

16 February 1996

Expressing the Heart of the Gospel:

a review of the three orders of Holy Communion in

A Prayer Book for Australia

by Dr. Robert Doyle

SUMMARY

1. Criteria

- 1.1 CLEAR EXPOSITION OF THE BIBLE
- 1.2 AGAINST THE COMMUNITY OF IDEAS
- 1.3 TAKING RESPONSIBILITY FOR MISTAKEN INTERPRETATIONS

2. Central Issue: Eucharistic Sacrifice

- 2.1 IN THE EARLY AND MEDIEVAL CHURCH
- 2.2 EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE IS SPIRITUAL
- 2.3 REFORMATION REPUDIATION OF EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE
- 2.4 EXPRESSING EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE: REAL PRESENCE AND EPICLESIS
- 2.5 WHAT WAS AT STAKE IN CRANMER'S REJECTION OF EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE: JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH ALONE
- 2.6 TRENDS IN ANGLICAN LITURGY SINCE LAMBETH 1958: OBJECTIVE SACRIFICE, ANAMNESIS
- 2.7 RELIGIOUS COMPOSITION OF AUSTRALIA

3. Evaluation of APBA First Order

4. Evaluation of APBA Second Order

- 4.1 OVERVIEW
- 4.2 THANKSGIVING 1
- 4.3 THANKSGIVING 2
- 4.4 THANKSGIVING 3
 1. *it is . . . our salvation*
 2. *by the power of your Word and Holy Spirit, sanctify this bread and wine, that we who share in this holy sacrament may be partakers of Christ's body and blood*
 3. *we commemorate and celebrate*
 4. *here we offer you a spiritual sacrifice*
 5. *Words of administration, and the alternate anthem: 'Lamb of God'*
 6. *Contemporary Roman Catholic practice and opinion*
- 4.5 THANKSGIVING 4
- 4.6 THANKSGIVING 5
- 4.7 THE POST-COMMUNION OF §27-34
- 4.8 SEASONAL VARIATIONS

5. Evaluation of APBA Third Order

6. Conclusion

Since the Christian Church has expressed its understanding of the death of Christ in the Lord's Supper (the Service of Holy Communion or Eucharist), it is no surprise that here controversies in the Christian tradition have been their most keen, and productive. To speak in a liturgical manner of the death of Christ is to speak of the heart of the gospel. In reviewing, then, the Eucharist services in *An Australian Prayer Book* we not only dare look full into the depth and significance of God's holy love for us, we also bound to recognise nearly two thousand years of Christian interpretation of Holy Scripture and its expression in liturgical form.

1. Criteria

Our subject matter suggests three criteria for appropriate analysis. In order of importance:

1.1 CLEAR EXPOSITION OF THE BIBLE

Because Christian liturgy is for edification (1 Cor 14 - which Cranmer appeals to in his 'Preface' to *The Book of Common Prayer*), it ought of divine necessity be a clear exposition of the teaching of the Bible. It is therefore the duty of those involved in writing and publishing liturgy to show that it is a clear exposition of the gospel; this by the nature of the case may neither be assumed or asserted, but ought be demonstrated.

1.2 AGAINST THE COMMUNITY OF IDEAS

Because liturgy is a public document within the Christian Church, it is not good enough to place private interpretations on it; any fair interpretation must be against the community of ideas which distinguish the long and recent histories of Christian liturgy and against the commonsense canons of English grammar and syntax, and against commonsense interpretations of the meaning of symbolic actions.

1.3 TAKING RESPONSIBILITY FOR MISTAKEN INTERPRETATIONS

Compelled by Christian love, we ought take responsibility for fellow Christians who read liturgy in ways which cloud the teaching of the Bible. For the spiritual good of that brother or sister we ought strive actively to exclude those interpretations.

A good example of this can be seen in Cranmer's revision of the first prayer book of 1549 into the book of 1552, which is embodied with few changes in our *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662. Bp Gardiner of Winchester welcomed Cranmer's original Lord's Supper service as clearly teaching transubstantiation and the re-offering of Christ that is at the heart of the Roman Catholic Mass. In spite of the personal animosity between the two, and the fact that Cranmer's pride in his first reformation prayer book was publicly wounded, and that he dismissed Gardiner's criticism's as the mean cavils of a 'mistaker', nevertheless, the Archbishop radically revised the Lord's Supper service of 1549 to remove all traces of the old doctrines that Gardiner had seized upon.

2. Central Issue: Eucharistic Sacrifice

One issue has continued to be at the heart of the debates and changes over structure and content of the Eucharist: the nature of the 'sacrifice' expressed. 'Eucharistic sacrifice' thus provides a useful key to examine *APBA* against the norm of Holy Scripture and the history of Christian tradition.

2.1 IN THE EARLY AND MEDIEVAL CHURCH

Almost universally in the Church before the 16th century Reformation, the Eucharist or Mass, as it was variously known, was believed to be in a real sense a re-immolation (re-sacrificing) of Christ for the sins of the living and the dead. Cyprian (d. 258) is a very early exponent of this view. In highly realistic language, Cyprian speaks of the priest sacramentally re-enacting the passion of the Lord which he originally presented to the Father, and that it is offered on behalf of people in need, including on behalf of the dead. 'As to our mentioning His passion in all our sacrifices [Eucharists] - for it is in the Lord's passion that our sacrifice consists (*passio est enim domini sacrificium quod offerimus*) - we ought to do nothing other than He himself did.'¹ With respect to our activities in the Eucharist, Cyprian regularly uses the terms 'sacrifice', 'oblation', and even refers once to 'the dominical victim' (*dominica hostia*).² Cyril of Jerusalem (315-86) and Chrysostom (347-407) use the same language to indicate with Cyprian that the Eucharist was not just metaphorically a sacrifice, but objectively and efficaciously so. In fact, they strengthen the notion of the Eucharist as objective sacrifice by calling it 'the holy and most awful sacrifice', and the 'sacrifice of propitiation', and identical with the one the Lord himself offered at the Last Supper and on the cross - 'the victim is always the same.' Chrysostom makes it clear that the whole action of the Eucharist takes place in the heavenly, the spiritual sphere.³ This is very significant because this view of ministry and mimesis is conformed to those Greek thought forms which saw the relationship between earth and heaven in metaphysical terms of image and reality. To say, then, that the mimetic reproduction of the actions of Christ at the Last Supper means that the Eucharistic action takes place in heavenly or spiritual sphere, is to say that it is *really* happening, not that it is a metaphor. In this way, the Eucharistic sacrifice is a real and salvific re-immolation of Christ. And again, it is stressed by Cyril and Chrysostom that such a propitiatory sacrifice, as the Eucharist is, is offered for the dead as well as the living: 'Christ slain on behalf of our sins, propitiating the merciful God on behalf both of them and of ourselves.'⁴

The significance of this is that all the distinctive features of the Roman Catholic doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass had been a central part of Christian liturgical theory and practice for over a 1000 years before the 16th century Reformers rejected it outright. The achievement of the Twenty-Second Session of the Roman Catholic Council of Trent was to codify these notions of eucharistic sacrifice, and make them the standard of theology and practice of the modern Catholic Church to this day. Therefore, we write our liturgies substantially in the same context as that of Thomas Cranmer and the English Reformers who gave us the distinctive reformation liturgy we see in the BCP of 1662. When we tie notions of sacrifice to the offering of the body and blood of Christ symbolized by the elements of bread and wine, especially after the deliberate and consistent exclusion of it by the Reformers, 1700 years of Christian tradition tells us unambiguously that we are re-immolating Christ. Official Roman Catholic theology, both pre and post-Vatican II, asks the question: 'When does the actual re-offering of Christ take place?' And gives the answer: 'in the prayer of consecration.' A Church which is in historical continuity with the main stream Churches, as the Anglican Church is, does not write its liturgies in a vacuum but against a tradition which gives meaning to what we write. We cannot in good faith ignore that meaning and still claim we belong to a community of ideas.

2.2 EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE IS SPIRITUAL

Even though the catholic tradition has always seen the eucharistic re-immolation of Christ in the most real and objective terms, it has also insisted that this re-immolation is spiritual. Thus Cyril also calls it 'the spiritual sacrifice, the unbloody service'.⁵ In contrast to the sacrificial activity of the Old Testament priesthood, Chrysostom calls Jesus' death 'the spiritual sacrifice'.⁶ If 'spiritual' is

¹ *Ep.* 63.17, cited from J.N.D Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines* (London: A&C Black, 1965) 215; for the wider context refer to the translation in *The Ante-Nicene Fathers* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986 [1851]) vol. 5 p. 363.

² Cited from Kelly, *Doctrines*, 215; see *ANF* 5.427.

³ *Hebr. hom.* 13, 1; 14, 1, cited from Kelly, *Doctrines*, 452; and for wider context see *Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1978 [1889]) 1st series, vol. 14. p. 433-4.

⁴ Cyril, *Cat.* 23, 8-10; cited from Kelly, *Doctrines*, 451; *NPNF* 2nd 7.154-5.

