Please read this report in conjunction with Resolution 11.06 of the Inter-Anglican Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations (IASCER) and Resolution 12 of the Joint Standing Committee of the Anglican Consultative Council and the Primates and Moderators of the Anglican Communion, February 2007.

Eucharistic Food and Drink
A report of the Inter-Anglican Liturgical Commission to the Anglican Consultative Council

Task
To prepare a report for the Inter-Anglican Liturgical Commission (IALC) to forward to the Anglican Consultative Council (ACC) concerning the use of elements at the Eucharist, especially deviations, and to make recommendations on guidelines for the same.

At its Hong Kong Meeting in 2002, the ACC adopted the following resolution:

This ACC:
1. awaits the survey by the IALC of the practice in relation to the elements of Holy Communion in the Churches of the Anglican Communion, and of some of the reasons given for any departure from dominical command; and
2. requests that the results of such a survey be presented to the Joint Standing Committee upon completion.

Process
Paul Gibson sent out a letter with the survey questionnaire attached (see Appendix 1) to all Provincial Secretaries. He followed up this correspondence with those Churches that did not respond by the deadline. In April 2005 Ron Dowling e-mailed all the Provincial Secretaries who had not yet responded.

The subcommittee consulted about the results and also with the Revd Dr Andrew McGowan of Trinity Theological School, Melbourne, Australia, a noted scholar and author in this area.

Data
For the results see the Table in Appendix 2.

There were responses from 29 Provinces/Churches. In the Table a complete blank indicates no response.

7 respondents indicate that the question of substituting for bread and wine has arisen.

10 respondents indicate that substitution has taken/takes place or may have done so unofficially.

1 Endorsed by the International Anglican Liturgical Consultation 2005. Copyright © 2005 by the Secretary General of the Anglican Consultative Council and may not be reproduced in whole or in part without the written consent of the Secretary General of the Anglican Consultative Council.
The reasons for substitution include allergies, concern for alcoholics, cost, desire to avoid alcohol, unavailability, legal situation.

Commodities substituted include rice or gluten-free bread, grape juice, de-alcoholised wine, biscuit, round cake, Coca-Cola, Fanta, banana juice, pineapple or passion fruit wine, raisins boiled in water with a little sugar added, rice cakes etc.

Sources and Formularies
The New Testament

Canon Law
The Canons of 1603-4, as revised in the various Provinces.

The Book of Common Prayer (1662)
…it shall suffice that the Bread be such as is usual to be eaten; but the best and purest Wheat Bread that conveniently may be gotten.\(^2\)

The Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral 1886, 1888
That, in the opinion of this [Lambeth] Conference, the following Articles supply a basis on which approach may be by God’s blessing made towards Home Reunion:
…
(c) The two Sacraments ordained by Christ himself – Baptism and the Supper of the Lord – ministered with unfailing use of Christ’s words of Institution, and of the elements ordained by Him.

Other documents included the Statement by the Inter-Anglican Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relations (IASCER) (see Appendix 3) and the ‘Kanamai Statement’ (see below). Several other articles have also been listed because of their particular relevance.

Discussion
The responses to the questionnaire give some reasons for substitution of wheat bread and grape wine. These could be described as those positively embraced and those factors forced upon a particular Province.

The major factor for embracing a substitution is that of cultural adaptation. For some Anglicans their local culture reads very different meanings into bread and wine as these are ‘foreign’ imports. Other elements from the local culture convey the notion of celebratory meal far more than bread and wine.

There are a number of factors forced upon various Provinces. Evidence from the questionnaire, the discussion at the Berkeley IALC (see No. 6 in the Minutes of the Berkeley IALC 2001), and other anecdotal evidence suggest that these factors include

\(^2\) The Book of Common Prayer (1662). Rubric at the end of the Service of Holy Communion.
the unavailability of wheat bread and/or fermented grape wine. The latter is more of a problem. Some Provinces find themselves governed by (Islamic) governments who have outlawed all alcoholic drinks. It is virtually impossible for these churches to obtain grape wine, or have it in their possession. In other Provinces wheat bread (wafers) and grape wine must be imported and this is far too expensive. In yet other places alcohol is associated with drunkenness and the local church teaches (and insists on) total abstinence. Other reasons offered include ministering with (recovering) alcoholics and also with those who have gluten allergies.

