [of God], brothers and sisters; and by revealing this identity it makes effective the paternity of God, as well as our own filiation and condition as brothers and sisters."²⁹⁶ For Chauvet, therefore, Christian identity is both a gift from God (making human persons God's children) given not simply vertically, that is from God to individuals, but at the same time, there is the horizontal relationship within the church between human persons which is made possible through God's gracious gifts. Moreover, the human response to those gifts by disciples is the call to act as God's children (that is, to act with God's intent) and in communion with other brothers and sisters of God within the Church.

The relationship of church, sacraments, and mission is construed through the lens of the Paschal Mystery. In light of the Ascension, Christ Jesus has departed and this causes disciples to feel the "loss" of his presence. This absence does not mean Christ Jesus cannot be "found", in contrast, Chauvet proffers that this very loss will lead disciples to find him in the church.²⁹⁷ Participation in the church thus reveals (symbolises) Christ, and by "consenting" to the church, one finds a Christological identity. This "coming together", that is, what Chauvet calls symbolisation,²⁹⁸ happens in the church when disciples confess Christ as well as participate in Christ so as to receive and effect this Christological identity. This means that Christian identity is a "meeting" between Christ and disciples within sacramental ritual. One's longing for the absent Christ is met with a Christ recognised and communicated in the church celebrating liturgy, and moreover, "binds"²⁹⁹ the assembly together in a shared, gifted identity in Christ. Meeting, in this context, implies a binding, and not just a juxtaposition of Christ and disciples. This Christic identity allows the church to be a symbol of Christ himself. There is at work in this construal of Christological identity a notion of grace, that is,

²⁹⁵ Ibid., 416 and 428

²⁹⁶ Ibid., 428.

²⁹⁷ Ibid., 177.

²⁹⁸ Chauvet points to "the Greek verb *symbolleîn*" which "literally [means] 'to throw together'" (*Symbol and Sacrament*, 112). He contrasts symbol with sign heuristically (in the sense of a mental construct though he argues that symbol and sign are always interconnected), so that sign represents something that is at a distance which can be empirically analysed, thus resulting in informative discourse. Symbol, Chauvet alternately suggests, is the mediation of identity, which, when engaged, the "something" leads to a recognition (mediation) of the reality present so that the mediation arising from the coming together is the reality of, the identity of, the person giving towards another (Ibid., 104).

²⁹⁹ Ibid., 130.

participation in Christ, and this is important for Chauvet's notion of Christian identity, and in particular, how Christic identity is lived out

Chauvet employs the language of gift to construe gratuitousness of Christian identity formation. He emphasises that grace within a gift exchange – because grace for Chauvet is not a “thing” but the “exchange” between God and human persons³⁰⁰ – has no value in itself because gift is not reduced to economic (what Chauvet calls “business exchanges”³⁰¹) value exchanges. God “takes the initiative” to freely give “free of charge”³⁰² to disciples. As Chauvet articulates, “The grace of the sacraments must be regarded less as ‘something’ (as spiritualized as it might be) than as a process of ‘receiving oneself’ as daughter or son, as sister or brother in Christ through the Spirit. Such is precisely the efficacy called symbol.”³⁰³ Grace³⁰⁴, then, in his theological construction of sacramental gift, is rooted in Christian identity. In this way, grace is not an object but an entering into relationship with Christ and his church. Morrill sums up Chauvet's construal of symbol and the importance of symbol to liturgical ritual:

[The] rite must be approached not as an instrumental ministration of some quantifiable thing (the unfortunate, long-regnant view of sacramental grace), as if Christ through his vicars were dispensing something of utilitarian value that can ‘get results’.... As Chauvet has so beautifully argued, what happens in the divine-human encounter of Christian liturgy is rather more a matter of a gift exchange, wherein the value of the person, the worth of his or her being as a further gift to the community, is primarily what is being celebrated and built up.³⁰⁵

Therefore, Morrill concludes, “Sacramental celebration is not so much about having something at the conclusion that one did not have before but rather about being more deeply aware of oneself and others as the very site of the loving faithfulness and gracious mercy of God, in whatever condition we find ourselves.”³⁰⁶ In particular, Chauvet understands Christ as the Divine Word communicated by the Holy Spirit. The sacraments Christologically are

³⁰⁰ Ibid., 100.

³⁰¹ Ibid., 101.

³⁰² Chauvet, *The Sacraments*, 88.

³⁰³ Ibid., 89.

³⁰⁴ Chauvet affirms that grace “is beyond every object, since it is outside the field of value, and before and beneath all subjects, since the latter, as believers, can never precede it: on the contrary, they proceed from it, unable to receive themselves from it except in a continual genesis of their identities as children-for-God and as brothers-and-sisters-for-others in Christ” (*Symbol and Sacrament*, 537).

³⁰⁵ Bruce T Morrill, *Divine Worship and Human Healing: Liturgical Theology at the Margins of Life and Death* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press/Pueblo, 2009), 17.

³⁰⁶ Ibid.

“nothing but a particular modality of the word.”³⁰⁷ This is a crucial point Chauvet makes. If liturgical/mysticism and social-political engagement, to use Morrill’s terms from above, are both aspects of God’s mission and are bridged Christologically, then they are particular modes of who Christ is. In terms of mission, then, what makes mission distinctive is not liturgical participation alone, but also the living from an identity of and gifted by Christ himself. The gift is not the objects (e.g., bread, wine, words, water, gestures, and so forth), nor the liturgy itself, but the actual anamnestic remembrance of one’s worth and to live from this identity.

Like Power and Morrill, Chauvet connects memorial and the Paschal Mystery together Christologically (and sacramentally). He explains, “It is the whole mystery of Christ’s Pasch – death, resurrection-exaltation, gift of the Spirit, Parousia – that is celebrated as a single reality in memorial.”³⁰⁸ The humanity of Christ Jesus following the Resurrection indicates that Christ Jesus retained the marks of his death, and for Chauvet, this means that Jesus’ death “is constitutive of his transfiguration [exaltation]” as well as “his humanity.”³⁰⁹

Disciples cannot escape the tragedy of death because

following Christ leads everyone onto the crucifying path of liberation..., but because this ‘following of Christ’ is ‘sacramentally’ the location where Christ himself continues to carry out through those who invoke him in the liberation for which he gave his life. The ritual story at each Eucharist, retelling why Jesus handed over his life, sends all Christians back to their own responsibility to take charge of history in his name; and so they become his living memory in the world because his living memory is ‘sacramentally’ engaged in the body of humanity they work at building for him.³¹⁰

Chauvet understands the life and incarnation of Christ Jesus through the lens of the death and resurrection of Christ Jesus, but even more so, he accentuates the *embodied* character of Christic remembrance, the Paschal Mystery. He continues, “we must proceed here...by moving backward starting from the death and resurrection in order to understand the incarnation.”³¹¹ Chauvet is less inclined to talk about the unity of divinity and humanity in Christ and he focuses alternately on the God “put to death in the name of the very law of God.”³¹² This illustrates Chauvet’s focus on identity even in the construal of a theology of the Paschal Mystery. It is the identity of Jesus and God (the sites of which include Scripture and Sacraments) – which Christian disciples are to adopt as noted above – that forms Christian identity. In other words, it is, in part, what the historical Jesus did that conveys the identity of

³⁰⁷ Chauvet, *The Sacraments*, 49.

³⁰⁸ Chauvet, *Symbol and Sacrament*, 484.

³⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 239.

³¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 241.

³¹¹ *Ibid.*, 487.

³¹² *Ibid.*, 487.

God, or as Chauvet summarises this divine identity: “his concrete manner of expressing in words and manifesting in deeds the newness of the reign of God whose imminent arrival he announces: a reign of grace and of mercy open to all who, in a spirit of poverty, recognize they have no righteousness of their own before God and thus accept to be welcomed by God by welcoming the message of Jesus.”³¹³ Because the acts of the historical Jesus prior to his death and resurrection are understood by Chauvet through the lens of Christ Jesus’ death and resurrection, they are only salvific due to their culmination in death on the cross. There, then, Christ’s death gives salvific meaning to the entire life of Christ Jesus. The implication here is that the lens of mission for Chauvet is kenotic, and mission entails self-emptying. How Chauvet construes kenotic mission is tied to how he draws on Christ’s suffering on the cross.

On the cross Jesus comes to experience “the bottom of the ‘nothing’ of humanity.”³¹⁴ Here God is dehumanised, in other words, by not simply experiencing the dignity of human living, but through the cruel and rejecting death of crucifixion. His own *body*, Chauvet contends, is “a body so wasted, so liquefied, so melted that it is already treated as dead by those who divide his clothing”³¹⁵ so that this is indeed the suffering Servant of God. This means that God’s exaltation, the resurrecting of Jesus, is always tied to the “disfigured body on the cross.”³¹⁶ Moreover, because humanity crucified Jesus, the cross also unveils the sin of humanity for Chauvet. By extension, then, this means that the Paschal Mystery reveals who Christ is (God’s Son) but also exposes human sin that would disfigure other human bodies. The identity of human persons, however, is not simply unlike God’s Son due to human sin, but for Chauvet, there is also a similarity.³¹⁷ This recognition of others as similar-yet-unlike-us requires a certain responsibility Chauvet insists. One must hand over oneself for the other which is a showing forth of love of God. One relinquishes power, becoming powerless, so in doing one is/becomes identified with Christ.³¹⁸ For Chauvet, therefore, to be a disciple is to live out like Christ in self-emptying love for God and others (ethics), whilst also giving of “the body of humanity” to become “God’s place.”³¹⁹ Thus, the body becomes the

³¹³ Ibid., 488.

³¹⁴ Ibid., 500.

³¹⁵ Ibid.

³¹⁶ Ibid., 501.

³¹⁷ Chauvet, following Heidegger, uses the example of a sheet of notebook paper to convey this notion of dialectic: “a little like the front and back sides of a sheet of paper” (*Symbol and Sacrament*, 503). The two sides are separated and distant from one another. Chauvet is thus trying to image the relation between God and humanity not in terms of transcendence and imminence, but in relations of Otherness. Therefore, Otherness reveals likeness and difference at the same time.

³¹⁸ Ibid., 506.

sacrament of Christic identity. The Paschal Mystery is manifested, therefore, as Chauvet proffers, in the “threefold manifestation in Scripture, sacraments, and ethics.”³²⁰ In this way, then, site of mission expands with the help of Chauvet from the site of *liturgy* to the site of the *body*. Mission is not simply humanisation but it is a love through which God seeks to heal the human disfigurement of sin within bodies. Mission is embodied because one’s identity is configured to Christ and lives from and out of this identity for others disfigured by sin in the church and in the world.

For Chauvet, Christology represents particularism (that is, a Christ present symbolically as church in a historical place), and the Holy Spirit represents the universal quality of grace, that is, the Spirit animates beyond ecclesial institution.³²¹ This tension between universalism and particularism, as Chauvet conceives it, is eschatological. The eschatological quality, as a theological category emphasised in Power and Morrill as well as in Chauvet, of grace cuts through any boundary between profane (secular history) and sacred (salvation history). In other words, there is *one* history, and history becomes the site of God’s gracious activity because bodies are empowered by the Spirit in their Christic identity to live in and out of self-emptying love. What is uniquely Christian in terms of sacraments and mission is Christic identity embodied within individual bodies (since one’s identity is Christic) and the ecclesial body (its identity is Christic as well), and the Spirit is boundless in the cosmic body where the Reign of God may also be glimpsed outside of liturgical enactment.³²² Or as Chauvet suggests, “Sacramentality arises only at the intersection of these two dimensions, cosmic and historic”³²³ or *Spiritual* and *Christic* as discussed above. This means that creation and historicity are sites of grace.³²⁴ Creation and history, therefore, not only have meaning and purpose apart from ecclesial sacramental ritual, but must be treated with dignity and respect. The liturgical ritual “acts as a symbolic

³¹⁹ Ibid., 509.

³²⁰ Ibid., 173.

³²¹ Ibid., 546.

³²² Chauvet also links this participation of humanity in the Trinity to a God’s-eye-view of the Trinity *ad intra*, which would take us beyond the scope of this thesis. Morrill summarises this as follows: “In the paschal mystery, the love between Father and Son becomes the love between God and humanity. The Spirit is the difference, the holiness [i.e., ‘the difference in God that is the source of our salvation, crossing out the god of human imagination and establishing a similitude between God and humans’] the otherness of love shared between Father and Son. The Spirit wrote that difference on the person-body of Jesus of Nazareth, raised him from death to glory, and now writes that difference on the bodies of believers in the rites of the church” (Morrill, *Divine Worship and Human Healing*, 125).

³²³ Chauvet, *Symbol and Sacrament*, 552.

³²⁴ Ibid.

revealer of what enables human life to be authentically Christian...³²⁵ and allows disciples to act in accord with Christic identity.

Chauvet's construal of Christian identity formed by scripture and sacrament within the Church that leads to the disciple's response to this identity being enacted in ethics has some missiological advantages. In similar vein to Power and Morrill, the place of Christian action within the world is given significant value. Much like the documents of the Roman Catholic Church (explored in Chapter 2), there is not only a positive though critical acknowledgement of the place of liturgy in and for the larger society in which Christians live, but also the necessary engagement of liturgically formed disciples within the world. This means that liturgy is less Schmemmann's "ascending" to the throne of God, but more of a universal unity of sacred and secular. As Chauvet rightly emphasises, the spiritual *is* the embodied, and historicity is a site of living from Christian identity as a form of mission. This will be explored in greater depth in Chapter 4.

The emphasis on *anamnesis* in all three theological projects helps me to locate mission both within *ecclesial* memory (which, as Chauvet highlighted, is located in liturgical, scriptural, and ethical enactment) and in the *human* memories that engage with ecclesial memory, so that both church (and its liturgy) and the world are sites of mission. Here, then, both liturgy and ethics (or living Christian identity within the world) are required. If God's gift of Christian identity is bestowed within liturgy, as Chauvet argues, and disciples respond by living from and out of this identity within the world (ethics), then the liturgy itself is not only intimately tied to ethics, but imparts Christian identity. Without disciples acting within the world, therefore, Christian liturgy has not been formative and transformative. Yet, Chauvet's construal of anamnesis is construed in terms of *kenosis*. As I have indicated previously, mission may not always be construed only in terms of *kenosis*. What does have potential for a notion of mission within the world are Chauvet's notions of embodiment and meeting. Mission in Christic terms, as I will develop in the next Chapter, is indeed a Christic identity from which one lives in and out, but also the implications of mission as the meeting of human and divine provides the advantage that the role of church and individual disciples working within the world, in cooperation with social-political entities and with non-Christian persons is the coming together of, the meeting of, Christ (in Christic identity and anamnesis) and the other within the world which will be explored more fully in the next Chapter.

Conclusions

What I have been trying to demonstrate in this Chapter, through several prominent examples, are the different ways in which liturgy, mission, and world relate to one another within liturgical theologies of mission. There are two basic ways of conceiving of this relationship. The first part focused on Schmemmann and those who later relied on his work to

³²⁵ Ibid., 253.

envisage liturgy as itself the site of mission. Not only does that position, I argued, limit mission itself to liturgical ritual, but it also results in the construal of mission within the world in limited terms; principally, the world must enter into the liturgy in order to participate in mission. Cooperation between world and ecclesial mission is underdeveloped in such a model of liturgy as mission.

The second example, those who rely on a particular model of liturgy and ecclesiology based on the Vatican II documents approach mission, liturgy, and world with a more developed ethical living within the world. This means that the Reign of God does not consist only in liturgy, but in the sites of suffering within the world to which Christians have a mission. If liturgy and daily life are *both* sites of mission, as I have been arguing, then Christic identity is embodied in liturgy and in ethical action. How might mission within the world be conceived of as a daily spirituality of engagement between liturgy, mission, and world that opens up a Christological embodiment in the encounter between the church's mission in cooperation with and in relationship to the world? The next section of this thesis will turn to a sacramentality of mission in order to suggest that mission becomes the meeting between church and world as they cooperate together, potentially, for the good of those most in need.

Chapter 4

The Sacramental Theology of Rowan D. Williams: A Missiological Reading

Introduction

This Chapter marks the turn from the previous critical Chapters towards the constructive agenda of this thesis. In the last Chapter I showed two general ways the relationship between mission, liturgy, and world are envisaged: (1) liturgy is mission, and (2) liturgy is central to mission but mission in the world is necessary. In both examples, liturgy is “the source and centre” of missional identity. I suggested that mission is central, and both liturgy and active discipleship in the world support and embody that mission.

In this Chapter, I turn to the sacramental theology of Rowan Williams, whose whole theology can be seen to be grounded in sacramentality. In order to suggest a notion of mission that is connected to liturgy, but avoids romanticisation and takes seriously the pilgrim nature of the Body of Christ, I want to situate a liturgical theology of mission within a notion of sacramentality. The advantage of this approach locates the relationship between liturgy, mission, and church with the world and in liturgy in a non-competitive dialectic. Sacramentality recognizes that the world and the church in its liturgy both share in the same condition.³²⁶ Mission, as I have been arguing, has shifted from the conversion of the other, to the conversion of the self and the church as the church engages in and with the world. This engagement is inherently prophetic in that it dialogically challenges world *and* church, self and society, and thus construes the meeting of these relationships as a transformative encounter.

4.1 Sacramentality

Sacramentality may be of help to our constructive task because it is less about special, sacred things, and more about the relationship between the Triune God and human persons, particularly the church itself. In other words, sacramentality has a relational dimension to it. Edward Schillebeeckx’s concept of Christ as the primordial sacrament, and the Church as the foundational sacrament, places sacrament as not simply in the notion of “sacramental

³²⁶ Much as *Gaudium et spes* began its theological teaching on ecclesiology. See Chapter 2. In addition to *Gaudium et spes*, my approach is to employ the broader notion of sacramentality initially explored through Chauvet in Chapter 3 though here tied to missiology.

presence” (Divine presencing)³²⁷ but rather the action of God as God encounters, meets, human persons.

Personally to be approached by the man Jesus was, for his contemporaries, an invitation to a personal encounter with the life-giving God, because personally that man was the Son of God. Human encounter with Jesus is therefore the sacrament of the encounter with God, or of the religious life as a theological attitude of existence towards God.³²⁸

It is not simply enough to say that Christ as the Sacrament of God, or the Church as the Sacrament of Christ, is about making transcendent presence visible. Additionally, there is a deeper reality that God’s act is always to elicit a transformation of relationship between God, the church, and the world.³²⁹ Nathan Mitchell gets to the heart of this when he states, “sacrament is a site of exchange, it is ‘commerce,’ transaction, something human between us and God.”³³⁰ Sacrament, then, is the dialogue between God and human persons, a dialogue which at its root is about deepening “a relationship between us and God”.³³¹

At the heart, then, of contemporary sacramental theology is the relationship between God and human persons, especially the relationship between God’s meeting with humankind within the world. Sacramentality thus offers a theological way to understand how God’s relationship with the world, with human persons, and with the church might help us to see mission within a liturgical theology. Kevin Irwin suggests that sacramentality is not simply about what happens in the rite – God’s presence coming about, but rather about how one approaches life: “It is about a catholic way of looking at life, not just a catholic way of doing liturgical ritual.”³³² But from a missiological perspective, especially through the lens of the definition set out in Chapter 2, sacramentality cannot remain simply at the level of how disciples look at the world, but preferably, how they *engage*, that is, live from and live out mission within their daily lives. Consequently, sacramentality provides a way to envisage the

³²⁷ David Brown, “Re-conceiving The Sacramental,” in *Gestures of God: Explorations in Sacramentality*, eds. Geoffrey Rowell and Christine Hall (London/New York: Continuum, 2004), 24.

³²⁸ Edward Schillebeeckx, *Christ the Sacrament of the Encounter with God* (Kansas City, MO: Sheed and Ward, 1963), 15-16.

³²⁹ Kenan B. Osborne notes that the “Church as sacrament raises the issue of the relationship between the Church and the kingdom. Theologians do not speak about the kingdom as a basic sacrament and there are no official [Roman Catholic] Church teachings in this direction either....the kingdom of God is of more importance than the Church, so that the Church is once again placed in a relativized position” (idem., *Sacramental Theology: A General Introduction* [Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1988], 95).

³³⁰ Nathan D. Mitchell, *Meeting Mystery: Liturgy, Worship, Sacraments*, Theology in Global Perspective Series (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2007), 183.

³³¹ Ibid., 183.

³³² Kevin W. Irwin, “A Sacramental World – Sacramentality as the Primary Language for Sacraments,” *Worship* 76, no. 3 (May 2002), 199. Whilst Irwin wants to develop a sacramental worldview, the aim in this thesis is rather to look at the missional aspect of sacramental theology.

missiological relationship between liturgy itself and the world, between holiness and God-forsakenness.