⁵ *Op. cit.*

⁶ *Hebr. hom.* 13.8-9, *NPNF* 1st 14.430-1.

applicable to the altar of the cross, so then to altar in the Church. In his epiclesis asking for the bread to become 'the precious body of Christ', Chrysostom refers to the Eucharist as 'this spiritual and unbloody worship.'⁷ Nearly 1200 years later Trent makes the same point about the Mass being spiritual using the traditional language of 'unbloody':

And inasmuch as in this divine service which is celebrated in the mass is contained and immolated in an unbloody manner the same Christ who once offered Himself in a bloody manner on the altar of the cross, the holy council teaches that this is truly propitiatory . . . For the victim is one and the same, the same now offering by the ministry of priests who then offered Himself on the cross, the manner alone of offering being different. The fruits of that bloody sacrifice, it is well understood, are received most abundantly through this unbloody one. . .⁸

In the contemporary text of the mass approved for use in Australia and New Zealand, the eucharistic offering is said to be, 'an offering in spirit and truth.'⁹

In the history of the notion of eucharistic sacrifice then, 'spiritual' has two meanings. It means, against any crude notions of physicality, 'not-material' (even though 'real', 'true', 'substantial'), and 'properly acceptable to God' (as opposed to 'sinful', 'carnal', 'unspiritual').

2.3 REFORMATION REPUDIATION OF EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE

In his *Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament*¹⁰ (1551), against medieval catholicism Cranmer uncompromisingly rejects any notion of an objective sacrifice of Christ in the Lord's Supper. In line with the humanist and Reformation approach to theological problems through a simple exegesis of the text of scripture, Cranmer turns in his biblicist way to how the New Testament understands 'sacrifice'. The text of the New Testament tells us that there are only two proper sacrifices: the one literal sacrifice of Christ on the cross, and the spiritual sacrifices of 'laud, praise, and thanksgiving.'

The first kind of sacrifice Christ offered to God for us; the second kind we ourselves offer to God by Christ.

And by the first kind of sacrifice Christ offered also us unto his Father; and by the second we offer ourselves and all that we have unto him and his Father.¹¹

Ranging freely over the book of Hebrews, and Romans 3, Cranmer expounds the one, only, objective, propitiatory and not repeatable sacrifice of Christ on Good Friday. Against this he explores the meaning of the 'spiritual sacrifices' of Christians outlined in 1 Peter 2:5, Hebrews 13:8-16 and Psalm 51:15-17. The *only* sacrifices which are properly spiritual, which a Christian may make, are those of praise, thanksgiving, penitence. That is, those which are responsive to the definitive action of God to rescue a fallen humanity from sin by the death of his son. To in any sense seek to reproduce *that* sacrifice is profoundly unspiritual, a rank act of disbelief, and a positive blasphemy. By our standards his language is strong, but in any notion of a eucharistic re-offering of Christ, Cranmer sees the whole gospel at stake:

And if we refuse to offer ourselves after this wise unto him, by crucifying our own wills, and committing us wholly to the will of God, we be most unkind people, superstitious hypocrites, or rather unreasonable beasts, worthy to be excluded utterly from all the benefits of Christ's oblation.

⁷ Cited from John H. McKenna, *Eucharist and Holy Spirit; the eucharistic epiclesis in 20th century theology* (Great Woking: Mayhew-McCrimmon/Alcuin Club, 1975) 30-1.

⁸ H.J. Schroeder, *The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent* (Rockford, Ill: Tan, 1978) 145-6.

⁹ *The New Sunday Missal: Texts approved for use in Australia and New Zealand* (London and Sydney: Geoffrey Chapman, 1982) 397.

¹⁰ References are to the Parker Society volume, *Writings and Disputations of Thomas Cranmer Relative to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper* (Cambridge University Press, 1844).

¹¹ 'Defence', in *Writings*, 346, 349.

And if we put the oblation of the priest in the stead of the oblation of Christ, refusing to receive the sacrament of his body and blood ourselves, as he ordained, and trusting to have remission of our sins by the sacrifice of the priest in the mass, and thereby also to obtain release of the pains in purgatory, we do not only injure Christ, but also commit most detestable idolatry.¹²

Cranmer further strengthens his remarks by insisting that there is no essential difference between lay people and priest in the administration of the Lord's Supper. When they act according to the teaching of the New Testament, they both offer exactly the same sacrifice: of penitence, praise, thanksgiving. The only difference is in the administration of the bread and wine. But this is only a matter of convenience, for the priest is a common servant - and here Cranmer provocatively draws down on thoroughly secular illustrations - just the minister who distributes the Lord's supper unto the other members of Christ's household.¹³

All remember Christ's death, all give thanks to God, all repent and offer themselves an oblation to Christ, all take him for their Lord and Saviour, and spiritually feed upon him, and in token thereof they eat the bread and drink the wine . . .¹⁴

Cranmer expressed these clear theological convictions in the definitive Prayer Book of 1552 (which is carried over to 1662) by completely removing *all* sacrificial language from the prayer of consecration in the Eucharist with respect to what *we* do, and reserved such language in *this* context to describe Christ's once and for all, unrepeatable sacrifice on the cross. Further, he used the language of *spiritual* sacrifice only in the responsive prayers said by the communicants after the communion has occurred. Further, what is meant by 'spiritual sacrifice' is explicitly spelt out as 'our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving'. Never, not even in the abortive first attempt at a Book of Common Prayer of 1549 (which suffered so much at the hands of a committee)¹⁵ does Cranmer leave the notion of 'spiritual sacrifice' hanging without explicitly giving its biblical content from Romans 12:1, 1 Peter 2:5, Hebrews 13:8-16 and Psalm 51:15-17. Further, even though the 1549 Prayer Book runs the responsive prayer (containing our spiritual self-offering to God) directly on from the prayer of consecration, that prayer, separated as it is from the prayer of response only by a rubric, still contains no language of eucharistic sacrifice.

2.4 EXPRESSING EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE: REAL PRESENCE AND EPICLESIS

Liturgy, in comparison to systematic theological writings, is a comparatively short and public expression of deep Christian truths. To communicate these it often must do so indirectly through structure, action and supporting doctrines. Two of the most important of these are the notion of the real presence of Christ and the use of an epiclesis.

The doctrine of transubstantiation, which became the official teaching of Roman Catholic Church in 1215, is the way the western Church expressed its understanding of the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, and the one which the Reformers took pains to repudiate. However, a doctrine of transubstantiation is not necessary to the catholic doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice. As the teachings of Cyprian, Cyril and Chrysostom show, and Greek liturgical tradition in general, the notion of the eucharistic as an objective sacrifice which re-immolates Christ for saving purposes, does not require the Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation as its foundation. Indeed, in Roman Catholic writings on the Mass, 'transubstantiation' is treated separately from 'sacrifice' as one

¹² 'Defence', in *Writings*, 349.

¹³ 'Defence', in *Writings*, 350f.

¹⁴ Op. cit.

¹⁵ G.R. Elton summarises the problems created by committee work for Cranmer's first effort at a Book of Common Prayer: 'The prayer book was Cranmer's work, but in its passage through Parliament it underwent important changes: where the original version had plainly denied transubstantiation and abolished the mass, compromises introduced to conciliate conservative opinion in the Lords produced so much ambiguity that both Protestants and Catholics could suppose themselves reasonably satisfied. However, . . .'; *Reform and Reformation: England 1509-1558* (London: Edward Arnold, 1977) 345. See also A.G. Dickens, *The English Reformation*, second edition (Pennsylvania State University Press, 1991) 242ff; G.J. Cuming, *A History of Anglican Liturgy* (London: Macmillan, 1969) 66ff.

of several theological components of the Eucharist.¹⁶ A mere lack of indications of transubstantiation in a Eucharist, does not therefore by that very fact deny that the Eucharist is an objective re-offering of Christ.

Notions of an objective Eucharistic sacrifice require some notion of a real and substantial presence of Christ.¹⁷ *Realis ac substantialis praesens*, 'real and substantial presence', is a technical phrase in the sacramental theology of the middle ages and the Reformation period with quite a precise meaning: the incarnate Christ is present in reality, in essence, that is, ontologically present. Therefore, any insistence that Jesus Christ has a real and substantial presence in the Eucharist will support any suggestion that the Eucharist is also an objective sacrifice much more logical force.

Eucharistic liturgies have signalled a doctrine of the real presence and the re-offering of Christ in a number of ways - from the rite as a whole, how it is performed, to particular elements in it. Amongst the latter are the words of administration: *The body (or blood) of Christ keep you in eternal life*,¹⁸ after the prayer of consecration singing the ancient hymn: *Oh lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us*,¹⁹ and the epiclesis in the prayer of consecration itself. All of these were deliberately excluded by Cranmer.

It is worth saying more about the epiclesis or invocation. In the history of liturgy, there have been many different forms of epiclesis used by theological cultures which believe in a real presence and an objective sacrifice. In what is considered its fully developed form, the epiclesis has three elements: a petition for the operation of the Spirit or the Word, the description of the effects of this operation in terms of the operation as the change of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ (Grisbrooke)²⁰ or just to sanctify the bread and wine (McKenna)²¹, and a statement of the ends for which this is sought, the fruits of communion. However, invocations which do not overtly specify the change of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ still spring from theological cultures which believe in a real presence and an objective sacrifice. What expresses the notion of the real presence of Christ in all invocations, and thus gives logical force to notions of objective sacrifice, is that all invocations focus on God being active and present through material objects.

