

**THE THEOLOGY OF THE EUCHARIST
FROM
A CHURCH OF IRELAND PERSPECTIVE**

BY

**THE REVD CANON MICHAEL KENNEDY, M.A., B.D.,
Ph.D.**

MAY 2021

DEDICATION

**To my dear wife, Jean
with very much love and gratitude**

and

my son, Simon and to Charlotte

and grandchildren

Michael, Logan, Sophia, Isabelle, Emily Rose, and Sienna

and

my daughter, Lise and to Robert

and

grandchild

Abigail

with infinite affection

THANKS AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish, at the conclusion of my preparation for the launch of this project online to express my thanks to a number of people,

- to the members of the Liturgical Advisory Committee of the General Synod, of which I have been a member since 1986, for their support and helpfulness; not least to the sub-group on liturgical resources of which I am also a member.
- to the members of the Literature Committee of the General Synod, and Church of Ireland Publishing for their support and helpfulness, shown originally in relation to the online publication (2011) of my Commentaries on the authorized services of the Church of Ireland, of which Dr Marshall has correctly remarked that this present project is intended as a companion volume. I would like to make mention of the admirable work of Mr Bryan Whelan, Publications Officer and Assistant Librarian in the Representative Church Body Library on matters to do copyright permission, for which I am truly grateful;
- and to Dr Billy Marshall, who has most kindly written a foreword for this work as a whole.

COPYRIGHT

Every effort has been made to trace the copyright holders and obtain permission to reproduce this material. Please do get in touch with the Literature Committee with regards to any enquiries or any information relating to the rights holder.

Foreword

by the Revd Dr William John Marshall,

former Vice-Principal of the Church of Ireland Theological College

The Anglican Communion of Churches has never claimed to be more than one of the sadly divided parts of Christ's Church but, like other traditions, it has certain valued qualities to contribute to the universal Church. In Dr Michael Kennedy's words it is characterised by 'tolerance, comprehensiveness and ordered liturgy'. This book examines the key Christian act of worship, the Eucharist, from a general Anglican perspective, and that of the Church of Ireland in particular.

Worship is prior to doctrine. *Lex orandi, lex credendi* (the law of praying is the law of belief). Doctrine necessarily arises as Christians reflect on their experience of Christ in worship and life. Dr Kennedy explores what Anglicans believe, and in particular what the Church of Ireland believes, about the Eucharist, not only in their liturgy but in their doctrinal formularies and the writings of their theologians. Anglican tolerance is not a bland acceptance of a wide range of incompatible opinions but a confidence in the power of truth to prevail (*magna est veritas et praevalabit*) Truth is not a delicate hot-house flower which needs to be protected by elaborate and rigid definitions but is a sturdy plant which thrives when there is honest enquiry and free debate. This book is a thorough examination of the Church of Ireland Eucharistic rites, Holy Communion I and Holy Communion II, and of its doctrinal statements in the 1870 Preamble and Declaration, the Thirty-nine Articles and the Catechism. The author also considers the writings of Anglican theologians, ecumenical agreements and responses to them. He gives a thorough discussion of the section on the Eucharist in the *Anglican/Roman Catholic Report* (ARCIC I) and Anglican and Roman Catholic responses to it, including those of the Evangelical Fellowships of the Church of Ireland and the Church of England. While his own position is clear he also gives fair accounts of other Anglican views.

Not everyone will agree with all the statements in this book but every reader will be better informed about the Eucharist. The serious student of the subject

should carefully peruse all of it, including the valuable material in the end notes and appendices. It is a useful reference book, with particular topics readily accessible through the comprehensive Table of Contents.

This book is an admirable companion to the author's magisterial *Commentaries* on the 2004 Prayer Book, accessible online. In both of them he has left us very much in his debt.

William Marshall

THE THEOLOGY OF THE EUCHARIST: FROM A CHURCH OF IRELAND PERSPECTIVE

GENERAL INTRODUCTION

The intention of this study is to provide an account of the theology of the eucharist from within the parameters of the liturgical and theological tradition of the Church of Ireland. It neither makes nor implies that there is any one single way of doing or presenting such a theology, given the diversity of outlook that characterizes the Church of Ireland just as it does the Anglican tradition generally.¹ The use of the indefinite article in the title indicates that this is one person's approach, although based on the threefold approach of Scripture, Reason and Tradition which first became explicit in Hooker, and has been evident to a greater or lesser extent in Anglican eucharistic reflection and in theology generally, from the sixteenth to the twenty-first centuries.²

The present work is intended as a critical reflection and commences with a brief account of the writer's presuppositions³, not all of which are to be taken as having equal weight. They focus especially on the concepts underlying the doctrine of the Real Presence and provide a biblical basis for a positive view of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. The role of the Holy Spirit in the eucharist is recognized and the concept of the consecration of the elements for their specific role and purpose is mentioned as is also the writer's underlying assumptions about the significance of ordination. The reference to extended communion has to some extent been overtaken by events, including a Synodical process which authorized a form of it in 2018.⁴ The present writer's assumptions about the diversity of use of the elements are a matter of his personal opinion.

The Notes which appear after every section of every Chapter in this study are intended as an integral part of the present work in the form of reference to sources, quotation of evidence, and summaries of various expressions of eucharistic doctrine, some official and others representative of the views of various spokespersons especially those involved in the field of liturgy. As far as possible the present writer has made use of the actual words of the documents cited, generally in precis form, to ensure that the viewpoints of those responsible are given accurately and fairly when making his own comments and criticisms. Although all parts of this work are inter-related and, hopefully, build up into a coherent view of the main aspects of eucharistic theology, including those reflecting serious differences both within and between churches, including the Church of Ireland,⁵ as far as possible each section is made as complete in itself as it can be. The omission of a set of "conclusions" at the end of the study is deliberate, because the discussion of the various aspects of eucharistic theology is ongoing and does not admit of neat solutions, still less definitive ones, although the writer's own views are probably more than evident from his engagement with the particular issues examined (below, *passim*), in the context in which they occur.

The work as a whole is divided into two main sections, "Church Formularies" (Chapter Two)⁶ which examines such fundamental Anglican sources as the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, and the terms of assent to them, the Church Catechism, and the Eucharistic doctrine expressed or implied in the actual orders of service (Holy Communion One and Holy Communion Two) which are to be found in the Church of Ireland's own form of the Book of Common Prayer (2004). Throughout the entire work the present writer's former contributions to liturgical study are assumed, his doctoral thesis, *The Theological*

Implications of Recent Liturgical Revision in the Church of Ireland (Open University, 1987, pp829), and his online *Commentaries* (2011, Church of Ireland Publishing, pp366) of all the authorized orders of service in the Church of Ireland as at the date of publication. The second part of the present work (Chapter Three) is concerned with "Assessments",⁷ with particular reference to the Church of Ireland and the ARCIC "Final Report" (1970). and to the World Council of Churches' document arising from the Lima Conference, "Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry", with a study of the Church of England's Response and that of other Anglican churches, and view of the Roman Catholic Church as represented by various official documents, and with a consideration of the further ecumenical study by ARCIC embodied in the publication "Clarifications". In a final part of the main body of this exercise, the work of the Inter-Anglican Liturgical Consultation whose subject-matter was the eucharist (Dublin, 1995) is examined and is followed by a review of some recent Anglican liturgical scholarship. Chapter Four rounds off the exercise with a "Personal Reflection."⁸

NOTES ON THE GENERAL INTRODUCTION

¹ Stephen Neill, *Anglicanism*, Penguin Books, 1958, *passim*

² See William Marshall, *Scripture, Tradition and Reason, - A selective view of Anglican theology through the centuries*, The Columba Press/APCK, 2010. Dr "Billy" Marshall was, for a number of years Vice-Principal of the Church of Ireland Theological College. The third chapter of the book focusses particularly on Richard Hooker.

³ See below, Chapter One.

⁴ Journal of the General Synod, 2018 which provides for the carrying of the sacrament to the person's home in case of sickness or for some other valid reason. A form to allow the sacrament to be brought from a church where the eucharist has been celebrated to a church which has no priest-celebrant is, at the time of writing, authorized for trial use with the permission of the bishop of the diocese where this form of extended communion is to be used.

⁵ Although the eucharistic texts to be found in Holy Communion Two in the 2004 Prayer Book are eirenic and intended to be of such a character that they can be "owned" in good faith by both clergy and laity of all shades of opinion in the Church of Ireland there are inevitably difference of approach to the theology of the eucharist.. See below, Chapter Three, Part Three (2).

⁶ Strictly speaking, the Revised Catechism, whose status is carefully explained in the relevant part of Chapter Two, is not a formulary in the sense of a text fully authorized by General Synod legislation. But it has been certified by the House of Bishops under Chapter 1:26 (3) "as being in its opinion neither contrary to, nor indicative of any departure from the doctrine of the Church of Ireland" and constitutes a valuable resource for understanding church teaching, covering, as it does, a number of issues in Christian theology from a Church of Ireland perspective which are not represented in the traditional "Church Catechism" and expresses itself clearly in modern English.

⁷ Although the "assessments" are written from one person's perspective, the sources quoted do indicate that the views expressed are representative of a great deal of historic and also present-day theological opinion within the Anglican tradition.

⁸ There is a legitimate sense in which "truth is personal" and such a consideration would seem to justify the present writer in adding such a reflection to this work as a whole.

**THE THEOLOGY OF THE EUCHARIST
FROM A CHURCH OF IRELAND PERSPECTIVE**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

GENERAL INTRODUCTION		I-III
CHAPTER ONE		
	PRESUPPOSITIONS	1
	NOTES ON CHAPTER ONE	4
CHAPTER TWO CHURCH FORMULARIES		
PART ONE	THE PREAMBLE AND DECLARATION PREFIXED TO THE CHURCH CONSTITUTION	17
	NOTES ON CHAPTER TWO PART ONE	20
PART TWO	THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES	23
	NOTES ON CHAPTER TWO PART TWO	28
PART THREE	EXAMINATION OF PARTICULAR ARTICLES	34
	NOTES ON CHAPTER TWO PART THREE	40
PART FOUR	THE PRAYER BOOK CATECHISM	53
	NOTES ON CHAPTER TWO PART FOUR	57
PART FIVE	THE REVISED CATECHISM	67
	NOTES ON CHAPTER TWO PART FIVE	70
PART SIX	EUCHARISTIC DOCTRINE IN THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER, 2004, HOLY COMMUNION ONE	78
	NOTES ON CHAPTER TWO PART SIX	87
PART SEVEN	EUCHARISTIC DOCTRINE IN THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER, 2004, HOLY COMMUNION TWO	96
	NOTES ON CHAPTER TWO, PART SEVEN	106
CHAPTER THREE ASSESSMENTS		
	THE CHURCH OF IRELAND'S ATTITUDE TO THE ARCIC FINAL REPORT, THE 1976 "COMMENT"	
PART ONE	NOTES ON CHAPTER THREE PART ONE	140
	THE CHURCH OF IELAND'S ATTITUDE TO THE ARCIC FINAL REPORT, THE 1986 "RESPONSE"	147
PART TWO		
	NOTES ON CHAPTER THREE PART TWO.	157

PART THREE	THE ARCIC REPORT AND EVANGELICALS	
	(1) THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND EVANGELICAL COUNCIL	181
	NOTES ON CHAPTER THREE PART THREE (1)	186
	(2) THE EVANGELICAL FELLOWSHIP OF THE IRISH CHURCH/THE CHURCH OF IRELAND EVANGELICAL FELLOWSHIP	188
	NOTES ON CHAPTER THREE PART THREE (2)	194
PART FOUR	THE RESPONSE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND TO LIMA/B.E.M. [BAPTISM, EUCHARIST AND MINISTRY] AND ARCIC TOGETHER WITH THAT OF THE CHURCH OF IRELAND TO B.E.M/LIMA AND OTHER PARTICULAR ANGLICAN RESPONSES.	
	(1) INTRODUCTION	198
	(2) THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND, LIMA/B.E.M.	199
	NOTES ON PART FOUR (1) AND (2)	206
	(3) THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND ARCIC	219
	NOTES ON PART FOUR (3)	225
	(4) THE RESPONSE OF THE CHURCH OF IRELAND AND OTHER ANGLICAN CHURCHES TO BEM [AND ARCIC	228
	NOTES ON PART FOUR (4)	246
PART FIVE	THE EUCHARIST AND LAMBETH, WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO THE 1958 LAMBETH CONFERENCE AND POST-1958 DEVELOPMENTS INCLUDING THE THE GENERAL RESPONSE OF THE BISHOPS TO ARCIC	263
	NOTES ON CHAPTER THREE, PART FIVE.	275
PART SIX	ROMAN CATHOLIC RESPONSES TO ARCIC	
	(1) "OBSERVATIONS"	286
	NOTES ON PART SIX (1)	290
	(2) "RESPONSE OF THE BISHOPS' CONFERENCE OF ENGLAND AND WALES" TO ARCIC.	296
	NOTES ON PART SIX (2)	300
	(3) "ONE BREAD, ONE BODY"	305
	NOTES ON PART SIX (3)	320
	(4) THE DEFINITIVE ROMAN CATHOLIC RESPONSE TO ARCIC	334
	NOTES ON PART SIX (4)	341
	(5) ARCIC'S REPLY "CLARIFICATIONS" ON EUCHARIST AND MINISTRY	344
	NOTES ON PART SIX (5)	352
PART SEVEN	CURRENT ANGLICAN THINKING ON THE EUCHARIST	
	(1) THE INTER-ANGLICAN LITURGICAL CONSULTATION 1995.	357

	NOTES ON PART SEVEN (1)	
	(2) RECENT ANGLICAN LITURGICAL THEOLOGY	386
	NOTES ON PART SEVEN (2)	389
	AFTERWORD.	412
CHAPTER FOUR	NOTES ON CHAPTER FOUR, AFTERWORD	413
		416
APPENDICES		421
BIBLIOGRAPHY		453

CHAPTER 1

THE EUCHARIST: PRESUPPOSITIONS

It is assumed by the writer that when Jesus instituted the Eucharist and said some such words as "This is my body" and "This is my blood of the new covenant" or "This cup is the new covenant in my blood", this is to be seen within the context of a *tradition of interpretation* of the constituent elements of the celebration of the Passover.¹ It is assumed that the immediate reaction of the hearers most likely would have been, "So that is what the bread and wine of the Supper are to be taken to mean." The focus of attention would have been on what the bread and wine had come to signify rather than on what they were in themselves or had become.² This is not to deny that there may be ontological implications in a statement of significance. It is assumed here that one can describe what something *is* with reference (1) to its physical characteristics - what can be observed, weighed, measured, (2) to the *significance* it has for those who observe and use it, (3) to the *function* it performs, and (4) to the *purpose* it serves. It will be seen that there is something of an overlap in (2), (3), and (4). These can probably, in this instance, be subsumed, as above, under "significance" alone. At the same time, the further categories may legitimately be taken as "spelling out" what "significance" in this kind of context actually means. The bread and the wine are "effectual" and not "mere" signs.³

In the light of the above considerations, it is assumed that the bread and wine in their liturgical context represent the *physical* body-and-blood of the historical Christ who offered Himself as a once-for-all sacrifice on the cross of Calvary. They *are* (or more correctly *become*) his *sacramental* body and blood in so far as they have the significance of Christ's body and blood for worshippers and they perform the function and achieve the purpose for which He gave them this designation. There is, thus a real (although non-physical) change in what the bread and wine *are*, by virtue of consecration. By the liturgical act commanded by Jesus we use them to accomplish the eucharistic sacrifice, and we receive them not as ordinary bread and wine, but as bread and wine charged with the significance, performing the function, and achieving the purpose of Christ's "Body" and "Blood". They also *communicate* the life of Christ to us, since the very words "body" and "blood" stand for the *life* of Jesus, and these words are by the act of consecration attached to the elements.⁴ To receive the elements in faith is equivalent to receiving Christ himself by this means.

It is assumed that the term "body" of Christ can refer in the New Testament, (1) to the "physical", flesh-and-bones body of Jesus, (2) to his "mystical" body, the Church, and (3) to his "sacramental" body, the eucharistic bread. It is assumed that while these uses are closely related, they should not be confused.⁵ It is considered that these uses have been confused, sometimes for long periods, and that the origins of this may be as early as the sub-apostolic period, for example in Ignatius of Antioch's reaction to the denials of Docetism.⁶ A parallel to this would be the way in which St. Paul's teaching on the resurrection of the body (which distinguishes clearly between the body which decays and the spiritual body which is yet to be, while relating them distinctly one to another) was displaced by the materialistic concept very widespread in the early Church, and persisting for many generations, namely, the "resurrection of the flesh." It is also assumed that the sacramental use of the elements does not in any way eliminate their identity, although in the Eucharistic context they acquire a new primary meaning. Since,

however, as outlined above, they are given a fresh significance, function, and purpose (and we are thinking here of the salvific purpose of God not merely of the intentions of the Church) in this sense they *are* different, so much so that the term "transubstantiation", (change of being) would not necessarily be inappropriate in this connection.⁷

It is also assumed that the sacrifice of Christ on Calvary was a once-for-all sacrifice which cannot be repeated and which requires no addition in order to accomplish the salvation of all men and women. The benefits of this *accepted* sacrifice are appropriated by faith. Any properly formulated doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice must conform to this truth (see Hebrews 7:27; 8:12). This means that if the Eucharist is a sacrifice (and it is assumed here that it is), then this is true only in a secondary and derivative, although also biblical, sense. Ideally the Eucharist itself should express both truths (because they are complementary), but only the first is *de fide*. Hence it is considered here that the value of a liturgy, still less its validity, does not depend primarily on the extent to which it expresses the view that in the Eucharist Christ is "offered"⁸

It is assumed that the word *anamnesis* in the dominical institution reflects an underlying Hebrew *zikkaron* or, just possibly, its Aramaic equivalent.⁹ The choice of the word *anamnesis* rather than *mnemosunon* to render this reinforces the view that what was meant was *a cultic act of memorial* before God. The words "before God", here indicate that what we have to reckon with is not only a reminder to us of what God in Christ has done for us (although this is certainly included in the meaning), but also, and even primarily, a liturgical act in God's presence with a fundamentally Godward orientation. The working definition of this aspect of the Eucharist is here assumed to be a "remembering before God in thanksgiving and supplication of the once-for-all sacrifice of His Son", the "remembering" being accomplished not just by *thinking* about what happened while partaking (as, apparently, in Cranmer),¹⁰ but by performance of the liturgical act of "taking and blessing or thanking, breaking and giving" after the example of the Lord. The word "offer" where it is used could be taken as shorthand for all this. In this sense the sacrifice of Christ is "offered" not by way of repetition (which is not, properly understood, the teaching of any church), but by way of liturgical remembrance before the Father.¹¹

It is assumed that the word "remembrance" is to be taken here in a very strong sense. It is, in biblical thought, no mere subjective mental recollection but in a real sense a "making present" of that which is remembered (although one must beware of any suggestion that one is "doing" anything to the historical events, which are truly past).¹²

It is assumed that the "offering" of the bread and the cup (found in almost all historic liturgies with the possible exception of some Gallican rites), performs the function of expressing the "Godward" aspect of the liturgical celebration. It is not, however, a *necessary* part of the rite.¹³ Jesus did not *command* the disciples to "offer" but to perform the liturgical rite. In fact, it is not even certain to what extent he actually *enjoined* the latter. The sense of his words is more likely, "When you do this, do this in remembrance of me", laying the stress on the *significance* of the rite rather than on its *performance*. The essentials of the rite are here considered to be the "thanking" and the "giving", since the "taking" and the "breaking", although part of it, are preliminaries to the principal actions.¹⁴

The role of the Holy Spirit is crucial to the process of "making present" by way of

remembrance. It is by the Holy Spirit that the bread and wine become to us the Body and Blood of Christ and "we are as if there." This is not to say that an epiclesis on the elements is essential to the validity of a rite. No such invocation is to be found at the Last Supper so far as our records go.¹⁵

It is assumed that there is no one "right" and "only" way for the bread and wine to be "consecrated". What matters is that the elements should be in some way (perhaps only by implication, but nonetheless clearly) designated for their sacred meaning and function. Having said this, there seems no good reason for necessarily excluding a "moment" of consecration as is done by many modern liturgical theologians. The elements can be identified in a moment - or not. Thus, consecration by formula, such as by the recitation of the Words of Institution, is a possibility (as well as an historical tradition), and so is consecration by invocation (of the Holy Spirit), or a combination of these. But it is assumed that any such identification will normally be performed within the context of *thanksgiving* and that "consecration by thanksgiving" was the earliest and most biblical concept.¹⁶

The question of "Who celebrates the Eucharist?" comes under the heading of "Ministry" which is not the primary focus of this project. However, it may be said that it is assumed here that the power to "perform" the liturgy is not inherently and necessarily restricted to any particular class of persons within the Church, appointed in any particular manner. But this is not to be taken as excluding the role of a representative *ministry* nor of the designation "priesthood" to describe it, nor of ordination as the normal means of admission to such an office.¹⁷

It is also assumed that Eucharistic developments which occurred quite late in the history of the Church may be legitimate, and that even if some of these were associated with certain abuses, *abusus non tollit usum*. For example, the writer has no difficulty in principle with extended communion,¹⁸ or even reservation for devotional purposes, although like everything else in the Church these are open to misuse. Nor is it felt that even such a concept as the validity and legitimacy of a mass said by a priest on his own is necessarily to be ruled out in all circumstances. Although the corporate dimension of the eucharist is primary a private celebration of such a kind, where made necessary by circumstances, represents and is united with the worship of the whole Church of Christ.¹⁹

NOTES ON CHAPTER ONE

[1] ***The tradition of interpretation of the Passover.*** It appears that interpretation was a significant feature of the Passover, especially in relation to: the elements of the meat, the exodus, the narrative/cultic credo, the four cups of wine, the roasted lamb, the unleavened bread, the bitter herbs, the saltwater, the fruit puree, and the prescription to eat reclining. In the Old Testament itself the unleavened bread is called "the bread of affliction" Deut 16:3, and in the liturgy of the Passover it is traditionally said, "This is the bread of affliction/distress which our forefathers ate in the land of Egypt. All who are hungry, let them come in and eat. All who are needy, let them come in and share with us the passover..." It is in this context that we must see the interpretative words spoken by Jesus, "This is my body which is for you", "This cup is the new covenant in my blood" (1 Cor 11:24, 25). Jeremias speaks of these words as "words of interpretation". J. Jeremias *Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, E.T. SCM 1966, pp87,88. However, caution is necessary in that the form of the Passover in the time of Jesus and the understanding of it has probably been subject to considerable development between then and now and it is hard to know how much of the current rite would have been in existence in New Testament times. P. Bradshaw, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship*, Revised and Enlarged Edition, SPCK, 2002, p.65.

[2] ***The significance of the bread and wine.*** This is discussed by Pope Paul VI in *Mysterium Fidei* of 1965 (CTS Do355), pp7,8, who insists that the change in the elements is "ontological". From the standpoint of the writer a change in meaning, function, and purpose does in fact have ontological implications, but not in the sense apparently meant in the papal document.

[3] ***Effectual signs.*** For a discussion of the relationship between "symbols" and (mere) "signs" and of the relationship between symbols and ontology, see N. Sagavsky (Ed.), *Liturgy and Symbolism*, Grove Liturgical Study No. 16, Grove Books, 1978. For further contributions to this general topic, see K.W. Stevenson, *Symbolism and the Liturgy I* (Roman Catholic contributors), Grove Liturgical Study No 23, Grove Books, 1980, and K.W. Stevenson, *Symbolism and the Liturgy II* (Non-Roman Catholic contributors), Grove Liturgical Study No 26, Grove Books 1981. See also two essays in the collection *Thinking about the Eucharist* by members of the Church of England Doctrine Commission (with a Preface by the Rt. Revd I. T. Ramsey, SCM 1972, Ch. 4. C.F. Evans, "The Eucharist and Symbolism in the New Testament, & Ch. 5. "Symbols and the Eucharist". A broader approach to symbolism may be found in G. Cope, *Symbolism in the Bible and the Church*, SCM, 1959. Also relevant, in a general way are F.W. Dillistone, *Christianity and Symbolism*, SCM, 1955, and P. Berger, *A Rumour of Angels*, 1959. A discussion of sacramental theology which relates developments in doctrine to the history of the sacraments (with particular reference to the Roman Catholic Church) may be found in J. Martos, *Doors to the Sacred*, SCM, 1981, in which Chapter VIII deals with the Eucharist. There is an article by B. Fischer in K. Stevenson, Ed., *Liturgy Reshaped*, SPCK, 1982, entitled, "Reform of Symbols in Roman Catholic Worship - Loss or Gain?"

[4] ***"Body" and "Blood" as words standing for the life of Jesus*** The Church of Ireland's version of the Revised Catechism has the question (53), "What is meant by receiving the Body and Blood of Christ?" The answer given is, "Receiving the Body and Blood of Christ means *receiving the life of Christ himself* who was crucified and rose again, and is now alive for evermore."

[5] A view supported by C.B. Moss in his textbook of Anglican dogmatics *The Christian Faith: An Introduction to Dogmatic Theology*, SPCK 1957 (originally published 1943), pp357,358 under the heading: Meaning of "Body, and "Blood",

The words "Body" and "Blood" do not mean the material body and blood of our Lord. To think that they do is to fall into the error of "Capharnaism", so called from the Jews of Capernaum who asked, "How can this Man give us His flesh to eat?"

The body is the means by which the spirit expresses itself. Though it has been widely held that our Lord has only one Body, it seems that He has at least two. The Church is His Body; but not that Body which was crucified and is now exalted to the throne of God. The bread in the Eucharist becomes the Body of Christ; not His material Body, nor His mystical Body (the Church), but His sacramental Body, the means by which He carried out Its purpose of feeding us spiritually with His own life.

We avoid many difficulties if we say that He has more than one Body, more than one means of expression. His material Body was one means of expression. the bread at the Last Supper was another. It has always been difficult to explain how the bread at the Last Supper could be our Lord's Body, if He had only one Body; but if He has more than one Body, the bread can be held to be His Body in a different sense.

Though it has been widely held that the Body of which we partake is the same Body as that which was born of the Blessed Virgin and hung on the Cross, there appears to be nothing in Holy Scripture or in any definition of the universal Church to prevent us from distinguishing them from one another.

In any case, the sacramental Body of Christ is not His dead Body, as was held by some of the Anglican divines of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, for He "was dead and is alive for evermore" (Rev. 1: 18).

[6] *Ignatius of Antioch on the Eucharist*. Referring to the Docetists he said (Smyrnaeans 7: 1), "They abstain from Eucharist and prayer, because they do not confess that the Eucharist is the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ who suffered for our sins..." This looks like a materialistic concept of the eucharistic "body"; and Justin Martyr (1st Apology 66:2) seems to teach a similar doctrine. However, in both cases the use may be derived from John 6:41-58. Paul Bradshaw, in his *Reconstructing Christian Worship*, SPCK, 2009, pp3-4 points out that several scholars have suggested the words "And the bread that I should give for the life of the world is my flesh" is John's version of the saying over the bread at the Last Supper, and some have claimed that this form could in one way at least be closer to the original as neither Hebrew nor Aramaic have a word for body as we understand the term, and so what Jesus would have said at the Last Supper would have been the Aramaic equivalent of "this is my flesh". On the other hand the early Christian writer Irenaeus seems concerned to distinguish between the "outward and visible sign," and the "inward and spiritual grace", to use the terminology of the Prayer Book catechism. He said, "Just as the bread, which comes from the earth, when it receives the invocation of God, is no longer common bread but eucharist, being composed of two elements, a terrestrial one and a celestial, so our bodies are no longer commonplace when they receive the eucharist, since they have the hope of resurrection to eternity" (*Haereses* 4:18:5). The concept of a "change" is common to all three writers.

[7] For an alternative approach to the doctrine of the "Real Presence" from a Roman Catholic viewpoint, similar in some respects to that presupposed by the writer, see E. Schillebeeckx, *The Eucharist*, 2nd Ed., Sheed and Ward, 1977, Part II.

The presupposition that a "high" doctrine of the Eucharistic Presence is compatible with a recognition of the continued real existence of the Eucharistic elements is implicit in the Anglican-Lutheran statement of 1972, "Both Communion affirm the real presence of Christ in this sacrament, but neither seeks to define precisely how this happens. In the eucharistic action (including consecration) and reception, the bread and wine, while remaining bread and wine, become the means whereby Christ is truly present and gives himself to the communicants." (*Anglican-Lutheran International Conversations, the Report of the Conversations 1970-1972* authorized by the Lambeth Conference and the Lutheran World Federation, SPCK, 1973, §68 pp 16,17).

Other significant approaches to a common Ecumenical faith in the Eucharistic Presence include the following:-

(1) "The Eucharist - A Lutheran-Roman Catholic Statement" St. Louis, 1967 in *Modern Eucharistic Agreement*, SPCK, 1973). It is agreed (11, 1b),

We affirm that in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper Jesus Christ, true God and true man, is present wholly and entirely in his body and blood, under the signs of bread and wine.

(11, 1c) Through the centuries Christians have attempted various formulations to describe this presence. Our confessional documents have in common affirmed that Jesus Christ is "really", "truly", and "substantially" present in this sacrament. This manner of presence "we can scarcely express in words", but we affirm his presence because we believe in the power of God and the promise of Jesus Christ, "This is my body ... This is my blood". Our traditions have spoken of this presence as "sacramental", "supernatural", and "spiritual". These terms have different connotations in the two traditions, but they have in common a rejection of a spatial or natural manner of presence, and a rejection of an understanding of the sacrament as only commemorative or figurative. The term "sign", once suspect, is again recognized as a positive term for speaking of Christ's presence in the sacrament. For, though symbols and symbolic actions are used, the Lord's Supper is an effective sign: it communicates what it promises...

Discussing remaining problems between the two communions, it is said, (11, 2c)

Lutherans traditionally have understood the Roman Catholic use of the term "transubstantiation" to involve:

- a. An emphatic affirmation of the presence of Christ's body and blood in the sacrament. With this they are in agreement.
- b. An affirmation that God acts in the eucharist, effecting a change in the elements. This all Lutherans teach, although they use a different terminology.
- c. A rationalistic attempt to explain the mystery of Christ's presence in the sacrament. This they have rejected as presumptuous.
- d. A definitive commitment to one and only one conceptual framework in which to express the change in the elements. This they have regarded as theologically untenable.

It can thus be seen that there is agreement on the that, the full reality of Christ's presence. What has been disputed is a particular way of stating the "how", the manner in which he becomes present.

Today, however, when Lutheran theologians read contemporary Catholic expositions, it becomes clear to them that the dogma of transubstantiation intends to affirm the fact of Christ's presence and of the change which takes place, and is not an attempt to explain how Christ becomes present. When the dogma is understood in this way, Lutherans find that they also acknowledge that it is a legitimate way of attempting to express the mystery, even though they continue to believe that the conceptuality associated with "transubstantiation" is misleading and therefore prefer to avoid the term.

Our conversations have persuaded us to both the legitimacy and the limits of theological efforts to explore the mystery of Christ's presence in the sacrament. We are also persuaded that no single vocabulary or conceptual framework can be adequate exclusive or final in this theological enterprise.

(2) *"Towards a common Eucharistic Faith - from the Group of Les Dombes"* (in *Modern Eucharistic Agreement*, SPCK, 1973). Under the heading of "Doctrinal Agreement on the Eucharist" V "The Sacramental Presence of Christ", it is agreed,

17. "The act of the Eucharist is the gift of Christ's person. The Lord said: 'Take, eat, this is my body which is given for you. Drink ye all of this for this is my blood of the new covenant which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins.' We accordingly confess unanimously the real, living, and effective presence of Christ in this sacrament.

18. "To discern the body and blood of Christ requires faith. However, the presence of Christ revealed to his Church in the eucharist does not depend on the faith of the individual, for it is Christ who binds himself in his words and in the Spirit to the sacramental act, the sign of his presence given.

19. "Christ's act being the gift of his body and blood, that is to say of himself the reality given in the signs of the bread and wine is his body and his blood. It is by virtue of Christ's creative word and by the power of the Holy Spirit that the bread and wine are made a sacrament and hence a "sharing of the body and blood of Christ" (1 Cor 10:16). They are henceforth, in their ultimate truth, beneath the outward sign, the given reality, and so they remain, since their purpose is to be consumed. What is given as the body and blood of Christ remains given as his body and blood and requires to be treated as such."

Under the heading of Pastoral Agreement, "The Meaning of the Eucharist", it is said, (III, "The Reality of Christ's Presence in the Sacrament"),

"By sharing and consuming the bread and wine of the eucharist, we receive, according to the life-giving Word of the Lord, his body that is given, his blood that is shed, his whole person. This bread and this wine are thus the body and blood of Christ, given by him to his Church. Fed, all of us, by Christ, who welcomes us to his table, we share his life as the Son of God and the brother of all mankind. This life that we received at our baptism, the eucharist feeds and tends in its growth and prepares for its fulfilment in our resurrection.

(3) A highly-significant approach to a consensus on the doctrine of the Eucharist is the Faith and Order Paper No III of the World Council of Churches, *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* (Geneva 1982), arising from a Conference at Lima, Peru, attended by over hundred theologians, representing virtually all the major church traditions: Eastern Orthodox, Oriental Orthodox, Roman Catholic, Old Catholic, Lutheran, Anglican, Reformed, Methodist, United, Disciples, Baptism, Adventist, and Pentecostal.

On the Eucharistic Presence it says (Eucharist, 13):

The words and acts of Christ at the institution of the eucharist stand at the heart of the celebration; the eucharistic meal is the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, the sacrament of his real presence. Christ fulfills in a variety of ways his promise to be always with his own even to the end of the world. But Christ's mode of presence in the eucharist is unique. Jesus said over the bread and wine of the eucharist: "This is my body ... this is my blood...". What Christ declared is true and this truth is fulfilled every time the eucharist is celebrated. The Church confesses Christ's real, living, and active presence in the eucharist. While Christ's real presence in the eucharist does not depend on the faith of the individual, all agree that to discern the body and blood of Christ, faith is required.

In the Commentary on this section it is stated,

Many churches believe that by the words of Jesus and by the power of the Holy Spirit, the bread and wine of the eucharist become, in a real though mysterious manner, the body and blood of the risen Christ, i.e. of the living Christ present in all his fullness. Under the signs of bread and wine, the deepest reality is the total being of Christ who comes to us in order to feed us and transform our entire being. Some other churches, while affirming a real presence of Christ at the Eucharist, do not link that presence so definitely with the signs of bread and wine. The decision remains for the churches whether this difference can be accommodated within the convergence formulated in the text itself.

For further reflection arising from the Lima document BEM see the article by J.M.R. Tillard, "The Eucharist, Gift of God", pp 104-118 in *Ecumenical Perspectives on Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, Faith and Order Paper 116, World Council of Churches, Geneva, Ed. Max Thurian, 1983.

For the comments of the Standing Committee of the General Synod of the Church of Ireland on the Lima document BEM see the *Journal of the General Synod of the Church of Ireland* 1985, "Report of the Standing Committee", Appendix C, pp90-99. This is reproduced in *Churches respond to BEM - Official responses to the "Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry Text*, Vol 1, Ed. Max Thurian, Faith and Order Paper 129, pp61-69.

[8] For a modern Anglican discussion of the relationship between the Accepted Sacrifice and the sacrificial action of the Eucharist, see A.G. Hebert, *Apostle and Bishop*, Faber & Faber 1963, Ch VII, "Sacrifice and Eucharist." He finds problematical the words of Du Moulin (1635) cited by Max Thurian of the Taizé community in his *L'Eucharistie*, "It can be said that in the Holy Supper we offer Jesus Christ to God, since there we pray God to accept on our behalf the Sacrifice of his death". It could be replied that this has been done, once for all, by the accepted sacrifice of the cross which is for all people, and that we can only "offer" this by means of remembering it before God in thanksgiving and supplication - in thanksgiving for what has been accomplished in a definitive and

unrepeatable way and in supplication for the benefits which flow from this sacrifice.

[9] On the meaning of *anamnesis* see J. Jeremias, *Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, SCM, 1966, pp237-255. Also M. Thurian, *The Eucharistic Memorial*, Ecumenical Studies in Worship, No's 7,8, translated by J.G. Davies, Lutterworth, 1960, 1961. This latter work, while most valuable, suffers from a failure to differentiate the particular meanings of the various Hebrew and Greek words signifying "memory". A Conservative Evangelical essay, useful for its treatment of the biblical evidence, but unsatisfactory in the conclusions drawn from this, is that by D. Gregg, *Anamnesis in the Eucharist*, Grove Liturgical Study No. 5, Grove Books, 1976. The writer's own B.D. thesis, *The Meaning and Role of the Anamnesis in the Anglican Liturgical Tradition* submitted to Trinity College Dublin in 1979, draws on these and other writers for a discussion on the meaning of the word. The first chapter deals with the "Biblical background" and the second with "Anamnesis in the early Church".

The concept of the anamnesis is central to much contemporary ecumenical thought on the Eucharist, just as it is central to the biblical accounts of the eucharist, (explicitly in Luke 22:19 part of the longer text" which is assumed here to represent an authentic tradition, even if not necessarily in the original Gospel text - and in 1 Cor 11:24,25). For example the Lima document, *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* cited above, has an entire section (B) on "The Eucharist as Anamnesis or Memorial of Christ'. It reads,

5. The Eucharist is the memorial of the crucified and risen Christ, i.e. the living and effective sign of his sacrifice accomplished once and for all on the cross and still operative on behalf of all mankind. The biblical idea of memorial as applied to the eucharist refers to this present efficacy of God's work when it is celebrated by God's people in a liturgy.

6. Christ himself with all that he has accomplished for us and for all creation (in his incarnation, servant-hood, ministry, teaching, suffering, sacrifice, resurrection, ascension, and sending of the Spirit) is present in this anamnesis, granting us communion with himself. The eucharist is also the foretaste of his *parousia* and of the final kingdom.

7. The anamnesis in which Christ acts through the joyful celebration of his Church is thus both representation and anticipation. It is not only a calling to mind of what is past and of its significance. It is the Church's effective proclamation of God's mighty acts and promises.

8. Representation and anticipation are expressed in thanksgiving and intercession. The Church, gratefully recalling God's mighty acts of redemption, beseeches God to give the benefits of these acts to every human being. In thanksgiving and intercession, the Church is united with the Son, its great High Priest and Intercessor (Romans 8:34; Heb 7:25). The eucharist is the sacrament of the unique sacrifice of Christ, who ever lives to make intercession for us. It is the memorial of all that God has done for the salvation of the world. What it was God's will to accomplish in the incarnation, life, death, resurrection, and ascension of Christ, God does not repeat. These events are unique and can neither be repeated nor prolonged. In the memorial of the eucharist, however, the Church offers its intercession in communion with Christ, our great High Priest.

[A comment is included in the margin:- "It is in the light of the significance of the eucharist as intercession that references to the eucharist in Catholic theology as "propitiatory sacrifice" may be understood. The understanding is that there is only one expiation, that of the unique sacrifice of the cross, made actual in the eucharist and presented before the Father in the intercession of Christ and of the Church for all humanity."

In the light of the biblical conception of memorial, all churches might want to review the old controversies about "sacrifice" and deepen their understanding of the reasons why other traditions than their own have either used or rejected this term"]

9. The anamnesis of Christ is the basis and source off all Christian prayer. So our prayer relies upon and is united with the continual intercession of the risen Lord. In the eucharist Christ empowers us to live with him, to suffer with him and to pray through him as justified sinners, joyfully and freely fulfilling his will.

10. In Christ we offer ourselves as a living and holy sacrifice in our daily lives (Romans 12: 1; I Peter 15); this spiritual worship, acceptable to God, is nourished in the eucharist, in which we are sanctified and reconciled in love, in order to be servants of reconciliation in the world.

11. United to our Lord and in communion with all the saints and martyrs, we are renewed in the covenant sealed by the blood of Christ.

12 Since the anamnesis of Christ is the very content of the preached Word as it is of the eucharistic meat each reinforces the other. The celebration of the eucharist properly includes the proclamation of the Word.

(Par 13, and the important comment on it, is given above).

[10] For Cramer's theology, see P. Brooks, *Thomas Cranmer's Doctrine of the Eucharist*. See also Cranmer's *Works*, 2 Vols ed. L.E. Cox, Cambridge, 1846

[11] For an exposition of the Scriptural evidence from this point of view see the writer's B.D. thesis, *The Meaning and Role of the Anamnesis in the Anglican Liturgical Tradition*, (TCD, 1979) op. cit. ppl-19. The key question is the significance of the concept of "remembrance" (*anamnesis*), to be found in the longer text of Luke's account of the Last Supper (22:19b, which may be regarded as a significant part of the early textual tradition, (whether or not it was actually in the original text of Luke), and 1 Cor 11:23-26 which is the earliest surviving account of the institution of the eucharist. The choice of *anamnesis* rather than *mnemosunon* suggests a memorial act, and most likely corresponds to the Hebrew *zikkarōn*, the alternatives, all from the same root Z K R, namely *zēker*, *azkarah*, and *hazkir* being less likely. The formula l^czikkarōn, corresponding to the dominical *eis anamnēsin* fits well with the concept of eucharistic memorial in this current study. In particular it coheres with the idea of a memorial before God which lies at the heart of the doctrine of the eucharistic sacrifice.

The first chapter of the writer's B.D. thesis contains a careful critique of David Gregg's *Anamnesis in the Eucharist*, Grove Liturgical Study No 5, Grove Books, 1976, which deals with the terms involved. The writer is in agreement with the presentation of the evidence in Gregg's study but would draw different conclusions from the evidence.

[12] "This command to execute a eucharistic action is to be understood in the light of the words which by now are so full of meaning for us: with a view to my memorial, in

memorial of me, as the memorial of me." This memorial is not a simple subjective act of recollection, it is a liturgical action. But it is not just a liturgical action which makes the Lord present, it is a liturgical action which recalls as a memorial before the Father the unique sacrifice of the Son, and this makes Him present in His memorial, in the presentation of His sacrifice before the Father and in His intercession as heavenly High Priest. The eucharistic memorial is a recalling to us, a recalling by us to the Father and a recalling of the Son to the Father for us." M. Thurian, *The Eucharistic Memorial*, Part 2. The New Testament, Ecumenical Studies in Worship No. 8, Ed. J. G. Davies and A. Raymond George, Lutterworth 1963, pp35,36.

[13] For differing views as to the legitimacy of the Eucharistic "offering" see (in opposition) R.P.C. Hanson, *Eucharistic Offering in the Early Church*, Grove Liturgical Studies No. 19, Grove Books, 1979, and (in sympathy) R Williams, *Eucharistic Sacrifice - the Roots of a Metaphor*, Grove Liturgical Study No 31, Grove Books, 1982.

[14] For the view of the Eucharist as a four-fold action, see G. Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, Dacre Press, 2nd Ed., 1945, esp. pp48-55. However, this has been questioned from various points of view. Colin Buchanan, in *The End of the Offertory - An Anglican Study* Grove Liturgical Study no 14, Grove Books, 1978 questioned the identification of the "Taking" with the Offertory. In the context of the Passover it would have involved, not offering but the raising of the bread a hands breadth from the Table while the thanksgiving was said. In more recent liturgies, probably not unconnected with Buchanan's criticism there has been a tendency to separate the bringing of the bread and wine to the celebrant and the act of "taking" the bread and wine. The latter is regarded as a preliminary to the thanksgiving which follows, and the breaking of the bread is a preliminary to the "giving" under whatever name it appears. In Holy Communion Two in the 2004 Prayer Book it is said that the table may be prepared by a deacon or lay people and the gifts of money may be brought forward and presented. Then, under the heading of *At the Preparation of the Table* the bread and wine are placed on the table for the communion if this has not already been done, and one of several prayers may be said. However, one of these is 1 Chronicles 29: 11,14 which reintroduces the concept of offering, "for all things come from you and of your own we give you." Then, under the heading of "The Taking of the Bread and Wine the bishop or priest who presides takes the bread and wine and may say, "Christ our passover has been sacrificed for us" to which the reply is **"therefore let us celebrate the feast"**. The four headings are:

The Taking of the Bread and Wine

The Great Thanksgiving (in which there is a sub-title referring to the three "Eucharistic Prayers")

The Breaking of the Bread.

The Communion (which corresponds to the "Giving" in Dix's schema).

[15] The role of the Holy Spirit. For a full discussion of the Epiclesis, see John 11 McKenna, *Eucharist and Holy Spirit*, Alcuin Club Collections No 57, Mayhew-McCrimmon, 1975.

There is a section on "The Eucharist as Invocation of the Spirit" in the WCC document, *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry* op. cit.

14. The Spirit makes the crucified and risen Christ really present to us in the eucharistic meal fulfilling the promise contained in the words of institution. The presence of Christ is clearly the centre of the eucharist, and the promise

contained in the words of institution is therefore fundamental to the celebration. Yet it is the Father who is the primary origin and final fulfilment of the eucharistic event. The incarnate Son of God by and in whom it is accomplished is its living centre. The Holy Spirit is the immeasurable strength of love which makes it possible and continues to make it effective. The bond between the eucharistic celebration and the mystery of the Triune God reveals the role of the Holy Spirit as that of the One who makes the historical the words of institution that it will be answered, the Church prays to the Father for the gift of the Holy Spirit in order that the eucharistic event may be a reality: the real presence of the crucified and risen Christ giving his life for all humanity.

A comment, on this section says,

This is not to spiritualize the eucharistic presence of Christ but to affirm the indissoluble union between the Son and the Spirit. This union makes it clear that the eucharist is not a magical or mechanical action but a prayer addressed to the Father, one which emphasizes the Church's utter dependence. There is an intrinsic relationship between the words of institution, Christ's promise, and the epiclesis, the invocation of the Spirit, in the liturgy. The epiclesis in relation to the words of institution is located differently in various liturgical traditions. In the early liturgies the whole "prayer action" was thought of as bringing about the reality promised by Christ. The invocation of the Spirit was made both on the community and on the elements of bread and wine. Recovery of such an understanding may help us overcome our difficulties concerning a special moment of consecration.

See also,

15. It is in virtue of the living word of Christ and by the power of the Holy Spirit that the bread and wine become the sacramental signs of Christ's body and blood. They remain so for the purpose of communion.

A comment on this section says,

In the history of the Church there have been various attempts to understand the mystery of the real and unique presence of Christ in the eucharist. Some are content merely to affirm this presence without seeking to explain it. Others consider it necessary to assert a change wrought by the Holy Spirit and Christ's words, in consequence of which there is no longer just ordinary bread and wine but the body and blood of Christ. Others again have developed an explanation of the real presence which, though not claiming to exhaust the significance of the mystery, seeks to protect it from damaging interpretations.

16 The whole action of the eucharist has an "epiclectic" character because it depends upon the work of the Holy Spirit. In the words of the liturgy, this aspect of the eucharist finds varied expression.

17. The Church, as the community of the new covenant, confidently invokes the Spirit. in order that it may be sanctified and renewed, led into all justice, truth, and unity, and empowered to fulfil its mission in the world.

18. The Holy Spirit through the eucharist gives a foretaste of the Kingdom of God: the Church receives the life of the new creation and the assurance the

Lord's return.

[16] A discussion of the role of the Words of Institution in relation to the consecration of the elements may be found in RF. Buxton, *Eucharist and Institution Narrative - a study in the Roman and Anglican traditions of the Consecration of the Eucharist from the Eighth to the Twentieth Centuries*, Alcuin Club Collections, No 58, Mayhew-McCrimmon, 1976.

For a general discussion on "The Theology of Consecration" see G. Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* op. cit. Ch X.

For a commendation of the idea of "consecration through thanksgiving" see the *Lambeth, Conference Report of 1958*, Section 3 "Progress in the Anglican Communion" B. The Book of Common Prayer, 2:85 "Consecration":-

We desire to draw attention to a conception of consecration which is scriptural and primitive and goes behind subsequent controversies with respect to the moment and formula of consecration. This is associated with the Jewish origin and meaning of *eucharistia* and may be called consecration through thanksgiving. "To bless anything and to pronounce a thanksgiving over it are not two actions but one" (Bouyer). "Everything created by God is good, and nothing is to be rejected if it is received with thanksgiving; for then it is consecrated by the word of God and prayer."

Thanksgiving unveils the glory and generosity of the Creator and the original meaning and purpose of creation. It releases man's response to what has been done for him in redemption and sets free the love implanted in him

The Word of God accepted by the People of God and coming back to God from the lips of those giving thanks, actually sanctifies the creatures over which it is pronounced (Bouyer, *Life and Liturgy* pp 119,120).

The identity of the concepts of "blessing" and "thanksgiving" has been questioned, for example by Paul Bradshaw in his *Eucharistic Origins*, Alcuin Club Collections 80, SPCK, 2004, pp8,9, where after discussing the odd mixture of both where "bless" is used over the bread but "give thanks" over the cup in Mark and Matthew he points out that these two words refer to two quite different Jewish liturgical constructions: the *berakah*, "blessing", which used the passive participle of the verb *barak*, "Blessed are you ...who...," and which eventually became normative in later Jewish prayer: and the *hodayah* "thanksgiving", which used an active form of the verb *hodeh*, "I/we give thanks to you...because". Both of the forms, he says, were in use by Jews in the first century, although the Qumran material and also Hellenistic Jewish sources seem to display a preference for the latter over the former.

On the origins of the Eucharistic Prayer, see L. Ligier, "The Origins of the Eucharistic Prayer", *Studia Liturgica*, Vol 9: No 4, 1973 and also T.J. Talley, "The Eucharistic Prayer of the Ancient Church", *Studia Liturgica* Vol 2: No 3/4, 1976. For a more recent critical reflection see Paul F. Bradshaw, *Eucharistic Origins*, SPCK, 2004 and also his *Reconstructing Early Christian Worship*, SPCK, 2009, Part One.

[17] However, the issue of ministry is considered in several places, for example under the heading of Ministry and Ordination in Chapter Three Part 6 (5) below, when the ARCIC document "Clarifications" is being examined.

[18] ***Holy Communion by Extension*** A form of *Holy Communion by Extension* (for

those unable to be present at the public celebration) according to the use of The Church of Ireland was approved by the House of Bishops and authorized in the Church of Ireland as from 28 February 2007 for a period of seven years, and this was later extended. The service was issued in accordance with the constitution of the Church of Ireland, Chapter 1 section 26 (3). What is intended to be a permanent form is, at the time of writing, being put forward as draft legislation to be considered by the General Synod. The text of this may be found in Appendix A.

A memorandum on the issue by the present writer, submitted to the Liturgical Advisory Committee in September 2007, and, he believes still relevant, read,

HOLY COMMUNION BY EXTENSION

The Passover (which according to the Synoptic Gospels is the matrix from within which the Holy Communion emerged) was and is highly inclusive, the participants including all present (the necessary quorum of male persons; women and children). In a similar way the early Christian eucharist appears to have been open to all the baptized, including infants, and that all present were expected to participate fully. There was originally, it seems, no recognition of non-communicating attendance of those who were by virtue of their baptism and admission to communion fully initiated into the Christian religion.

The question must have arisen at a very early date how those who were unable to attend the weekly eucharist through age, sickness or infirmity or through some other just cause such as imprisonment for their faith would be able to share in this defining act of Christian identity.

The earliest description of the eucharist (leaving aside the problematic *Didache*, which in any case does not tell us what actually happened at the Lord's Supper) is that to be found in Justin Martyr's *First Apologia* which includes:

And on the day which is called the day of the sun [Sunday] there is an assembly of all who live in the towns or in the country; and the memoirs of the Apostles or the writing of the prophets are read, as long as time permits. Then the reader ceases, and the president speaks, admonishing us and exhorting us to imitate these excellent examples. Then we arise all together and offer prayers; and, as we said before, when he have concluded our prayer, bread is brought, and wine and water, and the president in like manner offers up prayers and thanksgivings with all his might; and the people assent with *Amen*; and there is the distribution and partaking by all the Eucharistic elements; *and to them that are not present they are sent by the hand of the deacons.*

It is clear from this that the concept was basically that of those not able to be present sharing as far as possible in the actual Sunday service with their fellowship worshippers by means of the elements consecrated and used at that service rather than by means of a separate celebration. The principle of extended communion remained in the church although by medieval times in the West this had to some extent become a rather more limited ministry to those who were dying as part of their preparation for death. Against this, the Reformers were fully justified in reassessing the practice. Although it is clearly desirable for a Christian person to receive communion when seriously ill, holy communion for those who are sick needs to be set in a much wider context than this. The first edition of the Prayer Book (1549), which was introduced into the Church of Ireland on Easter Day 1551 (the 1552 edition was never authorized in the C of I) provided for what we now call "Holy Communion by extension". It also provided, where necessary, for an actual celebration of the eucharist.

The relevant portions of the rubrics read:

But if the sick person be not able to come to the church, and yet is desirous to receive the communion in his house, then he must give knowledge overnight, or else early in the morning to the curate, signifying also how many he appointed to communicate with him. And if the same day there be a celebration of the Holy Communion in the church, then shall the priest reserve (at the open communion) so much of the sacrament of the body and blood, as shall serve the sick person, and so many as shall communicate with him (if there be any). And so soon as he conveniently may, after the open communion ended in the church, shall go and minister the same, first to those that are appointed to communicate with the sick (if there be any, and last of all to the sick person himself).

But if the day be not appointed for the open communion in the church, then (upon convenient warning given) the curate shall come and visit the sick person afore noone. And having a convenient place in the sick man's house (where he may reverently celebrate) with all things necessary for the same, and not being otherwise letted with the public service or any other just impediment; he shall there celebrate the holy communion after such form and sort as hereafter is appointed.

From 1552 on, the provision for communion by extension disappeared, but communion of the sick in the form of an actual celebration of the eucharist remained, and this is provided for explicitly in the 2004 edition of the Book of Common Prayer (p40ff). The advantage of such an arrangement is that the person who is prevented from being in church through age, sickness or infirmity is able to have a celebration of Communion which is complete in itself although somewhat abbreviated. The disadvantage is that the connection between the house celebration and the liturgy of the assembled congregation is not particularly obvious. It is hard to say in what sense the person concerned is sharing in the normal regular Sunday worship of the congregation to which he or she belongs. It would seem to follow from this that, as in the original Prayer Book of 1549 (1551 in the Church of Ireland) it may be helpful to have more than one mode of receiving communion.

A primary reason for authorizing Holy Communion by extension is that it enables the person concerned to participate, in a significant way, in the regular worship of the Church. Theologically, it does not seem to differ entirely from a person who is unable to come to the rail to receive communion having communion brought down to them by members of the clergy and/or their authorized lay assistants when the latter are present. There are also particular circumstances which make Holy Communion by extension particularly appropriate:

- If there are members of the congregation who are accustomed to being weekly communicants it may not be practicable for the celebrant to celebrate communion for them weekly because of pressures of time and other engagements. Not every regular communicant is entirely satisfied with private (house) communions at Christmas and Easter and perhaps on one or two other occasions in the year;
- If there are large numbers of people, for example at festivals, who need to receive communion it may not be easy for the rector of the parish to celebrate communion for each one of them within a reasonable time-frame. Nor is it necessarily appropriate for any such clergyperson to rush from place to place multiplying celebrations in order to fulfil such a quota within a limited period. There is an

historic instinct in the church which places moral and spiritual (if not necessarily canonical) limits on the number of celebrations any person should be required to preside at on any one day.

- In an institution such as a large hospital it may be possible for a celebration to take place for those who are fit enough to attend in the hospital chapel. But is it necessarily the best solution for those who are scattered here and there individually in the wards to have separate celebrations if it is possible to bring the sacrament for the central celebration in which they are thereby enabled to share?

Holy Communion by extension is something which can be implemented without prejudice to the existing faith and order of the Church which links eucharistic presidency to pastoral care and oversight and limits it to those who have specifically been called, trained, and commissioned through the laying on of hands with prayer (ordination) to the full ministry of the Word and Sacraments. At the same time it recognizes the priestly character of the whole church by giving those not called, equipped or commissioned to this specific ministry a subordinate but useful liturgical and pastoral role under the authority of the person to whom the cure of souls has actually been committed. In no way does it take away from the pastoral responsibility of the rector of a parish and his or her assistant clergy who may themselves be involved in the ministry of holy communion by extension, but by the use of authorized lay representatives it extends the scope of what they are able to accomplish through a proper and appropriate kind of delegation.

With regard to the broader issue of **reservation** there is a dated but helpful discussion in the Alcuin Club's Prayer Book Revision Pamphlets, X, entitled *Reservation – its Purpose and Method*, Mowbray, 1923 (reprinted, 1953).