4.2 The Sacramental Theology of Rowan D. Williams

In order to address this gap, I turn to the sacramental theology of Rowan D. Williams.³³³ This choice is not arbitrary, but chosen specifically because Williams, I will argue, articulates the *simultaneous* experience of death and life, or holiness and God-forsakenness as a sacramental participation in God's mission; this is particularly so when his sacramental theology is analysed from the lens of mission. The concept of mission, as I have been arguing, has shifted from the conversion of the other to the conversion of the self and the church as it engages *with* the world, and not in any way apart from it. One of the ways we have seen this engagement take place in the previous Chapter was on the use of creation – things of this world – within the liturgy. There is a potential danger in how this is understood, particularly when creation is seen as something that is separated from, made holy, from the world within the liturgy. Sacramentality, in contrast, is less about the holiness of any particular *thing* (which, incidentally, lacks a missiological basis since the holiness of the object need not live out and from the holiness it embodies), and more about how God acts in and through the world in order that the world itself might be “re-worked by God” and “to show God's holy and liberating face.”³³⁴ In other words, a missiological dimension to sacramentality means the showing forth of holiness, the showing forth of God's mission, within the world.

This engagement is inherently *prophetic* in that it dialogically challenges *both* world and church, self and society, and thus shifts liturgical theology's use of a competitive dialectic between these relationships to one which sees the relationship as dialogical. But such engagement needs a critical edge; dialogue without being critical means that change between the dialogue partners may not take place, that conversion of the self as it dialogues with another will remain independent of one another. As we will see, my use of Williams as a critical focus inherently ties to sacramentality in such a way that sacramentality is about prophetic mission, not simply holiness for its own sake, but one which sets to “show God's holy and liberating face” by acting according to God's own mission within the world. Firstly, I will begin by reading his sacramental theology through a tripartite transformation of both self and Church towards God's purposes. Secondly, I will then draw out the missiological

³³³ Two biographies of the life of Rowan D. Williams can be found in: Rupert Shortt, *Rowan Williams: An Introduction* (Harrisburg, PA: Morehouse/Continuum, 2003), 11-72; Andrew Goddard, *Rowan Williams: His Legacy* (Oxford: Lion Hudson, 2013), 12-37. Whilst not a biography *per se*, Theo Hobson, *Anarchy, Church and Utopia: Rowan Williams on Church* (London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 2005), does explore the evolution of Williams's ecclesiology chronologically and according to distinct periods of Williams's life, such as, his time in Oxford and later his period as Bishop in Wales.

³³⁴ Rowan D. Williams, *On Christian Theology*, Contemporary Challenges in Theology, (Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2000), 202.

implications of Williams's contribution which will prove crucial to sacramental theology of mission I am aiming to construct.

4.2.1 *A Pre-Sacramental State of the Human Person and the Church*

The first part of Williams's three-part sacramental theology begins with what he calls the pre-sacramental state of the world. In Williams's theology, this is the most difficult concept to understand on its own, particularly because he is more interested in the transformation of one's current state *to* a sacramental state. In other words, he is less interested in the way the world is hurting, sick, and not fulfilled, than what it means to be transformed by God in the present. This means, in some ways, Williams takes for granted what the pre-sacramental state is by focusing more positively on what is hope-filled and possible, whilst minimising his discussion of what is negative and, moreover, frustrates arriving at the hope of transformation. Despite this difficulty, it is not impossible to glean what the pre-sacramental state is.

At the root of this state is a conception of human power which envisages human possibility to actualise economic, political, and personal gain in competition with the other. The driving force towards success, as Williams construes it, is the fear of failure. Society constructs an image of what success means – economic success (wealth), the power to control institutions and other human persons, fulfilling my own desires over and above, and even to the expense of, the other. There is a paradox, Williams notes, in societal success: “Performance [of success—that is, the possibility of actualising success] demands such a public measure, demands therefore that there be failures. And the failure is both necessary to the culture of success, and threatening to it; we need to have it there....”³³⁵ Success, in other words, is a *competition* between what one can accomplish over and above other human persons, based on the images of success society upholds in the media, in cultural narratives, and so forth. Yet, at the same time, there is a fear within human persons (of this societal worldview) that one will not be *able* to compete and will, therefore, fail to be successful. The competition means that for me to succeed, others must fail, or if I don't succeed, then I will be a failure, and a help to someone else's success. This failure, therefore, becomes both “an enemy and an ally”³³⁶ depending on how one performs. This means, as Williams diagnoses the societal problem, that the role of the human person within society is necessarily to seek and cause fragmentation so that the construction of my own successful self will simultaneously be working *against* the good of the community. In order to achieve this project, one must try to *perform* success, to work towards bettering one's own self with little empathy for the rest of society. For Williams, success and failure are as proffered by society as a contrastive dialectic; for success of the self, others *must* fail, and

³³⁵ *Ibid.*, 267.

³³⁶ *Ibid.*

this dialectic fragments social bonds. Thus, human hope within society is ordered towards gain; and loss in any manner (e.g., economically, politically, powerfully, and so forth) is failure and to be resisted at all costs.

For Williams, this is not simply one human person against another (that is, an individualistic competition of one's own needs over and above the needs of others), but also a competition of society itself.³³⁷ Societies, or we might say institutions, also compete against one another.³³⁸ One nation tries to compete with another, churches compete for members against others, businesses compete against one another as well. In both states – personal and/or corporate – the desire to possess can easily lead to corruption because it construes persons as adversaries. In other words, the narrative of society in Williams's account is one which brings about deep and widespread alienation between human persons, as well as between institutions. There is no hope within this framework for working on behalf of the common good. What this pre-sacramental state principally consists of is the success of one person over others which *simultaneously* brings about greater alienation against one another.

Williams's diagnosis of this societal vision of success is rooted in (original) sin, which seeks success and security and falsifies reality as it is and ought to be. In other words, human persons operate from this particular competitive framework (as a result of sin), so that the concern for the common good (what is true about reality) is something that needs to overcome the desire for success. This is not something that is easy, but rather difficult. One has to overcome one's own falsified worldview built on competition. At the root, then, of the human condition is not that humans lack love, but rather, as Williams construes it, human "love is flawed" in such a way "as not being able to see [i.e., respond to] what the other truly needs."³³⁹ Love is present, as it is directed solely for the benefit of one's self, whereas authentic love is always about the good of the other. But this is not simply my giving or loving another, but rather, by myself loving others, I become, as Williams concludes, lovable to

³³⁷ Ibid., 271.

³³⁸ Even subcultures within society or in the church itself can be working against one another, i.e., in a state of competition whereby one group works towards great opportunities at the expense of another subculture. For a helpful analysis of Williams' "interactive pluralism", a topic that would take us beyond the limits of this thesis, see Mark D. Chapman, "Rowan Williams's Political Theology: Multiculturalism and Interactive Pluralism," *Journal of Anglican Studies* 9, no. 1 (April 2011): 61-79. "Interactive pluralism" means that various religions (majority and minority), ethnic groups and so forth negotiate with one another in their differences whilst the state government ought to act as an arbitrator, ensuring the well-being (the common good we might say) of all human persons.

³³⁹ Rowan D. Williams, *Dostoevsky: Language, Faith, and Fiction* (London/New York: Continuum, 2010), 76.

other persons.³⁴⁰ In other words, the current, pre-sacramental state of the world is a falsified narrative which proffers a love of self in competition against others.³⁴¹

In this account of a pre-sacramental state, Williams does three things that relate to what this dissertation has already problematised. Firstly, like *Gaudium et spes*, Williams begins with a diagnosis of the world, a world that is disfigured due to sin, and therefore, both GS and Williams begin with a theological anthropology. Secondly, Williams does not simply provide an idealised notion of love, but he helps to extend and modify our notion of love to include competition as part of the givenness of human love. Divine love – whether in or outside of the context of the liturgical event – seeks to overcome competitive relationships, and the healing of these relations, we will see momentarily, is not only salvific but also sacramental. For Williams, sacramentality is about overcoming competition itself, and divine love is key to living in and out of an authentic sacramental mission. Fundamentally tied to Williams’s construal of sacramental mission is what we call “sacramental dispossession,” which is concerned with the ability to overcome this artificial worldview in terms of a struggle “of the will to resist the environment”³⁴², but also a deep love from God.

4.2.2 *Sacramental Dispossession*

Williams construes dispossession as a two-fold, simultaneous process of *surrendering* the self to the Divine Act whilst at the same time being *opened* to the Divine Act. This two-fold process leads to the third: repossession or sacramental transfiguration. But to bring conceptual clarity to this process as it is construed by Williams, I will heuristically³⁴³ focus first on dispossession within Williams’s sacramental theology, and then, subsequently, I will turn to sacramental repossession. If sin causes the human person to have a flawed identity, an identity which does not lead to life-giving liberation, then it is only in recognising this present condition that one can change one’s identity. One must, as Williams proffers, find and remake one’s identity through transitioning from being alienated from this world – one’s

³⁴⁰ Ibid., 105.

³⁴¹ Williams uses the word “competitive” for fractured relationships that result from sin in contrast to how I employ competitive dialectic. Williams is looking at how a sacramental life heals the sin of a competition that fractures and hurts other human persons. My use of competitive dialectic denotes, rather, the inattention to liturgical theologies of mission to a notion of mission in the world envisaged sacramentally. Whilst both competitions are about relationships, Williams is about salvific grace healing hurtful relationships, whereas competitive dialectic is employed with regard to the site of mission without positing this dialectic as sinful. Hence, Williams is a salvific relationship between grace and sin whereas competitive dialectic is in regards to the restriction of mission to a particular site of participation, and does not fall within Williams’s notion of competition.

³⁴² Rowan D. Williams, “Between Politics and Metaphysics: Reflections in the Wake of Gillian Rose,” *Modern Theology*, Vol. 11, No. 1 (January 1995), 7.

³⁴³ By heuristic I mean that I am setting up artificial, or rather, strict concepts in pure form, concepts which are inexorably interconnected in Williams’s theology.

flawed identity relates dysfunctionally with God's creation – to one that values and loves the cosmos as envisaged by God. Literally, this dysfunction causes one to feel “homeless”.

Overcoming sin – something only God can do, of course – is finding God, a God who loves and creates the person towards God's ends. This recognition brings “a beginning, not an end, an entry into a perilous and confused world.”³⁴⁴ Here Williams does not present a simple or even an easy solution to the challenge of overcoming sin in the world. Rather, recognition is not complete, but partial, or a glimpse of the dysfunctional relating between one another and with God and with creation itself. The ability to relate is still fragmented due to sin, so relationships remain “strange” and strained. This dysfunctional relating continues even after a single or after multiple experiences of conversion, or as Williams states: “an incapacity to feel for and with the pains of others is a massive diminution of what it is to be human.”³⁴⁵ In other words, sin prevents empathy, prevents one not simply from loving one's self, but also from loving the other; this is consistent with a traditional conception of sin, namely to be selfish, isolated and self-absorbed; namely, the inability to relate in a loving and open way to others.³⁴⁶

³⁴⁴ Rowan D. Williams, *The Wound of Knowledge, Christian Spirituality from the New Testament to St. John of the Cross* (London: Darton, Longman, and Todd, 1979), 73. Even though one feels “homeless” in a competitive framework, Matheson Russell notes that developing a Christian identity, in Williams' theology, leads to further displacement, that is, a continual “self-adjustment” for the good of the other. Therefore, Christian identity is never finished; it is always seeking to transform human identity according to God's purposes within one's historical context. See Matheson Russell, “Dispossession and Negotiation: Rowan Williams on Hegel and Political Theology,” in *On Rowan Williams: Critical Essays*, ed. Matheson Russell, (Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2009), 85-114. Maxine E. Walker, “How Do You Read It? Rowan Williams, Marilynne Robinson and Mapping a Postmodern Reading of the Good Samaritan Parable,” *Journal of Anglican Studies* 12, no. 2 (September 2013): 203-225, notes that Williams resists any finalisation of history, particularly within his notion of interreligious dialogue. Rather than a “Cosmic Christ” towards which all of history is steadily moving, Williams, Walker suggests, leads to Christian triumphalism, particularly in its relationship with other religions. To do such would lead to violence towards other religions. He is, therefore, “in favor of recognizing the ‘otherness’ of other faiths and the integrity of their systems” (Ibid., 211). Or as Williams himself states, “the third Reich's assault on the Jewish people in the urge to bring a kind of finality into history has rightly become the paradigm of ideological violence” (Williams, *On Christian Theology*, 102). Finality, therefore, becomes a violent ideology because it seeks to destroy the otherness of one's neighbour by insisting the other become part of one's own system or religion. Like Vatican II, Williams acknowledges, then, that being human or neighbourly towards the other is the principal form of Christian living in the world that first loves the other without actively trying to convert the other.

³⁴⁵ Ibid., 80.

³⁴⁶ This is a classic definition used by Augustine and later systematised by Luther: *homo incurvatus in se*. For the history of this term in Augustine and Luther see Matt Jenson, *The Gravity of Sin: Augustine, Luther and Barth on 'homo incurvatus in se'* (London/New York: T&T Clark, 2007). See also Sally Ann McReynolds and Ann O'Hara Graff, “Sin: When Women are the Context,” in *In the Embrace of God: Feminist Approaches to Theological Anthropology*, ed. Ann O'Hara Graff, 161-171 (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1995/2005). McReynolds and O'Hara Graff proffer that sin, from a feminist perspective, needs to be rethought not in terms of kenosis (giving of one's self), but giving too much of one's self. Giving too much of one's self may result in one's identity being lost and subjugated to the other. Thus, without essentialising sin, sin can be either an idolising of the self or the idolising of the other in such a way one is diminished in his/her humanity, and what characterises the sin is not keeping a balance between one's own well-being and the well-being of others.

This recognition itself is the Cross – it is a coming to know that we are severely limited in our ability to love and relate to others, God, and creation – one experiences the absence of God – that God is remote.³⁴⁷ But this is a possibility for change, not simply an awakening to pain, sadness, and sin, and offers the person the possibility to open him/herself up to God’s Spirit in this occasion. The Spirit “enflames” the heart, allowing the person to grow towards a greater desire for God. Benjamin Myers notes that the work of the Holy Spirit in Williams’ theology is in the act of “revising and repairing the human race, slowly and patiently....”³⁴⁸ The Spirit creates a “rough draft”³⁴⁹ of God’s desire for humanity. For Williams, then, recognition of the tragedy of sin in the world *is* a possibility to experience God’s Spirit, to open one’s self to that Spirit. In some ways, then, Williams articulates that the overcoming of one’s inability to love creation as God does, is not to simply contemplate this new relationship, but must also actively engage creation with this new desire. In other words, the church in mission is to turn towards creation, critically engaging it even knowing that one’s ability to relate with creation will always be limited. But how does this sin connect to sacramentality for Williams?

It could be said that sin is an “*anti-sacrament*” for Williams. Sin signifies not God’s presence, but God’s absence, and provides the desire to “find” God in order to relate appropriately to God, to others, and to the world in deeper and more sincere ways. By not witnessing to God’s love in a flawed world, the person is making God’s love invisible, but at the same time the person communicates not God’s love, but flawed love. This is not sacrament in the strict sense of making visible God’s presence, and in this way it can be conceived as an anti-sacrament. Sacrament, conversely, reveals God’s love whilst also, in the act of loving, conceals sin. What sacramentality does, therefore, is to interrupt human history, in order for human persons to reveal God’s interests. Part of the difficulty in not relating appropriately with others is inherent in the very preoccupation with trying to find the true self within the very selves of human persons. For Williams, this “cripples [us] in the actual business of encounter with material, intelligent others.”³⁵⁰ Here, for Williams, identity itself is sacramentally bound, that is, it is not a retreat into the depths of one’s self where one finds their true calling/meaning, (the invisible), but alternatively, it is the person going beyond their own self, towards the other in their embodied history that one constructs identity. Literally, identity is the sacramental encounter of God’s interests within human history. This

³⁴⁷ Williams, *The Wound of Knowledge*, 81.

³⁴⁸ Benjamin Myers, *Christ the Stranger: The Theology of Rowan Williams* (London: T&T Clark 2012), 58.

³⁴⁹ *Ibid.*

³⁵⁰ Williams, *Dostoevksy*, 120.

means that dispossession for Williams is kenotic not in the sense of self-emptying one's self, but rather a "de-centring" of one's self.

Sacramentality, when construed as such, is less about programmes or projects, and more about discerning, in the contemporary, how the other is in need and requires empathy and humility; this becomes apparent not simply in one loving the other, but in the other in turn being able to be loved, and likewise returning that love. Volpe notes that the role of humility allows for an "attitude of receptivity that characterizes" transformation in the act of dialoguing and negotiating with others.³⁵¹ The implications for mission is that history is the context where God's interests meet sinful interests in order to de-centre the person and institutions – including the church – in order to begin to live in and out, however partially it may be, of God's love. Unlike *Redemptoris missio* which characterised mission as preaching truth at the other, the implication of Williams' theology is that truth is performed in the act of meeting the other in humility and empathy. This is more in keeping with *anamnesis* as explored in Morrill, Power, and Chauvet. Performing *anamnesis* is a humble and empathetic act of meeting the other without trying to control the meeting through a preconceived ideal. Because God's love desires the good of the other, the gospel for Williams's theological explorations "do not involve the unexpected abandonment of a previously principled position.... They are fundamentally a matter of trying to enable discovery of more of the truth of the gospel, by the main means available to us of such discovery..."³⁵² the act of meeting. Therefore, the anti-sacrament is refusing to engage human history, or isolating one's self or the isolation of an institution – such as a church community – from the real, historical situatedness where sin is, and God's love is not only desired, but demanded.

Pain, or suffering, is "a sombre picture of the way in which suffering shatters human security and forces us to confront irreducible reality in its least palatable heart."³⁵³ Suffering has the potential to awaken human persons to new possibilities, and to the inability of relying on one's own power for one's own benefit. As such, suffering is recognition of "our [own] poverty"³⁵⁴ of life. Williams notes this is what makes us most human and distinct from God – suffering that results from not relating properly. Williams does not glorify suffering, thereby one does not need to look for suffering, but rather, the human person living in a particular context is confronted by suffering in many and various ways, so the need is not to look for suffering, but to realise that any one human person does not have the ability to transform sin. In particular, Williams relates this to Christology, especially in relation to the suffering of

³⁵¹ Medi Volpe, "'Taking Time' and 'Making Sense': Rowan Williams on the Habits of Theological Imagination," *International Journal of Systematic Theology* 15, no. 3 (July 2015), 357.

³⁵² Mike Higton, "The Ecclesial Body's Grace: Obedience and Faithfulness in Rowan Williams' Ecclesiology," *Ecclesiology* 7, no. 1 (2011), 28.

³⁵³ Williams, *The Wound of Knowledge*, 82.

³⁵⁴ *Ibid.*

Christ on the cross and how his suffering bridges the gulf between humanity and God, sin and love. “The dereliction of Christ on the cross, where ‘God cries out to God for mercy’ (in Ps. 66.5), is repeatedly taken as the moment in which Christ shows himself paradigmatically human and gives voice to all human suffering....”³⁵⁵

Christ as fully human and fully God suffers fully as humans do, and this means God knows intimately human suffering. In other words, because Christ experienced suffering, he experienced the history – the world – as human persons experience it. The way divinity and humanity are bridged is through suffering. The Cross is not only salvific, it also allows human persons to become “who Jesus is”.³⁵⁶ God in Christ can relate to humans because he is in solidarity with humanity in humanity’s history and with humanity’s suffering. Christ, as human does not actively look for suffering but experiences it as the result of being part of humanity, and therefore, in his divinity, he unites humanity’s suffering to God’s infinite Divine love. Suffering, therefore, bridges the gulf of humanity and God, not via a relationship of completion, but in authentic meeting. The cross is “the meeting place of God and humanity”.³⁵⁷ Williams particularly notes Christ’s vocalising a cry for mercy, thus suggesting that one’s whole body – spirit, body, soul, and voice – is turned to God, chooses to give over one’s whole self towards God’s love. This section illustrates that participation in Christ is to gradually move from the human condition of suffering to one that lives in divine love. This has sacramental implications, as I will show below, because suffering is met by God’s mission in a given context.

The Cross, therefore, is sacramental, it makes visible the concealed pain of humanity, and invites humanity to draw towards God’s own interests. The cross reframes human agendas. In the meeting with other human persons, bearing witness to God’s interests, “our untruths are laid bare to us and we lose the consolation of having a clear image of ourselves and how we stand before God.”³⁵⁸ The cross – suffering – tests us as who we are, and lays us bare before God, examined in order to witness to God’s love. Mission, from such a perspective, means the disciple is to use the whole body, one’s whole created reality existing in history, to live in and from God’s love not simply for the self, but for all of creation.

For Williams, this love is not an idealised, romantic love, but rather one found in pain, found in violence. This does not mean humans deliberately seek suffering, but the reality of human history is suffering, a suffering, as we have seen, rooted in competition – my success whilst others fail. Salvation, for Williams, is relating to the other, to God, and to creation in loving and deeper ways, and yet salvation for Williams also means experiencing violence.

³⁵⁵ Ibid., 83.

³⁵⁶ Williams, *Christ on Trial*, 134-135.

³⁵⁷ Williams, *The Wound of Knowledge*, 83.

³⁵⁸ Williams, *Christ on Trial*, 136.

But what is meant by violence? Violence is often construed negatively, and consequently, is something one tries to avoid, so why would violence be a part of a sacramental theology, or even a mission theology? One's identity – rooted in and affected by sin – can only be undone violently, Williams maintains, because one's identity is not only being questioned in the process of transforming relations, but also altered, challenged critically, and invited to change. Life is not only a state of suffering, but in the actual invitation to relate according to God's ways, one must first enter into deeper suffering, must experience the cross, crucifying one's flawed identity in the hopes that God's Spirit of mercy will meet the human person, and "overwhelm"³⁵⁹ him/her.