In 1552 Thomas Cranmer deliberately dropped an epiclesis from the first abortive prayer book of 1549.²² Why? Gardiner had pointed out, with some right, that such an epiclesis demonstrated a belief in the real and substantial presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper, and was also linked to the idea of the Eucharist being a real sacrifice.²³ Cranmer denied that he believed in a 'real and substantial presence', and that he had not intended to espouse such a doctrine by the epiclesis. Further, in the exactly the same way as the Swiss Reformers (against the Lutherans as well as the Roman Catholics), Cranmer carefully used the technical language surrounding notions of presence and insisted on a 'true and spiritual presence' only.²⁴

¹⁶ Refer Ludwig Ott, *Fundamentals of Catholic Dogma* (Rockford, Illinois: Tan, 1960) 370-415; Thomas L. Kinkead, *Baltimore Catechism* (Rockford, Ill: Tan, 1978) 221-242; *A New Catechism: Catholic Faith for Adults* (London: Burns & Oates, 1967) 332-347.

¹⁷ The converse does not necessarily have to be the case. Martin Luther, for all his insistence on a real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, utterly repudiated any notion of eucharistic sacrifice, and removed the language of eucharistic sacrifice from his prayers of consecration; refer Bard Thompson, *Liturgies of the Western Church* (New York: World Publishing Company, 1961) 134f, 111f.

¹⁸ For a fuller explanation see 4.4.5.

¹⁹ For a fuller explanation see 4.4.5.

²⁰ Refer W. Jardine Grisbrooke, 'Anaphora', in J.G. Davies (ed), *A Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship* (London: SCM, 1972) 15f.

²¹ John H. McKenna, *Eucharist and Holy Spirit: The eucharistic epiclesis in twentieth century theology (1900-1966)*, vol. 57, *Alcuin Club Collections* (Great Wakering: Mayhew-McCrimmon, 1975) 101-2.

²² The relevant wording of the 1549 epiclesis is: 'and with thy holy spirite and worde, vouchsafe to bl:esse and sanc:tifie these thy gyftes, and creatures of bread and wyne, that they maie be unto us the bodye and bloude of thy moste derely beloued sonne Jesus Christe'.

²³ 'Defence', in *Writings*, 59, 79-80f; 81-84ff where Gardiner ties the notions of real presence and eucharistic sacrifice together.

²⁴ 'Defence', in *Writings*, 71. John Calvin in his 1540 'Short Treatise on the Holy Supper of our Lord' also makes the same point with the same measured use of technical language. Refer, Joseph N. Tylenda, 'Calvin and Christ's Presence in the Supper - True or Real', *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 27 (1974) 65-75.

But as in the debate over the early Church Fathers' teachings on eucharistic sacrifice, despite his protestations, Gardiner had the better of Cranmer when it came to understanding the real intent of the earlier liturgies and writers who used invocations. In the end, Cranmer bowed to this by completely removing the epiclesis in the definitive, reformed prayer book of 1552. The history of the liturgical use of invocations and their accompanying theological writings makes an epiclesis incompatible with notions of 'true and spiritual presence only' and 'spiritual sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving'.

It is precisely this revised prayer of consecration of 1552 which the 1662 Book of Common Prayer uses.

2.5 WHAT WAS AT STAKE IN CRANMER'S REJECTION OF EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE: JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH ALONE

Cranmer is in the main stream of the Reformation's rediscovery of the Pauline doctrine of justification when he in his *Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament* (1550) advances four main reasons for rejecting any notion of objective sacrifice properly belonging in the Lord's Supper:

- i. the sufficiency for all history of God's action through the cross in history
- ii. the sufficiency of faith, in the light of the sufficiency of the cross, as the only proper response to the cross which embraces all the benefits of that cross
- iii. as well as by passing the sufficiency of the cross and of faith, the re-sacrificing of Christ is a crude and monstrous fiction in itself
- iv. the sufficiency of Christ's perfect priesthood terminates all propitiatory priesthood or ministry, and leaves us only with a desacralised ministry in which as 'common servants' the ministers assist their fellow Christians in all-of-us together offering exactly the same spiritual sacrifices that the New Testament enjoins: praise, thanksgiving, penitence²⁵

The depth and warmth of Cranmer's evangelical theology is evident as he explains his objections:

But now to speak somewhat more largely of the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ, he was such an high bishop, that he, once offering himself, was sufficient, by once effusion of his blood, to abolish sin unto the world's end. He was so perfect a priest, that by once oblation of himself he purged an infinite heap of sins, leaving an easy and a ready remedy for all sinners, that his one sacrifice should suffice for many years unto all men that would not shew themselves unworthy. And he took unto himself not only their sins that many years before were dead, and put their trust in him, but also the sins of those that, until his coming again, should truly believe in his gospel. So that now we may look for none other priest nor sacrifice to take away our sins, but only him and his sacrifice. And as he, dying once, was offered for all, so as much remaineth not more sacrifices for sin, but extreme judgment at the last day, when he shall appear to us again, not as a man to be punished again, and to be made a sacrifice for our sins, as he was before; but he shall come in his glory without sin, to the great joy and comfort of them which be purified and made clean by his death, and continue in godly and innocent living, and to the great terror and dread of them that be wicked and ungodly.

Thus the scripture teacheth, that if Christ had made any oblation for sin more than once, he should have died more than once; forasmuch as there is none oblation and sacrifice for sin but only his death. And now there is no more oblation for sin, seeing that by him our sins be remitted, and our consciences quieted.²⁶

Now by these foresaid things may every man easily perceive, that the offering of the priest in the mass, or the appointing of his ministrations at his pleasure, to them

²⁵ See 'Defence', in *Writings*, 350.

²⁶ 'Defence', in *Writings*, 347.

that be quick or dead, cannot merit and deserve, neither to himself, nor to them for whom he singeth or saith, the remission of their sins; but such popish doctrine is contrary to the doctrine of the gospel, and injurious to the sacrifice of Christ. For is only the death of Christ the oblation, sacrifice, and price wherefore our sins be pardoned, then the act or ministration of the priest cannot have the same office. Wherefore it is an abominable blasphemy to give that office or dignity to a priest, which pertaineth only to Christ; or to affirm that the church hath need of any such sacrifice: as who should say, that Christ's sacrifice were not sufficient for the remission of our sins, or else that his sacrifice should hang upon the sacrifice or a priest.

But all such priests as pretend to be Christ's successors in making a sacrifice of him, they be his most heinous and horrible adversaries. **For never no person made a sacrifice of Christ, but he himself only.**²⁷ And therefore St Paul saith [Heb 7:24, 28], that "Christ's priesthood cannot pass from him to another." For what needeth any more sacrifices, if Christ's sacrifice be perfect and sufficient? . . . Wherefore all popish priests that presume to make every day a sacrifice of Christ, either must they needs make Christ's sacrifice vain, unperfect, and insufficient, or else is their sacrifice in vain which is added to the sacrifice which is already of itself sufficient and perfect.

. . . And here they run headlongs into the foulest and most heinous error that ever was imagined. For if they make every day the same oblation and sacrifice for sin that Christ himself made, and the oblation that he made for our redemption and price of our sins; then followeth it of necessity, that they every day slay Christ, and shed his blood, and so be they worse than the wicked Jews and Pharisees, which slew him and shed his blood but once.²⁸

Cranmer breaks into an impassioned prayer, which demonstrates the primacy of 'justification by faith alone' in his theological thinking:

Almighty God, the Father of light and truth, banish all such darkness and error out of his church, with the authors and teachers thereof, or else convert their hearts unto him, and give this light of faith to every man, that he may trust to have remission of his sins, and be delivered from eternal death and hell, by the merit only of the death and blood of Christ; and that by his own faith every man may apply the same unto himself, and not take it at the appointment of popish priests, by the merit of sacrifices and oblations!

If we be indeed, as we profess, christian men, we may ascribe this honour and glory to no man, but to Christ alone. Wherefore let us give the whole laud and praise hereof unto him; let us fly only to him for succour; let us hold him fast and hang upon him, and give ourselves wholly to him. . . ²⁹

As already pointed out, Cranmer expressed this evangelical theology by first, removing all notions of eucharistic sacrifice from the prayer of consecration, and then, clearly explicating 'spiritual sacrifices' as a reflexive self offering of the Christian in terms of penitence, praise, thanksgiving and discipleship, and finally, placing such explicit self-offering outside the prayer of consecration. His definitive prayer book of 1552 did it better than the first attempt in 1549, which had suffered at the hands of a committee. But he managed to do it in both.

2.6 TRENDS IN ANGLICAN LITURGY SINCE LAMBETH 1958: OBJECTIVE SACRIFICE, ANAMNESIS

There have further developments in eucharistic liturgy in Anglicanism since 1662. Although some of the more prominent ones these can be traced from the late 18th century, and in the rise and course of the Anglo-catholic movement in the 19th and 20th centuries, it is changes since 1958 which are of the most importance in understanding the background to *APBA*. Although some of these trends have involved a deepening of the understanding of central Christian teachings on the

²⁷ Emphasis mine.

