

REV. WALERIAN BUGEL

ARE NON-CATHOLICS WORTHY TO BE NAMED
IN TEXTS OF CATHOLIC ANAPHORA?
SOME REMARKS ON NO. 121 OF *DIRECTORY FOR THE APPLICATION
OF PRINCIPLES AND NORMS ON ECUMENISM*

Abstract. The current *Directory for the application of principles and norms on ecumenism* from 1993 stipulates an exclusion from the anaphora prayers for other than Catholic communities, their representatives and needs, arguing with an “ancient liturgical and ecclesiological tradition.” The paper verifies such convictions on the basis of analysis of liturgical texts of both Roman and Eastern traditions, praxis on the local level and theological arguments. Finally it gives some propositions concerning models for prayers for unity with other Christian Churches within anaphora.

Key words: anaphora, prayer, Christian unity, *Ecumenical Directory*, exclusivity.

This year 50 years will have passed since the approval of the groundbreaking document concerning ecumenism, the decree *Unitatis redintegratio*. Although, by its nature, it should be especially a sort of applicative and implementing text for the core texts of the Vatican II, i.e. the constitutions, it has become itself portative to such a degree that it has been necessary to issue guidelines for its implementation into the life of the main principles and norms concerning the ecumenical movement.

As it is well known, the variety of specific conditions not only anticipates the concrete regulations and directives, but, above all, the latter are seldom able to fully capture the complexity of the situations for which they are issued. Additionally, progress towards mutual convergence and towards achieving visible unity may (and generally should) cause continuous obsolescence of

Rev. Dr. WALERIAN BUGEL—Department of Liturgy Theology at the Sts. Cyril and Methodius Faculty of Theology of the Palacký University in Olomouc; address for correspondence—e-mail: walerian.bugel@upol.cz

these guidelines. Thus in the case of the Catholic Church, regarded from the doctrinal point of view as a kind of world-wide monolithic formation (i.e. comprising both the Roman Catholic Church and the Eastern/Oriental Catholic Churches) there is the additional specific difficulty in the form of a certain formal compromise—in the sense of issuing such generally valid instructions applicable across different countries, traditions and cultures. For these reasons it is necessary to continuously update and specify the mentioned guidelines; a manifestation of this is the re-issuance of the so-called ecumenical directory in 1967 (1st part), 1970 (2nd part) and 1993.

If achieving full and visible unity of the Church is (at least in the catholic conception) the main goal of the ecumenical Movement, and this is inconceivable and doomed for failure without prayer, then it is clear that the question of prayer for the unity of the Church is a fundamental one and so attention should be paid to it. This consideration is being confirmed by the practices of many Christians for whom sincere and regular variously formulated prayer for unity of Churches has become an integral part not only of their involvement in Ecumenism, but especially of their Christian testimony arising from urge of heart. Nevertheless, at the same time the currently valid *Directory*, in addition to encouraging and providing specific guidelines for such a prayer, sets certain limitations in No. 121, especially in the form of the so-called closed Anaphora, i.e. exclusion of the Eucharist Prayer from the range of possible locations of prayers for non-Catholic communities, their representatives and needs. Yet it even invokes an “ancient liturgical and ecclesiological tradition allowing mentioning names of only those persons who are in the full communion with the Church celebrating the Eucharist.”

Nevertheless, such an approach to the whole matter raises a range of questions, some of which concern the support for the given argumentation, some others the legitimacy of excluding the whole Anaphora from the circle of texts for the possible inclusion of prayers for unity. However it isn't possible to omit the effort to adequately valorize different practices already implemented in some places, as well as the attempt to find a possible resolution which respects most aspects—especially the theological ones. The main aim of this article will be to cope with this defiance. The point of departure will be the very catholicity of the Church, observable not only historically and geographically, but especially at the theological and liturgical levels—i.e. not in its partial (and often even curtailed) form of tradition proper only to the Roman Church.

1. TEXT OF ARTICLE NO. 121
IN THE CONTEXT OF THE *DIRECTORY*

The effort to interpret the text of a specific norm without taking into account its full context would not be objective. Thus it will be necessary first to zoom in on both the text itself and its inclusion in the ensemble of the *Directory*, in consideration of other locations where the prayer for unity of Christians is treated in a way significant for the chosen subject matter.

In terms of structure and content, the *Directory* is divided into five main chapters, thematically entitled and ranked as follows:

I. Search for Christian Unity [The ecumenical commitment of the Catholic Church] (No. 9-36)

II. Organization in the Catholic Church at the Service of Christian Unity [Persons and structures involved in promoting ecumenism at all levels] (No. 37-54)

III. Ecumenical Formation in the Catholic Church [The aim and methods of formation; its doctrinal and practical aspects] (No. 55-91)

IV. Communion in Life and Spiritual Activity Among the Baptized [The norms for sharing in prayer and other spiritual activities, including in particular cases sacramental sharing.] (No. 92-160)

V. Ecumenical Cooperation, Dialogue and Common Witness [Cooperation among Christians with a view to dialogue and common witness in the world] (No. 161-218)

It is evident already from this enumeration that the mentioned article No. 121 is inserted into the chapter treating something that the former version of the ecumenical directory called *communicatio in spiritualibus* and *communicatio in sacris*. However, if we look at the division of the chapter 4 itself we find out that part B (part A concerns the baptism) entitled “Sharing Spiritual Activities and Resources,” which presents the questions of sharing spiritual goods, consists of four subchapters: “General Principles,” “Prayer in Common,” “Sharing Non-Sacramental Liturgical Worship,” “Sharing in Sacramental Life, especially the Eucharist.” What is most surprising is the inserting the article explicitly treating of Anaphora in the part “Sharing Non-Sacramental Liturgical Worship.” Is it explicable in some way?

Perhaps the best answer may be the quotation of the whole text of the given No. 121:

Blessings ordinarily given for the benefit of Catholics may also be given to other Christians who request them, according to the nature and object of the blessing. Public prayer for other Christians, living or dead, and for the needs and intentions of other Churches and ecclesial Communities and their spiritual heads may be offered during the litanies and other invocations of a liturgical service, but not during the Eucharistic Anaphora. Ancient Christian liturgical and ecclesiological tradition permits the specific mention in the Eucharistic Anaphora only of the names of persons who are in full communion with the Church celebrating the Eucharist.