[19] *Private Masses* A defence, from an Anglican viewpoint, of "Private Masses", and also of the reservation of the elements for devotional purposes including "Adoration" and "Benediction" may be found in E.L. Mascall, *Corpus Christi* 2nd ed., Longmans, 1965, Chapters 10, 11. His discussion of "private" masses arises from consideration of three possible answers to the question, "How can a priest best associate himself with, and take part in, this activity (the Church's participation in the one heavenly Mass) when there are more priests available at a particular place and time than are needed as celebrants to meet the needs of the laity?": (1) participation as members of the congregation; (2) concelebration by all priests present and (3) frequent and even daily, celebration of mass by each priest, individually. He regards the third option as legitimate but not obligatory. In the 2004 Prayer Book it is laid down in the General Directions for Public Worship, 14 (c) "Holy Communion shall not be celebrated unless there is at least one person present to communicate together with the priest", the evident intention being to preserve, at least minimally, the corporate aspect of the eucharist. However, circumstances may arise in which it is not practical for a priest to have access to a church let alone have at least one person to communicate with him or her and the question arises as to whether it is more important to keep the rubric, which does enshrine a valid general principle, or to be deprived of the celebration of communion?

CHAPTER TWO: CHURCH FORMULARIES

PART I - THE PREAMBLE AND DECLARATION PREFIXED TO THE CHURCH CONSTITUTION

One of the most basic documents determining the character of the Church of Ireland since Disestablishment over a century ago is the Preamble and Declaration adopted by the General Convention in the year 1870, printed at the back of successive editions of the Prayer Book and prefixed to the Church Constitution as an integral part of its most basic and irreformable structure.¹ Much of it is highly relevant to the topic of the doctrine of liturgy. The archbishops and bishops, clergy and laity, solemnly declared that:

1. The Church of Ireland doth, as heretofore, accept and unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as given by inspiration of God, and containing all things necessary to salvation; and doth continue to profess the faith of Christ as professed by the Primitive Church.

This establishes Scripture as a doctrinal norm in agreement with Article Six "Of the Sufficiency of the Holy Scriptures for Salvation", which says, "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the Faith or be thought requisite necessary to salvation. In the name of the holy Scripture we do understand those Canonical Books of the Old and New Testament, of whose authority was never any doubt in the Church." The liturgy as an embodiment of the Church's faith (on the principle *lex credendi, lex orandi*) must conform to this norm.² Nothing in the liturgy must suggest as a necessary article of the faith anything which cannot be established on the basis of scripture. Insofar as the liturgy contains non-scriptural insights (either those that are complementary to what is expressly contained in scripture, or those which develop the thought of scripture beyond what scripture actually expresses) these cannot be regarded, strictly speaking, as necessary either to the integrity of the liturgy or to the doctrinal tradition of the Church, although they may be legitimate and even in some cases highly desirable. It may, however, be noted, that the "faith of the primitive Church", clearly understood as being consonant with scripture, is to be maintained, and this would presumably include such faith as expressed in early liturgies. Although the phrase "primitive Church" could be taken as a synonym for the New Testament, it is much more likely, given historic Anglican usage, to refer to the Church of the first four General Councils (whose dogmas the Church of Ireland accepts); and this would give implied but not necessarily uncritical acceptance to a considerable amount of liturgical development during the early period.³

2. The Church of Ireland will continue to minister the doctrine, and sacraments, and the discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded; and will maintain inviolate the three orders of bishops, priests or presbyters, and deacons in the sacred ministry.

This establishes certain limits within which any development of the Church's sacramental life and its liturgical ministry must take place. There can be no departure from the form of the sacraments as instituted in Scripture, and these are to be administered by means of that three-fold order or structure of ministry which has come down to us from early times (the preface to the Ordinal claims that the three-fold ministry goes back to the Apostles, but admits it takes "diligence" to discover this. The claim is in fact questionable and can only be sustained by a selective use of scriptural evidence).

3. The Church of Ireland, as a Reformed and Protestant Church, doth hereby reaffirm its constant witness against all those innovations in doctrine and worship, whereby the Primitive Faith hath been from time to time defaced or overlaid, and which at the Reformation this Church did disown and reject.

It is to be noted that not all developments in doctrine or worship are here ruled out, but only those "whereby the Primitive Faith hath been from time to time defaced or overlaid." In this preamble the Church of Ireland describes itself as "Ancient, Catholic, and Apostolic" as well as "Reformed" and "Protestant".⁵ This would suggest that it is a Church in which there is room for what is ancient and traditional (and whatever is in accordance with and a legitimate development from the ancient and traditional) as well as one in which what is taught and practiced is subject to criticism on the basis of the norm of Scripture. Something is not wrong because it is new. On the other hand what is introduced must be judged in the light of the Bible and must accord with that which has been believed "always, everywhere, and by all" (Vincentius of Lerins). This applies to both doctrine and liturgy⁶

A second division. of the Declaration deals with the status of the Thirty-nine Articles, the Prayer Book and the Ordinal. It is stated,

The Church of Ireland doth receive and approve The Book of the Articles of Religion, commonly called the Thirty-nine Articles, received and approved by the archbishops and bishops and the rest of the clergy of Ireland in the synod holden in Dublin A.D. 1634; also The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to the use of the Church of Ireland; and the Form and Manner of Making, Ordaining, and Consecrating of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, as approved and adopted by the synod holders in Dublin, A.D. 1662, and hitherto in use in this Church. And this Church will continue to use the same, subject to such alterations only as may be made therein from time to time by the lawful authority of the Church.

It would appear therefore that any doctrine which finds expression in a Church of Ireland liturgy must be consonant with the teaching of the Thirty-nine Articles; and any statement, ecumenical or other, about the theology of liturgy, in order to be accepted by the Church of Ireland must be compatible not only with the Articles, but also with the Book of Common Prayer. The Book of Common Prayer itself, however, is subject to modification from time to time by the lawful authority of the Church.

At the time when this resolution was passed, it was the 1662 Prayer Book which was to be taken as the norm. There have been three revisions of the Prayer Book since then. That completed in 1878 was highly conservative and confined to such issues as the form of the absolution of the sick and the removal of the rubric relating to the use of the Athanasian Creed. That which came into effect in 1926 was mainly verbal and included a revised version of the traditional psalter. It was augmented by two alternative evening services in 1933 (one of which was the form of Compline) and by various additions and modifications including the provision of a Collect, Epistle and Gospel for the observance of St Columba's Day in 1963 and modifications to do with the admission of women as deacons and then as priests and bishops, the latter in 1990. That which came into effect in 2004¹¹ was a major revision of the whole Prayer Book which incorporated alongside traditional forms of service from the earlier books and also definitive versions of the modern rites which in various forms had been in use since the 1960s and 70s, leading to

the *Alternative Prayer Book* of 1984 and *Alternative Occasion Services* in 1993. Theologically speaking, the doctrinal content of the modern rites has equal status with that of the traditional orders of service and the two may be regarded as mutually interpretative. The normative character sometimes assumed for the Book of Common Prayer services as compared with the services of the alternative books has therefore been superceded by the production of a single book containing all the principal services of the Church of Ireland. A full set of commentaries, the work of the present writer, covering all the authorized orders of service of the Church is available online in the Resources section of the official Church of Ireland website. It may be accessed via www.ireland.anglican.org/prayer-worship/book-of-common-prayer/bcp-commentary and may be downloaded as a pdf or to be read in the issuu viewer in whole or in part. Its title is *The Book of Common Prayer (2004) Commentaries*, Michael Kennedy, Church of Ireland Publishing and it is sponsored by the Liturgical Advisory Committee of the General Synod of the Church of Ireland. There are only two copies in full book form, one of which is in the RB Library in Rathgar.

NOTES ON CHAPTER TWO, PART ONE

¹The "Preamble and Declaration" adopted by the General Convention in the Year 1870 may be found on pp3 of the *Constitution of the Church of Ireland* Dublin, 2003, edited by Brenda M.H. Sheil, immediately before Chapter One of the Constitution. It is also to be found on pp776-7 of the 2004 edition of the Church of Ireland's *Book of Common Prayer*. It is reproduced in Appendix A below. A brief exposition of this Preamble and Declaration is to be found in H.R McAdoo, *The Identity of the Church of Ireland*, Christ Church Cathedral, 1980. Dr. McAdoo was Archbishop of Dublin from 1977 - 1985, and was Co-Chairman of the first Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission. An exposition of the character of the Church of Ireland as "Ancient, Catholic, and Apostolic" and "Reformed and Protestant" (terms used in the Preamble and Declaration) may be found in the writer's unpublished doctoral thesis, *The Theological Implications of Recent Liturgical Revision in the Church of Ireland*,² 1987 pp 11-17 and 43-53. Copies of this thesis were deposited with the Representative Church Body Library in Dublin and with the Library of the Open University. The fundamental character of the Preamble and Declaration is underlined in Gilbert Wilson, *A Critique of 'Authority in the Church'*, Belfast 1977, pp57,58.

²*Lex credendi lex orandi* (together with its complement *lex orandi lex credendi*). The complex relationship between belief and worship is discussed by Geoffrey Wainwright in his magisterial *Doxology - A Systematic Theology*, Epworth, 1980, in Chapters VII and VIII. Also helpful is J. Martos, *Doors to the Sacred - A Historical Introduction to Sacraments in the Christian Church*, SCM, 1981. Martos' thesis, which he supports with a wealth of information and argument, is that (p.6.) "The sacramental experiences of Christians in one period of history generated a sacramental theology which in turn influenced the sacramental experiences of Christians in a later period, when the process repeated itself." For a brief summary of the book see the writer's review in the *Church of Ireland Journal Search*, published by the Religious Education Resource Centre, Mount Argus Road, Harold's Cross, Dublin, Vol 5, Number Two, Winter 1982 pp42-44.

³*On scripture as a sufficient rule of faith*. For traditional Anglican views on this see P.E. More and F.L. Cross (Eds), *Anglicanism*,² S.P.C.K. 1957, pp89-96 (quoting Richard Hooker, Peter Gunning, Jeremy Taylor, and William Beveridge). On the relationship of scripture and reason, *ibid.* pp97-118 (quoting William Laud, William Chillingworth, Robert Boyle, Daniel Whitby, and William Sherlock). On the Anglican view of antiquity and tradition, *ibid.* pp132-141, (quoting Francis White, James Ussher, Herbert Thorndike, William Payne, and Simon Patrick). All these authorities are from the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, and the views advanced are similar to those contained in the Church of Ireland's (later) "Preamble and Declaration" (see above). For example, William Payne (No. 70) said, "Let the Scripture, therefore, as sensed by the Primitive Church, and not by the private judgement of any particular man be allowed and agreed by us to be the Rule of our Faith; and let that be accounted the true Church, whose Faith and Doctrine is most conformable and agreeable with the Primitive." For a modern exposition of the same viewpoint, see H.R McAdoo, *Being an Anglican*, APCK/SPCK 1977, esp. pp5-19. See also W.G. Wilson, *Church Teaching, a Church of Ireland Handbook*, revised and enlarged edition, 1970, esp. Chapter Eight. The same author in his *The Faith of an Anglican - A Companion to the Revised Catechism*, Collins, 1980, p.301, under the heading "Twofold appeal to Scripture and Antiquity" points out that when the Declaration was drawn up in 1870 stating, "The Church of Ireland ... doth continue to profess the faith

of Christ as professed by the Primitive Church", this was retained by the General Convention against proposed amendments (which would have excluded or restricted this broad appeal to antiquity) to omit these words, or to substitute for them, "...the Faith of Christ as held by the Church when founded by the Apostles." E.J. Bicknell in his classic book *A Theological Introduction to the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion*,. *Third Edition* revised by H.J. Carpenter, Longmans, Green and Co. 1955, p.132, in the section on the interpretation of Scripture, quotes the well-known dictum, "The Church to teach and the Bible to prove".

⁴This may be taken to include both the development of liturgical forms expressive of the theology of liturgy and the sacramental teaching which became progressively more advanced during the early centuries. For early views of the sacraments see J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, Second Edition, Adam and Charles Black, 1960, pp193-199. For the later doctrine of the sacraments in the patristic period *op. cit.* pp422-455.

⁵It is significant that Irish Churchmen in the early seventeenth century were just as insistent as their English counterparts on the continuity of the post-Reformation Church with that which had existed prior to the Reformation. They had no doubt that they continued to belong to the Church of history - the ancient, Catholic, and Apostolic Church of this land. For example, James Ussher, in a sermon preached on June 20th 1624, on "The Catholicity of the Church" said, "Our Church was ever where now it is. In all places of the world where the ancient foundations were retained and those common principles of faith upon the profession whereof men have ever been wont to be admitted by baptism into the Church of Christ: there we doubt not but that Our Lord had His subjects and we our fellow-servants. That which in the time of the ancient Fathers was accounted to be truly and properly Catholic - namely, that which was believed, *everywhere, always, and by all*, that in the succeeding ages hath been preserved and is at this day entirely professed by our Church." (Quoted in R Wyse Jackson, Ed., *The Celtic Cross*, undated, p.21). Similarly, Archbishop John Bramhall (1594-1663) said, "I make not the least doubt in the world that the Church ...before and after the Reformation, are as much the same Church as a garden before it be weeded and after it is weeded is the same garden; or a vine, before it be pruned, and after it is pruned and freed from luxurious branches, is one and the same vine." (ibid.). The basic temper of these Irish "Caroline" (i. e. non-Puritan) divines is described in F.R Bolton, *The Caroline Tradition in the Church of Ireland*, SPCK, 1958.

⁶That the Vincentian Canon need not be interpreted in a very restrictive way in the Church of Ireland is shown by acceptance of developments in the faith and order (and liturgical life) of the Church which are unprecedented, but at the same time are not regarded as destructive of tradition. The legislation permitting the admission of women as priests and bishops from 1990 onwards is an example of what has been taken to be a legitimate development.

⁷The proviso in the Declaration. relating to adherence to the Prayer Book, "subject to such alterations only as may be made therein from time to time by the lawful authority of the Church" is highly significant. At the time the Declaration was drawn up an amendment was brought forward, which would (inter alia) have substituted for the sentence containing the above words, "That form of Liturgy or Divine Service shall be used in the Church of Ireland, which is comprised in the Book entitled 'The Book of Common Prayer, and administration of the Sacraments, and other rites and ceremonies of the

Church,' as at present received by the same". This amendment, which would have tied the Church of Ireland strictly to the 1662 Prayer Book, and exclusively to the doctrine contained or implied in it, was negatived.

⁸See the writer's doctoral thesis, *op. cit*, Chapter Two, ORIGINS, (1) Irish Prayer Books of 1878 and 1926, pp93-98.

⁹The liturgical forms contained in the "Alternative Prayer Book" of 1984 and related rites were also legitimate (but different) authoritative expressions of the faith and order of the Church of Ireland. For a full examination of the theological implications of modern liturgical revision in the Church of Ireland up to 1987, see the writer's doctoral thesis, *op. cit*, *passim*. The *Alternative Prayer Book* (1984) and its companion *Alternative Occasional Services* (1993) was superseded by the *Book of Common Prayer* (2004) containing a full set of traditional and modern services and serves as a very full liturgical and sacramental expression of the faith and order of the Church.

¹⁰By the inclusion of two alternative forms for Evening Prayer and by provision for St. Columba's Day, as also by modifications to the Ordinal made necessary by the admission of women to the diaconate, presbyterate, and episcopate.

¹¹See Reports of the Liturgical Advisory Committee in successive editions of the *Journal of the General Synod* from 1997 - 2004 and the resultant: *The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church according to the use of the Church of Ireland together with the Psalter or Psalms of David pointed as they are to be sung or said in churches and the Form and Manner of Making, Ordaining and Consecrating of Bishops Priests and Deacons*, Dublin, The Columba Press, By Authority of the General Synod of the Church of Ireland, 2004.

CHAPTER TWO: CHURCH FORMULARIES. PART TWO - THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES

According to the Preamble and Declaration prefixed to the Church Constitution, the Thirty-nine Articles constitute one of the doctrinal foundations of the Church of Ireland.¹ Every clergyman makes a specific "assent" to these, both at his ordination and at his institution to a cure. He says,²

(1) I approve, and agree to, the Declaration prefixed to the Statutes of the Church of Ireland, passed at the General Convention, in the year of Our Lord One Thousand Eight Hundred and Seventy.

(2) I assent to the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, and to the Book of Common Prayer, and of the Ordering of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. I believe the doctrine of the Church of Ireland as therein set forth, to be agreeable to the Word of God; and in Public Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments I will use the form in the said Book prescribed, and none other, except so far as shall be allowed by the lawful authority of the Church.

However, for the purposes of ecumenical discussion it is important to remember, (1) that not all the Articles are of equal importance, (2) that they have to be set in their historical context, (3) that taken collectively they are not of the same weight as certain declarations of faith held in common by all the historic churches, for example the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, and (4) that the assent given to the Articles by individual clergy is general in character, and does not necessarily signify detailed agreement with everything in them. Taking these points in turn:

(1) Particular Articles will no doubt be given varying amounts of theological emphasis by the differing schools of thought within Anglicanism. But in any Anglican "hierarchy of truths"³ it would seem that 1. "Of Faith in the Holy Trinity", 2. "Of the Word or Son of God, which was made very man", 4. "Of the Resurrection of Christ", and 5. "Of the Holy Ghost", would be regarded as expressing absolutely fundamental truths which are part of the essential deposit of faith. But 3. "Of the going down of Christ into Hell", for example, would not be regarded as having anything like the same degree of importance. Article 6. "Of the Sufficiency of the holy Scriptures for Salvation", would be taken as expressing convictions that must remain a theological cornerstone for any reformed Church. Other Articles, such as 24. "Of Speaking in the congregation in such a tongue as the people understandeth", and 30. "Of both kinds" refer to matters on which Anglicans would be strongly united, but do not deal with matters necessary to salvation. Article 35 "Of Homilies", scarcely does more than commend a set of four hundred year old sermons, and has little relevance to today's Church, although there are two of liturgical interest in the Second Book, namely "Of Common Prayer and Sacraments" and "Of the worthy receiving of the Sacrament", the latter containing a characteristic Cranmerian, "Herein thou needest no other man's help, no other sacrifice or oblation, no sacrificing priest, no mass, no means established by man's invention." At least one article is for the most part no longer applicable so far as the Church of Ireland is concerned. Article 37 "Of the Civil Magistrates", expounds the position of the monarch as supreme Governor of the Church (although without actually using that expression). This is no longer relevant in the Church of Ireland, and it has not been since the taking effect of the Act of Disestablishment on 1st January 1871. So if Church unity is to be based on agreement in fundamentals, it must not be assumed that the Thirty-nine Articles would necessarily prove a stumbling-block. Only

where they speak of the true fundamentals would they be of significance in relation to the achievement of unity. Highly important in this regard is the Bonn Agreement of 1932 between the Church of England and certain Old Catholic Churches, which established inter-communion without either the absorption of one Communion by the other or the achievement of total conformity in matters of theological opinion or liturgical practice.⁴ This agreement was ratified by the Church of Ireland.⁵

(2) The status of the Articles within Anglicanism was discussed at the Lambeth Conference of 1968. In an addendum to the report on the section "Renewal in Faith", in a passage headed, "The Thirty-nine Articles and the Anglican Tradition," it was said,⁶

In the matter of the Thirty-nine Articles we accept the main conclusion reached by the Commission set up by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, whose report entitled *Subscription and Assent to the Thirty-nine Articles* (1968) advocates neither casting the Articles aside nor revising them, but rather prefers to acknowledge their place in the historical context of a continuous, developing Anglican tradition. We commend the further study of this report, which recognizes that the inheritance of faith which characterizes the Anglican Communion is an authority of a *multiple* kind and that, to the *different* elements which occur in the different strands of this inheritance, *different* Anglicans attribute *different* levels of authority. From this foundation arises Anglican tolerance, comprehensiveness, and ordered liberty, though admittedly it makes Anglican theology variegated rather than monolithic, and informal rather than systematically deductive.

This inheritance of faith is uniquely set forth in the holy Scriptures and proclaimed in the Catholic Creeds set in their context of baptismal profession,, patristic reasoning, and conciliar decision. These the Anglican Communion shares with other Churches throughout the world. In the sixteenth century the Church of England was led to bear a witness of its own to Christian truth, particularly in its historic formularies - the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, the Book of Common Prayer, and the Ordinal, as well as in its Homilies. Together, these constitute a second strand in the Anglican tradition, In succeeding years the Anglican Communion has continued and broadened this responsible witness to Christian truth through its preaching and worship, the writings of its scholars and teachers, the lives of its saints and confessors, and the utterances of its councils. In this third strand, as in the Preface to the Prayer Book of 1549, can be discerned the authority given within the Anglican tradition to reason, not least as exercised in historical and philosophical enquiry, as well as an acknowledgement of the claims of pastoral care. To such a three-fold inheritance of faith belongs a concept of authority which refuses to insulate itself against the testing of history and the free action of reason. It seeks to be a credible authority and therefore is concerned to secure satisfactory historical support and to have its credentials in a shape which corresponds to the requirements of reason.

Here is the full range of the Anglican inheritance and it is in this inheritance that the Articles must be set if they are to be given their true status and significance. So, wherever the Articles are printed they should never stand alone but always be set within their proper context.

Secondly, when the Articles are mentioned or implied in any affirmation of faith required as a preliminary to ordination, or on other occasions, they should always

be set in their historical context, and assent and subscription should be regarded as an expression of a determination to be loyal to our multiple inheritance of faith. Through this inheritance there emerges an authority to which a man, in giving assent, professes his Christian allegiance with reasonableness and a good conscience.

Resolution 43 of the 1968 Lambeth Conference (passed by a majority of the delegates, but with thirty-seven dissentients) endorsed the views of its sub-committee. Under the heading "The Thirty-nine Articles" it was stated,⁷

43. The Conference accepts the main conclusions of the report of the Archbishops' Commission on Christian Doctrine entitled 'Subscription and Assent to the Thirty-nine Articles' (1968), and, in furtherance of its recommendation

(a) suggests that each Church of our communion consider whether the Articles need to be bound up with its Prayer Book;

(b) suggests to the Churches of the Anglican Communion that assent to the Thirty-nine Articles be no longer required of ordinands.

(c) suggests that, when subscription is required to the Articles or other elements in the Anglican tradition, it should be required, and given, only in the context of a statement which gives the full range of our inheritance of faith and sets the Articles in their historical context.

Resolutions of the Lambeth Conference are not binding upon member Churches of the Anglican Communion, but are of value as expressing the views of a representative gathering of those whose specific interest and responsibility is the faith and order of the Church, and as a guide to local decision-makers.

So far as the Church of Ireland is concerned, the question of omitting the Thirty-nine Articles from the Book of Common Prayer has not arisen. The Articles were not included in the Alternative Prayer Book because of its supplementary status, the Book of Common Prayer still having full force. However, in line with previous practice the Articles have been included in the Prayer Book of 2004 which has replaced that of 1926. Awareness has been shown of the difficulties arising from the language of some of the Articles⁸, and this has been reinforced by Declaration of the General Synod which in a slightly amended form has been approved by legislation by resolution and bill and, as agreed by Synod, is to be included in future printings of the Book of Common Prayer.⁸ This declaration may be regarded as of very great theological significance through the manner in which the Articles are set in their theological and historical context.⁹ No consideration has been given to the possibility of no longer requiring ordinands to assent to the Articles.

However, in relation to the third part of the Lambeth 1968 resolution it will be seen that the Preamble and Declaration prefixed to the Church Constitution of the Church of Ireland anticipated this approach by setting approval of the Thirty-nine Articles within the context of the life of a Church which is "Ancient, Catholic, and Apostolic", as well as "Reformed and Protestant", which accepts the Scriptures as the primary authority and adheres to the faith of Christ as professed by the Primitive Church. It may also be noticed that in expressing its acceptance of this, the Church explicitly allowed for some development in its formularies by stating in relation to its Prayer-Book, that "this Church will continue to use the same, *subject to such alterations as may be made therein from time to time by the lawful authority of the Church.*"¹⁰

So far as the individual clergyman is concerned, the form of the assent given at the beginning of this section links the Articles with the Church's liturgical heritage, understood as theologically significant, specifically with the Book of Common Prayer and the Ordinal. And prior to this, approval and agreement with the 1870 Declaration is affirmed, setting the assent to the Articles and Prayer Book within the context of a comprehensive view of the faith and order of the Church of Ireland.

(3) Collectively the Articles are not of the same weight as certain declarations of faith held in common by all historic churches. As a sufficient basis for Christian unity successive Lambeth Conferences have endorsed the "Lambeth Quadrilateral", consisting of the following elements of faith and order:- the Scriptures, the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, the Gospel Sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion, and the historic three-fold ministry of bishops, priests, and deacons, the latter commended as the only possible basis for a ministry to be universally recognised.¹¹ These are the essentials, and by way of contrast, to take one example, the sacramental teaching of the Articles, while important as showing what the sacraments mean within the context of Anglicanism, represents not so much the universal faith of Christians as an historical and almost ad hoc reaction of the Church of England and dependent churches to the sacramental controversies of the period of the Reformation. These are not necessarily the best, still less the only way of expressing the significance of these dominical rites. A positive approach to the interpretation of certain of the Articles, will, however, be found below.

(4) "Assent" to the Thirty-nine Articles has from time to time troubled clerical consciences, since not every clergyman feels able to accept every word of the Articles. However, it is generally accepted nowadays that this assent is of a general nature only."¹² This was not always the case. The prescribed form of subscription used from the seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries (from the canons of 1604) was, "I ... do willingly and from my heart subscribe to the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion of the United Church of England and Ireland, and to the three Articles of the thirtieth canon" (referring respectively to the Royal Supremacy, the Scriptural character of the Book of Common Prayer which the promiser agrees to use and no other, and to the Thirty-nine Articles themselves, which were to be believed as "agreeable to the Word of God, and to all things therein contained"). In 1865 a simpler declaration was drawn up, and this continued to be used by the Church of Ireland after disestablishment in 1871. Bicknell, in his "Theological Introduction to the Thirty-nine Articles" commented that "the change of language in the form of subscription was deliberate. We are asked to *affirm* today, not that the Articles are all agreeable to the Word of God, but that the doctrine of the Church of England as set forth in the Articles is agreeable of the Word of God. That is, we are not called to assent to every phrase or detail of the Articles but only to their general sense."¹³ Some, however, have argued that in fact the alteration of 1865 was intended as a simplification only and not as a change in the terms of subscription.¹⁴ Whatever the case, nothing more than general agreement would appear to be expected of clergy today in those parts of the Anglican Communion where ordinands (and incumbents of parishes at their institution) still continue to subscribe to the Articles. It may be noticed that in some parts of the Anglican Communion, for example the Episcopal Church of Scotland and the Episcopal Church in the United States of America, subscription to the Articles is not required of clergy. The Church of England has considerably modified its terms of subscription, although the Articles are still mentioned.¹⁵ The Church has not normally required subscription from the laity.¹⁶

In the light of the considerations set forth above it would appear, therefore, to be in order for Anglicans, including members of the Church of Ireland, in an ecumenical setting, to treat any discussion of the role of the Thirty-nine Articles as statements of the Anglican faith in such a way as to set these in their historical context, to appraise them within an Anglican "hierarchy of truths", to acknowledge their relative insignificance compared to the Creeds of Catholic Christendom, and to discuss them without any implication that every word of them is to be taken as necessarily the view of every Anglican or of any particular Anglican Church or indeed of the whole Anglican Communion.¹⁷

NOTES ON CHAPTER TWO, PART TWO

¹Brenda Sheil, ed., Statute of the General Synod, Chapter XV of 2003, *The Constitution of the Church of Ireland* as set out in the first schedule to the said statute and an Appendix, published by the General Synod of the Church of Ireland, Dublin, 2003, p.3.

²For the full form of the Declaration for Subscription, made for ordination, for licence to a curacy, and for institution as incumbent of a parish (or admittance to the office of vicar within the benefice) see the 2003 Church Constitution 4.14.

³A concept of a "hierarchy of truths" appears to be implied in E.A. de Mendieta's discussion of the role of dogma within Anglicanism in his *Anglican Vision.*, SPCK, 1971. He draws a fundamental distinction between *faith* and *theology*, and especially between faith and theological opinion, theory or system. Another distinction that has to be made is between the objective faith and its formularies. Even the solemn declarations of Ecumenical Councils are "partial, incomplete, and historically-conditioned". But some things are essential. The body of truths of which the Christian faith is made up is contained in the Bible, and, to a secondary degree, in the creeds of the Church, the dogmatic definitions of recognized General Councils, and in the whole witness, teaching, tradition, and experience of the Catholic Church throughout the ages. He draws attention to six fundamental truths or articles of faith that are not explicitly mentioned in the historic Creeds or in the Chalcedonian definition. There is the Pauline dogma of justification by grace through faith alone, complemented by the paramount importance of the sacraments. There is the primary and final authority of the Bible, complemented by the secondary but very important authority of the doctrinal Tradition of the Church. There is the spiritual nature of the Church of Christ, complemented by the historical and institutional nature of the Church, including the ordained ministry and the historic episcopate. Coming as he did from a background of patristic studies and Belgian Catholicism he was not favourably disposed towards the Articles, and had this to say,

Even a document such as the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, which for its time was comprehensive and relatively moderate, shows, in Articles eight to thirty-nine, an inextricable mingling and apparent confusion of the Catholic faith and of diluted Calvinistic theology.

This was in the context of a discussion of the failure of theologians "to distinguish clearly between those matters which formed part of the deposit of the divine faith, and those which were merely part of a system of theology devised by men who were too often fallible. But it is not easy to draw a sharp line between those beliefs which make up the substance or reality of faith, and all those human reasonings, deductions, syllogisms, and rationalizations which comprise theology." (op. cit. Chapters 5,6, esp. pp67,68, 84).

⁴For the *Bonn Agreement* see G.K.A. Bell (ed.), "Documents on Christian Unity", Third Series, 1930-48, OUP, 1948, p.62:

1. Each Communion recognizes the catholicity and independence of the other and maintains its own.
2. Each Communion agrees to admit members of the other Communion to participate in the Sacraments.
3. Intercommunion does not require from either Communion the liturgical practice characteristic of the other, but implies that each believes the other to hold all the

essentials of the Christian faith.

This agreement was made in 1931.

⁵In 1950 the Church of Irelands General Synod passed a resolution, which read,

That as unanimously recommended by the Church Unity Committee the necessary steps be taken to establish relations of intercommunion between the Church of Ireland and the Old Catholic Churches.

See JGS, 1950, pcviii. The Church Unity Committee in its Report cited the texts of the Bonn Agreement, and the Declaration of Utrecht (1889). JGS, 1950, pp308-311.

⁶*The Lambeth Conference 1968, Resolutions and Reports* SPCK and Seabury Press 1968, Addendum to the Report on "Renewal in Faith" pp82,83.

⁷*Ibid.*, pp40,41.

⁸A resolution was passed by the General Synod of 1975, as follows,

That this House recognising that certain statements in the 39 Articles are regarded as uncharitable, requests the House of Bishops to ask the Anglican Consultative Council to examine such statements with a view to the removal of understanding and the avoidance of language which might be deemed offensive to our fellow Christians of other denominations and to report to the member churches of the Anglican Communion not later than 31st December 1978.

This resolution was considered at the 1976 meeting of the Anglican Consultative Council, and its report says,

(iii) The Thirty Nine Articles.

The Council received a memorandum from the Bishop of Ossory on behalf of the House of Bishops of the Church of Ireland in fulfilment of a resolution of their General Synod of 1975 on the wording of certain of the Thirty Nine Articles which were regarded as giving offence to non-Anglican Christians. The memorandum suggested two possible ways:

- (a) a re-writing of the Articles concerned, and
- (b) to leave the Articles as they stand, but to add to them a short preface or preamble."

Resolution 2 The Thirty Nine Articles

(a) The Council is opposed to the re-writing of the Articles either in whole or in part. It sees no reason why any member church should not by resolution of its appropriate authorities issue an explanatory statement of the nature of the Articles and of their status to-day.

(b) The Council asks member churches to report to the Secretary General in time for the next Lambeth Conference or ACC-4:

- (1) on the present status of the Thirty Nine Articles in their church;
- (2) on the current practice regarding subscription or assent by the clergy and other officers of the church;

(3) whether they still print the Articles with the official liturgy of the church (see Resolution 43 of Lambeth 1968).

See *ACC-3 Trinidad, Anglican Consultative Council, Report of Third Meeting, Trinidad 1976*

There is no mention of the Thirty Nine Articles in the Lambeth Conference Report of 1978, nor in the Report of the Fourth Meeting of the Anglican Consultative Council in London, Ontario, in 1979, nor in the Report of the Fifth Meeting in Newcastle on Tyne, in 1981. The Index to the Report of the Sixth Meeting in Badagry, Nigeria in 1984 mentions the Thirty Nine Articles as a topic to be found on page 80, but the Articles are not to be found as an item on the agenda on page 80 or elsewhere in the Report. There is no mention of the Articles in the ACC-7 Report (Singapore 1987) or subsequent ACC meetings nor in the Lambeth Conference Reports of 1988 or 1998.

⁹At the General Synod of 1999 the following resolution was passed (JGS 1999, p.199),

Resolution Two

The General Synod of the Church of Ireland adopts the following declaration with regard to its understanding of the historical formularies of the Church of Ireland:

Declaration:

The Church of Ireland is part of the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Church, worshipping the one true God, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. It professes the faith uniquely revealed in the Holy Scriptures and set forth in the catholic creeds: which faith the Church is called upon to proclaim afresh in each generation. Led by the Holy Spirit, it has borne witness to Christian truth in its historic formularies, the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, the Book of Common Prayer the Ordering of Bishops, Priests and Deacons and the Declaration prefixed to the Statutes of the Church of Ireland (1870).

These historic formularies are a definition of the faith as proclaimed by the Church of Ireland, and thus form an important part of the inheritance through which this Church has been formed in its faith and witness to this day. The formularies that have been passed on are part of a living tradition that today must face new challenges and grasp fresh opportunities.

Historic documents often stem from periods of deep separation between Christian Churches. Whilst, in spite of a real degree of convergence, distinct differences remain, negative statements towards other Christians should not be seen as representing the spirit of this Church today.

The Church of Ireland affirms all in its tradition that witnesses to the truth of the Gospel. It regrets that words written in another age and in a different context should be used in a manner hurtful to or antagonistic towards other Christians.

The Church of Ireland seeks the visible unity of the Church. In working towards that goal this Church is committed to reaching out towards other Churches in a spirit of humility and love, that together all Christians may grow towards unity in life and mission to the glory of God.

Arising from the work of the "Hard Gospel" committee set up to examine and to combat sectarianism in the Church, this Declaration was brought to the General Synod in 2008,

and with one amendment was passed as a statute to be included in *The Book of Common Prayer* immediately preceding the *Articles of Religion* in all future printings of the Prayer Book. The amendment was to alter the third paragraph to read,

Historic documents often stem from periods of deep separation between Christian Churches. Whilst, in spite of a real degree of convergence, distinct difference remain, the tone and tenor of the language of the negative statements towards other Christians should not be seen as representing the spirit of this Church today.

The wording of the document derives its first paragraph from the Preface to the Declaration of Assent currently in use in the Church of England but without the concluding C of E sentence:

PREFACE

The Church of England is part of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church worshipping the one true God, Father, Son and Holy Spirit. It professes the faith uniquely revealed in the Holy Scriptures and set forth in the catholic creeds, which faith the Church is called upon to proclaim afresh in each generation. Led by the Holy Spirit, it has borne witness to Christian truth in its historic formularies, the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, the Book of Common Prayer and the Ordering of Bishops, Priests and Deacons. In the declaration you are about to make will you affirm your loyalty to this inheritance of faith as your inspiration and guidance under God in bringing the grace and truth of Christ to this generation and making Him known to those in your care?

DECLARATION OF ASSENT

I, A B, do so affirm, and accordingly declare my belief in the faith which is revealed in the Holy Scripture and set forth in the catholic creeds and to which the historic formularies of the Church of England bear witness; and in public prayer and administration of the sacraments, I will use only the forms of service which are authorised or allowed by Canon.

The Canons of the Church of England - Canons Ecclesiastical promulgated by the Convocations of Canterbury and York in 1964 and 1969 and by the General Synod of the Church of England from 1970, Fourth Edition 1986, with First Supplement 1987.

The writer's own view of the position and role of the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion is further explained in a unpublished lecture "The Thirty-nine Articles in the Anglican Tradition", given at a seminar for Queen's University Campus in Armagh on 11th December 2000.

It will be noticed that the effect of the Church of Ireland Declaration given above in both its original and amended form is not only to distance the church from uncharitable language but also to place the Articles themselves in their historical and theological context and this in a sense has an effect upon what is meant by the "assent" given to them. For historical information about the development of "assent" to the articles see below, [12].

[10] See above, *Notes on Chapter Two, Part One*, [7], p.

[11] *The Lambeth Quadrilateral* For the history of the Lambeth Quadrilateral, see S.

Neill, *Anglicanism*, Penguin, 1958, pp368,433. It was incorporated into the famous letter "To all Christian People" from the Lambeth Conference of 1920, the full text of which is available in G.K.A. Bell, *Documents on Christian Unity, 1920-1924*. In a slightly abbreviated form it also appears in H. Bettenson, *Documents of the Christian Church*, OUP, 1943, pp441-444. Sections VI, VII state:

We believe that the visible unity of the Church will be found to involve the whole-hearted acceptance of The Holy Scriptures as the record of God's revelation of himself to man, and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith; and the Creed commonly called Nicene, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith, and either it or the Apostles' Creed as the Baptismal confession of belief.

The divinely instituted sacraments of Baptism, and the Holy Communion as expressing for all the corporate life of the whole fellowship, in and with Christ.

A ministry acknowledged by every part of the Church as possessing not only the inward call of the Spirit but also the commission of Christ and the authority of the whole body.

May we not reasonably claim that the Episcopate is the one means of providing such a ministry? It is not that we call in question for a moment the spiritual reality of the ministries of those Communion who do not possess the Episcopate. On the contrary, we thankfully acknowledge that these ministries have been manifestly blessed and owned by the Holy Spirit as effective means of grace. But we submit that considerations alike of history and of present experience justify the claim which we make on behalf of the Episcopate. Moreover, we would urge that it is now and will prove to be in the future the best instrument for maintaining the unity and the continuity of the Church.

[12] "Assent". A history of subscription to the Articles is contained in E.J. Bicknell, *The Thirty-nine Articles*, third edition, revised by H.J. Carpenter, Longmans, Green & Co., 1955, pp20,21. The meaning of subscription has been a matter of argument and controversy from time to time, the most controversial interpretation ever being that of John Henry Newman in "Tract XC", 1841. His aim he described as being "merely to show that while our prayer-book is acknowledged on all hands to be of Catholic origin, our Articles also, the offspring of an un-Catholic age, are, through God's good providence, to say the least, not un-Catholic, and may be subscribed by those who aim at being Catholic in heart and doctrine." See H. Bettenson, *Documents of the Christian Church*, OUP, 1943, pp435-440. See Ian Ker, *John Henry Newman, a biography*, OUP, 1990, Chapter Five, "Crisis". Also, *Correspondence of John Henry Newman with John Keble and others*, 1841-1845, Ed. at the Birmingham Oratory, Longmans, Green and Co. 1917, Chapter III. It may be noticed that the *Prefatory Declaration of Charles I*, printed before the Articles in the 1662 Prayer Book insisted that "no man hereafter shall either print, or preach, to draw the Article aside any way, but shall submit to it in the plain and full meaning thereof. and shall not put his own sense or comment to be the meaning of the Article, but shall take it in the literal and grammatical sense." For the full text of this Declaration see G.R Evans and J.R Wright Eds, *The Anglican Tradition - A Handbook of Sources*, SPCK/Fortress, 1991, No. 240, pp258-260. Newman used this to disclaim any interest in the intentions of the framers of the Articles. .

[12] An example of how the Declaration of Assent was understood early in the twentieth century is to be found in an address to ordinands in the Diocese of Southwark by Bishop

(later Archbishop) C.F. Garbett,

By the Declaration of Assent, you ...declare your conviction that the doctrine of the Church of England as set forth in the XXXIX Articles, in the Book of Common Prayer and in the Ordinal, is agreeable to the Word of God. So far as the XXXIX Articles are concerned, I have never concealed my own wish that some other standard of doctrinal orthodoxy might be accepted, for they are in many cases ambiguous and in some cases inconsistent with modern knowledge: I doubt if anyone can accept from his heart every sentence in these Articles. They must be regarded as a general statement of the position of the Church of England against Rome and Nonconformity, and against any non-supernatural theism. The Assent could not honestly be made by anyone who denied the supernatural, or who believed that either the Church of Rome or the Nonconformists were right in the controversies which divide us on authority, doctrine, and the ministry. Wholeheartedly you accept the position of the Church of England against Rome and Nonconformity.

Charles Smyth, *Cyril Forster Garbett, Archbishop of York*, Hodder and Stoughton, 1959 p.187.

[13] Bicknell, op. cit., p.21.

[14] Bicknell.

[15] But even the strongly Calvinist interpretation found in W.H. Griffith Thomas, *The Principles of Theology – An Introduction to the Thirty-nine Articles*, admits that “there was to be no narrow interpretation, and the intention of the Act was certainly to grant relief.” Op. cit. p.liii.

[16] The current form of Declaration of Assent in the Church of England, which puts the Thirty Nine Articles in their context is to be found in Canon C15 is given above in the context of the Church of Ireland Declaration on the Articles of 1999 and 2009.

[17] Members of the university of Oxford and Cambridge were required to subscribe to the Articles before receiving their degrees, and, in addition, at matriculation at Oxford. This was not, however, a stipulation laid down by the Church. It was abolished by legislation in 1854 and 1871.

It may, however, be noted, that the fifth Canon of 1604 censures any who impugn the Articles. E.C.S. Gibson, *The Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England*, fourth edition revised, Methuen & Co, 1904, pp64-68. However, this is unlikely to be of current relevance, the canon law of the Church of England having been comprehensively revised.

CHAPTER TWO: CHURCH FORMULARIES

PART THREE - EXAMINATION OF PARTICULAR ARTICLES

In this section it is intended to examine briefly certain articles relating specifically to the doctrine of the Eucharist, namely the twenty-eighth, the twenty-ninth, the thirtieth, and the thirty-first. These are given below in Latin and English since both texts are equally authoritative and are mutually interpretative.

ARTICLE 28

De Coena Domini

Coena Domini non est tantum signum mutuae benevolentiae Christianorum inter sese, verum potius est Sacramentum nostrae per mortem Christi redemptionis. Atque adeo, rite, digne, et cum fide sumentibus, pans quem frangimus est communicatio corporis Christi: similiter poculum benedictionis est communicatio sanguinis Christi.

Panis et vini transubstantio in Eucharistia ex sacris literis probari non potest. Sed apertis Scripturae verbis adversatur, Sacramenti naturam evertit, et multarum superstitionum dedit occasionem.

Corpus Christi datur, accipitur, et manducatur in Coena, tantum coelisti et spirituali ratione. Medium autem, quo corpus Christi accipitur et manducatur in Coena, fides est.

Sacramentum Eucharistiae ex institutione Christi non servabatur, circumferebatur, elevabatur, nec adorabatur.

Of the Lord's Supper

The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another: but rather it is a Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ's death. Insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ: and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ.

Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of the Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord cannot be proved by Holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions. The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith.

The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped.

This article repudiates the view that the sacrament is merely a token of Christ's love, in this way distinguishing it sharply from an agape, and ruling out a Zwinglian view. This continues to be a relevant statement, since very inadequate ideas about the significance of the bread and wine at the Eucharist occasionally come to the surface in the Church of Ireland. For example, during the debates which preceded the adoption of the forms of Eucharistic liturgy that were to appear in the *Alternative Prayer Book* (1984) there was some resistance, at General Synod level, to the shortened words of administration, "The body of Christ keep you in eternal life", "The blood of Christ keep you in eternal life", prefaced by the invitation,

Draw near and receive the body of our Lord Jesus Christ which he gave for you, and his blood which he shed for you. Remember that he died for you, and feed on him in your hearts by faith with thanksgiving.

In the experimental Order known as "Holy Communion 1972" this form came first, and the Prayer Book words of administration (as an alternative) second. Representatives of one school of thought wanted the short form removed to an appendix, but this was not agreed to. However, in the *Alternative Prayer Book* of 1984 the traditional form came first.² In the Book of Common Prayer (2004) there are three alternative forms of invitation in Holy Communion Two, "Draw near...", "The gifts of God for the people of God..." and "Jesus Christ is the Lamb of God..." And the words of administration begin with the traditional Prayer Book form with "you" instead of "thee", with two other alternatives, "The body of Christ keep you in eternal life" and "The blood of Christ keep you in eternal life" *or* "The body of Christ given for you" and "The blood of Christ shed for you."

In view of the critical reaction, initially, of some Church members it is helpful to note that in fact the shorter forms of the words of administration concentrate as much on the purpose for which the elements are given in communion than on what they are in themselves.

It is perhaps significant in this regard that the language of scripture about the bread and wine at communion is sometimes oblique. St. Paul in First Corinthians Chapter Ten does not say, "The bread which we break is the body of Christ", rather (in words which are echoed in the article under consideration), "The bread which we break, is it not a partaking/participation (*communicatio, koinonia*) in the body of Christ?" (1 Cor.10:16). He does not say, "The wine which we drink is the blood of Christ". Rather, we read, "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a partaking/participation (*communicatio, koinonia*) in the blood of Christ?" "Cup" clearly stands here for what the cup contains; but one notices the indirect construction again in some of the scriptural accounts of the institution of the Lord's Supper. In 1 Cor. 11:26//Luke 22:20 one finds, "This cup is the new covenant in my blood" rather than "This is my blood of the (new) covenant/my new-covenant blood" as in Mark 14:24//Matt. 26:28. This may possibly reflect the abhorrence that would be felt by Jews at the idea of "drinking blood", but it may also indicate the characteristically indirect way in which true symbolism expresses itself. We are not dealing here with a univocal use of language. "This is my body" is not the direct equivalent of such a statement as "This is a table"³

This article repudiates "transubstantiation". As mentioned in the introduction it is assumed by the writer that there is a change in what the bread and wine "are", that is a change in the essence or substance of the elements. But this is not a physical change, nor a change in any way related to the physical properties of the elements, or in what might philosophically be supposed to underlie their physical existence. Rather, it is a change-in-being necessarily consequent upon their acquiring a new meaning, a new function, and a new purpose. This view presupposes that after consecration the bread and wine in a real sense *are* the body and blood of Christ, but also, that in a distinct sense they are *not* his body and blood (this sort of ambiguity being inherent in a proper use of symbolism).⁴ They are his *sacramental* body, his symbolic but effectual body and blood in the context of the Church's liturgical practice. They are not his flesh-and-bones body, which it is assumed no longer exists (in spite of the "black" rubric in the Book of Common Prayer, which, following Calvin, asserts that body to be in heaven), nor his blood in the sense of

the actual literal blood that bled on the Cross: but these are *represented* by the elements by virtue of being designated for the purpose in the eucharist. The sacramental elements still remain bread and wine, as the wording of the liturgy itself suggests,' but this, after consecration, is no longer their primary significance. Finally, it is assumed that when these elements are rightly,' worthily, and with faith received, they communicate *Christ*, they are an outward and visible means by which He Himself is inwardly, spiritually, and really received by the communicant. Hence one may properly speak of the "real" presence.'

Relevant here is mention of the original form of this Article which denied "the real and bodily presence, as they term it, of Christ's flesh and blood in the sacrament of the Lord's Table",⁹ and one could associate with this the original form of the "black" rubric which denied any "real and essential presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood."¹⁰ It is assumed by the writer that it is possible to have a scriptural interpretation of the elements as Christ's *sacramental* body and blood without this implying any presence of his "natural" flesh and blood, which is taken to be, quite simply, impossible." The final paragraph says that certain forms of sacramental usage were not instituted by Christ. It may well be that the original authors intended by this to exclude such customs - for them the fact that these had not come directly from Jesus would probably be a sufficient reason for not permitting them. However, as it stands this paragraph is simply a statement of fact. There seems not to be any adequate reason for ruling out reservation as wholly illegitimate unless one is going to follow the principle of attempting to exclude from the Church everything not specially commanded by the Lord. The practice of "extended communion" involving at least minimal "reservation" is found as early as Justin Martyr." Whether or not devotion to the sacrament is legitimate would seem to depend to a large extent on the attitude of the worshipper. Provided that the bread and wine that are consecrated are revered because of their significance - as the body and blood of Christ - and provided that the worship does not stop short at the symbol but is directed towards the one whom the symbol effectually represents, then such devotion would not seem necessarily to be misplaced. Idolatry (much feared by Protestants) is a danger wherever anything finite is involved, but - *abusus non tollit usum* - the abuse of something does not take away the right use of it."

ARTICLE 29

De manducatione corporis Christi, et impios illud non manducari

Impii, et fide viva destituti, licet carnaliter et visibiliter (ut Augustinus loquitur) corporis et sanguinis Christi sacramentum dentibus premant, nullo tamen modo Christi participes efficiuntur. Sed potius tantae rei sacramentum, seu symbolum, ad iudicium sibi manducant et bibunt.

Of the Wicked which do not eat the Body of Christ in the use of the Lord's Supper.

The wicked, and such as be void of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth (as St. Augustine saith) the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ; yet in no wise are they partakers of Christ, but rather to their condemnation do eat and drink the sign or Sacrament of so great a thing.

For those who receive without repentance or faith, the Eucharistic elements cannot have the meaning, function, or purpose of Christ's body and blood. Hence what they receive is only the symbol, but not the reality which the sign represents - they are not partakers of Christ. To such it might be said, *either*, "You have received Christ's (sacramental) "body", but this will not be of any benefit to you, rather you will receive condemnation", or (looking at it from another aspect), "You have received the outward sign, but you did not receive the inward reality, Christ's "body" and "blood" (in the sense of his presence, his very self, as in John 6:35-58)", and you will be judged for having made a mockery of so great a mystery."

ARTICLE 30

De utraque specie

Calix Domini Laicis non est denegandus: utraque enim pars dominici sacramenti ex Christi institutione et praecepto, omnibus Christianis ex aequo administrari debet.

Of both kinds

The cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the lay people. For both the parts of the Lord's Sacrament, by Christ's ordinance and commandment, ought to be ministered to all Christian men alike.

The denial of the cup to the laity seems to have arisen in the Middle Ages through a misplaced reverence which feared any profanation of the Lord's sacramental blood. It received theoretical justification through the doctrine of concomitance to the effect that the Lord's presence may be received fully under one of the sacramental species only.¹⁶

But - it is one thing to say that the Lord can be sacramentally received under one species only.¹⁷ It is quite another thing to say that this ought to happen as a general rule.¹⁸ The article reestablishes the biblical and patristic norm, which was to communicate in both kinds.¹⁹

ARTICLE 31

De unica Christi oblatione in cruce perfecta.

Oblatio Christi semel facta, perfecta est redemptio, propitiatio, et satisfactio pro omnibus peccatis totius mundi, tam originalibus quam actualibus. Neque praeter illam unicam est ulla alia pro peccatis expiatio. Unde missarum sacrificia, quibus vulgo dicebatur, sacerdotem offerre Christum in remissionem poenae aut culpae pro vivis et defunctis, blasphema figmenta sunt, et perniciosae imposturae.

Of the one oblation of Christ finished upon the cross.

The offering of Christ once made, is the perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual, and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said that the Priests did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.

It is regrettable that abusive language became part and parcel of the necessary task of defining the doctrinal position of Anglican Christianity. In recent years there has been an

increasing awareness of the difficulties created by this in an ecumenical context; and it was for this reason that a resolution was passed by the Church of Ireland's General Synod in 1975 referring specifically to the Thirty Nine Articles and requesting that the matter be looked into by the Anglican Consultative Council.²⁰ More recently, a resolution was passed distancing the Church from this kind of language and in 2009 this resolution, slightly amended, was made a statute and was to be incorporated into the Book of Common Prayer to appear immediately prior to the Articles²¹

It seems indubitable that one of the consequences of the rediscovery of the doctrine of justification by faith by leading reformers at the beginning of the sixteenth century was a fresh emphasis on the scriptural teaching of the once-for-all character of the finished work of Christ.²² Such an emphasis was not to be found in the text of the mass itself, where the stress was on the thought of the present offering.²³ Rightly or wrongly²⁴ the sacrifice of the mass (in the plural form in article thirty-one) was perceived by the reformers to be an infringement of this once-for-all sacrifice of Jesus; and with remarkable unanimity they rejected it. In its place, in doctrinal confessions, and in liturgical formulae (at least in the Anglican liturgy) was put an affirmation of the utter completeness, the irrevocable finality of what God had accomplished historically in Christ. And so, the prayer of consecration in the Book of Common Prayer asserts, in a manner designed to be entirely unambiguous, that Our Lord, by his death on the Cross for our redemption, "made there (by his one oblation of himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world", and the Holy Communion is described as a "perpetual memory" of that his precious death, until his coming again. This particular emphasis was found in practically all Anglican liturgies until some very recent revisions, in which other theological truths have been stressed.²⁵ Both the traditional form of the eucharist (Holy Communion One) and the three modern forms (Holy Communion Two) in the 2004 Prayer Book affirm the unique character of the sacrifice. "He made there (that is, on the cross) "a full, perfect, and all-sufficient sacrifice for the sins of the whole world" it says in the first eucharistic prayer.²⁶ "We proclaim his perfect sacrifice made once for all upon the cross, his mighty resurrection and glorious ascension..." it says in the second. "He opened wide his arms upon the cross and, with love stronger than death, he made the perfect sacrifice for sin" in the third.²⁷ As will be evident from the introduction to this present work the writer is not convinced that an emphasis on the once-for-all nature of Christ's sacrifice on the Cross should necessarily exclude all thought of the Eucharist as a sacrifice. It is a matter of history that a number of Anglican theologians, including many in the seventeenth century and even some in the late sixteenth century, combined the Prayer Book stress on the finality of the work of Christ with a sense of the Eucharist itself as being in some sense a *commemorative sacrifice*.²⁸ (This, necessarily, went beyond Cranmer, who saw sacrifice in the Eucharist in two senses only - the offering of praise and thanks to God for what He had accomplished in Christ, and the offering of "ourselves, our souls and bodies" as a response to God's grace appropriated by the worshippers in the Holy Communion).²⁹ Such a view have found expression to a greater or lesser extent in a number of Anglican liturgies.³⁰ Where this takes place, however, the thought of the Eucharist as sacrifice is limited by the presupposition of the once-for-all character of the offering of Christ on the Cross, and has to be interpreted in such a way as not to imperil it. This implies that the Eucharist is a sacrifice only in a subordinate and derivative manner. Some Anglican theologians would go so far as to say that the Eucharistic offering is identical to that of Calvary insofar as in both there is the same Priest and the same Victim (Christ);³¹ but if

this is a valid insight - and it does back at least to St. John Chrysostom in the fourth century A. D.³² - it would have to be complemented by stating that if in a real sense the Eucharist and Calvary are *one*, in a real sense also they are *distinct*. If the Eucharistic sacrifice is "unbloody" then it is not the same. If the Lord Jesus Christ is not being put to death again, it is not the same. If it is in any real sense a *commemoration* of his death (Our Lord's own word, *anamnesis*),³³ then it is not the same, since a commemoration of an event is not the same as an event itself, although it may make it present to us in a real way so that we are *as if there*.³⁴ In the light of the thirty-first Article, even when shorn of its offensive phraseology, most Anglicans would probably prefer to stress this distinction, although they might (with varying degrees of acceptance and emphasis, depending on what school of thought they belong to - Conservative Evangelicals would have nothing to do with this line of approach) agree that there is a close relationship between the sacrifice on Calvary with that in the Eucharist, with an essential "link" being the eternal "appearing" of Christ on our behalf in the heavenly places, interceding for us as our great high priest.³⁵

The way in which Anglicans have thought of the Eucharist Sacrifice and have to some extent given this liturgical expression, is covered at much greater length and in relation to the biblical and patristic background in the writer's B.D. thesis (Dublin, 1979), entitled, *The meaning and role of the anamnesis in the Anglican liturgical tradition*.

The thought of *an independent sacrifice* in the Eucharist is ruled out by all sound theology.³⁶

NOTES ON CHAPTER TWO, PART THREE

[1] On the text of this article, Bicknell (op. cit.), pp382, 283, says,

The original Article of 1553 on the Lord's Supper coincided with the low-water mark of sacramental teaching in the Church of England. It was contemporary with the Second Prayer-Book of Edward VI containing the "Black Rubric", which in its original form denied any "Real and Essential Presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood" in the sacrament. In its present form, as restored in 1662, it only denies the "Corporal" presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood", a most important change.