²⁸ 'Defence', in *Writings*, 348.

²⁹ 'Defence', in *Writings*, 348-9.

incarnation, resurrection and eschatological nature of Christian existence by reflecting them against the cross, the most controversial changes have again been to do with the nature of the sacrifice we are celebrating.

In Colin Buchanan's series of three books tracing changes in Anglican liturgies from 1958 to 1984, can be seen a strong move towards notions of eucharistic sacrifice, ie. in the real and objective sense.³⁰ For purposes of expressing eucharistic sacrifice, a subcommittee of Lambeth 1958 had recommended the phrase: 'we offer our praise and thanksgiving for Christ's sacrifice for us *and so present it again*, and ourselves in him, before the Father [emphasis mine].' Buchanan's interest was in the effect on liturgy of this recommendation. He notes that in the period 1958-68 only three totally new rites introduced oblations - in Africa, Wales and New Zealand. Anglican Churches in the United States of America, Brazil, Hong Kong, and Scotland all conserved inherited oblations.³¹

'Oblation' is a synonym for 'offering'. What is being offered? Various things are proposed: the bread and wine, ourselves and the Church. How are they being offered? They are being offered in and with Christ's original and continued offering to the Father, and in the representation of Christ's sacrifice in the Eucharist.

As we have seen with Cranmer, the Protestant Reformers denied the legitimacy of describing the Eucharist, and especially the elements of bread and wine, as an oblation, on the ground that to do so detracted from the uniqueness of Christ's offering. The death of Christ, and the sacrament of that death, is a movement from above down; God offers himself to us, not we too God; Christ sacrifices himself to the Father, not us to the Father. Our responses, which are responses to this act of sheer grace, lie on the other side this great act, lie on this side of Pentecost. More recent argument has made the same point. In the extensive discussions which followed Lambeth 1958, leading English evangelicals quite rightly pointed out that the New Testament does not at all depict Christ in his heavenly session continuously re-offering himself to the Father for our sins, but praying for us. In fact, Hebrews emphasises that Christ's self-offering at Golgotha was not only unique, but also a decisively *completed* action. Earlier, in the 1940's, the leading Anglo-catholic liturgiologist, Dom Gregory Dix, quite rightly exhorted his fellow Anglo-catholics *not* to incorporate any of our offerings in the eucharistic re-presentation of Christ' death, that is, in the eucharistic sacrifice, because to mix our offerings with Christ's was semi-pelagianism. In regard to the relationship in liturgy of our oblations and Christ's, it is a commonplace in liturgical scholarship to point out that Cranmer would only countenance three sacrifices: of the once and for all sacrifice of Christ, of our praise and thanksgiving, and of ourselves; and he strove to keep the first distinct from the latter two. Returning to Lambeth and its aftermath, the use of forms from 1549, and the emergence of the new emphases placed on *anamnesis* (see below), these oblations in new Anglican liturgies re-present Christ's sacrifice.

Anamnesis is a Greek word which can be translated as 'memorial'. It has become a technical term to refer to that part of the prayer of consecration in which we 'remember' the events of the first Lord's Supper. Modern liturgical writings in the catholic tradition have emphasised that 'to remember' does not mean to recall a past and absent deed or person, but to make that past event or person objectively present. When this understanding of 'remembrance' is deliberately linked with a concept of 'offering' in the Eucharist, then *anamnesis* very much strengthens the notion that in the Eucharist we are objectively re-offering or re-presenting the death of Christ at Golgotha.

In the period 1968 to 1975, Buchanan notes further moves towards oblations in new liturgies in England, Scotland, Canada, South Africa, North and South India, South East Asia, Korea, and Melanesia.³² Of course, some of these are following liturgical traditions which predate the 1960's. Further, more overtly objective notions of sacrifice are confined to new liturgies in Canada,³³ the

³⁰ *Modern Anglican Liturgies, 1958-1968* (London: Oxford University Press, 1968); *Further Anglican Liturgies 1968-1975* (Bramcote: Grove Books, 1975); and *Latest Anglican Liturgies, 1976-1984* (London: SPCK/Alcuin Club, 1985). The later is supplemented by his, *Anglican Eucharistic Liturgy, 1975-1985* (Bramcote: Grove, 1985).

³¹ *1958-1968*, 19-20.

³² *1968-75*, 20-22.

³³ Refer, *1968-75*, 116-117.

United States,³⁴ South Africa,³⁵ Scotland,³⁶ Korea³⁷ and Melanesia.³⁸ The latter two he estimates, 'reflect an older (and quite undefensive) catholicism'.³⁹ Given Buchanan's reluctance in these books to make doctrinal judgments, and silence from this point on, his estimate of Korea and Melanesia is significant. Finally, from 1976 to 1984, England,⁴⁰ the West Indies,⁴¹ and Nigeria,⁴² all move to objective oblations. Standing outside this trend are notably, the relatively diminutive Church of Ireland, and the sizeable Anglican Church of Australia.⁴³ Does *APBA* now place us within this trend?

Clearly, we are moving in the context of Anglican liturgies which proclaim a re-offering, an oblation of Christ, and have sought to do so for quite some time. Colin Buchanan's comments on the historical situation, although incidental, are sound: 'His approach⁴⁴ seems to have led some of them [Anglo-catholics] to wish to keep the sacrifice of Christ, *as objectively represented before the Father in the sacrament* [emphasis mine], in a somewhat different category from any sacrifice of ourselves'.⁴⁵ These liturgies do this by using a mixture of the old and the new. Many of the structures and terms which proclaimed eucharistic sacrifice in the 16th century appear again. This is not entirely unexpected since we belong to a 2000 year old Christian tradition. Certainly the modern period in liturgical theory and practice has brought new ways of expressing ourselves and new points of interest. The newer understanding and use of anamnesis is as a good case in point. But the same end point remains: objective eucharistic oblation, a sacramental representation of Christ's sacrifice.

And the same central truth of the Christian gospel is at stake as it was in Cranmer's day: justification by faith alone. We do not participate in the one, unique offering of Christ on Golgotha by sacramental action, but by faith alone. To pursue the former idea is monstrous, as Cranmer saw. Sacramental actions must unambiguously be subordinated to the truth of justification by faith alone, or witness to another Christ, and another way he has promised to work in the world other than by Word and Spirit.

Nor is it enough to affirm in a liturgy that Christ's sacrifice was once for all, sufficient and unrepeatable. From at least Chrysostom onwards, the whole catholic tradition - Greek, Roman Catholic, Anglo-Catholic - has *always* believed in and affirmed that the death of Christ on the Cross was once-for-all, sufficient, and even, unrepeatable. It is a standard catholic affirmation, as the article on Eucharist in the *New Catholic Encyclopedia* shows. They have *also* believed alongside this, and clean contrary to the teaching of the New Testament on justification by faith alone, that we participate in that unique event by re-presenting it sacramentally. Of course, in this way they heavily qualify their statements about 'unrepeatable' and 'sufficient', and that is why Cranmer and the Reformers rejected eucharistic sacrifice. The only 'qualification' that the Bible places on the sufficiency of Christ's death is faith. And not faith as a work or human performance (as is clear from Romans 4, and its background in Jewish inter-testamental thought about Gen 15:6, eg. 1 Maccabees 2:50-52ff), but faith as trust, and in that, faith alone. We participate in Christ and all his benefits by faith.

34 1968-75, 146-7.

35 1968-75, 209, 223.

36 1968-75, 71-78.

37 1968-75, 307-311.

38 1968-75, 385-6.

39 1968-75, 22.

40 1976-1984, 10-13, 41-2.

41 1976-1984, 171-3.

42 1976-1984, 200-201.

43 In the way he marshals evidence, Buchanan knows that he is drawing a long-bow by reading Second Series in *An Australian Prayer Book* (1978) in terms of it having an epiclesis and an objective oblation. Refer, *Eucharistic Liturgies*, 20-1; 1976-1984, 208.

44 That of the great doyen of modern Anglican liturgical studies, Dom Gregory Dix, who wanted to keep our self-oblation in the post-communion so as to not obscure the oblation of Christ in the prayer of consecration.

45 1958-1968, 20.

2.7 RELIGIOUS COMPOSITION OF AUSTRALIA

Religious background is an important factor in how people understand the structure, actions and wording of liturgy. The Anglican Church of Australia, in keeping with the missionary vision of the *Book of Common Prayer*, has historically sought to be the 'Church of Australia'. The New Testament describes the Lord's Supper as a proclamation of the gospel (1 Cor 11:26), and insists that all our words and actions in the Christian assembly witness clearly to the *idiotes*, the outsiders, of the saving action of God in Christ on their behalf (eg. 1 Corinthians 14, cf chapter 9). In that regard, we need to note that Roman Catholicism is the dominant Christian tradition in Australia, Eastern Orthodoxy is important, especially in Melbourne, and the religious experience of the majority of Anglicans is now definitively shaped by the Anglo-catholic movement.