As it may be seen, No. 121 itself begins with the problem of joint participation in blessing. Then it moves on to public prayers of characterized by invocation and tries to determine their location using the negative definition “not during the Eucharistic Anaphora.” The rest of the article presents, however, an attempt to justify the delimitation made; nevertheless, this part focuses on the Anaphora as such, and thus should belong rather to the following subchapter concerning the sacramental liturgy. From the point of view of liturgical taxonomy, however, the problematic cumulative nature of the article is not over yet: to wit, the majority of the described forms (litanies, invocations) occur both in the non-sacramental liturgy and in the celebration of the Eucharist—again the insertion is thus inaccurate. And what is more: in Catholic worship, while the liturgical blessings are granted most often by the presiding, at any rate by an ordained servant; in the case of prayers for needs of other Christians or non-Catholic Churches they can be recited—especially during non-sacramental celebration—by anybody, including non-Catholics themselves. Here, however, the text of the article No. 121 makes a double “turn”: from the level of the personal active participation (receiving blessings) it passes without any notice to the level of content (prayers for needs) and from the latter then to the structural level (location of the prayers within the worship). After all, the terminology itself isn’t systematic: the appellation “public prayer” corresponds neither to the nomenclature of the Roman Catholic worship (common prayer or *oratio fidelium* within the liturgy of the word; intercessions or *preces* within anaphora) nor to the Eastern worship practices. Yet the same part about liturgical forms is concerned, beginning with their delimitation (in the article No. 116—“By liturgical worship is meant worship carried out according to books, prescriptions and customs of a Church or ecclesial Community, presided over by a minister or delegate of that Church or Community. ... The concern here is non-sacramental worship.”).

Nevertheless, it seems that in the *Directory* the field of worship is elaborated at a much lower level than mainly the dogmatic or practical seizure—

which may be illustrated through analysis of the location of other key passages treating the prayer for unity of Christians.

The most obvious of these is the following one, which moreover perceives the prayer for unity in the context of worship practices, i.e. the sacramental, as well as the non-sacramental ones, occasional ones as well as the duly and regularly held ones—No. 62b:

It would be good to foster fidelity to prayer for Christian unity, according to the indications of this Directory, whether at the times the liturgy indicates—as, for example, in celebrations of the Word or else at Eastern celebrations known as “Litia” and “Moleben”—or especially during Mass—in the prayer for the faithful or the “Ectenie” litanies, or also in celebration of the votive Mass for Unity of the Church, with the help of the appropriate formularies.

But paradoxically, this article is a part of the 3rd chapter devoted to the ecumenical formation of believers! (It is even possible that the text of both of these, i.e. No. 121 and No. 62b, have been prepared by different commissions or counselors and none of the follow-up editors has considered it necessary to harmonize their content and stylistics.)

It is similar in the case of the conception of the ecumenical movement, which becomes—in addition to answering the prayer of Jesus “*ut unum sint*”—the Father’s response to the supplication of the Church inspired by the Holy Spirit.¹ Is it possible to understand these “supplications”—indicated here moreover referring to the Eucharistic worship—in a distinct context other than a liturgical one? In the same time the quoted article is a part of the 1st chapter of the *Directory*, focusing on the ecumenical commitment of the Catholic Church.

Neither is the 2nd chapter of the *Directory* void of mentioning prayer for unity of Christian Churches, namely the Eastern ones. No. 39 quotes, although without other development, the text of the Can. 902-904 CCEO where the prayer for the unity of the Church, and especially the Eastern Churches, is mentioned twice:

The Eastern Catholic Churches have a special duty of fostering unity among all Eastern Churches, first of all through prayers...²

¹ No. 22: “The ecumenical movement is a grace of God, given by the Father in answer to the prayer of Jesus and the supplication of the Church inspired by the Holy Spirit.”

² Can. 903 CCEO.

All Christian faithful, especially pastors of the Church, shall pray for that fullness of unity desired by the Lord.³

As I will deal with the Eastern liturgical traditions concerning prayers for unity of the Church in greater detail later in another part, I leave these texts now without further comment.

And finally I will return to the already quoted 4th chapter, which in No. 104 c), par. 1 specifies:

The sharing of spiritual activities ... must reflect ... the real communion in the life of the Spirit which already exists among Christians and is expressed in their prayer and liturgical worship.

Here is a guideline from “General Principles,” which—although it primarily treats the sharing of communion and unity-expressions existing within the liturgy of the various Churches—can offer a valuable rule of inquiry into the real situation in the Catholic Church concerning intercessions within Eucharistic liturgy, especially anaphora (including the naming of these person who are not yet in full communion with her).

2. CONTEMPORARY ROMAN-CATHOLIC PRAXIS CONCERNING PRAYERS (OR EVEN NAMING) FOR OTHER CHRISTIANS WITHIN ANAPHORA

Though the *Directory* uses the common term “Catholic Church” in the doctrinal sense, for the purpose of inquiring into concrete liturgical praxis it will be necessary to focus separately on Roman-Catholic Church and on Eastern/ Oriental Catholic Churches (because of their plurality and diversity this analysis will be undertaken in the next subchapter).

2.1. OFFICIAL EDITIONS OF THE WORLDWIDE USED ANAPHORS

The liturgical renewal of the Roman Church, started by the Second Vatican Council, enabled the successive introduction of 10 Eucharistic prayers (hence: EP) on a worldwide level.⁴

³ Can. 902 CCEO.

⁴ More in detail see e.g. Jerzy Stefański, *Modlitwy eucharystyczne w posoborowej reformie liturgicznej. Kwestie redakcyjne* (Gniezno: Prymasowskie Wydawnictwo Gaudentium, 2002; *Mod-*

The so-called Roman Canon was the sole EP used in the Latin Church for many centuries. Only by the decision of Pope Paul VI did the editing work begin on other EP. One of these should “reanimate” an old anaphora (the so-called Hippolyt anaphora or EP II), another create the contemporaneous anaphora on the basis of ancient liturgical texts (EP III), or take inspiration from the traditions of the Christian East (EP IV)—but all this within the framework maximally adapted to the Roman tradition. So in these EP it is possible to see a widening within *preces*: in the EP II in intercessions for the dead not only those are commemorated “who have fallen asleep in the hope of the resurrection” (this includes other Christians), but also those, “all who have died in your mercy.” EP III takes it over and gives the broader intercession for the gathering of “all your children scattered throughout the world,” and this tendency is more visible within the *preces* for the Church—besides the pope and local ordinary there were recommended “all the bishops, with the clergy and the entire people your Son has gained for you.”⁵ EP IV, which is an adaptation of the Egyptian version of the St. Basil’s anaphora, takes over this distinction within the *preces* for the Church (“bishops and clergy everywhere”) and appends “all your people” and “all who seek you with a sincere heart”—also the yet non-baptized people who formally do not belong to the Church. The intercession for the dead similarly includes not only those who “have died in the peace of Christ” but is broadened to “all the dead whose faith is known to you alone.”