So the third paragraph of the Article denied "the real and bodily presence, as they term it, of Christ's flesh and blood, in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper". In 1563 this Article was altered to correspond with the changes made in the Prayer-Book of 1559. The original third paragraph was struck out and the present one substituted. The author of our present paragraph, Bishop Guest, expressly stated that it was drawn up not "to exclude the Presence of Christ's Body from the Sacrament, but only the grossness and sensibleness in the receiving thereof." The rest of the Article remained unaltered, except that the second paragraph was strengthened by the addition of "overthroweth the nature of a sacrament".

See also, E.C.S. Gibson, *The Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England*, fourth edition revised, Methuen & Co. 1904, pp640-664.

[2] See the writer's *Liturgical Revision* op. cit. pp292-310 together with the relevant annotation for the controversies surrounding the definitive form of the Eucharist in the *Alternative Prayer Book* of 1984, and their ultimate resolution.

[3] On the biblical use of language see G.B. Caird, *The Language and imagery of the Bible*, Duckworth, 1980. H.E.W. Turner, in an article entitled "The Eucharistic Presence" in *Thinking about the Eucharist*, essays by members of the Archbishops' Commission on Christian Doctrine, ed. I. Ramsey, SCM 1972, pp 101, 102, said,

A more hopeful and irenic approach to the doctrine of the eucharistic presence seems to lie in a return to more dynamic and personalist categories or to start from the question 'Who is present?' and to go on from there.

It may be objected that the biblical narratives themselves exclude this possibility and that the phrases, 'This is my body' and 'This is my blood' require an entitative approach. It is common ground to all scholars that neither the Bible nor the Fathers had any terms which correspond exactly to the modern concept of personality; it would be sheer anachronism to expect that they should. The Biblical usage of body is not contrasted with 'person'; *it points towards it*. In Hebrew and Aramaic there are two words which can be translated by the Greek *soma* used in the words of institution - *guph* (corpse) or *basar* or *bisri* (flesh). If our Lord used the former at the Last Supper, it can only have a metaphorical or at least a proleptic significance (looking forward to the cross); if he used the latter, then neither the Greek *soma* nor the Latin *corpus* is an adequate rendering. Although Hebrew has the term *nephesh*, which is translated *psuche* in Greek, *basar* is never contrasted with *nephesh* in Hebrew in the same way as *soma* with *psuche* in Greek. St. Paul seems to have the Hebrew usage in mind in such passages as Rom. 12:2; Phil. 1:20.

This evidence leaves open such a paraphrase as "This is I myself my life enriched and made available by my death", which seems to catch the authentic echo of the institution narratives. The absence of a copulative in Aramaic does not decide the relation between the subject and the predicate either way. The absence of accents in Greek MSS makes it impossible to determine what emphasis should be placed on the Greek copulative in the passage.

The present writer does not believe it possible simply to displace the question "what is present?" by the enquiry "who is present"; but it would seem, once again, that the emphasis in the words of Jesus was not so much on the elements in themselves but on their meaning, their significance, *what they stood for*.

[4] Among the early Fathers, the one to whose Eucharistic doctrine this present exercise seems to approximate most closely is that of *St. Augustine* (354-430 A.D.). Augustine's theology of the eucharistic presence is complex, and is difficult to summarize effectively in a few sentences; but it has been said to include the following:

(1) The use of highly "realistic" language, for example, "Once the bread that you see on the altar is sanctified by the word of God, it is the body of Christ. And once the chalice is sanctified by the word of God, what the chalice contains is the blood of Christ." (Sermons 227).

(2) An awareness of the ambiguity of such language - there is a sense in which the elements *are*, and a sense in which they *are not* that which they represent, "For if sacraments did not bear a certain resemblance to the things of which they are sacraments, they would not be sacraments. In most cases this resemblance results in their *receiving the names* of those things. So, just as the sacrament of Christ's body is *after a certain fashion* Christ's body, and the sacrament of His blood is *after a certain fashion* His blood, so the sacrament of faith is faith." (Ep.98).

(3) A sharp distinction, where necessary, between the body consumed in the eucharist and Christ's historical/natural/physical/flesh-and-bones body. He presents Christ as saying, "You must understand what I have said in a spiritual sense. You are not going to eat this body which you see or drink that blood which those who will crucify me are going to shed." (Enarr. in ps 98:9). This is a spiritual gift, and the eating and drinking are spiritual processes. (Sermon 131:1). The eucharistic body is not the sensible flesh; rather we receive the essence of this flesh, viz. the spirit which quickens it. (Tract. in ev. loh 27:5).

(4) A spiritualizing tendency in interpretation, sometimes carried to its limits - "Why make ready your teeth and your belly? Believe, and you have eaten (Tract in ev. loh 25:12). "To believe in Him is to eat living bread. He who believes eats, and is invisibly filled, because he is reborn invisibly."

(5) He appears to have believed in the substantive reality of the bread and wine. J.N.D. Kelly in his *Early Christian Doctrines*, Adam and Charles Black, second edition, 1960, from which these examples of St. Augustine's writings have been taken, sums up on p.449, "His real point...is that Christ's body and blood are not consumed physically and materially; what is consumed in this way is the bread and wine. The body and blood are veritably received by the communicant, but are received sacramentally or, as one might express it, *in figura*."

(6) A close association between the *sacramental* body of Christ in the Eucharist, and the *mystical* body, the Church (to use the later terminology). In a well-known passage in

Sermon 227 he said, "So the Lord willed to impart His Body, and His Blood which He shed for the remission of sins. If you have received well, you are that which you have received. And in Sermon 272, "Your mystery is laid on the table of the Lord, your mystery you receive. To that which you are you answer 'Amen', and in answering you assent. For you hear the words (of administration) 'The Body of Christ' and you answer, 'Amen'. Be a member of the Body of Christ that the Amen may be true."

One may well contrast with this many-sided and carefully balanced teaching of St. Augustine the views which later gained wide currency in the Western Church, and against which the Reformers protested. For example, Paschasius Radbertus in 831 A.D. taught that by consecration the natural substance of the elements is eliminated: there is on the altar "*nihil aliud quam corpus et sanguis Domini*". Such a view would, from the standpoint of the Articles, "overthrow the nature of a sacrament", and would remain unacceptable to most Anglicans. Similarly unacceptable would be the view expressed in the oath imposed upon Berengarius in 1059 A.D., who was made to assert, "The bread and wine after consecration are not only a sacrament but also the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ and are sensibly *not only in sacrament but in truth* touched and broken by the hands of the priests and bruised by the teeth of the faithful". That this is not merely a matter of historical interest is shown by the favourable reference to the condemnation of Berengarius in the Encyclical Letter by Pope Paul VI *Mysterium Fidei* of 1965, CTS, Do.355, *52, p.23. This letter virtually ignores Scripture (except for **35,43). Nor is it evident that all the authorities quoted actually held the same understanding of the manner of the Eucharistic presence (for example was St. Cyprian's doctrine identical with that of St. Theodore of Mopsuestia, and is the teaching of the Didache the same as that of the Council of Trent?) Can one *legitimately* in this manner abstract statements of doctrine from their historical (and indeed philosophical) context?

[5] The "black" rubric in its 1552 and 1662 forms as given in F.E. Brightman, "The English Rite", Rivingtons, 1915, Vol 2, p721, is reproduced in **Appendix** , below, p.

[6] Holy Communion Two, First Eucharistic Prayer, BCP 210, "Therefore, Father, with this bread and this cup we do as Christ your Son commanded...". Similarly, the Second Eucharistic Prayer, BCP p214, anamnesis, "Father, with this bread and this cup, we do as our Saviour has commanded..." Similarly, the Third Eucharistic Prayer, BCP p.217 "May this bread and wine be to us the body and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ." With this one may compare Eucharistic Prayer I of the Roman Catholic Church, in *The Sunday Missal*, Fowler Wright Books, 1975, p.36, "...and from the many gifts you have given us we offer to you, God of glory and majesty, this holy and perfect sacrifice: the bread of life and the cup of eternal salvation." Eucharistic Prayer II, p.39, reads, "In memory of his death and resurrection, we offer you, Father, this life-giving bread, this saving cup."

[7] The word used in Article Twenty-eight is *rite*, signifying the due observance of all that Christ commanded, the right matter and form, according to Bicknell, op.cit. p.389. "Worthily" (*digne*) refers to the right inward disposition of the recipient. The role of faith is stressed in paragraph three of the Article - "And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith."

[8] This is implied in the language of the BCP Catechism, "What is the inward part, or thing signified?" "The Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper". The words "taken and" were added in the 1662 revision. Brightman, op. cit. p.789. BCP-1926, p.262. See below, pp.

In the Revised Catechism, Board of Education of the General Synod, 1971, later reissued as "A Catechism", Question 52 reads, "What is the inward and spiritual gift in Holy Communion?", and the answer is, "The inward and spiritual gift in Holy Communion is the Body and Blood of Christ, truly and indeed given by him and received by the faithful." Question 53 reads, "What is meant by receiving the Body and Blood of Christ?", and the answer is, "Receiving the Body and Blood of Christ means receiving the life of Christ himself, who was crucified and rose again, and is now alive for evermore." See below, pp.

[9] The text of the Forty-Two Articles of 1553 is reproduced in E.C.S. Gibson, *The Thirty-Nine Articles*, op. cit., pp70-89. The original form of the third paragraph of Article Twenty-eight was,

Forasmuch as the truth of man's nature requireth, that the body of one and the self-same man cannot be at one time in diverse places, but must needs be in some one certain place: Therefore the body of Christ cannot be present at one time in many, and diverse places. And because (as holy Scripture doth teach) Christ was taken up into heaven, and there shall continue unto the end of the world, a faithful man ought not, either to believe, or openly to confess the real and bodily presence (as they term it) of Christ's flesh and blood in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

[10] See above, note [5], and **Appendix** , p.

[11] In this way preserving the distinction, as outlined in the writer's "presuppositions" in Chapter One, p.2., between Christ's flesh-and-bones body which he had on earth, his "sacramental" body in the Holy Communion, and his "mystical" body, which is the Church. Any view of the "whereabouts" of Christ's *physical* body after the Ascension, however transformed, is purely speculative, and seems dependent upon a localised view of heaven.

[12] ***Extended Communion.*** "And when the president has given thanks, and all the people have expressed their assent, those who are called by us deacons give to each of those present to partake of the bread and wine mixed with water over which the thanksgiving was pronounced, and *to those who are absent they carry away a portion*" (Writer's emphasis). Justin Martyr, *Apology I:LXV* in Vol I of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, Ed. Roberts & Donaldson, Eerdmans, 1884/1981. There was also a custom, widely attested in the second to the fourth centuries of reservation by lay people who would keep the sacrament in their homes and communicate daily. For example, Tertullian, speaking of the dangers of having even a 'tolerant' heathen husband, said, "Will not your husband know what it is that you taste in secret before any food? And if he knows that it is bread, he is not likely to believe it to be what it is said to be. And will every husband, not knowing about these things, merely put up with the practice? Will he not grumble? Will he not have suspicions, whether it be bread or poison? (*Ad uxorem*, 11,5).

In his *De oratione*, 14 there is a reference to "...the body of the Lord having been received and reserved... ", H. Bettenson, Ed., *Documents of the Christian Church*, OUP, 1943, p.108.

In the *Apostolic Tradition*, ascribed almost certainly incorrectly to the third century writer Hippolytus, we read, "Let everyone take care that no unbeliever eats of the eucharist, nor any mouse or other animal, and that none of its falls and is lost. For it is the body of Christ, to be eaten by believers, and not to be despised. For having blessed (the cup) in

the name of God, you received as it were the antitype of the blood of Christ. Therefore do not pour any out, as though you despised it, lest an alien spirit lick it up. You will be guilty of the blood, as one who despises the price with which he has been bought." Cuming, G. J., Ed., *Hippolytus: a Text for Students*, Grove Liturgical Study No. 8, Grove Books, 1976, *37. It would appear that the lay person blessed the cup for themselves -Dix calls this a 'purely *local* Roman custom' - but a highly *significant* one in relation to the later view that only a priest can consecrate.

Reservation at home is also mentioned by Cyprian, *De lapsis*, 26. For an outline of Communion of the Sick, Reservation and Viaticum, see Lowther Clark, ed., *Liturgy and Worship*, SPCK, 1932, pp543-549. For the growth of extra-liturgical services in connection with the Blessed Sacrament, *ibid.*, pp742-745. For a cautious advocacy from an Anglican viewpoint, see the Alcuin Prayer Book Revision Pamphlet, *Reservation, its purpose and method*, Mowbray, 1923, reprinted 1953. The concept of "Extended Communion" has received attention more recently among some who would traditionally have been sceptical of reservation in any shape or form. See, for example, the essay by David Smethurst, *Extended Communion: an experiment in Cumbria*, Grove Worship Series No. 96, together with a Response from Colin Buchanan, Bishop of Aston, Grove Books, 1986. In the Church of Ireland, the possibility of providing explicitly for extended communion was considered by the Liturgical Advisory Committee in relation to a booklet incorporating forms for Ministry to the Sick. A sub-committee presented a draft rubric, which read,

Extended Communion. The minister of the parish may arrange to have Communion brought to those who for reasonable cause cannot come to church. The elements may be brought by the clergyman or by a reader or other parishioner. This must be done immediately after the celebration in church. The form provided is used. Consecrated bread and wine are not to be kept for any purpose other than immediate Communion of the sick or housebound.

[Sub-Committee Report arising from a meeting held on 8th November 1988]. As it appeared that this rubric was likely to prove controversial, it was not accepted at the subsequent meeting of the Liturgical Advisory Committee. LAC-118, 14th December 1988. It would appear, however, that there was nothing in the rubrics of *The Alternative Prayer Book* to prevent reservation for the purpose of communion. Rubric 9 (e) is concerned with reverent consumption *after* communion. "Any of the consecrated bread and wine remaining after communion is to be reverently consumed." (APB, "Concerning the Services of the Church", p.19). On the other hand, this was not permitted in the Book of Common Prayer (1926), since the comparable rubric (p.155) reads, "And if any remain of the Bread and Wine which was consecrated, it shall not be carried out of the Church, but the Priest, and such other of the Communicants as he shall then call unto him, shall, immediately after the Blessing, reverently eat and drink the same." In the *Book of Common Prayer*, 2004 the rubric in "General Directions for Public Worship" (12e) is identical to that in the *Alternative Prayer Book*.

[13] See the "Elucidation" (1979) of the ARCIC-1 document "Eucharistic Doctrine", which deals specifically with the question of reservation. *The Final Report* of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission, CTS/SPCK, 1981, pp23,24.

[14] With regard to John 6, especially vv52-58, there continue to be different views as to whether this was intended as an exposition of the significance of the Eucharist. See

Raymond E. Brown, *The Gospel according to John 1-XII*, Geoffrey Chapman, 1971, pp272-294. The present writer's view is that there must be *some* significance in the way in which John avoids a direct mention of the institution of the eucharist at the Last Supper. Is he not here using very strong language *derived from* the Church's experience and use of the sacrament in order to express the general significance of "believing in" Him (v.35 "I am the bread of life: he who comes to me shall not hunger, and he who believes in me shall never thirst")? This would concur with his similar concentration, not on the physical act of baptism, but on "baptism with the Holy Spirit" (Ch 1:33), where in a paradoxical way baptism in water is discounted, but nonetheless it provides a powerful metaphor to express and to interpret the experience of being renewed by the Holy Spirit.

[5] For a general view of the ambiguity that seems to be an inherent aspect of sacramental symbolism, see D. Tripp, "Ambivalence in the reception of Symbol - a problem of Pastoral Liturgy", No. 2 in *Symbolism and the Liturgy* H, ed. KW. Stevenson, Grove Liturgical Study No. 26, Grove Books, 1981, especially p.22, "the inescapable ambiguity of symbol". For a profound study of the inescapable ambiguities of religion in general, see the third volume of Paul Tillich's *Systematic Theology*, SCM, 1978, containing Part IV "Life and the Spirit" and Part V "History and the Kingdom of God". Particularly significant are Part IV 113 "The self-actualization of Life and its Ambiguities", Part IV 2B 1 "Spirit and New Being: ambiguity and Fragment (part of "The Manifestation of the Spiritual Presence in Historical Mankind")", Part IV III "The Divine Spirit and the Ambiguities of Life" comprising A. "The Spiritual Presence and the Ambiguities of Religion", B. "The Spiritual Presence and the Ambiguities of Culture", C. "The Spiritual Presence and the Ambiguities of Morality" and D. "The Healing Power of the Spiritual Presence and the Ambiguities of Life in General". Also relevant are Part V 1 B "The Ambiguities of Life under the Historical Dimension", and Part V IIC "The Kingdom of God and World History". It will be seen from this that "ambiguity" is a key concept of Tillich's philosophy of ecclesiology together with other creative concepts such as the "New Being" and the "Spiritual Presence".

[16] See *The Prayer Book Dictionary* Eds. G. Harford, M. Stevenson, A.W. Tyrer, Pitman, 1913, Entries, "Communion in One Kind" and "Communion, Manner Of, Denial of the Chalice". See also, *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, Second Edition, Eds. F.L. Cross, E.A. Livingstone, OUP, 1974, entry, "Concomitance".

According to the teaching of the Council of Constance (1415), "The present custom has been introduced for good reasons to avoid some dangers and scandals and thus it has been legitimate to maintain and observe it for similar or even greater reasons. It is true that in the early Church this sacrament was received by the faithful under both kinds, but later it came to be received under both kinds by those who consecrate it and under the species of bread alone by the laity. (This custom is legitimate) for it must be firmly believed and can in no way be doubted that the body and the blood of Christ are truly and integrally contained under the species of bread as well as under that of wine." See *The Christian Faith in the Doctrinal Documents of the Catholic Church* Eds J. Neuner and J. Dupuis, Revised Ed. Collins, 1983, No. 1506.

According to the Council of Trent (Doctrine on Communion under Both Species and on Communion of Little Children, 1562), as summarised in Neuner and Dupuis, op. cit. p.421,

1. No divine precept requires the faithful to communicate under both kinds.

2. Consequently, the Church has the power to determine the modality of the administration of the sacrament.

3. Communion under one kind only causes no substantial spiritual loss. (The Council, however, deliberately left undecided the question whether or not communion under both kinds gives grace more abundantly; the reason is that different schools held different opinions on this point).

The Doctrine of Concomitance had been clearly stated in the Decree on the Most Holy Eucharist (1551), in which the third chapter of which it was said, Neuner and Dupuis, op. cit., No's 1517, 1518,

This has always been the belief of the Church of God that immediately after the consecration the true body and blood of our Lord, together with His soul and divinity exist under the species of bread and the blood under the species of wine by virtue of the words. But the body too exists under the species of wine, the blood under the species of bread, and the soul under both species in virtue of the natural connection and concomitance by which the parts of Christ the Lord, who has already risen from the dead to die no more are united together... It is, therefore, perfectly true that just as much is present under either of the two species as is present under both. For Christ, whole and entire, exists under the species of bread and under any part of that species, and similarly the whole Christ exists under the species of wine and under its parts.

However, a shift in emphasis is to be found in the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy of the Second Vatican Council, in which it is said,

The dogmatic principles which were laid down by the Council of Trent remaining intact, communion under both kinds may be granted when the bishops think fit, not only to clerics and religious, but also to the laity, in cases to be determined by the Apostolic See, as, for instance, to the newly ordained in the Mass of their sacred ordination, to the newly professed in the Mass of their religious profession, and to the newly baptized in a Mass following their baptism.

W.M. Abbot and J. Gallagher, Eds., *The Documents of Vatican II*, Geoffrey Chapman, 1967, Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy, *55, p.156. The number of cases in which the new rite might be practiced was extended in 1970 (Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship, Instruction *Sacramentali communione*, June 29, 1970).

In the new "Code of Canon Law" of the Roman Catholic Church, promulgated in 1983, Canon 925 states,

Holy Communion is to be given under the species of bread alone or, in accordance with the liturgical laws, under both species or, in case of necessity, even under the species of wine alone.

[17] This principle seems to be recognized in the Church of Ireland insofar as episcopal approval was given to the experimental "Ministry to the Sick" Order, which includes the following rubric under the general heading of "Holy Communion with the Sick",

Reception of the consecrated bread and wine. Communion is normally received in both kinds separately, but may be by intinction or in either kind. (See Canon 13 (5).)

Canon 13:5 deals only with intinction, and does not, in fact, mention communion under one kind.

[18] A modern Jesuit theologian, Fr. L. Bermejo, argues strongly for a restoration of the cup to the laity as a norm for communion, on grounds of fidelity to the records of the institution in the bible including the immediate background to the institution; that the meal aspect of the celebration is better expressed by eating and drinking than by either eating or drinking; and for ecumenical reasons. L.M. Bermejo, *Body broken and Blood shed - the Eucharist of the Risen Christ*, Gujarat Sahitya Prakash, 1986, pp309-314. See also J.D. Chrichton, *Christian Celebration: the Mass* in the one volume edition of *Christian Celebration*, Geoffrey Chapman, 1981, pp18, 100-103.

[19] See the article "Communion in both kinds" in the *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, op. cit., p.322.

[20] See above, *Notes on Chapter Two, Part Two*, [8], pp24, 25.

[21] See above, *Notes on Chapter Two, Part Two*, [9], pp25, 26.

[22] As found in Rom. 6:10; Heb. 7:27, 9:12, 10:10; 1 Pet. 3:18 etc.

Expounding the relevant passages from Hebrews Chapters Seven, Nine, and Ten, Archbishop Cranmer in his "Defence" said,

For Christ offered not the blood of calves, sheep, and goats, as the priests of the old law used to do; but he offered his own blood upon the cross. And he went not into an holy place made by man's hand, as Aaron did, but he ascended up into heaven, where his eternal Father dwelleth; and before him he maketh continual supplication for the sins of the whole world, presenting his own body, which was torn for us, and his precious blood, which of his most gracious and liberal charity he shed for us upon the cross.

And that sacrifice was of such force, that it was no need to renew it every year, as the bishops did of the old testament; whose sacrifices were many times offered, and yet were of no great effect or profit, because they were sinners themselves that offered them, and offered not their own blood, but the blood of brute beasts; but Christ's sacrifice, once offered, was sufficient for evermore.

Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury, *A Defence of the True And Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ*, 1551, republished Focus Christian Ministries Trust and Harrison Trust, 1987, pp232-234 (The Fifth Book, Chapter II in the original).

[23] As in the prayers "Unde et memores" and "Supra quae",

Unde et memores, Domine, nos servi tui, sed et plebs tua sancta, ejusdem Christi Fuji tui Domini nostri tam beatæ passionis, nec non et ab inferis resurrectionis, sed et in caelos gloriosæ ascensionis: offerimus præclaræ majestati tuæ de tuis donis, ac datis, hostiam puram, hostiam sanctam, hostiam immaculatam, Panem sanctum vitæ æternæ, et Calicem salutis perpetuæ.

Supra quæ propitio ac sereno vultu respicere digneris: et accepta habere, sicuti accepta habere dignatus es munera pueri tui justi Abel, et sacrificium Patriarchæ nostri Abrahæ: et quod tibi obtulit summus sacerdos tuus Melchisedech, sanctum

sacrificium, imanaaculatam hostiam.

Wherefore O Lord, we thy servants, as also thy holy people, calling to mind the blessed passion of the same Christ thy Son our Lord, and also his rising up from hell, and his glorious ascension into heaven, do offer unto thy most excellent majesty, of thine own gifts bestowed upon us, a pure victim, a holy victim, a spotless victim, the holy Bread of eternal life, and the Chalice of everlasting salvation.

Upon which do thou vouchsafe to look with a propitious and serene countenance, and to accept them, as thou wert graciously pleased to accept the gifts of thy just servant Abel, and the sacrifice of our patriarch Abraham, and that which thy high priest Melchisedech offered to thee, a holy sacrifice, a spotless victim.

[24] For an exposition and defence of traditional Roman Catholic teaching on the Eucharistic sacrifice, see F. Clark, *Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford, second edition, 1967.

[25] For example, the emphasis in the post-Sanctus in Eucharistic Prayer B in the Book of Common Prayer (1979) of the Episcopal Church of the United States of America, is upon the creation, the calling of Israel, and the incarnation of Christ. *The Book of Common Prayer-according to the use of The Episcopal Church*, the Church Hymnal Corporation, New York and the Seabury Press, 1979, p.355. See also, Eucharistic Prayer 3 of *The Book of Alternative Services of the Anglican Church of Canada*, Anglican Book Centre, 1985, p.198. For a comment on this Order see Marion T. Hatchett, *Commentary on the American Prayer Book*, the Seabury Press, 1981, p.375. The Eucharistic Prayers 11, IM and IV, of the Scottish Episcopal Church focus attention on the themes of "Anticipation", "Returning to God", and "New Life, The Lord, The Spirit", *Scottish Liturgy - Eucharist*, including the Scottish Liturgy 1982, the General Synod of the Scottish Episcopal Church, 1989. For these particular prayers see the section "Scottish Liturgy, 1982, pp 13-21. See also, the Eucharistic Liturgy "Thanksgiving for Creation and Redemption", in *A New Zealand Prayer Book, Collins*, 1989, pp467-470.

[26] APB p.54.

[27] APB p,61

[28] According to Jeremy Taylor's teaching on the Eucharist., "As it is a Commemoration and Representation of Christ's, death., so it is a Commemorative sacrifice", from "The Great Exemplar", quoted in P. L. More and F. L. Cross, *Anglicanism – the thought and practice of the Church of England, illustrated from the religious literature of the seventeenth century*, SPCK, 1935, No 212 p.495. Similarly, John Bramhall, in his "Replication" said., "We acknowledge an Eucharistical Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, a commemorative Sacrifice or a memorial of the Sacrifice of the Cross; a representative Sacrifice, or a representation of the Passion of Christ before; the eyes of His Heavenly Father; an impetrative Sacrifice, or an impetration of the fruit and benefit of His Passion by way of real prayer; and lastly, an applicative Sacrifice, nor an application of His Merits unto our souls," More and Cross, op. cit. No. 214, p496. John Bramhall was Archbishop of Armagh from 1661-1663.

[29] In his *Defence* p. cit. pp234.236 (Book V Chapter III in the original), Cranmer said,

One kind of sacrifice there is, which is called a propitiatory or merciful sacrifice., that is to say such a sacrifice as pacifieth God's wrath and indignation, and obtaineth mercy and forgiveness for all our *sins*, and is the ransom for our redemption from everlasting damnation ...Another kind of sacrifice there is, which doth not reconcile us to God, but is made of there be reconciled by Christ, to testify our duties unto God, and to show ourselves thankful unto him; and therefore they be called 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.

[30] The evidence for this may be found in a succession of editions of the Eucharistic liturgies of the Anglican Communion,

B. Wigan, *The Liturgy in English*, OUP, 1962.

C.O. Buchanan (Ed.), *Modern Anglican Liturgies 1958-1968*, OUP, 1968

C.O. Buchanan (Ed.), *Further Anglican Liturgies 1950-1975*, Grove Books, 1975.

C.O. Buchanan (Ed), *Latest Anglican Liturgies 1976-1984*, Alcuin Club/SPCK, Alcuin Club Collections No 66, 1985.

Post - 1985 Eucharistic developments, to be found in individual Prayer Books of the Anglican Communion are also relevant.

For a study of the process see the writer's (unpublished) B.D. thesis, *The Meaning and Role of the Anamnesis in the Anglican Liturgical Tradition*, submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Degree of Bachelor of Divinity to the University of Dublin, March 1979, esp. Chapter Four, "Memorial and Sacrifice – from the Sixteenth to the Twentieth Centuries."

[31] For example, Dr. E.L. Mascall, in a contribution entitled, "Recent thought on the Theology of the Eucharist" in *A Critique of Eucharistic Agreement*, Ed. J. Lawrence, SPCK, 1975, said,

I think it has come to be seen in recent years that the only doctrine of the eucharistic sacrifice that is both adequate and tolerable is one that understands the eucharist as neither a repetition nor a commemoration of the Sauce of Christ, but as identically the same sacrifice, differing only in the mode of its presentation.

[32] According to G. Dix (*The Shape of the Liturgy*, Dacre Press, Westminster, Second Edition, 1945, p.243) Chrysostom is typical of the early writers, Eastern and Western alike, in his insistence both on the unity and the uniqueness of Christ's sacrifice and on its relation to the eucharist. In a comment about the emphasis laid by the Epistle to the Hebrews on this truth he said,

What then? Do we not offer daily? Certainly we offer thus, making an *anamnesis* of His death. How is it one and not many? Because it was offered once, like that which was carried [in O.T. on the day of Atonement] into *the holy of holies* ...*For we ever offer the same Person, not today one sheep and next time a different one,*

but ever the same offering. Therefore the sacrifice is one. By this argument then, since the offering is made in many places, does it follow that there are many Christs? Not at all, for Christ is everyone one, complete here and complete there, a single Body. Thus, as when offered in many places He is one Body and not many bodies, so also there is one sacrifice. One High--priest is He Who offered the sacrifice which cleanses us. We offer even now that which was then offered, which cannot be exhausted. This is done for an *anamnesis* of that which was then done, for 'Do this' said He 'for the *anamnesis* of Me'. We do not offer a different sacrifice like the high priest of old, but we ever offer the same. Or rather we offer the *anamnesis* of the sacrifice.

St. John Chrysostom, in Heb. Hom. xvii.3, quoted in Dix, as above.

Dix's view is confirmed by L Ligier in an important article "The Origins of the Eucharistic Prayer: From the Last Supper to the Eucharist", translated by Dr. Geofifey Wainwright, and reproduced in *Studia Liturgica*, Vol 9, No. 4, 1973, p 182,

The final and theological consequence [of certain developments in the eucharistic prayer] was that the doctrine of Christ as both priest and victim of the sacrifice of the Mass suddenly soared and spread extraordinarily in the course of the fourth century. Its echo rang through both East and West. All the Patristic authorities affirm it in almost identical terms: St. Ephraim, St. Gregory Nazianzen, Epiphanius, St. John Chrysostom, Theophilus of Alexandria, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine, etc. St. John Chrysostom preached that Christ was 'priest and victim' [Hom XVII 1, PG63, 129]; St. Augustine wrote that he was 'offerens et oblatio' [De Civitate Dei, X,xx, PL 41,298]. While affirming more than anyone the importance of the role of the Holy Spirit in the Mass, Chrysostom declared that the words of the Lord effect the Eucharist and that the celebrant lends him voice and hand'. [Hom i de prod. Judae, 6, PG 49, 380; Hom 11, ibid.389; In epist. II ad Tim, hom II 4, PG 62, 612]. Thus as early as the fourth century, when the use of the institution narrative was becoming general, St. John Chrysostom was preparing the way for the doctrine which sees in Christ the principal priest of the Mass, and in the celebrant his instrument and minister.

[33] 1 Cor. 11:24,25; Luke 22:19. For a discussion of the significance of the expression *eis ten emen.anamnesin* see the writer's *The Meaning and Role of the Ananmesis* op. cit., Chapter One, (reproduced below as **Appendix B**), An authoritative view is given by J. Behm in the *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, Ed. G. Kittel, Tr. (G.W. Bromiley, Vol 1., pp348,349. He says *ananmesis* means "remembrance" or "recollection" and is a synonym of *hupomnesis*. *ananmesis* is philosophically distinguished from *mneme* ("memory") as the "reliving of vanished impressions by a definite act of will". The active element in *anamnesis* (*poiein...anamnesin*, e.g. burial inscription in Nicomedia from the imperial period) leads on from the signification of a "recollection in the consciousness" to that of "recollection by word" or ""commemoration" (*commemoratio*) and "recollection by act" i.e. "an action whereby the object is re-presented in memory" (cf Num. 10:10 where *zikkaron* before God is accomplished by the blowing of trumpets; and Wisd. 16:6)

Expounding I Cor. 11:24,25 //Luke 22:19 he says,

Christians are to enact (*poieo*) the whole action of the Lord's Supper - this is the reference of the twofold *touto* in recollection of Jesus, and this not merely in such sort that they simply remember, but rather, in accordance with the active sense of

anamnesis and the explanation in v.26, in such a way that they actively fulfil the *anamnesis*. The making present by the later community of the Lord who instituted the Supper, and who put the new covenant into effect by His death, is the goal and content of their action in which they repeat what was done by Jesus and His disciples on the eve of His crucifixion.

Linguistically, Behm says, *eis anamnesin* = *lehazkir*; but acknowledges that it stands in the LXX of Lev. 24:7 for *leazkarah*, whereas in Ex. 12:14, where the Passover is appointed a day of remembrance of deliverance from Egypt, *lezikkaron* is rendered *mnemosunon*. On *anamnesis* as an act of recollection of the death of Christ in the celebration of the eucharist in the early Church he cites Justin, *Dialogues*, 41:1; 70:4, 117:3.

[34] This is a fundamentally biblical concept. Referring to the Jewish observance of the Passover (within the celebration of which the Lord's Supper was instituted) L.M. Bermejo, *op. cit.* p.6, says,

Commemoration of the past It is not a merely subjective remembrance of a past salvific act, for there is a mysterious, yet real identification between the liturgical celebration and the past event now commemorated. The past redemptive activity of Yahweh is rendered symbolically present here and now, as if the worshippers had themselves come out of Egypt centuries earlier. The Passover is simply the memorial of the past salvific event that in a certain way leaps over the centuries and becomes present under liturgical signs (Ex 12:42,43).

[35] A concept which was much emphasized by the Caroline Divines of the Seventeenth Century, especially Jeremy Taylor (Bishop of Down and Connor, 1661-1667). See HR McAdoo, *The Eucharistic Theology of Jeremy Taylor*, The Canterbury Press, Norwich, pp80-84. See also, F.R Bolton, *The Caroline Tradition in the Church of Ireland*, pp90-103 under the heading, "Irish Caroline Teaching: The Eucharistic Offering". It is to be found in C.B. Moss, *The Christian Faith*, SPCK, 1957, pp369,370,

All the Fathers, beginning with St. Clement of Rome, called the Eucharist a sacrifice; so do all the ancient liturgies. But whereas the New Testament appears to regard the Eucharist as corresponding to the feast which was the last stage of the sacrifice, the Fathers taught that it was also the representation on earth of what is continually going on in Heaven. As the Epistle to the Hebrews constantly asserts, our Lord is the true High Priest, 'a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek, (Heb. 6:20), who passed into the heavens at the Ascension, bearing His own blood (like the High Priest into the Holy of Holies), and who perpetually presents to the Father His own life, for His priesthood is unchangeable (7:24). The Christian Church, of which He is the Head, is 'a royal priesthood' (1 Peter 2:9), sharing the priesthood of its Head, and His heavenly work of offering. This the Church does by the whole of her life, which is, ideally, one long self offering, united with the self-offering of our Lord in Heaven; but she shares in His self-offering especially at the Eucharist, in which the congregation is united with Jesus Christ in Heaven, first by offering His Body and Blood (with which all their other offerings, their alms, the bread and wine, their own lives, are united), and then by receiving it in communion.

The thought of the heavenly high priesthood also became prominent in "Catholic" Anglican writers of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. See A.M. Ramsey, *From Gore to Temple*, London, 1960, pp50,51. Also G. Aulen, *Eucharist and*

Sacrifice,² Edinburgh 1958, p.55. The patristic view of the matter, as derived from biblical sources, is discussed by Rowan Williams in *Eucharistic Sacrifice The Roots of a Metaphor*, Grove Liturgical Study No 31, Grove Books, 1982, ppl3-17. This essay was intended as a constructive "response" from a "Catholic" Anglican perspective to R.P.C. Hanson's exposition of *Eucharistic, Offerina in the Early Church*, Grove Liturgical Study No. 19, Grove Books, 1979.

[36] ARCIC-1, *The Final Report*, the Windsor Statement on Eucharistic Doctrine (1971), 11:5, p.13.

Christ's redeeming death and resurrection took place once and for *all in history*. Christ's death on the cross, the culmination of his whole life of obedience, was the one, perfect and sufficient sacrifice for the sins of the world. There can be no repetition of or addition to what was then accomplished once for all by Christ. Any attempt to express a nexus between the sacrifice of Christ and the eucharist must not obscure this fundamental fact of the Christian faith.

[*Excursus on the Irish Articles of 1615*. It was maintained by Dr Eric Culbertson in *The Evangelical Roots of the Church of Ireland: James Ussher and the Irish Articles*, Church of Ireland Evangelical Fellowship p.22, that the Irish Articles of 1615 never having been repealed are still in full force in the Church of Ireland, the circumstances being that when the Thirty-nine Articles were accepted by the Irish Convocations in 1634 the earlier Articles (of a highly Calvinist character) remained. In reality they became a dead letter, with no mention of them when the 1662 Prayer Book (with the Thirty-nine Articles in it) was introduced following the Restoration of Charles II and have never been referred to by any authoritative body, whether Convocations (which ceased to exist when the Church of Ireland was disestablished under the Irish Church Acts of 1869) or the General Convention of 1870 or the General Synod (which has had supreme legislative authority from 1871). Most significantly, when a statement of general principles was drawn up under the title "Preamble and Declaration" in 1870 only the Thirty-nine Articles were referred to and as this is the fundamental legal document in the Church of Ireland, prefixed to the Church Constitution, it may be taken that *pace* Dr Culbertson's view the articles of 1615 have neither authority nor place in the Church of Ireland. Culbertson quotes "Toplady" (unidentified and undated, perhaps the nineteenth century hymn-writer?) to the effect that "The articles of 1615 are, to this day a part of the national creed established in Ireland. They were solemnly admitted by the ecclesiastical power, and as solemnly ratified by the civil. They could only be repealed and abolished by the same authority which had established them." This is not a judgement of an ecclesiastical authority such as the Court of the General Synod, nor of a secular court in either jurisdiction in Ireland, and may be regarded as the unsubstantiated opinion of a private person. Given the facts as outlined above, in the absence of any such ruling, the Articles of 1615 may be regarded as null and void and of merely historical interest, neither the Church itself having affirmed them post-Restoration in the 17th century and post-Disestablishment in the 19th century, nor any person or persons in the Church being required to subscribe to them]

CHAPTER TWO: CHURCH FORMULARIES PART FOUR – THE PRAYER BOOK CATECHISM.

Certain parts of the Prayer Book Catechism are relevant to an understanding of the Church's view of the Holy Communion.¹ First, there is the definition of a sacrament,²

I mean an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace, given unto us, ordained by Christ himself, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof.

Noteworthy here is the clear distinction between the outward sign and the corresponding inward grace, the institution by Christ (which puts Baptism and Holy Communion on a different level from other "commonly called Sacraments", such as Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction),³ the understanding of the outward and visible as instrumental in communicating the inward and spiritual, and the importance of the sacramental in serving as a visible assurance or pledge of the reality which is conveyed. The Anglican viewpoint is distinguished from the Zwinglian and any other which regards the sacraments as mere tokens of spiritual truth. It is congruous with the teaching of *Article 25*, which says,

*De Sacramentis*⁴

Sacramenta, a Christo institute, non tantum suet notae professionis Christianorum, sed certa quaedam potius testimonia, et efficacia signa gratiae atque bonae in nos voluntatis Dei, per quae invisibiliter ipse in nos operator, nostramque fidem in se non solum excitat, verum etiam confirmat.

Duo a Christo Domino nostro in Evangelio instituta sunt Sacramenta: scilicet, Baptismus, et Coena Domini

Quinque illa vulgo nominata Sacramenta: scilicet, confirmatio, poenitentia, ordo, matrimonium, et extrema unctio, pro Sacramentis Evangelicis habenda non suet, ut quae, partim a prava Apostolorum imitatione profluxerunt, partim vitae status sententiam in scripturis quidem probati: sed sacramentorum eandem cum Baptismo et Coena Domini rationem non habentes, ut quae signum aliquod visibile, see caeremoniam, a Deo institutam non habeant.

Sacramenta non in hoc instituta sunt a Christo ut spectarentur, aut circumferrentur, sed ut rite illis uteremur, et in his dumtaxat qui digne percipient salutarem habent effectum: Qui vero indigne percipient, damnationem (ut inquit Paulus) sibi ipsis acquirunt.

Of the Sacraments

Sacraments ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they be certain sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace, and God's good will towards us, by the which he doth work invisibly in us and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our Faith in him.

There are two Sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord.

Those five commonly called Sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance,

Orders, Matrimony, and extreme Unction, are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures; but yet have not like nature of Sacraments with Baptism, and the Lord's Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God.

The Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about, but that we should duly use them. And in such only as worthily receive the same they have a wholesome effect or operation: But they that receive them unworthily purchase to themselves damnation, as St. Paul saith.

Particularly important here are the treatment of the sacraments as "effectual signs of grace" (*efficacia signa gratiae*)⁵ and the stress on the invisible but real work of these signs, which not only bring to life (quicken/excitat) but also strengthen and confirm our faith in Christ.

The Catechism continues its definition of the sacraments of the Lord's Supper,

Q. Why was the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper ordained?

A. For the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, and of the benefits which we receive thereby.⁶

This definition fits in well with the dominical institution, "Do this in remembrance of me", the Pauline interpretation, "as often as you eat this bread and drink this cup you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes", and the Prayer Book assertion of the "perpetual memory" (BCP p.150). However, it is likely that "remembrance" is here thought of in psychological terms - "thinking of the sacrifice of Christ and its benefits" - rather than in the full biblical sense of a liturgical memorial. This is a general weakness of the Reformers' thought - to think of the Eucharist as an *occasion of remembrance* rather than as being itself a *liturgical act of remembrance!* Or, if any act was thought of this would tend to be limited to the reception of communion as in the 1552 Words of Administration,

Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving.

Drink this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and be thankful.⁹

In this present work it is assumed that it is the entire liturgical act - of "taking, blessing, breaking, and giving" the bread, and "taking, blessing, and giving" the wine (as coalesced into the classic "four-fold" shape discerned by Dix, and regarding the "blessing/thanking" and the "giving" as the most important elements) which constitutes the "memorial" commanded by Jesus to be continued.¹⁰

Further,

Q. What is the outward part or sign of the Lord's Supper?

A. Bread and Wine, which the Lord hath commanded to be received.¹¹

Both this, and the definition of the nature of a sacrament, as given above, assume the full reality of the sacramental sign, and to this extent would appear to be incompatible with the view that the "whole substance" of the bread and wine are converted into the "whole substance" of the Body and Blood of Christ.¹² However, it could be argued that to grant the continuance of the "accidents" - whatever can be weighted, measured, felt, tasted, and observed - is implicitly to accept some sort of continued "existence" of what can meaningfully continue to be called "bread" and "wine". The traditional order of the Mass

itself speaks of offering the "bread" and the "cup" *after* the Words of Institution, and this to some extent calls into question the theological model which speaks of these elements as if they were not.¹³ At the same time, as explained above, it is assumed here that there is a sense in which they can be said to *become*, what previously they were not, through *sacramental signification*.¹⁴

Hence,

Q. What is the inward part, or *thing signified*?

A. The Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper.¹⁵

Q. After what manner are the Body and Blood taken and received in the Lord's Supper?"

A. Only after a heavenly and spiritual manner: and the mean whereby they are taken and received is Faith."¹⁶

The latter question and answer were added to the Church of Ireland's Catechism because of fears of a materialistic misunderstanding of the sacramental presence.¹⁷ They are drawn from the twenty-eighth Article of Religion, and so do not constitute an alteration of the Prayer Book faith. In fact, this definition is probably one that could be assented to by most theologians of most denominations, and it is certainly compatible with the eucharistic faith as taught by St. Augustine.¹⁸ How far it could be said to be in agreement with the teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas, at a much later date, is more difficult to assess, although, taken together, these questions and answers would seem to stress the *distinction* between the sign and that which it represents rather than that unity which enables the name of the latter to be applied (legitimately and truly) to the former.¹⁹ This emphasis is not surprising within the historical context of a difference of opinion between the churches in which it was felt by Anglicans that there was a serious danger of these being confused.

Q. What are the benefits whereof we are partakers thereby?

A. The strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the Body and Blood of Christ, as our bodies are by the Bread and Wine.²⁰

Not everyone would be happy with the implied dichotomy between body and soul. This assertion needs to be balanced (complemented) by the traditional Prayer Book Words of Administration (from 1549, and combined with the 1552 Words from 1559 onwards),

The body of Our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for you preserve *your body and soul* unto everlasting life.

The blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ which was shed for you preserve *your body and soul* unto everlasting life.²¹

The sacramental species are received in faith for the benefit of the whole person - the psychosomatic entity in the completeness of his or her tripartite being - body, mind, and spirit. If it is true that we receive Christ "spiritually" it is also true that it is the whole person which benefits.

The objectivity of the gift is to some extent safeguarded by *Article 26* "Of the Unworthiness of the Minister which hinders not the Effect of the Sacrament"²² The gift of God in the sacrament depends not on such a subjective factor as the moral status of the

minister, but upon the institution and promise of Christ.²³

...Neque per illorum malitiam effectus institutorum Christi tollitur, aut gratis donorum Dei minuitur, quoad eos qui fide et rite sibi oblata percipient, quae propter institutionem Christi et promissionem efficacia sent, licet per malos administrantur...

...Neither is the effect of Christ's ordinance taken away by their wickedness, nor the grace of God's gift diminished from such as by faith and rightly do receive the Sacraments ministered unto them; which be effectual, because of Christ's ministration and promise, although they be ministered by evil men...

NOTES ON CHAPTER TWO, PART FOUR

[1] *The Catechism*.. The full title of the Catechism is "A Catechism, that is to say an instruction to be learned of every person, before he be, brought to be confirmed by the bishop" (BCP-1926/60, pp260-263). From 1549, to the Prayer Book revision of 1662 it was prefaced to the Order for Confirmation, it seems as an indication that the bishop was to put the questions to the candidates before confirming them. From 1662 to the present it has been printed separately before the conformation service. Originally, it consisted of an explanation of the nature of Baptism, the Apostles' Creed followed by a brief explanation of the doctrine of the Trinity, the Ten Commandments followed by an explanation of man's duty to God and his neighbour, and the Lord's Prayer with an explanation of its meaning. In 1604 a section on the sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion was added in response to a request by the Puritans at the Hampton Court Conference. This addition is usually considered to be the work of Bishop John Overall, but it may be based upon the work of A. Nowell, to whom the authorship of the original catechism is ascribed by some. In the Church of Ireland a question and answer relating to the manner of the reception of the Body and Blood of Christ were inserted into this part of the Catechism in the Prayer Book revision of 1878. See the entry "Catechism, the Prayer Book" in the *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, op. cit. pp249,250. For an exposition of the Catechism see A.W. Robinson, *The Church Catechism Explained*, APCK, Revised Edition 1955 (originally published 1893). The section on the sacraments maybe found in Pt. V. pp 125-152.

[2] BCP-1926/60 p262.

[3] This distinction between the two sacraments properly so-called of Baptism and Holy Communion and other rites "commonly called" sacraments, found in **Article 25** was strongly upheld by Anglican divines of the seventeenth century. Joseph Hall said, "In every sacrament therefore, must be a divine institution and command of an element that signifies, of a grace that is signified, of a word adjoined to that element, of a holy act adjoined to that word, Where these concur not, there can be no true sacrament..." No. 171 in More and Cross *Anglicanism* op. cit. pp412-413, from an edition of Hall's Works of 1837. Bramhall found the septenary number of Sacraments "never so much mentioned in any Scripture, or Creed, or Father, or ancient author; first devised by Peter Lombard; first decreed by Eugenius the Fourth; first confirmed in the provincial Council of Sens, and again in the Council of Trent". If the word "Sacrament" be taken largely, "then there are God knows how many Sacraments more than seven". If it be taken "strictly for a visible sign, instituted by Christ, to convey and confirm grace to all such partakers thereof as do not set a bar against themselves, according to the analogy between the sign and the thing signified; and in this sense the proper and certain Sacraments of the Christian Church, common to all, or (in the words of our Church) 'generally necessary to salvation', are but two, Baptism and the Supper of our Lord." J. Bramhall, *Works*, 1,55, as given in F.R. Bolton, *The Caroline Tradition in the Church of Ireland*, SPCK, 1958, pp78,79. The Council of Trent had decreed in 1547, "that if anyone shall say that the sacraments of the new law were not all instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord; or that they were more or less than seven, viz.: Baptism, Confirmation, the Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, and Matrimony; or that any one of these is not truly and properly a sacrament, let him be anathema". Concil. Trident. Sess. vii. can. 1., quoted in Bolton, op. cit. p.78. However, Bishop Lancelot Andrews said that the whole matter is a logomachia. If the thing were agreed upon, we should not strive for the name " From ""Two Answers to

Cardinal Perron" cited in More and Cross, *Anglicanism*, op. cit. No. 174 p.414.

The matter *is* referred to in the Second Book of Homilies, the Sermon on Common Prayer and the Sacraments,

Now with like or rather more brevity you shall hear how many Sacraments there be that were instituted by our Saviour Jesus Christ, and are to be continued and received of every Christian in due time and order, and for such purpose as our Saviour Christ willed them to be received. And as for the number of them, if they should be considered according to the exact signification of a Sacrament, namely, for visible signs expressly commanded in the New Testament, whereunto is annexed the promise of free forgiveness of our sin and of our holiness and joining in Christ, there be but two, namely, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord. For, although Absolution hath the promise of forgiveness of sin, yet by the express word of the New Testament it bath not this promise annexed and tied to the visible sign, which is imposition of hands. For this visible sign, I mean laying on of hands, is not expressly commanded in the New Testament to be used in Absolution, as the visible sips of Baptism and the Lord's Supper are; and therefore Absolution is no such Sacrament as Baptism and the Communion are. And, though the ordering of Ministers hath his visible sign and promise, yet it lacks the promise of remission of sin, as all other Sacraments besides do. Therefore neither it not any other Sacrament else be such Sacraments as Baptism and the Communion are. But in a general acception the name of a Sacrament may be attributed to any thing whereby an holy thing is signified. In which understanding of world the ancient writers have given this name, not only to the other five commonly of late years taken and used for supplying the number of the seven Sacraments, but also to divers and sundry other ceremonies, as to oil, washing of feet, and such like; not meaning thereby to repute them as Sacraments in the same signification that the two forenamed Sacraments are. And therefore St. Augustine weighing the true signification and exact meaning of the word, writing to Januarius, and also in the third book of Christian Doctrine, affirmeth that the Sacraments of the Christians, as they are "most excellent in signification", so are they "most few in number"; and in both places maketh mention expressly of two, the Sacrament of Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord. And, although there are retained by the order of the Church of England, besides these two, certain other rites and ceremonies about the Institution of Ministers in the Church, Matrimony, Confirmation of children by examining them of their knowledge in the Articles of the Faith and joining thereto the prayers of the Church for them, and likewise for Visitation of the Sick; yet no man ought to take these for Sacraments in such signification and meaning as the Sacrament of Baptism and the Lord's Supper are, but either for godly states of life, necessary in Christ's Church, and therefore worthy to be set forth by public action and solemnity by the ministry of the Church, or else judged to be such ordinances as may make for the instruction, comfort, and edification of Christ's Church.

Certain Sermons or Homilies appointed to be read in Churches in the time of Queen Elizabeth of famous memory, London, SPCK, 1914, pp376-378.

[41] BCP-1926/83 pp340,341.

[5] Sacraments as effectual signs of grace. Richard Hooker (c1554-1600) taught, "This is therefore the necessity of Sacraments. That saving grace which Christ originally is or hath

for the general good of His whole Church, by sacraments He severally deriveth into every member thereof. *Sacraments serve as the instruments of God to that end and purpose, moral instruments, the use whereof is in our hands, the effect in His - for we take not Baptism nor the Eucharist for bare resemblances or memorials of things absent, neither for naked signs and testimonies assuring us of grace received before, but (as they are indeed and in verity) for means effectual whereby God when we take the sacraments delivereth into our hands that grace available unto eternal life, which grace the sacraments represent or signify...*" R. Hooker, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, Dent, Everyman's Library, 1964 reprint, Bk V, LVII,5, pp236,237.

[61] BCP 1926/83, p.262.

[7] Dom Gregory Dix, in *The Shape of the Liturgy* Dacre Press, Second Ed. 1945, Chapter XVI, "The Reformation and Anglican Liturgy" pp613-734, laid stress on Cramer's emphasis on the purely mental and psychological aspect of "remembering" as the real eucharistic action. While Dix's use of historical evidence always has to be viewed with caution, some of his quotations from Cramer are quite suggestive in this regard, for example, p.671, "This is the eating of Christ's Flesh and drinking of His Blood, the *feeling whereof* is to every man the *feeling how* he eateth and drinketh Christ." Also, p.650, "...His holy supper was ordained for this purpose, that every man eating and drinking thereof should remember that Christ died for him, and so should exercise his faith, and comfort himself by the remembrance of Christ's benefits." A similar "psychological" approach to "remembrance" would seem to be implied in the Long Exhortations printed after the Prayer for the Church Militant in the 1552 Prayer Book, for example in the first exhortation, "I for my part am here present, and according to mine office, I bid you in the name of God, I call you in Christ's behalf; I exhort you, as you love your own salvation, that ye be partakers of this holy Communion. And as the son of God did vouchsafe to yield up his soul by death upon the Cross for your health: even so it is your duty to receive the Communion together in the remembrance of his death, as he himself commanded." In the second exhortation it said, "And to the end that we should always remember the exceeding great love of our Master, and only Saviour Jew Christ, thus dying for us, and the innumerable benefits, (which by his precious bloodshedding) he hath obtained to us, he hath instituted and ordained holy mysteries, as pledges of his love, and continual remembrance of his death, to our great and endless comfort...". There is perhaps a slight sense in this latter example of the rite itself being for "continual remembrance", but if this is so it would appear to be so only in a very attenuated sense. The atmosphere of the three Long Exhortations is almost, but not quite, that of a memorial service for an Absent Friend.

[8] For the biblical background to the Eucharist as a *liturgical act of memorial* see M. Thurian *The Eucharistic Memorial*, op. cit. For a summary and exposition of Thurian's view see also his *The Mystery of the Eucharist - an, ecumenical approach*, Mowbray, ET 1983. On page 14 he says,

This word memorial is central in the profound significance of the Eucharist. The memorial is no mere subjective memory; it is a liturgical gesture, making actual an event in the history of salvation (the exodus of God's people or the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross) in and for the Church, and it is, at the same time, a liturgical action *through which* the Church presents to the Father, Christ's unique sacrifice, as her offering of thanksgiving and intercession.

[9] *The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI*, Dent, 1952, p389.

These words *were* combined with the Words of Administration from the 1549 Book in the revision of 1559.

[10] Dix's "Four-fold" Shape has come in for a certain amount of criticism in recent years. Widely questioned is his identification of the "taking" with the liturgical "offertory". There was no "offertory" at the Last Supper; and the "taking", following Jewish custom at the Passover, would have consisted of (in the case of the Cup) lifting it up a handsbreadth from the table and holding it like this while saying the blessing. Moreover, in more recent liturgical thinking the "taking" is seen as a preliminary to (or accompaniment of) the "blessing/thanking", and the "breaking" as a preliminary to the "giving" so that the "fourfold" act does not consist of four actions of equal importance. What are really important are the "blessing/thanking" and the "giving". Changes in the headings in recent Church of Ireland rites reflect this development in understanding. In *the experimental rite known as "Holy Communion 1972"* the Communion was divided into four main sections (following the Offertory) headed "The Taking of the Bread and Wine", "The Thanksgiving over the Bread and Wine", "The Breaking of Bread", and "The Giving of the Bread and Wine". (C.O. Buchanan, Ed., "Further Anglican Liturgies 1968-1975", Grove Books 1975, pp99-102.) In the *Alternative Prayer Book* (1984) the "Ministry of the Sacrament" is subheaded, "The Taking of the Bread and Wine and the Giving of Thanks", and "The Breaking of the Bread and the Giving of the Bread and Wine". APB pp53-56, 59-62. This follows a similar development in Church of England rites from the experimental Order "Series III" to the definitive "Alternative Service Book" of 1980.