It is our view that health issues should be dealt with at the local level (parish/diocese) and, although important, are not really within the province of this report. However, it should be noted that de-alcoholised wine is now available more readily, and that gluten free bread is far more readily available as well. Roman Catholic arguments about the licitness of gluten free bread (or leavened bread for that matter) hold no authority in Anglicanism, especially when placed beside the BCP rubric.

The responses to the questionnaire do raise a couple of other questions.

1. What constitutes cultural authenticity? When does an import become part of the culture? The gradual globalisation of trade over the past few centuries means that many ‘imports’ are now seen as being part of the culture. The use of carbonated soft drinks in some parts of Africa is a case in point.

2. Is it the eucharistic elements themselves that carry the dominical tradition, or the eucharistic action, or both together? Does the breaking and sharing action carry the tradition as much as, as well as, or more than the use of wheat bread (whether leavened or unleavened)? Is the breaking and sharing of a rice cake outside the tradition while the sharing of small individual wheat wafers acceptable? (See Ruth Meyers’ material.)

What does it mean to, “do what the Lord did”? Andrew McGowan points to the variations from within the New Testament (e.g. barley bread in John’s Gospel) and to post-pasteurisation view of the distinction between grape juice and grape wine. (See Appendix 4.)

Recommendations

In respect to the responses reported in the survey, and the considerations set out above:

1. We reaffirm that the normative principle and practice of the Anglican Communion has always been and continues to be the use of the elements of bread and wine at the Eucharist.

2. We do not think that it is necessary or helpful to define ‘bread’ or ‘wine’ in precise detail. It is enough that the elements should be realistically capable of being called ‘bread’ and ‘wine’ in the context of the celebration of the Eucharist in a particular culture at a particular time.

---

3 It is only after the invention/discovery of pasteurisation and similar processes that it has been possible to stop grape juice from fermenting naturally.
3. We note that in some Provinces the Eucharist is celebrated with elements other than bread and wine. This is because it is very difficult for them to obtain either bread or wine, or it is because those particular communities use other elements for reasons to do with local culture or pastoral necessity. We consider these to be exceptional circumstances best dealt with by the Province concerned, giving serious consideration to the effect of such variation on other Provinces. We do not think it necessary, at the level of the Communion as a whole, to do other than reaffirm the general principle in 1. above.
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Ascetic Eucharists (New York, Oxford University Press, 1999)

Quevedo-Bosch, Juan, “The Eucharistic Species and Inculturation” in David R. Holeton, ed., Revising the Eucharist.
Appendix 1

Questionnaire

1. Has the use of elements other than wheat bread and fermented grape wine in the celebration of the Holy Communion been suggested seriously in your Province?
   Yes ☐ No ☐

1) Are elements other than wheat bread and fermented grape wine actually used in your Province?
   Yes ☐ No ☐

2) If so, please identify the elements that are substituted for wheat bread and fermented grape wine.

3) If elements other than wheat bread and fermented grape wine are used in your Province, would you say that this practice is:
   i) Very rare? Yes ☐ No ☐
   ii) Occasional? Yes ☐ No ☐
   iii) Widespread? Yes ☐ No ☐
   iv) General? Yes ☐ No ☐

4) If elements other than bread and fermented grape wine are used in your Province, is this practice governed by canons or other resolutions of a governing body of the Province. If so, please supply a copy of the relevant document.

5) If you have any other information which would help the working group complete its task, please send it with your reply.