Besides this, there is the possibility of inserting into EP I-III a peculiar prayer for just-married persons (who are called “faithful to you” in the EP I) including their naming. This ostensible detail can be significant from tracking viewpoint in the case when the spouses are a denomination-mixed couple—because a non-Catholic Christian can be named within anaphora. Although the theological-pastoral introduction (so-called *Praenotanda*) to *Ordo celebrandi matrimonium* presupposes in No. 36 that the denomination-mixed matrimony is not celebrated during the Mass, it states that this may be possible with permission of an ordinary (and, as will be showed later, this permission is given to all mixed couples by decision of Bishops’ Conference or by the single bishops).

litwy eucharystyczne mszału rzymskiego. Dzieje – teologia – liturgia, ed. H.J. Sobeczko (Opole: Wydawnictwo Wydziału Teologicznego Uniwersytetu Opolskiego, 2005). According to the separate fashion of each of 4 variants of the *Prex eucharistica pro variis necessitatibus* in the 3rd editio typica of Roman Missal some authors use the number 13 of EP.

⁵ III. EP is built on the Eucharistic ecclesiology concerned of whole Church and not only its local manifestation.

For EP II and III it is possible to use the variant version of text in memorial of the dead (usually during funerals or requiem mass)—and there the dead is called by baptismal name. Though the customary meaning is, that this variant is for Catholics only, an opposite situation is not excluded, especially within denominationally-mixed families—the norms⁶ demand only that a celebration of Catholic funeral is non-contrary to the will of the late individual and the ordinary give his permission (often given in a blanket form for all such situations). Ultimately, the proper text of prayer comes from the typology of incorporating to the Christ's death via baptism and from likeness to Him during resurrection—and this is common to all Christians without their affiliation to concrete denomination.

To these four EP there were appended some others in the 70–80s of last century. Within the EP for Reconciliation II an intercession appears for the Church to become “a sign of unity and instrument of your peace among all people” (*Ipse Ecclesiam tuam inter homines signum efficiat unitatis pacisque tuae instrumentum*), despite non-enumerating of concrete structures or denominations. But the continuation (only along to the newest version of *missal*) of this request seems to reduce sense of the phrase “all the bishops and all your people” (*cunctis Episcopis univérsoque pópulo tuo*)⁷ to the Catholic Church solely, because it adds the precedent part of intercession with the naming of pope and local bishop, beseeching to “keep in communion” (*in communióne consérvet*)—and this sounds more unambiguous at the canonical level than the theological one.

The next group of EP which have been introduced after Second Vatican Council are those for the Mass for children. Their peculiarity is they are non composed in Latin, but in living languages. EP for Children I and II presuppose in the *preces* the naming of near persons and the dead (this was, for unknown reason, omitted completely in EP Ch I and partially in EP Ch II in the Latin *editio typica tertia*)—regardless of their denominational affiliation. The intercessions for living were in EP Ch I broaden on “Christian everywhere (in Czech and Polish versions “big family of Christians”) and all other people in the world”; and in EP Ch III in facultative variant for Easter season on “all Christians” (in Polish and Czech versions “all disciples of Christ.”

The last group of EP with worldwide permission is generated by these for Masses for Various Needs and Occasions (in some national editions of Missal

⁶ Cf. *Directory*, No. 120, which although is structurally incorporated into non sacramental celebrations, but in local practise is rife to make funerals within Mass.

⁷ The Polish version reads: “z całym ludem chrześcijańskim” (“with all Christian people”).

designated as the EP V and the sequence of variants are changed). In the variant I (The Church on the Way to Unity) the intercession for Church appears (in *editio typica tertia* only): “that your people may shine forth as a prophetic sign of unity and concord.” In all four variants the request for the dead is formulated similar to the EP IV (with differentiation of those, “who have asleep in the peace of your Christ” and those “whose faith you alone have known.”

2.2. PRAXIS ON REGIONAL, NATIONAL OR DIOCESAN LEVEL

Besides the worldwide used EP, in national or regional editions of Roman Missal there exist other anaphors which have been permitted by the Apostolic See. Making a comprehensive review is impossible for me now, as is their analysis. Some of them were published in *Notitiae*,⁸ an official gazette of the Congregation for Divine Worship and the Discipline of the Sacraments; but the exhaustive list can be formulated only after respecting of all approved texts.

However, the Church’s authorization of the EP texts doesn’t come from Roman congregations only—some versions can also be approved by the Bishops’ Conferences, which are edited only as *supplement* to the official liturgical books.

The last circle is formed by the praxis with permission of the local bishop (or by the Episcopal conference) which is not recorded in the liturgical books. It is possible to give, as an example, the praxis in Poland (though consisting from a small number of situations) concerning an “addition” to the anaphoral *preces* in form of intercession for growth of unity between the pope and some principal representatives of other Christian confessions (most frequently the Orthodox Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople and the Anglican Archbishop of Canterbury) or between the Churches lead by them. This praxis had its connection principally with theologians from the Ecumenical Institute of the John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin and was approved (at least) by its so-called head chancellor, that is, the archbishop of Lublin. It is attested within publications of the teachers of this institute.⁹

⁸ In this gazette are normally absent the liturgical texts composed for the specific groups of addressees (e.g. for the Australian Aborigenes) or permitted only *ad experimentum* for a certain time.