The whole concept of the "Offertory" has come under fire in certain quarters. C.O. Buchanan in *The End of the Offertory - an Anglican Study*, Grove Liturgical Study No 14, Grove Books 1978, argued (1) that the "bringing up" of the bread and wine, is quite separate from the "taking", and that (2) both these actions are at root functional, and of very little weight compared with the main actions of Jesus in giving thanks and distributing. From the opposite pole of churchmanship came some weighty words of caution about a fashionable emphasis on the offertory as the "layman's liturgy", from Dr. Michael Ramsey, then Bishop of Durham, in a lecture on *The Parish Communion* (Durham Essays and Addresses, SPCK, 1956, p.18)

(One of the dangers of the Parish Communion lies in) the Doctrine of Sacrifice. Here there is too often a most alarming lop-sidedness. The new movement places much emphasis upon the offertory, as the offering to Almighty God of the bread and the wine as the token of the giving to him of the people's common life. Appropriate ceremonial brings out this moment in the rite: layfolk carry the elements in procession from the back of the church, and lumps of coal and other objects may be brought to the church to reinforce the point. And the point is indeed a true and Christian one, for though its place in the New Testament is a little obscure it finds vivid expression in St. Irenaeus (for example Adv. Haer. IV. XVII, 5; XVIII.I). The idea of sacrifice is taught in many parishes in connection with the offering of bread and wine in the offertory and ourselves, our souls and bodies, in the prayer after the Communion.

By itself, however, this sort of teaching about sacrifice can be a shallow and romantic sort of Pelagianism ...for we cannot, and we dare not, offer aught of our

own apart from the one sacrifice of the Lamb of God.

[11] BCP 1926/83 p.262.

[12] *The outward part, or sign.* The doctrine of transubstantiation was given its classic form by St. Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274). Discussing the question of "whether the substance of bread and wine remain in this sacrament after consecration" he seems unable to conceive of these "becoming" the Body and Blood of Christ except by means of the sort of conversion which leaves only their appearances but not their substantive reality,

...I reply that it has been held that the substance of bread and wine remain in this sacrament after consecration. But this is an untenable position, for in the first place it destroys the reality of this sacrament, which demands that in the sacrament there should be the true body of Christ, which was not there before consecration. Now a thing cannot be in a place where it was not before except either by change of position, or by the conversion of some other thing into it-But it is clear that the body of Christ does not begin to be in the sacrament *through* change of position-Therefore it remains that the body of Christ can only come to be in the sacrament by means of the conversion of the substance of bread into his body; and that *which* is converted into anything does not remain after the conversion. (*Summa Theologica*, iii.Q. lxxv, Article II).

This is one possible sacramental "model", but it is not necessarily the one which best accords with *Scripture* (which speaks freely of "bread" and "cup" as does the canon of the mass (now Eucharistic Prayer I, see below, *Note 13*), which presumably predates this kind of thinking. Nor is it necessarily a better model than that which makes a clear distinction between the sacramental sign and that which is signified - indeed from the standpoint of the latter it is the Thomist argument which "overthroweth the nature of a sacrament" (*Article 28*). Nor is it necessarily the model which accords best with reason. On the contrary it seems reasonable to have a view which sees the sacramental "body" and "blood" as physically identical with real "bread" and "wine", but having the meaning, function, and purpose of the sacrament. It is not evident that anything essential to the Holy Communion as a means of grace is omitted from such a model; and it has the advantage of allowing for a "real" presence of Christ without requiring the laws of nature to be suspended in order to achieve this. Without denying the power of God to achieve the miracle of transubstantiation as defined, it seems better not to postulate *such* a suspension of natural law unless this seems to be required by the evidence (preferably in a concurrence of scripture, tradition, and reason, on the matter).

St. Thomas asked the further question (*Summa Theologica*, iii, Q. Article III), "Whether the substance of bread or wine is annihilated after the consecration of this sacrament?"

...I reply that, since the substance of bread or wine does not remain in the sacrament, some have thought it impossible that their substance should be converted into that of the body or blood of Christ, and therefore have maintained that through the consecration the substance of bread or wine is either resolved into underlying matter or annihilated ...but this is impossible, because it is impossible to suppose the manner in *which* the true body of Christ begins to be in the sacrament, unless by conversion of the substance of bread; and this conversion is ruled out by the supposition of the annihilation of the substance of bread, or its resolution into underlying matter...

This does not seem to the present writer, to be a particularly helpful line of argument. The impression given is of a struggle to express difficult truths within an exceedingly limited conceptual framework - one notices the expression "it is impossible to suppose". One is struck both by the distance of this sort of terminology from the language of the Bible, which is rich in the use of metaphor, and from more modern conceptions of the nature of matter. For a re-thinking of the issue from a modern Roman Catholic standpoint see E. Schillebeeckx, *The Eucharist*, Sheed & Ward, Second Edition, 1977, esp. pp 94-101.

Aquinas continues, Article IV, "Whether bread can be converted into the body of Christ?"

...I reply that this conversion is not like natural conversions but is wholly supernatural, effected solely by the power of God ...Ail conversion which takes place according to the laws of nature is formal ...but God ...can produce not only a formal conversion, that is the supercession of one form by another in the same subject, but the conversion of the whole being, that is, the conversion of the whole substance of A into the whole substance of B. And this is done in this sacrament by the power of God, for the whole substance of bread is converted into the whole substance of Christ's body ...hence this conversion is properly called transubstantiation.

The question, however, is not whether God *can* do this, but whether he *does* do so. One cannot validly argue that because He is able to do this therefore he must have done so and must be continuing to do so. One appreciates that St. Thomas Aquinas was writing within a certain context of faith. However, from an Anglican standpoint it would never be sufficient to say in effect, "The Church says so, therefore it is" One must "test everything" (1 Thess. 5:21, a saying which related originally to the inspired utterance of prophecy - even words purporting to come from God must be "tested" to see if they are authentic).

Article V. "Whether in this sacrament the accidents of bread and wine remain after the conversion?"

I reply that it is apparent to sense that after consecration all the accidents of bread and wine remain. And this indeed happens with reason, by divine providence. First, because it is not customary but abhorrent for men to eat men's flesh and to drink men's blood. Therefore Christ's flesh and blood are set before us to be taken under the appearances of those things which are of frequent use, namely bread and wine. Secondly, lest this sacrament should be mocked at by the infidels, if we ate our Lord under his proper appearance. Thirdly, in order that, while we take the Lord's body and blood invisibly, this fact may avail towards the merit of faith...

What would the "proper appearance" of Christ be? Flesh and bones? This would suggest that possible confusion between the Lord's natural, physical, flesh-and-bones body and his sacramental "body" to which reference has already been made. [Page 1, above]. There seems no reason in principle why the Lord's sacramental "body" may not physically consist of (real) bread, just as his mystical "body" consists of (real) people. Is there anything special about flesh and bones? Or, flesh-and-blood, which as St. Paul teaches "shall not inherit the kingdom of heaven"? ("I tell you this, brethren: flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, nor does the perishable inherit the imperishable. For this perishable nature must put on the imperishable, and this mortal nature must put on immortality..." 1 Cor 15:50,53).

Article VI. "Whether the body of Christ is in this sacrament as in a place?"

...I reply that ...the body of Christ is not in this sacrament according to the proper mode of spatial dimension, but rather according to the mode of substance. Now any body has a position in space according to the mode of spatial dimension, inasmuch as its extension is measured thereby. Hence Christ's body is not in this sacrament as in a place, but in the mode of substance, i.e. **in** the way in which a substance is contained by dimensions; for the substance of Christ's body takes the place of the substance of bread. Hence, as the substance of bread was not subject to its own dimensions locally, but in the mode of substance, neither is Christ's body ...Wherefore Christ's body is in no way locally in this sacrament...

A simpler way of putting this might be to say that Christ is not present as in a place - but we are.

A further question and answer found in iii. Q. lxxvii, Article I are, "Whether the accidents remain without a subject in this sacrament?"

...The accidents in this sacrament remain without a subject, and this can indeed be brought about by the power of God. For since the effect depends more on the first cause than on the second, God, who is the first cause of substance and accident, is able, through his infinite power, to keep the accident in being, even after the removal of the substance through which it was kept in being, as through its proper cause.

Once again the argument seems to move from what God might be able to do to what he is supposed to have done and to be doing. But is such a hypothesis really necessary? At best, from an Anglican standpoint, it might be regarded as a permissible theological opinion (although open to the objections of Article 28), but not under any circumstances as part of the essential and necessary deposit of faith. It is observed that a footnote to the Agreed Statement on Eucharistic Doctrine, Windsor, 1971, *The Final Report* op. cit. p.14 says,

The word *transubstantiation* is commonly used in the Roman Catholic Church to indicate that God acting in the eucharist effects a change in the inner reality of the elements. The term should be seen as affirming the *fact* of Christ's presence and of the mysterious and radical change which takes place. In contemporary Roman Catholic theology it is not understood as explaining *how* the change takes place.

See also, the "Elucidation", Salisbury, 1979, Section 6, *The Final Report* op. cit. pp20-22, esp.,

Becoming does not here imply material change. Nor does the liturgical use of the word imply that the bread and wine become Christ's body and blood in such a way that in the eucharistic celebration his presence is limited to the consecrated elements. It does not imply that Christ becomes present in the eucharist in the same manner that he was present in his earthly life. It does not imply that this *becoming* follows the physical laws of this world. What is here affirmed is a sacramental presence in which God uses realities of this world to convey the realities of the new creation: bread for this life becomes the bread of eternal life. Before the eucharistic prayer, to the question: "What is that?", the believer answers: "It is bread." After the eucharistic prayer, to the same question he answers: "It is truly the body of Christ, the Bread of Life ... in the eucharist the human person encounters in faith

the person of *Christ in his sacramental body and blood*.

(The quotations from St. Thomas Aquinas on the Eucharist given above are drawn from H. Bettenson, Ed., *Documents of the Christian Church*, OUP, 1959, pp245-210. For an English translation of the full *Summa Theologica* see that produced by L. Shapcote and English Dominicans, London: Bums, Dates, 1912-1936, New York: Benziger, 1947, 1948).

[13] Eucharistic Prayer I (which is derived from the pre-Vatican II Latin Rite) reads (at the anamnesis),

Father, we celebrate the memory of Christ, your Son. We, your people and your ministers, recall his passion, his resurrection from the dead, and his ascension into glory; and from the many gifts you have given us we offer to you, God of glory and majesty, this holy and perfect sacrifice: *the bread of life and the cup of eternal salvation*.

Eucharistic Prayer II has,

In memory of his death and resurrection, we offer you, Father, *this life-giving bread, this saving cup...*

Eucharistic Prayer IV has, (in the intercessions)

Lord, look upon this sacrifice which you have given to your Church; and by your Holy Spirit, gather all who share *this bread and wine*" [Scotland, Ireland, and South Africa; England and Wales have "who share *this one bread and one cup*"].

Within all four Eucharistic Prayers are to be found as a congregational acclamation (3) the scriptural words "When we eat this bread and drink this cup, we proclaim your death, Lord Jesus, until you come in glory". It is extremely unlikely that the apostle St. Paul whose words these are (1 Cor. 11:26) made any distinction between "substance" and "accidents" or would have in any way denied the reality of the outward and visible sign of "bread" and "wine", although these had for him, and for those from whom he received the tradition of the Lord's Supper the significance of the Lord's "body" and "blood". As outlined in the Introduction (Chapter One, Note I above), these words have to be seen within a tradition of interpretation in the observance of the Passover. For example, in the Recital of the Haggadah the Mazzoth are exhibited, and the celebrant says (in Aramaic), "This is the bread of affliction that our fathers ate in the land of Egypt..." See *The Haggadah - a new edition with English translation introduction and notes by Cecil Roth*, the Soncino Press Ltd, 1975, p9.

For the texts of the Eucharistic Prayers in the Mass see Harold Winston Ed. *The Sunday Missal - Texts approved for use in England and Wales, Scotland, Ireland, South Africa*, Collins Liturgical Publications, 1975, pp33-48.

[14] Chapter One, ppl-3 & annotation, above.

[15] BCP 1926/83 p.262.

The inward part, or thing signified. A "high" doctrine of the Eucharistic Presence was taught by a number of Anglican divines of the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries; and this "Caroline" school of thought was represented in the Church of Ireland. See F.R. Bolton, op. cit. pp 104-129. For example, James Ussher (1581-1656) in spite of

his pronounced Calvinism had this to say in a Sermon preached before the Commons House of Parliament in St. Margaret's Church, Westminster in 1624,

Thus in the Lord's Supper the outward thing, which we see with our eyes, is bread and wine; the inward thing which we apprehend by faith is the Body and Blood of Christ. In the outward part of this mystical action, which reacheth to that which is *sacramentum* only, we receive this Body and Blood but Sacramentally; in the inward, that containeth *rem*, the thing in itself we receive them *really*. And consequently the presence, of these in the one is relative and symbolical, in the other real and substantial" (More and Cross, *Anglicanism*, op. cit. No. 211 p.488.)

But there was also a characteristic dislike of any attempt to define the manner of the presence too exactly. John Bramhall, later Archbishop of Armagh (1661-1663), in a controversial work of 1653, summed up his argument,

This is the reason why we rest in the Words of Christ, This is my Body, leaving the manner to Him that made the Sacrament. We know it is Sacramental, and therefore efficacious, because God was never wanting to His own ordinances where man did not set a bar against himself; but whether it be corporeally or spiritually (I mean not only after the manner of the Spirit, but in a spiritual sense); whether it be in the soul only, or in the Host also; and if in the Host, whether by Consubstantiation or Transubstantiation; whether by Production, or Adduction, or Conservation, or Assumption, or by whatsoever other way bold. and blind men dare conjecture; we determine not. 'Motum sentimus, Modum nescimus, Praesentiam credimus'.

"High" doctrines of the Eucharistic presence were revived in the nineteenth century by the Tractarians together with ceremonial customs ("ritualism") in which they sought to give liturgical expression to their faith. For their theology see A. Hardelin, *The Tractarian Doctrine of the Eucharist*, (Upsalla).

For a modern restatement of this position see E.L. Mascall, *Corpus Christi*, Revised and Enlarged edition, op. cit.

[16] BCP 1926/83 p.262.

This question and answer are derived from Article 28 (see above p.

[17] The addition was of Evangelical provenance, being proposed at the Revision Committee by Master Brooke and seconded by Lord Plunkett. *General Synod of the Church of Ireland Revision Committee Report*, presented to the General, Synod of 1873, Hodges, Foster and Co. 1873. When the matter came before the Synod itself in 1874 it was moved by Revd. Lord Plunkett (later Archbishop of Dublin) and seconded by the widely-esteemed Revd. Dr. George Salmon, Regius Professor of Divinity (later Provost) of Trinity College Dublin. JGS, 1874, p.26.

[18] As outlined in the *Notes on Chapter Two. Part Three*, (41, above, p.

[19] A useful summary of the Eucharistic teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas may be found in Darwell Stone, *A History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, Longmans, Green & Co, Vol 1, 1909, pp319-334. He concludes,

Different minds will estimate differently the soundness of the arguments and conclusions of St. Thomas in accordance with differences of natural temperament

and experience and philosophic opinions; it might well be agreed by all scholars that with the methods of his age and with the light that was possible to him he strove earnestly to preserve belief in the spiritual character of the Eucharistic presence of the body of Christ

See also, E.L. Mascall, *Corpus Christi - Essays on the Church and the Eucharist*, Enlarged and Revised Edition, Longmans, 1965, Chapter VIII, "The Eucharistic Theology of St. Thomas".

[20] BCP 1926/83 p. 262

[21] BCP 1926/83 p.151

[22] BCP 1926/83 p.341

[23] The object of this Article, first issued in 1553, is to condemn the view maintained by the Anabaptists, that the ministry of evil ministers is necessarily inefficacious and ought to be rejected. The same view is expressly condemned in the Confession of Augsburg and in the *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*. See E.C.S. Gibson, *The Thirty nine Articles of the Church of England*, fourth edition revised, Methuen & Co. 1904.

CHAPTER TWO: CHURCH FORMULARIES.

PART FIVE - THE REVISED CATECHISM.

The Revised Catechism is a catechism approved for use in the Church of Ireland.¹ Of Church of England provenance, it was authorized for experimental use in the Church of Ireland under a clause of the Church Constitution requiring that it be certified by the House of Bishops "as being in its opinion neither contrary to, nor indicative of any departure from, the doctrine of the Church of Ireland."² Consideration was given to its replacement by an amended version which would have received permanent authorization by resolution and bill of the General Synod on the expiry of its "experimental" use in 1987.³ However, instead of this the Standing Committee of the General Synod was notified of a resolution adopted by the House of Bishops, which said,⁴

That the House authorises the use of the Revised Catechism (1971) on an optional basis for instruction in schools and confirmation preparation.

Subsequently permission was given to the Sunday School Society for Ireland to reproduce sections of the Revised Catechism in the Sunday School Course "Growing Together", which was for a time widely used in the Church of Ireland. More recently it has been republished by the Board of Education of the General Synod as a resource for those providing confirmation training or adult education.⁵

It would appear, therefore, that, although the Revised Catechism has not been fully approved by Synodical action, it may fairly be taken as representative of the faith of the Church of Ireland.⁶ An exposition of this catechism, intended for world-wide distribution and entitled *The Faith of an Anglican*, was produced by Revd Dr. W.G. Wilson, a Church of Ireland clergyman, then Dean of Connor, and subsequently Bishop of Kilmore.⁷ The sections relevant to this present discussion are the following,

*39 What do you mean by a sacrament?

By a sacrament I mean the use of material things as signs and pledges of God's grace, and as a means by which we receive his gifts.

*40 What are the two parts of a sacrament?

The two parts of a sacrament are the outward and visible sign, and the inward and spiritual grace.

*41 How many sacraments has Christ, in the Gospel, appointed for his Church?

Christ in the Gospel has appointed two sacraments for his Church, as needed by all for fullness of life, Baptism and Holy Communion.

*42 What other sacramental ministries of grace are provided in the Church?

Other sacramental ministries of grace are confirmation, ordination, holy matrimony, the ministry of absolution, and the ministry of healing.

*50 What is Holy Communion?

Holy Communion is the Sacrament in which, according to Christ's command, we make continual remembrance of him, his passion, death and resurrection, until his coning again, and in which we thankfully receive the benefits of his sacrifice.

It is, therefore, called the Eucharist, the Church's sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, and also the Lord's Supper, the meal of fellowship which unites us to Christ and to the whole Church.

*51 What is the outward and visible sign in Holy Communion?

The outward and visible sign in Holy Communion is bread and wine given and received as the Lord commanded.

*52 What is the inward and spiritual gift in Holy Communion?

The inward and spiritual gift in Holy Communion is the Body and Blood of Christ, truly and indeed given by him and received by the faithful.

*53 What is meant by receiving the Body and Blood of Christ?

Receiving the Body and Blood of Christ means receiving the life of Christ himself, who was crucified and rose again, and is now alive for evermore.

*54 What are the benefits we receive in Holy Communion?

The benefits we receive are the strengthening of our union with Christ and his Church, the forgiveness of our sins, and the nourishing of ourselves for eternal life.

*55 What is required of those who come to Holy Communion?

It is required of those who come to Holy Communion that they have a living faith in God's mercy through Christ, with a thankful remembrance of his death and resurrection; that they repent truly of their sins, intending to lead the new life; and be in charity with all men."

*39 and *40 echo the teaching of the Articles and the Prayer Book Catechism.

COMMENTS

*41 This explains the Prayer Book teaching about "two sacraments only, as generally necessary to salvation", "generally" being understood as meaning "universally", and "salvation" being interpreted as "fullness of life." It could be said, however, that this updating of the Church's teaching raises as many questions as it resolves, since it appears to imply that only those who have been baptized and are communicants can have "fullness of life". This would necessarily exclude non-sacramental Christians such as the Salvation Army and the Society of Friends, and it would also appear to refuse any possibility of salvation ("fullness of life") to non-Christians in good faith.⁸

*42 This clarifies in a useful way the position of the five "commonly called sacraments", describing them in a positive way as "sacramental ministries of grace", while distinguishing them from the two Gospel Sacraments appointed by Christ. This corrects the inadequacies of Article Twenty-Five which referred in a non-specific way to "the corrupt following of the Apostles", and could say no better for any of these five rites than that they "partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures."⁹ The Revised Catechism goes on to show the positive significance of each of these ministries (**48, 56-59).

*50 The definition of the Holy Communion makes a significant advance on that found in the Prayer Book Catechism. Instead of the emphasis on the psychological aspect which seems to be implied in the Prayer Book answer to the question, "Why was the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper ordained?" - "For the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the

death of Christ, and of the benefits we receive thereby", the stress is on the liturgical action, whereby "we *make* continual remembrance of him."¹⁰ And the commemoration of the death of Christ is set in a wider context, which includes the preceding passion, the resurrection and the second coming. This is desirable for two reasons. First, while the Lord's Supper is a proclamation of the "Lord's death" as St. Paul taught (1 Cor. 11:26), this does not exclude the commemoration of the other saving events in the "history of Jesus". Jesus himself said simply, "Do this in remembrance of *me*"(Luke 22:19; 1 Cor. 11:24,25). Second, this restores the eschatological perspective, also found in St. Paul (1 Cor. 11:26), so that, as often as we eat this bread and drink the cup, we proclaim the Lord's death *until he comes*.¹¹

The definition also stresses the aspect of "thanksgiving", hence the title "Eucharist".¹² The whole rite is called "the Church's sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving", indicating that the primary purpose of the Eucharistic celebration is our worshipful response to the grace of God in Christ Jesus - it is not merely a device for obtaining spiritual benefits. There is also a corporate dimension to the observance of this rite. It is not simply an occasion for an individual to "make his communion", but is "the Lord's Supper, the meal of fellowship which unites us to Christ and the whole Church." Nor is the fellowship limited to "the Church Militant here on earth", as in the 1662 rite, for it has specifically to do with "the whole Church."

**51,52 restate the Prayer Book interpretation of the outward and visible sign and the inward and spiritual part or thing signified or (here) "gift". However, in the context of the ongoing ecumenical discussion it is important to note that "the outward and visible sign" in Holy Communion is "bread"¹³ and "wine"¹⁴ given and received as the Lord commanded, there being no room for equivocation as to the reality of that which is here outwardly and visibly shared.¹⁵ Nor is there any doubt about the "inward and spiritual gift", which is effectually represented by the sacramental species and is "truly and indeed given by Christ and received by the faithful"¹⁶

*53 This explanatory comment usefully expounds what it *means* to "receive the Body and Blood of Christ", namely to receive His "life". This is a biblical concept (John 6:25-59)¹⁷; and the use of the word "life" in this context is probably to be taken as another way of saying that in the Eucharist we receive Christ Himself who is the Bread of Life.¹⁸

*54 This section on "benefits" mentions our union with Christ, and forgiveness, as well as the "strengthening and refreshing of our souls", which is the only fruit of communion mentioned by the Prayer Book Catechism. And there is an eschatological dimension here in the mention of the "nourishing of ourselves for eternal life."¹⁹

NOTES ON CHAPTER TWO, PART FIVE

[1] "The Revised Catechism", issued by the Board of Education of the General Synod of the Church of Ireland. In its original form its text was drawn up by the Church of England Archbishops' Commission; and it was authorized for experimental use by the Convocations of Canterbury and York in 1961. For a commentary on the original Church of England text see H.C.G. Herklots, *The Call of God*, Hodder & Stoughton, 1962.

[2] The Church of Ireland's Liturgical Advisory Committee, following the addition of the words "and any catechism" by the General Synod of 1971 to Chapter 1, Section 26(3) of the Church Constitution (dealing with the experimental use of services) agreed to the request of the Board of Education for the issue of the Revised Catechism. As it existed in 1971 Section 26(3) read,

Any form of Service and any Lectionary which a Liturgical Committee appointed by the General Synod has recommended for experimental use with a view to its permanent use being authorised by resolution and bill under the provisions of this section may be used without the enactment of a statute from such date and for such period, not exceeding five years, as may be appointed by the House of Bishops and notified by it to the Standing Committee of the General Synod, subject to the following conditions:

(1) It shall be certified by the House of Bishops as being in its opinion neither contrary to, nor indicative of any departure from, the doctrine of the Church of Ireland.

(2) Any such experimental use shall be under the supervision and control of the bishop of the diocese or other the ordinary.

(3) In the case of a cathedral which is not a parish church, such experimental use shall require the approval of the dean, the chapter, and the cathedral wardens, if any. (4) In the case of any other church or place, such experimental use shall require the approval of the incumbent and of the churchwardens.

In 1972 the word "seven" was substituted for "five", and in 1976 the word "fifteen" was substituted for "seven". This meant that the Revised Catechism could be used under the terms of this legislation until 1987.

[3] A draft revision of the Revised Catechism was prepared by a special committee appointed jointly by the Archbishop of Armagh (The Most Revd Dr. J.W. Armstrong) and the Liturgical Advisory Committee. The committee, which met six times in 1985/1986 submitted its report to the House of Bishops and the Liturgical Advisory Committee in June 1986. It was intended that some of the historical documents of the church might be placed in an appendix to the Revised Catechism. These, it was thought, should include the Nicene Creed, the Preamble and Declaration, and a reference to where the Thirty Nine Articles could be found. A further suggestion was that the Lambeth Quadrilateral might be included. The members of the Catechism Committee were Rt. Revd N.V. Willoughby, Bishop of Cashel and Ossory (Chairman); Rt. Revd J.R.W. Neill, Bishop of Tuam (Convener and Hon. Secretary); Rt. Revd E.F. Darling, Bishop of Limerick and Killaloe; the Very Revd. G. Mayes, Dean of Lismore; the Revd C. West., the Revd Canon S. Smart; Revd Canon V.S. Dungan; Mrs G.O. Simms; Dr Kenneth Milne, Mr Victor Carson, and Mr Norman Richardson. Bishop Darling and Mrs Simms were unable to be present when the final text was approved. The draft document, from which the

information recorded above has been drawn, was circulated to members of the Liturgical Advisory Committee for their meeting (LAC-107) on 26th June 1986. The minutes of that meeting state,

The committee decided to submit the draft catechism to the House of Bishops. It did not consider it to be a liturgical text, and considered that in setting up the Catechism Committee with members of different theological emphases and educational expertise whose members had agreed a text the LAC had answered the request of the House of Bishops in their letter of 20th April 1985. The secretary was asked to write to the secretary of the House of Bishops to this effect...

[4] JGS 1987, Report of the Standing Committee, p.94. It is not clear what canonical authority the House of Bishops had for putting forth the existing Revised Catechism without proceeding by means of resolution and bill as implied by the experimental use of it under Chapter 1 of the Church Constitution 26(3). Presumably this was felt to be a lawful extension of the *jus liturgicum* traditionally deemed to be inherent in the office of a bishop (and mentioned so far as prayers and hymns are concerned in Chapter Nine of the Church Constitution, 6[c]). No reason was given for their action, which may, however, not have been unconnected with strong dissatisfaction with the draft text and the prospect of divisive debates at the General Synod. The writer had written to the Bishops of Cashel and Ossory and of Tuam protesting against what appeared to be a watering down of the Church's sacramental teaching as contained in the original "Revised Catechism" (In a letter dated 17th June 1986). A critique of the Committee's proposals appears below in *Appendix ???*

[5] Journal of the General Synod (JGS) 1989, p85.

[6] Having been declared to be not "contrary to, nor indicative of any departure from" that faith under the experimental services legislation (see [2] above), and having been widely accepted and used in the Church especially since the appearance of the Sunday School course "Growing Together" (see [5] above). The republishing by the Board of Education of the General Synod extends the use of the Revised Catechism indefinitely. The author of this study has unofficially produced a version making the language more inclusive and bringing the baptismal teaching into line with that in Christian Initiation Two in the 2004 Book of Common Prayer.

[7] W.Gilbert Wilson, *The Faith of an Anglican - A Companion to the Revised Catechism* with a Foreword by the Most Revd Dr. G.O. Simms, Archbishop of Armagh, Collins, Fount Paperbacks, in association with APCK, 1980.

[8] Anglicans of the Tractarian tradition took the "generally necessary to salvation" quite literally. See V. Staley, *The Catholic Religion - A Manual of Instruction for Members of the Anglican Communion*, Mowbrays, originally published in 1893, twenty-ninth edition, completing 272,000, 1961, p.258, "On (our Lord's) authority, the Church has ever held them (the sacraments) to be 'generally necessary to salvation' i.e. for all men in general, without exception, where they can possibly be had. On the plain testimony of our Lord, no one can hope for salvation who willfully neglects to use the divinely appointed means of receiving it." It is not entirely clear where the "plain testimony" is to be found - John 3:5? John 6:53? However, there does seem to be some hope for the heathen.

For a very different and more recent approach by a very different kind of Anglican Catholic, there is the comment of Dr. J. Macquarrie in his *Principles of Christian Theology*, SCM, Revised Edition, 1977, p.465. With reference to baptism he says,

Let us remember again that while the sacramental structure is essential to the Church, as a community that exists in the world and has an embodied being, the operation of the Spirit is never tied to the structure. It is possible on the one hand for the sacrament of baptism to be given, and yet for its normal course of unfolding to be frustrated and not brought to maturity; and it is possible on the other hand for the Spirit to move in those who have not received the sacrament but who are nevertheless brought within the community of the Spirit.

[9] Commenting on Article 25, Gibson, op. cit. pp603,604 stated,

It cannot be said that the account given in this paragraph of the five rites is quite exact. It is said that they are (1) *such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the apostles*, i.e. from a bad imitation of them, a *prava apostolorum imitatione*. This would well apply ... to Extreme Unction, and perhaps also is intended to refer to Penance in its medieval form, in view of the superstitions connected with it. (2) They are *partly states of life allowed in the Scriptures*. "Allowed", it must be remembered, meant a good deal more in the sixteenth century than it does now. It did not stand for "permitted", but was equivalent to "approved of" (Latin, *probat*). Thus "states of life allowed in the Scriptures" involves no lack of appreciation of the rites so described. The phrase may be taken to refer to Matrimony and Holy Orders, both of which can be spoken of as "states of life". But it cannot include Confirmation, which is not a "state of life" at all. Nor does it seem probable that this apostolic ordinance, which the Church of England has always maintained and insisted upon, can be included under the first head [He discounts the view of Mason that Confirmation is intended to be described as having grown out of "the corrupt following of the apostles", since "in the official language of the time, Confirmation meant distinctly the rite of unction, after a certain form, with a chrism elaborately compounded.] It remains, then, that the description is somewhat carelessly drawn, and that one of the five rites is not really included in it.

[10] This reflects much recent liturgical scholarship. The concept of a liturgical *act* in obedience to the Lord's command was taken seriously in the language used in the Rite A Eucharistic Prayers in the Church of England's *Alternative Service Book 1980*. The explanation entitled, *The Alternative Service Book 1980 - A Commentary by the Liturgical Commission*, CIO Publishing, 1980, says under the heading of "The Anamnesis", p.86,

Because the next paragraph -the anamnesis - is the response by which the president verbalizes how we, with *this* bread and *this* cup, obey the command 'Do this', the writing of new texts, and the revising of old ones, has in recent decades been the subject of the minutest scrutiny in which various understandings of what we 'do' in the eucharist have been in encounter with each other. In the process considerable progress in mutual understanding has been made. Thus, whereas at the beginning of the period of revision and experiment it appeared difficult to agree upon one eucharistic prayer, the present rite has four, each of them at this point expressing what we 'do' in different ways, but each of them agreed in the General Synod by the various shades of theological understanding in the Church of England. The

anamnesis has a subordinate clause or phrase, which declares that what we 'do' we do in remembrance of Christ and of his saving work, and then a main clause which describes what we 'do'. These may be set out thus:

Prayer 1: "We celebrate ...his one perfect sacrifice."

Prayer 2: "We make ...the memorial of Christ your Son our Lord." Prayer 3: "We celebrate this memorial of our redemption."

Prayer 4: "We offer you through him this sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving."

In the first three prayers there is specific reference to 'this bread and this cup'... and this gives a very specific and particular reference to our response to our Lord's general command to his Church, which the people of God are to obey down the centuries until he comes again.

The *anamneses* in the eucharistic prayers in the Church of Ireland's *Alternative Prayer Book* (1984) also reflected a concept of a liturgical act of remembrance, and those to be found in Holy Communion Two in the Book of Common Prayer (2004), show a similar understanding the "remembrance",

Eucharistic Prayer One (BCP p210): "Therefore, Father, with this bread and this cup we do as Christ your Son commanded: **we remember his passion and death, we celebrate his resurrection and ascension, and we look for the coming of his kingdom.**" The corporate dimension is emphasized by the explanatory language being said by all.

Eucharistic Prayer Two (BCP p.215): "Father, with this bread and this cup, we do as our Saviour has commanded; **we celebrate the redemption he has won for us; we proclaim his perfect sacrifice made once for all upon the cross, his mighty resurrection and glorious ascension; and we look for his coming to fulfil all things according to your will.**"

Eucharistic Prayer Three (BCP p.217) does not have an anamnesis as such. However, the interactive nature of the prayer indicates that those concerned are engaged in a corporate liturgical act, and the plural form "we" is significant in this context. The doxology includes the words, "Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, Blessed Trinity: with your whole Church throughout the world we offer you this sacrifice of thanks and praise and lift our voice to join the song of heaven..." In semitic thinking a "sacrifice of thanks and praise" could mean one consisting of thanks and praise or one motivated by thanks and praise or a combination of both meanings.

The Church of England's *Alternative Service Book, 1980*, was superseded by *Common Worship* from 2000 onwards. There are eight Eucharistic Prayers in the Order One Holy Communion labelled A to H as well as an Order One form in Traditional language. Although the *Companion to Common Worship, Vol 1, SPCK 2001*, Alcuin Club Collections 78, edited by Paul Bradshaw does not contain the paragraph from the ASB Commentary given above, it is clear that a similar breadth of understanding is reflected in the *Common Worship Liturgies*.

Prayer A "Therefore, heavenly Father, we remember his offering of himself made one for all upon the cross; we proclaim his mighty resurrection and glorious ascension; we look for the coming of your kingdom, and with this bread and this cup we make the memorial of Christ your Son our Lord."

It is a little bit difficult in this prayer to discern the relationship between the subjective and the objective and whether it speaks of one kind of memory or two. However the concluding words indicate a memorial act.

Prayer B “And so Father, calling to mind his death on the cross, his perfect sacrifice made once for the sins of the whole world; rejoicing in his mighty resurrection and glorious ascension, and looking for his coming in glory, we celebrate this memorial of our redemption. As we offer you this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, we bring before you this bread and this cup and we thank you for counting us worthy to stand in your presence and serve you”

To “bring” the bread and cup would seem to indicate a sacrificial understanding of the eucharist although the word “offer” is avoided, and to “stand” in God’s presence and serve him also would seem to indicate a significant emphasis on the Godward aspect of the rite.

Prayer C “Therefore, Lord and heavenly Father, in remembrance of the precious death and passion the mighty resurrection and glorious ascension of your dear Son Jesus Christ, we offer you through him this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.”

It is noteworthy that there is no explicit mention of the bread and the cup and the wording suggests a rather attenuated concept of what is offered, which seems to be a sacrifice *consisting of* praise and thanksgiving rather than one *whose motive is* praise and thanksgiving. But it is hard to tell. However, the next paragraph includes the words, “Although we are unworthy, through our manifold sins, to offer you any sacrifice, yet we pray that you will accept this the duty and service that we owed. It is not specified precisely what this “duty and service” consists of, but it is clear that there is a Godward orientation implied.

Prayer D “Therefore Father, with this bread and this cup we celebrate the cross on which he died to set us free. Defying death he rose again and is alive with you to plead for us and all the world.”

The word “plead”, it is pointed out in the *Companion* has been used across the spectrum of belief, by Evangelicals and Calvinists as well as by the Archbishops in their 1897 response to Pope Leo XIII’s Bull against Anglican Orders. It is found here (not mentioned in the *Companion*) and also in Prayers G and F.

Prayer E “So, Father, we remember all that Jesus did, in him we plead with confidence his sacrifice made once for all upon the cross. Bringing before you the bread of life and cup of salvation, we proclaim his death and resurrection until he comes in glory”.

There is a significant correlation between the “pleading” and the “proclaiming” and the “bringing”, the latter apparently a euphemism for “offering”, and there is something a little open to question in the church’s apparent unwillingness to do everything to the bread and wine of the eucharist except to “offer” it in spite of the long history of the offering of the elements, attested, for example in the (possibly) third century, *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus. However, the use of the word in this context still seems to give rise to fears and hesitations.

Prayer F “Therefore we proclaim the death that he suffered on the cross, we celebrate his resurrection, his bursting from the tomb, we rejoice that he reigns at your right hand on

high and we long for his coming in glory.”

“As we recall the one, perfect sacrifice of our redemption, Father, by your Holy Spirit let these gifts of your creation be to us the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ; form us into the likeness of Christ and make us a perfect offering in your sight.”

The word “recall” in the Church of Ireland’s “Holy Communion 1972” gave rise to anxieties about the sacrifice being repeated in spite of the explicit affirmation in that rite of the uniqueness and finality of what the Lord accomplished once for all on Calvary’s cross and “remember” was substituted and passed into the anamnesis in the *Alternative Prayer Book*’s first eucharistic prayer and that in *The Book of Common Prayer 2004*. Here the element of self-offering which is an integral part of the New Testament doctrine of sacrifice is incorporated into the eucharistic prayer itself instead of following the fashion of hiving it off to the post-communion.

Prayer G “Father, we plead with confidence his sacrifice made once for all upon the cross: we remember his dying and rising in glory, and we rejoice that he intercedes for us at your right hand.”

It is at this point that one begins to wonder whether it is really necessary to have eight modern language eucharistic prayers? There does not seem in the Church of Ireland to be any demand for more than the three in Holy Communion Two, that in the Ministry to those who are Sick, and the form for a celebration where a significant number of children is present.

Prayer H “As we proclaim his death and celebrate his rising in glory send your Holy Spirit that this bread and this wine may be to us the body and blood of your dear Son.

As noted in the *Companion* the anamnesis and epiclesis seem to have been combined here, and there is no distinct indication that this is to be understood as the church’s interpretation of the command to “do this in remembrance of me”. A draft of this prayer was the starting point for what became the interactive Eucharistic Prayer Three in the Prayer Book of 2004, which transformed what might be regarded as a mediocre offering out of all recognition and in a theologically bold move directly addressed the Three Persons of the Holy Trinity in turn and then the Trinity itself.

[11] For the eschatological dimension of the Eucharist see, G. Wainwright, *Eucharist and Eschatology*, Epworth, 1971.

[12] The word "Eucharist" is found in the Latin version of *Article 25* as an equivalent of "Supper of the Lord", "Panis et vini transubstantiatio in *Eucharistia*..."

[13] "Bread". Dr. Wilson in *The Faith of an Anglican* op. cit. p.349 cites the rubric that has existed in the Prayer Book Holy Communion service since 1552 directing that "the Bread shall be such as is usual to be eaten; but the best and purest Wheat Bread that conveniently may be gotten" (BCP 1926/1983 p.155), and argues,

Justification for the rubric may be found in the fact that in all the New Testament accounts of the institution of the sacrament the Greek word *artos* is used, which indicates the use of ordinary leavened bread: elsewhere in the New Testament *azumos* is used to denote leavened bread.

However, if the Last Supper were the Passover, as the Synoptic Gospels (Mt 26:17//Mark 14:12//Luke 22:7) represent, then the bread used at it *must have been unleavened*. Only if

one follows the (apparent) Johannine view that the Supper took place on the previous night (John 13:1) can one support the view that the bread used was not unleavened bread. The use of the word *artos* rather than *azumos* does not establish anything. J. Jeremias has shown in his "The Eucharistic Words of Jesus", op. cit. pp62-66 that the unleavened bread was frequently referred to as *lech artos*. For example, the shewbread, which was unleavened, was always called *lechem/artos*. The unleavened Passover bread, the *massah* was called *lech artos* (the ordinary name for "bread" in Hebrew/Greek) in Deut. 16:3 *lechem'oni* , "bread of affliction", and by Philo and Josephus. Also, as Jeremias points out, in Luke 24:30,35 *artos* must mean unleavened bread: the Emmaus incident took place during Passover week.

It is likely that the use of ordinary bread was normal from the earliest days of the Church, since unleavened bread would not have been readily available except during the Passover season, and then only in congregations with a Jewish-Christian component. But, if one accepts the Synoptic dating of the Last Supper there is precedent for the use of unleavened bread at the Eucharist - in the example and use of the Lord Himself. Historically, Eastern Orthodox Christians have used leavened bread; while the custom in the West up to the Reformation was to use leavened, after which there was a divergence of tradition between Protestants and Roman Catholics.

Wafer bread (which is unleavened) was forbidden in the Church of Ireland by the draconian legislation of the 1870s. Prior to the revision of the Canons in 1974, Canon 37 said, "In the administration of the Lord's Supper, the elevation of the paten or cup beyond what is necessary for taking the same into the hands of the officiating minister, the use of wine mixed with water, or of *wafer bread*, and all acts, words, ornaments, and ceremonies other than those that are prescribed by the Order in the Book of Common Prayer, are hereby declared to be unlawful, and are prohibited..."

In 1974, following an involved discussion at the General Synod, the following canon was passed (13:5),

The bread to be used in the service shall be such as is usually eaten, of the best quality that can conveniently be procured; and the use of wafer bread is prohibited except in cases of illness where it may be desirable to administer the Holy Communion by means of intinction, subject to any conditions which the ordinary may prescribe.

This at least concedes that the use of unleavened bread is not necessarily mistaken in principle. It is also noteworthy that the specification of wheaten bread does not occur in the Book of Common Prayer 2004. It appears that originally barley bread may have been used. (L.M. Bermejo, *Body Broken and Blood Shed - the Eucharist of the Risen Christ*, Gujarat Sahitya Prakash, India, 1986, p.316). In the General Directions on p.77 of the Prayer Book under the heading 14e it says simply, "The bread to be used shall be the best and purest bread that can be obtained..."

[14] "Wine". The fermented juice of the grape. Non-alcoholic wine was permitted under certain circumstances by Durandus in his *Rationale* (cf entry "Wine" in the *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, op. cit., p.1492). *The Code of Canon Law of the Roman Catholic Church, in English Translation*, Collins 1983, Can. 924:3 says only, "The wine must be natural, made from grapes of the vine and not corrupt." A discussion as to whether bread and wine are absolutely necessary under all circumstances may be found in L.M. Bermejo, *Body Broken and Blood Shed* op. cit. pp314-320.

[15] A draft entitled *A New Revised Catechism* was drawn up by a Working Party of the Board of Education of the General Synod of the Church of England at the request of the House of Bishops; and was published for consideration and discussion in July 1990 (Church House Publishing). In response to the question, "What is the outward and visible sign in Holy Communion" the answer given is,

Bread and wine, taken for God to use; bread and wine, over which thanks are given to God; bread broken and wine poured out; bread and wine received in remembrance before God of Christ and his saving death.

[16] A classic Anglican statement is that by Jeremy Taylor (1613-1667) who in his "The Real Presence and Spiritual of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament proved against the Doctrine of Transubstantiation", quoted in H.R. McAdoo, *The Eucharistic Theology of Jeremy Taylor Today*, The Canterbury Press, Norwich, 1988, as follows,

The doctrine of the Church of England and generally of the Protestants, in this article, is - that after the minister of the holy mysteries hath rightly prayed, and blessed or consecrated the bread and wine, the symbols become changed into the body and blood of Christ, after a sacramental, that is, in a spiritual real manner: so that all that worthily communicate, do by faith receive Christ really, effectually, to all the purposes of his passion ...the result of which doctrine is this: *It is bread, and it is Christ's body. It is bread in substance, Christ in the sacrament*; and Christ is really given to all that are truly disposed, as the symbols are; *each as they can; Christ as Christ can be given; the bread and wine as they can* ... It is here, as in the other sacrament ...there and here too, *the first substance is changed by grace, but remains the same in nature.*

[17] For a discussion of John 6, see J. Marsh, *St John*, Pelican NT Commentary, Penguin Books, 1968; R. Brown, *The Gospel According to St. John* Vol 1 in the Anchor Bible series, Chapman, 1975, pp232-304; R.H. Lightfoot, *St. John's Gospel*, OUP, Oxford Paperbacks, 1960, ppl51-171.

[18] This seems congruous with the teaching of John Overall, Bishop of Norwich (1560-1619), to whom the questions and answers in the Prayer Book Catechism relating to the sacraments are attributed, who said in his *Praelectiones*, as quoted in H.R. McAdoo, *The Eucharistic Theology of Jeremy Taylor Today*, op.cit., p.142,

In the sacrament of the Eucharist or the Lord's Supper the body and blood of Christ, and therefore *the whole Christ*, are indeed really present, and are really received by us, and are really united to the sacramental signs, as signs which *not only signify but also convey*, so that in the right use of the Sacrament, and to those who receive worthily, when the bread is given and received, the body of Christ is given and received; and when the wine is given and received, the blood of Christ is given and received; and therefore the whole Christ is communicated in the Communion of the Sacrament...

[19] For a useful exposition of this section see W.G.Wilson, *The Faith of an Anglican*, op. cit., pp357-359.

CHAPTER TWO: CHURCH FORMULARIES. PART SIX - EUCHARISTIC DOCTRINE IN THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER: HOLY COMMUNION ONE

According to the Preamble and Declaration prefixed to the Church Constitution, the Book of Common Prayer is an integral part of the faith and order of the Church of Ireland.¹ In its 1662 form it was "received and approved" by the General Convention of 1870, and a commitment was made to "continue to use the same, subject to such alterations only as may be made therein from time to time by the lawful authority of the Church".² Canon Four entitled "The Book of Common Prayer" deals specifically with its use,³

All ministers shall use and observe the orders, rites and ceremonies prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer as well in reading the holy scriptures and saying of prayers as in administration of the sacraments without either diminishing or adding anything in the matter or form thereof, save as hereinafter provided.

The special position of the Book of Common Prayer is reinforced by Canon Five, entitled, "The prescribed form of Divine Service to be used in Churches", although this also provides for "such services as may be otherwise prescribed or authorised", and for "additional" and "special" services,⁴

The services contained in the Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, or such services as may be otherwise prescribed or authorised, and no other, shall be used in churches; provided that there may be used in any cathedral or church

- (a) at any hour on any Sunday or weekday an additional form of service, provided that such form of service and the mode in which it is used is for the time being approved by the ordinary, and
- (b) upon any special occasion approved by the ordinary, neither such additional form of service nor special form of service shall be in substitution for any of the services so prescribed."

In the legislation for an experimental use of services prior to their being brought before the General Synod for permanent authorisation, there is a requirement that any such service "shall be certified by the House of Bishops as being in its opinion neither contrary to, nor indicative of any departure from, the doctrine of the Church of Ireland."⁵

Taking these constitutional provisions together it is clear that the Book of Common Prayer is liturgically normative, and the doctrine contained, expressed, or implied by it is that of the Church of Ireland.⁶ The Prayer Book of 2004 incorporates within it both traditional rites derived from previous editions, especially that of 1926 with its additions and modifications up to 1990 and modern rites, derived from the Alternative Prayer Book (1984) and Alternative Occasional Services (1993). This present section deals with the traditional rite of Holy Communion as it is to be found in the current Prayer Book under the heading, "Holy Communion One" In this, and in the following section, dealing with the modern rites under the heading "Holy Communion Two" the theological analysis makes use of the following categories: Presence, Memorial, Communion and Fellowship, Proclamation, Thanksgiving, Sacrifice and Eschatology. It is assumed that although the traditional rite is essentially that of Thomas Cranmer, as amended in 1559, 1604 and 1662 by the Church of England, and in 1878, 1926 and 2004 by the Church of Ireland, the Church is not, and never has been tied to his personal opinions.⁷ It is, however, helpful, in

any discussion of the rationale of this order of service, to be aware of what these were as, quite clearly, they informed the format of the service and the theological language used.⁸

(1) **Presence** The real presence of the risen, ascended, and glorified Christ is presupposed in the entire rite. Prayer (such as that in the Collect for Purity at the beginning of the service) is offered "through Christ our Lord". The Summary of the Law is introduced with the words "Hear what our Lord Jesus Christ *saieth*" the present tense indicating that the Lord is assumed by this means to be speaking in the hear-and-now to the worshippers.⁹ The response, "Lord, have mercy upon us..." is probably to be understood as addressed to the Second Person of the Blessed Trinity.¹⁰ The mediation of Christ is invoked in most of the Prayer Book Collects of the Day, and in some of them (for example the Fourth Sunday before Lent) it is explicitly asserted that he "liveth and reigneth with (the Father) and the Holy Ghost, ever one God, world without end."¹¹

Although most of the collects follow the classic principle of prayer *to* God the Father, *through* God the Son, *in* God the Holy Spirit, several (for example that of the Third Sunday in Advent and the Post-Communion for the Eighteenth Sunday after Trinity) are addressed directly to the Son.¹² Before and after the reading of the Gospel, the Real Presence of Christ in his written Word is acknowledged in the words that are said or sung, "Glory be to thee, O Lord" and "Thanks be to, thee, O Lord".¹³ At the end of the Prayer for the Church Militant the Lord Jesus is described as "our only Mediator and Advocate".¹⁴ That the Lord, who is present communicates himself to his people not only in the Word but also in the Supper is implied in the first of the three Long Exhortations, where it is said that the heavenly Father "hath given his Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, not only to die for us, but also *to be our spiritual food and sustenance in that holy Sacrament*".¹⁵ The Comfortable Words, like the Summary of the Law, are assumed to be words of Christ addressed by Him to the congregation by this means.¹⁶ What Christ now eternally *is* is affirmed in various ways in the Proper Prefaces, for example that of Easter, where it says, "For he is the very Paschal Lamb, which was offered for us, and hath taken away the sin of the world; who by his death hath destroyed death, and by his rising to life again hath restored to us everlasting life."¹⁷ The purpose of communicating, according to the Prayer of Humble Access is so that "we may evermore dwell in him, and he in us."¹⁸ And in the Prayer of Consecration the petition is made "that we receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine, according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood",¹⁹ which suggests further a relationship of the most intimate kind with One who is deemed to be *really present*. The first half of the Words of Administration seem to make the same point: "The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which *was given* for thee (past tense) *preserve* (present tense) thy body and soul unto everlasting life";²⁰ "The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life".²¹ The mediatorial role of Christ is again asserted in doxologies at the close of both post-communion prayers.²² Then, the second part of the Gloria in Excelsis, that great outburst of praise at the conclusion of the rite before the blessing, is addressed directly to the Lord Jesus, who is the only-begotten Son, the Lamb of God, and the Son of the Father, the One who "taketh away the sins of the world", and who "sittest at the right hand of God the Father".²³ And the doxology is also concerned to affirm the eternal presence of the risen and ascended one: "For thou only art holy, thou only art the Lord; thou only, O Christ, with the Holy Ghost, art most high in the glory of God the Father. Amen."²⁴

That the nature of the Eucharistic presence, in spite of catechetical and other definitions, is in a sense beyond our comprehension is, perhaps, indicated in the reiterated use of the word "mysteries". In the Third Exhortation it is said of the Lord Jesus Christ that "he hath instituted and ordained holy mysteries, as pledges of his love, and for a continual remembrance his death...";²⁵ and in the second post-communion prayer the worshippers are referred to as those "who have duly received these holy mysteries".²⁶

With regard to the sacramental devotion that might be supposed to be a natural accompaniment of a recognition of the Lord's Presence in the Eucharist, the rubrics hedge this around with restrictions and prohibitions. The Declaration on Kneeling (traditionally known as the "Black" Rubric) deriving in its original form from Cranmer's Second Prayer Book of 1552 warns lest "the same kneeling should by any persons...be misconstrued and depraved; it is here declared, that thereby no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread or wine there bodily received, or unto any corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood. For the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored; (for that were idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians;) and the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one."²⁷ True sacramental devotion, however, is addressed to the person of Christ whose "body" and "blood" are effectually represented, after consecration by the bread and wine. Any reverence paid to the outward and visible signs is for the sake of that which is inwardly and spiritually present. The bread and wine are revered, not for what they are in themselves, but as the *sacramental* body and blood of Jesus, which is what they become by virtue of the significance they acquire in the context of the celebration of the Eucharist.²⁸ Failure to grasp this point may be seen in the Preface to the 1878 edition of the Prayer Book, where the "Black" rubric is referred to and where it says,²⁹

As for the error of those who have taught that Christ has given Himself or His Body and Blood in this Sacrament, to be reserved, lifted up, carried about, or worshipped, under the veils of Bread and Wine, we have already in the Canons prohibited such acts and gestures as might be grounded on it, or lead thereto; and it is sufficiently implied in, the Note at the end of the Communion Office (and we now declare afresh) that the posture of kneeling prescribed to all communicants is not appointed for any purpose of such adoration; but only for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgement of the benefits of Christ, which are in the Lord's Supper given to all worthy receivers, and for the avoiding of such profanation and disorder as might ensue if sane such reverent and uniform posture were not enjoined.

(2) **Memorial** In the limited sense of remembrance of benefits this is a key concept in the Prayer Book liturgy. In the first of the three Long Exhortations "warning" for the celebration of the Holy Communion, begins in these terms,³⁰

Dearly beloved, on day next I purpose, through God's assistance, to administer to all such as shall be religiously and devoutly disposed the most comfortable Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, *to be by them received in remembrance of his meritorious Cross and Passion*; whereby alone we obtain remission of our sins, and are made partakers of the kingdom of heaven.

And in the second Exhortation, it says,³¹

"And as the Son of God did vouchsafe to yield up his soul by death upon the Cross for your salvation; so it is your duty to receive the Communion in remembrance of the sacrifice of his death, as he himself hath commanded..."

While in the third Exhortation, it also says,³²

And to the end that we should always remember the exceeding great love of our Master, and only Saviour, Jesus Christ, thus dying for us, and the innumerable benefits which by his precious blood-shedding he hath obtained to us; he hath instituted and ordained holy mysteries, as pledges of his love, and for a continual remembrance of his death, to our great and endless comfort.

A similar concept is found at the heart of the liturgy in the Prayer of Consecration, which affirms that (Christ) "did institute, and in his holy Gospel command us to continue, *a perpetual memory of that his previous death*, until his coming again."³³ It would appear to have been Cranmer's view that this memorial was, performed by eating and drinking in remembrance of Christ, since the dominical command to do this, which comes at the end of the Prayer of Consecration is followed immediately by the act of communion. The second part of each of the Words of Administration (in Cranmer's Second Prayer Book the *only* Words of Administration) appear to express this view,³⁴

Take and eat this *in remembrance that Christ died for thee*, and feed on him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving.

Drink this *in remembrance that Christ's blood was shed for thee*, and be thankful.

This understanding of the Eucharistic action is expressed more explicitly in the part of the Prayer of Consecration immediately preceding the Words of Institution,³⁵

Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee; and grant that we receiving these thy creatures of bread, and wine, according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, *in remembrance of his death and passion*, may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood.

(3) ***Communion and Fellowship***. By "Communion and Fellowship" is meant here the mutuality of relationships among those who partake of the Lord's Supper which is "in Christ". That coming to Communion is not to be thought of merely in individualistic terms is indicated throughout the Eucharistic celebration by the use of the word "we". There are no prayers in the first person singular in the Prayer Book rite, although the Nicene Creed begins "I believe..." and certain parts of the service (notably the Commandments and the Words of Administration) are addressed to the individual believer. The Collect for Purity which comes at the beginning of the celebration asks the Lord to "Cleanse the thoughts of *our* hearts by the inspiration of thy Holy Spirit, that *we* may perfectly love thee, and worthily magnify thy holy Name..."³⁶ The response to the Summary of the Law is "Lord, have mercy upon *us*, and write these thy laws in *our* hearts, *we* beseech thee"³⁷ In the Confession "*We* acknowledge and bewail *our* manifold sins and wickedness, which *we*, from time to time, most grievously have committed..."³⁸ The plural form is used in the response to the Sursum Corda and in all the Proper Prefaces, and also in the Prayer of Humble Access, where it says, "*We* do not presume to come to this thy Table, O merciful Lord, trusting in *our* own righteousness..."³⁹ The same corporate approach is to be found in the Prayer of Consecration itself, in the Lord's Prayer

("Our Father") and in the two post-Communion Prayers.⁴⁰

That this corporate fellowship is a fellowship "in Christ" is indicated in a number of ways. The petition for Communion in the Prayer of Consecration asks that "we receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine...*may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood*".⁴¹

The second post-Communion gives thanks "thou dost vouchsafe to feed us...with the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood of thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ...and that we are very members incorporate in the mystical body of thy Son, which is the blessed company of all faithful people..." In the final paragraph the prayer is "that we may continue in that holy fellowship...through Jesus Christ our Lord".⁴²

The special character of the Holy Communion as a celebration is indicated by the use of the word "Feast" in the first of the Long Exhortations.⁴³

(4) **Proclamation** A restoration of a preaching ministry was one of the essential aims of the Anglican Reformation;⁴⁴ and the significance of the proclamation of the Word as an integral part of the administration of the Lord's Supper is underlined by the heading, following the Nicene Creed, "The Sermon".⁴⁵ No such rubric is to be found in Morning and Evening Prayer One although there is a general obligation under Canon 7, headed "The duty of preaching", as follows,⁴⁶

Every incumbent shall provide that one sermon at least be preached on every Sunday in every church, or other building licensed for the purpose, in which Divine Service is performed within his cure, unless he be excused therefrom by the ordinary. The preacher shall endeavour with care and sincerity to minister the word of truth according to holy scripture and agreeable to the Articles of Religion and the Book of Common Prayer, to the glory of God and the edification of the People.