Violence is, perhaps, too strong a term. Granted, altering one's identity towards God's purposes may be difficult and painful, but does this necessarily entail something "violent?" The term violence lacks a positive quality. In the next Chapter, mission will be explored from the view of resisting that which oppresses, and violence is something that should be resisted as it inflicts harm. Williams's word choice is unfortunate, but what he is getting at is important, namely that living according to God's purposes is no simple task.

In Williams's theology, then, the Cross relates to human existence in two ways. Firstly, as mentioned above, the competitive nature of contemporary society is a given reality of suffering. Secondly, the very process of moving beyond the present state of competition is itself intimately linked to suffering because one's entire body, being, must slowly and gradually transition from one identity to a new identity. Will one risk this painful transition? Will one stop during the course of the process because the process causes too much suffering? This suggests then that the two types of suffering are not the same. The existential suffering of given life will intensify as it meets what I will call the mission of God, and what Williams refers to as God's purposes.

The use of the verb "overwhelm" above emphasises for Williams not only that *God* is doing the work, but to find true change, one must be overwhelmed "violently" in order to truly adjust to the necessary degree towards God's ways. Violence for Williams means that the dialogue of relations is unequal. There is a struggle between God's mission and human interests. There is an inherent struggle happening as these two interests, or any interests for that matter, enter into dialogue with one another. At the basis is a tendency for disagreement between what God wants and what humans desire. For Williams, it is not some inner personal identity that one must return to, but "to self-adjusting, self-centring corporate practises"³⁶⁰ which do not avoid dialogue and conflict, but rather seek to learn from the other, and to grow as a human person for the common good. The common good personally

³⁵⁹ Williams, *The Wound of Knowledge*, 86.

³⁶⁰ Williams, "Between Politics and Metaphysics", 7.

challenges self-interest, and therefore, transformation requires these two purposes to conflict.

Theologically, it is the overwhelming act of God which brings about “an adversarial moment in the construction of the self and its knowledge of itself”³⁶¹ In other words, the act of dispossessing one’s self means that in turning to the other, whether human and/or the Divine Other, one comes to know that one’s self is neither complete in himself or herself, nor that one can achieve goals (particularly those of God) without engaging with others, and especially by surrendering to the other, just as Christ surrendered out of love for humanity in the interests of God. Therefore, one does not seek suffering, but rather, God’s mission allows human persons to de-centre themselves, to turn to God’s love, and enact this love within history for the good of others but not in a perfect, complete way, but always partial and always challenging the human person to transform interests. This human transformation from the pre-sacramental state through dispossession means that whilst this transformation is difficult, a struggle, there lies the possibility of deepening bonds with other human persons, and with God, and, the good of the world.

Having established how dispossession is a spiritual quality that is not romanticised, this Chapter will now turn to how dispossession leads to engagement in and with the world.

The experience of the Cross, for Williams, is not an escape from the world, but rather, a full engagement with the world and all those who dwell therein. If suffering is an “anti-sacrament”, a recognition of God’s absence and our poverty within the cosmos, then suffering is not always something to be avoided, but engaged. These are opportunities to meet God’s Spirit, and so in some sense, one ought to seek out Divine Love, in the hopes of transitioning through suffering as God does act through and against it. It is “only with other men and women, do we learn hope, pity, joy, trust or love. It is knowing both their utter and intense reality and their doomed frailty that begins to suggest to us the perspective of authentic hope.”³⁶² In other words, to know and experience God’s love, one must meet God acting to “overwhelm” the suffering of human lives. Therefore, entering into the darkness of human existence, one may not find one’s identity within one’s self, a turning towards one’s inner dimension in order to find one’s true identity. As Williams highlights, however, God is not present and acting simply internally, but also outwardly, by meeting others and entering into historical living. One may be shaped by events outside of one’s self; identity is not a static, internal substance one tried to grasp. Rather, identity is shaped by interaction with history. Another important aspect of engagement is what transpires in this meeting. If, as suggested, sacramentality is the meeting between God and human persons, then how this engagement functions needs to be explored.

³⁶¹ Williams, *On Christian Theology*, 242.

³⁶² Williams, *The Wound of Knowledge*, 88.

This engagement, or what Williams calls “negotiation”, is not about compromising or “adjusting” to *each* other, such as one changes the other person, but alternately, a recognition that my conditional worldview can only grow and change in engaging with the worldview of another. This engagement with the other affords the person to question critically one’s worldview and to allow it to be reshaped, and hopefully, Williams suggests, the other person does the same. In other words, engagement is “to accumulate what is strange – where one is not defending oneself above all else.”³⁶³ It is something that happens to me, but always through my response and cooperation. In terms of theological engagement, it is God’s act that engages humanity in its frailty in order to renegotiate one’s identity. Because identity is historically conditioned, as noted above, then the Divine Act, as Williams suggests, may engage with human failure, once human failure is embraced. This dispossession of the self is a giving away of the self for the good of others. This is a Christic and therefore Paschal transition from competition to caring for the other. The person can experience God acting to transform the person in their whole person – though identity will slowly and gradually transform because this transformation is not a magic transformation. The Divine Act enters into the world, into human persons, to save human persons from suffering. In this theology, then, God is not lifting people out of history, but in contrast, human persons are called to engage history, their present reality, in order to meet the Divine Act, and seek to slowly transform from sin to the concern for the world’s well-being. This notion of engagement has implications, I will show momentarily, for a missiological notion of sacramentality. But for now it is important to note that the transformation from the pre-sacramental state through dispossession to the next phase, repossession, is always about God’s mission engaging human persons in history, in the hopes that the good of creation will not be thwarted but thrive. This suggests, then, that mission is world-engaging, and a God who empowers disciples’ agency, slowly and gradually, not to compete against the other, but to seek out the well-being of others.

4.2.3 *Repossession*

The third part of Williams’s sacramental theology is repossession. What is significant in Williams’s method is that he does not begin with sin, but rather with repossession, or what we might term transfiguration. Whilst some scholars have posited that Williams neglects sin, in my reading,³⁶⁴ it is not that he neglects sin, but rather, he is principally concerned with not the world as it is but what the world and human persons within it can become. In addition, Williams’s notion of the pre-sacramental state evidences that he has grappled with the

³⁶³ Williams, *On Christian Theology*, 250.

³⁶⁴ For an example see Medi Ann Volpe, *Rethinking Christian Identity: Doctrine and Identity, Challenges in Contemporary Theology Series* (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013).

problem of how sin not only fractures relationships between humans, God, and the cosmos, but that the very process of growing as Christian disciples is one that is intimately and repeatedly confronting the reality of sin, that slowly and persistently tries to thwart God's mission in and for the world. In this sense his approach is teleological – he begins with the end in mind, the eschatological transformation that occurs, much as Schmemmann did. What is inherently present within Williams's sacramental theology is an unromanticised view of how human agents come to live in and live out of God's mission. What Williams takes fundamentally as a given, is that mission as holiness is a spiritual process enmeshed in struggle and difficult coming to terms with what God's mission requires in historical situations. But the advantage of this is that Christians are not called to be perfectly holy, but that holiness is glimpsed when the concern for human persons and for creation are acted upon by any one. The smallest act to a grandiose act is a glimpse of holiness, of the mission of God. What this transformation looks like – this glimpse of holiness – for Williams is found in his notion of repossession. How does he envisage the move from dispossession to repossession, because such a move will help in conceiving sacramentality from a missiological perspective?

The act of being repossessed means being filled with the Spirit of God. Williams discusses the epiclesis of the Eucharistic Prayer to explain this perspective. The Spirit is called down (invoked) upon the assembly as well as upon the Eucharistic elements during the prayer of thanksgiving, and so too in the epicletic invocation, the act of dispossession – the gifts are being de-centred in their identity – the gifts are repossessed by the Spirit. In the same way, when one acknowledges one's own finitude and desire for something more, which is an invocation for God to meet the person, dwell within the person, and be imbued with God's act, God acts to repossess the person. In other words, the epicletic nature of repossession is to *consecrate* and to make the person *holy*. What is principally important for Williams, however, is that epiclesis is not simply about making things holy in and for the sake of themselves, but in addition for the purpose in calling forth the Holy Spirit so that being indwelt by the Spirit, Christian disciples may be led to new ways of acting within the world. For Williams, God acts not only within but also upon human persons in order to re-make (i.e., re-create) them “in order to show the face of the holy and liberating God.”³⁶⁵ In other words, they become sacraments – visible signs – of God's holiness to the world. Of course, the epiclesis is not only an invocation of the Spirit, but also a call for Christ to become present and act. The Spirit is called upon the bread and wine at Eucharist, in order that Christ might become present. Here, then, Williams evidences that to participate in Christ's life, one is empowered pneumatically. Christic participation with this pneumatology prevents Christic participation from falling into Christocentrism, that is, only focusing on Christ apart from the other Trinitarian “persons”. In this sense, then, Christic participation is Trinitarian participation

³⁶⁵ Williams, *On Christian Theology*, 202.

because to participate in God's (i.e., the first "person" of the Trinity) mission enacted by Christ, one must invoke and cooperate with the Spirit to live in and out of mission. How does Williams connect this invocation for empowerment by the Spirit to be repossessed?

Christology is about the meeting of human and divine, the coming together of material and divine in order for the Divine to be embodied by human nature.³⁶⁶ In other words, sacramentality is intimately connected to the Incarnation. But whereas Christ Jesus is the perfect embodiment of Divinity in human nature, without confusion in Chalcedonian creedal formulation, sacraments are glimpses of Divinity in a world that has not yet reached the eschatological end in Christ.³⁶⁷ Sacramentality and the Incarnation imply relationality. The "disparate and dissimilar" natures – fully human and fully Divine – in the person of Christ Jesus means that in Christ humanity and Divinity fully relate to one another, and become one.³⁶⁸ So sacramentality is a glimpse of the proper relationality between God's mission (the Divine purpose for Williams) and humanity, but because human persons are not the Second Person of the Trinity, whilst they can be indwelt by the Spirit, they are not perfectly united, are not perfectly relational, to God as Christ Jesus is in the Incarnation. The repossession, therefore, is the relationality of the Divine with the human. This is a transfiguration from human desire to Divine mission, because the Divine is invoked, dwells in the human person, and the person participates in the Divine mission.

This is the goal of hope. As Williams states, "The hope of the world becoming other is anchored, in the Christian sacraments, by the conviction that all human significant action arises from the primordial action, the art and sign, of a God committed to drawing our lives into the order of healing and communion."³⁶⁹ This transformation is Christological – God "makes the world in Christ, to be his [visible] 'sign' a form of living and acting that embodied his nature and purpose."³⁷⁰ Sacramentality, therefore, is a transfiguring of human persons into visible expressions of Christ Jesus's purpose within the cosmos. This means that sacraments are not just expressions and manifestations of God's presence but mark the coming together, the transition – *transitus* – of life from sin to divine activity. For Williams,

³⁶⁶ Ibid., 206.

³⁶⁷ This is a similar point Schillebeeckx highlights, namely, sacraments are events where Christ is revealed in the present in such a way as to draw human persons towards God's eschatological fullness. Schillebeeckx states, "In Christ not only were God and his love for men [sic] revealed, but God also showed us in him what it is for man to commit himself unconditionally to God the invisible Father....In and through the religious service of Jesus, God has revealed himself" (Idem., *Christ the Sacrament of the Encounter with God*, 18).

³⁶⁸ Kathryn Tanner, *Christ the Key*, Current Issues in Theology (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2010), 242.

³⁶⁹ Williams, *On Christian Theology*, 207.

³⁷⁰ Ibid., 208.

then, this process is *passio*³⁷¹ in both senses of the word – both passion (as the Cross already discussed), but also the passing or transitioning from one way of identity (an old way of relating based in competition) towards a new identity (relating in better ways for the well-being of others). In this sense, then, sacramentality is also about the passion and the transitioning from one way of relating to the cosmos (and to God) as well as recognising that the transition entailed in transforming towards God’s purposes are connected to suffering and struggle such as Jesus experienced on the cross.

What makes Christian identity distinctive, for Williams, is this new way of relating to the world, not only having ecclesial affiliation, that is, participation within liturgy itself. So, then, what is the role of the church within this sacramental process? For Williams, this means that the sacraments as well as the church itself are “places” where God’s divine Spirit is principally seen, heard, and experienced. Christ’s act of transfiguration is what defines not only human identity but also ecclesial identity. The sacraments within the church are “definitive interactions”³⁷² of Divinity and humanity. The church within the sacraments explicitly and purposefully interacts with the Divine, seeking to be dispossessed and repossessed in order for God’s purposes to become tangible. The Church and the sacraments, therefore, embody and point towards God’s purposes for all of creation.³⁷³ The quality of being human, and the church itself, is its life being moulded and transformed by the Spirit. The church’s mission is to interpret and name “the deepest direction and growth of human life as being *in* Christ and *towards* the Father.”³⁷⁴ Whereas some models of ecclesiology within liturgical theologies of mission would suggest that the Church is a refuge from the sinfulness of the world (see the previous Chapter), Williams in contrast envisages the church and human persons actively being led *into* the world seeking out darkness, in order to not simply critique it, but to engage it, learn from it, and be challenged by it as well as being critical of it. Whilst they share the formative and unique role liturgy plays in helping to imbue and transform Christians into missionary disciples, they differ, for the most part, in their notion of the relationship between liturgy and the world. Rather than setting up a contrastive relationship between liturgy, church, mission and the world, Williams sets up a *necessary* engagement of church and world. For the church to be authentic to God’s mission it has a responsibility to go where suffering and competition (sin) is most evident, where the well-being of human persons is most neglected, and live in and out of God’s mission for the good of others. Yet, because human persons are simply glimpses of Christ’s purpose, human persons are unable to live out of Christ’s mission fully, and their ability is always

³⁷¹ This early church distinction was made by C. Mohrmann, “Pascha, Passio, Transitus,” *Ephemerides liturgicae* 66 (Rome, 1952): 37-52.

³⁷² Williams, *On Christian Theology*, 125.

³⁷³ *Ibid.*

³⁷⁴ *Ibid.*; emphasis original.

impeded by human frailty. What is important for my purpose is that Williams helps me to locate mission sacramentally, without a collapsing of mission into church/liturgy. The importance of this approach is that mission as holiness can be construed not simply as humanisation, but there is a deep spiritual participation in Christ's life (empowered by the Spirit), that leads Christian disciples to critically engage the marginalised in such a way as to learn from them, and enter into relationship that benefits church's mission.

Another strength to Williams's approach is that what becomes distinct for the church and human persons is not a *separation* of the mission from the world, but rather, the acknowledgement that transformation only happens when both *meet*, and allow the Divine Act to transform not simply persons and institutions, but also the cosmos itself, the context where this meeting takes place. In this sense, liturgy as a participation in God's mission is lacking if it does not occur within the world. To paraphrase Louis-Marie Chauvet, mission must be verified in the world and not simply within liturgy.³⁷⁵ Sacraments as liturgical rites require, then, sacramentality within the world. Yet, for Williams, this process is dynamic because there is never one simple transition, but a life repeatedly being transformed, repeatedly being invited to transform gradually, as life goes along. "Human ways of doing things change and develop. Human doing calls out for a response in the form of another way of doing it. It engages and extends the first. Depends on it, yet challenges it."³⁷⁶ In other words, this sacramental process is about the call towards further doing, that is, the furthering engagement between sin and life. The church itself, pilgrimaging through history, is not perfectly holy, and therefore, it still possesses, potentially, characteristics which are not of service to God's interests. Therefore, this is always a need for the church itself to be challenged to transform even more as it engages with the world.

But Williams acknowledges further challenges. What the church does is not always successful, because sometimes the transformed act can bring "ill," not "good." These acts are "strange" because Christ's acts "are signs of a form of human life yet to be realised and standing at odds with the political and cultic status quo."³⁷⁷ Therefore, whilst God's deepest purposes can be partially realised, they can cause even more difficulties because other communities and persons may be antithetical to these Divine purposes. Thus both good and ill can emerge. Christologically, the Church and human persons become a sacrament of Christ's life, or as Williams states it, "...it is his [Christ's] identity that is set before us as a sign, the form of a new people of God. [T]he life (and death) of Jesus is a sign of God, showing how a human biography formed by God looks."³⁷⁸ Therefore, the Church's mission is

³⁷⁵ Chauvet, *Symbol and Sacrament*, 276-278.

³⁷⁶ Williams, *On Christian Theology*, 199.

³⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 203.

not simply to imitate Christ, nor simply to participate in Christ's life, but actually showing through doing what Christ showed was significant for God's deep purposes for the cosmos. Here Williams is in agreement with my definition of mission from the Second Vatican Council. Mission is both a *mimesis* and a participation in Christ's life. In particular, both are shaped on the Paschal characteristics of Christ on the Cross. Mission as holiness is giving of the self for the sake of the world and others. Williams's notion of the sacramental character of human living extends and deepens my definition of mission.

Ecclesial identity is also distinctive because there is, one hopes, a deep intimacy between God and the church. The church explicitly and purposefully engages with God through the particular sacramental rituals, through prayer in general, and the reading of the scriptures, in such a way as to come to know God. This knowledge, as already alluded to, is not simply a rational knowledge of God, but a loving and intimate knowledge of what God calls forth for the world. Whilst there is a sense God judges human sinfulness, and the failure of humans to act according to God's purposes, there is also a sense that God does not demand anything from human persons. For Williams, God calls for a renewed action that is *adequate* but not necessarily *heroic*. "God asks not for heroes but for lovers; not for moral athletes but for men and women aware of their need for acceptance, ready to find their selfhood in the longing for communion with an eternal 'other'."³⁷⁹ What Williams means here is not that Christians are not to live out ethical and moral lives, but rather, he does not want to romanticise Christian discipleship or even ecclesial existence (or action) by placing a competitive dialectic between church and world. Slightly altering this dialectic from oppositional to one of relationality, in that mission is the world and church working together for the well-being of the cosmos. The church (and disciples) and liturgy are decentred because God's mission is central and entails living in and out of God's mission in liturgy but also in the world. Therefore, being heroic may be possible, but this assumes that one has overcome sin in such a way as to be heroic. Moreover, it neglects that fact that people and churches are constantly being called to be transformed. The meeting of God and human darkness (sin), whether spiritual or moral, is characterised as being turbulent, not always heroic. In addition, there is the simple fact that even the smallest act can be a transition, a symbol of resurrection, within life.

For Williams, sacramental living is not about achieving status or recognition, but rather, a life lived from the meeting and challenging love of God. There is a risk in heroic deeds, and that is that it can be sinful – done for the wrong reasons – namely, not for God's purposes, but for "self-indulgence."³⁸⁰ Rather than heroics, the cross is the model for human

³⁷⁸ Ibid., 204.

³⁷⁹ Williams, *The Wound of Knowledge*, 89.

³⁸⁰ Ibid., 90.

living. Not only is one to be dispossessed of one's self,³⁸¹ but also of one's own actions in order for God to work through them. Williams is cautious about relating grace to success or achievement, rather grace is "the compatibility of what we do with the glorifying of God – hence...the need to conceal 'good works' from others and to place no reliance upon them oneself." God empowers one to do good, but one should not be seeking out achievement as that is an act of self-interest. Rather God's purposes are served and take precedence over any "heroics" by a person. In particular, for Williams, there is always a danger of conflating holiness and perfection, namely, doing good acts. Success, as noted above, is the given reality of human persons and drives self-interest. In the sacramental spirituality of Williams, however, holiness is construed not in terms of success but as being faithful to God's mission. Perfection will always elude human desire this side of the eschaton, but, I suggest, missiological acts live in and out God's purposes no matter how small and imperfect.

Love is not simply behaviour; it is an attitude as well. This attitude for Williams must come before doing good. Love as sanctity "heals and restores" human persons and the church, but does not perfect it.³⁸² What is restored is one's attitude of detachment from one's darkest self in order for God to heal and restore the whole person – attitude and actions together. But as of yet, humans are incapable of perfection in deeds. This attitude is not simply being open to the Divine Act, which it must be, but it also allows for a response to the Divine Act. What God does, calls for, is a lived response, or more precisely, a way one lives his or her life as a response to what God has already done. Again, this is a relational engagement between God and the person/church, as well as the lived response as it acts within history.

This type of engagement does two things for Williams. Firstly, it opens the person to praying in new ways, because what one does has changed. In other words, change of attitude and change of acting allows one to begin to pray in new ways. As conversion happens in one's life or in the church, the prayers do not simply take on new significance, they also need to change to respond to how faith and life has changed. What Williams calls "attitude" is similar to *anamnesis* put forward by Power, Chauvet, and Morrill.³⁸³ One's attitude (the way one thinks and feels towards something) is transformed by interacting with the past in the present for the future. The future becomes partially present in the here and now when one remembers God's mission lived in and out by Christ in the present in order that history is transformed. This *anamnesis*, as I noted, is prophetic because God's mission affects history in the present.

³⁸¹ Ibid., 175.