Please return to:
   Paul Gibson
   Coordinator for Liturgy
   588 Millwood Road
   Toronto ON M4S 1K8
   Canada
## Appendix 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q1 Qualified</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q2 Qualified</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aotearoa NZ &amp; Polynesia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rice or gluten-free bread where there are allergies; grape juice for children and alcoholics</td>
<td>Rubrics refer to “bread and wine”.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-alcoholic wine for wine</td>
<td>Occasional</td>
<td>Not by the General Synod of the ACA, but by at least one diocesan synod ordinance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bangladesh</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The question has never arisen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermuda</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burundi</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wine is expensive and some Anglicans don’t take alcohol</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Some countries are using locally made non-alcoholic wine which of course doesn’t prevent the blessing from God at Eucharist. Coke is less considered in many countries like USA or UK, in some others it is highly estimated as a luxurious drink</td>
<td>Some aboriginal communities use de-alcoholized red wine. Gluten-free/rice bread for those with wheat allergies</td>
<td>Very rare</td>
<td>Exceptions occur but are not officially sanctioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Very rare</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Africa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central de America</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Flour bread, biscuit, round cake, Coca, Fanta etc.</td>
<td>Widespread</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPSA</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q1 Qualified</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q2 Qualified</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>There are unreported local deviations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Very rare</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerusalem &amp; The Middle East</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lusitanian Church</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melanesia</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nippon Sei Ko Kai</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North India</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Raisins boiled in water with a little sugar added</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Papua New Guinea</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>First raised prior to the autonomy in 1988</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Mostly in ecumenical services</td>
<td>Rice cakes and rice wine</td>
<td>Very rare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It has always been taught in our only Seminary that the primary symbols of the Eucharist are not bread and wine, but people.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Q1</th>
<th>Q1 Qualified</th>
<th>Q2</th>
<th>Q2 Qualified</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spanish Reformed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>gluten-free bread for allergy sufferers, unfermented grape juice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South East Asia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South India</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Cone</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Biscuits and fruit juice</td>
<td>General</td>
<td>No canons or resolution</td>
<td>In villages without bread or biscuits, people are encouraged to use local staple foods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanzania</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uganda</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Biscuits for wheat bread, soda e.g. coca cola for wine. Banana juice, pineapple or passion fruit wine also used. Many churches did this during the difficult years of Idi Amin 1971-79. It was difficult to get bread and wine. Not sure whether the practice is still going on</td>
<td>Very rare</td>
<td>Canon 2.13.3 of Canons of Church of Uganda, “In absence of grape wine well boiled banana juice wine or pineapple or</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Province</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q1 Qualified</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q2 Qualified</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| USA      | No | No           |    |              |   |   |   | passion fruit wine may be used, in consultation with the bishop”.
| Wales    | No | No           |    |              |   |   |   | Deviations are mostly at parish not diocesan level |
| West Africa |     |              |    |              |   |   |   | |

Since many replies were qualified rather than positive or purely negative, I have tried to indicate the qualifications. Two replies do not have the Province clearly indicated on them.
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Inter Anglican Standing Commission on Ecumenical Relationships

Statement on EUCHARISTIC FOOD

The Commission noted the resolution of the International Anglican Liturgical Consultation that a recommendation be sent to the Standing Committee of the ACC ‘that a survey be conducted to determine practice in relation to the elements of Holy Communion throughout the Communion with particular reference to the reasons for local practice where it is different and also a proposal that the ACC form a small working group, including members of the IALC, to study the data and draft a report with suggested guidelines for further consideration by IALC and to ACC Standing Committee.’ The Commission, having studied the paper by Paul Gibson which introduced the IALC debate and the debate itself as summarised in the IALC minutes and recognising the particular difficulties facing churches in certain regions, wishes to draw the attention of the Primates and the Standing Committee of ACC to the following points,

i) The constitutive authority for the Eucharist lies in the action of Jesus at the Last Supper in taking, blessing, breaking and giving bread and wine and commanding his disciples to do this in remembrance of him. As Paul writes, “As often as we eat this bread and drink this cup we proclaim the Lord’s death until he comes” (1 Corinthians 11:26).