Within the Eucharistic canon the five Proper Prefaces may be considered to constitute "proclamation" of what God has accomplished for us in and through Christ and His Holy Spirit.⁴⁷

Although the Words of Institution are set within the context of the *Prayer of Consecration* they do constitute a declaration of what Christ did at the Last Supper, and so are, in a sense a "proclamation" of the significance of the liturgical act. And further, the initial paragraph of the Prayer, although addressed to God the Father, expresses clearly the nature of the once-for-all sacrifice made by His Son Jesus Christ upon the Cross, and so fulfils in words (as the act of Communion fulfils sacramentally) the Pauline dictum, "as often as you eat (this) bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes" (1 Cor 11:26).⁴⁸

(5) **Thanksgiving** The note of thanksgiving is muted in the Book of Common Prayer Liturgy (there is, for example, nothing within the Prayer of Consecration to indicate that in itself it is a *Eucharistic* Prayer) but it is far from wholly absent. In the first of the Long Exhortations it is said⁴⁹

Wherefore it is our duty *to render most humble and hearty thanks* to Almighty God our heavenly Father, for that he hath given his Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, not only to die for us, but also to be our spiritual food and Sustenance in that holy Sacrament.

And in the Third Exhortation we read,⁵⁰

And above all things, *ye must give most humble and hearty thanks* to God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, for the redemption of the world by the death and passion of our Saviour Christ, both God and man...To him therefore, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, let us give (as we are bounden) continual thanks; submitting ourselves wholly to his holy will and pleasure, and studying to serve him in true holiness and righteousness all the days of our life.

To him therefore, with the Father and the Holy Spirit, let us give (as we are most bounden) continual thanks; submitting ourselves wholly to his holy will and pleasure, and studying to serve him in true holiness and righteousness all the days of our life. Amen.

Although the Prayer of Consecration (as noted above) is not explicitly eucharistic, the note of thanksgiving is sounded at the beginning of the canon by the words (following the *Sursum Corda*) "Let us give thanks unto our Lord God" with the reply, "It is meet and right so to do". And the general concept of thanksgiving is taken up by the priest as he says,⁵¹

It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty, that we should at all times, and in all places, give thanks unto thee, O Lord, Holy Father, Almighty Everlasting God.

The Proper Prefaces (for Christmas, Easter, Ascension, Whitsunday and Trinity) may be considered as particular thanksgivings on theologically significant occasions.⁵²

The Words of Institution contain a reference to the Lord's having "given thanks" over the Bread and Wine at the Last Supper.⁵³

Thanksgiving is also deemed the proper response to reception of the eucharistic gift, as may be seen in the second half of each of the Words of Administration, where the communicants are bidden to receive the Bread "by faith *with thanksgiving*" and to "*be thankful*" when they partake the Cup.⁵⁴

Both of the post-communion prayers express thanksgiving, the first in general terms, the second, specifically for the ongoing feeding on Christ through what has just been received,⁵⁵

O Lord and heavenly Father, we thy humble servants entirely desire thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.

Almighty and everliving God, we most heartily thank thee, for that thou dost vouchsafe to feed us who have duly received these holy mysteries, with the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood of thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ...

Thanksgiving is also incorporated into the great outburst of praise with which the Gloria in Excelsis (before the blessing) begins,⁵⁶

We praise thee, we bless thee, we worship thee, we glorify thee, we give thanks to thee for thy great glory...

(6) *Sacrifice* Although the concept of offering is minimized in the Book of Common Prayer rite, it is far from being entirely absent. It is, however, probably true to say that the basic underlying concept is not so much that which is offered to God in the eucharistic celebration but that which is (as the result of the Lord's once-for-all sacrifice on Calvary)

ministered to the communicants⁵⁷

A sacrificial concept is to be found in the title "The Offertory", where the emphasis in the interpretative sentences is mainly upon the significance of the collection (the "alms for the poor").⁵⁸ Bread and wine are, however, placed upon the Table at this point (after the priest has presented the collection).⁵⁹ In the Prayer for the Church Militant, which follows, the Lord is asked "to accept our alms and oblations, and to receive these our prayers, which we offer unto thy Divine Majesty".⁶⁰ The reference to "alms and oblations" is in brackets which would suggest that they refer to the twofold ingredients of the collection, although there is a school of thought which takes "oblations" as a reference to the elements rather than the money.⁶¹

The thought of the Lord Jesus Christ as the one who has been given up as a sacrificial offering is implied in two of the four "Comfortable Words", namely John 3:16 "So God loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son, to the end that all that believe in him should not perish, but have everlasting life", and 1 John 2:1,2 where it says, "If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: and he is the propitiation for our sins."⁶¹ This concept is then emphatically reiterated at the beginning of the Prayer of Consecration, where it says,⁶²

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, who of thy tender mercy didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the Cross for our redemption; who made there (by his one oblation of himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world...

This is congruous with the reference in the First of the Long Exhortations where it speaks of people receiving the Sacrament, "in remembrance of *his meritorious Cross and Passion; whereby alone we obtain remission of our sins, and are made partakers of the kingdom heaven.*"⁶³

The manner in which the act of communion immediately follows the consecration may indicate that the fulfilment of the dominical command, "do this in remembrance, of me" with respect to the Bread, and "Do this, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of me" is thought to be fulfilled by the eating and drinking "in remembrance that Christ died for thee" and "in remembrance that Christ's blood was shed for thee", which follows. It appears that the concept is that of a sacrificial feast, the sacrifice itself having been offered once for all on the Cross of Calvary. This, however, has to be inferred, since there is no "anamnetic" paragraph in the Prayer of Consecration, only the petition that "we receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine, according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood".⁶⁴

In the first of the two post-communion prayers there is the thought of a twofold offering, "this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving", and that of "ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy and lively sacrifice unto thee". It is acknowledged that the worshippers are "unworthy" through their manifold sins, to "offer unto thee any sacrifice", but God is asked to "*accept this our bounden duty and service; not weighing our merits, but pardoning our, offences, through Jesus Christ our Lord.*"⁶⁵

The thought of Jesus as the Lamb of God by whose once-for-all sacrifice the sins of the world are taken away recurs in the middle section of the Gloria in Excelsis, whose presence at the end of the rite is a distinctive feature of the traditional Prayer Book

liturgy,⁶⁶

O Lord God, Lamb of God, Son of the Father, that takest away the sins the world, have mercy upon us. Thou that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us. Thou that takest away the sins of the world, receive our prayer...

A striking example of the manner in which the Holy Communion One liturgy may be interpreted in sacrificial terms is given in the authoritative document, *Saepius Officio - The Reply of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to the Letter Apostolicae Curae of Pope Leo XIII, 1897*. This was the official reply to the condemnation of Anglican Orders by the Pope on various grounds but especially on a supposed defect of intention to ordain priests in the sense in which the Roman Catholic Church understood priesthood as involving the grace and power of the Christian priesthood in the consecration and oblation of the Body and Blood of the Lord. With regard to the theology of the Anglican rite the archbishops said,⁶⁷

We truly teach the doctrine of Eucharistic sacrifice and do not believe it to be a "nude commemoration of the Sacrifice of the Cross"...But we think it sufficient in the Liturgy which we use in celebrating the holy Eucharist, - while lifting up our hearts to the Lord, and when now consecrating the gifts already offered that they may become to us the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, - to signify the sacrifice which is offered at that point of the service in such terms as these. We continue a perpetual memory of the precious death of Christ, who is our Advocate with the Father and the propitiation for our sins, according to his precept, until His coming again. For first we offer the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; then next we plead and represent before the Father the sacrifice of the cross, and by it we confidently entreat remission of sins and all other benefits of the Lord's Passion for all the whole Church; and lastly we offer the sacrifice of ourselves to the Creator of all things which we have already signified by the oblations of His creatures. This whole action, in which the people has necessarily to take its part with the Priest, we are accustomed to call the Eucharistic sacrifice.

(7) **Eschatology** The eschatological dimension is not prominent in the Prayer Book rite. However, in the Nicene Creed it is affirmed of the Lord Jesus Christ, that "he shall come again with glory to judge both the quick and the dead: whose kingdom shall have no end." And the Creed ends with the words, "And I look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen."⁶⁸ The Advent readings put across the concept of the Last Things; and this emphasis is also to be found in the Advent 1 Collect, which is used throughout the season, "that in the last day, when *he shall come again in his glorious majesty* to judge both the quick and the dead, we may rise to the life immortal, through him who liveth and reigneth with thee and the Holy Ghost, now and ever. Amen."⁶⁹ At the conclusion of the Prayer for the Church Militant, there is also a reference to the ultimate end, "And we also bless thy holy Name for all thy servants departed this life in thy faith and fear; beseeching thee to give us grace so to follow their good examples, that with them we may be partakers of thy heavenly kingdom..."⁷⁰

The concept of the "Return" of Christ (following 1 Cor 11:26) is also to be found in the Prayer of Consecration which refers to the Lord's action by which he "did institute, and in his holy Gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory of his precious death, *until his coming again*".⁷¹

The first parts of the Words of Administration refer to the ultimate goal of Christian living when they say,⁷²

The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee *preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life.*

The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee *preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life.*

In the second post-communion prayer there is a reference to the communicants being "heirs, through hope, of thy everlasting kingdom, by the merits of the most precious death and passion of thy dear Son."⁷³

Two of the collects printed at the end of the rite, which may be used before the blessing have an eschatological emphasis,⁷⁴

Assist us mercifully O Lord, in these our supplications and prayers, and dispose the way of thy servants towards the attainment of everlasting salvation...

Almighty God, with whom do live the spirits of them that depart hence in the Lord; We humbly beseech thee that it may please thee, of thy gracious goodness, *shortly to accomplish the number of thine elect, and to hasten thy kingdom;* that we, with all those that are departed in the true faith of thy holy Name, *may have our perfect consummation and bliss, both in body and soul, in thy eternal and everlasting glory;* through Jesus Christ our Lord.

NOTES ON CHAPTER TWO, PART SIX.

[1] BCP, 2004, p.777

The Church of Ireland doth receive and approve...The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to the use of the Church of Ireland; and the Form and Manner of Making, Ordaining and Consecrating of Bishops, Priests and Deacons, as approved and adopted by the synod holden in Dublin, A.D. 1662, and hitherto in use in this Church. And this Church will continue to use the same, subject to such alterations only as may be made therein from time to time by the lawful authority of the Church.

[2] Ibid.

[3] *Constitution of the Church of Ireland*, 2003: Chapter IX Part 1; Canon 4.

[4] Ibid. Canon 5 (1):(a), (b).

[5] Ibid. Chapter 1, 26:3 (a). For conditions of use see (b), (c), (d).

[6] The concept of the Book of Common Prayer as a standard of doctrine; and the importance of local variations being consistent with its spirit and, principles is to be found in successive Lambeth Conference Reports up to and including 1948. These are documented in *Prayer Book Revision in the Church of England - a Memorandum of the Church of England Liturgical Commission*, LC 1958/2, SPCK, London, 1958, Appendix 2 "Lambeth Conferences and the Book of Common Prayer" pp42-55. In 1958 the principle of revision of the Prayer Book was recognised with certain provisos. Resolution 74 stated,

The Conference, recognizing the work of Prayer Book Revision being done in different parts of the Anglican Communion,

(a) calls attention to those features in the Books of Common Prayer which are essential to the safeguarding of our unity: i.e. the use of the Canonical Scriptures and the Creeds, Holy Baptism, Confirmation, Holy Communion, and the Ordinal;

(b) notes that there are other features in these books which are effective in maintaining the traditional doctrinal emphasis and ecclesiastical culture of Anglicanism and therefore should be preserved;

(c) and urges that a chief aim of Prayer Book Revision should be to further that recovery of the worship of the Primitive Church which was the aim of the compilers of the first Prayer Books of the Church of England." See *The Lambeth Conference 1958 - The Encyclical Letter from the Bishops together with the Resolutions and Reports*, SPCK and Seabury Press 1958, p1.47, Resolution 74. See also the Report of the Prayer Book Sub-Committee, pp2:78-2:81.

That the Book of Common Prayer Eucharist could legitimately be modified by theologically significant revision was the view of the document *Principles of Prayer Book Revision*, prepared for the Lambeth Conference of 1958. Under the heading of "Deficiencies of 1662"* in relation to the Holy Communion, it was stated (p.37),

The most conspicuous defects, to which a comparison of the rites which have been or are still in use in other branches of the Church, and Biblical research concur in

pointing most emphatically, are three in number, namely:

(1) The absence from it of any formula for making a memorial before God of the saving events commemorated, which is a meaning once again widely attached to the Scripture usage of the Greek word *anamnesis* and is intimately connected with the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist.

(2) Its lack of fullness and balance in its presentation of the work of redemption by its concentration on the death of Christ alone without and reference to the resurrection, exaltation, and second coming:

(3) The meagreness, apart from the Preface and Sanctus, of the eucharistic element in a prayer which originally developed out of the thanksgiving uttered by our Lord at the Last Supper.'

**Principles of Prayer Book Revision - The Report of a Select Committee of the Church of India, Pakistan, Burma, and Ceylon* appointed by the Metropolitan to review the Principles of Prayer Book Revision in the Anglican Communion, LC 1958/3, SPCK, London, 1957.

[7] How little the Church of the Reformation era considered itself bound by Cranmer's teaching is shown in significant alterations in emphasis in the sacramental portions of the Articles between in 1563 (after his death). For example, in the Article "Of the Sacraments" (25), paragraph three originally read,

The Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about, but that we should rightly use them. And in such only, as worthily receive the same, they have an wholesome effect, and operation, and yet not that of the work wrought, as some men speak, which word, as it is strange, and unknown to holy Scripture: so it engendereth no Godly, but a very superstitious sense.

In 1563 this was changed to,

The Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about, but that we should duly use them. And in such only as worthily receive the same they have a wholesome effect or operation...

In the 1553 version of Article 28 "Of the Lord's Supper" the second last paragraph read,

Forasmuch as the truth of man's nature requireth, that the body of one, and the selfsame man cannot be at one time in diverse places, but must needs be in some one certain place: Therefore the body, of Christ cannot be present at one time in many and diverse places. And because (as holy Scripture doth teach) Christ was taken up into heaven, and there shall continue unto the end of the world, a faithful man ought not, either to believe, or openly to confess the real and bodily presence (as they term it) of Christ's flesh and blood in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper

In 1563 this was altered to,

The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith.

[8] See Cranmer's own writings on the Eucharist in his *Defence* of 1550, 1551. The full title was *A Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ with a Confutation of sundry errors concerning the same*

grounded and stablished upon God's Holy Word, and approved by the consent of the most ancient Doctors of the Church. A reprint of this entitled "Cranmer on the Lord's Supper" was produced by Focus Christian Ministries Trust and Harrison Trust in 1987. See also P. Brooks, *Thomas Cranmer's Doctrine of the Eucharist* (1965), and Hugh Bates "The Worthy Communicant", Chapter VII in *Thomas Cranmer, Essays in Commemoration of the 500th Anniversary of his Birth*, Ed., Margot Johnson, Durham Turnstone Ventures, 1990, P. Forster, "Some Reflections on the Theology of Thomas Cranmer", Chapter XV, *ibid.*; R.F. Buxton, *Eucharist and Institution Narrative - A Study in the Roman and Anglican traditions of the Consecration of the Eucharist from the Eighth to the Twentieth Centuries*, Alcuin Club Collects No. 58, Mayhew-McCrimmon, 1976, Chapter Three "Cranmer and the Edwardine Communion Rites"; C.C. Richardson, *Zwingli and Cranmer on the Eucharist*, Evanston, 1949, T.M. Parker, Review of C.W. Dugmore, "The Mass and the English Reformers", in the *Journal of Theological Studies*, 1961, NS XII, p.140. [9] BCP (2004) p.131.

[9] BCP (2004) p.202.

[10] *Ibid.* p.202.

[11] *Ibid.* p.255

[12] *Ibid.* pp158, Collects One and Two; p 294, Collect Two, which may, it seems, although the relevant rubrics are ambiguous, be used with Holy Communion One.

[13] *Ibid.* p.182.

[14] *Ibid.* p.184

[15] *Ibid.* p.182. This conforms to Cranmer's teaching in his *Defence op. cit.* p.19, where it says,

And for this consideration our Saviour Christ hath not only set forth these things most plainly in his holy word, that we may hear them with our ears; but he hath also ordained one visible sacrament of spiritual regeneration in water, and another visible sacrament of spiritual nourishment in bread and wine, to the intent that, as much as is possible for man, we may see Christ with our eyes, smell him at our nose, taste him with our mouths, grope him with our hands, and perceive him with all our senses. For as the word of God preached putteth Christ into our ears; so likewise these elements of water, bread, and wine, joined to God's word, do after a sacramental manner put Christ into our eyes, mouths, hands, and all our senses." Explaining this language, he says further (*op. cit.* p.25), "...this spiritual meat of Christ's body and blood, is not received in the mouth, and digested in the stomach, (as corporal meats and drinks commonly be) but it is received with a pure heart and a sincere faith. And the true eating and drinking of the said body and blood of Christ, is with a constant and lively faith to believe, that Christ, gave his body and shed his blood upon the cross for us, and that he doth so join and incorporate himself to us, that he is our head, and we his members, and flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bones, having him dwelling in us, and we in him. And herein standeth the whole effect and strength of this sacrament. And this faith God worketh inwardly, in our hearts by his Holy Spirit, and confirmeth the same outwardly to our ears by hearing of his word, and to our other senses by eating and drinking of the sacramental bread and wine in his holy Supper.

[16] *Ibid.* p.185 "Hear what comfortable words *our Saviour Christ* saith unto all that truly turn to him."

[17] *Ibid.* p.186. Cranmer in his *Defence* (*op. cit.* pp236,237) had this to say about the

once-for-all sacrifice of Christ,

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 one effusion of his blood to abolish sin unto the world's end. He was so perfect a Priest, that by one oblation 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 show 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 as pertained to him, he took all men's sins unto himself. So that now there remaineth no more sacrifices for sin, but extreme judgment at the last day, when he shall appear to us again, not as 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...

[18] Ibid. p.187

[19] Ibid. p.188.

[20] Ibid. p.188.

[21] Ibid. pp 188.

[22] Ibid. pp 189, 190

[23] Ibid. p.190

[24] Ibid. p.190.

[25] Ibid. p.200.

[26] Ibid. p.190.

[27] Ibid. p.196.

The "Black" Rubric was published with a preamble by royal authority, but without the sanction of the Act of Uniformity, as an addition to the Prayer Book of 1552, being found in most, though not all, extant copies, it was removed without comment, probably on the ground of its illegality from the printed Prayer Books of Elizabeth's reign from 1559 onwards. It was reintroduced by the Convocations of 1661 with the substitution of the words "corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood" for "real and essential presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood". See the entry "Black Rubric" in G. Harford and M. Stevenson Eds, *The Prayer Book Dictionary*, London: Pitman and Sons, 1913.

[28] See above, Chapter One pp1-3 & annotation.

[29] BCP (2004) p.9. For a brief account of the Irish Revision of 1878 see the writer's thesis *Theological Implications* pp93-98 & annotation. See also, Richard Clarke, "The 1878 Book of Common Prayer" in *The Prayer Books of the Church of Ireland 1551-2004* by Michael Kennedy, Richard Clarke, Edgar Turner, Brian Mayne, The Columba Press 2004.

[30] BCP (2004) p.197. This accords with Cranmer's teaching in his *Defence* (op. cit. V.13, p.251), "But his holy Supper was ordained for this purpose, that every man eating and drinking thereof should remember that Christ died for him, and so should exercise his faith, and comfort himself by the remembrance of Christ's benefits; and so give unto Christ most hearty thanks, and give himself also clearly unto him." However, the passage, which appears in its present form in 1662 and is derived from the 1549 liturgy, is absent

from the 1552 Holy Communion. In 1549 the passages read,

Dear friends, and you especially upon whose souls I have cure and charge, on next, ;I do intend by God's grace to offer to all such as shall be Godly disposed, the most comfortable Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, to be taken of them, in the remembrance of his most fruitful and glorious Passion: by the which passion, we have obtained remission of our sins, and be made partakers of the kingdom of heaven, whereof we be assured and ascertained, if we come to the said Sacrament, with hearty repentance for our offences, steadfast faith in God's mercy, and earnest mind to obey God's will, and to offend no more.

[31] BCP (2004) p.199

[32] Ibid. p.200.

[33] Ibid. p.188 This seems to be confirmed by Cranmer's statement in his Defence (op. cit. V.9 p.244), "All such popish masses are to be clearly taken away out of Christian Churches, and the true use of the Lord's Supper is to be restored again, wherein godly people assembled together may receive the sacrament each man for himself, to declare that he remembereth what benefit he hath received by the death of Christ, and to testify that he is a member of Christ's body, fed with his flesh, and drinking his blood spiritually."

[34] BCP (2004) p.188.

[35] In 1549 this had read,

Hear us (O merciful Father) we beseech Thee; and with thy holy Spirit and Word, vouchsafe to +bless and +sanctify these thy gifts, and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved son Jesus Christ.

The changes made (Partly in response to Stephen Gardiner's having read the traditional catholic doctrines into this and other passages) were clearly intended to express Cranmer's own theological views more exactly and carefully.

[36] BCP (2004) p.180.

[37] BCP (2004) pp 180,181.

[38] BCP (2004) p185.

[39] BCP (2004) p187.

[40] BCP (2004) pp188-190.

[41] BCP (2004) p.188.

[42] BCP (2004) p.152. Hugh Bates in his essay "The Worthy Communicant" - Chapter VII in *Thomas Cranmer - Essays in Commemoration of the 500th Anniversary of his Birth*, Ed., Margot Johnson, Turnstone Ventures, Durham, 1990, p.118 - argues against the view adumbrated by Dix "and echoed by Parish Communion zealots" that Cranmer's services encourages and individualist and isolationist devotion",

It is hard for us, after four and a half centuries, to envisage the original intended setting of the service. It is not the 'early service' in a parish church which has undergone a Victorian gothic restoration, some time after the Public Worship Regulation Acts of the last century, pretending to be a Low Mass with only a modicum of success. We would see it rather differently if we could imagine the group of those who had earnestly repented of their sins and were in love and

charity with their neighbours, gathering elbow to elbow and cheek by jowl around the Lord's Table. Cranmer himself was well aware of the need not to draw too hard and fast a line between the faith of the individual and the faith of the Church.

[43] BCP (2004) p.197. The word "celebrate" was used in the 1549 rite, where it referred to Christ who "did institute, and in his holy Gospel command us to *celebrate* a perpetual memory of that his precious Death until his coming again..." See *The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI*, Everyman's Library No. 448, J.M. Dent, 1952 p.222.

[44] On account of the incapacity of many of the clergy it was, however, necessary to issue Homilies which were to be read when it was not possible to have a sermon. See *Article 35* "Of Homilies" (BCP (2004) p.787).

[45] BCP (2004) p.183.

[46] The Constitution of the Church of Ireland, op. cit. Chapter Nine, Canon 7 p.9:2.

[47] BCP (2004) p.186-7.

[48] Ibid. (2004) p.188.

[49] Ibid. p.197. This Exhortation has undergone a process of evolution, the concept of thanksgiving remaining constant in the passage under review, as follows,

1549 Wherefore our duty is to come to these holy mysteries, with most hearty thanks to, be given to almighty God, for his infinite mercy and benefits given and bestowed upon us his unworthy servants: for whom he hath not only given his body to death, and shed his blood, but also doth vouchsafe in a Sacrament and Mystery, to give us his said body and blood to feed upon spiritually...

1552 Forasmuch as our duty is to render to Almighty God our heavenly father most hearty thanks, for that he hath given his son our Saviour Jesus Christ, not only to die for us, but also to be our spiritual food and sustenance, as it is declared unto us, as well, by God's word, and by the holy Sacraments of his blessed body, and blood...

The current form dates from 1662.

[50] BCP (2004) p.200.

[51] Ibid p.186.

[52] Ibid pp186-7.

[53] Ibid p.188. However, Cranmer does not seem to have perceived the full significance of this, since the Eucharistic Prayer itself in both the 1549 and 1552 liturgies is deficient in thanksgiving.

[54] Ibid p.188.

[55] Ibid pp189,190. In the latter prayer the 1549 service referred back more specifically to the act of communion by means of the use, of the past tense,

Almighty and everliving God, we most heartily thank thee, for that thou hast vouchsafed to feed us in these holy Mysteries, with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of thy son, our Saviour Jesus Christ...

[56] Ibid p190.

[57] This appears to be the interpretation of the Prayer Book rite favoured by R. Hanson and R. Fuller in the first edition of their apologetic work, *The Church of Rome - A Dissuasive*, SCM, 1948, p.20 where they say, "The Roman Catholic priest exists

primarily to *offer to God* the sacrifice of the mass, whereas the Anglican priest exists primarily to *administer to men* the word and the sacraments, the Anglican Communion being an essentially different service from the Roman Mass." Without necessarily endorsing Hanson and Fuller's view of the inherent status of the Anglican priesthood or the Anglican communion (many Anglicans, historically, including the Caroline Divines of the seventeenth century and their successors in the Oxford Movement in the nineteenth century would have wished emphasize the Godward aspect of the eucharistic celebration - and some forms of the Book of Common Prayer communion recognize this explicitly), the Manward emphasis seems to be most prominent in rites of the 1552-1662 type. The very title "The Order for the *Administration* of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion would seem to support this.

[58] BCP (2004) pp192-6.

[59] Ibid p.183 "Bread and wine for communion are placed on the table"

[60] Ibid. p. 183. "Alms" referred to what was given to the poor and needy. "Oblations" (added in 1662) seems to have referred to all other offerings of the people (including what was given to the "curate"). However, Bishop Patrick in his *Mensa Mystica* (1667, Works 1:157) and his *Christian Sacrifice* (1670, Works 1:377), interpreted the word "oblations" as referring to the elements. He was followed by the Non-Jurors in this, and Charles Wheatley assisted in making it widespread. It is pointed out in *The Tutorial Prayer Book*, Ed. C. Neil and J.M. Willoughby, the Harrison Trust, 1912 p.316 that a special service of 1635, which does speak of offering the bread and wine, expressly used the word "oblations" of the money received at the reading of such sentences as were not chosen for alms. Bishop Andrewes, it is stated, had two basins, one for alms and another for offerings. Wren, one of the revisers used the words "oblation" and "prospora" of the collection. Cosin in 1668 twice used the actual phrase "alms and oblations" of money; so also Sancroft in 1686. See also the entry "oblations" in the Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church, op. cit. p.989, and, the entry "Church Militant, Prayer for the" in *The Prayer Book Dictionary*, op. cit. p.204.

[61] BCP pp185-6.

[62] Ibid p188

[63] Ibid p197

[64] Ibid p188. Bishop Lancelot Andrews (1555-1625) in his *Responsio ad Apologiam Cardinalis Bellarmini*, cited in More and Cross, *Anglicanism* op. cit. no. 200, p.465 said, "The Sacrifice which is there is Eucharistic, of which Sacrifice the law is that he who offers it is to partake of it, and that he partake by receiving and eating, as the Saviour ordered."

[65] Ibid p.189 Cranmer made a clear distinction between a "propitiatory sacrifice" offered once for all by Christ alone, and a "sacrifice of praise" which could be offered by those who were reconciled.

One kind of sacrifice there is, which is called a propitiatory or merciful sacrifice, that is to say, such a sacrifice as pacifieth God's wrath and indignation, and obtaineth mercy and forgiveness for all our sins, and is the ransom for our redemption from everlasting damnation.

And although in the old testament there were certain sacrifices called by that name, yet in very deed there is but one such sacrifice whereby our sins be

pardoned and God's mercy and favour obtained, which is the death of the Son of God our Lord Jesu Christ; nor never was any other sacrifice propitiatory at any time, nor never shall be.

This is the honour and glory of this our High Priest, wherein he admitteth neither partner nor successor. For by his one oblation he satisfied his Father for all men's sins, and reconciled mankind unto his grace and favour....

Another kind of sacrifice there is, which doth not reconcile us to God, but is made of them that be reconciled by Christ, to testify our duties unto God, and to show ourselves thankful unto him; and therefore they be called 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.

[Defence op. cit., Book V, Chap. III, p.235]

[66] Ibid p.190

[67] The Church Literature Association, 1977. The original Latin texts may be found in *Anglican Orders (Latin) The Bull of His Holiness Leo XIII, September 13, 1896 and the Answer of the Archbishops of England March 29th 1897*, Published for the Church Historical Society, SPCK, 1932. There is a vast literature on the subject of Anglican orders. Much original material may be found in *Anglican Orders - the Documents in the Debate*, ed Christopher Hill and Edward Yarnold S.J., Canterbury Press, 1997, and helpful contributions may be found in George H. Tavard, *A Review of Anglican Orders - the Problem and the Solution*, Theology and Life Series 31, The Liturgical Press, Collegeville, Minnesota, 1990, and *Essays on the Centenary of Apostolicae Curae 1896-1996, with an English translation of the Document and the Anglican response*, edited with an introduction by F. William Franklin, Foreword by Hugh Montefiore, Mowbray, 1996. An abbreviated version of the Response may be found in the second edition of H. Bettenson, Ed., *Documents of the Christian Church*, pp322-325.

[68] BCP (2004) p.183.

[69] Ibid p.241

[70] Ibid p184

In the 1549 Liturgy the comparable passage read,

And here we do give unto thee most high praise, and hearty thanks, for the wonderful grace and virtue, declared in all thy saints, from the beginning of the world: and chiefly in the glorious and most blessed virgin Mary, mother of thy son Jesu Christ our Lord and God, and in the holy Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles and Martyrs, whose examples (O Lord) and steadfastness in thy faith, and keeping thy holy commandments, grant us to follow. We commend unto thy mercy (O Lord) all other thy servants, which are departed hence from us, with the sign of faith, and now do rest in the sleep of peace: Grant unto them, we beseech thee, thy mercy, and everlasting peace, and that, at the day of the general resurrection, we and all they which be of the mystical body of thy son, may altogether be set on his right hand, and hear that his most joyful voice: Come unto me, O ye that be blessed of my father, and possess the kingdom, which is prepared for you from the beginning of the world: Grant this, O father, for Jesus Christ's sake, our only mediator and advocate.

In the 1552 liturgy the entire passage was omitted. It was restored in the form cited in the main text in 1662. There is some similarity to the wording of the Injunctions of 1559: A form of bidding the prayers...Finally, let us praise God for all those, that are departed out of this life in the faith of Christ, and pray unto God, that we may have grace for to direct our lives after their good example, that after this life, we with them may be made partakers of the glorious resurrection in the life everlasting.

[Brightman, *The English Rite*, op. cit. Vol. pp664, 665, 690]

[71] BCP (2004) p.188

[72] Ibid p.188.

[73] Ibid p.190

[74] Ibid p.194

The first of these is to be found in every edition of the Prayer Book Communion from 1549 onwards. The second is to be found in Irish Prayer Books from 1878 onwards.

CHAPTER TWO: CHURCH FORMULARIES. PART SEVEN - EUCHARISTIC DOCTRINE: HOLY COMMUNION TWO.

The modern forms of the Eucharist contained in the 2004 edition of the Book of Common Prayer are the end product of a process of liturgical revision in the Church of Ireland commencing in 1962 with the setting up by the General Synod of the Liturgical Advisory Committee.¹ Important stages in this development were the production of experimental Orders of Service in 1967 and 1972, consolidated in the *Alternative Prayer Book* 1984, which, together with its companion volume *Alternative Occasional Services* 1993 was superseded by the 2004 Prayer Book containing traditional and modern orders of service.² Although the revisers understood their terms of reference as excluding any "change" in the essential doctrines of the Church as these were set out in the 1926 edition of the Book of Common Prayer³ many of the theological emphases are different, and so the Holy Communion Two rites may be considered, theologically speaking to be complementary to that to the traditional Prayer Book rite which appears under the heading of Holy Communion One. Since 1984 provision came to be made for the celebration of the Holy Communion with rites not contained in the *Alternative Prayer Book* (such as the Marriage and Funeral Rites), and a partly new Eucharistic Prayer received approval by the General Synod for use in ministering to the sick and these prepared the way for the similar rites in the 2004 Prayer Book⁴ These additional arrangements have been borne in mind in making this assessment of the theology of the modern Eucharistic rites currently approved in the Church of Ireland.⁵ The same categories - presence, memorial, communion and fellowship, proclamation, thanksgiving, sacrifice, and eschatology have been used as in the previous section when assessing the eucharistic teaching of Holy Communion One.⁶

(1) **Presence** It has been customary for centuries to speak of the "real presence" of Christ in the Holy Communion.⁷ This refers both to the authenticity of Christ's presence in this holy ordinance,⁸ and to the sacramental mode by which he is deemed to make himself present.⁹ But, as noted above¹⁰, there is a "real presence" of Christ in his Word as well as in the Sacrament,¹¹ and so this sub-section falls naturally into two parts, *Word* and *Sacrament*.

Christ's presence in his Word

In the Prayer Book of 2004 the significance of the Word has been underlined by the more generous provision of scripture readings than in the 1926 Prayer Book,¹² After the Old Testament reading¹³ and also the Epistle¹⁴ there appears the affirmation, "This is the word of the Lord" to which the people respond, "Thanks be to God".¹⁵ At the reading of the Gospel all stand to acknowledge Christ's personal presence in his own Word,¹⁶ and affirm this recognition in the saying or singing of the words "Glory to you, Lord Jesus Christ", "Praise to you, Lord Jesus Christ", the second set of words following the reader's declaration, "This is the Gospel of Christ".¹⁷ The sermon normally comes immediately afterwards,¹⁸ so that the Word of God is both read and preached,¹⁹ and this in turn leads to the Church's corporate confession of faith in the incarnate Word thus made present, in the form of the Nicene Creed.²⁰ The use of three readings may be considered normative, and is provided for also in Holy Communion One; and a highly significant development was the adoption of the Revised Common Lectionary and related sets of readings which has greatly expanded the Scriptural provision in the Church of Ireland.

Christ's presence in the Sacrament

The Lord's presence in the sacramental part of the rite is implied in the greeting prefaced to the Sursum Corda and the Eucharistic Prayer, "The Lord be with you",²¹ together with its response, "And also with you." It is expressed in the alternative greeting, "The Lord is here" with its reply from the people, "His Spirit is with us."²² The distinctive mode of the presence is sacramental,²³ accomplished by the consecration and the reception in faith of the eucharistic elements. To effect the consecration the bread and wine are "taken",²⁴ and the priest blesses God/gives thanks over them with the assent of the people.²⁵ At the heart of the Eucharistic Prayer lies the institution narrative whose solemn recitation underlines the relationship between the current celebration and its dominical foundation at the Last Supper.²⁶ No designatory gesture is mandated apart from the initial "taking" but there is nothing preventing the celebrant from an appropriate symbolism. The special character of the "eucharistized" elements is recognized by the rubric relating to their disposal where there is any bread or wine remaining after communion.²⁷ The new significance given to the elements by virtue of their consecration is underlined by the form of prayer used for the purpose of supplementary consecration, "that this bread/wine also may be to us his body/blood to be received in remembrance of him,"²⁸ regardless of whether the words are actually used or not, a silent addition to what is already consecrated being regarded as fully valid. What is present objectively must also be received in faith. And so the communicants are given the consecrated bread and wine with the words,²⁹

The invitation reads,

Draw near with faith,
Receive the body of our Lord Jesus Christ which he gave for you,
and his blood which he shed for you.
Remember that he died for you,
and feed on him in your hearts by faith with thanksgiving.

or

The gifts of God for the people of God.
**Jesus Christ is holy,
Jesus Christ is Lord,
to the glory of God the Father.**

or

Jesus Christ is the Lamb of God,
who has taken away the sins of the world.
Happy are those who are called to his supper.
**Lord, I am not worthy to receive you,
but only say the word and I shall be healed.**

And there are several alternative forms of the Words of Administration,

The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for you, preserve your body and soul to eternal life. Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for you and feed on him in your hearts by faith with thanksgiving.

The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for you, preserve your body and soul to eternal life. Drink this in remembrance that Christ's blood was shed for

you, and be thankful.

Or one of the shorter forms may be used,

The body of Christ keep you in eternal life.
The blood of Christ keep you in eternal life

or

The body of Christ given for you.
The blood of Christ shed for you.

A rubric directs that the communicant replies "Amen" signifying his or her assent to the words which have been spoken.³⁰

All of these Words of Administration would appear to presuppose and imply an identification of the bread and wine, as consecrated, with the sacramental "body" and "blood" of Christ, the third form being particularly direct and emphatic. However it may be noted that the bare form "The body of Christ" and "The blood of Christ" which is among those authorized in the sister Church of England is not included.³¹

The Communion Anthems, the Benedictus qui venit and the Agnus Dei (in two forms) may be viewed as an expression of recognition of the Christ who is really present and who is the bearer of sins. He is the "one who comes" to whom praise and thanks are due. He is the Redeemer who "grants us peace".³²

(2) **Memorial** Because Christianity is an historical religion a significant part of the liturgical life of the Church has always been taken up by commemoration. In the Eucharist this takes two main forms. There is a general reminder of the history of salvation provided through the scripture readings and through the other observances of the Church's year.³³ There is also the specific liturgical act of a "memorial before God" performed in the sacramental part of the rite in obedience to the command of Jesus to "do this in remembrance of me."³⁴

The Prayer Book incorporates the provisions of *The Revised Common Lectionary* following a period of trial use which had been approved by the House of Bishops from 1995 onwards.³⁵ This provides provides a cycle of scripture-readings for Sundays, Principal Holy Days and Seasons (spread over three years),³⁶ to be used at Morning and Evening Prayer and at Holy Communion,³⁷ This is supplemented by courses of readings for a "Second Service" or a "Third Service" which were drawn up by liturgists representing the four Anglican churches in the British Isles.³⁸ There is normally a relationship between the Old Testament reading, the Psalm and the Gospel, the system being modified in the period after Trinity when there is a choice between "paired" (related) readings designated by the letter P or semi-continuous readings designated by the letter C.³⁹ Except on Festivals and other occasions where there is a specific theme running through the entire service, the readings from the Epistles follow their own semi-continuous course.⁴⁰ With regard to weekdays the Liturgical Advisory Committee did not wish to tie the church down permanently since there had already been many changes down through the years. Currently the Church of England provision is followed for Morning and Evening Prayer and the Eucharistic Lectionary, which is based on that in the Roman Catholic Church but ecumenically modified, first as the *Common Lectionary*, and then on the basis of experience of use in the form of the *Revised Common Lectionary* is fully authorized by the General Synod of the Church of Ireland and is published in the

Church of Ireland Directory (and also as a “separate”) on an annual basis.⁴¹

The Church's understanding of what it does in response to the command of Jesus at the Last Supper is traditionally expressed in the liturgical "anamnesis" (remembrance), a paragraph which occurs after the institution narrative.⁴² The connection was made particularly clear in the development of the first Eucharistic Prayer in Holy Communion Two (based upon the earlier experimental rite "Holy Communion 1972") by the insertion of the word, "therefore" in the *Alternative Prayer Book of 1984* and incorporated into the 2004 Prayer Book.⁴³ In the words which follow it is evident that in this rite what is understood primarily by "remembrance" is a liturgical act. "Therefore, Father, with this bread and this cup we do as Christ your Son commanded: **we remember his passion and death, we celebrate his resurrection and ascension, and we look for the coming of his kingdom.**"⁴⁴ This act has a Godward reference: the prayer is addressed to the Father.⁴⁵ That a manward aspect is not excluded is, however, implied by the Words of Administration.⁴⁶

In the comparable part of the second Eucharistic Prayer in Holy Communion Two (which came, originally, from the *An Australian Prayer Book 1978* and the basic part of which appeared in the *Alternative Prayer Book, 1984*), no specific "memory" words appear.⁴⁷ But once again the emphasis is upon a liturgical act - "Father, with this bread and this cup we do as our Saviour has commanded; we celebrate the redemption he has won for us; we proclaim his perfect sacrifice made once for all upon the cross, his mighty resurrection and glorious ascension; and we look for his coming to fulfil all things according to your will."⁴⁸ A rich concept of "anamnesis" is here implied, carefully relating the church's present "celebration" of its redemption with its "proclamation" of what was once for all accomplished for it, and its anticipation of the fulfilment of all things in Christ.⁴⁹ The influence of the Pauline account in First Corinthians 11:23-26 is evident.⁵⁰

In the third Eucharistic Prayer in Holy Communion Two (based originally on Eucharistic Prayer H in the Church of England's *Common Worship* but largely re-written)⁵¹ there is no specific anamnestic passage, but there is the acclamation, which is an integral part of the prayer and turns into a petition,⁵²

Praise to you, Lord Jesus Christ:
dying, you destroyed our death,
rising, you restored our life;
Lord Jesus, come in glory.

(3) *Communion and Fellowship* There are many indications of the corporate aspect of the Holy Communion, not least in the use of the language of "we" and "us" throughout.⁵³ That the essence of the Christian religion is as much to do with our relationship with our neighbour as with our relationship with God is spelled out in the Lord's Summary of the Law,⁵⁴ and, in greater detail, in the various permutations of the Ten Commandments to be found in the 2004 Prayer Book.⁵⁵ The Nicene Creed affirms the faith of the Church in the first person plural.⁵⁶ And the Lord's Prayer, used immediately before the act of Communion, speaks of "Our" Father.⁵⁷ The mode of use of Holy Communion Two in the 2004 Prayer Book as implied by the rubrics also indicates that this service is not intended as a ministerial monologue, nor is the worshipper to be concerned merely with making his or her communion on an individualistic basis. Very many opportunities are given to those present to join in the act of worship together in words of supplication, penitence, praise, and thanksgiving.⁵⁸ In addition to this it is possible for members of the congregation to

exercise a number of liturgical functions including scripture reading,⁵⁹ the leading of prayers of intercession, and, when authorized to do so, the administration of the Cup.⁶⁰

Theologically, the meaning of the Eucharist as Communion and Fellowship is brought out strongly at several points in the Holy Communion Two. In the first Eucharistic Prayer the fellowship of the holy meal as something brought into being by the power of the Spirit is expressed as follows, "Grant by the power of the life-giving spirit that we may be made one in your holy Church and partakers of the body and blood of your Son, that he may dwell in us and we in him."⁶³ It may be noticed that the mutual indwelling of the members of the Church in Christ is given as the goal of participation in the Holy Communion. In addition, in the Proper Preface for saints' days, there is a particular reference to fellowship,⁶⁴ "In the saints you have given us an example of godly living, that, rejoicing in their fellowship, we may run with perseverance the race that is set before us and with them receive the unfading crown of glory."

In the comparable part of the second Eucharistic Prayer the Holy Spirit is mentioned again, "Renew us by your Holy Spirit, unite us in the body of your Son..."⁶⁵ Earlier in the same prayer (prior to the Words of Institution) there is a reference to spiritual fellowship,⁶⁶

Merciful Father, we thank you for these gifts of your creation, this bread and this wine, and we pray that we who eat and drink them *in the fellowship of the Holy Spirit* in obedience to our Saviour Christ in remembrance of his death and passion may be partakers of his body and his blood.

In the seasonal addition for use on saints' days it says in the same prayer,⁶⁷

You have called us into the fellowship of (...and) all your saints, and set before us the example of their witness and of the fruit of your Spirit in their lives.

In the second Eucharistic Prayer there is a specific mention of our common life, namely, "In your great love you gave him [Jesus] to be made man for us and *to share our common life*."⁶⁸

Then, in the service as a whole, at the Breaking of the Bread, the concept of *koinonia*, sharing, is given as a key to the understanding of the whole observance. Quoting 1 Cor 10:16,17, it says, "The bread which we break is a sharing in the body of Christ. *We, being many, are one body for we all share in the one bread.*"⁶⁹ There is also a strong sense of eucharistic fellowship in the words in the first of the two post-communion prayers in Holy Communion Two, "May we who share Christ's body live his risen life; we who drink his cup bring life to others; we whom the Spirit lights give light to the world..."⁷⁰ And this sense of a united witness, of togetherness in Christ, is also to be found in the second post-communion prayer, which are said by all present, "**Send us out in the power of your Spirit to live and work to your praise and glory**"⁷¹ These words are said by all present.

(4) **Proclamation** It is well-known that the addition of the Creed to the liturgy of the Lord's Supper was comparatively late.⁷² Strictly speaking, in a fully balanced service, the Creed is redundant, since the saving acts of God in Christ, which are commemorated within it, are also rehearsed in the great Prayer of Thanksgiving, the Eucharistic Prayer. This rehearsal, this *proclamation* of the mighty acts of God through to the (anticipated) second coming, with the cross of Christ at the heart of it, is handled in different ways in

the first and second Eucharistic Prayers in Holy Communion Two.⁷³ In the first Order there is only a brief pre-Sanctus⁷⁴ but no less than thirteen Proper Prefaces are provided for seasonal and occasional use.⁷⁵ Nine of those given are Christological in character,⁷⁴ the remainder being concerned with God the Holy Trinity, with the Blessed Virgin Mary, and with the saints.⁷⁵ In the post-Sanctus, God the Father is praised and acknowledged as the Creator and Sustainer of all things,⁷⁶ and as the one who not only made us in his own image, male and female, and even when we turned away from him, never ceased to care for us, but also in his love and mercy freed us from the slavery of sin.⁷⁷ The incarnation, and death on the cross are commemorated;⁷⁸ and the once for all character of the sacrifice of the Son Jesus Christ is firmly upheld.⁷⁹ Mention of the Last Supper leads naturally into the Words of Institution⁸⁰ and on to the anamnesis.⁸¹

In the second Eucharistic Prayer there are no Proper Prefaces as such, but there is the equivalent of strategically placed "seasonal additions" specifically designed⁸² for use with this particular Prayer.⁸³ The Prayer, however, may be used without them, since the pre-Sanctus by itself implies a remarkably rich Christology, giving glory and honour, thanks and praise to the Father for the role of the Son in the creation of the universe and of man, in becoming incarnate, in offering himself as a perfect sacrifice, and in achieving the reconciliation required by man.⁸⁴ His eternal priesthood as the one "who ever lives to intercede for us" is strongly affirmed, together with the resurrection and the heavenly session.⁸⁵ The sending of the Holy Spirit through Him upon the Church to make of the disciples a royal priesthood called to serve Him for ever is also recalled.⁸⁶ In the anamnesis⁸⁷ the word "proclaim" occupies a central position, showing that this concept is the key to the understanding of this particular Order,⁸⁸ in accordance with the apostolic interpretation, "as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes." (1 Cor 11:26).⁸⁹ The different emphases of the first and second Eucharistic Prayers be summed respectively by the words "remember" and "proclaim".⁹⁰ It may be noticed that the Lord's death is not viewed in isolation in either rite.⁹¹ Here it is coupled with "his mighty resurrection and glorious ascension" and it is also linked with the parousia.⁹²

The third Eucharistic Prayer follows a different and creatively original pattern without an extensive rehearsal of the mighty acts of God in Christ but addressing each Person of the Holy Trinity in turn and then the Trinity as a whole and recalling the specific character of each one of them, particularly in relation to the Holy Communion itself.⁹³ There are no Proper Prefaces or any equivalent variation or addition, the phrase "sacrifice of thanks and praise" perhaps being the key to this particular form.⁹⁴

(5) **Thanksgiving** The concept of "thanksgiving" is very fully explored in the three prayers in Holy Communion Two as the alternative title of the service as a whole,⁹⁵ "eucharist" (thanksgiving) itself implies, the word also being used as a sub-heading for these variant forms of "The Great Thanksgiving." ⁹⁶ All three of these versions of the central prayer in each rite is deemed to be a prayer of thanksgiving,⁹⁷ echoing the Lord's "giving of thanks" at the Last Supper,⁹⁸ and embodying a concept of "consecration by thanksgiving"⁹⁹ The consecrated gifts are to be received with thanksgiving.¹⁰⁰ There is also a thanksgiving for Communion together with an offering of "ourselves, our souls and bodies" after all have partaken.¹⁰¹

Looking first at the various forms of the Great Thanksgiving,¹⁰² in each case this is preceded by the traditional invitation, "Let us give thanks..."¹⁰³ In the first Prayer the

theme of thanksgiving is taken up immediately when it is affirmed by the celebrant that "at all times and in all places it is right for us to give you thanks and praise",¹⁰⁴ and particular grounds for giving thanks are specified when there is a Proper Preface.¹⁰⁵ God the Father is "blessed" ("Blessèd are you, Father") following the Sanctus and Benedictus qui venit as the creator and sustainer who has given his Son Jesus Christ as a once-for-all sacrifice and has instituted the holy eucharist.¹⁰⁶ After the words of the anamnesis, in which it is suggested that what the Church is performing in obedience to the command of Jesus is an act of remembrance, it says, "Accept through him this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving."¹⁰⁷ The meaning of the expression is not free from ambiguity;¹⁰⁸ but it would seem to indicate that such thanksgiving is to be understood as the motive for such an act, or that it is its principal accompaniment, or even its essence. Moreover it is by this giving of thanks over the bread and the cup that consecration is effected.¹⁰⁹

The second Eucharistic Prayer has been carefully planned to conform as far as possible to the typical form of a Jewish blessing.¹¹⁰ The Jewish *berachah*, or prayer of adoration, blessing God, which is used at the Passover,¹¹¹ and may, possibly, have been used at the Last Supper,¹¹² commonly had four parts: an invitation; a statement of motives, recounting in thanksgiving the great deeds of God; petitions; and a hymn or doxology.¹¹³ The invitation here is again in the traditional form, "Let us give thanks..."¹¹⁴ A long section (the pre-Sanctus) follows giving grounds for thanking God the Father, and recounting his redemptive deeds.¹¹⁵ Then, following the part which deals with the institution of the Last Supper and the fulfilment in this present celebration of the command of the Lord to "do this...",¹¹⁶ comes petition - both for the worshippers and for the whole Church.¹¹⁷ And the prayer concludes with a doxology, "**Blessing and honour and glory and power are yours for ever and ever. Amen**" which is said or sung by all present.¹¹⁸

In both Orders the act of Communion is made in an attitude of thanksgiving. Worshippers according to the first form of the Invitation are to "Draw near with faith", and to receive the body of the Lord which he gave for (them), and his blood which he shed for (them).¹¹⁹ They are to "remember that he died for (them) and "feed on him in their hearts by faith with thanksgiving".¹²⁰ And, in the first (traditional) form of the Words of Administration they "are to "Take and eat this (the bread) in remembrance that Christ died (for them), and feed on him in (their) hearts by faith with thanksgiving."¹²¹ They are to "Drink this (wine) in remembrance that Christ's blood was shed (for them), *and be thankful*."¹²²

In the post-Communion in the service as a whole, there is an optional prayer, beginning, "Father of all, we give you thanks and praise, that when we were still far off you met us in your Son and brought us home. Dying and living he declared your love, gave us grace, and opened the gate of glory."¹²³ Then, in a further prayer, the priest and congregation together refer specifically to the sacramental gift, "Almighty God we thank you for feeding us with the spiritual food of the body and blood of your Son Jesus Christ."¹²⁴

(6) *Sacrifice*¹²⁵ The Holy Communion, as the first Eucharistic Prayer in Holy Communion Two puts it (in language echoing that of the traditional Holy Communion One) is "a perpetual memory" of the precious death of the Lord Jesus Christ on Calvary "until he comes again".¹²⁶ Particular stress is laid upon the unique character of the sacrifice of Jesus in both the first and second prayers. According to Eucharistic Prayer One "he made there" (that is, on the cross), "the one complete and all-sufficient sacrifice for the sins of the whole world".¹²⁷ The relationship between the Holy Communion and

this once-for-all sacrifice is that of "doing" what Jesus did at the Last Supper "in remembrance of" him.¹²⁸ The same idea is found in the second Prayer, "Father with this bread and this cup, we do as our Saviour has commanded; we celebrate the redemption he has won for us; we proclaim his perfect sacrifice made once for all upon the cross, his mighty resurrection and glorious ascension; and we look for his coming to fulfil all things according to your will."¹²⁹ The "remembrance" in this second Prayer is associated especially with the eating and drinking of the fellowship meal, the Lord's Supper, "Merciful Father, we thank you for these gifts of your creation, this bread and this wine, and we pray that we who eat and drink them in the fellowship of the Holy Spirit in obedience to our Saviour Christ in remembrance of his death and passion may be partakers of his body and his blood."¹³⁰ However, the "doing" in both cases would appear to refer to more than the act of making one's communion. Rather it has to do with the fourfold action of taking the bread and wine, giving thanks over them, breaking the bread and giving the bread and wine - The association of this act of remembrance with the concept of offering occurs in several ways. Most important is the inclusion of the expression already mentioned, "this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving" within the Eucharistic canon.¹³¹ This occurs in the first and third Prayers, and, as suggested above, is inherently ambiguous.¹³² It could mean a sacrifice which *consists* of thanksgiving, or one whose *motive* is thanksgiving, or it could even embrace both these ideas.¹³³ If the first interpretation is to be accepted, then the reference would be to the "giving of thanks" which is what the Eucharistic Prayer consists of.¹³⁴ If the second is preferred, then the reference would be to the act of remembrance.¹³⁵ The Church would be remembering before God in thanksgiving (and supplication) the sacrifice once made.¹³⁶ In the second Prayer the thought is rather that of "proclaiming" the sacrifice, not by words only but by performing the action commanded by Jesus when he said, "Do this...",¹³⁷ The expression "this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving" was in the Australian Prayer Book of 1978 - from which this Eucharistic Prayer comes -in the post-communion,¹³⁸ and was in the *Alternative Prayer Book of 1984* but dropped out when the post-communions were standardized for all three Eucharistic Prayers in the 2004 Prayer Book but may perhaps have referred to the whole celebration.¹³⁹ In Eucharistic Prayer Three it comes in the penultimate paragraph and may be taken as an epitome of the entire prayer,¹⁴⁰

Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, Blessed Trinity:
 with your whole Church throughout the world
 we offer you this sacrifice of thanks and praise
 and lift our voice to join the song of heaven,
 for ever praising you and saying:

Holy, Holy, Holy Lord...

Other sacrificial concepts include that of the offertory¹⁴¹ at the presentation of the alms and preparation of the gifts¹⁴² and the idea of self-offering at the conclusion of the service. With regard to the "offertory", this has been carefully separated from the first of the four actions of the Lord's Supper, the "taking" of the bread and wine, probably to avoid Gregory Dix's confusion of the two ideas¹⁴³ The bringing of the alms to the Lord's Table is optional at this point.¹⁴⁴ The placing of the bread and wine for Communion on the Lord's Table is subject to the proviso, "if this has not already been done".¹⁴⁴ But having said this, there is a rationale for bringing the gifts so that they may be acknowledged as God's gifts, and that thanks may be offered for them, and that they may be taken and used specifically for their role and purpose within the context of the Lord's

Supper.¹⁴⁵ There would appear to be sacrificial implications in two of the four prayers that may be said at this point,¹⁴⁶

How can I repay the Lord
for all the benefits he has given to me?
I will lift up the cup of salvation
and call upon the name of the Lord.
I will fulfil my vows to the Lord
in the presence of all his people.

Psalm 116:12-14

and

Lord, yours is the greatness
and the power and the glory
and the victory and the majesty;
for all things come from you
and of your own we give you.

1 Chronicles 29:11,14

The concept of self-offering, derived ultimately from Romans 12:1¹⁴⁵ is associated with mission in the post-communion part of the service.¹⁴⁶ The relevant part of the second prayer includes, "Through him we offer you our souls and bodies to be a living sacrifice. Send us out in the power of your Spirit to live and work to your praise and glory."¹⁴⁷

(7) **Eschatology** An eschatological aspect has been present in the Eucharist from its foundation,¹⁴⁹ as the Pauline emphasis "until he comes" itself indicates.¹⁴⁸ It is well represented in the first and second Eucharistic Prayers in Holy Communion Two, especially the second.