Against this community of ideas, and the question of clear exposition of the teachings of Holy Scripture, I offer the following evaluation of the Eucharist services in *APBA*.

3. Evaluation of APBA First Order

First Order is almost word for word a reproduction of first order in *AAPB*. Most criticisms that can be made are also ones against how *AAPB* revised the Holy Communion service of *BCP*, either directly or by not taking the opportunity to more clearly express the teaching of the New Testament at a few points. Thus, First Order *APBA* has the effect of making *AAPB* the measure of Anglican liturgy (against the wishes of its authors and our constitutions) instead of *BCP*.

Three areas of change from *AAPB* are worthy of note:

i. The commandments are in abbreviated form only, whereas *BCP* and *AAPB* had them in full, with the latter using brackets to allow a shortened version to be used if desired. The exclusively abbreviated version in *APBA* seems to be a concession to modern sensibilities about the jealous love of God for his people, his wrath against sin, the biblical presentation of the creation as a six day act, and the mention of the neighbour's wife in the context of property. It also removes mention of God's 'steadfast love to thousands of those who love me and keep my commandments', and the fact that God has added a promise to the command to honour our parents. In this way, this abbreviated form has the effect of denying the participant in the Holy Communion the theological grounding of the commandments in the person, works and purposes of God.

ii. In the text of the Nicene Creed, 'and became man', has been changed to 'and became truly human'. Although in line with the move in our society towards inclusive language, the change is unfortunate in that it has lost one half of the meaning of 'became man'. Creeds are symbolic of, or point toward, scriptural truth. Historically speaking, the primary layer of meaning to 'became man' is the assertion of Jesus true humanity in the face of Docetism and Apollinarianism. 'Truly human' has caught that. However, 'became man', *anthropos*, also in the context of the creed's recital of salvation history points towards the truth that Jesus is not just any 'human', but 'the man', the Second Adam, the second head of the human race. 'Truly human' can only bear the interpretation of the abstract quality, 'humanity', but not the weight of the particular, concrete individual, 'the second Adam' in whom our true humanity is restored. Romans 5:12-21 bears clear witness to the centrality of the Adam/Christ comparison in understanding salvation, with its δι' ἑνός ἀνθρώπου ... οἱ πολλοὶ, πολλῶν μαλλόν ... δι' ἑνός ἀνθρώπου ... εἰς πάντας ἀνθρώπους εἰς διακαιώσιν ζωῆς. This parallel runs throughout the passage and in its context in Romans is an indispensable key to understanding the full nature of the justification which Christ brings.

A second difficulty with this version of the Nicene Creed is its change from the text in *BCP* and *AAPB*: 'Who for us men and our salvation . . .', to 'For us and our salvation . . .'. The older words are a literal translation, where the word *anthropos* is a Greek word which in this context means, 'humankind', and has traditionally been translated by the word 'men', meaning, 'mankind'. In our modern context 'men' sounds like 'male members of the human race only', and so *APBA* has

sought to overcome this by dropping it out all together. This otherwise laudable move has the unfortunate consequence of losing the meaning in the symbol, 'for us men'. This phrase, which can be translated: 'for we of the human race', is saying that Jesus did not become incarnate on behalf of the animal or vegetable part of creation, or even angels, but for we sons and daughters of Adam, we who have embraced Adam's sin in our rebellion against God. As it stands now, 'for us and for our salvation', not only obscures the point being made by the creed, but also sounds sectarian; ie. Christ was only incarnate for we who are saying this creed. But the humanity Christ took upon himself was the common humanity of us all, and he is the new head, not just of we who are saying the creed, but the whole human race. That broad picture of the gracious purposes of God in the incarnation was preserved by not only, 'became man', but also the specificity of 'for us men and our salvation'. The omission is unfortunate, for the problem with gender specific language could have been met, and the meaning of the creed preserved, if a translation like, 'for we humankind and our salvation', had been used.

Although these problems exist in all recitations of the Nicene Creed in *APBA*, it is especially poignant in Second Order, which attempts to reflect the broader concerns of salvation history against the cross (see below).

iii. The prayer of consecration has brought back from *BCP* the description 'satisfaction' in describing the nature of the death of Christ. This is an advance because it more clearly presents the scriptural description of Christ's death as a substitutionary atonement.

Therefore, overall First Order represents only a slight change from *AAPB* first order, and some of that change is to be welcomed.

4. Evaluation of APBA Second Order

4.1 OVERVIEW

Second Order, in line with its predecessor in *AAPB*, seeks to reflect just not on the cross more 'narrowly' defined, but to reflect the whole of creation and redemption, the whole of salvation history, against the cross. It sometimes does this with a broad recital of salvation history, sometimes by highlighting one or two important theological concerns. Theologically, this is laudable, as it is itself an exposition of the cross in keeping with the New Testament's outlook, and is also how the New Testament views the wider aspects of creation and redemption.

That said, this endeavour has not always grasped the weight of the New Testament's witness, and at places obscures it. Instances of this problem will be dealt with under the 5 alternative thanksgivings.

Three specific problems are evident in the sections before the thanksgiving, and thus generally apply to Second Order.

First, the notion of substitutionary atonement, which is a foundational part of the New Testament's explanation of the meaning of the death of Christ, is absent, unlike *BCP* where it is central. The pointers in the *BCP* to substitutionary atonement (which somewhat sets a standard here for liturgical markers) are mentions of the reality of God's wrath against sin and ourselves and its removal through the satisfaction which Christ's meritorious death has brought, the fact that God is Judge, and the citation of appropriate bible verses. In *BCP* these occur prominently in the warnings and exhortation before communion ('his meritorious Cross and Passion', 'how sore punishment hangs over your heads for the same', 'we eat and drink our own damnation . . . we kindle God's wrath against us; we provoke him to plague us with divers diseases, and sundry kinds of death. Judge therefore yourselves, brethren, that ye be not judged of the Lord'), the confession ('Judge of all men', 'provoking must justly thy wrath and indignation against us'), the comfortable words which cites 1 John 2:1 ('he is the propitiation for our sins'), and the prayer of consecration ('a full,

perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world'). All these are missing from Second Order, which evokes other biblical descriptions of Christ's death: sacrifice, the great exchange, example, reconciliation, freeing from sin, death and evil. Without substitutionary atonement, the 'for us', 'for many' material in Second Order only indicates purpose; whereas with it, it also indicates, as it does in the institution narratives of the Synoptic gospels, 'on behalf of us', 'on behalf of many', ie. in our place. This absence is a great impoverishment of our understanding of the significance of Christ's death. Besides its foundational place in the biblical material, substitution very strongly emphasises that in the atonement the wrath of God really has been turned away from *me*. The Judge has been judged *in my place*.

Secondly, why has mention of the mercy of God been removed from the absolution, which in its twofold occurrence in *BCP* frames 'hath promised forgiveness of sins to all them that with hearty repentance and true faith turn unto him'? Although notions of grace and mercy are evident in the call to penitence, and the first line of the confession, and appears again in the middle of the *Gloria in excelsis* which follows, the absolution is for the penitent the most critical stage where the declaration of God's forgiving activity is made. The omission of mention of 'mercy' here has the unfortunate consequence of suggesting a causal link between God's forgiveness and our faith.

Although forgiveness and faith (and repentance) are indeed linked, that link must not be conceived of as causal. Anterior to forgiveness as its cause is the sheer grace and mercy of God. In its use of 'mercy' to frame the promise of forgiveness, *BCP* is articulating in liturgical form the deep truth embodied in Article 11 on Justification: 'we are accounted righteous before God, *only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ* by Faith (emphasis mine)'. Faith, and repentance, are not conditions in a contract between God and us, but are responsive to grace. It is the mercy of God, shown in 'the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ', which ultimately guarantees that we have been forgiven, not our confession of sin. The Bible presents the covenant that God has made with us in his Son, not in terms of a commercial contract: 'if . . . then', but in terms of unconditional grace or promise calling forth the unconditional response of faith. The marriage covenant is the closest human analogy. The removal of mention of the mercy of God from the absolution tends to throw us back onto ourselves, an effect strengthened by the particular focus elsewhere in Second Order on what *we* are doing, the offering *we make*.

Thirdly, the rubric just prior to The Great Thanksgiving states: 'The gifts of the people are brought to the Lord's Table'. *BCP* placed the reception of alms and oblations before the prayers and the preparation for communion, that is, well before the prayer of consecration. There is a good reason for placing it where it is in *APBA*, for it completes the flow of ideas: approach to God in confession and forgiveness - being ministered to by God's word - bringing our prayers to God - and then our offerings to support God's ministry to us. There is even a similar patter of approach in what follows in the Thanksgiving and the post communion: hearing the gospel - proclaiming it together - petition - offering our thanks. But, the history of liturgy and the continual struggle over eucharistic offering show us there is also a problem with placing the offering of gifts just before the Thanksgiving.