ii) It has been constant Anglican practice, in accordance with the continuous tradition of the Church, to do this with the elements of bread and wine in obedience to the Lord’s command.

iii) Although the other symbolic occasions on which Jesus shared meals with his disciples and with many whom the society of his day regarded as outcasts speak powerfully to what it means to share his life and break bread in obedience to his command, it is the dominical command to “do this” at the Last Supper which is fundamental.

iv) To vary in any way official Anglican practice in this respect would be to put hard won ecumenical agreements on the Eucharist seriously in jeopardy, and we have not authority to do this.

v) In contexts where there are severe difficulties in the obtaining of wine for the Eucharist, Anglicans should seek to remedy this in conjunction with Roman Catholics and other ecumenical partners. Where the issue is one of expense this should be a primary call on the support of wealthier churches in the Communion. Assistance with practical difficulties can be given by the ACO.

vi) It should be noted that Christians work within a given symbolic framework inherited from God’s revelation in the Old Testament and fulfilled in the New and this should be regarded as normative.

vii) Whilst it may often be possible, as Gregory the Great commanded Augustine, to ‘baptise’ many local customs and use them in Christian worship, the matter of the sacrament should be inviolable, and we should recognise that Christians have often had to be ‘counter-cultural’ for the sake of the Gospel.
viii) Where practices of using other sacramental elements are being pressed, or are even occasionally used, provinces should be reminded of the fundamental obligations to do what the Lord did, and adhere to that rather than adopting a cultural relativism.
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Two Notes on the Elements of the Eucharist
Andrew McGowan, Trinity College, Melbourne.

1. The Elements of the Eucharistic Meal in Early Christianity
Wheat bread and fermented grape wine were not necessarily the only elements used in meal gatherings of the ancient Church that we would now call “Eucharist”. Three types of “variation” from that norm (although this is not necessarily an accurate way to think of the diversity of uses) may be noted.

a) The character of the bread
There is no reason to assume that the bread used at Eucharistic meals was always made from wheat. This assumption probably derives from the close association of the Eucharist with the seder of the Passover, but ignores the variety of Eucharistic traditions, even in the NT, that connect ongoing Christian meals with Gospel traditions such as resurrection appearances and not solely with the Last Supper. The slightly later evidence of the Mishnah is that the bread of the seder could be made from wheat, barley, spelt, oats or rye. Barley was cheaper and more easily obtained in some areas (see Rev 3.3). The specific identification of the bread in the Johannine story of the Sign of the Loaves (John 6), usually understood as bearing at least some Eucharistic reference, as barley (6.9,13), should not be ignored. The use of the word artos even in the Last Supper stories also leaves open the nature of the bread as leavened or unleavened. The use of bread, leavened or unleavened, made from grains other that wheat is therefore conceivable and almost certainly did take place in the early Church.

b) The contents of the cup
The use of grape wine seems to have been the norm in the ancient Church. There were also wines made from other fruits and substances, and it is not inconceivable that these were used, especially in the Near East. Use of other forms of wine or alcoholic drink at the seder of the Passover at least represent a parallel case, granted that Rabbinic evidence is later than the NT. Indications that the wine of the Last Supper was understood to be from grapes (Mark 14:25 etc) need not be seen as an absolute obstacle to variety, partly because the expression “fruit of the vine” may be understood somewhat generically as a circumlocution for wine, and partly because not all communities regarded the Last Supper as sole model for Eucharistic practice.