³⁸² Ibid., 177.

³⁸³ See Chapter 2, pages 00.

The construal of missional identity was based in participation within the liturgy, but Williams turns this around, so that identifying that one's being – attitude and action of mission in the world, a response to God's mission, also shapes how one participates within liturgy. Not acting, or acting minimally, in God's mission in the world will shape the way one comes to and participates in liturgy. This means that the mission intimately and intensely communicated in and through liturgy will be hampered by not living in and out of mission within daily living. Consequently, liturgical mission will help or hamper daily mission in the world, and the reverse is equally true. Here, then, I suggest, is a notion of mission that takes liturgical participation as well as action in the world as equally and necessary components of what it means to live in and out of God's mission.

Secondly, the change of attitude and acting makes one more aware of what God has given to allow this acting to take place. For Williams, acting itself or even attitude are not enough, there needs to be meaningful reflection on one's attitude, one's acting, how one ought to act in response to the Divine Gift. To understand this sacramentally, Williams turns to the purpose of the Eucharist – to build up the Body of Christ, the church. This is what God does in and through the sacrament, but the response of the disciple is not simply in the physical reception of the sacrament, but rather to reflect meaningfully on how one may respond to God's act in the Eucharist. In this case, Williams suggests, sacraments effect healing and union, and therefore, the church and Christian disciples are to effect transformation and change within the world, which is to be signs of healing and union in a world fragmented. "All bread and all wine are shadowed with their Eucharistic use."³⁸⁴ In a more general way, all sacramental acting shadows, or relates, to the lived world in such ways to suggest how human life should be lived in response to the Divine Gift. In this way, the gift from God to the disciple or to the church is not simply for the internal life of the human person or even the church itself (a type of self-congratulating, as it were), but a further doing for others in their contextual need. Giving, as such, is unconditional; it simply acts for the other whether friend, stranger, or family.

This theology of gift exchange is similar to Chauvet, discussed in the previous Chapter. To recall, gift, for Chauvet, was not a thing but an identity formed within liturgical ritual that has implications for ethical living in the world. Williams is very similar on this point, grace is not a thing but an act, and the act gifted by God is "returned" to God by further doing for others. Both agree that grace is not a thing but an act that does not necessarily "get results". Moreover, Chauvet and Williams also agree that the value of grace lies on the building up of the person and the church, and I might add, on the acting for good of the cosmos itself.

Relying on Thomas Aquinas, Williams interprets Aquinas's notion of how sacraments have a spiritual dimension: "a sign is the means of coming to the knowledge of someone or

³⁸⁴ Williams, *On Christian Theology*, 207.

something other than ourselves; the work of God for our salvation... i.e., it is not itself an item, an object that can be isolated in our world, it is supremely alien to the everyday world, yet, not in any way an identifiable reality in competition with it; so it can only be shown or signified materially.³⁸⁵ Once again, sacraments are about relationality, relating not simply to God, but also to the material world, both of which are other than one's own self. One begins not simply to interact with it, like an object, but rather, to interact – that is, to engage it, in order to come to know how to respond to it in transformed acting. Williams notes, the "otherness' of God is not like that; it is more radical. And it is only by speaking and engaging with the material world in a particular way that we come to express truly and respond properly to the real otherness of God."³⁸⁶

But this relating to God through materiality should not be romanticised or idealised. What God is calling human persons and the church to do in life is not something that can be fully realised in the present. Rather, the notion of simultaneously being freed by God to act is limited by the fragmentation of the material order not yet existing in perfect sanctification. As Williams states,

This Jesus acts for a community that does not yet exist, the Kingdom of God, he chooses rabbis and judges from the twelve tribes of the future, he heals and forgives, he takes authority to bring the outcasts of Israel into this world by sharing their tables. His strange isolation, the suspicion and incomprehension he meets, have to do with the fact that his acts are signs of a form of human life yet to be realised and standing at odds with the political and cultic status quo. The 'sense' he is making is...that God is the God who, by his free commitment, brings a people into being; yet the 'people' in whose name he acts, whose forms and signs he constructs in his healing and fellowship, is and is not identical with the Israel that now exists.³⁸⁷

In other words, sacraments are about transitions, or threshold experiences of moving, very gradually and slowly, towards the final Reign of God; but in the present, human life must continually grapple with the fact that one lives with a longing and inability to lead fully holy lives whilst also being gradually sanctified. Like Jesus, Williams seems to suggest, we are to live for a community that does not yet exist, the Reign of God. In other words, what sacraments do is show forth not simply an image of the future Kingdom of God, but a meaning of how life is related to God, and should be related to God's healing act. Sacramentality, therefore, is the simultaneous experience of responding positively to God's act but at the same time being confined by the present existential reality of the way sin

³⁸⁵ Ibid., 200-201.

³⁸⁶ Ibid., 201.

³⁸⁷ Ibid., 203.

distorts humanity's ability to respond always successfully to God's act.³⁸⁸ In this sense, then, what Jesus did as living in and out of God's mission, as conveyed through scripture, is himself an image of what the Reign of God looks like. Sacramentality is a glimpse, however meagre and "strange" it may seem in the present reality as it prophetically challenges what it means to act as Christ did in his perfect state of Divinity. The Reign is glimpsed when humanity – whether in liturgy or in daily life – engages the cosmos with the intent of God's mission. Kathryn Tanner gets to the heart of this when she states, "Jesus relates to other human beings as their savior in virtue of the power he has as the Word of God; and he relates to them as their fellow sufferer in sharing with them a humanity that needs to be elevated and healed from the effects upon it of a conflict-ridden, death-dealing world."³⁸⁹

4.3 Missiological Implications of Rowan Williams's Sacramental Theology

Not only is Rowan Williams's theology inherently sacramental, as the above treatment has demonstrated, but his sacramental theology, I suggest, contains missiological implications. The foundational aspect of his missiological sacramental theology is the relationship between God, human persons, and the cosmos: "Human creatures are summoned to relate to the world and to use its resources in such a way that God's self-offering in love comes through,

³⁸⁸ As mentioned in Chapter 1, this thesis is construed through a Catholic theological anthropology. How does Williams's theological anthropology harmonise with the approach of this thesis? His theological anthropology is not Calvinist in the sense that the human person is "depraved" due to original sin. I would suggest that Williams has a middle way between Luther on the one hand and an overly optimistic position on the other. Whereas Luther emphasised the existential reality of sin over and above grace, an overly optimistic view emphasises grace and neglects the reality of sin. The "middle way", rather acknowledges the existential reality of sin, but, to paraphrase Elizabeth Dreyer, grace has a slight "edge" over sin. See idem., *Manifestations of Grace*, Theology and Life Series 29 (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press/Michael Glazier, 1990), 238. Dreyer states, "the Christian story relates unequivocally that the victory over death has been won in life, death and resurrection of Jesus. Evil and the suffering it causes are to be fought at every turn both within each person and in the structures of the world, but evil will not be ultimately victorious in the face of God's universal love" (Ibid., 237). Like Augustine, the priority of grace and its role in transforming the human person has been a constant throughout the argument of this thesis and its interlocutors. The Reformers, reacting to the socio-cultural *milieu* of medieval piety they saw as semi-Pelagian, emphasised the individual's reliance solely on grace (*sola gratia*) and faith (*sola fide*). God's alien "Otherness" in Luther's justification declares the person righteous which is received through faith. For Luther, and more so with Calvin, human goodness could only be conceived of as God's goodness bestowed in Christ whilst one remains unworthy. Christ's goodness allows one to "do good". Grace alone allows love, otherwise human love is egoistic. Whilst Williams has much in common with Augustine and Luther on the existential reality of sin and the human ability of be self-consumed (i.e., focused on one's success over and above that of the other), he has a Catholic and Orthodox emphasis on human participation in salvation, i.e., *theosis* or deification. The emphasis here is on the human cooperation with divine grace to grow and change a person/community as well as the potential to discover grace in daily activity. Therefore, much like this thesis, Williams has an ecumenical, or a "middle way", in his theological anthropology that underlies his sacramental theology. In other words, these theologies do not need to be mutually exclusive if a balance on sin and grace is maintained. In addition, human agency is accented without being overly optimistic or pessimistic. God's initiative is always central. For summaries of Luther's theological anthropology See idem., *Manifestations of Grace*, 126-143; Stephen J. Duffy, *The Dynamics of Grace: Perspectives in Theological Anthropology* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press/Michael Glazier, 1993), 173-210; Roger Haight, *The Experience and Language of Grace* (Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1979), 79-104.

³⁸⁹ Tanner, *Christ the Key*, 245.

and they are given the power and the freedom to do this by the Spirit who unites them to the Word of God in human flesh, Jesus crucified and raised.”³⁹⁰ The call to discipleship is more than simply an existential fulfilment of the human person, or even of the ecclesial community, but rather, the individual disciple’s and the ecclesial community’s mission is rooted in a life which allows for and expresses God’s love for and within the cosmos. Mission, for Williams, is about the church and disciples engaging prophetically with and towards the world in which the church finds itself. There is no competitive dialectic between liturgy/church/mission and world. Rather, God’s mission, it seems to me in Williams’s sacramental theology, is the call for the church (as well as disciples) to de-centre itself, entering into the world out of love for the common good. Because Williams acknowledges that all human persons – whether disciples or not, much in the same way *Gaudium et spes* does – are living lives encumbered by competition rooted in selfishness, he places his theology within a framework that already begins in the shared reality of the world in which both disciples and others are located presently. By so doing, like GS, mission is broadly conceived as healing the world of alienation between persons, institutions, and the earth. Mission is construed relationally, and the church has a responsibility to live in and out of God’s purpose not simply for its own self, but for the world. To live mission in the world, Williams’s theology implies, is to live for the needs of the other. For a liturgical theology of mission not to be construed with a romanticised view of liturgy, I suggest, is potentially possible through the construal of in terms of sacramentality, rooted in a theological anthropology of the sort proffered by GS and Williams. Suffering and hope meet in the given context where mission is lived out. The relationality of church with the world is better conceived of as a deep relatedness that all creation finds itself in, and that individual disciples and the church are called explicitly by how Christ Jesus lived his own life to relate to and engage with the world that already “speak[s] of”³⁹¹ God.

But the cosmos is not simply a static world where God’s holiness shines through. It is, for Williams, a cosmos “full of the life of a God whose nature is known in Christ and the Spirit.”³⁹² This is not simply a Trinitarian theology of sacramentality, it is a dynamic call to mission. The cosmos has the potentiality to communicate the Trinitarian life, not simply to show forth how holy and transcendent God is, but rather, it is a call for human persons that they are, themselves, called to communicate and participate in “the life of a God whose nature is known in Christ and the Spirit.” In other words, mission is not simply incarnational – that is, a summons to *be* Christ – but one which is to *show* the love of God which is possible

³⁹⁰ Rowan D. Williams, “Foreword,” in *Gestures of God: Explorations in Sacramentality*, eds. Geoffrey Rowell and Christine Hall (London/New York: Continuum, 2004), xiii.

³⁹¹ Ibid.

³⁹² Ibid.

only through the power of the Spirit. In this sense, mission in the world is analogous to the epiclesis of the Eucharistic Prayer. By living in and out of mission in the world, disciples and the church in performing an ecclesial act are empowered by the Spirit to be and act as Christ did by confronting suffering and seeking out the well-being of others. Williams's notion of sacramental mission, therefore, is one which is a call not simply to be transformed within one's self, or to treat to one's inner self rendered holy, or even for the church itself to be shut off in holiness from the world. Mission is, rather, a call to show forth God's deep love for the world, a love which is not simply present, but is also absent, because the call is not complete, not fully successfully. The Divine is working through sinful human persons, agents not always perfectly attuned to God's mission. The church, as well as mission itself, is both sacrament and anti-sacrament, and consequently, the church is both fulfilling God's mission as well as concealing that mission. The church itself can never fully possess or fulfil God's mission as it remains the *telos* of the entire cosmos.

This absence is just as important as God's presence within Williams's sacramental theology. The recognition of absence in mission means that God's transforming love is never fully attained, or, for that matter, fully lived out in the present. It is less God's absence than it is humanity's inability to successfully follow God's mission. Williams on this point is similar to Powers and Chauvet discussed in Chapter 3. Because of the historical reality of the present, God's future of hope is always a presence but also an absence. The absence, to recall, is because of Christ's Ascension to heaven, and the human person feels the absence of Christ's humanity in the present, though through the power of the Spirit the human person is able to recognise that Christ is present to history but always partially. Williams shares this perspective of the present but absent Christ in whom human persons await the fullness of God's Reign. Williams notes that because of this presence in absence, God's purposes will always be partial and limited. There is always a call to mission, not simply a call to a known future, but rather, a call in the present to be empowered by God's love in order that all relationships with one another and with the world and with God is always rooted in God's own life of love. This is a contextual sacramentality. There is no previous plan or programme to implement, as God's act within the present need can never be known beforehand, it happens in the encounter, and transformation, as such, is always dynamic and being construed in the dialogical event. Williams sums this up as follows:

The knowledge of Jesus' identity as 'Son' or 'Word' in history is not something to be read off from a supposedly natural record, nor, on the other hand, is it some kind of abstract projection of transcendental significance on to an historical void. It is realized in the process by which the memory of Jesus and the humanity of the Church give shape and definition to each other, so that the 'memory' of Jesus is never simply the recollection of a distant individual, what sacraments and the reading of scripture are supposed to be about, is the context in which we speak of the agency of the one God as witness and interpreter, as the Holy Spirit. And it is worth recalling Vladimir Lossky's account of the Spirit as that which realizes in the

endless diversity of human lives the set of renewed human possibilities opened up by the work of Christ.³⁹³

Christ's life – one which we have seen shows forth God's love in history as the Incarnation – is about God's action becoming manifest in history. This is implicitly congruent with our notion of mission from Chapter one. Mission is living in and out of God's love for the world, relating to the world in such a way that humanisation may occur. But Williams's sacramental theology broadens this definition by suggesting that humanisation is a limited term from the view of sacramentality. Humanisation suggests that mission is simply for human persons, but Williams's sacramental theology hones in on the fact that God acts not simply in and for human persons, but for the good of all creation. Therefore, mission is also about how human persons relate to the created reality around them. Mission, therefore, is not simply witnessing to God's work, but rather, dispossessing of one's self so God might act in and through human persons and the church. At this meeting between God's action and human dispossession, God appears where death and life coincide.³⁹⁴ This is what shapes missional identity: "In these acts the church makes sense of itself"; "individuals do as well."³⁹⁵

But whilst this sacramental mission sounds easy enough to live in and live out, for Williams, sacramental mission is difficult, and can be quite painful in the process of transformation. This can be found implicitly in Williams's own recounting of the resurrection narratives in the Gospels.

The [resurrection] stories themselves are about difficulty, unexpected outcomes, silences, errors, about what is not easily reconcilable as regards location or time or *dramatis personae*, stories which, while they appear to presuppose a background of prophetic anticipation are in fact about laborious recognition, as often as not, the gradual convergence of experience and pre-existing language in a way that inexorably changes the register of the language."³⁹⁶

Williams makes a crucial distinction between anticipation and recognition. Whilst these stories, and sacramentality itself, anticipate transformation, this is never enough. Just as the disciples had to recognise Christ in the breaking of the bread, in his *action*, so too Christian disciples must try to recognise God's action in history. This is not simply to make Christians more discerning in how they embody God's actions in history, but in contrast, to not identify ecclesial acts as fully in line with God's acts, because "the community's history and administration is so manifestly vulnerable to distortion and betrayal."³⁹⁷ The church and

³⁹³ Williams, *On Christian Theology*, 26.

³⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 125.

³⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 205.

³⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 187.

³⁹⁷ *Ibid.*

disciples are to reflect upon and discover what God's life means for the world. It never exhausts God's love or action.

The Christian mission is to be "the material thereness of Jesus",³⁹⁸ and not to do so is to fail to recognise and participate in God's mission. Mission, in Williams's theology, is inherently about living in the midst of suffering whilst also "becoming the channel for God's work of reconciliation."³⁹⁹ Transformation is possible for those who are "hopeless and impure and materially or morally destitute"⁴⁰⁰ because humans respond to God's act, whilst at the same time recognising that this convergence of human act and divine act is always partial, fractured within history. This means, that transformation does not simply embody Jesus but there is simultaneously "a fundamental ungraspability about the source of whatever power or liberty is at work in the community"⁴⁰¹ so that God's mission is never possessed fully by human persons or within human actions, but always are anti-sacraments – God's mission is always lacking and in need of further activity by God. But an important implication of Williams' sacramentality is that his language is couched not simply in spiritual language but in economic language as well: dispossessed, possession, competition, success. In this regard, then, mission is about gift, spiritual and economic.

To live in and out of mission, then, is a sharing not simply of one's spiritual resources, but a sharing of whatever goods, a created reality, is needed for the well-being of humanity. Yet, goods, if conceived in terms of sacramentality, means that creation cannot be used simply for selfish ends, but recognising its own well-being is important as well. Mission, then, is not simply spiritual living, but is something that interacts with the world in various modes and levels, economics, socio-political and so forth. Yet, Chauvet's notion of symbol helps to expand Williams' notion of sacramentality and the economic, socio-political modes of mission. Recalling that Chauvet emphasised that symbols are never reduced to an economic exchange of value because God's gifts are always freely given, highlights that mission is to be lived in and lived out in all spheres of human living (and within the cosmos itself).

Though Chauvet is interested in Christian identity as the transformation effected by God's grace, a missiological emphasis expands this to show that the transformation effected by God's grace not only forms Christian identity but it is also an act, potentially, for the good of the cosmos. Wherever suffering exists, the ecclesial mission is to be in solidarity with the needs of suffering creation. As Williams states, "The narrative of Jesus is not finished, therefore not in any sense controlled, even by supposedly 'authorized' tellers of the story; his agency continues, now inseparable from the narrative of God's dealings with God's people,

³⁹⁸ Ibid., 189.

³⁹⁹ Ibid., 190.

⁴⁰⁰ Ibid.

⁴⁰¹ Ibid., 193.

and so his story cannot be simply and decisively told.”⁴⁰² This implicitly means that sacramental mission is always ongoing, seeking to be contextualised in history, but even as it does so it repeatedly needs to be discerned and enacted. It is God’s act that must become body, must become historically enfleshed, but it does so through a human that responds authentically to God’s mission. Jesus’ mission is, therefore, always “unfinished”,⁴⁰³ always in need of appropriation and responsive action.

The absence within his theology of sacramentality “confirms the reality of a creative liberty, an agency not sealed and closed, but still obstinately engaged with a material environment and an historical process.”⁴⁰⁴ This is not simply proclaiming the truth of God’s mission, but is also “the patient diagnosis of untruths, and the reminding of the community where its attention belongs.”⁴⁰⁵ Jesus is never the possession of the community, because he is alive beyond qualification or risk, and it is he who ought to possess the community as they dispossess themselves for the sake of God’s mission.

Conclusion

The above has shown that in Williams’ theology of sacramentality is a construal of sacrament as Incarnation in its fullest Christological implications. This means for sacramentality that mission is the meeting of material and divine in order to transform the material towards divine purposes. This does not mean that the material – the humanity of the church or of human persons – is lost, but rather, is indwelt by God’s Spirit. In this engagement of human and Spirit, the human person becomes like Christ (indwelt by Christ’s Spirit to act like Christ). The mission of the church and of human persons is to show forth what God’s purposes are: to live out Christ’s life; to seek and engage suffering; and to be sacraments of repossessed life towards which all humanity is called. This does not mean Christian disciples are perfected or become moral heroes, but simply that they are gradually being sanctified, and out of this sanctity good may come from God’s power. The church and the Christian disciple represent, like sacraments, the transitioning – a verb, not a static noun of completion – to new identity (divine act) whilst also existing simultaneously with a flawed identity. Sacraments and the church point us not simply to the future, but they also critique our contemporary state. Thus, sacraments are grace and judgment, opportunity and failure, holiness and God-forsakenness.

⁴⁰² Ibid.

⁴⁰³ Ibid., 194.

⁴⁰⁴ Ibid., 196.

⁴⁰⁵ Ibid.

Williams's sacramental theology, viewed through the lens of mission, is not romanticised or idealised, nor is mission seen as something easily done. In contrast, Williams' view is inextricably tied to the sacramental de-centring mission does in the church, in the lives of disciples, and in the cosmos itself. What begs the question, and not much attention is paid to it in Williams's theology, is the notion of Christ's entire life. If mission is conceived through the lens of sacramentality, as I am arguing, then to participate and imitate Christ's life cannot be only concerned about the Cross, but it must also concern itself with Christ's entire ministerial life. To develop our liturgical theology of mission from the lens of sacramentality, the need to broaden the conception of mission Christologically to include his entire life will be the focus of the next Chapter.