⁹ *Nad przepaściami wiary. Z ks. Wacławem Hryniewiczem OMI rozmawiają Elżbieta Adamiak i Józef Majewski* (Kraków: Znak, 2001), 223, where author is speaking about “finally fighting of this privilege” (“wywalczenie w końcu tego przywileju”) for the so-called academic church at the Catholic University of Lublin. See Stanisław Celestyn Napiórkowski, “Nowe Dyrektorium Eku-
meniczne. Uwagi polskiego ekumenisty,” *Biuletyn Ekumeniczny* 24 (1995), 4: 42 [reprint: idem,

From formal-content side it was an inclusion to the EP both the request for unity of the Churches and the naming of non-Catholic hierarchs; but the formulation of No. 121 of *Directory* is not fulfilled (“prayer for other Christians ... and for the needs and intentions of other Churches ... and their spiritual heads”). Though from canonistic point of view the terminology used by narration about this praxis was not unequivocal (custom X indult X privilege),¹⁰ it can be understood in context of ecumenical activity broadened over the framework of whole-Church directories and approved by the Polish Bishops’ Conference in the 1970s (firstly regarding permission to give a homily by non-Catholic clergy during the Masses of the Week of prayer for Christian unity).¹¹

The attitude of the Polish Bishops’ Conference concerning the celebration of mixed marriages concerning the celebration of mixed marriages can be given as another example. In its *Instruction (Instrukcja w sprawie duszpasterstwa małżeństw o różnej przynależności kościelnej* [Instruction on the pastoral care of couples of different church affiliation]) from 14.3.1987 this body has permitted the blessing of marriage between Catholic and Orthodox Christian during the Mass (without any limitations regarding the naming of both persons in EP) and taking Holy Communion without additional approval of the local bishop. The decision of 1.6.2006 of the Metropolitan of Lublin, Józef Życiński, concerning the mixed couple, went far: it permitted the Mass celebration for all mixed couples (not just those of the Orthodox Christian faith), without limitations to the mention of their names.¹²

Razem dla Chrystusa. Wybór publikacji teologiczno-ekumenicznych (Lublin: Gaudium, 2013), 81]—where he writes: “od dawna wymieniamy imiona zwierzchników innych Kościołów chrześcijańskich” (“for a long time we enumerate the names of the principals of the other Christian Churches”) which was characterized as a “custom” (Pol. “zwyczaj”).

¹⁰ Although these terms have not the same content, it is possible that during time it was going on all these categories: on the basis of the fixed custom it was given an indult for some places (e.g. academic church at the Catholic University of Lublin) which has could be a “exception” in other localities and situations.

¹¹ “Kościół rzymskokatolicki w Polsce zdobył szczególny przywilej od Stolicy Apostolskiej, pozwalający na odejście od zasad zapisanych w przepisach kościelnych. Przywilej uzyskany przez Konferencję Episkopatu Polski miał zostać potwierdzony kard. Józefowi Glempowi przez watykańską Kongregację Nauki Wiary.” (“The Roman Catholic Church in Poland has gained a special privilege from the Apostolic See which had permit to bypassing of the rules written in Church’s norms. This privilege to the Polish Bishop Conference has should be confirmed by the Vatican Congregation for Doctrine of Faith to the Card. J. Glemp”). Dariusz Brunz, “Przywilej dla ekumenicznych kaznodziejów – burza przed tygodniem modlitw o jedność chrześcijan,” <http://www.ekumenizm.pl/article.php?story=20130110235131574> [accessed 29.1.2014].

¹² Both quoted after: “Dokumenty w sprawie małżeństw mieszanych i spotkań ekumenicznych. Załącznik 2: Przypomnienie i zarządzenie arcybiskupa lubelskiego w sprawie małżeństw mieszanych”.

3. THE PRAXIS OF EASTERN/ORIENTAL (CATHOLIC) CHURCHES CONCERNING ANAPHORA

If the *Directory* should be a norm valid and useful for the entire Catholic Church, it is not possible to omit the analysis of praxis concerning the prayer for unity of Churches in all Eastern and Oriental liturgical traditions—because the Eastern/Oriental Catholics share these texts with other Eastern/Oriental Churches.

Due to the extensiveness of sources (it includes at least more than 150 complete anaphors, numerous other fragments of prayers, as like as homilies and writings of Fathers) it is not possible to make here a complete investigation. Therefore it will be utilized mainly the analysis of one of the greatest experts on Eastern liturgies, Robert F. Taft SJ, in his monograph on diptychs within history of Byzantine Eucharistic liturgy,¹³ which he compared with almost all available monuments from the other liturgical traditions.

First, some facts must be recalled from a historical point of view. The litany demands within Eucharistic liturgy were formed according to the invocations pronounced in anaphora; the latest ones include all people with their entire needs, regardless of it was formulated explicitly or only implicitly.¹⁴ Second, the distinction between “diptychs” and “intercessions” is of later date; and concerning content, intention and stylistic forms of these petitions there is no agreement between scholars. Third, the citation of the names of the superior hierarchs, with whom the concrete Church was in communion, is also not a question of the first three centuries, but it mirrors later development far from the end of 4th century.¹⁵ Moreover this development was marked by cultural differentiation which had conditioned rise of the liturgical families after First Council of Nicea (325). Fourth—it is not possible to say something about “one tradition” in the later centuries, or about the “single” tradition even of the same local Churches—concerning the fashion of *preces* for living and/or dead within the Eucharistic celebration.

ných wyznaniowo,” in Stanisław Celestyn Napiórkowski, *Razem dla Chrystusa. Wybór publikacji teologiczno-ekumenicznych* (Lublin: Gaudium, 2013), 445-447.

¹³ Robert F. Taft, *A History of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom*, vol. IV: *The Diptychs* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta vol. 238) (Roma: Oriental Institute Press, 1991).

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 32.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 30-32.

Originally (before the half of the 4th century) the diptychs contained the double list of selective character with actual names of individual persons for whom the sacrifice was offered; but even those not named were believed to have been included in it. The place for proclaiming the intercessions was two-fold from the ancient times: before anaphora or during it, most frequently after epiclesis.¹⁶ Their double character concerned the reasons for commemorating of the concrete people too: the variable parochial lists of offering persons or the fixed official hierarchical lists. These former lists have manifested tendency toward confessionalisation during doctrinal controversies of next centuries, which was showing the bonds of communion between Churches—although they were read only occasionally by solemn occasions.¹⁷ This can be demonstrated on several examples.

The Strasbourg Papyrus (4th-5th century), witnessing the Egyptian tradition, gives the list of names of those persons for whom the offering was made.¹⁸ The anaphora of *Apostolic Constitutions* does not make any mention of concrete names—it remembers people only within the classes.¹⁹ Cyril [John] of Jerusalem knows both calling by name and “general” remembrance.²⁰ The East-Syriac and Maronite [Šarar] anaphoras, like the Gallican tradition, read the diptychs before the beginning of anaphora.²¹ The tradition of non-Chalcedonian Churches, especially of Mopsuestia, commands to read only the names of bishops of local see. Jacob of Sarug describes in his *Homily on the Memorial* a custom inscribing of the names of the dead persons on the Eucharistic bread.²²

The first testimony of distinction between daily remembrance of only the local hierarch’s name and more solemn occasionally doing remembrance of all hierarchs along with lower clergy comes from Marutha of Maipherqat (the beginning of 5th century). Because of doctrinal polemics and controver-

¹⁶ “In the Antiochene-type anaphoras ... the intercessions flow from the epiclesis as a natural continuation of its petitions for the consecration and fruitfulness of the gifts.”—*Ibid.*, 38. More in detail see e.g. Baby Varghese, *West Syrian Liturgical Theology* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004), 102-106.