In the first Eucharistic Prayer in Holy Communion Two there is a reference, following the wording in the Book of Common Prayer to "a perpetual memory" of the Lord's precious death, "until he comes again".¹⁵⁰ The interpretation of the liturgical action given in the anamnesis is that "with this bread and this cup we do as Christ your Son commanded: we remember his passion and death, we celebrate his resurrection and ascension, and *we look for the coming of his kingdom.*" In the second Prayer the eschatological note comes twice into the post-Sanctus,¹⁵¹

Father, with this bread and this cup,
we do as our Saviour has commanded:
we celebrate the redemption he has won for us;
we proclaim his perfect sacrifice,
made once for all upon the cross,
his mighty resurrection and glorious ascension;
and we look for his coming
to fulfil all things according to your will.

Renew us by your Holy Spirit,
unite us in the body of your Son,
and bring us with all your people
into the joy of your eternal kingdom.

In Eucharistic Prayer Three the acclamation following the institution narrative contains an eschatological petition,

Praise to you, Lord Jesus Christ:

**dying, you destroyed our death,
rising, you restored our life;
*Lord Jesus, come in glory.***¹⁵²

This eschatological perspective occurs also in the Lord's Prayer, in which we pray, "your kingdom come, your will be done on earth as in heaven."¹⁵³ A similar concept is expressed in the first of the two post-Communion prayers in which petition is made to "keep us firm in the hope you have set before us, so that we and all your children *shall be free, and the whole earth live to praise your name; through Christ our Lord. Amen.*"¹⁵⁴ Relevant also in this connection are several of the proper prefaces for Eucharistic Prayer One, especially those of Advent,¹⁵⁵ Ascension,¹⁵⁶ Transfiguration¹⁵⁷, and Saints' Days.¹⁵⁸ Some of the Collects, for use with Holy Communion One and Holy Communion Two¹⁵⁹ also speak of the Last Things,¹⁶⁰ as do some of the lections.¹⁶¹

NOTES ON CHAPTER TWO, PART SEVEN

[1] *Journal of the General Synod* (JGS) 1962 ppcxxvii - cxxviii.

Synod resolved:

That a Liturgical Advisory Committee be appointed -

- (a) To formulate and suggest to the General Synod such liturgical proposals relating to Publick Worship, as may seem desirable to the Advisory Committee from time to time.
- (b) To consider and report on, if requested to do so by the General Synod, such other liturgical proposals relating to Publick Worship as may be brought before the said body from time to time.
- (c) To foster the study of the Book of Common Prayer and of the Public Worship of the Church by preparing Articles relating to these subjects and offering them for publication.
- (d) To report to the General Synod annually.

A list of members is appended, and this is updated as required annually. Members serve for the three year term of office of the General Synod, their membership being renewable.

For a full history of liturgical revision in the Church of Ireland from 1962 to 1987 see the writer's doctoral thesis *The Theological Implications of Recent Liturgical Revision in the Church of Ireland*, submitted to the Open University in 1987, Chapters Three and Four.

[2] *Ibid.* Chapter Three [3] pp195-201, [5] pp207-213 & annotation. For the general principles underlying the new Prayer Book see the Preface - prefixed at the Revision of 2004. The first two paragraphs read,

In 1997 the General Synod of the Church of Ireland, after careful consideration, requested the Church's Liturgical Advisory Committee to prepare a new edition of the Book of Common Prayer. Since disestablishment, two previous editions of the Book of Common Prayer had been produced (in 1878 and in 1926), but this new Book of Common Prayer was to include not only services of the Church handed down through the centuries but also services in contemporary language. In the three decades prior to 1997 the General Synod had authorised a large number of services in modern language as alternatives to those contained in the Book of Common Prayer; and thus this book, now given to the Church, represents the cumulative labours of committee and of synod over many generations.

In undertaking our task, we embraced a time-honoured vision of Common Prayer which informs the contents and presentation of this book. We sought to unify the worship of God's people, while allowing reasonable scope for diversity within the essential unity of the Church's prayer. We were determined to produce a book which would have equal capacity to enrich private as well as corporate devotion. We desired that this book, like previous editions of it, should properly articulate and embody the Church's faith. We hope that the book would strengthen our bonds of unity with sister churches who share our approach to Common Prayer, and we were therefore fully attentive to the reports of successive meetings of the International Anglican Liturgical Consultation.

[3] Preface to the Alternative Prayer Book 1984 (APB) p.7. "Again the guiding principle was laid down that there should be no change in the essential doctrines of the church as they are set out in the Book of Common Prayer". In fact no such direction was ever

incorporated into the terms of reference of the Liturgical Advisory Committee. However, the mind of the General Synod in relation to the theology of revision may be considered to have been expressed in an amendment to the Church Constitution in 1969 which permitted the experimental use of forms of services prepared by the Liturgical Advisory Committee with the proviso that these had to be "certified by the House of Bishops as being in its opinion neither contrary to, nor indicative of any departure from, the doctrine of the Church of Ireland." [*Constitution of the Church of Ireland*, 2003, Chapter 1:26 (3)a.] For full details of the Experimental Services legislation and amendments to this see *Theological Implications op. cit* Appendix O, p.689. In a formal sense this only applied to services issued for experimental use with a view to their ultimately being authorised by resolution and bill. It did not apply to what are termed in the Church Constitution "additional" or "special" services in Canon 5:1 (a) and (b). However*, there is no reason to doubt that the members of the Liturgical Advisory Committee considered themselves morally bound to produce services that did not involve a doctrinal "change" and that the General Synod in approving such services did so on the (tacit) understanding that no alterations in the fundamental doctrines of the Church of Ireland were intended or indeed implied. The Preface to the 2004 Prayer Book, part of which is quoted in note 2 above puts the principle positively in the form, "We desired that this book, like previous editions of it, should properly articulate and embody the Church's faith."

*The present writer was a member of the Liturgical Advisory Committee from 1986 and was involved throughout the entire process of the formation of the 2004 Prayer Book.

[4] See *The Marriage Service 1987* pp15-31; *Funeral Services 1987* pp26-43; *The Institution of an Incumbent - An Alternative Order*, 1991, pp8,10; and the alternative *Order for the Ministry to the Sick*, JGS 1992. The post-1984 orders of service were incorporated into the publication *Alternative Occasional Services 1993*, and the definitive forms are to be found in the 2004 Prayer Book under the headings of "Marriage Services" pp406-438, "Ministry to those who are Sick", pp439-464, and "Funeral Services" pp465-516. An order for the Institution of an Incumbent was produced separately, post-2004, and was under review at the time of writing.

[5] The four alternative Eucharistic Prayers being the three provided in the 2004 Prayer Book pp209-217 and that in the Ministry to those who are Sick in the 2004 Prayer Book, pp440f.

[6] This mode of analysis was derived by the writer from that in Yngve Brilioth's *Eucharistic Faith and Practice, Evangelical and Catholic*, authorised translation by A.G. Hebert, SPCK, 1953. His subdivisions were, Eucharist or Thanksgiving; Communion and Fellowship; Commemoration or the historical aspect; the Eucharistic Sacrifice; and Mystery and the Presence." A paper by the writer entitled *Liturgical Reform*, read to the Armagh Clerical Union in January 1966 made use of some of these divisions; and they were also used in the writer's paper, *The Doctrine of the Revised Order for Holy Communion - Holy Communion 1972*, read to the clergy of Tynan Rural Deanery in May 1973. It is interesting that this concept was anticipated several centuries ago in Daniel Waterland's classic *A Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist - with four charges to the clergy of Middlesex connected with the same subject*, reprinted by Oxford at the Clarendon Press in 1880. Waterland lived from 1683 to 1740. His headings were,

1. Breaking of Bread 2. Communion 3. Lord's Supper 4. Oblation 5 Sacrament
6. Eucharist 7. Sacrifice 8. Memorial 9. Passover 10. Mass. In his treatment of "The

Commemoration of Christ" op. cit. p60 his view of its theological orientation is indicated by the words "Hitherto I have been considering the Eucharistical commemoration as a memorial before God, which is the highest view of it: but I must not omit to take notice, that it is a memorial also before men, in the same sense as the paschal service was". He speaks of the first as a memorial in the "larger" sense and of the latter in the "stricter" sense. Here, as elsewhere, his thought is complex and is difficult to summarize. [7] F.L. Cross, Ed., *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, second ed., OUP 1974, p1162. An early instance of the use of the expression "the real presence" is in H. Latimer, who, as reported in J. Foxe's "Book of Martyrs" (1563) held that "this same presence may be called most fitly a real presence, that is a presence not feigned, but a true and faithful presence." For some representative views of the Caroline Divines on the Eucharistic Presence see P.E. More and F.L. Cross, *Anglicanism - the thought and practice of the Church of England, illustrated from the religious literature of the seventeenth century*, SPCK 1957, pp463-494.

For the views of Bishop Jeremy Taylor in particular, a figure of great significance for the Church of Ireland, see H.R. McAdoo, *The Eucharistic Theology of Jeremy Taylor Today*, The Canterbury Press, Norwich, 1988, pp46,48,50, 51,60,61,85-7,97,104-5, Chapter VI passim, Chapter VII passim, 175, 184, 189, 190, 191, 193, 200-201. On an early tract On the Reverence due to the Altar Taylor said, "We do believe that Christ is there really present in the Sacrament, there is the body and blood of Christ which are 'verily and indeed' taken and received by the faithful, saith our Church in her Catechism" (op. cit. p.48). A later work was entitled, *The Real Presence and Spiritual in the Blessed Sacrament* (op. cit. p.109).

[8] Latimer, op. cit. A modern example is from the *Report of the Tripartite Conversations between the Church of Ireland, the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, and the Methodist Church in Ireland*, which stated, (JGS 1973 p201 *2), "In the sacrament the risen Christ, through the Holy Spirit, offers Himself to be received in faith for spiritual nourishment and growth in grace, until He come in glory. The sacrifice made once for all by Him upon the Cross for man's redemption is shown forth and effectively remembered, and the risen Christ is really present."

[9] From the seventeenth to the nineteenth centuries there were three main schools of sacramental interpretation in the Church of England (and other Anglican Churches), the Virtualist, the Memorialist, and the Receptionist. See W. MacKean, *The Eucharistic Doctrine of the Oxford Movement*, Putnam, 1953, Chapter One. In the Tractarian writers (and their successors in the Oxford Movement) there was a tendency to stress a "real objective presence" sometimes said to be given "in, with, and under" the forms of the bread and wine. MacKean, op. cit., see also, A. Hardelin, *The Tractarian Understanding of the Eucharist*, Uppsala 1965, Part Two, Chapter Two, "The Eucharistic Presence". For a modern representation of this viewpoint see E.L. Mascall, *Corpus Christi*, Longmans, second (revised) edition, 1965, Chapter VII. The doctrine of transubstantiation, however, was usually rejected. Today, there are many Anglicans, particularly among the Conservative Evangelicals, who probably hold "Receptionist" views". There would also be many who would not wish to attempt to define too exactly the precise nature of the relationship between the Risen Christ and the elements. See E.J. Bicknell, *A Theological Introduction to the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England*, Third Edition, revised by H.J. Carpenter, Longmans, 1955, pp389-407.

[10] See above p.

[11] G. Wainwright, *Doxology - The Praise of God in Worship, Doctrine, and Life*, Chapter V, *9, pp178-181. He quotes St. Augustine, Origen, and the twelfth century Abbot Rupert of Deutz in support of this view, and also the Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy of the Second Vatican Council, *7, "He (Christ) is present in his word, since it is he himself who speaks when the holy scriptures are read in church". That this also applies to preaching in Classical Protestant thought is indicated in some words from the Second Helvetic Confession (1566), "Praedicatio verbi divinei est verbum divinum". Wainwright, op. cit. p.511, Note 421. On the importance of the "story" in communicating Christian truth see J. Barton and J. Halliburton, "Story and Liturgy", Chapter Four in *Believing in the Church - the Corporate Nature of Faith, a publication from the Doctrine Commission of the Church of England*, SPCK, 1981. See also M. Vasey, *Reading the Bible at the Eucharist*, Grove Worship Series No 94, Grove Books, 1986.

[12] Through the choice of the readings from the three year course in the Revised Common Lectionary for the principal service and provision for "Second" and "Third" services for Sundays and Festivals and other occasions. The principles behind this are explained in the 2004 Prayer Book on pp24-26 and the detailed tables are set forth on pp27-70. A fuller account of the RCL may be found in *The Revised Common Lectionary* published by the Consultation on English Texts, 1992, Introduction pp9-20.

[13] BCP 2004 p.204 where it is called "The First Reading is normally from the Old Testament" is normally from the Old Testament" which allows for departure from this principle, for example for the Easter Season, when, following tradition, the Old Testament Reading is replaced by readings from Acts. In Holy Communion One a major change is in the expansion of the Ministry of the Word to include Old Testament (called "The Lesson"), Psalm, Epistle and Gospel. It is not clear why the word of this section is not identical to that in Holy Communion Two although a partial explanation may be found in the fact that the Orders of Service which make up the 2004 Prayer Book were subject to separate pieces of legislation, and complete consistency was not easy to attain. Traditionally, the Prayer Book service, as it used to be called, normally made no provision for an Old Testament lesson or psalm at Holy Communion. The traditional set of readings from the 1926 Prayer Book is still authorized for use as may be seen in the 2004 Book on pp71-73.

[14] Ibid.

[15] Ibid.

[16] BCP 2004 p.204, rubric, "Stand".

[17] BCP 2004 p.204.

[18] BCP p.204. The rubric states, "The Nicene Creed is said on Sundays and principal holy days. The Creed may be omitted on ordinary weekdays or on festivals which are not principal holy days" The rationale is that the Word of God is read and preached and then responded to in the historic corporate affirmation of faith. While creedal formulae were early used at baptism the use of the Creed at the Eucharist was comparatively late. According to J.N. Alexander in "Creeds in Liturgy" in *The New SCM Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship* p138 it "originated in Antioch late in the fifth century and was regularized by the patriarch of Constantinople early in the sixth century. The use of the creed in the West originated in Spain in the late sixth century at the direction of the

Council of Toledo (589). These early uses of the creed in both East and West were continuing responses to the ongoing challenge of Arianism to the orthodox faith of the church. The widespread use of the creed in the West was slow in coming and developed over several centuries. Its use received further impetus at the end of the eighth century when the emperor Charlemagne and his theological advisors strongly reiterated the insertion of the Latin *Filioque* (and the Son) in the third article of the text..." He points out that Pope Leo III (785-816) resisted the use of the Creed in the eucharist and it was until the eleventh century that its use was approved and finally was made normative on Sundays at Rome. Holy Communion One follows the uniquely rigid Prayer Book tradition of making its use normative on all occasions, but Holy Communion Two follows a more rational practice of making its use on weekdays optional.

The restoration of the (original) first person plural "We believe" (three times in the version in Holy Communion Two), enables a meaningful distinction to be made between the use of the personal "I believe" in the Apostles' Creed which is used at baptisms as well as a Morning and Evening Prayer and on other occasions and the "We believe" of the Nicene Creed which indicates the church's corporate confession of faith. It is highly regrettable that in the recent liturgical changes in the Roman Catholic Church, the first person singular has reverted to. This remains in Holy Communion One, the principle of the Liturgical Advisory Committee being to make only the most minimal changes in that rite, except in the rubrics.

[19] In the *Alternative Prayer Book, 1984* the use of the Creed before or after the sermon was permitted, allowing the traditional Prayer Book arrangement to continue to be used. This is now not provided for in Holy Communion Two. Canon Brian Mayne in his *Alternative Prayer Book 1984 - A Commentary on Morning and Evening Prayer and the Holy Communion*, preferred the second (and now mandatory) arrangement, and said, "It completes the proclamation of the Word as the preacher relates the message of the readings to our life and situation today."

[20] Mayne, op. cit., "This is our verbal response to the Ministry of the Word as we profess together our common faith in the One God who has made himself known to mankind - the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit."

[21] BCP 2004 p.53. This salutation is ultimately derived from Holy Scripture (Ruth 2:4), and in its Christian use is probably co-extensive with Christianity. It is to be found in the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus both in the Eucharist and at the Bringing in of Lamps at the Communal Supper. See G.J. Cuming, *Hippolytus: a text for students*, Grove Liturgical Study No. 8, Grove Books, 1976, pp10,23. It was retained in the 1549 Order for Holy Communion, but omitted from the 1552 rite. Most revisions of the Prayer Book Order and virtually all modern Anglican liturgies prefix it to the Sursum Corda, which is followed in Holy Communion Two (BCP 2004 pp209, 212, 216). The function of this greeting, here and elsewhere, appears to be to join priest and people in the liturgical act which follows; but there is an implied recognition of the Lord's presence. The traditional response "and with thy spirit" has given way to "and also with you" followed post-Vatican II provision in the Roman Catholic Church and was intended to follow the principle of the use of common language wherever possible, but this has been frustrated by the recent change in that church to "and with your spirit" which seems to get the worst of both worlds.

[22] This distinctive greeting first appeared in the English Series 3 service (1973), although the draft Order in the Church of England document *Modern Liturgical Texts* (op. cit. 1968) had "The Spirit of the Lord be with you; And also with you". This form was explained and defended by R.J. Halliburton in his essay "The Canon of Series 3", Chapter Eight in *The Eucharist Today - studies on Series 3*, Ed. R.C.D. Jasper, SPCK 1974. According to the researches of Van Unnik a number of biblical texts which speak of God "being with somebody" use the word "Lord" in the sense of the Spirit. Strictly speaking, this is no longer a greeting, but a declaration that "The Spirit of God is really present". Op. cit. pp101-103. The actual form of the salutation, however, suggests that we are speaking here of a presence of Christ "in the Spirit" since it says in the response, not "The Spirit is with us" but "*His* Spirit is with us."

[23] That is, the mode of the presence is understood to be congruous with the view of the nature of a sacrament as expressed in the Revised Catechism:-

Q.39. "What do you mean by a sacrament? By a sacrament I mean the use of material things as signs and pledges of God's grace, and as a means by which we receive his gifts."

Q.40. "What are the two parts of a sacrament? The two parts of a sacrament are the outward and visible sign, and the inward and spiritual grace."

Q.41. "How many sacraments has Christ, in the Gospel, appointed for his Church? Christ in the Gospel has appointed two sacraments in his Church as needed by all for fulness of life, Baptism and Holy Communion."

Clearly then, the sacraments are understood as channels of grace, communicators of gifts, and as necessary means to the fulness of life in Christ. This is reinforced by the series of questions and answers about Holy Communion:-

51. "What is the outward and visible sign in Holy Communion? The outward and visible sign in Holy Communion is bread and wine given as the Lord commanded."

52. "What is the inward and spiritual gift in Holy Communion? The inward and spiritual gift in Holy Communion is the Body and Blood of Christ, truly and indeed given by him and received by the faithful."

53. "What is meant by receiving the Body and Blood of Christ? Receiving the Body and Blood of Christ means receiving the life of Christ himself, who was crucified and rose again, and is now alive for evermore."

[24] BCP 2004 p. The "taking" is understood here as a preliminary act. Commenting on the comparable part of the ASB, the Commentary by the Church of England's Liturgical Commission says, p.78, note, "It seems that Jesus' action in lifting the elements from the table at the Last Supper was designatory, identifying the elements he would be describing as his body and/or blood." In the BCP 2004 the position is complicated by the mandatory manual act of laying the hand on the bread and the cup in the first Order (BCP 2004 p.54) and "taking" the bread and cup into the priest's hands in the second Order (BCP 2004 p.60) during the Words of Institution. It would appear that the biblical custom presupposed by the accounts of the Lord's "taking" the bread (and later the cup) into his hands was that the head of the household took the bread and held it a handbreadth from the table during the thanksgiving.

[25] BCP 2004 pp209-217. The comments here also apply to the Order for the Communion of those who are Sick which differs only in the pre-Sanctus from the first

Eucharistic Prayer in Holy Communion Two. Implied here is the concept of "thanksgiving by consecration" commended by the Lambeth Conference of 1958, "We desire to draw attention to a conception of consecration which is scriptural and primitive and goes behind subsequent controversies with respect to the moment and formula of consecration. This is associated with the Jewish origin and meaning of *eucharistia* and may be called consecration through thanksgiving." Committee Report, "Progress in the Anglican Communion - B, The Book of Common Prayer", p.2.85 in *The Lambeth Conference 1958 - The Encyclical Letter from the Bishops together with the Resolutions and Reports*, SPCK and Seabury Press 1958.

[26] BCP 2004 pp210, 215, 216-7. No manual act beyond the initial "taking" is prescribed, presumably to illustrate the concept that "the whole prayer consecrates", and to avoid a "moment of consecration". This will be discussed later in consideration of the report of the Inter-Anglican Liturgical Consultation (Dublin) in 1995. However, it does not seem to the present writer that there cannot be focal points in the eucharistic canon, and that it is meaningful not only to have the initial "taking" but to raise the bread and the cup, successively at the relevant paragraphs in the eucharistic prayer, underlining in gesture as well as in the words of the liturgy the significance of this bread and wine in keeping with the words of the Saviour and to raise them again in the historic "Little Elevation" at the doxology associating them with the praise and thanks and the giving of glory to God with which the Eucharistic Prayer ends. Some concept of consecration not being wholly dependent on the saying of the entire prayer is indicated by the provision for "When the Consecrated Elements are insufficient" in the 2004 Prayer Book p.240 where the principle seems to be that of "consecration by addition" with or without words, the words prescribed referring to the institution. The expression "may be to us" his body/blood (cf the similar wording in Eucharistic Prayer Three) coheres well with the concept of the sacrament maintained in this present study-. As a general principle of consecration Dr Gilbert Sinden in his commentary *When We Meet for Worship*, Australia, 1978, pp140,142 says (in relation to what is now Eucharistic Prayer Two in the 2004 Prayer Book), that it is sufficient when more than one vessel is used for either element for the priest to take one vessel only in his hands for the institution narrative; and he cites an old rule that it is presumed the priest intends to consecrate all elements placed in vessels on the corporal.

For an examination of the significance of the recitation of the Institution Narrative, see R.F. Buxton, *Eucharist and Institution Narrative - a study in the Roman and Anglican traditions of the Consecration of the Eucharist from the Eighth to the Twentieth Centuries*, Alcuin Club Collections No. 58, Mayhew-McCrimmon, 1976. In the BCP 2004 the Words of Institution are considered an integral part of the consecration, even although (in the case of supplementary consecration) the addition of bread and wine may be considered to bring the elements within the scope of the Eucharistic Prayer, including the Institution Narrative, which has already been said.

[27] "Any of the consecrated bread and wine remaining after the administration of communion is to be reverently consumed" (General Directions for Public Worship 14 (e). This, however, is a significant modification of the Prayer Book rubric (p.155) which states, "And if any remain of the Bread and Wine which was consecrated, it shall not be carried out of the Church, but the Priest, and such other of the Communicants as he shall then call unto him, shall, immediately after the Blessing, reverently eat and drink the same." The word "immediately" is not included in the BCP 2004 rubric, nor is there any

prohibition on carrying the elements out of the Church, so that the way is left open for the practice of "Extended Communion" which is explicitly provided for in a form drawn up by the Liturgical Advisory Committee and approved for use by the House of Bishops. The rubric ensures that the consecrated bread and wine are to continue to be treated as sacramental and not as ordinary bread and wine. Problems may arise when there is an overestimate of the amount of wine to be consumed by the congregation to the extent that reverent consumption borders on the impossible even when it takes place after the celebration.

[28] The concept of "be to us" has a long history, being found in the Roman rite in the form, "Ut *nobis* corpus et sanguis *fiat* ("may become") dilectissimi filli tui domini nostri iesu Christi..." F.E. Brightman, *The English Rite*, Rivington's, 1915, Vol II, p.692. Cranmer translated this passage into English in the 1549 Prayer Book, "that they may be unto us the body and blood of thy most derely beloved son Jesus Christ..." Brightman, op. cit. In 1552 and following editions of the Prayer Book there was a re-writing, "Grant that we, receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine, according to thy son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed body and blood". Brightman, op. cit. The present wording in the BCP 2004 form for additional consecration is also to be found in the Church of England's *Common Worship*, p.296. It is susceptible of a variety of theological interpretations including receptionism, if taken by itself. However, the Words of Administration in their traditional form suggest that there is both an objective gift and a subjective receiving (see below [29] For a discussion of the issue, see C.O. Buchanan, *Further Anglican Liturgies 1968-1975*, op. cit. pp31-34. Also relevant is the Church of England Liturgical Commission's *A Commentary on Holy Communion Series 3* (SPCK 1971), pp26-27.

[29] BCP 2004 pp56, 62. The conjunction of the "objective" (1549) and "subjective" (1552) forms of Words of Administration was an achievement of the revision of 1559. G.J. Cuming, *A History of Anglican Liturgy*, 1969 Ed., p.122. With regard to the objective reality even the emphatically Protestant Ridley (martyred for his faith under Queen Mary) went so far as to say,

The bread which was before common bread is now made a lively representation of Christ's body, and not only a figure, but effectuously representeth His Body: that even as the moral body was nourished by that visible bread, so is the internal soul fed with the heavenly food of Christ's Body, which the eyes of faith see, as the bodily eyes see only bread. Such a sacramental mutation I grant to be in the bread and wine, which truly is no small change, but such a change as no mortal man can make, but only that omnipotency of Christ's word.

Cited in Coslett Quin *At the Lord's Table - a theological and devotional commentary on the Holy Communion Service according to the Anglican Rite of 1662*, Lutterworth Press, 1954, p.178. The Revd Coslett Quin was Professor of Biblical Greek in Trinity College, Dublin from 1961 and a highly respected figure who was later to translate some of the Church of Ireland's modern liturgies into Irish.

The balance between the "objective" and "subjective" aspects in Holy Communion Two is maintained by the words of the Invitation, and also by the differing nuances of the various forms of the Words of Administration.

[30] Although not having the same degree of significance as the "Amen" at the end of the Eucharistic Prayer, this response at the administration enables the communicant to make a

personal affirmation of faith in response of the words spoken as the bread and wine are given.

[31] It seems a pity that the very beautiful text 5 in the "Words at the Giving of Communion" in the Church of England's *Common Worship* p.295 were not included,

The bread of heaven in Christ Jesus

The cup of life in Christ Jesus.

[32] Traditionally the Benedictus qui venit was attached to the Sanctus; but in the *Alternative Prayer Book 1984* on account of some reservations it was removed a position among the Communion Anthems. After much discussion at the Liturgical Advisory Committee it was added to the Sanctus in Holy Communion Two with an explanatory rubric in Eucharistic Prayer One but not in Eucharistic Prayers Two and Three. The explanatory rubric was removed (presumably as unnecessary) by an amendment during the Synodical process of authorization of Holy Communion Two. There is no reason under the liturgical canons why it may not be used in Prayers Two and Three if desired. For the use of the Benedictus at High Mass in the Roman Catholic Church prior to the reforms of Vatican II see T. Klauser, *A Short History of the Western Liturgy*, 2nd ed., OUP, 1979, pp133,134.

At an early stage after its introduction to the liturgy the Agnus Dei (to be found in two versions in the 2004 Prayer Book p. 220) served as a "confractorium" to be sung during the breaking of the bread which went on until this was finished when the conclusion was sung. This seems to have happened in Rome under a Syrian Pope, Sergius I and in *Ordo Romanus Primus* it seems that the bishops and priests broke all the consecrated loaves which acolytes carried in linen sacks to those who were to distribute them. Robert Cabié in *The Eucharist - The Church at Prayer*, Vol 2, New Edition, edited by A.G. Martimort, (translation) published by Geoffrey Chapman, 1983 (GB 1986) p.110 says that the rite was a practical necessity in view of distributing communion, and it took some time if the congregation was a large one. It meant that the symbolism of the slain Lamb of the new Passover was added to the sign of the father of the family giving food to his children, as at Jewish meals.

In accordance with the rubric other hymns may be sung at this point. It is appropriate that these should give expression to forms of eucharistic devotion whenever possible.

[33] In an essay on "The Role of the Lectionary" in *Using the Bible in Worship*, Grove Liturgical Study No 11, Grove Books, 1977, pp25-27, John Tiller said that the three functions of the lectionary are to link the congregation to the Christian tradition, to impose upon the worshippers the duty of listening, and to enable the liturgy to become the vehicle of proclamation.

[34] For a full discussion see the writer's *The Meaning and Role of the Anamnesis in the Anglican Liturgical Tradition*, B.D. thesis (unpublished), University of Dublin, 1979. The chapter headings are, 1. The Biblical background; 2. Anamnesis in the early Church; 3. The Anglican Reformation; 4. Memorial and Sacrifice - from the 16th - 20th centuries; 5. The Current Position.

On the concept of the Eucharist as a "Memorial before God" see J. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus, English translation of the third edition*, SCM, 1966, Chapter V. See also M. Thurian, *The Eucharistic Memorial*, 2 Vols, Ecumenical Studies in Worship No's 7,8, Lutterworth, 1960, 1961. For a Conservative Evangelical assessment

of the scriptural evidence, see D. Gregg, *Anamnesis in the Eucharist*, Grove Liturgical Studies No 5, Grove Books, 1976. For a critique of Gregg's book see the writer's B.D. thesis, cited above, Chapter One. For a summary of this thesis see the writer's paper for the Clerical Reading Society in 1979 with the same title as the thesis (unpublished).

Other relevant sources are included in the bibliography to the writer's Ph.D. thesis, op. cit.

[35] See *Lectionaries for Trial Use in the Church of Ireland* authorised by the House of Bishops for experimental use in churches and chapels of the Church of Ireland from Advent 1995. These included a lectionary for the Principal Services on Sundays and Holydays based on the *Revised Common Lectionary*, the Consultation on Common Texts, Washington 1992 and lectionaries for a Second or Third Service prepared by the Church of England's Liturgical Commission. The appropriate collects, which appeared in a separate booklet had been produced by an Interprovincial Consultation representing the Church of England, the Church of Ireland, the Church in Wales and the Scottish Episcopal Church. Some modifications of the latter were made by the Liturgical Advisory Committee for incorporation into the 2004 Prayer Book.

[36] BCP 2004 pp27-70

[37] This enabled the readings at the Office and those for Holy Communion to be fully integrated, although there are additional readings (from the Gospels) provided for the Second Service series and there is only intermittently a Gospel reading in the Third Service series.

[38] No provision is made in the BCP 2004 for a course of readings for a daily celebration of the Holy Communion, but attention is drawn to the "Daily Eucharistic Lectionary", derived from the Missal, and used by the Church of England, in the Church of Ireland's Directory for each successive year. The readings are printed out in full in *Common Worship - Daily Eucharistic Lectionary*, Canterbury Press, Norwich, 2008.

[38] BCP 2004 p.322, Notes 3. "The second set of psalms and readings...is for a second service in a church - for example at Evening Prayer if the principal set is used in the morning, or vice versa."

[39] BCP 2004 pp45-62 under "Principal Service"

[40] For example, seven readings from Ephesians on the Year B readings for the Sundays between 10th-16th July and 21st to 27th August.

[41] A separate lectionary is also published each year running from Advent Sunday in one year to the eve of Advent Sunday in the next and published with the year at the top of the title page, the Church of Ireland Publishing logo and the title, *Church of Ireland - Sunday and Weekday Readings*. A useful table appears at the back listing the Sundays and Holy Days in the order of the Calendar for the particular year.

[42] See the writer's *The Meaning and Role of the Anamnesis in the Anglican Liturgical Tradition*, op. cit. ppl,2.

[43] BCP 2004 p.55. This was a reversion to historic use, as the pre-Reformation Roman rite had "Unde et memores...", and the anamnesis in the 1549 BCP began, "Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father..." In 1552 everything that followed the Words of Institution was omitted from the Prayer of Consecration, although the ill-fated Scottish liturgy of 1637 reintroduced what it called "this Memorial or Prayer of Oblation"; and this usage

was followed in liturgies derived from or influenced by the Scottish Order. See B. Wigan, *The Liturgy in English*, op. cit. p.44 and passim.

[44] BCP 2004 p. 210. Examination of the *anamnesis* in any rite of the eucharist is a useful starting point for a clue to its theological understanding. See the writer's *The Meaning and Role of the Anamnesis*, op. cit. [42] above, although by definition this does not include the *epiclesis*, which customarily follows the *anamnesis* and gives an indication of the nature of the liturgical action of the Holy Spirit.

[45] BCP 2004 pp 209-11. Note the reiteration of the address to the Father, "Father, almighty and everliving God...", "Blessèd are you, Father...", "Therefore, Father, with this bread and this cup...", "All honour and glory are yours, Almighty Father..." BCP 2004 pp53-55.

[46] BCP 2004 p219, especially the first form. This speak of gifts from God to man appropriated by faith with thanksgiving, "in remembrance that" Christ died and his blood was shed for the communicant.

[47] BCP 2004 p.61. This is very unusual in modern Anglican liturgies. The Church of England's *Common Worship rites* have "we remember", "calling to mind", "in remembrance of", "we remember all that Jesus did", "As we recall the one, perfect sacrifice of our redemption", "we remember his dying and rising in glory", "Father, we do this in remembrance of him. Only Prayer D (CW p.195 has no "remember" word in the anamnesis out of eight eucharistic prayers in their modern language Order One services. The 1982 Scottish rite has "recall". The 1984 Welsh rite has "making the memorial". The Canadian rites (based on the American) have "recalling", "remembering", "we remember", "recall", and "celebrate the memorial". Only the fifth Canadian Eucharistic Prayer has no memory word but simply "celebrate". C.O. Buchanan, *Latest Anglican Liturgies 1976-1984*, Alcuin Club/SPCK 1985, Chapters 1-3, 5, and a comparable picture emerges from his *Anglican Eucharistic Liturgies, 1985-2010 - the authorized rites of the Anglican Communion*, Canterbury Press, 2011.

[48] BCP 2004 p.215.

[49] See the writer's unpublished presidential paper, *The Ministry of the Sacrament: Alternative Order in the Alternative Prayer Book*, written for the Armagh Clerical Union, January 1985, p.5.

[The Eucharistic Prayer Two in Holy Communion Two gives the complete form of the eucharistic prayer in the 1978 Australian Prayer Book but in the context of a single order for Communion rather than a complete "Alternative" order as in the Alternative Prayer Book of 1984.

[50] A careful and full exposition of the Holy Communion in the Australian Prayer Book of 1978 is given in Chapter Four of *When We Meet for Worship - a manual for using An Australian Prayer Book, 1978* by Gilbert Sinden SSM. On the biblical basis he expounds the significance of the Last Supper in terms of its *sacrificial* intent, its *covenantal* character, its *Passover* overtones, its *prophetic* aspect, its embodiment of *brotherhood*, and its claim to the *Messiahship* of Jesus. The structure of the Eucharistic Prayer is carefully modelled on the Jewish liturgical and family form of *berakah*, or prayer of adoration, blessing God, which Sinden says, had four parts: an invitation; a statement of motives, recounting in thanksgiving the great deeds of God; petitions; and a hymn or doxology. This undoubtedly has the effect of linking the Christian eucharist with the kind

of biblical understanding which prevails in Judaism but suffers from the difficulty that it is not clear (because of insufficiency of evidence) exactly what liturgical forms were fully established in the time of Jesus and how much diversity existed.

[51] This form, in an interactive mode, largely the work of Bishop Colin Buchanan, came before the Liturgical Advisory Committee in a draft form and was recast in a manner which emphasized its Trinitarian character by addressing each Person of the Holy Trinity in order and then the Trinity in its totality and adding after the Sanctus the concluding words, "Thanks be to you, our God, for your gift beyond words. **Amen. Amen. Amen.**" This piece of liturgical creativity has given to Eucharistic Prayer Three a freshness and a dynamism which make it, in its definitive form, one of the finest pieces of liturgical writing in the 2004 Prayer Book. Colin Buchanan (at that time Bishop of Woolwich) wrote an account of his input into the matter in "Common Worship - Eucharistic Prayer H (in Order One) an unauthorized account" reprinted from Ushaw Library Bulletin and Liturgical Review, no 13, September 2000. The congregational responses are mainly his, and read far better than the modified version in the Church of England's Prayer H, although the Liturgical Advisory Committee felt that one less response (although the words were retained to be said by the celebrant) made the interaction a little bit less overpowering.

[52] BCP 2004 p.217. The Church of England's Prayer H may be slightly more anamnetic through the responses to the narrative of institution, "**We do this in remembrance of him: his body is the bread of life**" and "**We do this in remembrance of him: his blood is shed for all**" but this seems in the main a restatement of what is in the Lord's own words apart from the reference to the "bread of life" which actually is in Eucharistic Prayer Three from Colin Buchanan's, and such a flat repetition does little or nothing to add significance to the Prayer.

[53] A classic study, uniting the concepts of the Holy Spirit, Holy Communion, and Fellowship, is that by J.E.L Oulton, *Holy Communion and Holy Spirit - a study in doctrinal relationships*, SPCK, 1954. Although this is dated in some respects - for example in accepting John as a primary source for the eucharist as over against the Synoptics and espousing Dix's chaburah theory of its origin - it has a considerable value in setting the eucharist within the context of the *koinonia* to which the New Testament as a whole bears witness, whether in the teaching of the Epistles or in the fellowship of Jesus and his Friends.

The corporate aspect of worship, finding its full expression in the Holy Communion, was stressed in the teaching associated with the Liturgical Movement. The two classic Anglican books arising from this were A.G. Hebert (Ed.) *The Parish Communion*, SPCK, 1937, and his *Liturgy and Society - the Function of the Church in the Modern World*, Faber & Faber; and this emphasis on the corporate aspect in his *Apostle and Bishop*, Faber and Faber, 1963, pp128-130, is stressed under the heading, "The Solidarity of the Body of Christ". E. Underhill in *Worship*, Nisbet & Co., 2nd Ed. 1937, has a chapter on "The Principles of Corporate Worship" (pp83-99). The significance of the corporate aspect of the Christian religion is underlined by the sub-title of the Doctrine Commission of the Church of England's publication, *Believing in the Church - the Corporate Nature of Faith*, SPCK, 1981.

[54] BCP 2004 p.202. In addition, the "new commandment" to "love one another" appears in the BCP 2004 at the Peace, at which the significance of inter-personal

relationships at the Lord's Supper is indicated by the (optional) use of the sign of peace. The same message is communicated by the introductory words, "Christ is *our* peace. He has reconciled *us* to God *in one body* by the cross. *We* meet in his name and *share* his peace."

[55] BCP 2004 pp222-3. The interactive version of abbreviated 10 Commandments from the Old Testament, in essence warning us what *not* to do, is interspersed with verses from the New Testament, telling us what we *should* do. An interactive version of the Beatitudes is also an option.

[56] BCP 2004 p.205. This restores the original form as indicated above. See J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Creeds*, 3rd Ed. Longman, 1972, p215.

[57] BCP 2004 p.218. However, the "our" is understood since both the Matthean and Lucan versions begin with *pater*, "Father", although the plural is used further down in the prayer. Matthew 6:9, Luke 11:2.

[58] Including the forms already mentioned, At the Greeting, in the Collect for Purity, in the Gloria in Excelsis, in the response to the Readings, in the Nicene Creed, in response to the Intercessions, in response to the Summary of the Law or the Commandments, at the Confession, in the Prayer of Humble Access, at the Peace, in the Ascription, in response to the salutation preceding the Eucharistic Prayer, the Sursum Cords, and the Gratias Agamus, in the Sanctus, the Acclamations (Second Order only), the great Amen, and in the "Blessing and glory" (Second Order only); also in the Lord's Prayer, in the second half of the words at the Breaking of the Bread, in the Amen at the administration of the elements, in the Post-Communion Prayer and in the response to the Dismissal. One may add to this the congregational participation in the hymns, psalm(s), canticles, anthem, and communion anthems when they are used.

[59] General Directions for Public Worship. BCP p77, 14(b), This includes the words, "The Gospel should be read, where possible, by a deacon." In the absence of a deacon it is appropriate for a Reader to do so.

[60] BCP 2004 p206 "Prayers may be read by a deacon or lay person, or may be in silence with biddings, or may be in the form of open prayer, where members of the congregation contribute." See also *The Marriage Service, Two*, p.423, "The prayers are led by the minister or by others appointed by the minister, using either of the following forms. Other prayers may be included." In relation to the administration, it states in the General Directions for Public Worship, BCP p.77 14(b) "The bishop of the diocese may permit lay persons approved by him to assist the priest in the administration of the bread and wine." This marks an advance of the provision in the *Alternative Prayer Book 1984*, where no mention is made of lay people administering in both kinds, although it is normal for a celebrant to administer the bread and an assistant the cup.

[61] BCP 2004 p.211. This is a "Communion Epiclesis" rather than a "Consecratory Epiclesis". On the Holy of the Holy Spirit in the Eucharist see J.H. McKenna, *Eucharist and Holy Spirit - the Eucharistic Epiclesis in Twentieth Century Theology*, Alcuin Club Collections No 57, Mayhew-McCrimmon, 1975. A new emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit in the Eucharist is characteristic of modern Anglican liturgical revision. See the liturgies in the collections edited by C.O. Buchanan, *Modern Anglican Liturgies 1958-1968*, OUP, 1968; *Further Anglican Liturgies, 1968-1975*, Grove Books, 1975; *Latest Anglican Liturgies 1976-1984*, Alcuin Club/SPCK, 1985, *Anglican Eucharistic Liturgies*

1985-2010, Canterbury Press, 2011. Nor should the profound significance of the Collect for Purity in Anglican liturgies be overlooked. The retention of this prayer at the beginning of even the most recent Anglican liturgies (sometimes as an option but usually as a fixed part of the order of service) witnesses to the place this has in Anglican sacramental spirituality. This was commented on in the Prayer Book section in the Report of the 1958 Lambeth Conference on p.2.85, "Whether or not an invocation of the Holy Spirit upon the worshippers or upon the elements or both is to be included in the Prayer of Consecration, it is to be remembered that the Holy Spirit informs and vivifies the whole Rite and that the so-called Collect for Purity has in consequence a profound theological significance."

For a brief summary of the meaning and role of the Epiclesis, see G. Cuming, *He gave thanks: an introduction to the Eucharistic Prayer*, Grove Liturgical Study No. 28, Grove Books 1981, pp29-31.

[62] In the Experimental Order *Holy Communion 1972* the mutual indwelling appeared as a benefit additional to "being made one in your holy Church and partakers of the Body and Blood..." In the BCP 2004, by the elimination of the word "and" the mutual indwelling has become the goal of Communion "by the power of the life-giving Spirit" - "that we may be made one in your holy Church and partakers of the body and blood of your Son, *that he may dwell in us and we in him*". It may be noted that in the thought of the BCP 2004 the communion and fellowship is not limited to the worshippers on earth, but joins the church on earth with the church in heaven. This may be seen (*inter alia*) in the Collects of Saint Brigid (BCP 2004 pp304-5), and of All Saints' Day. The latter, in the Collect Two form reads,

Almighty God,
you have knit together your elect
in one communion and fellowship
in the mystical body of your Son Christ our Lord:
Grant us grace so to follow your blessed saints
in all virtuous and godly living
that we may come to those inexpressible joys
that you have prepared for those who truly love you;
through Jesus Christ our Lord. **Amen.**

[63] The thought of praise uniting the church militant with the church triumphant also appears, in the Te Deum (pp125,126-7), in the Preface for Saints' Days (BCP 2004 p.235, cited in the main text), and in the words leading up to the Sanctus in the Eucharistic Prayer One, "And so with all your people, with angels and archangels, and *with all the company of heaven*, we proclaim your great and glorious name, for ever praising you and saying..." (BCP 2004 p.209). The same phrase is found in Eucharistic Prayer Two. (BCP 2004 p.214). The Seasonal Addition for use on Saints' Days emphasizes the *koinonia* which brings together Christians here and now and in the hereafter, "You have called us into the fellowship of (...and) all your saints, and set before us the example of their witness and of the fruit of your Spirit in their lives." The praise which occurs on earth which joins with that in heaven appears in Eucharistic Prayer Three in the words leading up to the Sanctus,

Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, Blessed Trinity:
with your whole Church throughout the world
we offer you this sacrifice of thanks and praise
and lift our voice to join the song of heaven,
for ever praising you and saying...

It may be noted that the similarity of the language at the end of Eucharistic Prayer One to that of the Prayer of Humble Access is not accidental. It seems to have been the original intention of the revisers to omit "Humble Access" and include the basic idea of mutual indwelling at this point. See the 1971 Draft Order, JGS 1971, p.204. Following criticism at the 1971 Synod, it was restored in a shortened form, for optional use, and appeared in the 1972 Order. In the 1980 Draft the full text was recovered; and its use was made obligatory by an amendment passed by the General Synod and entered into the *Alternative Prayer Book, 1984*. In the 2004 Prayer book it still appears in its full form but its use, at least in theory, is restricted by a rubric, "If the Penitence comes at this point of the service it may be followed by" [The Prayer of Humble Access] In its current form it expresses strongly a doctrine of our mutual indwelling in Christ through sacramental participation.

[For the history and significance of the Prayer of Humble Access see the writer's doctoral thesis *Theological Implications*, Appendix GG (3)].

[64] BCP 2004 p214 The present wording of this section, from *An Australian Prayer Book, 1978*, which was adopted as part of the eucharistic provision in the *Alternative Prayer Book 1984* and is now Eucharistic Prayer Two in Holy Communion Two in the 2004 Prayer Book reflects a certain evolution of thought in Australian liturgical revision (upon which this Order is based). The 1973 "Australian Experimental Liturgy" had separate thanksgivings over the bread and the cup, each incorporating the appropriate "Words of Institution". In discussing the current form in a footnote, Dr Gilbert Sinden, in his commentary *When we meet for Worship*, Australia, 1978, p.139, says, "In the text of (this section) the most important change since *Australia 1973* is the paragraph beginning "Merciful Father, we thank you..." This now incorporates a prayer based on the corresponding petition of 1662 ("Hear us, O Merciful Father..."). Two further ideas, however, have been added to the content of this part of 1662. The first is a specific thanksgiving for "these gifts of [God's] creation, this bread and this wine". This thanksgiving has been a constant feature of Australian liturgies since 1966, and is based on our Lord's example and command at the Last Supper. The other is an explicit reference to the Holy Spirit. Many correspondents of the Commission had asked for an epiclesis or invocation of the Holy Spirit at this point. The Commission did not believe it appropriate to pray that the Holy Spirit would do anything to the bread and wine; it preferred to follow the most ancient example and to include a specific mention of the Holy Spirit in relation to the communicants. After a good deal of trial of such phrases as "by the power of your Holy Spirit", the Commission felt that the most suitable reference at this point was to the 'fellowship of the Holy Spirit', especially as there is a further petition, towards the end of the prayer, that we may be renewed by the Holy Spirit." See also Evan Burge in *St. Mark's Review*, June 1977, p.19.

For the 1973 Australian Experimental Order see Buchanan, *Further Anglican Liturgies*, op. cit. pp340-352.

[65] Ibid.

[66] BCP 2004 p.214. This is part of the basic text of the Prayer.

[67] Ibid.

[68] BCP 2004 p.212. This is part of the basic text of the Prayer.

[69] BCP 2004 p.218. On the "Fraction" see Dix, *Shape of the Liturgy*, op. cit. p.131, "The original purpose of the fraction, both at the Jewish 'grace before meals' and at the last supper, was simply for distribution. But symbolism laid hold of this part of the rite even in the apostolic age. It is clear from 1 Cor 10:17 that in St. Paul's time the fragments were all broken off a single loaf before the eyes of the assembled communicants. This is the whole point of his appeal for unity in the Corinthian church. This was still the case in the time of Ignatius who writes of 'breaking one bread' (or 'loaf', *hena arton*), again as the demonstration of the unity of the church. Before the end of the second century, however, this symbolism had lost its point and another was substituted for it, in some churches at least, that of the 'breaking' of the Body of Christ in the passion."

St. Augustine, however, seems to have held a utilitarian view of the "Fraction", referring to it as 'ad distribuendum comminuitur', Ep. 149:16.

[68] BCP 2004 p.212

[69] BCP 2004 p.218

[70] BCP 2004 p.220.

[71] BCP 2004 p.221

[72] BCP 2004 p.205 The recitation of the Creed in the public ministration of the Holy Eucharist was first introduced by Peter the Fuller, Bishop of Antioch in 471, and adopted by Timotheus, Bishop of Constantinople in 511. In the West it was adopted first in Spain, by the Third Council of Toledo in 589, as an antidote to Arian heresy; then in France in the time of Charlemagne, and lastly in the Roman Church under Pope Benedict VIII in 1014. J.H. Blunt, *The Annotated Book of Common Prayer*, Rivingtons, 1866, p.170. See also P.J. Cobb, *The Liturgy of the Word in the Early Church* in Jones, Wainwright, Yarnold, *The Study of Liturgy*, op. cit. p.187.

[73] BCP p.209

[74] BCP pp.224-236. J.D. Crichton, "Christian Celebration: The Mass", in *Christian Celebration - The Mass, the Sacraments, the Prayer of the Church*, pp.84,85, "The proclamation of God's word does not cease with the reading of the scriptures and the homily. The church has taken into herself God's message, and now, almost exclusively in her own words, proclaims the meaning of the message. In the Roman tradition this is done in the first place by the 'preface' and the most plausible interpretation of that word (Lat. *prae-fatio*, a speaking out before God and his people) is that it means 'proclamation'. In the Eastern tradition much of the first part of the anaphora is given over to a proclamation of the saving works of God, resuming the main phases of the history of salvation. This proclamation, with which is combined the invocation of the divine names, continues the action of the ministry of the word and shows that the eucharistic celebration itself is a part of the history of salvation carrying it forward until the parousia which is announced in the acclamation after the consecration." It may be said that Eucharistic Prayer One in the Book of Common Prayer 2004 the "Roman" pattern as described above, and Eucharistic Prayer Two "Eastern". Eucharistic Prayer Three is focused very

specifically on the relationship between the work of Christ and the Holy Communion.

For the rehearsal, or "proclamation" of the mighty acts of God in salvation-history at the Passover, see the current form of the Haggadah, in *The Haggadah, a new edition with English translation, introduction, and notes by Cecil Roth, illustrated by Sonia Nachshen*, the Soncino Press Ltd, London, Jerusalem, New York, pp9-34.

An interpretation of the word "anamnesis" in terms of "proclamation" may be found in G.D. Kilpatrick, "Anamnesis" in *Liturgical Review*, Vol 5, No 1 (May 1975), pp35-40; and this was discussed by the writer in Appendix 1 of his unpublished B.D. thesis on *The Meaning and Role of the Anamnesis in the Anglican Liturgical Tradition*, submitted to the University of Dublin, March 1979.

The word "proclaim" is found as a key word in certain early liturgies, mainly Egyptian. See R.C.D. Jasper and G.J. Cuming, *Prayers of the Eucharist, Early and Reformed*, 2nd Ed., OUP, 1980, Chapter 10, "Early Egyptian Fragments", p.44, "The British Museum Tablet", p.45 "The Deir Balyzeh Papyrus", and Chapter 11, p.53, "The Liturgy of St. Mark".

"Proclamation" in the Church's liturgical tradition is discussed by Karl-Heinrich Bieritz in "Patterns of Proclamation", *Studia Liturgica*, Vol 15, 1982/1983 pp18-23.

For a discussion of the Pauline view of the Eucharist see C.P.M. Jones, "The Eucharist, the New Testament", pp151-159 in Jones, Wainwright and Yarnold, *The Study of Liturgy* op. cit. See also D.E.H. Whiteley, *The Theology of St. Paul*, Blackwell, 1974, pp178-185.

A more general account of the Holy Communion in the New Testament, including the 1 Cor 11 passage, may be found in G.D. Kilpatrick, *The Eucharist in Bible and Liturgy*, the Moorhouse Lectures, 1975, CUP, 1983.

[75] BCP 2004 pp224-231, 233.

[76] BCP 2004 pp232, 233-236.

[77] BCP 2004 pp210-211 As the Exodus freed the Children of Israel from slavery in Egypt, so mankind has now been delivered from the slavery of sin by the redemption sacrifice of Jesus the Son of God.

The wording here has been modified (at the suggestion of the Very Revd J.T.F. Paterson, from that in the *Alternative Prayer Book, 1984*, p.54, where it read,

Blessed are you, Father,
the creator and sustainer of all things;
you made man in your own image,
and more wonderfully restored him
when you freed him from the slavery of sin.

In neither case was there an explicit mention of the sojourn in Egypt followed by the Exodus although it seems to be implied. [78] BCP 2004 p.210.

[79] Ibid. "He made there the one complete and all-sufficient sacrifice for the sins of the whole world."

[80] Ibid. The links being "On the night that he was betrayed...", and "Therefore, Father..."

[81] Ibid.

[82] Ibid.

[83] BCP 2004 pp212-214. These were termed "Seasonal Additions" in the place where the eucharistic prayer with them was printed in *An Australian Prayer Book 1978*, pp167-9. They did not appear at all in the *Alternative Prayer Book 1984* although their use would have been compatible with the liturgical canons. The whole prayer is reproduced in Eucharistic Prayer Two in the 2004 Prayer Book but without the title. The rubric says,

The indented paragraphs may be added to the prayer at the appropriate season or day.

[84] BCP 2004 pp213-4

[85] BCP 2004 p.214

[86] Ibid.

[87] BCP 2004 p.215.

[88] See the present writer's paper (unpublished) read to the Armagh Clerical Union in October 2008 with the title, "Eucharistic Prayers in the Book of Common Prayer, 2004". In this informal expression of a personal opinion I said about this prayer,

Eucharistic Prayer Two derives from a desire to have an alternative to Prayer One and was requested by Evangelicals on the LAC when forms of the eucharist were being drawn up for the *Alternative Prayer Book, 1984*. This has always baffled me a bit because the Australian Liturgical Commission, just like the Liturgical Advisory Committee, represents all shades of opinion, and its secretary was actually a monk! This prayer was largely the work of Dr Evan Burge, who died not long ago but whom I met at a meeting of the Inter-Anglican Liturgical Commission some years ago and he was a man I was immensely impressed with. It is carefully modelled on a Jewish *berakah* or prayer of blessing which commonly had four parts: an invitation; a statement of motives, recounting in thanksgiving the great deeds of God; petitions, and a hymn or doxology. It could, therefore, in its methodology, hardly be more biblical. A particular feature is the very full rehearsal of the mighty works of God in Christ, with seasonal and special additions which are meant to be included as appropriate. If the key word in the first eucharistic prayer is "remember" the key word here is "proclaim" as in 1 Corinthians 11:26, "As often as you eat this bread and drink the cup you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes." If I had to choose one of the three prayers in this part of the Prayer Book this is the one I would personally go for.

[89] Kenneth Stevenson called the eucharist "a sacrifice of proclamation", in his *Eucharist and Offering* (New York: Pueblo, 1986), p.235, cited in Christopher J. Cocksworth, *Evangelical Eucharistic Thought in the Church of England*, CUP, 1993 p.217. Stevenson says,

Story is sacrificial because we are recounting the mighty acts of God as events which have a bearing on us now, so that to recount the story in the eucharist is to proclaim realities that involve commitment by us as God is committed to us in the first place. This is why to "offer thanks" is more than a mere verbalization. The conservatism of the liturgy in keeping to the venerable formula, "lift up your hearts," shows that the *eucharistia* has a solemnity about it that marks it off from any other liturgical proclamation. In an age that takes words for granted and

analyzes them beyond measure, *the sacrifice of proclamation* [present writer's italics] is even more important for the eucharistic congregation to enter into and to appropriate.

[90] See above, [88].

[91] BCP p.215. As it tends to be in the traditional Prayer Book One Order, for example in the words "suffer death upon the Cross for our redemption", "a perpetual memory of that his precious death (until his coming again)", "in remembrance of his death and passion" etc. The writer's assumption as expressed in the Introduction of his own B.D. thesis is that, "The function of the liturgical anamnesis is to express in words the Church's response to an understanding of the dominical command, 'do this in remembrance of me.'" Op. cit. p.1.; and in view of the words of Christ, "Do this in remembrance of me" the writer would see the proclamation of the Lord's death as properly set within the context of a celebration of all the mighty acts of God in Christ. However, not all would agree with this line of approach. For example, D. Gregg in *Anamnesis in the Eucharist*, Grove Liturgical Study No. 5, 1976, p.31, writing from a Conservative Evangelical standpoint preferred the concept, enshrined (he said) in one way by Cranmer, that obedience to the original rubric is best achieved by doing it, and not by *reciting* it. If anamneses (in the technical sense) were to be included, he said, then, in regressive order of "propriety" these were: (a) those that referred to Christ's death only; (b) those that referred to his death *and* to the parousia; (c) those that gave a general reference (i.e. to "him" or to "our redemption"; (d) those that gave a composite reference to various aspects of his total existence, but confined the focus of any verb of "proclamation" or "commemoration" to his death only; (e) those that gave a composite and completely indiscriminate reference to all these aspects.