While there were different forms of grape (and other) wine, such as “new wine” or tirosh (Hos 4.11), it is misleading to think of these as “non-alcoholic”, or as having properties that would make any significant impact on choice; all such substances contained some alcohol, for one thing. Thus some Christian groups who wished to avoid wine used water or no cup at all, primarily to avoid the symbolic connections of wine with sacrifice; the ability for the liquid to be used as a libation would have been one of the normal tests of “wine”. The existence of pasteurized grape juice in the present day thus introduces a choice not present in the ancient world, where to avoid the moral and symbolic connotations of wine it would have been necessary to avoid fruit juices altogether.
There were also circumstances where milk and honey, and/or water, were used as an additional ritual drink; this is attested primarily in relation to baptism.

c) Additional foods

The example of milk and honey just mentioned is a case where foods or drinks additional to the expected bread and wine were used. There were also cases where the meal was expanded to include other foods perhaps symbolic of plenty or festivity, such as cheese and olives, indicating the importance of some particular celebration. In some more sectarian settings, meat and wine were avoided altogether, and Eucharistic meals might have included a variety of acceptable foods including fish, cheese and vegetables.

2. “Transmission” and “Translation”: Synchronic and Diachronic Considerations

The fidelity of the Church to Jesus’ command to “do this in memory of me” has arguably followed two interwoven kinds of logic, one of which might be called “transmission” and the other “translation”. By the first I mean the diachronic logic of conscious tradition, where the Church receives and imitates the actions of Jesus in the specific ways it understands him to have given and intended them. By the second I mean the synchronic logic of conscious inculturation, where the Church seeks to re-enact the meaning of the actions of Jesus anew in each context. Each of these forms of logic is already present and acknowledged in liturgy and elsewhere; for instance, the use of the Hebrew word “Hallelujah” follows the first; to say or sing “praise the Lord” follows the second. In general, neither of these approaches has an unqualified claim on liturgical practice; there has always been a level of interplay between them.

Transmit

In terms of the Eucharistic elements, the principle of “transmission” is maintained in attempts to use elements similar to those of the Last Supper in particular. Yet since the origins of the Eucharist are broader than that, it is also possible to evoke this principle a little more broadly at least. Some may argue that the significance of bread and wine, even diachronically, derives from them being the ancient Mediterranean staples as well as from more specific ritual precedents. In any case, the value of the principle may be distinguished from the value of particular claims based on it; the official teaching of the Roman Catholic Church, which extends to insisting on the use of unleavened wheat bread as well as fermented grape wine, probably involves some historical mistakes about the necessary “matter” of the ancient seder as well as a very particular and exclusive theological reading of the connection between Passover and Eucharist.

Even relatively strict interpretations of this principle differ, since—to invoke a famous example—eastern Orthodox Churches use leavened, rather than unleavened bread. Yet in general the “transmission” approach may be said to support use of the elements Jesus would have used; bread made from grains such as wheat and barley common in the eastern Mediterranean, and grape wine.

It may also be noted that transmission has as developmental as well as a preservative aspect—which may to some extent be understood as part of its necessary interaction with translation. That is to say, even use of wheat bread and grape wine has changed
over time and in different settings according to local and contemporary conventions. The standard wafer bread and fortified wine of much recent western liturgy bears little or no immediate aesthetic resemblance to the bread and wine of first-century Palestine, despite origins in similar plants. In very recent times, the move to forms of unleavened (or at least flat) bread seems to suggest a concern to evoke Mediterranean or ancient Near Eastern food more directly, at least visually.

The interpretation of Jesus’ example is always interpreted ecclesially, rather than in isolation, assuming the ongoing practice of the Church which could not really be inferred purely from the narratives of institution themselves. In isolation, a practice based solely on transmission of practice could become absurd. Jesus was not generally understood to advocate an annual seder even if that is what he was doing, for instance. This means that context is always a necessary element of any adequate transmission.