¹⁷ Taft, *A History of the Liturgy*, 58-59.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 35-36.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 41.

²⁰ *Cat.* 5,8-9: „we beseech God over that sacrifice of the world, for emperors, for armies and auxiliaries, for the sick, for the oppressed; and, praying in general for all who need help, we all offer this sacrifice.”—*Ibid.*, 37-38.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 43.

²² *Ibid.*, 52-53.

sies after Chalcedon the question of orthodoxy of concrete person was raised as very important in the diptychs too.²³

The tradition of the Great Church [= Constantinople] lead to name only the pentarchial patriarchs, chiefs of hierarchical authority, bishops, presiding celebrant, emperors (with their consorts) and the members of their family—and the rest of people recorded in diptychs were called only by categories or classes.²⁴

Concerning of calling by name of concrete persons during anaphora there were another customs too. Ignatius of Antioch wrote to Smyrna (*Ad Smyrn.* 5,3) that the names of “unbelievers” [= false teachers] would not be written for commemoration—but it is not certain, if it was a normal practice, or only an allusion to the biblical idea of Book of Life.²⁵ The same rule (*neque nomen ... ad altare recitetur*) is possible to be observed in the letter of the pope Leo I, the Great, to Alexandrian patriarch Anatolius: it concerned to protagonists of the schism at “Robber Council” of Ephesus (449) and on Council of Chalcedon (451). And in the *Regula fidei* of the pope Hormisdas sent to the Byzantine emperor Anastasius I in 515—was included a promise to not recite the names of excommunicated bishops within the celebration of sacred mysteries.²⁶ Here it is noteworthy that this ‘exclusion’ dealt only with concrete names of those persons who caused the troubles within the Church and not of their predecessors.

Regarding commemoration by name of the patriarchs of other sees or the pope—it was peculiar to the Byzantine tradition. After reduction of number and quality of contacts between Constantinople and Rome (the half of the 7th century) there was time when no commemoration of pope was made during patriarchal liturgies, despite the fact that it did not come to the breaking of communion. And in reverse, despite the signing the bull of union in Florence, the Greek bishops refused to commemorate the pope by name in their diptychs—and for Latins it was not create a real problem.²⁷ The tradition of remembrance of pope during Byzantine Eucharistic liturgy was related to the historical situation on Crete, which took place from 1210 to 1669 under Venetian domination; after the union of Florence there were only the Latin hierarchs. The introduction of papal name to the books was an adaptation to

²³ *Ibid.*, 55-56.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 167.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 33.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 121-124.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 124-125 and 127-128.

the Catholic pyramidal model of ecclesiology and became a part of the later Roman liturgical editions for the Uniates (and even for the Orthodox too)—originally there was only the remembrance of the local bishop.²⁸

The given examples and facts show the great variety of customs and both local and temporal-valid traditions. Against the demand to have respect for “Ancient Christian liturgical and ecclesiological tradition” without its specification seems quite unreliable.

4. THE LITURGICAL-THEOLOGICAL VIEW ON ANAPHORAL REQUESTS FOR THE UNITY OF CHURCH

Since the facts analysed thus far expressed mainly the historical aspect of problem, now is the time to complete it with the systematic-theological part—both the liturgical theology and the theology of unity.

The liturgy which is the top of Church’s life together is the source of sanctification of man; from side of Christ’s new-testamental priesthood forms a whole, although with inner graduation. The Eucharistic celebration establishes the centre of liturgical life and anaphora is the middle point of the Eucharistic liturgy (which is valid for these traditions, where the anaphora is not a synonym to the whole Mass-celebration, as e.g. in Coptic liturgy). If it is usual and acceptable to beseech for the unity of Christians and their Churches during other liturgical celebrations, then it is illogical to omit these requests in Eucharistic liturgy, including its most solemn part, which is the anaphora.

The very specific part of anaphora are *preces* or intercessions and the main duty of them is to express the unity of the celebrating communion with all the Church—not only the earthly one, but also the heavenly too, because the Eucharistic offering is, as Christ’s offering of Himself, made for all without any exclusion. *Preces* is a form of presidential prayer, so it assimilates the main celebrant to the Christ, the only Mediator and Intercessor.²⁹ Thereby it is not surprising that from the ancient times (e.g. see the *Didaché* from turn of 1st and 2nd century) here is made a request for achievement of unity in the Kingdom of God for all redeemed.³⁰ The presence of the Eucharistic Christ, who is also the Head of the Church, with all His opus of

²⁸ *Ibid.*, 136-138.

²⁹ Cf. Bogusław Nadolski, *Liturgika*, IV: *Eucharystia* (Poznań: Pallottinum, 1992), 198.

³⁰ Cf. Bogusław Nadolski, “Eucharystyczna modlitwa,” IV.8, in *Leksykon liturgii*, ed. Bogusław Nadolski (Poznań: Pallottinum, 2006), 439.

salvation, is at the same time (= during anaphora) the reason for realization of the unity of the Church on earth.

So the Eucharistic celebration becomes an anticipation of achieved unity of all who by the baptism were incorporated into Christ—not only within one denomination, but over her borders. The Persons of Holy Trinity are neither not restricted nor bonded by the controversies between Churches, which moreover never can destroy the gift of salvation offered through the Eucharist. So the gift of Eucharistic presence immeasurably mode towers above our canonical divisions which impinge on only historical constituent of God’s people.³¹ According to the wise intuition of Eastern Christianity, the Eucharistic presence becomes a sacramental anticipation of the Last Judgement too, when, in fashion of words of Byzantine liturgy, the sole expectation of all will be the hope to hear a “good apology” from Christ’s mouth—and not to decide on worthy or unworthy status of the others.

In such way self-fulfilling eschatology led the Christians of the ancient times with endeavour to put all their important petitions near the central “moment” of celebration, which means near the anaphora;³² or at least bring into contact to the Eucharist these things which should be blessed and consecrated—as it was in case of blessing of oils at the end of Canon in Roman liturgy and blessing of the other foodstuffs in Egyptian liturgy.