Chapter 5

Ministerial Vision for Prophetic Mission:

Delores S. Williams on Mission and Implications for a Sacramental View of Mission

Introduction:

This Chapter will expand upon the sacramental theology of mission discussed in the previous Chapter. As we have seen in liturgical theologies of mission (in Chapter 3) as well as the notion(s) of mission in the official documents of mission from the Vatican (in Chapter 2), there is a common underlying idealised view of mission and liturgy as liberative. Human persons are not always open to dispossession of the self in favour of God's mission. Human persons are able to resist God's mission. This is a view of resistance in the negative; yet, Delores S. Williams presents a positive quality of resistance, not of God, but of that which is contrary to God's ways. Indeed, this theology of resistance is something very much imbedded in Delores S. Williams' womanist theology. In order to develop a concomitant expanded notion of sacramental mission, we now turn to Delores S. Williams' theology in the hopes of exploring how human persons can live out God's mission not only within the liturgy but also in the various contexts in which the individual finds him/herself.

In this Chapter, then, we turn to the theology of Delores S. Williams. Williams herself critiques the liturgy from a place not at the centre of the church, or even from a theological centre, but from the margins, a place Rowan D. Williams argued is where the church needs to listen and to engage in order to be challenged to live out Christ's mission more faithfully and robustly. Rowan D. Williams, as not only a bishop, but also as the Archbishop of Canterbury, was not in the margins of the church; he was in a position of authority and was a symbol of Anglican Communion worldwide, not to mention the significance of this role the Archbishop of Canterbury has within the national and political workings of England and Wales, and of the United Kingdom more broadly through his role in the House of Lords. So whilst his theology seeks out the voices of the margins, he himself was and is at the centre of ecclesial-theological discourse.

Delores S. Williams herself is a womanist theologian, that is, an African American female theologian, who reflects on and critiques theological discourse from the perspective of an African American woman.⁴⁰⁶ In particular, she is well aware of the place of African

⁴⁰⁶ Womanist theology, M. Shawn Copeland contends, "signals a perspective or approach that places the differentiated (e.g., religious, personal, cultural, social, psychological, biological) experience of African American women at the hermeneutical center of theological inquiry and

American women within the church and how theology throughout the ages has neglected not only African American women but also some equally important members of the church, such as women who are poor, those who identify as queer, those who lack education, and those who are socio-economically marginalised. Not only do these concerns for those most marginalised address Rowan D. Williams' (and *Evangelii gaudium's*) challenge to take the margins seriously in theology, but they also help us to construct a sacramental theology of mission that does not posit a highly distinctive ecclesial relationship with society that results in a competitive dialectic. Delores S. Williams' theology is imbued with the recognition that the activity of mission, the church itself, as well as its liturgy, and society(ies) as a whole is marked by oppression for those at the margins of society and/or the church. If Rowan D. Williams helped me in situating mission as holiness in the process of decentring the church and one's self for the good of God's mission, then Delores S. Williams augments this vis-à-vis the social sin of oppression, deeply a part of her theology. In particular, she will help to expand my definition of mission as holiness to include the daily survival and resistance to oppression that the oppressed suffer every day. In this way, then, mission is not always simply the dehumanisation of the other, but may also include an initial step prior to dehumanisation, or more precisely, a step towards dehumanisation which, I will show, includes daily survival and resistance to dehumanisation.

My method throughout this Chapter will be to examine Delores S. Williams' critique of liberation, her construal of resistance, and how her Christology helps in the task of constructing a liturgical theology of mission. In addition, Delores S. Williams' own theology is rooted not only in the transformation of the self, but also in the living out of Christ's own ministry that challenges structural oppression of those marginalised and oppressed. Her distinctive notion of living out Christ's own ministry will also expand the notion of mission as holiness as imitation of Christ's life. These will be shown to be for Williams the fundamental priorities for contemporary disciples.

5.1 Delores S. Williams: A Mission Theology from the Margins

5.1.1 An Unromanticised View of Exodus

A great deal of liberationist theologies turn to the Exodus account as a paradigm for the type of liberation God desires for human persons living with and under oppression.⁴⁰⁷ God liberates the Israelites from their oppressive enslavement in the land of Egypt. God leads them to the Promised Land where they will no longer experience slavery; there, they will

research, reflection, judgment" from "Womanist Theology," in *The New Catholic Encyclopedia*, Vol. 14, (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press/Gale, 2003), 822.

⁴⁰⁷ See Peter Hebblethwaite, "Let My People Go: The Exodus and Liberation Theology," *Religion, State and Society* 21, No. 1 (1993): 105-114.

have enough food to eat, they will be free to do meaningful work, and they will finally be content. This narrative of the Exodus event suggests that enslaved people can and will find total liberation in the present. Not only does such a construal of liberation suggest a complete transformation of the present is possible in the here and now, but it also raises the question of whether the Exodus experience was really as idyllic as these theologies suggest.

In her deconstruction of the Exodus event, Delores S. Williams notes the destructive force this form of liberation historically wrought on those *not* chosen by God. The Israelites, she proffers, committed genocide against the Canaanites, robbed the land and homes of a people that was already living in what would become the Promised Land. Even if one wanted to justify the Exodus experience as liberative for Israel, it was itself not without costs to those who did not belong to the elected people of Israel. Moses, the one who encountered God so intimately yet transcendently in the burning bush was forbidden by God to enter the Promised Land. The Israelites themselves suffered loss of lives as they trekked from Egypt to the Promised Land, fighting battles, and surely some of the people died from natural death over the forty years wandering in the desert. Not all of the Israelites themselves, therefore, experienced liberation. Williams, however, notes that those peoples who lost their lives and their land to violence wrought by God's People in the quest for the Promised Land, these displaced refugees did not find liberation. In other words, what Williams is drawing the reader's attention to is that not only is liberation from oppression advantageous for the Israelites but it was itself oppressive to others who were not a part of the Israelites. It was, unfortunately, also destructive to the Canaanite's humanity itself.

The implication of Williams' deconstructive reading of the Exodus event's form of liberation itself, therefore, remains in a *competitive* dialectic between two contrasting sides – those chosen by God and those who were not. The competition remains between those chosen by God, that is, the recipients of God's favour, and the losers who lose lives, land, and a basic quality of life. Could not Israel have found liberation and a quality of life which did not entail competition, but rather one based on cooperation? Must the oppressed and the oppressor always be in dialectical competition? This begs the question, is liberation the best *telos* for mission, particularly when one's liberation means the oppression or destruction of another? In particular, does this mean that Williams herself rejects liberation for a different way of realising a quality of life that serves all humanity, rather than simply some peoples? The implication, I will show later, for a liturgical theology of mission means that mission may result in the liberation of those with whom the church cooperates to live out Christ's mission in the world, as well as that the goals of mission for the church may not need to be construed competitively with the world.

Williams' own theology does not necessarily forgo liberation completely, but what she does insist on is that liberation as the *telos* of what I would call mission is best construed not as a competitive dialectic, and rather envisages *resistance* against the forces that would

wield death and oppression towards any human person. In the Exodus, for example, Israel should have resisted any actions that would have caused oppression towards any other person or group. In the face of oppression, the oppressed ought, Williams contends, to find “a way out of no way.”⁴⁰⁸ This is shorthand for the total theological project Williams is constructing. In the midst of oppression, one cannot be content that one *will* find liberation, because this suggests not only that liberation will be achieved in actuality, but also that simply because one may be liberated from oppression the person may still be lacking in a life of quality. Stated another way, for Williams, liberation and quality of life cannot be reduced into one another. Speaking of the emancipation of slaves after the Civil War in the United States, Williams recalls how slaves were freed, i.e., they found liberation from slavery, but their *survival* was still questionable due to lack of education, inability to find meaningful work, continual racism in parts of the Southern States, and so forth. They were liberated, but they needed to be able to survive so that their quality of life might be improved. Therefore, by *romanticising* liberation, it would be easy to neglect the ramifications and the consequences following from liberation, as well as the fact that something more basic, a dignified human life, entails both liberation and a quality of life. If looked through the context of the contemporary official Roman Catholic documents on mission, “a way out of no way” suggests that resistance against destructive forces is to resist against forces that participate in dehumanisation.

Williams herself offers a less romanticised view of liberation due to the fact she privileges the necessity for a quality of life over and above liberation. Though, as we will see, this does not mean that Williams rejects liberation, but rather, liberation must be sought *along with* or *subsequent to* a dignified human life. Moreover, Williams’ approach is to prioritise the existential and historical context of those living in oppression over an idealised notion of liberation. In other words, the implication here for a liturgical theology of mission is how mission contends with the historical context in which disciples, and the larger society itself, is struggling for a quality of life under oppression, especially with a particular concern for those marginalised, excluded, and oppressed. This means mission as holiness is not simply anti-marginalisation⁴⁰⁹ but the church’s concern for the quality of life for those oppressed in society. In this way, dehumanisation expands to focus not simply on the full liberation of those marginalised, but the prior step of recognising that mission may include the daily survival of those oppressed on the margins of society and church. Dehumanisation expands, I would suggest, to include the daily survival of those living under oppression. The complexity of these two complementary and interrelated *purposes* of mission is exemplified

⁴⁰⁸ Delores S. Williams, *Sisters in the Wilderness: The Challenge of Womanist God-Talk* (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1993), ix.

⁴⁰⁹ See Chapter 2, pages 00.

for Williams in the biblical account of Hagar in Genesis, an account containing two stories of Hagar which embody significantly the experience of African American women's plight before and after emancipation from slavery.

5.1.2 *Hagar in the Wilderness: Mission as Quality of Life*

The first story of Hagar recounts how she escapes enslavement from Sarai, and flees into the wilderness. In this story, therefore, Hagar has finally achieved liberation from slavery under Abraham and Sarai; however, Hagar's life is at stake. There in the desert, she is pregnant, lacking in food and water, and has no ability to keep herself alive. An angel appears to Hagar, and for Williams this is a manifestation of God, a God present "in the midst of her [Hagar's] personal suffering and destitution"⁴¹⁰, and tells Hagar to return to the oppression of slavery under Sarai and to be obedient to her. "The angel of the LORD found her by a spring of water in the wilderness, the spring on the way to Shur. ⁸ And he said, 'Hagar, slave-girl of Sarai, where have you come from and where are you going?' She said, 'I am running away from my mistress Sarai.' ⁹ The angel of the LORD said to her, 'Return to your mistress, and submit to her.'"⁴¹¹ Why would God command Hagar, who escaped from slavery, that is, found liberation, to return to oppression? Williams argues it is because Hagar's most immediate need is *not* liberation but a more fundamental instinct to survive. Despite the fact that Hagar was "momentarily in control of her destiny" she was still "without the support and physical sustenance a pregnant woman needs."⁴¹² At least under slavery she would have a bed, food to eat, and the resources to give birth to her child. In other words, what was most pressing was not liberation but the very survival, or what Williams calls the "quality of life" of Hagar and her infant.

How might the distinction between liberation and quality of life connect to a mission theology? As we have seen before, the Second Vatican Council and Post-Vatican II mission documents offer two contrasting though complementary concepts for mission: mission as holiness is both contemplation and justice, that is, living in (participation) and out of (*mimesis*) Christ's life for the good of those marginalised. Rowan D. Williams' theology likewise was rooted in the individual being transformed by the act of God in order to grow in God's divine holiness. Delores S. Williams, however, does not even deal with holiness explicitly (though below I suggest that she has an implicit though partial notion of mission as holiness imbedded in her theology), though her notion of quality of life is intimately tied to justice that serves those oppressed in the world. All three, however, have a deep concern for those not at the centre of the church's life, and though mission is to help alleviate

⁴¹⁰ Williams, *Sisters in the Wilderness*, 20.

⁴¹¹ Genesis 16. 7-11. *New Revised Standard Version*.

⁴¹² Williams, *Sisters in the Wilderness*, 20.

marginalisation, Delores S. Williams is less idealised in how much mission can really liberate the marginalised from oppression. For Hagar, justice is not the liberation from slavery but the meeting of her basic needs. The Divine meeting did not initiate holiness for Hagar, but rather, it did transform her goal from one of liberation to one of survival. If the other mission theologies stress holiness as the primary lens for mission, Williams accents justice as the more pressing need. The implication is that full liberation, or holiness, will be lacking, or more precisely, will be far from perfect in an imperfect world, with imperfect human persons. Further implications of this notion of mission as justice will be made clearer below.

Yet, whilst these two poles of mission seem distinct, they are actually very closely related, particularly because Rowan D. Williams and the official Roman Catholic mission documents understand holiness not simply as transformation of the internal person towards God's mission, but also as the living out of justice. As I argued in Chapter 2, mission as holiness entails both contemplation and justice. Where these two poles of mission contrast with one another is that liberation is not only construed from a more anthropological need to survive in Delores S. Williams' account, but also liberation and survival are not simply ecclesial, personal, or spiritual, but there is a socio-political edge to them. Oppression could be in society, in the home, as well as possibly even in the church itself. So holiness must also, as Williams' theology implies, have more than a spiritual and ecclesial characteristic; one that engages in the world wherever oppression may take place.

This theme is found throughout the Conciliar and Post-conciliar documents on mission, in Rowan D. Williams' sacramental theology, and now in Delores S. Williams. The given reality of the world, that is, how things are in the historical present, is where to begin to ask how the ecclesial act of mission might address the quality of life of those marginalised. Unlike some liturgical theologies of mission, the central concern is not how liturgy participates in mission, but rather that mission is de-centred from the liturgy to the present context of those marginalised in order to address the quality of life of those in need.

Rather than seeing mission as simply liberation from sin and the forces that deny the quality of life, in Williams' theology, mission is far more *tangible* and *realistic*, or perhaps *basic*, to the contextual situation of the person. When there is seemingly no other option, as exemplified in Hagar's situation, God gives the gift of survival, that is, a "new vision", "to see survival resources where she saw none before."⁴¹³ This *meeting* between God and Hagar is sacramental, not simply because it was a meeting, but because as we saw in Chapter 4,⁴¹⁴ sacramentality is the meeting between God and the human person and/or the church in such a way as to bring about the transformation towards holiness. Williams expands the notion of mission as holiness, because it is not simply the human person who resists sin and evil, but the marginalised who are met by Christian disciples in the ecclesial act of mission find a

⁴¹³ Williams, *Sisters in the Wilderness*, 31.

⁴¹⁴ See Chapter 4, pages 00.

sense of holiness – that is, they are gradually transforming from circumstances of dehumanisation to a deeper, hopefully, quality of life. Mission as holiness, therefore, is not simply a personal quality, nor a social phenomenon, but a personal, ecclesial, and social transformation that includes resisting dehumanisation by addressing quality of life.

Yet, it was not simply enough for God to “meet” Hagar in her situation, that is, God did more than simply become present to Hagar. God provided her not only a vision to survive, but this meeting brought about the participation of Hagar in God’s own mission. She had a part in God’s mission, even though she was unable to see what the full divine mission was at that moment. This meeting entails not simply a *dialogue* between God and Hagar, but rather the meeting provided a source of *enlightenment* that allowed Hagar to make her way back to oppression, in order to survive for the moment. Building on this idea, then, the act of ecclesial mission finds new insights in how to live in and out of mission by dialoguing with, and coming to know what is needed for the quality of life of those marginalised. Vision becomes important epistemologically, that is, how is vision known, and Christologically, viz-à-viz knowing how to enact God’s vision. This construal of vision will become important in constructing a liturgical theology of mission later in this Chapter by extending knowing of mission from liturgical participation to a broader notion of mission as holiness.

5.1.3 Finding God’s Vision in the Midst of Oppression

Much like Rowan D. Williams, Delores S. Williams construes the present existential characteristic of the human person as being that the need for the divine gift of vision or knowledge which is always partial. There is a sense that God’s mission for Hagar is apophatic. Williams uses the word “vision” as the basis of knowing what God’s offer of a quality of life is contextually. The use of mission, in contrast, may better acknowledge what Williams herself is trying to argue; namely, that whilst God’s ways may not be known apart from God’s own initiative, God provides less a vision and more a mission for the person who participates in the meeting with God. In other words, there is the possibility to gain enlightenment, and the source of that new mission emerges from the meeting between God and the human person. One’s own vision is never enough; it must emerge from the very meeting with God. The meeting itself is efficacious in terms of mission because it is simultaneously sacramental, God entering into human history, meeting the person within their context, and providing a path towards survival, especially when none seems possible. God, according to Williams, does two things for Hagar. God provides both a new consciousness in the present context, and also the gift of empowerment to act in such a way as to survive and have a quality of life that allows the person to endure oppression. In this way, mission is empowered agency.

As I will show later, mission would be better construed not only as liberation, but as survival and resistance not only to socio-political oppression, as Williams is concerned with,

but oppression rendered as all sinful forces seeking to oppress the living out of God's mission. Where Williams suggests resistance to oppression, I will broaden resistance as not simply forces that oppress but also the very sinful context of the human person that causes them to oppress in the first place. In some ways, Delores S. Williams and Rowan D. Williams both share a negative view of humanity and the world, as it is either a world that oppresses (Delores S. Williams) or it is a place of competition and flawed human love (Rowan D. Williams).⁴¹⁵ They also share the notion that what one (or the church) is able to do is always imperfect and fragile, thus not guaranteeing either perfection or liberation. Yet, their distinction is on the emphasis of how to engage with sin. Delores S. Williams is concerned about the sin of institutions – social sin – that structuralises sin and causes systemic oppression. This is in distinct contrast to Rowan D. Williams, for whom sin is rooted in human competition and flawed love, and thus sin is more individual than it is social. This does not mean that Rowan D. Williams does not address social forces, but the actual engagement between love and flawed love, wherever they are to be found, offer the potentiality for transfiguration towards God's mission. These are not necessarily competitive, but rather seek to acknowledge that God's mission is always to resist, survive and be liberated from sin, whether spiritual, structural, economic, political, or personal.

The categories of spiritual, structural, economic, political and personal are not simply liturgical terms, but terms referencing daily activities. In this way, God's mission is directed at transformation of sin, dehumanisation, and marginalisation, by grace, into humanisation and inclusion. These categories taken together, then, suggest the church's mission is to find inclusion for the marginalised in all levels and areas of daily living. Mission is broad and directed to world activities without restricting mission to liturgical activities. The role of liturgy within this mission is an important key issue that needs to be addressed, and will be later on in this Chapter. Before that, Williams offers a biblical example of the political and economic impact on daily life that will help to show how mission might be construed to address economic and political marginalisation.

5.1.4 *The Political and Economic Realities of Oppression: Mission as Resistance*

If this first wilderness experience of Hagar is the individual person meeting and responding to God's act, the second wilderness experience in the second narrative in Genesis is related to the domestic sphere. In Genesis 21, Hagar and Ishmael are sent away from by Abraham after Sarai insists that her own son will not have to share an inheritance with Ishmael. Cast into the desert, after using up all of the water and food Abraham gave to them, thirsty and

⁴¹⁵ Here is where a Protestant theological anthropology is most apparent. The distinction between a depraved theological anthropology of Luther and especially Calvin is typically contrasted with a Roman Catholic and Orthodox theological anthropology of deprived. Luther argued for a *theologia crucis* in opposition to a *theologia gloria*, whilst Barth rejected analogy because he proffered that it leads to human arrogance since God could be known through a natural theology (*analogia entis*).

hungry, lacking a place of shelter, God hears Hagar crying and provides water for them to survive. God also prophesises that Ishmael will grow up and become part of a great nation. The first story Williams proffers and as we have seen above, is about the individual's spiritual quest to survive. God's gift of new vision was the work of the Spirit, who empowered Hagar to return to her situation. The second story takes on a political and economic turn. Economic, because Hagar and Ishmael are sent away so that Ishmael would not gain an inheritance, thus elevating their status within the community and the family.⁴¹⁶ "Abraham has given Hagar and his son no economic resources to sustain them in their life away from the family. Hagar and Ishmael seem consigned to a future of poverty and homelessness."⁴¹⁷ Unlike Rowan D, Williams's construal of existential and spiritual homelessness, Delores S. Williams brings to the fore the economic realities of literally being homeless, that is, economically deprived of a quality of life. The present-day import of this narrative to contemporary African American women is related familiarly by Williams:

The African-American community has taken Hagar's story unto itself. Hagar has 'spoken' to generation after generation of black women because her story has been validated as true by suffering black people. She and Ishmael together, as family, model many black American families in which a lone woman/mother struggles to hold the family together in spite of the poverty to which ruling class economics consign it. Hagar, like many black women, goes into the wide world to make a living for herself and her child, with only God by her side.⁴¹⁸

In this regard, then, Delores S. Williams takes Rowan D. Williams's sacramentality one step further, I maintain, by suggesting that poverty is not simply spiritual – the lack of Divine Love – but that economic situations where one's life is impoverished economically needs to be taken account of in a liturgical theology of mission. In other words, the entire historicity of human living must be rooted in a concern for the quality of life in its entire dimension: economical, existential, political, and spiritual.

This biblical example demonstrates that the marginalised do not need simply spiritual quality of life, but a quality of life that covers the entire existential reality of the a person's life. Those who may be economically or politically marginalised may come to liturgy, and may participate fully within the liturgy, where they may not even be marginalised. During the liturgy, they are spiritually nourished. But when they leave the liturgy, and go back into the daily struggle for a quality of life economically and politically, a bifurcation takes place between liturgy and daily living. Mission in and during the liturgy is fruitful, but how exactly is mission addressing the present context of the marginalised? The marginalised at liturgy are participating in God's mission liturgically, and are, therefore, deepening their identity in

⁴¹⁶ Ibid., 28.

⁴¹⁷ Ibid., 29.