Placing it just before the thanksgiving, which has been a widespread trend in Anglican liturgy post Lambeth 1958, and in keeping with Roman Catholic practice,⁴⁶ has the effect of making it a symbol of 'our offering to God.' This sets the stage for regarding the Eucharist as an objective offering which we make. As already pointed out by Dom Gregory Dix, this mixing of our gifts to God with his gift to us in the death of his son, is semi-pelagian, and diminishes Christ's work by obscuring its uniqueness, and the fact that what we may offer God, can only be a reflex, a response to pure and all encompassing grace. In the biblical presentation of the Lord's Supper, the emphasis is on what God is offering us, not on what we are offering God.

In the following, I have included the additional prayers and anthems (pp 145-6), for they obviously bear directly on the theological meaning of the thanksgiving.

⁴⁶ See, *New Sunday Missal*, 390-1.

4.2 THANKSGIVING 1

Thanksgiving 1 is distinguished by a special reflection on the incarnation. This appears to expound quite well the New Testament's understanding of the significance (against the cross) of the incarnation, birth and life of Jesus Christ. In the birth narrative of Matthew's gospel, the one who 'by the power of your Spirit was born of Mary' (*APBA*'s clause) is described as the one who 'will save his people from their sins.' This notion is picked up in *APBA* by the description of Jesus as 'Saviour', and further expanded in the following paragraph with its clear statement as to Jesus death on the cross, 'the one true sacrifice for sin' which obtains, in his rising to new life, 'an eternal deliverance for his people.'

However, there is a question, and a problem.

First, the biblical language of the Lord's Supper as a 'proclamation of the gospel', is preserved in *BCP*. In *AAPB*, we 'proclaim' and 'celebrate' in the first and third thanksgiving, and only 'proclaim' in the second. In *APBA* Thanksgiving 1 we are engaged in 'proclaiming' and we also 'celebrate', in Thanksgiving 2 we only 'celebrate', in Thanksgiving 3 we 'proclaim' (an option in brackets) and 'celebrate', in Thanksgiving 4 we again 'proclaim' and 'celebrate', and in Thanksgiving 5 neither word is used to describe the activity.

Because it takes its rise from the New Testament, the meaning and effect of 'proclamation' language is relatively clear. It makes the Lord's Supper more God-centred and neighbour-centred, in that the New Testament depicts gospel proclamation as primarily God's work, directed outwards to the world as well as inwards to the Church, a work which we enter into as his fellow-workers. But, what is the concept of 'celebration', and where is it in the Bible with respect to the Lord's Supper?

Secondly, a major theological problem is signalled by inclusion in all but Thanksgiving 5 of the option: 'Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord . . .'. In the history of liturgy, this is a clear pointer to a real, objective presence of Christ in the Eucharist, an anticipation of what is about to happen, an understanding which strongly supports the notion of the Eucharist as an objective re-offering of Christ. It appeared in the prayer book of 1549, but as the concluding part of the anthem 'Holy, holy, holy', before the prayers, and thus well distanced from the prayer of consecration. It thus occurred at the same place as it did in the old Mass, but in modern versions of the Mass it has become incorporated into the thanksgiving.⁴⁷ In the reformed prayer book of 1552, Cranmer omitted it all together, as does 1662, and *AAPB*. In the light of the movement in liturgy since Lambeth 1958, its pointed inclusion here helps to build a climate which obscure the uniqueness of Christ's atoning death on Calvary, and its application, summed up in the doctrine of justification by faith alone.

4.3 THANKSGIVING 2

Thanksgiving 2 is distinguished by its recital of biblical history from creation through redemption in Christ through to his coming again. There is a wholeness about it which commends it. A minor problem is the wording of 'and teaching justice by the prophets.' In the context of western views of 'justice', including modern ones, which focus on 'retributive justice', and when they conceive of a broader view of justice, do so without God, the use of the word places limitations on the theological and christological view of 'righteousness' which the Bible teaches. 'Justice' in the older and even the more contemporary western sense is not quite what the prophets taught.

Again, the thanksgiving contains the anthem 'Blessed is he who comes', and describes the activity as celebration, and not proclamation.

In the closing section, we pray: 'Accept, we pray, our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving'. Again, this mixing of our 'sacrifice' to God, even though properly described as one 'of praise and thanksgiving', with the sacrifice for us by his son, is open to be interpreted as semi-pelagian, and diminishes Christ's work by obscuring its uniqueness. In the biblical presentation of the Lord's

⁴⁷ Refer, *New Sunday Missal*, 393.

Supper, the emphasis is on what God is offering us, not on what we are offering God. Even in the prayer book of 1549, Cranmer separates 'our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving' from the prayer of consecration by a rubric. In the book of 1552, it is removed to after the communion, thus making it purely responsive to grace and not somehow an objective thing we are offering God along with our gifts (§25).

4.4 THANKSGIVING 3

The movement toward seeing the Eucharist as somehow an objective sacrifice, gains full momentum in this thanksgiving. Along with the preceding rubric about bringing our gifts (§25), and 'Blessed is he who comes', the thanksgiving is distinguished by the following features.

1. The prayer sees the rite as being both a petition for salvation and actually conferring saving benefits. The Preface states:

it is . . . our salvation, that we should at all times and in all places give thanks [offer Eucharist] to you, . . . ;

and after the offering of the 'spiritual sacrifice':

In your grace and mercy, bring us to the joy of your eternal kingdom with all the company of the redeemed.

2. The prayer contains an epiclesis or invocation (a calling down of the Holy Spirit onto the elements):

*and, by the power of your Word and Holy Spirit,
sanctify this bread and wine,
that we who share in this holy sacrament
may be partakers of Christ's body and blood.*

3. The wording, 'command us to continue, a perpetual memory', is characteristic of BCP's recital of the institutional narratives and acts to describe what we are doing. It is now replaced with:

we commemorate and celebrate

4. With the elements of bread and wine before him, the priest prays:
here we offer you a spiritual sacrifice.

What estimate may we make of this?

1. it is . . . our salvation

This is the first time in Australian Anglican liturgy (ie. as approved by our constitutions and General Synod), that the activity of Eucharist is described as not just 'our duty, our joy', but as 'our salvation'. That is, the thanksgiving is framed by descriptions and contents which give the Eucharist a saving intent. This is in line with main stream pre-Reformation liturgies in which the Eucharist, or Mass, was believed to be in a real sense a re-immolation (re-sacrificing) of Christ for the sins of the living and the dead. What is missing here is any element suggesting that what we are doing includes the dead.

2. by the power of your Word and Holy Spirit, sanctify this bread and wine, that we who share in this holy sacrament may be partakers of Christ's body and blood

This explicitly contains, on Grisbrooke's view, two of the three elements which make for a fully developed epiclesis: a petition for the operation of the Spirit or the Word, and a statement of the ends for which this is sought, the fruits of communion. On McKenna's view, it contains all three elements.⁴⁸ The second element, which for Grisbrooke must describe the effects of the operation of

⁴⁸ McKenna, *Eucharist and Holy Spirit*, 101-2.

the Spirit and Word in terms of the change of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, is here limited to *sanctify this bread and wine*. However, Grisbrooke points out that not all three elements need full expression for there to be a genuine epiclesis.⁴⁹ Indeed, this epiclesis is much like that of Hippolytus, whose influence has been traced into several liturgies by Colin Buchanan.⁵⁰

What expresses the notion of the real presence of Christ in all invocations, and thus gives logical force to notions of objective sacrifice, is that all invocations focus on God being active and present through material objects: *sanctify this bread and wine* .

In the light of Cranmer's removal of an epiclesis that was very close to this one, (the main differences are in the second element)⁵¹, its reintroduction by APBA makes the reference to 'spiritual sacrifice' focus on Christ's death on Golgotha, which in this context is being offered to God by us (see below). Because as a Church of Historical Christendom we live in a matrix of signs and meanings created and nurtured by our liturgical traditions, a return to that which the Reformation settlement rejected is to also embrace the pre-Reformation theological understanding of the rejected items.

3. *we commemorate and celebrate*

What is the significance of *we commemorate*? As mentioned above, modern liturgy has recovered from the early Greek Church an understanding of anamnesis in these terms: to make that past event or person objectively present. When this understanding of 'remembrance' is deliberately linked with a concept of 'offering' in the Eucharist, then *anamnesis* very much strengthens the notion that in the Eucharist we are objectively re-offering or re-presenting the death of Christ at Golgotha. What is required in liturgy to indicate that this view of anamnesis is being invoked? Because it was unknown in the west at the time of the Reformation, here Cranmer's liturgies are of little use.

The normal form for this recovered understanding in these terms: a statement of the memorial and a statement of the offering, inseparably linked by making the offering grammatically dependent on and relative to the memorial. The memorial always mentions at least the passion, resurrection and ascension of our Lord, and some anamneses contain a reference to the second coming. In ancient liturgies, the statement of the offering always explicitly offers the bread and cup.⁵² In modern liturgies which have been created in an environment appreciative of this type of anamnesis, 'remembering' is cast in active terms of 'making memorial', as distinguished from the prior appearance of memorial material in the institution narrative, 'in remembrance of me.'⁵³

'We commemorate' in Thanksgiving 3 falls clearly into the category of a remembrance which makes a past event or person objectively present, thus objectifying the eucharistic sacrifice, already signalled, in terms of Christ's offering to the Father on the first Good Friday.