The Eucharist is withal not the sole sacrament which builds and anticipates the unity. Marriage is worthy of special mention, as it enables not only the “extraordinary” sharing of Holy Communion in case of mixed-couples during wedding-celebration, but—according to the Eucharistic-sacramental based ecumenical ecclesiology of Peter Neuner—during their further marital life too.³³ In favour of possibility of Eucharistic communion between baptised belonging to various denominations—though without relation to the marriage, but in the framework of anticipation of the future visible unity among Churches—some other ecumenists also argue.³⁴ So it

³¹ Cf. Waław Hryniewicz, *Czy wspólnota Stołu Pańskiego jest już możliwa?*, in *To czyńcie na moją pamiątkę. Eucharystia w perspektywie ekumenicznej* (Warszawa: Verbinum, 2005), 248-252.

³² It was explicitly formulated by the author of *Mystagogical catechesies* (5,9): “... believing that it will be the greatest profit to the souls for whom supplication is offered is the presence of the holy and most dread sacrifice.”

³³ Peter Neuner, *Ekumenická teologie. Hledání jednoty křesťanských církví* (Praha: Vyšehrad, 2001), 206-209. Author outcomes from the sacramental character of matrimony among baptized, where realizes the Church in her unity and not the schism; this realization of domestic Church demands for Eucharist, without it is the existence of ecclesial unity of this community unthinkable.

³⁴ Cf. e.g. Hryniewicz, *Czy wspólnota Stołu Pańskiego jest już możliwa?*, 220-255.

means that even within the framework of existing “argumentation” in sense of exclusion from anaphora demands those who cannot participate in Holy Communion, it is illegitimate to try exclude the Christian of other denominations.

The progress made thanks to the ecumenical dialogues so far has enabled the considerable changes in praxis of *communicatio in spiritualibus et in sacris* which has been in force through centuries. The utilization of opportunities which have opened before us is also a confirmation, of whether and how seriously we are undertaking our ecumenical commitment. So the request of one of the Polish ecumenists, Stanisław Celestyn Napiórkowski, to keep the mention of non-Catholic hierarchs within anaphora where it became custom is not astonishing.³⁵ This request can be, besides a practical reasons, encouraged by the theological one, which flows from already cited formulation of No. 22 of *Directory*: “The ecumenical movement is a grace of God, given by the Father in answer to the prayer of Jesus and the supplication of the Church inspired by the Holy Spirit.” This, God’s grace given to us in answer to supplication of Church inspired by the Spirit, can not be refused without the fear of embezzlement in God’s eyes.

Without scruples, if some people are afraid of possible “scandal” among faithful in case of introducing into anaphora the names of the non-Catholic hierarchs (even only in form of suggestion), there is necessary to have more respect for the *sensus fidelium*. It seems to be a paradox that many clergymen condemn such possibility (even at level of deliberation), but on the side of faithful such praxis finds acceptance and gratefulness—even if they only have heard or read about it and have no possibility of experiencing it.³⁶

And finally, we can omit the question of the sense, symbolism and theology of the name. Partly that, it goes on a context of topic prayer of the Church, which always is based on the calling of God’s name. For Christians, it implies not only to be a bearer of Christ’s name, but also to receive in God’s eyes the “name” of His child and, as with the name endowed human individual, become able to be a partner in whole-life dialogue with Him,

³⁵ “Porzucanie obecnie tego zwyczaju byłoby przyjęte jako dowód hamowania ekumenizmu po naszej stronie. ... niechaj będzie wolno zatrzymać odmienny zwyczaj ‘anafory ekumenicznie otwartej’, jeśli już się przyjął w jakimś Kościele” [“Abandoning of this custom should be now received as an evidence for hindering ecumenism on our side ... let be dare to retain a different custom of ‘ecumenical-opened anaphora,’ if it was adopted in any Church”]—Napiórkowski, *Nowe dyrektorium ekumeniczne*, 42 [reprint—p. 81].

³⁶ See the reactions of readers quoted in: Waław Hryniewicz, *Nadzieja w dialogu. Korespondencja z czytelnikami (1976-2006)* (Warszawa: Verbinum, 2007), 70–72.

who “knows the name and age of all.”³⁷ In case of prominent representatives of Churches—including the Roman pope—the name can express the specific duty imposed on his bearer; and in case of multiple names of the hierarchs of (mainly) Oriental Churches it can express both the fidelity to tradition and magnitude of estimation manifested to them. But to the contrary—riddance of possibility to pronounce the name should be, in according to biblical tradition, by right interpreted as negation of the dignity and importance of concrete individual,³⁸ who moreover personifies a concrete Christian Church.

5. EVALUATION AND PROPOSITIONS OF POSSIBLE SOLUTIONS

The analysis and reflections allow us to attempt an evaluation. After carefully consideration of partial conclusions it is possible to say the following:

Article 121 in its second part diverges with the Church’s praxis at the local level and with liturgical worship on world level too. Along with the emphasis on canonical reasons it ignores the theological aspect of the problem. Also from a historical perspective it neither gives the clear data nor takes into account both the renewal of Roman liturgy and the plurality of traditions of Christian East concerning the Eucharistic celebration. The wording of No. 121 even, to some measure, questions the conviction of the special role of the Eastern Catholic Churches within the ecumenical movement, consisting of “‘fidelity’ to the ‘ancient traditions’”³⁹—non verbally but factually: through real imposing upon a different tradition to the one which these Churches naturally observe.

A question can be posed about the background to such wording of No. 121. Was it only a unhappy editing of the whole document, or a “prevention” in form of prohibition “supported” by inadequate argumentation, or perhaps an unwitting expression for tendency to put the canonical view over the theological one (moreover without sufficient knowledge)? Whether it was an involuntary overestimation of what is deemed its own tradition,

³⁷ *Preces* from the anaphora of St. Basil according to Byzantine tradition.

³⁸ Cf. “Imię,” in *Słownik teologii biblijnej*, ed. Xavier-Léon Dufour (Poznań, Warszawa: Pallotinum, 1985), 322–324.