⁴¹⁸ Ibid., 33.

Christ. Equally important to *mimesis* of Christ's life is the enactment of imitating Christ in the world, at all levels (economic, political, spiritual, and so forth), and Williams is able to extend the notion of mission by articulating how living out of Christ's life encompasses one's entire life (spiritually, politically, and economically).

Williams offers an epistemology for coming to know God's vision. There are three possible modes of gaining access to God's mission for Williams. The first is the subjective, that is, within one's own prayer life and reflecting on the richness of the scriptures. Here the person herself or himself reflects personally on discerning what is God's mission within the various prayers and according to the scriptures. Williams herself is cautious about allowing one's own subjective experience to dominate in gaining access to God's vision. There is a sense that one's own experience, or one's ability to know God's vision, is always partial at best, and perhaps distorted at worse.⁴¹⁹ She states:

One last word must be said about womanist god-talk in general. As black women retrieving our experience from 'invisibility,' each of us retrieves from the underside of the underside partial facts about ourselves and partial visions of missing parts of our experience. So, in theology, our womanist work together is to connect these pieces of fact and vision. Like a mosaic, these 'colored pieces' will eventually make many designs of black women's experience. These designs, as well as the pieces that compose them, will be available to serve as 'pieces' for future generations of black women seeking to understand and describe women's experience anew in light of the relation between the past and changing times.⁴²⁰

There is a sense that one's own experience must enter into dialogue with the experience of others in order to enlarge one's own vision. Epistemologically, this suggests that what one knows is enlarged by trying to understand what other people know through a process of dialogue. This communal, dialogical form is always partial, so that the "mosaic" is always being reshaped and enlarged as more voices enter that dialogue. Dianne M. Stewart notes a contradiction within Williams' notion of experience, particularly as experience is used singularly rather than experiences. There is, as Serene Jones would argue in her critique of Williams, no such thing as one "Black experience", which would be an essentialist notion of

⁴¹⁹ The apophatic, *theologia crucis*, that lies behind this claim is one that rejects analogy, or *theologia entis*. Whilst this problem cannot be solved here, Elizabeth A. Johnson notes that a healthy suspicion of our analogies (or image of God) is beneficial because such a stance allows one to critique images that are not liberative for all human persons and creation. Yet, analogies do allow something to be said of God in a positive though partial way. Johnson states that twentieth century Catholic theology has refused "to understand analogy as a hybrid between univocity and equivocity; rather, [this movement] insists on the original nature of the analogical relationship that grounds subsequent speech. We exist analogously, in and through being grounded in holy mystery which always surpasses us" (Idem., *She Who Is: The Mystery of God in Feminist Theological Discourse* [New York: Crossroad, 1992], 116). Therefore, speech about God from a contemporary Catholic perspective stresses "the nonliteral although still meaningful character of its speech about God" (Ibid.). This is helpful in terms of recognising that liturgical speech of God is partial but can still be meaningful. Whilst Protestants and Catholics may not agree on this issue, both contend "there is [a] basic agreement that the mystery of God is fundamentally unlike anything else we know of, and so is beyond the grasp of all our naming" (Ibid., 117).

⁴²⁰ Ibid., 12.

race and gender in the Black community,⁴²¹ but Stewart offers a more generous reading of Williams by situating the use of experience in the overall project of Williams. Stewart argues “that it is actually a necessary outcome of her commitment to exposing the systematic and structural nature of racist sexism, experienced by Black females over several centuries.”⁴²² In this way, whilst Williams is more concerned about the overall experience of oppression African American women have been recipients of, it does not necessarily mean that experience is not contextual. I will show momentarily that the contextual experience is where immediate oppression is felt, and it is there that one resists oppression.

The second mode includes the communal events and persons the community identifies with. The move here is from personal, that is the subjective individual, to the larger context of a communal body, most especially the church community. The assumption, though Williams does not say this, is that this body may challenge any subjective knowing of God’s mission acquired in personal reflection. The idiosyncratic interpretations are critiqued and judged, it would seem, by the wider body. But as we saw in Rowan D. Williams, there is also a sense that the community itself is not perfectly holy (that is, free from sin), and therefore, there is always a need for the community itself to be judged and critiqued by how well it lives according to God’s mission. So Rowan D. Williams’ view that *society* itself can be a critique against which to judge the ecclesial community’s own living out of God’s mission can further enhance and augment Delores S. Williams’ own second mode of knowing God’s mission. Even a negative experience of oppression in society can be “an anti-sacrament” calling the individual and the ecclesial community to actively resist and reshape their living out of God’s mission according to the contextual encounter with and in society. In this way, the community and the individual are acting as prophetic signposts of God’s loving justice in the world.

The third mode includes the objective elements of the Christian tradition: scripture and liturgy. But this objective mode includes not only the sources of God’s positive revelation, but also the *negative* situation (oppression) in which the person and/or the community finds itself. For Williams, the engagement with these sources of revelation within a given context entails the subjective as well as the communal interpretation in order to identify God’s vision for this time and this place. That is to say, Williams’ liberationist theology is inherently epistemological. In this sense, Williams is careful to ensure that God’s vision is indeed discerned to be *God’s* vision because the context *and* the revelation of God must both engage with the individual and the church in order to live out that vision within the

⁴²¹ Serene Jones, “Women’s Experience’ Between a Rock and a Hard Place: Feminist, Womanist and *Mujerista* Theologies in North America,” *Religious Studies Review* 21, no. 3 (July 1995): 171-178.

⁴²² Dianne M. Stewart, “Womanist God-Talk on the Cutting Edge of Theology and Black Religious Studies: Assessing the Contribution of Delores S. Williams”, *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* 58, Nos. 3-4 (Fall 2004), 68.

context. This practical process takes the various ways in which God's mission is and is not being manifested both in liturgy (or the ecclesial body) and within society. This also suggests that contexts vary, and therefore, there is no one single experience of oppression or of women. Thus, whilst Williams uses experience in the singular, embedded in her theology is a clear concern that those oppressed look to the given, historical reality of the context in order to shape how resistance might be developed as a response.

There is no competitive dialectic between society and liturgy/church. Rather, especially if Rowan D. Williams's own "pre-sacramental state" is taken as part of Delores S. Williams's tripartite epistemology there is a necessary need, and one would hope, desire, to engage society in such a fashion as to discern how and in what ways the liturgy, the community and society are living (or not) according to God's mission. In other words, what is sinful within that context must be discerned in order that the quality of life, or a transfiguration in Rowan D. Williams's theology, within the context may be challenged, and hopefully, transformed for those most marginalised. In this sense, then, the salvation of the church, as well as society, is at stake since the task of Christian disciples is to look to the margins in order to discern what oppresses the marginalised.

Joan M. Martin alludes to the salvific quality of the type of engagement Williams is proposing in her tripartite epistemology: "While those expressions [of survival] may address the past historical experience and utter a hope for the future, it is primarily a telling about the present condition, state of affairs, needs, and the desire to be saved."⁴²³ Though Martin remains at the level of "telling", that is the narrative level of engagement, Williams is more concerned about how knowledge leads to action, to the agency of those whose quality of life is lacking. The basic need to survive in the midst of oppression is a type of loving action – a God who acts for the immediate concerns of the oppressed. That is, as Martin continues, this is "a response by God that is caring, but not necessarily fully redemptive."⁴²⁴ Martin notes that to care, that is, to love the other at most or be concerned for the welfare of the other, may not be redemptive, but the act of caring is itself what Christian disciples are called to do. This notion of redemption and caring will be discussed below as this relates intimately to Williams' construal of the import of Christology. For now, what is important is that this becomes God's mission not only to address spiritual needs, but also bodily needs of food, shelter, and so forth. The implication here is that, for Williams, mission is not simply spiritual, but it is also material (in the sense that mission is concerned with the basic needs of the human body in order to survive from oppressive conditions). Thus mission is spiritual, bodily, and political.

⁴²³ Joan M. Martin, "From Womanist Theology to Womanist Ethics: The Contribution of Delores S. Williams," *Union Seminary Quarterly Review*, 58 no 3 - no 4 (Fall 2004), 209.

⁴²⁴ Martin, 209.

Finding God's vision, this epistemological process implies, will be much like Hagar's own quest, it will be a *struggle*. The struggle, as implied in Williams' theology, is that the process is not as easy as it seems. Discernment will require dialogue over a significant time, and it will need to be intentional towards the three modes of knowing in order to adequately understand God's vision for the present conditions. The struggle may in fact emerge from communities where some people are opposed to the prophetic dimension of God's revelation, or where the community is not willing to engage with the local context in order to live out that vision. This is challenging, because it entails a slow, intentional discernment and a willingness to engage with one another as well as with society.

The struggle may also arise from the fact that one may be longing for liberation, but liberation may not occur immediately, in contrast, one is gifted with a vision to survive under oppression, just as Hagar herself was gifted not with liberation but with survival. This suggests that there will not be a direct path towards liberation, as it may be far off, and God's mission is sought for the present, historical ways that mission is not being lived out. What this does, therefore, is to *alter* the dialectic from church or liturgy versus the world, to a meeting between God's revelation and where that positive mission is lacking in the world, within the church, and even in the liturgy. In other words, for our purposes, the sacramental encounter with God's mission can be manifested *anywhere* (there is no limit to God's mission breaking into history), and the dialectic is not competitive, but rather, one that acknowledges and discerns how God's vision is being enacted (or not) within whatever context one finds one's self: liturgy, church, and/or society. In other words, mission does not occur only in the liturgy or even solely in the confines of the church. In a much fuller view of mission, Williams recognises that mission may even be hazardous, because it calls the church to go into those places most in need of care (in the positive), and in need of help in order to resist (in the negative) those forces of sin that cause oppression in the first place. This mission is hazardous because the church unites in solidarity with the oppressed by caring for their welfare and quality of life.

Going back to the previous example of God images we see how the liturgy itself can be oppressive. If the prayers of the liturgy only make use of male images for God, then it would be easy for women to see themselves lacking in their ability to participate in God's mission. As Elizabeth A. Johnson notes, what is not assumed into God is not redeemed, and if God cannot be imaged as a woman, then women cannot image God, and, therefore, women cannot be fully saved.⁴²⁵ For Johnson, what is at stake in the issue of female images for God is the salvation of womankind itself. Yet, for Williams, it is not simply creating images for God that engender liberation or even salvation, but rather, she goes one step beyond Johnson's prophetic proposal, by insisting that authentic participation in God's vision is more fundamental to disciples being saved, because it requires a prophetic stance to resist and to

⁴²⁵ Johnson, *She Who Is*, 153.

survive life under oppression. It is less what God looks like, and more what God does and seeks for the good of all humankind and creation that is imperative for Williams. In this sense, therefore, there is no dialectic of competition. For the world – in which the church and the liturgy are a part – to be as God wishes, then all human persons must be working together for the quality of life of the entire cosmos.

But are images for God to be abandoned? For Williams, they are not as important as participation in God's prophetic vision, so they may not necessarily be abandoned, which would be of concern with regard to the liturgy. In liturgical prayers, God is addressed, and so the naming of God that allows women and men, those marginalised and those at the centre of the church not simply to see themselves in the God images, but to hear their participation in the prayers addressed to God. Therefore, address of God and participation in God cannot be divorced, but a recognition that participation may be limited liturgically if one is marginalised by the prayers themselves.

Whilst the Holy Spirit empowers the human person to live according to God's mission, where does one today find knowledge of God's mission? For Williams, the notion of mission is found principally in Christology. So far, Williams has been concerned with the Genesis pericopes of Hagar, and even about discernment of revelation, but how does this relate to Christology? As we have seen thus far, there have been high Christologies at work within Schmemmann's liturgical theologies of mission, and yet there have been prophetic Christologies of imitation in Morrill, Power, Chauvet, and the Conciliar documents. I have argued, that participation in and imitation of Christ Jesus are two *interlinked, complementary* ways to live out mission. The imitation of Christ in Williams' theology is the concern of the next section, which will allow us to envisage Christological imitation not only as kenosis but also as resistance.

5.1.5 *Mission: Living Out Christ's Ministerial Life*

In Chapter 4⁴²⁶ I noted that relationship of sacrament to Incarnation. In particular, what Christ did in his acting in full obedience to God's mission revealed the Kingdom of God that yet exists. Whilst this seems paradoxical, the point is that because Christ was fully divine and fully human, he was able to live in and out of God's mission in such a way that it was salvific and liberative for those whom he met. Williams adds and expands this to suggest that liberation whilst always a potentiality, this side of the eschaton may still be far off. The Incarnation serves as the fulfilment of mission, complete and fully liberative for those oppressed. Yet, the very act of participating in God's call to live in and live out Christ's mission entails recognising that sin distorts and may even prevent the possibility of those marginalised to grow in their quality of life. There is a sense of humility, that as humans, it is

⁴²⁶ See Chapter 4, pages 00.

always God's act in and through human persons that first calls disciples to care, and what comes out of that care for the other cannot always be predicted. Earlier, I noted that Williams is critical of redemptive Christologies, and it is because she fears they support surrogacy roles of redemption, where African American women were surrogates for raising the master's children, for conceiving children for the master, and so forth. In these roles, slave women took the place of someone else, because the powerful slave master controlled the bodies of the slaves.⁴²⁷ She uses this to explore and critique surrogate notions of redemption, and this has particular bearing on how I have set up Christology thus far.

Delores S. Williams offers a Christology that expands our notion of sacramentality. To understand her Christology, we must first understand her soteriology. She approaches the cross very cautiously and yet with critical force. Any approach to the cross that would glorify the death of Jesus is questionable, she contends, because the cross itself was an instrument of torture and death by the Roman Empire, and to suggest that the cross is redemptive would entail that God wishes suffering and death.⁴²⁸ Rather, she argues, God brings life out of the human, sinful propensity to inflict death-dealing circumstances. God gave a new vision to humanity in the transformation of Christ. What is redemptive, therefore, is the *transformation* of life in the midst of death.⁴²⁹

Moreover, and helpful to our own concern for the initiation of Christ's own life, is the notion of the ministerial life of Christ. To reduce redemption to the cross, that is, the *death* of Jesus is to *neglect* the rest of his earthly life. What Christ Jesus did in his entire life was to show a new vision in the midst of death-dealing forces. He raised the dead, he cast out demons, he healed those afflicted physically, and he challenged inequitable economic situations in the Temple. These were all occasions of transforming the vision, that is, the raising of the consciousness of the people.⁴³⁰ In other words, Jesus resisted oppressive situations, and acted according to God's vision. The cross did not support this vision, but rather, was "opposed to this vision."⁴³¹ The implication here is that one need not die in order to find life. As we have seen in prior accounts, the question of participating in God's authentic mission was construed as a dying to one's self in order to find authentic life. For Williams, there are two reasons why human persons ought not to search out self-sacrifice or death-dealing forces.

⁴²⁷ Delores S. Williams, "Black Women's Surrogacy Experience and the Christian Notion of Redemption", in *Cross Examinations: Readings on the Meaning of the Cross Today*, ed. Marit Trelstad (Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 2006), 19.

⁴²⁸ Williams, *Sisters in the Wilderness*, 165-167.

⁴²⁹ *Ibid.*, 172-173.

⁴³⁰ *Ibid.*, 164-165.

⁴³¹ *Ibid.*, 165.

Firstly, those oppressed are *already* the recipients of death-dealing forces.⁴³² They do not have to seek death out, because they are already experiencing and living within these forces daily. These forces need healing and transformation, not continuation. The vision they need is not to seek out more forces of death, or even to see these forces as salvific or somehow bettering them as disciples, but rather, to be given a quality of life that supports life in the midst of suffering and oppression.

Secondly, at its very root, death (i.e., death-dealing forces) distorts God's vision; that is, death is not an entrance into God's mission, and is, therefore, directly contrary to death. Quite rightly, Williams notes that the crucifixion entailed the mocking of, the violent hurting of, and destroying of the human body.

The execution destroyed the body, but not before it mocked and defiled it. The cross thus becomes an image of defilement, a gross manifestation of collective human sin. Jesus, then, does not conquer sin through death on the cross. Rather, Jesus conquers the sin of temptation in the wilderness (Matthew 4.1-11) by resisting...death.... Jesus therefore conquers sin in life, not in death.⁴³³

Therefore, as Williams notes, the cross mocked and destroyed his body, and it also, by implication, was an act against to mock and destroy the very mission he embodied. The cross, therefore, is antithetical to God's mission, or for Williams, God's vision. Therefore one must resist death rather than actively seeking it out, in order that God's gift of God's self, God's life in and through the Holy Spirit, must be transformed.

In much the same ways as Rowan D. Williams, Delores S. Williams is much more concerned about transforming current sinful practises, but does not her critique of Jesus' death challenge the kenotic Christology of Rowan D. Williams? His three-part sacramental theology rests heavily on the dispossession of one self in order to be repossessed by God. Dispossession, as I noted, need not be construed as actively seeking suffering or death, that is, the cross. In contrast, Rowan D. Williams recognises that suffering and sin are the context into which human persons live, and mission, I argued, is not only to be *transfigured* (living in) but also to be *transfiguring* (living out) suffering and death. Dispossession is giving up competitive relations with others for one of deepening relationships. Therefore, the three-part sacramental theology of Rowan D. Williams does not conflict with Delores S. Williams' concerns against seeing death as redemptive. Both agree that transforming sin is the cause or desire of God, not death. Delores S. Williams, however, extends Rowan D. Williams' theology by seeing Christ's ministerial life as constitutive to mission in addition to death and resurrection.

How does resistance, then, fit into the transformed vision? Because there is a much more realistic and less idealised vision of God's mission – that is, survival not liberation –

⁴³² Williams, *Sisters in the Wilderness*, 162.

⁴³³ *Ibid.*, 166.

then resistance is more like a holding out against those death-wielding forces. This is evidenced in how Williams relates Jesus's resisting temptation whilst he was in the wilderness. Of course, the *pericope* is concerned with Jesus and temptation, and Williams understands temptation as the forces of oppression trying to distort God's vision. In the face of forces trying to bring about great imbalances of death over life, Jesus resisted temptation. As Williams notes, "he refused to allow evil forces to defile the balanced relation between the material and the spiritual, between life and death, between power and the exploitation of it."⁴³⁴ Here, Williams acknowledges explicitly that sin "defile[s] the balanced relation", in other words, sin is not only something that the church and the world share in at the anthropological level, but it also sets up unbalanced relations resulting in a competitive dialectic between two contrasting poles, whether that is life and death, male and female, or poor and rich. The sin of temptation leads one to want to set up opposing relations where none ought to exist. The challenge of God's mission, then, as Williams seems to suggest, is that there will always be the struggle of the person with temptation – to create imbalances that create oppression.

5.2 Implications of Delores S. Williams' Theology for a Liturgical Theology of Mission

Whilst Williams does not employ a notion of mission as holiness, she does have a strong sense of mission as holiness which stresses the justice aspect of imitating Christ's life. Unlike Rowan D. Williams, in contrast, who overbalances contemplation for justice, Delores S. Williams stresses justice over contemplation. If taken together, however, these two Christological categories of mission are able to balance one another out. Rowan D. Williams' participatory Christology suggests the transformation that occurs when God is met in circumstances where one is open to the Divine Act that can transfigure the persons towards God's mission. Delores S. Williams' emphasis on Jesus resisting death in the desert, and that sin can be conceived as temptation to participate in death at all levels of socio-location, is quite conducive to Rowan D. Williams' sacramental theology. The anti-sacrament is living a life of not only competing against others, but life is full of the temptation to and possible acts of competition that pit persons and institutions against one another – to see others fail, and so their quality of life is diminished.

Returning to Williams' example of Hagar, we are reminded that Hagar had no power to take care of her basic resources: food and water; nor did she have adequate means to provide resources for birthing a child in the wilderness. What is important, therefore, in Williams' theology is not only the quality of one's *holiness* (resisting the temptation to dehumanise others), but also, one's ability to follow God's vision of *surviving* under oppression. Williams, therefore, extends the notion of mission as holiness to include the quality of life of those marginalised and in need. Earlier, mission as holiness was linked to

⁴³⁴ Ibid.

goodness, but not necessarily in the sense of one's own goodness but for the good of the other. One need not be perfectly good or holy, but holiness is directed back to the act of God that takes place in the act of mission by the Christian disciple. It is God who acts to further holiness, and this holiness becomes tangible when the quality of life of the marginalised is addressed at all levels. There is no romanticising the notion of mission here, because one need not be a hero, nor does the act of mission need to liberate the marginalised, it simply needs, in that moment to help someone grow in their quality of life.