[92] The acclamations between the Words of Institution and the anamnesis are themselves a proclamation, "Christ has died, Christ is risen; Christ will come again".

[93] BCP pp216-7.

[94] BCP p.217.

[95] BCP p.201 "The Celebration of The Holy Communion, also called The Lord's Supper or the Eucharist".

[96] BCP p. 209 "The Great Thanksgiving. One of the following Eucharistic Prayers is said by the presiding minister".

For the early history of the Eucharistic Prayer and its origins in the *berachah*, see L. Ligier, "The Origins of the Eucharist Prayer", *Studia Liturgica*, Vol 9, No 4, 1973, pp161-185, also T.J. Talley, "The Eucharistic Prayer of the Ancient Church", *Studia Liturgica*, Vol 11, No's 3/4, 1976, pp138-158. A more recent treatment by Talley, drawing out the implications of his earlier work is "The Eucharistic Prayer: Tradition and Development", Chapter Four in *Liturgy Reshaped*, Ed. K. Stevenson, SPCK, 1982.

There is a brief treatment of the Eucharistic Prayer in terms of the *berachah* in G. Cuming, *He gave thanks: an Introduction to the Eucharistic Prayer*, Grove Liturgical Study No 28, Grove Books, 1981, Section 2. A rather dated treatment of the theme of Eucharist or Thanksgiving in the Holy Communion of the early Church may be found in Y. Brilioth, *Eucharistic Faith and Practice, Evangelical and Catholic*, ET A.G. Hebert, SPCK, 1965, Chapter Two, Part 1.

A more recent view is that of A.H. Couratin in "The Thanksgiving: An Essay by Arthur Couratin" in *The Sacrifice of praise - studies on the themes of thanksgiving and redemption in the central prayers of the eucharistic and baptismal liturgies, in honour of Arthur Hubert Couratin*, Ed. D.H. Tripp, C.L.V. - Edizioni Liturgiche, Rome, 1981, pp19-61.

[97] Ibid.

[98] Luke 22:19, 1 Cor 11:24. In both of these the verb is *eucharisteo*, to "give thanks", corresponding to the Hebrew *hodeh*. However, in Mt. 26:26 the best reading seems to be from *eulogeo*, to "bless", corresponding to the Hebrew *barak*. following Mark 14:22. Paul Bradshaw in *Reconstructing Early Christian Worship*, SPCK 2009 comments (p.17), "In spite of a persisting misconception among many New Testament scholars that these verbs are merely synonyms that might be employed interchangeably, they actually refer to two quite different liturgical constructions". He deals with this more extensively in his *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship - Sources and Methods for the Study of Early Liturgy*, Revised and Enlarged Edition, SPCK, 2002, pp43-44, and says (in part - the detailed references in Bradshaw's original text have been omitted),

First Century Prayer Patterns

While it is true – as Christian scholars have constantly asserted – that the *berakah* was a first century Jewish prayer-form, it was not the only form that prayer could then take in the Jewish tradition, nor was there one standard form of *berakah* in current use. The *berakah* (plural *berakot*) derives its name from the Hebrew verb *barak*, to bless, and several variant types of liturgical formulae utilizing its passive participle *baruk* (or in Greek, *eulogetos*) in reference to God can be detected in the Hebrew Bible and in inter-testamental literature. As well as very short doxological formulae, such as "Blessed is the Lord for ever" there are also longer acclamations containing either a relative clause or are a participial phrase. The use of a relative clause to express the particular actions of God which were the reason for the blessing appears to be older than that of the use of the participial phrase, which tends to speak in more general terms of the qualities of God, as in "Blessed is God, the one living forever, and [blessed is] his kingdom."

In either case, however, this simple *anamnesis* of God might be expanded into a more complex structure by the addition of other elements. A more detailed narrative description of God's works is very common, as our supplication and intercession – the remembrance of God's past goodness constituting the ground on which he might be asked to continue his gracious activity among his people – but confession of sin or protestations of unworthiness and faithfulness are also found. The petitionary element often ends with a statement that its purpose is not just the benefit of the supplicants but the advancement of God's glory, and both the narrative description and such petition may lead back to praise in a concluding doxology. Although in the Hebrew Bible these *berakot* are nearly all cast in the third person, they are developed in the inter-testamental period an increasing preference for the second person instead, as in "Blessed are you, O Saviour of Israel, who..."

On the other hand, the praise of God might be expressed in ways other than the *berakah*. An alternative construction (sometimes called the *hodayah*) instead use the Hebrew verb *hodeh*, or sometimes some other verb, but in an active and not a

passive form with God addressed directly in the second person. Although *hodeh* is usually translated into English as "give thanks", its primary purpose is not the expression of gratitude but rather confession or acknowledgement that something is the case, the same verb also being used for the confession of sin. It was at first rendered into Greek by compound forms of the verb, *homologeō*, although later *eucharisteō* became established as an alternative. Like *barak*, it could be used in brief doxologies, or with a subordinate clause to articulate the reason for the praise usually introduced with the conjunction *ki* that is in Greek *hoti* and the formula could be expanded with further narrative description or by the addition of supplication before returning to a doxological conclusion. This liturgical form is common among the material from Qumran.

Similarly, Jewish prayers of praise in this period might dispense entirely with any introductory formula, and begin directly to recount the mighty works of God, either speaking of God in the third person or addressing God directly in the second person, and could then pass on to supplication and to a concluding doxology. More complex liturgical forms might combine elements of different types. Furthermore, the difference between the constructions could be blurred to some extent by the fact that the *hodayah* might occasionally use a relative clause, like the *berakah*, and the *berakah* a subordinate clause like the *hodayah*.

Whichever word in the Hebrew or its Aramaic equivalent underlying the Greek texts relating to the Last Supper is the more original, the overall context of the Passover is one in which the mighty acts of God in the deliverance of his people in the events of the Exodus are rehearsed and proclaimed, and praise and thanks are offered. The present-day text of the Passover has numerous examples of the use of *baruk* - blessed (are you), and these appear to predominate, but there are also expressions of thanksgiving, and there is even an example of both together as in "For all this, O Lord, our God, we render thanks to you and bless you. Blessed be your name..." See *The Haggadah - A New Edition with English Translation Introduction and Notes* by Cecil Roth, The Soncino Press Ltd, London, Jerusalem and New York, seventh impression, 1975, p.47 for the example. The implications for the Christian eucharist (in which this word has predominated) is that elements of praise (including blessing), thanksgiving and proclamation are combined in the great prayer of thanksgiving and consecration that lies at the heart of this observance. The institution narrative itself may be regarded as part of the proclamation although this does not necessarily exhaust its significance within the eucharistic prayer as a whole.

[99] Attention was drawn to this by the Prayer Book sub-committee of the Lambeth Conference of 1958, chaired by Dr George Simms (Archbishop of Dublin),

Consecration

We desire to draw attention to a conception of consecration which is scriptural and primitive and goes behind subsequent controversies with respect to the moment and formula of consecration. This is associated with the Jewish origin and meaning of *eucharistia* and may be called consecration through thanksgivings. "To bless anything and to pronounce a thanksgiving over it are not two actions but one." [Louis Boyer, *Life and Liturgy*, p.120]

"Everything created by God is good, and nothing is to be rejected if it is received with thanksgiving; for then it is consecrated by the word of God and prayer" (1 Tim. 4:4,5).

Thanksgiving unveils the glory and generosity of the Creator and the original meaning and purpose of creation. It releases man's response to what has been done for him in redemption and sets free the love implanted in him.

"The Word of God accepted by the People of God and coming back to God from the lips of those giving thanks, actually sanctifies the creatures over which it is pronounced." [Bouyer, op. cit. p.119]

The findings of the 1995 (Dublin) Inter Anglican Liturgical Conference, included the specific statement in its "Principles and Recommendations" on pp261-2 of David R. Holeton, *Our Thanks and Praise - The Eucharist in Anglicanism Today - Papers from the Fifth International Anglican Liturgical Consultation*, Anglican Book Centre, 1998.

6. In the eucharist, we encounter the mystery of the triune God in the proclamation of the word and the celebration of the sacrament. The fundamental character of the eucharistic prayer is thanksgiving, and the whole eucharistic prayer should be seen as consecratory. The elements of memorial and invocation are caught up within the movement of thanksgiving.

This in turn draws on the work of Working Group (1) whose remit was Eucharistic Theology (and of which the writer was a member) which said under the heading of "B. Thanksgiving and Blessing,"

1. Thanksgiving is a fundamental concept of the Christian life and finds a special place in baptism, the eucharist, and in other rites of the church. In relation to the Holy Communion, we ought to see the entire rite as eucharistic; thanksgiving permeates every aspect of it. It is within this context that we see the significance of the eucharistic prayer (of thanksgiving/consecration). The scope of this thanksgiving (which itself derives from the Lord's giving of thanks of the Last Supper) is comprehensive, and embraces creation and salvation history (centred on the self giving of Christ) as well as Eucharistic consecration

2. We would encourage provinces as a matter of policy to offer a range of complementary Eucharistic prayers which in their very complementarity can embrace or point to the whole range and depth of eucharistic theology, without any one prayer having to bear the whole weight of meaning. Thanksgiving for Christ's saving work, centred on the cross, must find expression in all eucharistic prayers.

3. In relation to the structure of the Eucharistic prayer, we see this as consisting essentially of thanksgiving and supplication, recognizing that the one is intimately related to the other.

4. We would draw attention to the inter-related character of the traditional parts of the Eucharistic prayer inclusive of the opening dialogue (derived to some extent from Jewish sources), thanksgiving to God for his work in creation, the rehearsal of the mighty acts of God in Christ, the institution narrative, the anamnesis, the epic thesis of the Holy Spirit, petitions, and doxology.

5. The institution narrative is part of the series of mighty acts which we remember. Rather than being a formula for consecration, it is best understood as the mandate for the performance of the Eucharistic action, and the promise of Christ's presence.

6. The post-communion prayers may take up the theme of thanksgiving for Communion, but need not necessarily be restricted to this. Together with the dismissal, for example, such prayer may articulate the sending out of the community in mission and service.
7. We would draw attention to the value of hymns with the theme of thanksgiving for use at the eucharist. We would emphasize the devotional character of hymns in interpreting the liturgy as well as in nourishing piety.
8. The concept of consecration by thanksgiving has a wider application than the Eucharist itself. In relation to persons, we see this as exemplified in ordination prayers, and in relation to material gifts in the blessing of the baptismal water.
9. Generous quantities of the Eucharistic elements should be placed on the table to reflect the generosity of God who gave his only Son for us. Supplementary consecration should be avoided as far as possible, but if it is required, than any words used should not be seen as an independent liturgical act, but should clearly refer to the eucharistic prayer. Whatever is done and said at this point should take seriously but the nature of the sacrament and the sensibilities of the faithful.
10. Thanksgiving for what God in Christ is accomplished once for all on the cross anticipate what God still has in store for us and for the whole creation of which the Eucharist is the foretaste and pledge.

This statement is not without faults and flaws (for example is the concept of the institution narrative as a "mandate" adequate when it may also be part of the proclamation of the mighty acts of God in Christ? And may it not act as a focal point in the prayer indicating as it does the relationship between what is done in the here and now and that which was instituted by Christ at the Last Supper?). However, the main thrust of it is clear, and what is said about "thanksgiving through consecration", although not the only possible way of achieving the consecration, does represent in a specially helpful way a biblical approach to the matter.

[100] BCP 2004 p219.

[101] BCP 2004 pp220, 221.

[102] BCP 2004, pp209-217.

[103] BCP 2004, pp.209, 212, 216. *Gratias agamus*. This, the second part of the dialogue ("Let us give thanks"), like the *Sursum Corda* which precedes it is ancient, being attested in the hard-to-date *Apostolic Tradition*, St. Cyprian (252) in the West and St Cyril of Jerusalem (c.350) in the East or perhaps his successor John of Jerusalem, St John Chrysostom (c.347-407), St Augustine of Hippo (354-430), and St Caesarius of Rome (c.470-542). Gregory Dix in *The Shape of the Liturgy*, Dacre, 1947 (p.52) thought it reflected a form for grace after meals within Judaism, and so may have been a specific link with the Last Supper and other fellowship meals between our Lord and the disciples. Apparently, when one hundred or more persons were present the words "to the Lord our God" were added to "Let us give thanks".

[104] BCP 2004 p.209.

[105] BCP 2004, pp224-236.

[106] BCP 2004 p.210. This is one of the rare places when the Hebraic expression

"Blessèd are you" is found in a modern liturgy.

[107] BCP 2004 p.211.

[108] The ambiguity results from a peculiarity of the Hebrew language, which, deficient in adjectives, gets around the difficulty by attaching nouns to each other in what is called the "construct" state. J. Weingreen, *A Practical Grammar for Classical Hebrew*, Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1939, pp43-49.

[109] See [99] above. This leaves the difficult and awkward problem of Supplementary Consecration where there is insufficient bread and wine during the administration. The provision made in the 2004 Prayer Book refers back to the thanksgiving that has already been said (and is not repeated) and to the institution of the eucharist by Christ and prays (when words are used) that additional bread and wine may also "be to us his body/blood" (BCP p.240),

D. When the Consecrated Elements are insufficient

If either of the consecrated elements is insufficient, the presiding minister adds further bread or wine, silently, or using the following words:

Father,

having given thanks over the bread and the cup
according to the institution of your Son Jesus Christ,
who said, Take, eat, this is my body.

and/or

Drink this, this is my blood.

We pray that this bread/wine also may be to us his body/blood,
to be received in remembrance of him.

There is ample precedent for the silent addition of bread and wine to that which has already been consecrated, and this is summed up in the Chapter entitled "Holy Communion" in Paul Bradshaw, ed, pp1334-5 *Companion to Common Worship* although the practice is not in fact permitted in the Church of England,

Supplementary Consecration

By the end of the first millennium it was accepted that further supplies of the sacrament could be consecrated by contact, unconsecrated wine being added to consecrated wine, and unconsecrated bread being sprinkled with consecrated wine. By the 13th century a theology of consecration by formula had been developed: in the West the institution narrative was accepted as the formula, and in the East the invocation of the Holy Spirit upon the bread and wine. This led to greater scruples about additional elements, and the Western church outlawed the practice, but allowed the repetition of the narrative where there was a defect in the first consecration (such as the priest forgetting to put wine in the chalice). This rule appears in the Sarum use, and is followed in the 1548 order for situations where insufficient wine has been consecrated.

Using the mediaeval formula for supplementary consecration in this way was without precedent, and nothing is said about it in the 1549, 1552, and 1559 Prayer Books. In 1573 the puritan, Robert Johnson was tried and convicted for adding more wine to the chalice without any words, despite his defence that there was no rubric to prove them wrong. However, Canon 21 of 1604 did require the

institution narrative to be said over bread and wine 'newly brought', and this was followed in the Scottish 1637 book and in 1662. It was not considered entirely satisfactory by all, however, and in the proposed 1689 book the repetition of the narrative was preceded by a brief petition. Charles Wheatly in 1710 argued that the whole prayer should be repeated, or at least a section from "Hear us, O Merciful Father. The Scottish book of 1764 required the whole of the prayer from "All glory be to Thee through to the *epiclesis*, and this practice was followed in the first and subsequent American books. 1928 required only the relevant part of the institution narrative and an *epiclesis*. Series 1 and series 2 made no provision.

In 1968 the Liturgical Consultation of the Lambeth Conference and the Doctrine Commission both looked up the matter, and there was general agreement with the Liturgical Commission on the principle that new bread and or wine should be brought into the sacramental action before the exhaustion of the original supplies. This was put into practice in the Church of England's experimental service, Series 3 in which the president returns to the holy table, adds more, and uses words which establish that these elements belong to the same context as the original elements. ASB Rite A modified the Series 3 words slightly by putting them in the present tense: "Father, giving thanks over the bread and wine..." CW returns to the 1973 form, "Having given thanks", since the ASB words might imply that a new giving of thanks was taking place. Despite pleas that the action should be done silently, causing less disruption in service, none of the CW orders allows this, although the rubric is deliberately silent as to whether public attention should be drawn to the action.

By providing words, although permitting silent addition, the provision in the Church of Ireland's Prayer Book of 2004 gives definition to the intention of the liturgical act.

[110] Gilbert Sinden, *When We Meet for Worship - A manual for using As Australian Prayer Book 1978*, op. cit. p.138,

The Prayer of Thanksgiving and Consecration is therefore closely patterned on our Lord's command to do as he did at the Last Supper. A good deal of light is thrown on some other aspects both of the 1662 consecration prayer and on this Prayer of Thanksgiving and Consecration when we realize that the form which our Lord used (whether or not the Last Supper was a Passover *Seder*) was the common Jewish liturgical and family form of *berakah*, or prayer of adoration, blessing God. The *berakah* commonly had four parts: an invitation; a statement of motives, recounting in thanksgiving the great deeds of God; petitions; and a hymn or doxology.

In the light of this, it is surprising that no place has been found in this Eucharistic Prayer Two as it now is in the Church of Ireland for the characteristic Jewish, "Blessed are you..." which is nonetheless to be found in Eucharistic Prayer One.

[111] *The Haggadah - A New Edition with English Translation, Introduction and Notes* by Cecil Roth, The Soncino Press Ltd, London, Jerusalem, New York, seventh impression 1977, This is used throughout the book, but particularly relevant is the form used over the *Mazzah* which is "Blessed art Thou, O Lord, our God, King of the Universe who sanctified us by His commandments and commanded us concerning the eating of Unleavened Bread". The blessing over the (third) cup is, "Blessed art Thou, O Lord, our God, King of the Universe, Creator of the fruit of the vine".

[112] For an important study of the forms of the Jewish blessing and their bearing upon the Christian Eucharist see L. Bouyer, *Eucharist*, ET, Notre Dame, 1968.

[113] See above, [110]

[114] See above, [103]

[115] BCP pp112-14. A Jewish example (of Grace after Meals) is given in Dix, op. cit., p.53 from the *Authorized Daily Prayer Book*, compiled by Rabbi S. Singer, with notes by the late Israel Abrahams, p.279sq. This may be found in the New Edition of the same publication on p.378,

Blessed art Thou, O Lord our God, eternal King, Who feedest the whole world with Thy goodness, with grace, with loving-kindness and with tender mercy. Thou givest food to all flesh, for Thy loving-kindness endureth for ever. Through Thy great goodness food hath never failed us: O may it not fail us for ever, for Thy great Name's sake, since Thou nourishest and sustainest all living things and doest good unto all, and providest food for all Thy creatures whom Thou hast created. Blessed art Thou, O Lord Who givest food unto all.

We thank Thee, O Lord our God, because Thou didst give as an heritage unto our fathers, a desirable, good and ample land, and because Thou didst bring us forth, O Lord our God, from the land of Egypt, and didst deliver us from the house of bondage; as well as for Thy Covenant which Thou hast sealed in our flesh; for Thy Law which Thou hast taught us; Thy statutes which Thou hast made known unto us; the life, grace and loving-kindness which Thou hast bestowed upon us, and for the food wherewith Thou dost constantly feed and sustain us, every day, in every season and at every hour. For all this, O Lord our God, we thank Thee and bless Thee. Blessed be Thy name by the mouth of all living, continually and for ever; even as it is written "And thou shalt eat and be satisfied, and thou shalt bless the Lord thy God for the good land which He has given thee". Blessed art Thou, O Lord, for the food and for the land.

Have mercy, O Lord our God, upon Israel Thy people, upon Jerusalem Thy city, upon Zion the abiding place of Thy glory, upon the kingdom of the house of David Thine anointed, and upon the great and holy house that was called by Thy Name. O our God, our Father, feed us, nourish us, support and relieve us, and speedily, O Lord our God, grant us relief from all our troubles. We beseech Thee, O Lord our God, let us not be in need either of the gifts of men or their loans, but only of Thine helping hand, which is full, open, holy and simple, so that we may not be ashamed nor confounded for ever and ever..."

Points of particular interest are that both blessing and thanksgiving are to be found in this prayer although with the emphasis on the former. The movement from Blessing/thanking to supplication is also significant in the light of the insight that this may be taken to have been the original format of the eucharistic prayer in the early Church and provides a basic schema for revised liturgies.

[116] BCP 2004 p. 214.

[117] BCP 2004, p.215 These, however, are minimal compared to the intercessions in some early eucharistic prayers.

[118] Ibid. Both Eucharistic Prayer One and Eucharistic Prayer Two conclude with a

congregational doxology and the Amen. In Eucharistic Prayer Three there is instead the Sanctus (without the Benedictus qui venit) and a triple Amen following the words, "Thanks be to you, our God, for your gift beyond words"

[119] BCP 2004, p.219.

[120] Ibid.

[121] Ibid.

[122] Ibid.

[123] This prayer was composed by Professor David Frost who was also mainly responsible for the revised version of the psalms that had been used in the *Alternative Prayer Book* of 1984 in *A Prayer Book for Australia - for use together with The Book of Common Prayer (1662) and An Australian Prayer Book (1978)*, *Liturgical Resources authorised by the General Synod*, Broughton Books, 1995.

[124] BCP 2004 p.221.

[125] See the writer's doctoral thesis, *Implications*, Chapter IV **3,4, and annotation for some of the argumentation about the concept of eucharistic sacrifice at the time the *Alternative Prayer Book 1984* was being finalized. However, by the time the proposals of the Liturgical Advisory Committee were being brought forward as draft legislation for the form of the eucharist for inclusion in the 2004 Prayer book both opposition and criticism were much less evident at the General Synod. Voting at the crucial Second Reading was as follows:

Clerical	Ayes	148	Noes	3
----------	------	-----	------	---

Lay	Ayes	205	Noes	14
-----	------	-----	------	----

At the **Third Reading** (final) it is stated that "No votes against the motion were recorded".

Journal of the General Synod, 2001, pplxxiv, xcvi-xcvii.

With regard to the controversy it was alleged by some that the modern forms of the liturgy involved a discarding of the doctrine of "justification by faith" believed to be enshrined in the traditional Prayer Book liturgy (now Holy Communion One). In a letter to the Church of Ireland Gazette, published 1st Oct. 1982 in response to criticism from a Conservative Evangelical clergyman the present writer said,

It is alleged by your correspondent, Reverend John McCammon, that the structure and wording of the revised form of the Holy Communion service represent a swing away from the biblical doctrine of justification by faith. This is not so, as an examination of the service clearly shows.

The structure of the revised service provides first for the reading and preaching of the Gospel of God's grace. This leads us, following the intercessions, into penitence and to the confession that we come to the Lord's Table trusting not in our own righteousness, but in God's manifold and great mercies. In the great Eucharistic Prayer we then celebrate what God in Christ has done for us, notably that on Calvary He "gave his only Son Jesus Christ to become man and suffer death on the cross to redeem us", and made there "the *one complete* and *all-sufficient* sacrifice for the sins of the whole world". Then, by faith, we appropriate

the benefits of His once-for-all sacrifice, in making our Communion.

And it is not true that the inclusion of the expression 'sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving' within the canon implies any addition to or extension of the once-for-all sacrifice of Jesus since the interpretation of this phrase is governed by the unambiguous statement referred to above. In scriptural use a "sacrifice of thanksgiving" or "thanksgiving sacrifice" can mean either a sacrifice *consisting* of thanksgiving or one whose *motive* is thanksgiving. When taken over into Christian use it may refer either to the liturgical memorial-before-God commanded by Jesus or to the offering of thanksgiving which is the principal purpose of this memorial. In neither case does it imply any incompleteness in what Jesus accomplished once only.

One may add that critics of the inclusion of this expression within the canon miss the point completely, as the function of the Eucharistic prayer is properly to express the *whole* meaning of the *complete* rite.

The present writer's reference to the "Penitence" coming *after* the Ministry of the Word reflects the order of *Holy Communion 1972* which became the form of the eucharist in the *Alternative Prayer Book*. This is still an option in Holy Communion Two (rubric, p.207) but the version, as printed, has the Penitence as a preliminary to the service as a whole. Confronted with God's commandments as found in the Summary of the Law or in a form of the Ten Commandments the congregation is led to express its faults and failings in the confession and receives the assurance of forgiveness conveyed by the absolution.

[126] BCP 2004 pp188, 210. The word "memory" here is nowhere defined. The richness of the concept of memory in the context of the liturgy is fully examined in a seminal study by Peter Atkins in his *Memory and Liturgy - the Place of Memory in the Composition and Practice of Liturgy*, Ashgate, 2004. A publisher's summary accurately expresses the method and scope of the book as follows:

In *Memory and Liturgy*, Peter Atkins draws on the fruits of his research into the process of the brain and our memory and applies it to liturgical worship. His extensive experience in writing and using liturgy keeps this book rooted in reality. In its 10 chapters the author applies the functioning of the brain and the memory to remembrance of God in worship; God's memory of us through Baptism; our remembrance of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist; the corporate memory of the community created through worship; the healing of memories of sin and pain through forgiveness; three aids to help us worship; the process of continuity and change in liturgy; and the connection between memory, imagination and hope.

The conclusion summarizes the main practical issues. This provides a checklist for those serving on liturgical commissions and those involved in the teaching of the practice of liturgy. This book is a positive contribution to the ongoing search for suitable liturgical worship and music for the 21st century.

[127] BCP 2004, p.210.

[128] Ibid. The "doing" being a corporate act of "taking", "blessing/giving thanks", "breaking", and "giving". The concept of Eucharistic sacrifice, insofar as it is implied by this action is one of the most divisive areas in the theology of the Eucharist. For this reason it features prominently in modern ecumenical discussion, and is looked at in various ways in this study. The biblical background, with particular reference to the

sacrifice of Christ himself is discussed in R.J. Daly, *The Origins of the Christian Doctrine of Sacrifice*, Darton, Longman & Todd, 1978. The metaphorical character of such a concept as applied to the work of Christ is indicated by G.B. Laird, in his *The Language and Imagery of the Bible*, Duckworth, 1980, p.17. As the concepts of memorial and sacrifice are intimately linked, works on the biblical memorial listed above under [33] are relevant. In addition to the writers already cited on this one might add the following, H. Eising, the article "ZKR" in the *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*, G.J. Botterwick and H. Ringgren (1980 Vol. IV); J. Behm, "anamnesis/hupomnesis", article in the *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, Ed. G. Kittel, Tr. G.W. Bromiley, Eerdmans, 1964, pp348, 349; D. Jones, "Anamnesis in the LXX and the interpretation of 1 Cor. XI;25" in the *Journal of Theological Studies, New Series*, No. 6, pp183-191; C.E.B. Cranfield, *A Ransom for Many*, London Independent Press, 1965, Ch 4, "The Institution of the Holy Supper"; J. Ratzinger, "Is the Eucharist a Sacrifice?" pp35-40 in *Concilium*, Vol 4 No. 3, April 1967. For an examination of the evidence of the development of the idea of Eucharistic Offering see R.P.C. Hanson, *Eucharistic Offering in the Early Church*, Grove Liturgical Study No 19, Grove Books, 1979. For a more positive view see R. Williams, *Eucharistic Sacrifice - The Roots of a Metaphor*, Grove Liturgical Study no 31, Grove Books, 1982. "'Sacrifice" is given as one of the main categories of thought in the early Christian theology of the Holy Communion in Y. Brilioth, *Eucharistic Faith and Practice*, op. cit., Chapter 2, Section 4, "The Eucharistic Sacrifice" pp42-48. The concept of sacrifice in this early period and its biblical background is brought out in two essays in *The Sacrifice of Praise*, ed. B.D. Spinks, op. cit., namely G.G. Willis "Sacrificium Laudis", Essay 44 pp73-87, and B.D. Spinks, "The Cleansed Leper's Thankoffering before the Lord: Edward Craddock Ratcliff and the Pattern of the Early Anaphora", Essay 8 pp161-178. A.G. Hebert in his book *Apostle and Bishop - a Study of the Gospel, the Ministry and the Church Community*, Faber and Faber, 1963, deals with Priesthood and Sacrifice in the Scriptures" in Chapter VI pp91-105, the relationship between "Sacrifice and Eucharist" in Chapter VII pp106-127. Roman Catholic teaching is carefully expounded with particular reference to the Anglican Reformation by F. Clark, *Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation*, Blackwell, second edition 1967. Relevant to the discussion occasioned by this major book are J.J. Hughes, *Stewards of the Lord*, Sheed and Ward, 1970; N. Lash, *His Presence in the World -the study of Eucharistic Worship and Theology*, Sheed and Ward, 1968, Chapter 2, "Sacrifice or Meal", Chapter 4 "Whose Sacrifice?", and E.L. Mascall, *Corpus Christi*, Longmans, second edition, 1965, Chapters IV-VI. The writer's unpublished B.D. thesis, *The Meaning and Role of the Anamnesis in the Anglican Liturgical Tradition*, submitted to the University of Dublin, March 1979, op. cit. discusses concepts of memorial and sacrifice in relation to the biblical background, the early Church, the Anglican Reformation, the period from the sixteenth to the twentieth centuries, and the current position within the Anglican Tradition. A very full account of the development of thought on the Eucharistic Sacrifice among "Catholic" Anglicans may be found in Alf Hardelin, *The Tractarian Understanding of the Eucharist*, Uppsala, 1965, Pt 2:3 "The Eucharistic Sacrifice". Bishop Gore's views may be found in an article by R.C.D. Jasper in *Church Quarterly Review* January-March 1965 (SPCK) pp21-36, esp. p.33, entitled "Gore on Liturgical Revision". Official documents of the Roman Catholic and Anglican Churches on this issue insofar as it has a bearing on the doctrine of ministry may be found in *Anglican Orders (Latin)*, *The Bull of His Holiness Leo XIII*, Sept. 13th 1896 (Apostolicae Curae) and the *Answer of the Archbishops of England*, March 29th 1897", published for the

Church Historical Society, SPCK, 1932. The doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice and its liturgical expression was considered in the pre-Lambeth 1958 document *Principles of Prayer Book Revision*, LC 1958/3 op. cit., esp. pp43,44, 47-50; and this was taken up in the 1958 *Lambeth Conference Report* pp2.83-2.85. Other recent Anglican contributions have included the following: *Eucharistic Sacrifice - the Addresses given at the Oxford Conference of Evangelical Churchmen*, Sept. 1961, Ed. J.I. Packer, London Church Book Room Press; Four articles under the heading "We offer this bread and this cup" contributed by J.L. Houlden, A.H. Couratin, J. Moreton, and G. Cuming in *Theology*, October 1966, responded to by C.O. Buchanan and R.T. Beckwith "This bread and this cup", *Theology*, June 1967; M. Moreton, *Made fully perfect*, Church Union 1974, and *Consecrating, Remembering, Offering*, Church Literature Association, 1976; J.H. Houlden, "Sacrifice and the Eucharist", Chapter Six in *Thinking about the Eucharist*, SCM 1974; E.L. Mascall, "Recent thoughts on the theology of the Eucharist" from *A Critique of Eucharistic Agreement*, Ed. J. Lawrence, SPCK, 1975, pp63-79. A little-known but creative contribution from the Church of Ireland by J.E. Long may be found in *One Eternal Eucharist of Love*, Ed. C.M. Gray-Stack, Chapter Two "Sacrifice and what it means", and Chapter Three "Transubstantiation and Sacrifice", published by the Dean and Chapter of Cashel, undated. A useful summary may be found in E.L. Mascall, "Eucharist, Eucharistic Theology" in *A Dictionary of Christian Theology*, Ed. A. Richardson, SCM, 1969. A valuable article by Hans-Joachim Schulz, "Patterns of Offering and Sacrifice" may be found in *Studia Liturgica* Vol 15, 1982/1983, No. 1. Godfrey Ashby, *Sacrifice - its Nature and Purpose*, SCM 1988, with chapters on "Sacrifice and the Eucharist" and "Filling up the Sacrifice", is also relevant.

[129] BCP 2004 p.215.

[130] Ibid.

[131] BCP pp211, 217, in the latter case the phrase is "sacrifice of thanks and praise".

[132] For a study of the metaphorical and literal uses of this expression see G.G. Willis, "Sacrificium Laudis", Essay 3 in *The Sacrifice of Praise*, Ed. B.D. Spinks, Rome, 1981, pp73-76.

[133] Hence the overall title in Holy Communion Two, "The Great Thanksgiving" BCP p.209.

[134] As in the *anamnesis* in the First Eucharistic Prayer, "we *remember* his passion and death, we *celebrate* his resurrection and ascension, and we *look for* the coming of his kingdom." The conjunction of past, present and future tenses was a careful creation of the sub-committee on the holy communion which drew up the Order *Holy Communion 1972*, the first truly modern-language form of the Lord's Supper.

[135] As explained above the absence of adjectives in Hebrew involves attaching nouns to one another with the result as explained. The context can very often be a clue to the meaning of such a construction. The ambiguity can in some circumstances produce an enrichment of the concept by looking at what is being referred to in more than one way.

[136] BCP 2004 p.215.

[137] Ibid.

[138] *An Australian Prayer Book - for use together with The Book of Common Prayer, 1662*, Second Order, p.172. See also *The Alternative Prayer Book 1984*, according to the

use of The Church of Ireland, Collins, 1984, "The Ministry of the Sacrament - An Alternative Order, pp59-63, first post-communion, p63 (a prayer derived from the first post-communion in the 1662 rite.

[139] Its placing within the eucharistic prayer implies a particular connection with the Ministry of the Sacrament but not necessarily exclusively.

[140] BCP 2004, p.217.

[141] BCP 2004 p.208.

[142] BCP 2004 p.221.

[143] Dix, op. cit, pp110-124.

[144] BCP 2004 p.208

[145] Ibid. *Rubric*.

[146] BCP 2004, p.208.

[147] "I appeal to you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies as a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God, which is your spiritual worship."

[148] BCP 2004 p. 221.

[149] Ibid.

[110] G. Sinden, *When we meet for Worship*, 1978, p.138.

[111] Ibid.

[112] Ibid.

[113] Ibid.

[114] Sinden, op. cit. p.139. Note the words "all your people".

[115] Ibid. This congregational response is taken from the song of the angels who stand around God's throne (Rev. 7:11,12). Compare the First Eucharist Prayer in the ASB p.732.

[116] BCP 2004 pp56,62.

[117] Ibid.

[118] Ibid.

[119] BCP 2004 p.57 *30.

[120] BCP 2004 p.57 *31. The "spiritual" character of the gift is underlined in the wording of the Church of Ireland rite. The ASB does not have "spiritual". ASB p.145.

[121] BCP 2004 p.63 *30a.

[122] No comment is made on this in Sinden, *When we meet for Worship*, op. cit. It may be noticed that the Australian Prayer Book provides three alternative post-communion thanksgivings, none of which includes this particular expression. *A new Australian Prayer Book*, op. cit. pp173, 174.

[123]

[124] BCP 2004 p.54.

[125] Ibid.

[126] BCP 2004 pp54,55.

[127] BCP 2004 p.61.

[128] BCP 2004 p.60.

[129] BCP 2004 p.55

[130] See [105] above.

[131] They are not mutually exclusive. Thanksgiving may be held to be the principal ingredient in the four-fold action. It may also be considered its principal motive.

[132] This would seem to have been the interpretation given to it by Dr. H.R. McAdoo, Archbishop of Dublin (and co-chairman of the ARCIC- 1 discussions) when, responding to criticism of the text at the 1982 General Synod of the Church of Ireland, he said, "it means what it says".

[133] This interpretation would, in the writer's view, make better sense in the context in which the expression occurs in the first Eucharistic Prayer, immediately after interpreting the Lord's command as something "done" with the bread and the cup - in other words a liturgical *act* of remembrance.

[134] Speaking on the theology of the Eucharist at the 1986 General Synod (in connection with a debate about ARCIC), the writer said, "On the question of the "memorial" it is common ground that we cannot add to or reiterate the once-for-all sacrifice of the Cross. But we can "remember" it before God. That's what the word "remembrance" meant and still means at the Jewish Passover. It is not merely a reminder to man, but *a remembering before God*. We remember Our Lord Jesus Christ's once-for-all sacrifice before the Father in thanksgiving and supplication, giving thanks for what has been done for us and asking for the effective application of the benefits which flow from that once-for-all act. All this is a liturgical *act* of remembrance, for Our Lord did not tell us merely to 'think this', but to 'do this' - to perform this act." This concept of the liturgical act of remembrance is covered more fully in the writer's B.D. thesis, *The meaning and role of the anamnesis in the Anglican liturgical tradition*, op. cit., especially Chapters One and Two.

[135] BCP 2004 p.61, "Father, with this bread and this cup, we do as our Saviour has commanded; we celebrate the redemption he has won for us; we proclaim his perfect sacrifice made once for all upon the cross..."

[136] BCP 2004 p.63.

[137] See [122] above.

[138] BCP 2004 p53. The concept of the "Offertory" has come in for some criticism in recent years, in reaction to the emphasis laid upon it in the "Parish and People" movement. See C.O. Buchanan, *The End of the Offertory - an Anglican Study*, Grove Liturgical Study No 14, Grove Books, 1978, esp. p.31 - where the former Bishop of Durham (later Archbishop of Canterbury), Michael Ramsey, warned about the danger of "Pelagianism" in this regard, "(One of the dangers of the Parish Communion lies in) The Doctrine of Sacrifice. Here there is too often a most alarming lop-sidedness. The new movement places much emphasis upon the offertory, as the offering to Almighty God of the bread and the wine as the token of the giving to him of the people's common life...And the point is indeed a true and Christian one, for though its place in the New Testament is a little obscure it finds vivid expression in St. Irenaeus (e.g. Adv. Haer. IV.xvii.5; xviii.I). The idea of sacrifice is taught in many parishes in connection with the offering of bread and wine in the offertory and ourselves, our souls and bodies, in the prayer after the Communion.

"By itself, however, this sort of teaching about sacrifice can be a shallow and romantic sort of Pelagianism...For we cannot, and we dare not, offer aught of our own apart from the one sacrifice of the Lamb of God."

[139] Compare BCP (1926) rubrics pp141, 143.

[140] This conforms to the BCP tradition, where the Prayer of Oblation comes after the act of Communion, and is similarly to be found in the ASB and *An Australian Prayer Book 1978*. However, the Eucharistic Prayer should properly express the whole meaning of the entire rite: there is therefore no justification in attempting to split off a particular category of meaning such as self-offering and putting it elsewhere in the rite. By way of contrast the Scottish Liturgy of 1982 has the rather startling wording in the Anamnesis and Oblation, "Made one with him, we offer you these gifts and with them ourselves, a single holy, living sacrifice." C.O. Buchanan, *Latest Anglican Liturgies*, Alcuin Club Collectsion No. 66, Alcuin Club/SPCK, 1985, p.58.

[141] BCP 2004 p.53 *22. It may be noted that Dix's identification of the Offertory with the first of the four Eucharistic actions, is now generally discredited.

[142] Ibid.

[143] Ibid.

[144] It is assumed here that the "Offertory" looks forward to the Eucharistic Prayer which "offers" the gifts by giving thanks over them. This appears to have been the view of St. Irenaeus in the second century A.D. in the passage cited by Archbishop Ramsey (see above [138]),

Again, giving directions to His disciples to offer to God the first-fruits of His own created things - not as if He stood in need of them, but that they might be themselves neither unfruitful nor ungrateful - He took that created thing, bread, and gave thanks, and said, 'This is My body'. And the cup likewise, which is part of that creation to which we belong, He confessed to be His blood, and taught the new oblation of the new covenant; which the Church receiving from the apostles, offers to God throughout all the world, to Him who gives us as the means of subsistence the first-fruits of His own gifts in the New Testament...

A. Roberts and J. Donaldson, *The Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Eerdmans, 1981, p.484. See also Adv. haer. IV. xviii. 4-6. It is unnecessary to have special "offertory" prayers such as the "Blessed are you, Lord, God of all creation" of the Missal.

[145] "I appeal to you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies as a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable to God, which is your spiritual worship."

[146] This contrasts with the BCP where the connection is with the "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving". BCP (1926) pp151,152.

[147] BCP 2004 p.57.

[148] BCP 2004 p.63. Here it comes after a prayer in which the Lord is asked to "accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving".

[149] The eschatological emphasis of the Eucharist is stressed by J. Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, op. cit. esp. pp237-256, where he interprets the anamnestic command as "that God may remember me". He says, p.252, "God remembers the Messiah in that he causes the kingdom to break in by the parousia". Not all NT scholars agree with this piece of exegesis. Nevertheless the "eschatological perspective" is given by J. Reumann in his book, *The Supper of the Lord - The New Testament, Ecumenical Dialogues, and Faith and Order on Eucharist*, Fortress Press, 1985, as one of the "key

themes" in recent study of the Eucharist. A major review is that of G. Wainwright in his *Eucharist and Eschatology*, Epworth, 1971.

The eschatological significance of Jesus' teaching about the kingdom is his parables is indicated in J. Jeremias, *The Parables of Jesus*, SCM, rev. ed. 1963.

[150] 1 Cor 11:26.

[151] BCP 2004 p.54, BCP p.210.

[152] BCP 2004 p.215.

[153] BCP 2004 p.217.

[154] For this understanding of these petitions in the Lord's Prayer see J. Jeremias, *New Testament Theology, Vol 1*, ET, SCM, 1971, pp193-203. He suggests that *artos epiousios* should be understood as "Tomorrow's Bread", "Tomorrow's Bread, give us today", meaning the "bread of the time of salvation", the bread of life.

[156] BCP 2004 p.225

[157] BCP 2004 p.230

[158] BCP 2004 p.233.

[159] BCP 2004 p.235.

[160] Notably that of Advent 1 Collect Two p.241

Almighty God,
Give us grace to cast away the works of darkness
and to put on the armour of light
now in the time of this mortal life
in which your Son Jesus Christ came to us in great humility;
that on the last day
when he shall come again in his glorious majesty
to judge the living and the dead,
we may rise to the life immortal;
through him who is alive and reigns with you and the Holy Spirit,
one God, now and for ever. **Amen.**

[161] For example Advent readings, *passim*.

CHAPTER THREE: ASSESSMENTS

ASSESSMENTS, PART ONE - THE CHURCH OF IRELAND'S ATTITUDE TO THE ARCIC-1 REPORT, THE 1976 "COMMENT".

The Church of Ireland's initial response to the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission dialogue consisted of a "Comment"¹ on the Windsor document entitled "Eucharistic Doctrine",² published in September 1971. The Commission's "Elucidation" of this (1979) was subsequent to the "Comment".³

The Windsor document was brought officially to the attention of the Church of Ireland in 1972 when it was printed as an Appendix to the Report of the Church Unity Committee to the General Synod.⁴ In 1973 the Anglican Consultative Council requested reports from the Churches of the Anglican Communion in response to this Statement. The Standing Committee referred the request in the first instance to the Church Unity Committee, and a report from the Church Unity Committee was in due course considered by the Standing Committee.⁵

The Standing Committee in April 1975 adopted a Comment on the Agreed Statement. This was entitled, "Church of Ireland Comment on the Anglican-Roman Catholic Agreed Statement on Eucharistic doctrine to be submitted to the Anglican Consultative Council". This draft response was submitted to the General Synod of the Church of Ireland in 1976, and, with two amendments, was passed.⁶ Although it was described in the resolution as "The Comment of the Church of Ireland" the significance of the document appears to have been overlooked when the "Final Report" of the Commission as a whole was considered in 1986. Although it is mentioned briefly in the "Response" of that date it was not reproduced, although a similar Comment on the Agreed Statement on Authority in the Church (Venice 1976) was included in that document.⁸ This earlier "Comment" on Eucharistic Doctrine appears still to have some relevance, but it has to be taken in conjunction with, and regarded as to some extent superceded by, the critique contained in the later and more definitive "Response".⁹

In the 1976 "Comment" the "substantial measure of agreement" reached by the Commission was welcomed, although it was felt that there remained a considerable divergence between some of the "contemporary Roman Catholic theology" in the Statement and the official authoritative teaching of the Roman Catholic Church. "Until this divergence has been resolved it is evident that the 'substantial agreement' reached falls short of 'full agreement' on several fundamental points"¹⁰

The general approach and method of the Agreed Statement was commended. The attempt to find theological language which was inclusive and the general avoidance of an exclusive approach was welcomed. The Statement's declaration that the purpose of the eucharist is "to transmit the life of the crucified and risen Christ to his body, the Church, so that its members may be more fully united with Christ and with one another" was regarded as generally acceptable.¹¹ Particularly welcomed was the emphasis in the Statement on the unique "once for all" character of Christ's death and resurrection and that "there can be no repetition of or addition to what was accomplished once for all by Christ".¹² It was noted that the Statement emphasizes that the presence of the Lord in the eucharist is of a *sacramental nature*. This understanding would appear to be in accord with the Church of Ireland's definition of sacraments as "effectual signs of grace" (*efficacia signa gratiae*) in Article 25. It was also noted that the Statement uses the term

"true presence" (par 6) as well as "real presence", and emphasizes the *fact* of Christ's presence rather than any attempted definition of "the mystery of the eucharistic presence". It was said, "Anglican rejection of the philosophical framework associated with the doctrine of transubstantiation should be taken in conjunction with the refusal of Anglicanism to accept an explanation of the 'how' as revealed truth and binding and exclusively definitive".¹³

'We are gratified', it said in the Comment, "that the Statement draws attention to the vital connection between Christ's gift of himself in the Holy Communion and our 'response of faith'".¹⁴ The emphasis on the activity of the Holy Spirit in the eucharistic liturgy was "welcomed" in the draft Comment. However, when the draft came before the General Synod, this was amended to "noted". It appears that the Church of Ireland, through its Synod, was unwilling to commit itself to the statements that it is "by the transforming action of the Spirit of God (that) earthly bread and wine become the heavenly manna and the new wine", and that through the prayer of consecration "A Word of faith addressed to the Father, the bread and wine become the body and blood of Christ by the action of the Holy Spirit, so that in communion we eat the flesh of Christ and drink his blood".¹⁵

The insistence in the Statement on the essential inter-connection between the gift of Christ in this sacrament and the reception of the elements was welcomed.¹⁶ But it was added that the Church of Ireland would welcome in the Agreed Statement an explicit recognition of the reception of both bread and wine in the communion, in accordance with Christ's institution of the sacrament (Mark 14:23), the teaching of the Apostles (for example 1 Cor 11:26), and the universal tradition of the Church for over one thousand years.¹⁷ The Agreed Statement as a whole was welcomed as a valuable contribution to that "serious dialogue, which, founded on the gospels and on the ancient common traditions may lead to that unity in truth for which Christ prayed" (Common Declaration of Pope Paul VI and the Archbishop of Canterbury, March 1966).¹⁸

NOTES ON CHAPTER THREE, PART ONE

[1] Report of the Standing Committee, Appendix E, *Journal of the General Synod 1976*, pp83-5. See also ppcv, cxxxv.

[2] *The Final Report*, op. cit. Pp9-16.

[3] *The Final Report*, op. Cit. Pp17-25.

[4] *Journal of the General Synod* (JGS), 1972, pp161-5. The Church Unity Committee was a body appointed by the General Synod whose membership included the archbishops and bishops of the Church of Ireland, the four hon. Secretaries of the General Synod, and other clerical and lay members elected triennially. The annual report covered not only the activities of the Committee itself, but ecumenical matters relevant to the Church of Ireland.

[5] Report of the Standing Committee, JGS 1976, p61.

[6] Voting (by orders) on the amended resolution was as follows:-

Clergy: For 148. Against 2. Laity: For 157. Against 8.

[7] See *The Response of the General Synod of the Church of Ireland to the Final Report of ARCIC-1*, May 1986, APCK/OUP p1.

[8] *Response*, op. cit. pp103-155. That the failure to print the 1976 "Comment" was an oversight rather than a matter of deliberate policy was implied in a conversation between the present writer and the Rt. Revd. Dr. W.G. Wilson, Bishop of Kilmore, who had a significant role in the production of the "Response" and seconded its adoption at the 1986 General Synod.

[9] For an exposition of the *Response* see below, Chapter Three, Part 2. One of the difficulties in taking the *Comment* and *Response* together is that the *Comment* was (with certain reservations) positive in character, while the *Response* was more critical.

[10] The text of the *Comment* was amended at this point on the proposal of Very Revd W.G. Wilson, seconded by Revd. J. Barry, by the addition of the following reference, (*Cf. The Supplement to A New Catechism, 1969, and the Encyclicals Mysteriorum Fidei, 1965, and the Credo of Pope Paul VI, 1968*).

It is evident that the line of approach in the Windsor statement was very different from that of the papal document *Mysteriorum Fidei*, where, under the heading of "Reasons for Pastoral Concern and Anxiety", referring to the contemporary situation within the Roman Catholic Church Pope VI said,

(Par 10) "We have become aware that there are a number of speakers and writers on this sacred mystery who are propagating opinions that are likely to disturb the minds of the faithful and to cause them considerable mental confusion in matters of faith. Such opinions relate to Masses celebrated privately, to the dogma of transubstantiation and to eucharistic worship. They seem to think that, although a doctrine has been defined once by the Church, it is open to anyone to ignore it or to give it an interpretation that whittles away the natural meaning of the words or the accepted sense of the concepts."

(Par 11) "Let Us give you examples: It is not right to exalt the 'community' Mass, so-called, to the detriment of Masses which are celebrated privately. Nor is it right to be so pre-occupied with considering the nature of the sacramental sign that the impression is created that the symbolism - and no-one denies its existence in the most holy Eucharist - expresses and exhausts the whole meaning of Christ's presence in this sacrament. Nor is it right to treat of the mystery of

transubstantiation without mentioning the marvellous change of the whole of the bread's substance into Christ's body and the whole of the wine's substance into his blood, of which the Council of Trent speaks, and thereby to make these changes consist of nothing but a 'trans-signification' or a 'transfinalisation'. to use these terms. Nor, finally, is it right to put forward and give expression in practice to the view which maintains that Christ the Lord is no longer present in the consecrated hosts which are left when the sacrifice of the Mass is over."

[11] "Comment" (par 2). "The fact of the eucharist is part of Christian faith and practice from the earliest days of the Church, but no one doctrinal explanation has received universal acceptance. We are glad that the Statement, while achieving agreement about the reality of the eucharist and what it is for, at the same time takes note of 'a variety of theological approaches within both our Communions' ".

One finds, once again, a very different *ethos* in *Mysterium Fidei*, which, under the heading "Close connection between our faith and the traditional formulas which express it" stated,

(par 23.) "For when the integrity of faith has been preserved, a suitable manner of expression has to be preserved as well..."

(par 24) "This rule of speech has been introduced by the Church in the long work of centuries with the protection of the Holy Spirit. She has confirmed it with the authority of the Councils. It has become more than once the token and standard of orthodox faith. It must be observed religiously. No-one may presume to alter it at will, or on the pretext of new knowledge. For it would be intolerable if the dogmatic formulas, which Ecumenical Councils have employed in dealing with the mysteries of the most holy Trinity, were to be accused of being badly attuned to the men of our day, and other formulas were rashly introduced to replace them. It is equally intolerable that anyone on his own initiative should want to modify the formulas with which the Council of Trent has proposed the eucharistic mystery for belief. These formulas, and others too which the Church employs in proposing dogmas of faith, express concepts which are not tied to any specified cultural system. They are not restricted to any fixed development of the sciences nor to one or other of the theological schools. They present the perception which the human mind acquires from its universal, essential experience of reality and expresses by use of appropriate and certain terms borrowed from colloquial or literary language. They are, therefore, within the reach of everyone at all times and in all places."

[12] Comment (par 3). "We rejoice in the Biblical emphasis of this passage, in accord with much New Testament teaching and, in particular, with the Epistle to the Hebrews, which emphasizes that 'He has no need, like those high priests, to offer sacrifices daily, first for his own sins and then for those of the people; he did this once for all when he offered up himself' Heb. 7.27. RSV). See also Hebrews 9:12; 25f. And 10:12-14.

Comparing the careful exposition of the "once for all" in the Windsor Statement (par 5) with the teaching of *Mysterium Fidei* on the Eucharistic sacrifice, the emphasis in the latter is on the Sacrifice of the Mass. Priests are urged (par 33) to "keep in mind the power which they received at the hands of the consecrating bishop. This is the power of offering the sacrifice to God and of celebrating Masses for the living as for the dead in the Lord's name (a reference to the formula in the *Pontificale Romanum*). The only reference to the relationship between the Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Sacrifice of the Cross is an oblique one in a quotation from St. John Chrysostom (par 38) cited to confirm Christ's

presence at the offering of the Sacrifice of the Mass - "No matter who is responsible for the offering, be it Peter or Paul, it is the same oblation; the oblation which priests now carry out is the same as that which Christ gave his disciples. It is in no way inferior, for it is not men who are sanctifying the priests' oblation, but the very person who sanctified the original oblation. Even as the words the Lord spoke are the same as those which the priest says, so too the oblation itself is identical".

[13] *Comment* (par 4). It was noted that the view expounded in the Windsor Statement had an affinity with the teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas, who denied that Christ is locally in the sacrament (*Corpus Christi non est in hoc sacramento sicut in loco*. S. T. iii Q lxxvi A.v.).

The emphasis, in *Mysterium Fidei*, is, once again, different, and seems to go beyond the fact of the presence to a particular view of how this is so, explicitly denying the reality of the sacramental species after consecration and so in the Anglican view overthrowing the nature of a sacrament (Article 28). The "change" in what the bread and wine "are" is not one consequent upon their role and function in the context of the Eucharistic celebration and the fresh significance conferred on them, but is regarded as independent of this (par 46),

If no-one is to misunderstand this mode of presence, which oversteps the laws of nature and constitutes the greatest miracle of all in its kind, our minds must be docile and we must follow the voice of the Church through her teaching and prayer (which) informs us that Christ becomes present in this sacrament precisely by a change of the bread's whole substance into his body and the wine's whole substance into his blood. This is clearly a remarkable, a singular change and the Catholic Church gives it the suitable and accurate name of transubstantiation. When transubstantiation has taken place, there is no doubt that the appearance of the bread and the appearance of the wine take on a new expressiveness and a new purpose since they are no longer common bread and common drink, but rather the sign of something sacred and the sign of spiritual food. But they take on a new expressiveness and a new purpose for the very reason that they contain a new 'reality' which we are right to call *ontological*. For beneath these appearances *there is no longer what was there before but something quite different*. This is so in very fact and not only because of the valuation put on them by the Church's belief, since on the conversion of the bread and wine's substance, or nature, into the body and blood of Christ, *nothing is left of the bread and the wine but the appearances alone*. Beneath these appearances Christ is present whole and entire, bodily present too, in his physical 'reality', although not in the manner in which bodies are present in place.

(Par 47).

For this reason the Fathers have had to issue frequent warnings to the faithful, when they consider this august sacrament, not to be satisfied with the senses which announce the properties of bread and wine. They should rather assent to the words of Christ: these are of such power that they change, transform, 'trans-element' the bread and wine into his body and blood". Such a "physical" change is not necessarily implied in the language of the "Windsor" Statement, and would appear to Anglicans to be at variance with the view that the presence of the Lord in the eucharist is of a *sacramental* nature.

[Emphases in the quotations above are of the present writer]

[14] *Comment* (par 5). The balance between objectivity and subjectivity is well represented in Anglican liturgical theology in the traditional words of administration (BCP 2004, Holy Communion One, p.188),

The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life. Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving.

The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life. Drink this in remembrance that Christ's Blood was shed for thee, and be thankful.

These words are reproduced (using "you" and "your" for "thee" and "thy") in the modern form of the Eucharist, Holy Communion Two), together with the (wisely used) alternative,

[To the whole body of communicants]

Draw near and receive the body of our Lord Jesus Christ which he gave for you, and his blood which he shed for you. Remember that he died for you, and feed on him in your hearts by faith with thanksgiving.

or

The gifts of God for the people of God
**Jesus Christ is holy,
Jesus Christ is Lord,
to the glory of God the Father.**

or

Jesus Christ is the Lamb of God,
who has taken away the sins of the world.
Happy are those who are called to his supper
**Lord, I am not worthy to receive you,
but only say the word and I shall be healed.**

[To the communicants individually or severally]

The body of Christ keep you in eternal life. **Amen.**

The blood of Christ keep you in eternal life. **Amen.**

The body of Christ given for you. **Amen.**

The blood of Christ shed for you. **Amen.**

Although there is some difference in emphasis a theological balance is maintained even when the shorter forms of the actual administration are used, with in each case an indication of the purpose for which the sacramental elements are given rather than an exclusive emphasis on what they are considered to be in themselves. The stark forms "The body of Christ. **Amen**", "The blood of Christ. **Amen**", although provided in some other parts of the Anglican Communion, including the Church of England, are not provided here. Moreover the "objectivity" of the words actually spoken to each communicant is balanced by the "subjectivity" of the response, "Amen" to be made by each person after he or she receives.