³⁹ No. 39 [quotes Can. 903 CCEO]: “The Eastern Catholic Churches have a special duty of fostering unity among all Eastern Churches, first of all through prayers, by the example of life, by the religious fidelity to the ancient traditions of the Eastern Churches.”

which ensue from the conviction, proclaimed through centuries and still latently present in some (especially in Curia) circles, that the customs and ceremonies of the Church, which would be “mater et magistra” for all other, are almost automatically better and more lofty than the traditions of the other Churches? Without my attempt or possibility to give a clear answer to the above questions (though I presume that more probably all the listed reasons occur in combination), I tend to simply recall the practical obstacles dealt with (if not directly conquered) by those who have devoted their lives to ecumenical efforts and/or are fired with sympathy for it. In the same way it is necessary to warn about the risk of losing credibility in the eyes of other Christians as well as of those who expect integrity of words and explicitness in attitudes from us.

After the analytical and evaluative part it is time to offer a proposal to solve the whole situation. This is not an attempt to reformulate the text of the incriminated No. 121, but an effort to show what possibilities there are.

This proposal must however respect certain instructions which are contained in other articles of the same *Directory*. First there is the aspect of content. Prayer for unity among leaders of Churches should take into account a certain duality, which is a provisional “destiny” of the divided Christianity. The *Directory* says to this subject in No. 104c):

The sharing of spiritual activities and resources, therefore, must reflect this double fact:

- 1) The real communion in the life of the Spirit which already exists among Christians and is expressed in their prayer and liturgical worship;
- 2) The incomplete character of this communion because of differences of faith and understanding which are incompatible with an unrestricted mutual sharing of spiritual endowments.

Next there is the formal aspect, which is—face to face with the liturgical plurality which is manifestation of the diversity of traditions and spiritual richness of the Churches—equally important. Here also we can invoke instructions of the *Directory* from No. 111c):

It is desirable that the structure of these celebrations should take account of the different patterns of community prayer in harmony with the liturgical renewal in many Churches and ecclesial Communities, with particular regard being given to the common heritage of hymns, of texts taken from lectionaries and of liturgical prayers.

In relation to the Eastern liturgical texts it is necessary to respect both if the traditions envisages anaphoral prayers for the living or not, and if the expression of it is the ekphonesis of the celebrant or the text of prayers in ektenia chanted by the deacon during the worship of believers after the Anaphora and before the communion (and thus face to face to the Eucharist).

In the framework of the Western liturgical tradition it is then necessary to take into account both whether the Anaphora expresses rather the Roman or the Western model of intercessions (or even the structure) and what its *preces* for the Church are like. If there is, for example, only a mention of two basic levels of the Church, i.e. the local and the universal one (expressed by pronouncing the name of the local bishop and the pope), it will be necessary to complete the prayer for growing unity among Churches as such; while where there is mention of the Holy Spirit as cause of unity among those receiving Christ in the Eucharist, it is appropriate link to this. It is likewise there that “Christians” or “disciples of Christ” are mentioned in general, and also “other bishops” or “clergy” or “servants of the Church.” At the same time it is possible to consider whether and to what extent it is appropriate to add also particular names, or settle for a more general characteristic accenting their “specific” status in the community of the God’s people (e.g. “those leading other Christian communities,” “those who are in connection with us by an incomplete bond of unity” etc.). Equally it is possible—especially in connection with the texts of EP for Reconciliation—to consider use of the formulation taken from the Anaphora of St. Basil in the Byzantine version: “put the end to the schisms between the Churches,” or the similar one from Anaphora of James the Apostle: “heal the schisms between the Churches”; according to current needs this formulation may be more specified for concrete communities whose relationships are more difficult because of a conflict (“especially among...”).

For the sake of the length of this paper I will limit myself to the above-given examples and not far try to find the patterns in the texts of other Christian traditions, especially Old-Catholic and Anglican. Even these ones can bring numerous inspirations in regard to rediscovering the value of anaphora as the central liturgical text in some Churches of these denominations.⁴⁰ An insuperable source of inspiration could be the Eastern/Oriental anaphors, especially the ancient ones, though some of them are not used yet.

⁴⁰ Cf., e.g., the Old-Catholic missal in Czech language, edited in 2011: *Eucharistická slavnost starokatolické církve: Starokatolický misál* (Praha: Biskupský ordinariát a synodní rada Starokatolické církve v ČR, 2011), containing 48 anaphors.

It is very important that proposed interpolations respect both the structural and the theological fashion of EP, which should be “supplemented” in this manner, together with watching the character of source-text of the inspiration. The verbal aspect can also not be omitted in the sense that the lack of full unity between the Christian Churches cannot be camouflaged.

Perhaps there will emerge a need to create, for the start, some models or patterns, at least alternatively clearly formulated rules which will enable it. In addition, the continuous formation of both the priests (contemporary and future ones) and the faithful will be necessary.

6. INSTEAD OF CONCLUSION

The propositions given under last point remains on an academic field; yet, they come from an awareness of responsibility of theologians for the form of life and witness of their own Church. In spite of this, they might seem too courageous or even utopian. For the participant of the Second Vatican Council, the Catholic Church’s efforts to engage in the ecumenical movement after centuries of divisions, controversies, negative attitudes, polemics and excommunications had seemed so brave and utopian. The goal of these endeavors—an accomplishment of full and visible unity among Christians and their ecclesial communities—would seem to us, after 50 years, in spite of achieved progress, still very distant. But the real character of the Eucharistic presence, which at the same time remains a mystery and a deposit of future unity, though still is celebrated separately, enables us now—facing her—to pray for one another and beseech the removal of that which separate us not only from each other, but mainly from the only Lord and the Head of His Church.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Brunecz, Dariusz. “Przywilej dla ekumenicznych kaznodziejów – burza przed tygodniem modlitw o jedność chrześcijan”—<http://www.ekumenizm.pl/article.php?story=20130110235131574> [accessed 29.1.2014].
- “Dokumenty w sprawie małżeństw mieszanych i spotkań ekumenicznych. Załącznik 2: Przypomnienie i zarządzenie arcybiskupa lubelskiego w sprawie małżeństw mieszanych wyznaniowo.” In Stanisław Celestyn Napiórkowski, *Razem dla Chrystusa. Wybór publikacji teologiczno-ekumenicznych*. 445-447. Lublin: Gaudium, 2013.