Apart from the question of eucharistic sacrifice, several evangelical writers have argued that this concept of anamnesis as an understanding of the intent of early liturgy is untenable on historical grounds, and not a defensible understanding of the notion of 'remembrance' in the Bible's presentation of the passover and the last supper. Here, remembrance is directed to people, not to God.⁵⁴

⁴⁹ Grisbrooke, 'Anaphora', 15f.

⁵⁰ Buchanan, 1976-1984, end paper.

⁵¹ The relevant wording of the 1549 epiclesis is: 'and with thy holy spirite and worde, vouchsafe to bl:esse and sanc:tifie these thy gyftes, and creatures of bread and wyne, that they maie be unto us the bodye and bloude of thy moste derely beloued sonne Jesus Christe'.

⁵² Grisbrooke, "Anaphora," 15. Grisbrooke, or his editor, has clearly inverted the words 'former' and 'latter'. In all the liturgies I have looked at, any offering follows the memorial, which is logical.

⁵³ Buchanan, 1968-1975, refer end paper, 'Table of Eucharistic Prayers'.

⁵⁴ Roger Beckwith dismisses it as 'an obvious piece of wishful thinking, unsupported by either etymology or usage'. Refer R. T. Beckwith, "Eucharist," in *New Dictionary of Theology*, ed. S. B. Ferguson and D. F. Wright (Leicester: Inter-Varsity Press, 1988), 238. Also see, Thomas Hewitt, "The Development of Eucharistic Doctrine up to the English Reformation," in

But, it is more than untenable, it is a denial of what the Bible affirms. In the Bible, remembrance is to take us *backwards*, not to bring something past forward into the present. Thus in Deuteronomy 4, when Moses reminds the desert generation of what has at last brought them to this point of entry into the promised land, he says: 'forget not the things that your eyes have seen nor let them slip from your mind . . . make them known to your children . . . - how you once stood before the Lord your God at Horeb . . . you approached and stood at the foot of the mountain . . . he declared to you his covenant . . .' But, they were *not* there! The generation that was actually there was dead, except for Moses, Joshua and Caleb. Moses' audience were there because of the promise of God to their forefathers that he would bless their descendants, be their God too. Foundational to the Bible's presentation of salvation history is the notion of past acts and promises of God which permanently change things and embrace the future, often because of corporate personalities. Supremely, this occurs with the death and resurrection of Jesus. We are told in Romans 6 that 'we have died with Christ' (aorist tense), 'buried with him' (aorist), and thus enjoy all his benefits. The events of the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ have permanently changed the ontological structure of the universe, such that even unbelievers will be clothed with resurrection bodies and enter judgment in that state - Colossians 1:15-20, 2:14-19; John 5:29, 1 Corinthians 15:20-26. Thus we are saved as we are taken *back* by faith and incorporated into those events, not by them being brought forward. In primitive religions, the myths are re-enacted so as to bring those realities into the present and thus bring their benefits to the participants. But the Christian reality is entirely otherwise, God has already done all that is necessary in our space and time, so salvation must consist of a move back to enjoy a redeemed present. 'Remembrance' in terms of bringing past events into the present is not just poor history and exegesis, it is profoundly anti-Christian because it denies God's work and promise.

4. *here we offer you a spiritual sacrifice*

This somewhat forms the climax of Thanksgiving 3. In context, and the context of our community of ideas, what does it mean? It will not naturally bear the meaning of 'our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving', as in Thanksgiving 2, and in the prayer book of 1549.

Considered historically, by placing the words '*spiritual sacrifice*' back into this prayer of consecration, which is already so pregnant with markers of objective eucharistic sacrifice and the objective presence of Christ, and taking them at face value as the priest stands with the bread and wine laid out before him, we have a pointed return to the liturgical, and hence, theological traditions of the catholic Church, even pre-1549: an objective offering of Christ to the Father. In the context of the history of eucharistic liturgy and theology, the words '*spiritual sacrifice*' can then only carry its meaning as 'not-material' (even though 'substantial') and 'properly acceptable to God'. Cranmer's position, we noted, is that, in fact, such a eucharistic sacrifice is profoundly *unspiritual*.

Further, by not explicating '*spiritual sacrifice*' in terms of 'ourselves' (as does Thanksgiving 2 and 1549), we also force the word '*spiritual*' to qualify '*sacrifice*' in terms of the two remaining options: 'not-material' and 'properly acceptable to God'. This result is strengthened by the fact that an amendment at General Synod to replace the words 'a spiritual sacrifice' with 'ourselves as spiritual sacrifices' was defeated.

To put it another way, if we wish to invoke the meaning Cranmer gives to '*spiritual sacrifice*', then we need to do what he did: remove all notions of eucharistic sacrifice from the prayer of consecration, and explicate what we mean by spiritual sacrifice (as the offering of ourselves), and place it outside the prayer of consecration and in a position which makes it only responsive to that grace of God which was accomplished once and for all on the first Good Friday. The disputed prayer of consecration in APBA does none of this.

Returning to the modern context of APBA, may we not understand 'spiritual' here as reflexive: 'we offer ourselves as spiritual sacrifices'? That is, may we see here an implicit reference to either Romans 12:1 or 1 Peter 2:4?

The structure and wording of Cranmer's reformed liturgy, and his writings, stand in the background of all Anglican liturgy, and as we have already seen, those structures and wording are overthrown here, thus they do not allow us to see implicit references to Romans 12:1 or 1 Peter 2:4. Further, the wider history of eucharistic sacrifice, and the symbolism of the bread and wine spread before the priest in sight of the people, and the markers of the objective presence of Christ in the Thanksgiving, also do not allow 'spiritual sacrifice' to be an implicit reference to Romans 12:1 or 1 Peter 2:4. Under those circumstances, to claim implicit references to these two verses is counter the logic of the situation. Neither will English grammar and syntax allow it. 'To offer' is a transitive verb; for it to be used reflexively it needs to be qualified by a reflexive pronoun, as in 'we offer ourselves.' I know of no place in English literature where it is other than this. Finally, 'offer' as a reflexive requires the same number for subject and (reflexive) object; as in, 'he offers himself', 'they offer themselves'. The prayer of consecration in APBA has a plural subject, 'we', and a singular object, 'a sacrifice'.

To read, 'we offer ourselves as spiritual sacrifices', in 'we offer a spiritual sacrifice', can only work if we embrace a post-modernism which holds that 'the writer brings the words and the reader brings the meaning.' If that is the case for this prayer, the objectivity of the divine self-communication which is Holy Scripture is at stake. An objectivity that the Reformers, at least, believed was able to break through our sinful misapprehension and bring true and saving knowledge of the one true God. In their preaching and exegetical commentaries the Reformers consciously made two assumptions: (i) the writer is able to give expressions to his thoughts, (ii) the expositor is able to understand that expression. Why, is this possible? Because, 'language is the *character mentis* (mark of the mind)'.⁵⁵

But there are other indicators in Second Order of objective eucharistic sacrifice, which in Thanksgiving 3 is in terms of our offering of Christ to the Father.

5. Words of administration, and the alternate anthem: 'Lamb of God'

Eucharistic liturgies have signalled a doctrine of the real presence and the re-offering of Christ in a number of ways - from the rite as a whole, how it is performed, to particular elements in it. Amongst the latter we have already noted the epiclesis and the modern understanding of anamnesis. Two others appear in Second Order: the words of administration of the bread and wine, *The body (or blood) of Christ keep you in eternal life*, after the thanksgiving; and the singing of the ancient hymn, *Oh lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us*, during the distribution of the elements.

The language of, *the body of Christ keep you in eternal life*, in context is very direct, and is used by Roman Catholic liturgies and by modern Anglican liturgies which have been written in response to the call by Lambeth 1958 for an objective offering in the Eucharist. Cranmer's book of 1552 replaced all such highly realistic language with language that located Christ not in the elements but outside them, in the heart of the believer, by faith: *Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith, with thanksgiving.*

The reappearance of the *Agnus dei* (Lamb of God) is a strong indicator of eucharistic re-offering of Christ. In the Roman use, *Agnus dei* is recognized as a prayer to the Son of God under the forms of bread and wine. The present tense of 'you take away the sin of the world' is a particular denial of the historical completeness of Christ's atoning death, and was seen to be so by the English Reformers who lobbied for its removal from 1549. Thus Thomas Becon, chaplain to Cranmer, called those who used it 'abominable idolaters', and the practice 'intolerable blasphemy'.

⁵⁵ Eg., see John Calvin, *Commentary on 1 Corinthians* (Edinburgh: St Andrews Press, 1960) 58-9.

Bp Ridley forbade its use in 1550. Attempts to reinstate it were rejected in 1662.⁵⁶ Its appearance here in *APBA* feeds the modern understanding of anamnesis.