Williams' theology does not shrink away from engagement with the world. Rather, the world may contain its share of sin, evil, and oppression, but it is not outright viewed negatively. Moreover, the person, the church, or the family should not disengage from the world, because to do so would be to disengage from God's mission to resist evil wherever it is found. The Roman Catholic documents on the domestic church (the family) did not consider that families can be dysfunctional, and therefore not always sources of love and well-being. Williams, on the other hand, recognises that "the adversary [of a Black woman] does not only exist in other worlds..., but when he/it lives in her own house."⁴³⁵ In addition, there are political and economic dimensions to mission if it is to engage with the world in all of its dimensions. Threats to human survival can come not only from other individuals, but also from the government, the church, the family, and other structural entities. Williams notes that even the church and the church's liturgy have had aspects that needed to be endured and resisted. Williams

contends that the African American church in its various denominational manifestations often functions as a two-edged sword. Its patriarchal and androcentrically biased liturgy and leadership arrogates black women's worth on the one hand, while the church simultaneously functions as the subaltern sacred space wherein black women find reprieve from the burdens of life that regularly threaten their bodies and souls.⁴³⁶

Even as Black women found strength in hearing God's word and encountering God in worship, the liturgy itself contained patriarchal and androcentric influences. The preacher was a male, and spoke to male experience whilst the language for God was male.⁴³⁷ Even the church and its liturgy at times need to be resisted and endured even whilst it continues to provide strength. Interestingly, even here, Williams does not proffer that one disengage from liturgy, even when there are components that are oppressive, rather, because God is working (despite humanity's shortcomings) there still may be ways to be strengthened in and

⁴³⁵ Eboni Marshall Turman, *Toward a Womanist Ethic of Incarnation: Black Bodies, the Black Church, and the Council of Chalcedon* (New York: Palgrave, 2013), 144

⁴³⁶ *Ibid.*, 141.

⁴³⁷ Williams, *Sisters in the Wilderness*, xii; Delores S. Williams, "Straight Talk, Plain Talk: Womanist Words about Salvation in a Social Context," in *Embracing the Spirit: Womanist Perspectives on Hope, Salvation and Transformation*, ed. Emilie M. Townes (Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1997), 115.

know God's vision. Relying as well on Williams' "monumental work",⁴³⁸ Diana L. Hayes states:

Womanist theology provides us with a foundation upon which to critique not only the masculinized, self-serving language of Christian theology but its embodiment in the Christian churches themselves, cleansing them of their sexism, racism, classism, and homophobia by creating a language that speaks of life, hope, equality, and love; a language that builds, rather than destroys communities of affirmation.⁴³⁹

Therefore, it is not simply enough to participate in liturgy to live in and out of mission, but mission may even have to be taken further by challenging unjust aspects of liturgical rituals. Every situation, then, whether liturgical or not; has aspects of sacrament and anti-sacrament.

There is a sense, then, that sacrament contains anti-sacramental qualities this side of the eschaton. There is a real ambiguity here that Williams does not dismiss, and no strict dialectic between world and liturgy or even world and church appears even in her discussion on liturgy. Liturgy itself (as well as the church) can be equally as imperfect as the world itself, but God can use both world and liturgy in order to provide strength in the midst of sin, death, and evil. Women, as well as others, in such contexts can be prophetic voices challenging the world, the church, and its liturgy to become more consistent with the ministerial vision of Jesus. Therefore, to actively disengage or close off one's self from the church or the liturgy or even the world would be not simply *detrimental* to God's mission, but would be *contrary* to that mission, as it would fail to live out God's hope for survival in the midst of oppression.

Conclusion

In this Chapter Williams' theology has contributed to our notion of mission as holiness in several ways. In particular, Williams' theology has provided a more expansive notion of mission which has been lacking within the other accounts up till now.

Firstly, mission is not simply a participation in love, it must also be an action, though rooted in the care for the other, that resists oppression wherever it is found, not simply in the world, a world that must be engaged, but also within the liturgy, the family, and the church, all of which can have aspects that are oppressive to disciples. This does not mean that the church or the liturgy ought to be abandoned, because despite the negative aspects, there is still a power at work which can provide hope and empowerment for God's mission.

Dialogue assumes equal partners capable of engaging with one another. Williams has shown, secondly, and quite rightly, that not all situations, particularly where oppression is found, can entail that the oppressed and the oppressor enter into dialogue with one another. In these contexts resistance might be more hopeful and realistic given the circumstances.

⁴³⁸ Diana L. Hayes, *Standing in the Shoes My Mother Made: A Womanist Theology* (Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2011), 6.

⁴³⁹ *Ibid.*, 8.

But even more, liberation may not happen, but God is still active in providing a direction towards God's mission if Williams' epistemological process is repeatedly done over a long period of time.

Thirdly, mission so far has been construed as the quest for holiness, but Williams has shown that quests for goodness or even for Divine love neglect the need for a quality of life for the human person. One may be holy and good, but be in miserable conditions of oppression, and these two qualities of the individual person may not empower one for resisting oppression. Moreover, they may emphasise the spiritual over the material and may even neglect the political aspect of God's mission. They may, ultimately, fail to provide hope for a better quality of life.

Fourthly, as we have seen, mission as holiness as I have been arguing is particularly concerned with living Christologically. Jesus himself, I would add, was not only God made flesh, but also God's *mission* made flesh. So to live in and out of mission is empowered Christologically through the Spirit and in enacting Christ Jesus's ministerial life. Rather than simply trying to live out a prayer text or from a theology of the communion rite, one may forget that liberation or communion in circumstances of oppression may be unrealistic and offer a romanticised view of what can be possible. In these circumstances, the meaning of Christ's life may provide a deep spirituality of resistance to oppression, and therefore, a deeper living out of God's mission in the world. This is not to suggest that spirituality or discipleship within the world is superior to the liturgy, or even that the liturgy itself is somehow ineffective for the context in which it is celebrated. Rather, as Williams herself notes, the liturgy, even when there are aspects that oppress, can still be a place where disciples find strength, nourishment, and a vision of God's mission that needs to be enacted.

The consequence of Williams' theology is a conception of mission within a particular Christological stance, as well as a critical view of liturgy itself and how the relationship between the liturgy/church and world should be construed. The next and final Chapter tries to construct a sacramental theology of mission, critically building upon the two theologies we have explored already (Rowan D. Williams and Delores S. Williams) in order to re-define what mission means in liturgical theology.

Chapter 6

Conclusions:

Towards A Liturgical Theology of Mission

This study began with an exploration of mission in contemporary liturgical theologies of mission with a view to uncovering the relationship between mission that is enacted in liturgy and mission that takes place in society. Whilst some liturgical theologies of mission proffer what I have characterised as a romanticised view of liturgical mission and, by so doing, set up a distinctive ecclesial, liturgical spirituality of mission over and against mission in the wider society, other liturgical theologians (Power, Morrill, and Chauvet) provided a more helpful approach to construing the way liturgy helps to shape mission – something I have characterised as holiness. In such a view of holiness, missiological identity is distinctive not only due to liturgical participation but also due to living from an identity gifted by Christ within the world. Following these liturgical theologians, I could argue that mission happens in the world; more precisely in the sites of suffering when disciples act Christologically for the humanisation of others. This analysis then permitted my constructive theological definition of mission as living in and from the Christic memory for the good of others and creation.

The relationship of the concepts of mission, church, and world was explored initially via the official Roman Catholic documents on mission from the Second Vatican Council and the Post-Vatican II periods. This provided, in Chapter 2, a theological framework to excavate an unromanticised view of the relationship between liturgy and the church enacting mission in its local societal context, as well as highlighting dimensions of a contemporary Roman Catholic theology of mission from official documents. This exploration provided my definition of mission as holiness which, further to what was said in the above paragraph, consists of Christic *mimesis* and Christic *participation*. The advantage of such a definition of mission is the strong relationship it affords between mission within the world as well as missional participation within the liturgy.

Two contrasting views of mission were identified as being operative in the various documents considered in Chapters 1 and 2. There is an older view of mission envisaged as church planting and church growth, and this persists as the main conception of the mission theology in *Ad gentes* (AG). The history of the formulation of the document evidenced that bishops living in mission countries put their efforts into *Gaudium et spes* (GS) rather than into AG. This decision by the bishops meant that mission lost its contemporary relevance and stunted its ability to adapt to the changes of the modern conditions of the world, and remained, by and large, outdated to the needs and changing circumstances of the world. GS,

rather, emphasised the church's mission to a world in need, and emphasised that the world and the church both are influenced by sin and have a common foundation (and concern). *Evangelii nuntiandi* further emphasised this missionary nature of the church through the concept of mission as humanisation.

Theologically based on these official Roman Catholic mission documents, mission, as I noted, is construed as holiness, the active living in and living out of the depth of God's love for the justice of the world as Christic participation and *mimesis*. This two-fold dynamic of mission was, therefore, framed Christologically, and the need for the balance between participation and *mimesis* bridges the gap between where the site of mission occurs, both within liturgical enactment and within the church living out in the world.

Firstly, mission is *mimesis* of Christ's own ministerial life recorded in the New Testament, and secondly, an explicit and intentional Christic participation through the power of the Holy Spirit which makes possible mission in this two-fold dynamic. I framed this as the contemplation, that is, the participatory dynamism of mission is to participate through the power of the Spirit in Christ himself, and the imitation of Christ's life. The advantage of this unifying of two Christic aspects of mission is that "there emerges between those wallowing in the vexations of the secular life and those enjoying the vision of God in which the blessed share, a distinctive intermediate position of those who are *in via*."⁴⁴⁰ Whilst Soskice seeks to unite contemplation and active life by suggesting that discipleship is "simply attention to God which is a form of love,"⁴⁴¹ the important insight here is that love requires not simply contemplation of God, as if that were somehow in competition with loving one's neighbour, but rather, the significance is that love has two inexorably linked aspects: attention to God and to the other. Therefore, Christic mission, rooted in love, requires paying attention to a love of God not somehow in competition with this world, that is on another plane of existence, but rather by attending to, and being loved by and loving with the God acting through the other.

I suggested that both of these aspects of the mission must be held in tension, otherwise, Christologically, mission becomes simply a human work particularly when mission is dislodged from participation, or mission simply becomes the contemplation of Christ's mission that does not become lived out within society. Moreover, mission, I showed, is a Christic transformation of the self and the church into the living in and out of this Christic transformation for the good of the world and the self, so that these two Christological characteristics of mission cannot be separated from one other.

⁴⁴⁰ Janet Martin Sockice, *The Kindness of God: Metaphor, Gender, and Religious Language* (Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 2008), 21.

⁴⁴¹ *Ibid.*, 20.

Roman Catholic documents on liturgy that address mission evidenced that liturgy is the “source and summit” of the church’s life and mission, and the implication of such language does two things. Firstly, it rightly acknowledges that liturgy is important to mission and the lives of disciples. Secondly, this language implicitly conveys that mission outside of liturgical ritual (humanisation) is secondary to liturgical ritual itself. Whilst Peter C. Phan argued for the reversal of these two poles: daily life is the “source and summit” of the liturgy, I suggested that mission itself is the “source and summit” and liturgy and daily living are both necessary components of mission.

My survey of the liturgical documents provided an expansion of mission as humanisation and participation to include the site of the household as an ecclesiological embodiment of mission. These documents build upon the other mission documents by focusing on a specific construal of mission as *kenosis*. In particular, these theologies focus on the suffering involved in *kenosis*. *Kenosis* serves as the model for contemplation and imitation of Christ.

In Chapter 3, I identified the ways in which contemporary liturgical theologies of mission approached the relationship of liturgy, mission, and world. Schmemmann, and those who were heavily influenced by his approach to mission (Senn and Meyers as two examples of this reliance on Schmemmann) conceived of mission as the participation within the liturgical ritual itself. Whilst they emphasise the importance of envisaging liturgy as a participation in mission, these theological approaches could be read as to suggest that all mission requires is participation in liturgy. Is this asking liturgy to do too much? Can liturgy, though rightly an effective and efficacious encounter with the Divine mission of God in ritual form be the sole site of knowing and participating in authentic mission? In other words, the focus was on how liturgical celebrations or the ecclesial nature of mission become manifest, and therefore, I showed, mission was construed only in terms of liturgical participation, and therefore, liturgical theologies of mission, whilst addressing the Christological participation within the church’s enactment of liturgy, they did not sufficiently address the second aspect of our definition of mission, namely, *mimesis* of Christ’s ministerial life within the world empowered by Christic participation.

The consequence of these liturgical theologies of mission, I showed, is to create a rift between liturgy/church on the one hand, and society on the other. By arguing how liturgy offers a distinctive identity for mission, these theologies began not in the way GS did, with what unites Church and world, but what is unique and *exclusive* to the church. The implication of liturgy as the sole site of God’s mission is the reduction, or the limiting, of the Divine Act of mission to liturgy in particular, or the church in general. This necessarily limits mission from something that is and can be actively working within society apart from the liturgical rite. In order to address this lacuna, I suggested, was not simply developing a theology of how the liturgy itself is missional, but rather, to unite liturgy/church and world as

sites where mission may occur. The bridge to unite liturgy/church and world as sites of mission, I highlighted, was through the theological language of sacramentality. Sacramentality itself bridges not only Christological participation in liturgy, but it also provides theological support for the empowerment of human agency to live Christ's life outside of the liturgical event. Sacramentality, I argued, starts not with distinctions between church/liturgy and world, but by uniting what is different with what is similar. Therefore, sacramentality, rather than excluding mission in the world, includes liturgy and world as sites of mission. This, I hypothesised, could overcome a competitive dialectic between liturgy/church and society/world.

The approach that I advance more closely resembles the contemporary liturgical theologies of mission by Power, Morrill, and Chauvet. Their emphasis on the eschatological participation in *anamnesis* helped me to my definition of mission as holiness by recognising that the individual memories of human persons and Christ's memory meet so as to challenge human identity to be more Christ-like, whilst at the same time recognising that this newly formed missiological identity is, I suggested, to live in and out of Christ's memory gifted within the church's liturgical ritual. Therefore, Christic identity is embodied in liturgy and in ethical action within the world as sites of mission.

To construe mission in such a way, I drew on Rowan D. Williams's sacramental theology in Chapter 4. His concern is not with how sacramental rites are efficacious, but rather, that human action, particularly when it is rooted in the divine activity, is sacramental. In other words, participation in the divine act is not only a participation in God's mission, but it also mediates Christologically God's missionary act within human bodies that themselves are called to live out. His sacramental mission, as I called it, is principally Incarnational, and is, therefore, intimately bound up with Christology, so that mission becomes a sacrament of the Incarnation when human persons receive and dispose themselves towards the Divine act, thereby human bodies become the site where the Divine activity becomes mediated and manifested, and this Divine Act becomes shown forth within society. Human bodies do not become Incarnations themselves as that would transgress into idolatry, but rather, show forth the work of God through the human body.

Like the sacramental theology of Edward Schillebeeckx, Williams assumes a chasm between the Divine and the human, thereby to prevent divine activity from becoming misidentified as magic, on the one hand, or the control of human persons, on the other – misidentifications Williams sees as responsible for the divine presence being reducible to an idol. Divine aseity (that is, God's sovereignty and freedom) is collapsed into the localisation of Divine Presence that becomes an idol. Williams' intervention is a Chalcedonian re-articulation: namely, Christ's two natures, human and divine, are not mixed or confused, otherwise the result would be the collapsing of the divine into the human. The two natures are not collapsed into one another, though they are united in the person of Christ Jesus. The

human body of Christ becomes a site where the Divine Act is not merely witnessed to, but is shown forth in embodied activity. The human person dispossesses one's self to the Divine Act in order to be transfigured by God. This transfiguring, I highlighted, is what sacrament is for Williams. Sacramentality is not only rooted in theological anthropology, but even more importantly, I suggested, sacramentality is when human agency and Divine activity become aligned in order for God's mission to become tangible and active not only in liturgy but also within society.

This means, for Williams, that not only are liturgy, church and the world sites where the Divine Activity can transfigure created reality into God's mission, but they also circumscribe any potential dichotomy between liturgy/church and world. Williams himself even argues that the world in general, and the marginalised most especially, ought to be listened to in order to critique how the church (or disciples) are living in and out of God's mission or not. Christic participation and *mimesis* as dimensions of mission as holiness, I suggested, is the process of de-centring one's self according to Christ's mission for the good of others and creation.

In Chapter 5, I turned to the theology of Delores S. Williams in order to expand mission not only kenotically but also in terms of resistance to one's own dehumanisation and the temptation to dehumanise others. Delores S. Williams herself as well as her theology are from the margins; the very margins that Rowan D. Williams contends the church should listen to but cannot himself voice/author. But even more importantly, Delores S. Williams is construing theology from the perspective of those who often experience dehumanisation: women, ethnic minorities (in Williams' case, African American), and socio-economically disadvantaged. If one is in the position of privilege, then a kenotic spirituality of self-emptying has the potential to advocate for and assist those who suffer oppression of any kind. However, if one has no identity to "self-empty" in the first place, then *kenosis*, I argued, may potentially prolong suffering because one may give of him/herself over to the oppressor. Rather than a liberationist notion of soteriology, Delores S. Williams suggests that Christ's ministerial life can be known through not self-sacrificing love (the Christic participation of mission in official Roman Catholic mission documents as well as within Rowan D. Williams), but through resistance to temptation, the temptation to oppress others.

This temptation is the negative side (sin) of the positive aspect of humanisation explored in Chapter 2 particularly in *Evangelii nuntiandi*, whereby humanisation is directed at alleviating the oppression of others. By combining these positive and negative aspects of humanisation, mission is not simply bringing about liberation, as if all forms of dehumanisation can be overturned in the here and now (this, as I showed, is a romanticised notion of humanisation), but also recognising the temptation to dehumanise others that disciples and the church is capable of doing. Once it takes adequate account of this perspective "mission" is, as I demonstrated, a resistance to the temptation to dehumanise

others as much as it is simply bringing about humanisation. Moreover, mission may entail the basic human need to survive under oppression, especially when liberation may not be possible. Mission as holiness after Delores S. Williams must, therefore, include survival under oppression.

In contrast to liturgical theologies of mission, Williams herself explicitly states that the liturgy can be a place of dehumanisation, particularly when the dignity of the human person is oppressed from the pulpit by the preacher, or when certain groups are excluded from full participation because of ethnicity, gender identity, or socio-economic conditions. In Augustinian fashion, the human person is prone towards dehumanising others, and in conditions of dehumanisation, “finding a way out of no way” seems intangible. This does not mean that liturgy is completely ineffective or someone ought to be abandoned for justice, but what it does suggest is that society is bad and the church/liturgy is good. The nuance I am trying to make, and that Williams exposes, is that dehumanisation on this side of the eschaton is found in all sites, whether liturgical, domestic, ecclesial, or societal. Mission, therefore, I highlighted in Williams, is the conversion of the self away from the temptation to dehumanise others by turning the self to enact what Christ did, resistance to oppressing others, or in our own definition of mission, by loving the other in their humanness.

This Christology of Delores S. Williams hardly seems compatible with Rowan D. Williams’s de-centring Christology. However, through the lens of our conclusions from Chapter 2 – that mission is both the participation in and a *mimesis* of Christ’s life – then the seemingly disparate Christologies of both Rowan D. Williams and Delores S. Williams can in fact be reconciled. In order to live out of Christ’s mission to resist temptation (of the self, the family, the church, or others) one (or the church) must be at the same time empowered by and showing forth the Divine Activity in the site of the body, as noted above. By taking these two Christologies together, mission becomes sacramental when it not only participates liturgically, ecclesially, domestically, and contemplatively, but also when it is lived out prophetically by resisting and countering the temptation to dehumanise the other, whether human or the cosmos.

In this way, sacramentality highlights the relationship between liturgy/church and society by emphasising mission as encounter. Sacramentality reframes the relationship in terms of cooperation and mutual dialogue between disciples/church and the society in which disciples and the church find themselves.

Sacramentality is the embodying and living out of the Divine Act. To rephrase Louis-Marie Chauvet, mission has a body, and not simply a voice. A sacramental theology of mission, as I have tried to construct, resists the temptation to dehumanise others, and recognises the efficaciousness of the Divine Act when “the other” is encountered in its true and authentic form. Divine Mission becomes manifested and represented when Christic

participation and *mimesis* are lived in and lived out against the temptation to dehumanise others.