Translation

Issues of “variation” from the traditional norms that are being raised in contemporary discussions are perhaps of three kinds. In no particular order, there is the practical difficulty in obtaining wheat bread and grape wine in settings where these are not grown or made; second there is the problem of meaning raised in the use of elements otherwise unknown to the culture; and third there are issues involving the necessity of individual communicants who should or believe they should abstain from one or other of the traditional elements for reasons of health, broadly speaking. Each of these involves some suggestion that changes to the elements be made to make them appropriate to the context.

It is possible to argue that the setting in which the Eucharist is celebrated must always provide some of its specifics, since meaning depends on the system of which it is a part. An argument for translation may also include belief that a local context provides sufficient for the Church to celebrate the sacrament, even without globalisation, and that to mean what Jesus meant and to do what Jesus intended, we ought to do (or be open to doing) what he “would” do in the present and local milieu. Thus different breads and different wines may be seen as possible, or even necessary.

Yet strong proponents of indigenization may well overlook the fact that form, as well as matter, are culturally determined. Thus it would be possible to argue that a local staple (or festive) diet, not necessarily a form of bread and wine in particular, might be best; or that some form of cultural expression of communion or sacred memory other than a meal be employed.

We may also note that concerns expressed about the Western character of the traditional elements may require nuance. Wheat bread and grape wine would not originally have been the most obvious elements for a meal enculturated in northern European settings. Many Christian signs are insisted upon despite their “meaninglessness” outside the specific history of Jesus and the Church. Yet it is undeniable that the meaning of signs is determined in part by factors such as neo-colonialism—a category to which sacramental theology may not yet have made its

---

4 The changes across the 1548, 1549 and 1552 Communion services make for an instructive shift towards a more “translated” position, where at least quality (and wheaten origin) is insisted upon.
last response. The diachronic “transmission” approach can and ought to be understood as itself allowing some breadth and diversity which “translation” concerns might well employ.
Appendix 5

Extract from the Minutes of the 2001 IALC (Berkeley)

6 Eucharistic Food

Paul Gibson reviewed a paper (circulated in advance of the meeting) he had prepared to stimulate discussion on the possibility of substituting other commodities for bread and wine at the eucharist. He set the subject within the context of accounts of eating and drinking events in the ministry of Jesus, noting the variety of food involved (water, bread, wine, and fish) and suggested that the act of eating and drinking may be primary and the commodity secondary (but not unimportant) and that perhaps the origins of the eucharist should be seen within the broader framework of all these events rather than as a discrete and isolated event on its own. He recognized that a case can be made for celebrating the eucharist with food other than bread and wine because the act of sharing food is primary and the bread and wine tradition has not been maintained in Christian tradition with the purity that some may have wished (the use of grape juice intended not to be wine is an example). However, whatever food is used at the eucharist should carry symbolic freight as profound as bread and wine in the culture of Jesus and should come to the table with the same intimations of nurture, fellowship, generosity, dignity and solemnity. Further still, we must ask if we have used bread and wine with integrity. Do our styles of giving communion really suggest sharing food, and is it really food that is shared? (We often use bread that is as much unlike ordinary bread as possible.) Do we pray over food in a fashion that grasps its symbolism of God’s kingdom with implications for present political, social, and interpersonal behaviour? He said he did not consider the question closed, but remained cautious.