An epiclesis, realistic words with the distribution of the bread and wine, and the *Agnus dei* were deliberately excluded by Cranmer in 1552. 1662 did the same, except that it added to Cranmer's words of distribution the words, *The Body [Blood] of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life*. But Cranmer's words of 1552, and the context which comes without change from 1552 into 1662, quite deliberately keeps the focus away from the elements and our performance of the Eucharist to Golgotha and the ascended Christ who dwells outside the elements, in our hearts, by faith. This is far different to *APBA*, which has brought back not only the epiclesis, realistic words of distribution, and the *Agnus dei*, but as we have already noted, more beside; thus giving logical force to the notion of objective sacrifice.

6. Contemporary Roman Catholic practice and opinion

The modern text approved in Australia and New Zealand for the Roman Catholic service of the Mass, has fourteen indicators of eucharistic sacrifice in terms of Christ's real presence and the eucharistic re-offering of Christ's sacrifice on Golgotha:⁵⁷

- i. the introductory explanation of the meaning of the mass
- ii. the term 'altar'
- iii. the ceremony of veneration of the altar
- iv. the preparation and presentation of the gifts just before the Eucharistic Prayer
- v. the anthem, 'Blessed is he who comes' in the Eucharistic Prayer
- vi. the rubric: 'this traditional prayer of the Roman rite emphasises the sacrifice of Jesus Christ on the cross and our sacramental offering of the same sacrifice'
- vii. petitions which indicate that the Eucharist sacrifice has a salvific intent, for the living and the dead
- viii. a petition for God to accept 'this offering'
- ix. an epiclesis
- x. an anamnesis
- xi. a prayer that 'your angel may take this sacrifice to your altar in heaven. Then, as we receive from this altar the sacred body and blood of your Son'.
- xii. the saying of the Lord's Prayer in the presence of the consecrated elements
- xiii. the *Agnus dei* during the reception of the elements
- xiv. the words of administration, 'the body of Christ', 'the blood of Christ'.

In Second Order *APBA*, using Thanksgiving 3, nine of these are present. Cranmer eliminated all which appeared in the medieval rite. In *APBA*, absent are the introduction and the rubric, the term 'altar' and the ceremony of veneration of the altar, the prayer for the mutual reception of sacrificial victims in heaven and in the Church, and the application of saving benefits to the dead.

It is perhaps no surprise then that at the last meeting of AUSTARC in Melbourne, after Second Order and Thanksgiving 3 were discussed, when the Roman Catholic representatives were asked by the Anglican chairperson whether they felt they could use Second Order, they unanimously answered yes, with comfort, but only with Thanksgiving 3.⁵⁸ That is a fair judgment that the Roman catholic theology of eucharistic sacrifice is taught in Second Order with Thanksgiving 3.

⁵⁶ Charles Neil and J.M. Willoughby, eds., *The Tutorial Prayer Book: for the teacher, the student, and the general reader* (London: Church Book Room Press, 1959) 347.

⁵⁷ *New Sunday Missal*, 363-427.

⁵⁸ 'It was asked if Roman Catholic clergy could be happy with this prayer, and the answer was, yes, but that this probably would not be true of any of the other Thanksgiving prayers.'; Minutes of Meeting of AUSTARC 20th and 21st November, 1995, Held at Corpus Christi College, Clayton.

4.5 THANKSGIVING 4

Thanksgiving 4 is distinguished by its reflection on creation. It is a commendable attempt, but fails to capture the New Testament's view of the creation focussed through the cross, that of eschatological upset and catastrophe: Romans 8:18-25, Mark 13:14-23,24-27. Neither does the Thanksgiving capture the immediate expectation offered for the gospel's impact on that very important part of creation, human society and culture: an expectation and experience of suffering and persecution as believers are marginalised by a scandalized world - Mark 13:1-23, John 15:20, Acts 24, Colossians 1:24, 2 Tim 3:1-12. Given the extensive work that has been done on this in recent theology, by Jürgen Moltmann amongst others, this failure is to be regretted.

Again, the thanksgiving contains the anthem 'Blessed is he who comes'.

4.6 THANKSGIVING 5

This thanksgiving is distinguished by the absence of 'Blessed is he who comes'. It moves from a reflection on creation to the entrance of sin and the sending of Jesus.

Again, this thanksgiving does not quite capture how the New Testament reflects creation against the cross. It is also a little undefined in its statement about the purpose of the sending of Jesus: 'he showed us how to love you.' The question of 'how' is not addressed, which is a pity because the New Testament depicts Jesus as the one true man of faith, whose faith has brought us righteousness (Matt 27:43, Romans 3:21-26, Galatians 2:15-21, Phil 2:6-8, Romans 5:19, Hebrews 5:7-9). 'Working for justice' in the closing memorial acclamation again is open in our modern context to misunderstanding what the New Testament means by 'justice.'

4.7 THE POST-COMMUNION OF §27-34

The Lord's Prayer (§27) has been restored to its former position in 1549, before the communion, although the rubric allows it to be used elsewhere. Cranmer removed it from this position in 1552, as in 1662, because it looks as though we are saying our prayers to God who is present in the bread and wine: 'give us this day our daily bread'. It is another indicator of the objective presence of Christ and that we are engaged in an objective sacrifice.

The abbreviated words of distribution (§29), 'the body of Christ/blood of Christ keep you in eternal life', are again in the history of past and recent liturgy indicators of the objective presence of Christ in the elements and of an objective sacrifice which brings salvation.

The alternate prayer b. for the sending out of God's people (§30) has a phrase and a clause which raise difficulties. 'At this table' throws the emphasis on what we are doing, 'your table' would be better; 'we who have reached out our hands to receive this sacrament' again focuses on our acts.

4.8 SEASONAL VARIATIONS

The seasonal variation named 'Australia' (161-2) is an attempt to place reconciliation between the indigenous and non-indigenous peoples of Australia within a Christian context. It is very commendable, and comes close to succeeding. However, a few problems are evident.

The citing of 2 Chronicles 7:14, in this context is unfortunate for it inappropriately identifies Israel with Australia.

We give you thanks that in him
 you have revealed to us your presence
 in the vastness of this land,
 your love in its fruitfulness, and
 your purpose in its cycles of death and renewed life.

Three comments can be made about this part of the Preface. First, 'in him . . . revealed . . . your presence in the vastness' is ambiguous where it ought to be as clear as the New Testament is. The method of God's undoubted revealing of himself in Australia in Christ is the preaching of the gospel. Without this clear explanation the sentence is open to an interpretation in the direction of an affirmation of sinful humanity having a capacity to draw true knowledge of God from nature apart from the gospel opening our eyes. The New Testament calls the natural theology of people without the gospel, 'superstition', 'ignorance', 'vanity', 'darkness', the teaching of demons (Acts 17:16-22, Ephesians 2:1-2, 12, 4:17-20, cf Romans 1:18-23). It also shows a thankless disregard for what God has clearly done. Again, for the same purpose of clear explication of the Bible's teaching, 'you love in its fruitfulness . . . and cycles of death and renewed life' ought to be in a new sentence to introduce a new idea: God's providential care of 'the just and the unjust' in the maintaining of the natural order.

In the Blessing, 'God of this ancient land', runs the risk of civil religion, and in its present context operates on the identification of Israel with Australia in the Invitation.

5. Evaluation of APBA Third Order

Third Order appears to be a conservative presentation of second order in *AAPB*. If this is the case, its inclusion of several indicators of substitutionary atonement is commendable. Thus, in the absolution (§15) 'God is slow to anger and full of compassion', and the sentences of assurance of forgiveness include 1 Peter 2:24, 'himself bore our sins in his body.' In that light, the brief confession, the shortest in all Eucharist services, seems out of place. The thanksgiving (§18) lacks the 'Blessed is he who comes', and other indicators of objective presence and sacrifice. The opening reflection is on the 'image of God'. Unfortunately, the following reflection on Christ does not take the obvious opportunity to speak of Jesus Christ as the perfect image of God who restores the image of God in us by his incarnation, life, death and resurrection, and heavenly session. The words of administration unhappily contain the abbreviated 'the body/blood of Christ keep you in eternal life.' However, the offering of ourselves as living sacrifices is after the communion, ie. in the position of *BCP*.

6. Conclusion

With their clearer presentation than *AAPB* of the New Testament's teaching on substitutionary atonement, First Order, and to a lesser extent, Third Order, are very welcome.

Most of the theological problems occur in Second Order. Thanksgiving 1 has helpfully focused the incarnation through the cross, but this is offset by two major problems which are shared by Thanksgiving 3 and to some extent by Thanksgiving 4. Thanksgiving 5 is the least objectionable of the alternatives in Second Order. But overall, Second Order, both in the pre- and post-Thanksgiving sections and in the Thanksgivings themselves, has two major sets of problems. First, the New Testament's teaching on substitutionary atonement is absent. Secondly, Second Order has imported at crucial points so many Catholic structures and indicators that it is, in its Thanksgiving 3 form, entirely acceptable to informed Roman Catholic theologians. As Archbishop Cranmer saw so clearly, the very things which make Second Order *APBA* acceptable to Roman Catholics, are the very things which obscure and even deny the teaching of the Bible on salvation. Therefore, in the liturgy of an evangelical Church, Second Order has no place.

© Robert Doyle
Moore Theological College, Sydney, Australia