- Eucharistická slavnost starokatolícké cirkve: Starokatolícký misál*. Praha: Biskupský ordinariát a synodní rada Starokatolícké cirkve v ČR, 2011.
- Hryniewicz, Waław. "Czy wspólnota Stołu Pańskiego jest już możliwa?" In *To czyńcie na moją pamiątkę. Eucharystia w perspektywie ekumenicznej*, 220-255. Warszawa: Verbinum, 2005.
- Hryniewicz Waław. *Nadzieja w dialogu. Korespondencja z czytelnikami (1976-2006)*. Warszawa: Verbinum, 2007.
- http://www.vatican.va/roman_curia/pontifical_councils/chrstuni/general-docs/rc_pc_chrstuni_doc_19930325_directory_en.html [accessed 29.01.2014].
- "Imię." In *Słownik teologii biblijnej*, edited by Xavier-Léon Dufour, 322-326. Poznań, Warszawa: Pallottinum, 1985.
- Modlitwy eucharystyczne mszału rzymskiego. Dzieje – teologia – liturgia*, edited by Helmut Jan Sobeczko. Opole: Redakcja Wydawnictw Wydziału Teologicznego Uniwersytetu Opolskiego, 2005.
- Nad przepaściami wiary. Z ks. Waławem Hryniewiczem OMI rozmawiają Elżbieta Adamiak i Józef Majewski*. Kraków: Znak, 2001.
- Nadolski, Bogusław. "Eucharystyczna modlitwa", IV.8. In *Leksykon liturgii*, edited by Bogusław Nadolski, 430-446. Poznań: Pallottinum, 2006.
- Nadolski, Bogusław. *Liturgika. IV: Eucharystia*. Poznań: Pallottinum, 1992.
- Napiórkowski, Stanisław Celestyn. "Nowe Dyrektorium ekumeniczne. Uwagi polskiego ekumenisty." *Biuletyn Ekumeniczny* 24 (1995), 4: 40-43 [reprint: Idem. *Razem dla Chrystusa. Wybór publikacji teologiczno-ekumenicznych*, 79-82. Lublin: Gaudium, 2013]
- Neuner, Peter. *Ekumenická teologie. Hledání jednoty křesťanských církví*. Praha: Vyšehrad, 2001.
- Stefański, Jerzy. *Modlitwy eucharystyczne w posoborowej reformie liturgicznej. Kwestie redakcyjne*. Gniezno: Prymasowskie Wydawnictwo Gaudentium, 2002.
- Taft Robert F. *A History of the Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom*. Vol. IV: *The Diptychs* (Orientalia Christiana Analecta vol. 238). Roma: Oriental Institute Press, 1991.
- Varghese, Baby. *West Syrian Liturgical Theology*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2004.

CZY NIEKATOLICY GODNI SĄ WYMIENIANIA PO IMIENIU W TEKSTACH KATOLICKIEJ ANAFORY?

KILKA SPOSTRZEŻEŃ NA TEMAT ART. 121 DYREKTORIUM W SPRAWIE REALIZACJI
ZASAD I NORM DOTYCZĄCYCH EKUMENIZMU

Streszczenie

Włączenie się Kościoła katolickiego w ruch ekumeniczny spowodowało liczne zmiany w dotychczasowej wiekowej praktyce. Dekret o ekumenizmie, pomimo swego uzupełniającego wobec soborowej Konstytucji o Kościele charakteru, musiał być wkrótce uściślony w formie konkretnych instrukcji i wskazówek. Z nich powstało tzw. *Dyrektorium ekumeniczne*, które też trzeba było dostosowywać do wciąż postępujących osiągnięć dialogów. Obecna jego wersja z 1993 r., uznająca za podstawę działań ekumenicznych nawrócenie i wysiłek modlitewny, zawiera pewne ograniczenia w tym zakresie, jakie wieloletnim ekumenistom wydają się być dyskusyjne. Jednym z nich jest podany w art. 121 zakaz umieszczania próśb za Kościoły chrześcijańskie i ich przedstawicieli w ramach anafory, przy czym dokument powołuje się na „dawną tradycję chrześcijańską w liturgii i eklezjologii”. Takie postawienie sprawy ewokuje szereg pytań, dotyczących zarówno zasadności przytoczonej argumentacji i rugowania z anafory modlitw za jedność, jak też oceny już wcześniej wprowadzonych, za zgodą niektórych biskupów, praktyk tzw. anafory ekumenicznie otwartej. Celem niniejszego studium jest znalezienie na nie odpowiedzi, zwłaszcza

z uwzględnieniem badań liturgicznych tradycji rzymskiej w ramach odnowy posoborowej oraz Kościołów wschodnich, oraz postulatów teologii ekumenicznej.

Przeprowadzone analizy wykazały kilka zasadniczych faktów. Sam tekst art. 121 jest niespójny (odnosi się tak do błogosławieństw, prośb, jak też do anafory), nie uwzględnia rozłożenia pierwiastków strukturalnych w liturgii (zwłaszcza Katolickich Kościołów Wschodnich), a jego umiejscowienie w *Dyrektorium* w ramach podrozdziału na temat liturgii niesakramentalnej przeczy przyjętym podstawowym klasyfikacjom liturgiki. Posoborowe Modlitwy eucharystyczne liturgii rzymskiej zawierają prośby dotyczące także chrześcijan innych wyznań (oraz wszystkich innych ludzi), choć – poza dodatkowymi prośbami za nowożeńców czy podczas Mszy pogrzebowych – raczej nie przewiduje się wymieniać dodatkowych imion przy wspomnieniu papieża i miejscowego biskupa. Kościoły Wschodnie posługują się ponad 150 anaforami, występującymi w ramach kilku rodzin liturgicznych, pojedyncze zaś wspólnoty eklezjalne strzegą nieraz bardzo zróżnicowanych tradycji, dotyczących również wspominania przedstawicieli innych Kościołów (a tradycje te nieraz zmieniały się na przestrzeni wieków) – jednakże całe to bogactwo zostało w art. 121 *Dyrektorium* zupełnie pominięte (o ile w ogóle znane było jego autorom). Dlatego powoływanie się na bliżej nieokreśloną „dawną tradycję chrześcijańską”, jaka ma stać się jedynym modelem dla całego konfesyjnie rozumianego Kościoła katolickiego (a więc włącznie z chrześcijanami tradycji wschodnich), uznać należy za nieprzekonywujące, niedorzeczne, a nawet budzące podejrzenia o próbę konfesjonalizacji i uniformizmu. Zamiast tego w tekście zarysowano pewne możliwości praktycznego uzupełniania ekumenicznych „braków” w ramach obecnie stosowanych Modlitw eucharystycznych.

Słowa kluczowe: anafora, modlitwa, jedność chrześcijan, *Dyrektorium ekumeniczne*, ekskluzywizm.