Bibliography

- Albergo, Giuseppe. *History of Vatican II, Vol. V: The Council and the Transition, the Fourth Period and the End of the Council, September 1965-December 1965*, Joseph Komonchak, English ed. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2006.
- Anderson, E. Byron. *Common Worship: Tradition, Formation, Mission*. Nashville, TN: The General Board of Higher Education and Ministry, 2017.
- _____. "Reform, Participation, and Mission: 'To Derive the True Christian Spirit'." *Worship* 88 (2014): 218-239.
- Augustine, *De Baptismo*, 5.38. Quoted in Richard P. McBrien, *The Church: The Evolution of Catholicism*, 5. New York: HarperOne, 2008.
- Benedict XVI. Address at the closing lunch of the 2005 Synod on the Eucharist. Vatican website. Accessed 29 August 2015. https://w2.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/speeches/2005/october/documents/hf_ben_xvi_spe_20051022_pranzo-sinodo.html.
- _____. *Deus caritas est*. Encyclical Letter. Vatican Website. Accessed 27 July 2017. http://w2.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_ben-xvi_enc_20051225_deus-caritas-est.html.
- _____. *Sacramentum caritatis*. Post-Synodal Apostolic Exhortation. Vatican website. Accessed 9 September 2015. http://w2.vatican.va/content/benedict-xvi/en/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_ben-xvi_exh_20070222_sacramentum-caritatis.html.
- Bevans, Stephen B. "The Mission Has a Church: An Invitation to the Dance", *Australian eJournal of Theology*. Australian Catholic University, 1-14. Accessed 10 June 2016. https://www.google.ie/url?sa=t&rct=j&q=&esrc=s&source=web&cd=1&cad=rja&uact=8&ved=0ahUKEwIaqbaGwcTSAhWBC8AKHTZPCTMQFqgbMAA&url=http%3A%2F%2Fwww.acu.edu.au%2F_data%2Fassets%2Fpdf_file%2F0004%2F197644%2FBevans_Mission_Has_Church.pdf&usq=AFQjCNFU0gzil9Wf2LH8v6T69aQVXGYT7Q.
- _____. "Introduction." In *A Century of Catholic Mission: Roman Catholic Missiology 1910 to the Present*, Regnum Edinburgh Centenary Series, Vol. 15, ed. Stephen B. Bevans, 1-7. Oxford: Regnum Books, 2013.
- Bevans, Stephen B. and Jeffrey Gros. *Evangelization and Religious Freedom: Ad Gentes and Dignitatis Humani*. Rediscovering Vatican II Series. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 2009.
- Bevans, Steven B. and Roger P. Schroeder. *Constants in Context: A Theology of Mission for Today*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2004.
- Bosch, David J. *Believing in the Future: Toward a Missiology of Western Culture*. *Christian Mission and Modern Culture Series*. Trinity Press International, 1995.
- Brown, David. "Re-conceiving the Sacramental." In *Gestures of God: Explorations in Sacramentality*, eds. Geoffrey Rowell and Christine Hall, 21-36. London/New York: Continuum, 2004.
- Cavanaugh, William T. "Church." In *The Blackwell Companion to Political Theology*,

- Peter Scott and William T. Cavanaugh, eds., 393-405. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing 2005.
- Chan, Simon. *Liturgical Theology: The Church as Worshiping Community*. Downers Grove, IL: IVP Academic, 2006.
- Chapman, Mark D. "Rowan Williams's Political Theology: Multiculturalism and Interactive Pluralism." *Journal of Anglican Studies* 9, no. 1 (April 2011): 61-79.
- Chauvet. *The Sacraments: The Word of God at the Mercy of the Body*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press/Pueblo, 2001.
- _____. *Symbol and Sacrament: A Sacramental Reinterpretation of Christian Existence*, trans. Patrick Madigan and Madeleine Beaumont. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press/Pueblo, 1987/1995.
- Copeland, M. Shawn. "Womanist Theology." In *New Catholic Encyclopedia, Vo. 14*. 822-3. Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press/Gale, 2003.
- Davies, J.G. *Worship and Mission*. London: SCM Press, 1966.
- Dreyer, Elizabeth. *Manifestations of Grace*. Theology and Life Series 29. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press/Michael Glazier, 1990.
- Duffy, Stephen J. *The Dynamics of Grace: Perspectives in Theological Anthropology*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press/Michael Glazier, 1993.
- Dupuis, Jacques. *Who Do You Say That I Am?* Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1994.
- Fagerberg, David W. *Theologia Prima: What Is Liturgical Theology?* 2nd ed. Chicago: Liturgy Training Publications, 2012.
- Ferrone, Rita. *Liturgy: Sacrosanctum Concilium*. Rediscovering Vatican II Series. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 2007.
- Flett, John G. *The Witness of God: The Trinity, Missio Dei, Karl Barth, and the Nature of Christian Community*. Grand Rapids, MI: William B. Eerdmans, 2010.
- Francis. *Evangelii gaudium*. Apostolic Exhortation. Vatican Website. Accessed 10 April 2015. http://w2.vatican.va/content/francesco/en/apost_exhortations/documents/papa-francesco_esortazione-ap_20131124_evangelii-gaudium.html
- Fuellenbach, John. *Church: Community for the Kingdom*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 2002.
- _____. *The Kingdom of God: The Message of Jesus Today*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1995.
- Gaillardetz, Richard and Catherine E. Clifford. *Keys to the Council: Unlocking the Teaching of Vatican II*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2012.
- Garrigan, Siobhán. "Ethics." In *The Study of Liturgy and Worship: An Alcuin Guide*, eds. Juliette Day and Benjamin Gordon-Taylor, 193-201. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press/Pueblo, 2013.
- Goddard, Andrew. *Rowan Williams: His Legacy*. Oxford : Lion Hudson, 2013.

- Haight, Roger. *The Experience and Language of Grace*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1997.
- Hayes, Diana L. *Standing in the Shoes My Mother Made: A Womanist Theology*. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 2011.
- Healy, Nicholas M. *Church, World and the Christian Life: Practical-Prophetic Ecclesiology*. Cambridge Studies in Christian Doctrine. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- Hebblethwaite, Peter. "Let My People Go: The Exodus and Liberation Theology." *Religion, State and Society* 21, No. 1 (1993): 105-114.
- Higton, Mike. "The Ecclesial Body's Grace: Obedience and Faithfulness in Rowan Williams' Ecclesiology." *Ecclesiology* 7, no. 1 (2011): 7-28.
- Hobson, Theo. *Anarchy, Church and Utopia: Rowan Williams on Church*. London: Darton, Longman and Todd, 2005.
- Irvin, Dale T. and Scott W. Sunquist. *History of the World Christian Movement, Volume II: Modern Christianity from 1454-1800*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2012.
- Irwin, Kevin W. "A Sacramental World – Sacramentality as the Primary Language for Sacraments." *Worship* 76, no. 3 (May 2002), 197-211.
- _____. *Context and Text: Methods in Liturgical Theology* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press/Pueblo, 1994), 46.
- _____. *Liturgical Theology: A Primer*. American Essays in Liturgy Series. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1990.
- Jenson, Matt. *The Gravity of Sin: Augustine, Luther and Barth on 'homo incurvatus in se'*. London/New York: T&T Clark, 2007.
- John Paul II. *Ecclesia de eucharistia*. Encyclical Letter. 2003, Vatican website. Accessed 27 July 2017.
http://www.vatican.va/holy_father/special_features/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_20030417_ecclesia_eucharistia_en.html.
- _____. *Evangelium vitae*. Encyclical Letter, Vatican website. Accessed 21 July 2017. http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_25031995_evangelium-vitae.html
- _____. *Redemptoris missio*. Encyclical Letter. Vatican Website. Accessed 7 November 2014. http://w2.vatican.va/content/john-paul-ii/en/encyclicals/documents/hf_jp-ii_enc_07121990_redemptoris-missio.html
- Johnson, Elizabeth A. *She Who Is: The Mystery of God in Feminist Theological Discourse*. New York: Continuum Press, 1999/2002.
- Johnson, Maxwell E. "Liturgy and Theology." *Liturgy in Dialogue*, eds. Paul F. Bradshaw and Bryan Spinks, 203-227. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press/Pueblo, 1993.
- The Joint Declaration on the Doctrine of Justification*. Vatican website. Accessed 29

October 2017.

http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/chrstuni/documents/rc_pc_chrstuni_doc_31101999_cath-luth-joint-declaration_en.html.

- Jones, Serene. "Women's Experience' Between a Rock and a Hard Place: Feminist, Womanist and *Mujerista* Theologies in North America." *Religious Studies Review* 21, No. 3 (July 1995): 171-178.
- Hahnenberg, Edward P. "The Mystical Body of Christ and Communion Ecclesiology: Historical Parallels." *Irish Theological Quarterly*, vol. 70 (2005): 3-30.
- Irwin, Kevin W. *Contexts and Texts: Method in Liturgical Theology*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press/Pueblo, 1994.
- _____. *Liturgical Theology: A Primer*. North American Essays in Liturgy. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1990.
- _____. "A Sacramental World – Sacramentality as the Primary Language for Sacraments." *Worship* 76, no. 3 (May 2002): 197-211.
- _____. *The Sacraments: Historical Foundations and Liturgical Theology*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 2016.
- Kreider, Alan and Eleanor Kreider. *Worship and Mission after Christendom*. Milton Keynes, UK/Colorado Springs, CO, USA: Paternoster, 2009.
- Kwok, Pui-lan. "Feminist Theology, Southern." In *The Blackwell Companion to Political Theology*, eds. Peter Scott and William T. Cavanaugh, 194-209. Oxford, UK/London: Wiley and Sons, 2004.
- Manalo, Ricky. *The Interrelationship of Sunday Eucharist and Everyday Worship Practices*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press/Pueblo, 2014.
- Mannion, Gerard. "Charity Begins at Home...an Ecclesiological Assessment of Pope Benedict's First Encyclical." *New Blackfriars* 88, no. 1018 (November 2007): 649–664.
- Marx, Paul B. *Virgil Michel and the Liturgical Movement*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1957.
- McReynolds, Sally Ann McReynolds and Ann O'Hara Graff. "Sin: When Women are the Context." In *In the Embrace of God: Feminist Approaches to Theological Anthropology*, ed. Ann O'Hara Graff, 161-172. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1995/2005.
- McBrien, Richard P. McBrien. *The Church: The Evolution of Catholicism*. New York: HarperOne, 2008.
- McManus, Frederick R. "Foreword." In Kathleen Hughes, *The Monk's Tale: A Biography of Godfrey Diekmann, O.S.B., i-xiii*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1991.
- Meyers, Ruth A. "Missional Church, Missional Liturgy." *Theology Today* vol. 67 (2010): 36-50.
- _____. *Missional Worship, Worshipful Mission: Gathering as God's People, Going Out in God's Name*. Grand Rapids, MI/Cambridge, UK: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2014.

- _____. "Unleashing the Power of Worship." *Anglican Theological Review* vol. 92, no. 1 (2010): 55-70.
- Mitchell, Nathan D. *Meeting Mystery: Liturgy, Worship, Sacraments*. Theology in Global Perspective Series. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2007.
- Mohrmann, C. "Pascha, Passio, Transitus." *Ephemerides liturgicae* 66. Rome, 1952.
- Moore-Keish, Martha L. *Do This In Remembrance of Me: A Ritual Approach to Reformed Eucharistic Theology*. Grand Rapids, MI/Cambridge, UK: William B. Eerdmans, 2008.
- Morrill, Bruce T. *Anamnesis as Dangerous Memory: Political and Liturgical Theology in Dialogue*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press/Pueblo, 2000.
- _____. *Divine Worship and Human Healing: Liturgical Theology at the Margins of Life and Death*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press/Pueblo, 2009.
- Myers, Benjamin Myers. *Christ the Stranger: The Theology of Rowan Williams*. London: T&T Clark, 2012.
- Newbigin, Lesslie. *The Gospel in a Pluralist Society*. London, SPCK Press, 1989.
- _____. *The Open Secret: Introduction to the Theology of Mission*, 2nd rev. ed. London, SPCK Press, 1995.
- O'Malley, John. *What Happened at Vatican II?* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2008.
- Osborne, Kenan B. *Sacramental Theology: A General Introduction*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1988.
- Paul VI. *Evangelii nuntiandi*. Apostolic Exhortation. Vatican Website. Accessed 3 November 2014. http://w2.vatican.va/content/paul-vi/en/apost_exhortations/documents/hf_p-vi_exh_19751208_evangelii-nuntiandi.html
- Phan, Peter C. *Being Religious Interreligiously: Asian Perspectives on Interfaith Dialogue in Postmodernity*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2004.
- _____. "Crossing Borders: A Spirituality for Mission in Our Times." In *In Our Own Tongues: Perspectives from Asia on Mission and Inculturation*, 130-150. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2003.
- _____. "Christian Mission in Asia: A New Way of Being Church." In *In Our Own Tongues: Perspectives from Asia on Mission and Inculturation*, 13-31. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 2003.
- _____. "The Liturgy of Life as the 'Summit and Source' of the Eucharistic Liturgy: Church Worship as Symbolization of the Liturgy of Life?" In *Incongruities: Who We Are and How We Pray*, eds. Timothy Fitzgerald and David A. Lysik, 2-23. Chicago: Liturgy Training Publications, 2000.
- _____. "Women and the Last Things: A Feminist Eschatology." In *In the Embrace of God: Feminist Theological Approaches to Theological Anthropology*. Ed. Ann O'Hara Graff, 206-227. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1998/2008.
- Power, David Noel. *Eucharistic Mystery: Revitalizing the Tradition*. New York:

- Crossroad, 1992.
- _____. "Foundations for Pluralism in Sacramental Expression: Keeping Memory." *Worship* 75 (2001): 194-209.
- _____. *Mission, Ministry, Order: Reading the Tradition in the Present Context*. London/New York: Continuum, 2008.
- _____. *Sacrament: The Language of God's Giving*. New York: Crossroad, 1999.
- Power, David Noel and Michael Downey. *Living the Justice of the Triune God*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press/Michael Glazier.
- Rausch, Thomas. *Towards a Truly Catholic Church: An Ecclesiology for the Third Millennium*. Collegeville, MN: Michael Glazier/Liturgical Press, 2005.
- Regan, Patrick. *Advent to Pentecost: Comparing the Seasons in the Ordinary and the Extraordinary Forms of the Roman Rite*. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press/Pueblo, 2012.
- Ross, Melanie Ross. "Joseph's Britches Revisited: Reflections on Method in Liturgical Theology." *Worship* 80, no. 6 (2006): 528-550.
- Ross, Susan. *Extravagant Affections: A Feminist Sacramental Theology*. New York: Continuum, 1996.
- _____. "God's Embodiment and Women: Sacramental Theology." In *Freeing Theology: The Essential of Theology in Feminist Perspective*, ed. Catherine Mowry LaCugna, 185-210. New York: HarperCollins, 1993.
- Russell, Matheson. "Dispossession and Negotiation: Rowan Williams on Hegel and Political Theology." In *On Rowan Williams: Critical Essays*, ed. Matheson Russell, 85-114. Eugene, OR: Wipf and Stock, 2009.
- Sanks, T. Howland. "The Social Mission of the Church: Its Changing Context." In *The Gift of the Church*, ed. Peter Phan, 267-291. Collegeville, MN: Michael Glazier/Liturgical Press, 2000.
- Saliers, Don E. *Worship as Theology: Foretaste of Glory Divine*. Nashville, TN: Abingdon, 1994.
- Schattauer, Thomas H. "Liturgical Assembly as Locus of Mission." In *Inside Out: Worship in an Age of Mission*, ed. Thomas H. Schattauer, 1-21. Minneapolis, MN: Fortress Press, 1999.
- _____. "Practice of *Missio Dei* in Word and Sacrament." *Currents in Theology and Mission* 38, no. 5 (October 2011): 322-326.
- Schillebeeckx, Edward. *Christ the Sacrament of the Encounter with God*. Kansas City, MO: Sheed and Ward, 1963.
- Schemmann, Alexander. *The Eucharist: Sacrament of the Kingdom*. Trans. Paul Kachur. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1988.
- _____. *For the Life of the World: Sacraments and Orthodoxy*. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1963.

- _____. "The Missionary Imperative." In *Church, World, Mission: Reflections on Orthodoxy in the West*, 209-216. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1979.
- _____. "The World as Sacrament." In *Church, World, Mission: Reflections on Orthodoxy in the West*, 217-227. Crestwood, NY: St. Vladimir's Seminary Press, 1979).
- Schreiter, Robert J. "Changes in Roman Catholic Attitudes toward Proselytism and Mission." In *New Directions in Mission and Evangelization*, Vol. 2, eds. James A. Scherer and Stephen B. Bevans, 113-125. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1994.
- Schussler Fiorenza, Elizabeth. *Discipleship of Equals: A Critical Feminist Ecclesial-ology of Liberation*. London: SCM, 1993.
- Second Anglican/Roman Catholic International Commission. *Salvation and the Church: An Agreed Statement*. Vatican website. Accessed 29 October 2017. http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/chrstuni/angl-comm-docs/rc_pc_chrstuni_doc_19860903_salvation-church_en.html.
- Second Vatican Council. "Ad gentes: The Decree on the Missionary Activity of the Church." In *Vatican Council II: Constitutions, Decrees, Declarations*, ed. Austin Flannery. Northport, NY: Costello Publishing, 1996.
- _____. "Sacrosanctum concilium: Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy". Vatican website, Accessed 3 September 2017, http://www.vatican.va/archive/hist_councils/ii_vatican_council/documents/vat-ii_const_19631204_sacrosanctum-concilium_en.html
- _____. "Lumen gentium: The Dogmatic Constitution on the Church." In *Vatican Council II: Constitutions, Decrees, Declarations*, ed. Austin Flannery. Northport, NY: Costello Publishing, 1996.
- _____. "Gaudium et spes: The Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World." In *Vatican Council II: Constitutions, Decrees, Declarations*, ed. Austin Flannery. Northport, NY: Costello Publishing, 1996.
- Senior, Don and Carrol Stuhlmüller. *The Biblical Foundations for Mission*. London, SCM, 1983.
- Searle, Mark. *Called to Participate: Theological, Ritual, and Social Perspectives*, eds. Barbara Searle and Anne Y. Koester. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2006.
- Senn, Frank, *The Witness of the Worshiping Community: Liturgy and the Practice of Evangelism*. Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1993.
- Short, Rupert. *Rowan Williams: An Introduction*. Harrisburg, PA: Morehouse/Continuum, 2003.
- Shorter, Aylward. *Theology of Mission*. Theology Today Series, no. 37. Cork, Ireland: Mercier Press, 1972.
- Sockice, Janet Martin. *The Kindness of God: Metaphor, Gender, and Religious Language*. Oxford/New York: Oxford University Press, 2008.
- Sobrino, Jon. "Central Position of the Reign of God in Liberation Theology." In

- Systematic Theology: Perspectives from Liberation Theology*, eds Jon Sobrino and Ignacio Ellacuría, 38-74. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1993/1996.
- Stewart, Dianne M. "Womanist God-Talk on the Cutting Edge of Theology and Black Religious Studies: Assessing the Contribution of Delores S. Williams." *Union Seminary Quarterly Review* 58, Nos. 3-4 (Fall 2004): 65-83.
- Tanner, Kathryn. *Christ the Key*, Current Issues in Theology. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- Ticciati, Susannah. *Job and the Disruption of Identity: Reading after Barth*. London/New York: Continuum, 2005.
- Turman, Eboni Marshall. *Toward a Womanist Ethic of Incarnation: Black Bodies, the Black Church, and the Council of Chalcedon*. New York: Palgrave, 2013.
- Tuzik, Robert L. "Introduction: Whence the Liturgical Movement?" In *How Firm a Foundation: Leaders of the Liturgical Movement*, 1-11. Chicago: Liturgy Training Publications, 1990.
- van Gelder, Craig and Dwight J. Zscheile, eds. *The Mission Church in Perspective: Mapping Trends and Shaping the Conversation*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic, 2011.
- Vogel, Dwight W. "Liturgical Theology: A Conceptual Geography." In *Primary Sources of Liturgical Theology: A Reader*, ed. Dwight W. Vogel, 1-15. Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press/Pueblo, 2005.
- Volpe, Medi Ann. *Rethinking Christian Identity: Doctrine and Identity*, Challenges in Contemporary Theology Series. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013.
- _____. "'Taking Time' and 'Making Sense': Rowan Williams on the Habits of Theological Imagination." *International Journal of Systematic Theology* 15, no. 3 (July 2015): 345-360.
- Walker, Maxine E. "'How Do You Read It?' Rowan Williams, Marilynne Robinson and Mapping a Postmodern Reading of the Good Samaritan Parable." *Journal of Anglican Studies* 12, no. 2 (September 2013): 203-225.
- Williams, Delores S. "Black Women's Surrogacy Experience and the Christian Notion of Redemption". In *Cross Examinations: Readings on the Meaning of the Cross Today*, ed. Marit Trelstad, 19-32. Minneapolis, MN: Augsburg Fortress, 2006.
- _____. *Sisters in the Wilderness: The Challenge of Womanist God-Talk*. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis Books, 1993.
- _____. "Straight Talk, Plain Talk: Womanist Words about Salvation in a Social Context." In *Embracing the Spirit: Womanist Perspectives on Hope, Salvation and Transformation*, ed. Emilie M. Townes, 92-117. Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1997.
- Williams, Khalia Jelks. "Engaging Womanist Spirituality in African American Christian Worship." *Proceedings of the North American Academy for Liturgy* (2014): 95-109.
- Williams, Rowan D. *Christ on Trial: How the Gospel Unsettles Our Judgment*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2000.
- _____. *Dostoevsky: Language, Faith, and Fiction*. London/New York: Continuum,

2010.

- _____. "Foreword." In *Gestures of God: Explorations in Sacramentality*, eds. Geoffrey Rowell and Christine Hall, xiii-xiv. London/New York: Continuum, 2004.
- _____. "Fresh Expressions, the Cross and the Kingdom." In *Fresh Expressions of Church and the Kingdom of God*, eds. Graham Cray, Aaron Kennedy, and Ian Mobsby, 1-12. Ancient Faith, Future Mission Series. Norwich, UK: Canterbury Press, 2012.
- _____. *On Christian Theology. Challenges in Contemporary Theology*. Malden, MA: Blackwell, 2000.
- _____. "Between Politics and Metaphysics: Reflections in the Wake of Gillian Rose." *Modern Theology*, Vol. 11, No. 1 (January 1995): 3-22.
- _____. *The Wound of Knowledge: Christian Spirituality from the New Testament to St. John of the Cross*. London: Darton, Longman, and Todd, 1979.