Members described circumstances in which the use of wine presented problems and in which substitutes are already in use. The Provincial Synod of Burundi has decided that wine will not be used at the altar. The problem was described as a spiritual issue because there is no distinction between drinking from the altar and drinking from the public bars. And second, it is an economic matter because they do not have enough money. A member from Rwanda said that there is no problem in using wine at the moment, but it is very expensive and parishes often go for months without communion because they have no wine. Some other Christian groups persuade Anglicans not to go to communion because the wine contains alcohol. In Uganda there is no problem with wine. Some local drinks are not clean, but wine is clean. However, chalices are not always available and the water used is not always safe. In Uganda communion by intinction was adopted by the House of Bishops because of the problems of AIDS. A member said that during the worst of the American blockade of Cuba wine was shipped from England. Later Cubans started producing wine out of local products of honey, fruit, or grain. People still miss the English wine because it relates better to the biblical story, but they recognize their own product as their wine. A member from Sudan said that in the church’s beginning years wine was used, but later during a period of revival wine was criticized by the Christians themselves. The Synod of the church decided to find out what should be the right element. A member said that if Christ was born in Sudan would he ask his members to use wine where there is no wine? The church uses a drink made of dried fruit and a little sugar. He said that his country is in time of war and sometimes cassava is used.
instead of bread because there is no bread available. A member from Kenya said that the church in her Province uses wine imported by the government from Cyprus. When the missionaries came to Kenya they condemned the local brew—anything local was bad—and it is still not possible to use a local brew. It would be too much of a compromise. She said the Consultation should release the Provinces from the bondage of having to do things like using imported wine from Cyprus or using wafer bread. A member from the Arabian Gulf said that in some countries the church unofficially makes wine, but when it is not available grape juice is used. A member from the Philippines said that when his Province became autonomous they asked if they could use local bread and wine and were told to use any bread and wine they wanted. This became a problem in relationships with Roman Catholics. The central symbolism of the eucharist is not bread and wine but people and if they are not transformed by the eucharistic celebration the element doesn’t matter. If local bread and wine are used it must be done with great catechesis. A member from Polynesia said that wine and wafers are still used, but in the ecumenical field other things have been happening. Some years ago a Tongan theologian used coconut. At the Pacific Theological College bread and wine are offered to those who need that, and coconut to those who prefer that. The Anglican Church has not really begun to discuss this. At a recent reconciliation ceremony, kava, a local drink which is not alcoholic but which has narcotic qualities, was used. A member reported that among first nations people in North America many congregations now use bread in whatever local form it usually appears. Wine is more of a problem because it has had an oppressive history. In some places peyote has been used, with the understanding that it should not be used to the point of inebriation, and this attitude has been transferred to wine. But the question remains how can you use an intoxicating substance? Grape juice and non-alcoholic wine are often used, because most reservations are dry. Hawaiians are still upset because they were denied permission to use poi instead of bread. In Alaska, sacred meals are still very much part of the culture. Potlatch is practised among all Alaskan people, which always includes whale blubber. Although potlatch is a very sacred event, it is never connected with what Jesus did. This results in the eucharist being seen as a meagre event by comparison. An elder who is a priest is starting to say at the eucharist that Jesus made potlatch for the people and this is beginning to have an impact on how the symbols are taken and received. Most people are very strict about how they use the wine and bread. A member noted that there are two aspects to the question: the problems of those who do not have or do not use bread and wine and the problems of those who have them but do not use them in truly meaningful ways. A member from Pakistan told the meeting the Pakistan went dry but Christians are allowed to have wine. In cities the parishes get wine from the Roman Catholic Church or make their own wine from raisins and sugar. In rural areas there is more of problem because Christians do not wish to offend their Muslim neighbours and grape juice is often used. Robert Gribben, the ecumenical partner, told the meeting that the Methodist Church identified itself with the temperance movement. The work of Pasteur suggested that unpasteurized wine contained germs. Other factors contributed to a suspicion of wine. Eventually it was agreed that the “fruit of the vine” should be used, because many people were using Ribena or fruit juice or a local soft drink. In Australia there has been discussion among Methodists about the use of dealcoholized wine—another unpleasant drink! He said he would like to see greater scholarly exploration of the use of water.

Paul Gibson moved and Tessa MacKenzie seconded:
that a recommendation be sent to the Standing Committee of the Anglican Consultative Council that a survey be conducted to determine practice in relation to the elements of holy communion throughout the Communion, with particular reference to the reasons for local practice where it is different and to the impact of concern about both intoxication and the risk of infection, and that the ACC form a small working group including members of the IALC to study the data and draft a report with suggested guidelines for further consideration by the IALC and the ACC Standing Committee.