[15] *Comment* (par 6). The amendment was proposed by Revd S. Smart (a Conservative Evangelical) and seconded by Revd Canon J. Barry (whose churchmanship might be described as "Central"). Canon Barry wrote for many years in the *Church of Ireland Gazette* under the pen-name "Cromlyn", representing the Northern Irish constituency within the Church.

In Holy Communion Two in the 2004 Prayer Book there is an emphasis upon the role of the Holy Spirit in all three Eucharistic Prayers. However none of these prayers could legitimately be described as a "consecratory" epiclesis. In the first Eucharistic Prayer there is a "communion" epiclesis which reads,

...and as we eat and drink these holy gifts, grant by the power of the life-giving Spirit that we may be made one in your holy Church and partakers of the body and blood of your Son, that he may dwell in us and we in him... (BCP p. 211)

In the second Eucharistic Prayer, prior to the Institution Narrative, there is a generalised reference to the worshippers eating and drinking the bread and wine in the fellowship of the Holy Spirit in obedience to our Saviour Christ and in remembrance of his death and passion in relation to their being partakers of his body and blood. And in the concluding paragraph there is a general invocation of the renewing power of the Spirit,

Renew us by your Holy Spirit,
unite us in the body of your Son,
and bring us with all your people
into the joy of your eternal kingdom...

In the third Eucharistic Prayer there is a connection between the work of the Holy Spirit and the what the elements signify in the context of the eucharistic celebration, using the strong expression "be to us". However there is no necessary implication that this is, of itself, to be classified as exclusively consecratory in character.

All of this falls considerably short of the ARCIC view.

[16] See above [14]

[17] The call for communion in both kinds, permitted under certain circumstances in the Roman Catholic Church since Vatican II (see the *General Instruction on the Roman Missal*, 26th March 1970, also *Sacramentali Communionem*, 29th June 1970, translated in Flannery: Vatican II, pp206ff) reflected a concern for the integrity of the Eucharistic celebration going back to the time of the Reformation. But in the Book of Common Prayer Article 30 "Of both kinds" says,

The Cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the Lay-people: for both the parts of the Lord's Sacrament, by Christ's ordinance and commandment, ought to be ministered to all Christian men alike.

[18] *Comment* (par 7). The basic principle of the ARCIC dialogue was here explicitly accepted by Synod.

CHAPTER THREE: ASSESSMENTS, PART TWO - THE CHURCH OF IRELAND'S ATTITUDE TO THE ARCIC-1 REPORT, THE 1986 "RESPONSE"

Following the publication of the ARCIC Final Report in 1981 it became necessary for the two Communion involved to devise suitable methods of assessment of the state of the dialogue.¹ The Anglican Consultative Council, at its meeting in Newcastle upon Tyne in the same year, stated that it was quite clear that "the formal acceptance of any ecumenical agreement remains with the Provincial Synods of the (Anglican) Communion"² To determine whether or not the "substantial agreement in faith" claimed by ARCIC had in fact been achieved, a resolution was passed commending to the Churches of the Anglican Communion the two questions posed by the Co-Chairmen in a letter of 2nd September 1981 to the Archbishop of Canterbury.³

Whether the Agreed Statements on Eucharistic Doctrine, Ministry and Ordination, and Authority in the Church (I and II) together with Elucidations are consonant in substance with the faith of Anglicans?" and "Whether the Final Report offers a sufficient basis for taking the next concrete step towards the reconciliation of our Churches grounded in agreement in faith?

The Standing Committee of the General Synod, at a meeting held in September 1982, referred the *Final Report* to the Church Unity Committee with a request for comments by 1st June 1984.⁴ It was intended to present to the General Synod of 1985 a draft of comments on behalf of the Church of Ireland for submission to the Anglican Consultative Council before 31st December 1986.⁵ However, there was an unexpected development at the 1983 Synod when a highly critical motion was put down by two Conservative Evangelical members, Mr. D.B. O'Callaghan and Mr. V.G. Carson.⁶ This in turn was considerably amended, and the resolution in its final form read as follows.⁷

That this Synod requests its Standing Committee to assess the ARCIC Final Report (inter alia) against the standards of the Preamble, Declaration and Articles of Religion of the Church of Ireland.

It was this resolution which resulted in the Church's definitive *Response* being in two parts, the first (Section A) having the heading, "Consonant in Substance with the Faith of Anglicans?" and the second (Section B) having the heading, "The ARCIC Final Report, considered in relation to the Preamble and Declaration, and the Articles of Religion of the Church of Ireland".⁸ Inevitably there was some repetitiveness in the document considered and approved by Synod in 1986. It may be noted that the *Response* appeared only in the 1986 Report (a few weeks before the meeting of Synod), so it was not possible for the Church at large to study and discuss the contents of the Report or to suggest alterations before it came before Synod as the subject of a formal motion.⁹ It may be questioned whether this was an entirely satisfactory procedure, although, since Synod meets only once a year, by May 1986 there was a deadline involved for submission of comments to the Anglican Consultative Council in preparation for the Lambeth Conference of 1988.¹⁰ It was proposed at the 1986 General Synod by Very Revd J.T.F. Paterson (then Dean of Kildare, later Dean of Christ Church, Dublin), and by the Bishop of Kilmore, the Rt. Revd. Dr. W.G. Wilson¹¹,

That the General Synod of the Church of Ireland

- a. records and expresses its appreciation of the work of the members of ARCIC-1 and especially its Co-Chairmen, Archbishop Henry McAdoo and Bishop Alan Clark, and its Co-Secretaries Monsignor W.A. Purdy and Revd. C.J. Hill;
- b. adopts the Response of its Standing Committee to the *Final Report* of ARCIC-1.
- c. considers that the terms and implications of part b. of the ACC-5 Resolution concerning the Final Report are so broad and relate to only part of what "agreement in faith" would have to entail, that it is not possible realistically to answer with a general "Yes";
- d. welcomes the continuing dialogue of ARCIC-II and notes particularly that among the issues it will be considering are Justification by Faith and Anglican Orders and looks forward to concrete results following these deliberations;
- e. requests further consideration of
 - (i) the status of Contemporary Theology in relation to the official doctrines of our two communions;
 - (ii) the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews in relation to the all sufficient sacrifice of Christ;
 - (iii) the relationship of Scripture to Tradition;
- f. directs that this resolution and the attached Response be forwarded forthwith to the Anglican Consultative Council.

An amendment, indicating a more positive view of the outcome of ARCIC-1 was proposed by Revd Canon A.E. Stokes, and seconded by Revd C.M. Wilson,¹² That in section c. of Resolution 2 everything after the words "considers that..." be deleted and that it be replaced by the following:-

while the terms and implications of part b. of the ACC-5 Resolution concerning the Final Report are broad and relate to only part of what "agreement in faith" would have to entail, nevertheless it is possible realistically to answer with a general "Yes".

This amendment was declared lost on a vote by orders.¹⁴

It was proposed by Mr J.R.H. Conacher, seconded by Mr V.G. Carson and passed:-

That Resolution 2 on page 101 be amended by the addition of the following clause -

g. requests and authorises the Honorary Secretaries to take steps to secure and facilitate the early publication of the Resolution and of the said Response (to which may be annexed the Preamble and Declaration of the Church of Ireland).

The substantive motion was passed.¹⁵

The overall response to the *Final Report* was therefore unfavourable, and the tone of the Response is, in general, critical. Some words of appreciation and encouragement of further dialogue did, however, appear in the Introduction to the Response, where it was stated,¹⁶

We wish to place on record our belief that ARCIC-1 has made an important and positive contribution to mutual understanding and advance in relationships between the Anglican and Roman Catholic Churches. We applaud the dedication, scholarship, and integrity which lies behind its work. This is a major achievement to be welcomed with generosity and gratitude.

It is important in our search for unity in truth that we continue to engage in open-minded and open-hearted study of the ARCIC-1 Report; to support strongly the work of ARCIC-II; and to encourage growth in personal and community relationships between members of the Church of Ireland and people of all Christian traditions in Ireland, including those of the Roman Catholic Church.

Reference was made to the changed relations between the Anglican and Roman Catholic Churches beginning with the *Common Declaration* issued by Archbishop Michael Ramsey and Pope Paul VII in 1966 following their meeting, which affirmed their intention to inaugurate "between the Roman Catholic Church and the Anglican Communion a serious dialogue which, founded on the Gospels and the ancient common traditions, may lead to that unity in truth for which Christ prayed".¹⁷ This in turn had been made possible through the Second Vatican Council's promulgation of the *Dogmatic Constitution on the Church (Lumen Gentium)* and the Decree on Ecumenism (*Unitatis Redintegratio*) of 1964; "the former showed definite sign of a widening of the Roman Catholic understanding of the Church, and the latter could refer to Christians of other communions as 'separated brethren'. However, it was also affirmed that the work of ARCIC found its roots not only in that new situation created by Vatican II. The Anglican Communion had, for the most part of the (twentieth) century, been deeply committed to dialogue with other Communion in pursuit of full communion. In 1920 the Lambeth Conference's *Appeal to All Christian People* on the subject of Reunion had been of formative influence in the development of ecumenical relationships during this century. This being so, the work of the Commission was not viewed in isolation; rather, it was part of a whole process of ecumenical discussion which involved virtually all the major Christian Communion of the world."¹⁸

A presumed difference between "Contemporary Roman Catholic theology" and the official authoritative teaching of the Roman Catholic Church is stressed in the Response.¹⁹ It was considered that at several points in the ARCIC *Final Report* this modern theology was evident as having facilitated the agreement reached by members of the Commission (for example in relation to the way in which the term "transubstantiation" is to be understood).²⁰ However the Common Declaration of 1966 had made it clear that Anglican dialogue was with the Roman Catholic Church "which cannot be defined (sic) without reference to its official teaching". It would therefore be less than realistic not to take due cognizance of the official doctrines of the two Communion as expressed in official documents and pronouncements. So far as the Church of Ireland was concerned the General Synod had directed that the ARCIC *Final Report* was to be assessed against the standard of the Preamble, Declaration, and Articles of Religion of the Church of Ireland. And since "contemporary Roman Catholic theology" had received no endorsement from any Vatican authority nor from any recent Pope, it was considered that the work of ARCIC must also be related to official Roman Catholic doctrine if fruitful dialogue was to be developed.²¹

Examination of Response Section A - Consonant in substance with the Faith of Anglicans? 1. Eucharistic Doctrine (1971) and Elucidation (1979).

It was noted, first, that the "Elucidation" on Eucharistic Doctrine had made no response to the Church of Ireland's view that ARCIC should demonstrate its commitment to follow "biblical teaching" and the "tradition of our common inheritance", by insisting on the reception of both bread and wine in the communion, in accordance with Christ's institution of the sacrament (Mark 14:23), the teaching of the Apostles (e.g. 1 Cor 11:26), and the universal tradition of the Church for over a thousand years.²² It was still believed that communion in both kinds is the only appropriate approach to the administration of the sacrament.²³ Under the heading of "Comprehensiveness" it was considered to be "consonant with the faith of Anglicans" to follow "Elucidation" (1979) in stating that,²⁴

Some traditions have placed a special emphasis on the association of Christ's presence with the consecrated elements; others have emphasized Christ's presence in the heart of the believer through reception by faith. In the past, acute difficulties have arisen when one or other of these emphases has become almost exclusive. In the opinion of the Commission, neither emphasis is incompatible with eucharistic faith, provided that the complementary movement emphasized by the other position is not denied.

However, it was felt that, even within the context of comprehensiveness, the Church of Ireland could not accept the validity of the idea of defined as "the wonderful and unique change of the whole substance of the bread into [Christ's] body and of the whole substance of the wine into his blood, while only the species of the bread and wine remain", as taught by the Council of Trent and re-affirmed in Pope Paul VI's Encyclical *Mysterium Fidei*.²⁵ It was pointed out that ARCIC did not require this interpretation.²⁶

In the view of the *Response* the ARCIC reference to the presence of Christ in the eucharist was consonant with Anglican understanding of that sacrament,²⁷ If, however, the language of ARCIC were to be interpreted by the Roman Catholic Church as being consistent with that Church's traditional definition of transubstantiation, then all the implications and associations of that doctrine were considered to be such as to raise very serious questions about the reconciliation of such diverse interpretations with the ARCIC wording.²⁸

Under the heading of "Adoration or veneration" it was noted it had been said in "Elucidation" (1979): "If veneration is wholly dissociated from the eucharistic celebration of the community it contradicts the true doctrine of the eucharist".²⁹ Within the Anglican tradition careful reverence for the consecrated elements was certainly enjoined, for the Book of Common Prayer Rubric directs that the priests and others should "reverently eat and drink the same" if any of the consecrated elements remained after communion.³⁰ But the use of the word "veneration" had seemed to some Anglicans to imply that the elements should become the objects of worship, as was clearly stated in official Roman Catholic teaching and was the logical concomitant of belief in transubstantiation.³¹

On "The Eucharist and the Sacrifice of Christ" concern was expressed about the statement that "in the celebration of the memorial, Christ in the Holy Spirit unites his people with himself in a sacramental way so that the Church enters into the movement of his self-offering".³² According to the *Response* no biblical basis for this dogmatic assertion could be found.³³ On the contrary, "our understanding of the uniqueness and unrepeatable nature of Christ's sacrifice on Calvary is not set aside in the sacramental context."³⁴ It

seems to have been imagined by the authors of the *Response* that official Roman Catholic teaching implied a repetition of the sacrifice, and the Post-Conciliar Instruction *Eucharisticum Mysterium* is quoted to this effect.³⁵ This, it was claimed, was one of the areas in the Final Report in which a real divergence could be detected between "contemporary Roman Catholic theologies" and official Roman Catholic doctrine.³⁶ Accepting that the reference to "substantial agreement" could mean agreement in essentials, it was felt that there were still unresolved differences between the Anglican and Roman Catholic positions. This was certainly the case in relation to Christ's sacrifice and current eucharistic understanding and practice. In particular, it was considered that there was still an unresolved area of difference in the question of the sacrificial nature of the eucharist and its relation to Christ's historical sacrifice.³⁶

It is very difficult to find in this first part of the *Response's* Critique a consistent and clear positive doctrine of the Eucharistic presence and sacrifice.³⁷ As argued earlier in this thesis it is possible to hold that there is in a real sense a "change" in what the bread and wine are by virtue of their sacramental significance, purpose and use without necessarily implying (which would be contrary to Anglican doctrine) that these cease to be in any real sense "bread" and "wine".³⁹ Moreover, it is also possible to hold to a view of eucharistic sacrifice which allows for the once-for-all oblation of Calvary being remembered before God in thanksgiving and supplication without implying that the original event is being either extended or supplemented.⁴⁰ Such an approach to the doctrines of the Eucharistic presence and sacrifice has a long and honoured history within Anglicanism, being well-represented, for example in the writings of Jeremy Taylor (Bishop of Down and Connor from 1660-1667).⁴¹ Archbishop H.R. McAdoo, Co-Chairman of ARCIC-1, has drawn attention to the similarities between Taylor's thought and that of ARCIC.⁴² Nor is it necessary, in the writer's view, for the matter of the veneration of the Reserved Sacrament to be treated in such a negative manner.⁴³

Examination of Response Section B - The ARCIC Final Report, considered in relation to the Preamble and Declaration, and the Articles of Religion of the Church of Ireland.

While the stated governing concept of all ARCIC's work had been its intention of participating in a dialogue which, founded on the Gospels and the ancient common traditions, might lead to that unity in truth, for which Christ prayed, it appeared to the authors of the *Response* to be necessary to investigate whether the ARCIC Agreed Statements were compatible with the Preamble and Declaration and the Thirty-nine Articles on the following points:

1 Communion in both kinds.⁴⁴

This confirmed and amplified what was said in Section A, referring in particular to Article 30, "Of both kinds". It was noted that this Article had been composed by Archbishop Parker in 1563 and had been accepted by Convocation as its response to the Council of Trent's decision of July 1562 to confirm the medieval practice of communion in one kind only.⁴⁵ While the increasing practice of communion in both kinds in parts of the Roman Catholic Church was noted with pleasure, it was still believed it should be acknowledged by ARCIC that the sharing in the bread and wine of the eucharist was the only appropriate approach to the ministering of the sacrament.⁴⁶ The Commission's position on this important matter was still unclear and, until clarified, must be deemed to be incompatible with "the Gospels and the ancient common traditions" (Common

Declaration 1966), with Article 30, and with the Preamble and Declaration to the Constitution of the Church of Ireland.

It seems to have been overlooked that in an experimental form for the Ministry of the Sick, authorised by the House of Bishops for use from the time of its publication in 1985 until 1st January 1991 the following **Note** occurred,⁴⁷

Reception of the consecrated bread and wine. Communion is normally received in both kind separately, but may be by intinction or *in either kind*. (See Canon 13 [5].) [Emphasis – the writer's]

By resolution and bill what was then a definitive version of this Order, entitled *Ministry to the Sick and to others requiring particular pastoral care* was brought before the General Synod in 1992.⁴⁸ Subsequently it was incorporated in a book of *Alternative Occasional Services*⁴⁹ (1993). As the Note about Communion is included in this Order, it would appear that the Church of Ireland, notwithstanding the reservations expressed in the 1986 *Response* has, while maintaining the principle of communion in both kinds as the norm, given permission for communion in one kind only in certain circumstances.⁵⁰ This was later authoritatively confirmed by the use of the same words, given above, in the “Ministry to those who are sick” in the 2004 Prayer Book, p.440, third paragraph.

2. Transubstantiation⁵¹

The word “transubstantiation” occurred only in a footnote in the Eucharistic Statement; ARCIC did not explicitly repudiate the doctrine underlying the use of that term.⁵² It was noted that two members of ARCIC, E.J. Yarnold and Henry Chadwick in *An ARCIC Catechism* (1983)⁵³ in reply to the question, “Did the Commission neglect the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation?” had stated,⁵⁴

Transubstantiation is not neglected or sidestepped. Its essential meaning is given in the text of the ARCIC statement: what the faithful receive is not common bread or wine but the very body and blood of the Lord.

This was an answer to critics who feared that it suggested that Christ's presence in the eucharist is confined to the elements, and that the Real Presence involves a physical change in them, it declared,⁵⁵

Becoming does not here imply material change. Nor does the liturgical use of the word imply that the bread and wine become Christ's body and blood in such a way that in the eucharistic celebration his presence is limited to the consecrated elements. It does not imply that Christ becomes present in the eucharist in the same manner that he was present in his earthly life. It does not imply that this becoming follows the physical laws of this world. What is here affirmed is a sacramental presence in which God uses the realities of this world to convey the realities of the new creation: bread for this life becomes the bread of eternal life.

It was thought that this response to ARCIC to criticisms of its repeated use of the word “become” with reference to the consecrated elements becoming the body and blood of Christ, might remove the anxieties of some Anglicans, for it accorded with Chrysostom's principle that in the sacraments “Christ has given nothing which is purely material, but even in material things the reality is spiritual.” “Becoming” could be understood in the light of what God intended rather than what the baker intended.⁵⁶ When the Agreed Statement on *Eucharistic Doctrine* had been published in 1971 many readers had thought

that the Roman Catholic Church had now reduced “transubstantiation” to a footnote and that a significant change had taken place in Roman Catholic teaching.⁵⁷ But the papal Encyclical *Mysterium Fidei*, the *Credo of the People of God*, and the Commission of Cardinals who examined the Dutch Catechism had shown that, at the official level in Rome, no significant change had taken place.⁵⁸ This view was supported by the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith: in its *Observations* on the *Final Report* it had quoted the Council of Trent's definition of transubstantiation as ‘the wonderful and unique change of the whole substance of bread into His body and of the whole substance of wine into His blood, while only the species of bread and wine remain.’⁵⁹ In response to criticisms of the original Agreed Statement, ARCIC replied,

It is the glorified Lord himself whom the community of the faithful encounters in the eucharistic celebration through the preaching of the word, in the fellowship of the Lord's supper, in the heart of the believer, and in a sacramental way, through the gifts of his body and blood, already given on the cross for their salvation (*Elucidation, par 6a*).

Such an affirmation of the reality of Christ's presence would be acceptable to Anglicans; but any interpretation in terms of the traditional Roman Catholic definition as given in *Mysterium Fidei* would raise serious obstacles to compatibility with the Preamble, Declaration and Articles of Religion.⁶¹

The question, however, is not whether the Preamble, Declaration, and Articles of Religion are in agreement with Roman Catholic teaching as given in the definitions of Trent and elsewhere. Not only are they not directly compatible, but they were intended not to be.⁶² Rather, what is at stake in the Anglican-Roman Catholic dialogue is whether, in spite of such doctrinal differences, there is a sufficient amount of common ground to allow the two Churches to recognize that they have a shared faith.⁶³ This is what is implied in the *Common Declaration*,⁶⁴ and this is what has been explored in the ARCIC-1 statements about the Eucharist.⁶⁵ If the Roman Catholic Church recognises that all the characteristics of ‘bread’ and ‘wine’ are present in the sacramental ‘species’ does the denial of the substantive reality of these species undermine the eucharistic *faith*⁶⁶ of Protestants? If the Anglican churches affirm that the bread and wine are, in a real sense the ‘body’ and ‘blood’ of Christ after consecration, does their recognition of the continued existence of the sacramental species as bread and wine undermine the eucharistic *faith* of Roman Catholics?⁶⁷ Is it reasonable, in an ecumenical context, to require either less or more than is implied in the statement in *Elucidation* (1979), ‘Before the eucharistic prayer, to the question: ‘What is that?’, the believer answers: ‘It is bread.’ After the eucharistic prayer, to the same question he answers: ‘It is truly the body of Christ, the Bread of Life.’”⁶⁸ The Lord himself offered neither a definition nor an explanation, but identified the bread with His Body, and the wine with His Blood.⁶⁹

3. The “movement of Christ's self-offering”

According to the authors of the *Response* in the first and second centuries there are few references to the eucharist as an “offering” or “sacrifice”.⁷⁰ Justin Martyr, in the earliest account of Sunday eucharistic worship had mentioned only the offering of “prayers and thanksgivings”.⁷¹ Bishop Lightfoot, after a meticulous examination of the writings of the early Fathers, concluded that until the time of Cyprian the sacerdotal view of the ministry was not held “apart from a distinct recognition of the sacerdotal functions” of the whole body of the Church.⁷² This [early] concept of priesthood was fundamentally contradictory

to what was implied in ARCIC's two controversial phrases: "another realm of the Spirit" [in relation to the ordained ministry] and "enter into the movement of Christ's self-offering"⁷³ Until the time of Cyprian, references in the earliest patristic writings were generally to the oblation of the gifts, not of the Body and Blood of Christ.⁷⁴ There had not been found in the early centuries any suggestion that the worshippers "enter into the movement of his self-offering" in the eucharist.⁷⁵ R. and A. Hanson, in their handbook of Anglican teaching, *Reasonable Belief*, considered that "Christ does not need to be offered in the eucharist."⁷⁶ Was such a concept compatible with Article 31, or with the faith of the Primitive Church?⁷⁷ However, this portion of the *Response* is open to serious question. References to the theology of the Eucharist in the first three centuries are not numerous, but it would appear that the view that the Eucharist is in some sense a sacrifice is universal, being explicitly found in the *Didache* (perhaps as early as 60 A.D.),⁷⁸ 1 Clement (c.96 A.D.),⁷⁹ Justin Martyr (c.135)⁸⁰ - in spite of what was said in the *Response*, Irenaeus (c.130-200)⁸¹ and in the earliest liturgical texts such as Hippolytus, *Apostolic Tradition*⁸² and the *Anaphora of Addai and Mari*.⁸³ It is not clear to what extent the teaching of Cyprian (d.258) marks an advance on this.⁸⁴ It may also be pointed out that the existence of Article 31 has not inhibited Anglican theologians in good standing (from the sixteenth century onwards) from teaching an advanced doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice.⁸⁵

4. Reservation and Adoration.⁸⁶

In its original statement on *Eucharistic Doctrine* (1971) ARCIC had made no reference to two important issues relating to the eucharist – the subjects of reservation and adoration. In response to a criticism as to "whether the permanence of Christ's eucharistic presence has been sufficiently acknowledged?" and a request for a discussion of the reserved sacrament and devotions associated with it, the Commission had discussed the subject at some length in *Elucidation* (1979).⁸⁷ The view had been taken that "adoration in the celebration of the eucharist is first and foremost offered to the Father..The Christ whom we adore in the eucharist is Christ glorifying the Father."⁸⁸

In justification of the practice of reservation, ARCIC had pointed out that the practice had been known to Justin Martyr in the second century,⁸⁹ and it had acknowledged that "later there developed a tendency to stress the veneration of Christ's presence in the consecrated elements."⁹⁰ In fact, however, that development was unknown until the medieval period, and was peculiar to the Western Church.⁹¹

The *Response* indicated that in discussing these important issues it was desirable to make a clear distinction between them. Reservation of the sacrament had clearly been practiced in the Primitive Church and was still justifiable where it was the only means of providing the sacrament for the sick, or for those who were deprived of the ministrations of a priest to celebrate the eucharist with them.⁹² Adoration, however, had no strong precedents in the practice of the early Church, and in some cases had given rise to such distortions of sound doctrine that, as ARCIC observed, "the original purpose of reservations was in danger of becoming totally obscured."⁹³ O.C. Quick had observed that "in patristic times, although there was without doubt a strong belief in some Real Presence in the elements...there is comparatively little trace of any adoration of Jesus as personally present in the eucharistic species."⁹⁴ ARCIC had been courageous enough to declare,⁹⁵

If veneration is wholly dissociated from the eucharistic celebration of the community it contradicts the true doctrine of the eucharist.

These words, it was thought, lay very close to O.C. Quick's view of the elements,⁹⁶

As physical objects they are consecrated, that is, set apart for Christ; but He takes them up into the Eucharistic action, only when that action is in process. And though the mind will at all times naturally associate the reserved elements with their Eucharistic meaning, they actually express that meaning only in the Eucharist itself.

The *Code of Canon Law* of the Roman Catholic Church was cited in the *Response* (with particular reference to canons 934, 937, and 940) to show the importance of the veneration of the Reserved Sacrament in that body.⁹⁷ The latter Canon made it clear that, in contrast with the early Church's practice of reserving the sacrament to provide communion for the sick, the modern purpose of reservation was to keep a local presence of Christ, under the form and appearance of bread, in each church, for the administration of the Viaticum and the adoration of "our Lord Jesus Christ concealed beneath the same species."⁹⁸

ARCIC had acknowledged that "differences arise" between those who administered the reserved sacrament only to members of the Church who were "unable to attend the eucharistic celebration", and those "who would also regard it as a means of eucharistic devotion." For the latter, adoration of Christ in the reserved sacrament should be regarded as an extension of eucharistic worship even though it did not include immediate sacramental reception, which remained the primary purpose of reservation. "Any dissociation of such devotion from this primary purpose, which is communion in Christ of all his members, is a distortion in eucharistic practice."⁹⁹

The Commission had attempted to reconcile these two views by postulating "to complementary movements within an indissoluble unity: Christ giving his body and blood and the communicants feeding upon them in their hearts by faith."¹⁰⁰ Nevertheless it confessed that,¹⁰¹

In spite of this clarification, others still find any kind of adoration of Christ in the reserved sacrament unacceptable. They believe that it is in fact impossible in such a practice truly to hold together the two movements of which we have spoken: and that this devotion can hardly fail to produce such an emphasis upon the association of Christ's sacramental presence with the consecrated bread and wine as to suggest a static and localized presence that disrupts the movement as well as the balance of the whole eucharistic action.

The latter view, it was claimed, would be shared by most members of the Church of Ireland, who would endorse the declaration in Article 28 that, "The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped."¹⁰²

The critique of the *Response* is, once again, open to question at a number of points. It is not by any means clear that the reserved sacrament was received in the early Church only by the sick.¹⁰³ It would also seem reasonable to assume that whoever received it did so with reverence for the Lord's body.¹⁰⁴ There does not seem to be any convincing reason why the meaning attached to the elements should be expressed only in the Eucharist itself.¹⁰⁵ The words "local", "localized" are used too freely (admittedly once by ARCIC itself)¹⁰⁶ since, according to St Thomas Aquinas, who gave the doctrine of transubstantiation its classical form, Christ is not present in the sacrament *sicut in loco*

“as in a place”.¹⁰⁷ Strictly speaking, it does need to be said that one cannot “reserve a presence” since the risen and exalted Christ is not under the control of the Church. But it is certainly possible to reserve the effectual signs of that presence which make it possible after the manner of a sacrament for the worshippers to experience the presence of Christ locally.¹⁰⁸ Properly, veneration of the sacrament may be regarded as veneration of Christ, sacramentally represented, and hence legitimate.¹⁰⁹ The date of the development of this practice as an organized cultus is irrelevant to the question of its legitimacy.¹¹⁰ The citation of Article 28 is puzzling. If it is intended to suggest that the reservation of the sacrament is unlawful since it is “not by Christ's ordinance” this would rule out not only veneration of it but also reservation for the sick, which the authors of the *Response* apparently favour.¹¹¹ On the other hand if the statement that reservation is not by Christ's ordinance is intended to express the view that it is a matter of ecclesiastical tradition this does not of itself give any firm indication of whether it should be acceptable or not.¹¹² It is hard to avoid the conclusion that whatever the view of its original author, Article 28 at this point says less than it appears to be saying.¹¹³

NOTES ON CHAPTER THREE, PART TWO

[1] These would necessarily differ, the Roman Catholic Church having a centralised structure of government, and the Churches of the Anglican Communion being "autocephalous" - independent and self-governing.

[2] With the exception of the Church of England, which, because of its established position remains subject in certain respects to the authority of parliament, supreme legislative authority in other parts of the Anglican Communion rests with the Provincial Synods. In the Church of Ireland, the Preamble and Declaration Prefixed to the Church Constitution (1870) affirms,

The Church of Ireland, deriving its authority from Christ, Who is the Head over all things to the Church, doth declare that a General Synod of the Church of Ireland, consisting of the Archbishops and Bishops, and of Representatives of the Clergy and Laity, shall have chief legislative power therein, and such administrative power as may be necessary for the Church, and consistent with its Episcopal Constitution.

[3] ACC-5 Anglican Consultative Council, Report of Fifth Meeting, Newcastle upon Tyne 1981, ACC 1981, Resolution 4: ARCIC, pp40,41. This read in full,

The Council:

especially its Co-Chairmen, Archbishop Henry McAdoo and Bishop Alan Clark, and its co-secretaries Mgr W.A. Purdy and the Revd C. J. Hill.. Expresses its gratitude to all those who have served on ARCIC since 1970, and b. commends to the Churches of the Anglican Communion the two questions proposed by the Co-Chairmen in their letter of 2nd September 1981 to the Archbishop of Canterbury, viz.

"Whether the Agreed Statements on Eucharistic Doctrine, Ministry and Ordination, and Authority in the Church (I and II), together with Elucidations are consonant in substance with the faith of Anglicans" and "Whether the Final Report offers a sufficient basis for taking the next concrete step towards the reconciliation of our Churches grounded in agreement in faith";

c. Endorses the further proposal that a new Commission be set up, with the two broad terms of reference proposed in the same letter: to work out, on the basis of the Final Report, the implications of reconciliation grounded in faith should the two Churches respond favourably to the questions posed; and to suggest the stages through which the two Churches would eventually move towards organic unity in full communion and also the practical steps involved at each stage.

[4] JGS 1983, Report of Standing Committee, Section 5, p.82. [5] Ibid.

[6] JGS 1983, p.lxx. This read,

This Synod requests its Standing Committee to assess the ARCIC Final Report against the standard of the Preamble Declaration and Articles of Religion of the Church of Ireland.

Noting the apparent failure of the Report to base its doctrines on Holy Scripture alone, Synod requests the Standing Committee rigorously to test the scriptural basis for claimed agreement in areas of historic difference, including:

- the method by which Christians today may establish what spiritual truths been revealed to us by God; the manner of Christ's presence in the Holy Communion;
 - the nature of Christian priesthood/presbyterhood;
- the validity of the arguments supporting the primacy of the Bishop of Rome.
- The Committee should also affirm the impossibility of full doctrinal agreement without commitment to the doctrine of Justification by Faith and its logical application to all disputed doctrines concerning salvation.

[7] JGS 1983 p.lxx. The original resolution was amended on the proposal of Revd. J. Hartin, seconded by Revd. Canon G.M.D. Woodworth.

[8] See *The Response of the General Synod of the Church of Ireland to the Final Report of ARCIC-1, APCK/OUP, May 1986*, pplf, 29f.

[9] JGS 1986, "Report of the Standing Committee", ppl03-155. A "Report" is sent out to all General Synod members a few weeks before the Synod meets. Later, this is bound up with a record of the proceedings of Synod, and becomes the "Journal" of the General Synod. The original promise to bring a draft Report before the Synod of 1985 was not kept. Since only formal amendments could be brought before Synod at its meeting in 1986, it was not in practice possible either for most Synodsmembers to absorb such a complex Report in full or to have it altered in detail.

[10] See [5] above.

[11] JGS 1986 pplxxx-lxxxii. Dean Paterson was one of the four Hon. Secretaries of the General Synod.

[12] Ibid. It may be noted that the wording of both the original motion and this amendment was very broad and even vague. It is not clear, for example, what the word "realistically" was intended to signify. The writer's impression was of confusion in the minds of some Synodsmembers, and this may have hindered support for the amendment.

[13] Ibid.

[14] Ibid.

[15] *Response* p.x.

[17] For the Common Declaration (a very important milestone in Anglican-Roman Catholic relations after Vatican II) see *The Archbishop of Canterbury's visit to Rome, March 1966*, CIO 1966, pp14-17. For a description of the event and an indication of its significance as perceived by Archbishop Ramsey see O. Chadwick, *Michael Ramsey*, OUP, 1991, pp316-323. See also A. Hastings, *A History of English Christianity 1920-1990*, pp530-531. Referring to the meeting and the Common Declaration he commented, "Here was both a deliberate example of prayer in common and a degree of mutual recognition which would have seemed unimaginable a decade earlier. From now on the relationship in England, as everywhere, between the Catholic Church and the Anglican Communion would have somehow to reflect that service in St. Paul's (basilica)".

[18] *Response* p.x. For the Letter "To All Christian People" from the Lambeth Conference 1920, see Bell, G.K.A., *Documents on Christian Unity -1924*, London 1924. An abbreviated version appears in Bettenson, *Documents of the Christian Church*, 2nd Ed., OUP, pp327-329. For a brief account of the formulation of the Appeal see R. Lloyd, *The Church of England 1900-1965*, SCM 1966, pp.403-410.

[19] *Response* pp.x,xi and *passim*. Note also the terms of the resolution passed by the Synod 1986 requesting (e)(i) further consideration of "the status of Contemporary Theology in relation to the official doctrines of our two Communions". The term seems to have been taken from the footnote on transubstantiation in the Windsor Statement (*The Final Report*, op. cit. p.14). See below, [26].

[20] *Response* pp30-32.

[21] *Response* p.xi.

[22] *Response* p.l. E.C.S. Gibson, in *The Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England*, fourth edition revised, Methuen & Co, London 1904 pp677ff, cites the severe condemnation of certain early abstainers from the chalice by Popes Leo 1 (in 440 A.D.) and Gelasius 1 (490 A.D.),

They [some Manichees] receive Christ's Body with unworthy mouth, and entirely refuse to drink the Blood of our Redemption; therefore we give notice to you, holy brethren, that men of this sort, whose sacrilegious deceit has been detected, are to be expelled by priestly authority from the fellowship of the saints. [Leo 1, Hom. xli, 440 A.D.]

We have ascertained that certain persons, having received a portion of the sacred Body alone, abstain from partaking of the chalice of the sacred Blood. Let such persons, without any doubt (since they are stated to feel themselves bound by some superstitious reason), either receive the sacrament in its entirety, or be repelled from the entire sacrament, because the division of one and the same mystery cannot take place without great sacrilege. (Gelasius 1, *Corpus Juris Canon. Decret. III. ii. 12*. St. Thomas Aquinas was later to allege that "Gelasius speaks only in reference to priests".)

In the eleventh century, the custom of communicating in one kind only was creeping into the Catholic Church, probably from motives of reverence, according to Gibson, and anxiety to avoid accidents or scandals. At this time the matter attracted some attention, and the custom of communicating in one kind alone was definitely condemned by the Council of Clermont under Urban II (1095), as well as by Pascal II at the beginning of the next century (1118). The twenty-eighth Canon of the Council is clear, and states positively that "no one shall communicate at the altar unless he receive the Body *and the Blood* separately and alike, unless by way of necessity and for caution" (*Conc. Clarom. Can. xxviii*); while the words of Pope Pascal are these,

Therefore, according to the same Cyprian, in receiving the Body and Blood of the Lord, let the Lord's tradition be observed; nor let any departure be made, through a human and novel institution, from what Christ the Master ordained and did. For we know that the bread was given separately and the wine given separately by the Lord Himself; which custom we therefore teach and command to be always observed in the holy Church, save in the case of infants and of very infirm people, who cannot swallow bread."

[23] *Response* pp29,30.

[24] *Response* pp17-25. .1; "Elucidation", see *The Final Report*, op. cit.

[25] *Response* p.2; Council of Trent DS 1652; *Encyclical Letter (Mysterium Fidei of His Holiness Paul VI by Divine Providence – His Venerable Brethren, the Patriarchs,*

Primates, Archbishops, Bishops, and other Local Ordinaries being at Peace and in Communion with the Apostolic See and to the Clergy and Faithful of the whole Catholic world, concerning the Doctrine and Worship of the Holy Eucharist, official Latin text in the Acta Apostolicae Sedis, Vol. LVII, 1965, No. 11., translated by the Revd. Austin Garvey, M.A., CTS Do 355.

[26] The Windsor Statement (*Final Report* p.14) declared that "Communion with Christ in the eucharist presupposes his true presence, effectually signified by the bread and which, in this mystery, become his body and blood". In a footnote it stated,

The word *transubstantiation* is commonly used in the Roman Catholic Church to indicate that God acting in the eucharist effects a change in the inner reality of the elements. The term should be seen as affirming the fact of Christ's presence and of the mysterious and radical change which takes place. In contemporary Roman Catholic theology it is not understood as explaining how the change takes place.

It is interesting in this connection that Dr Andrew Sall, the ex-Jesuit, who was received into the Church of Ireland in 1674, cites the Anglican formularies and Bishop Cosin's *Historia Transubstantionis Papalis* to show that Anglicans "believe and profess that Christ our Saviour is really and substantially present in the blessed Sacrament of the Eucharist, and his body and blood really and substantially received in it by the faithful". The difference between the teaching of the Church of Ireland and that of the Roman Catholic Church "is only regarding the mode of his presence". Protestants adore and reverence the "person of our Saviour, God and Man really present"; but to give the accidents the worship of latria "cannot with any colour of reason be excused from a formal idolatry". A. Sall, *True Catholic and Apostolic Faith* (1846 ed.), p224ff, cited in F.R. Bolton, *The Caroline Tradition in the Church of Ireland*, SPCK, 1958, p.112.

[27] *Response* p.3. For a history of Anglican Eucharistic teaching see Darwell Stone, *A History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, in two volumes, Longmans, Green and Co., 1909, Vol II, Chapters X - XIII, XV, XVI.

[28] It would appear that the authors of the *Response* here are suggesting that in order for the ARCIC agreement on the Eucharist to be acceptable to the Church of Ireland, transubstantiation in its traditional sense must be explicitly excluded. Since ecumenism rests upon the presupposition that those participating in it do so as faithful members of their own Churches, such a precondition would appear to make agreement impossible.

[29] *Response* p.3, "Elucidation", *The Final Report*, op. cit. p.32

[30] BCP-1926, p.155 "And if any remain of the Bread and Wine which was consecrated, it shall not be carried out of the Church, but the Priest, and such other of the Communicants as he shall then call unto him, shall, immediately after the Blessing, reverently eat and drink the same". However in the 2004 Prayer Book in the General Directions for Public Worship, §14 (e) it says, "Any of the consecrated bread and wine remaining after the administration of communion is to be reverently consumed." At the time of writing legislation relating to Extended Communion was in the process of being brought before Synod to put permission for this on a permanent basis. See Appendix XXX

[31] *Response* p.3.

[32] *Response* P.3; "Elucidation", *Final Report*, op. cit. p.20.

[33] *Response* p.3. It was noted that Bishop B.C. Butler, a member of ARCIC, replying to criticisms that the Statement made no reference to the Eucharistic Sacrifice, had observed,

This is not true...a careful reading of the section of the Statement on the Eucharist as anamnesis will disclose that the Eucharist is here regarded as the "making effective in the present" of "the totality of God's reconciling action in Christ". This reconciling action of God is summed up in the Cross, and from the New Testament times the event of the Cross has been regarded as a sacrifice. To make that sacrifice effective in an anamnesis ("memorial" in the rich Biblical sense of the term) is to represent it, and in the Eucharist "the members of Christ united with God and one another ... enter into the movement of his self-offering" (*The Tablet*, 8 January 1972).

[34] *Response* p.4. This echoes traditional Anglican concerns about the uniqueness of the Sacrifice of the Cross, even among those who have a "high" doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. For example, John Bramhall (Archbishop of Armagh 1661-1663) had this to say in his "An Answer to M. de la Milletiere, His Impertinent Dedication of His Imaginary Triumph; or His Epistle to the King of Great Britain, Wherein he inviteth His Majesty to forsake the Church of England and to embrace the Roman Catholic Religion" (1653) in his *Works*, ed. L.A.C.T., Vol 1, p.54, cited in More and Cross *Anglicanism*, op. cit. No 213 p.496,

You say we have renounced your Sacrifice of the Mass. If the Sacrifice of the Mass be the same with the Sacrifice of the Cross, we attribute more unto it than yourselves; we place our whole hope of salvation in it. If you understand another Propitiatory Sacrifice distinct from that (as this of the Mass seems to be; for confessedly the priest is not the same, the altar is not the same, the temple is not the same), if you think of any new meritorious satisfaction to God for the sins of the world, or of any new supplement to the merits of Christ's Passion, you must give us leave to renounce your sacrifice indeed and to adhere to the Apostle "By one offering He hath perfected for ever them that are sanctified."

However in 1656 he felt able to offer the following exposition of a doctrine of Eucharistic Sacrifice which was not in any sense to be regarded as contrary to the Sacrifice of the Cross, in his "A Replication to the Bishop of Chalcedon's Survey of the Vindication of the Church of England from Criminous Schism", Chapter II, section vii; Chapter IX, section vi. *Works*, ed L.A.C.T., Vol II pp88, 276, reproduced in More and Cross, *Anglicanism*, op. cit. No. 214, p.496.,

The Holy Eucharist is a commemoration, a representation, an application of the all-sufficient propitiatory Sacrifice of the Cross. If his Sacrifice of the Mass have any other propitiatory power or virtue in it than to commemorate, represent, and apply the merit of the Sacrifice of the Cross, let him speak plainly what it is...

We acknowledge an Eucharistical Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; a commemorative Sacrifice or a memorial of the Sacrifice of the Cross; a representative Sacrifice, or a representation of the Passion of Christ before the eyes of His Heavenly Father; an impetrative Sacrifice or an impetration of the fruit and benefit of His Passion by way of real prayers; and, lastly, an applicative Sacrifice, or an application of His Merits unto our souls. Let him that dare go one step further than we do; and say that it is a suppletory Sacrifice, to supply the defects of the Sacrifice of the Cross. Or else let them hold their peace and speak

no more against us in this point of sacrifice for ever.

[35] *Response* p.4,

It is indeed the priest alone, who, acting in the person of Christ, consecrates the bread and wine, but the role of the faithful in the eucharist is to recall the passion, resurrection, and glorification of the Lord, to give thanks to God, and to offer the immaculate victim not only through the hands of the priest, but also together with him; and finally, by receiving the Body of the Lord, to perfect that communion with God and among themselves which should be the product of participation in the sacrifice of the Mass (*Vatican Council II: The Conciliar and Post-Conciliar Documents*, ed. Austin Flannery (1975), pp.110f.).

It is not clear, however, that this language is intended to convey a concept of an additional sacrifice. Rather it is to be understood within the context of traditional Roman Catholic teaching which stresses, on the contrary, the unity of the Eucharistic Sacrifice with that of the Sacrifice of the Cross. For example, in 1898 Pope Leo XIII had said,

After Christ's ascension into heaven, that very same sacrifice [of the cross] is continued by the Eucharistic sacrifice. Consequently they are in serious error who reject the latter, as if it derogated from the reality and efficacy of the sacrifice wrought by Christ when he was nailed to the cross, "offered once for all to drain the cup of a world's sins" (Heb. ix.28). That expiation for sins was wholly perfect and complete; nor is it in any way another expiation, but the very same, that is present in the Eucharistic sacrifice...It was the divine plan of the Redeemer that the sacrifice consummated once upon the cross should be perpetual and perennial. It is made perpetual in the most holy Eucharist, which brings not merely a figure or an empty commemoration of the reality but the reality itself, although under a different appearance. ("Letter to the Bishops of Scotland", 1898 (Leonis XIII Acta, vol. XVIII, pp.110-111) cited in F. Clark, *Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation*, op. cit. pp246,247.

[36] For a critical re-thinking of the Eucharistic Sacrifice see Luis M. Bermejo, S.J., i, Gujarat Sahitya Prakash, 1986, Chapter Three, pp53-110. Speaking of the relationship between the Mass and Calvary he says (p.73),

The Mass and Calvary-cannot be placed on the same footing, as if they were two coordinated sacrifices. The term "sacrifice" cannot be applied equally to the event of Calvary and to the daily event on our altars, for the notion of sacrifice is rich and flexible, admitting of several interpretations. It is obvious that historically Jesus died and was raised only once, and this sacrifice of his remains absolutely unique and unrepeatable. Christ's death and resurrection know no duplicates, for in their historical reality they cannot be repeated or re-enacted in any way. Paradoxically, the Mass is at once extremely close to Calvary and yet very remote from it. There is between the two a very solid link of union, but also a yawning abyss of separation that cannot possibly be bridged over. For they both represent two different orders, the historical (cross-resurrection) and the sacramental (the Mass), and these two orders or levels must not be confused; they should always be kept, not disconnected, but certainly distinct.

And on the propitiatory sacrifice he says (pp101,102),

Is it possible to hold that the Lord is appeased (let alone placated) by the sacrifice of the altar? For even the sacrifice of Calvary cannot, properly speaking, appease or placate God, for God was already appeased and gracious even before the death of Jesus. It is not Calvary that explains the graciousness of God but exactly the opposite; it is God's graciousness that explains Calvary. The paschal mystery is not the cause, but rather the result and manifestation, the overflow of God's intrinsic loving kindness. And if, properly speaking, even the cross of Christ cannot effect that graciousness in God, much less can the eucharistic memorial do it ... Hence, rather than a propitiatory sacrifice in itself, the Mass is the sacramental memorial of Christ's propitiatory sacrifice, which is now, in the Eucharist, existentially apprehended by man.

[37] *Response* p.5.

[38] The contrast with the positive tone and coherent theological approach in the Church of England's Response is noticeable. See *Towards a Church of England Response to BEM and ARCIC*, produced by the Faith and Order Advisory Group, GS 661, 1985; and also *The Church of England's Response to BEM & ARCIC, Supplementary Report, the Board for Mission and Unity*, GS 747, 1986. For an assessment of these two documents see below Chapter 3 Part Four.

[39] See above, pp

[40] See above, pp

[41] Taylor held an advanced view of the Eucharistic Sacrifice,

As it is a Commemoration and Representation of Christ's death, so it is a Commemorative Sacrifice. As we receive the symbols and the mystery, so it is a Sacrament. In both capacities, the benefit is next to infinite. First, for whatsoever Christ did at the Institution, the same He commanded the Church to do in remembrance and repeated rites; and Himself also does the same thing in Heaven for us, making perpetual intercession for His Church, the Body of His redeemed ones, by representing to His Father His Death and Sacrifice. There He sits, a High Priest continually, and offers still the same one perfect Sacrifice; that is, still represents it as having been once finished and consummate, in order to perpetual and never failing events. And this also His ministers do on earth. They offer up the same Sacrifice to God, the Sacrifice of the Cross by prayers, and a commemorating rite and representment, according to His holy Institution ... Our very holding up the Son of God and representing Him to His Father is the doing an act of mediation and advantage to ourselves in the virtue and efficacy of the Mediator. As Christ is a Priest in Heaven for ever and yet does not sacrifice Himself afresh not yet without a Sacrifice could He be a Priest, but by a daily ministration and intercession represents His Sacrifice to God and offers Himself as sacrificed, so He does upon earth by the ministry of His servants. He is offered to God; that is, He is by prayers and the Sacrament represented or offered up to God as sacrificed, which in effect is a celebration of His Death, and the applying it to the present and future necessities of the Church as we are capable by a ministry like to His in Heaven. It follows, then, that the celebration of this Sacrifice be in its proportion an instrument of applying the proper Sacrifice to all the purposes which it first designed. It is ministerially and by

application an instrument propitiatory; it is eucharistical; it is an homage and an act of adoration; and it is impetratory and obtains for us and for the whole Church all the benefits of the Sacrifice, which is now celebrated and applied. That is, as this rite is the remembrance and ministerial celebration of Christ's Sacrifice, so it is destined to do honour to God, to express the homage and duty of His servants, to acknowledge His supreme dominion, to give Him thanks and worship, to beg pardon, blessings, and supply of all our needs. And its profit is enlarged not only to the persons celebrating, but to all to whom they design it, according to the nature of sacrifices and prayers and all such solemn actions of religion. [From "The Great Exemplar, The History of the Life and Death of the Holy Jesus." Part III, Section xv (Discourse xix). *Works*, ed. R. Heber, Vol. III, pp296,297f; cited in *More and Cross Anglicanism*, op cit., no 212, pp495,496.]

[42] H.R. McAdoo, *The Eucharistic Theology of Jeremy Taylor Today*, The Canterbury Press, Norwich, 1988.

[43] See above, p.

E.J. Bicknell, in his classic *The Thirty-nine Articles*, op. cit. revised by H.J. Carpenter, was opposed to extra-liturgical veneration of the sacrament. But it was admitted that the following considerations, among others, would probably be urged by those who took a different view from that in the text,

(1) In the later Middle Ages the desire to see the Host at the elevation and the extra-liturgical use of the sacrament became dominating elements in popular eucharistic piety and tended to displace completely the participation of the people in the whole eucharistic action, especially since the reception of Holy Communion was very infrequent. This represented a fundamental perversion of eucharistic doctrine and practice, and fully explained the strictures of the Reformers on any use of the sacrament outside the liturgy and their positive desire to insist on the participation of the people in the whole rite, to emphasize the reception of communion as integral to it, and to encourage more frequent reception. In the situation then existing these measure were salutary and necessary.

(2) At the time of writing in the Church of England the question of extra-liturgical devotions arose in a context very different from that of mediaeval times. In quarters where the desire for such devotions existed, frequent communion was usual and was not, according to the evidence available, endangered where those devotions were practised.

(3) If reservation were conceded the devotional use of the reserved sacrament would be not mainly, and certainly not exclusively, a doctrinal issue. The real question was "is the devotional use of the reserved sacrament a good and desirable kind of prayer?" Could it be so ordered as to promote a right total eucharistic practice and not to disturb its true balance? Much would depend not only on the whole context of teaching and practice in a particular parish in which the sacrament was used devotionally outside the liturgy, but also on the character of the prayers and hymns used in the special service. If these were restricted to what was sound and healthy, it was unlikely that this form of devotion to Our Lord could produce undesirable effects of lead to distorted views. [Footnote to p.406]

[44] *Response* pp.29f.

[45] *Response* p. 29. For the writer's exposition of Article 30 see above pp

[46] *Ibid.*

[47] *Ibid.*

[48] *The Ministry to the Sick*, approved by the House of Bishops and authorized for use in the Church of Ireland until 1st January 1991, in accordance with the Constitution of the Church of Ireland Chapter 1 Section 26 (3), Collins, 1985, p.11. Canon 13 (5) reads,

The bread to be used in the service shall be such as is usually eaten, of the best quality that can conveniently be procured; and the use of wafer bread is prohibited except in cases of illness where it maybe desirable to administer the Holy Communion by means of intinction, subject to any conditions which the ordinary may prescribe.

It may be noticed that there is in fact no mention of communion in one kind only. However, the incorporation of the 1985 rubric as a Note in the definitive alternative Order of 1991 (see below [49], [50], fully authorised by Synod, may be taken as implying an enlargement of the scope of the canon to allow this in certain circumstances. The same provision was carried over to the 2004 Prayer Book.

[49] JGS 1992, pp

[50] *Alternative Occasional Services – according to the use of the Church of Ireland, by authority of the General Synod of the Church of Ireland*, The General Synod of the Church of Ireland 1993, p49ff.

[51] See above [48]

[52] *Response* p.30.

[53] *Ibid.*

[54] E.J. Yarnold and H. Chadwick, *An ARCIC Catechism*(1983) CTS.

[55] *Response*.31, *Elucidation* [1979), in *The Final Report*, cit. p.21

[56] See above pp

[57] *Response* .31

[58] *Ibid.*

[59] *Ibid. Observations on the Final Report*, CTS, 1982 p.6 and (with reference to the Council of Trent), DS 1652.

[60] *Elucidation* (1979), *The Final Report*, op. cit. par. 6(a), p.21.

[61] *Response* p.61. A similar concern from the Roman Catholic side is expressed in *Observations*, op. cit. pp3,4. See below, pp

[62] The Declaration Section 1 (3) states,

The Church of Ireland, as a Reformed and Protestant Church, doth re-affirm its constant witness against all those innovations in doctrine and worship, whereby the Primitive Faith bath been from time to time defaced or overlaid, and which at the Reformation this Church did disown and reject.

Although not all developments in the faith and life of the Church are condemned (only those by which the Primitive Faith had been "defaced or overlaid" and which had been disowned at the Reformation) yet it is clear that some aspects of Roman Catholic teaching (before and after the Reformation) are deemed to be excluded in the Church of Ireland.

The Thirty-nine Articles in their definitive form were ratified in the Church of England in 1571 (eight years after the conclusion of the Council of Trent) and accepted in the Church of Ireland in 1634. Where they differ from the teaching of Trent (as for example in the Eucharistic teaching of articles 28, 29, 30, and 31) they may be deemed to reject that teaching. How the interpretation of these articles may be approached in an ecumenical context is discussed earlier in this thesis on pp

[63] Emmanuel Amand de Mendieta, in his irenic *Anglican Vision* (SPCK, 1971) distinguishes, in an ecumenical context, between "Theological Principles" and "Theological Theories and Systems" (pp98ff). He also makes a distinction between "Faith" and "Theology", the latter including a distinction between "Objective Faith" and "its formularies" (pp67ff). Ecumenical agreement is to be aimed at on the level of theological principles and faith, but is not attainable (nor is it necessary for the purpose of reunion) on the basis of theological theories and systems. The whole book, written by a distinguished patristic scholar and theologian who came from Roman Catholicism to Anglicanism, is an important contribution both to inter-Anglican understanding and to ecumenism.

[64] There is no mention in the *Common Declaration* of total agreement in doctrinal teaching or in liturgical practice. Rather, it was stated,

They [that is, the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Pope] affirm their desire that all those Christians who belong to these two Communion may be animated by ... sentiments of respect, esteem and fraternal love, and in order to help these develop to the full, they intend to inaugurate between the Roman Catholic Church and the Anglican Communion a serious dialogue which, founded on the Gospels and on the ancient common traditions, may lead to that unity in truth, for which Christ prayed.

[65] "Our intention has been to seek a deeper understanding of the reality of the eucharist which is consonant with biblical teaching and with the tradition of our common inheritance, and to express in this document the consensus we have reached." *The Final Report*, op. cit. p.12.

[66] For members of the Church of Ireland a sacrament would still be ... an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us, ordained by Christ himself, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof.

A sacrament would still consist of two parts: the "outward visible sign", and the "inward spiritual grace".

The "outward part or sign of the Lord's Supper" would still be "Bread and Wine, which the Lord hath commanded to be received".

The "inward part, or thing signified" would still be "The Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper".

And the Body and Blood of Christ would still be deemed to be taken and received in the Lord's Supper "only after a heavenly and spiritual manner; and the mean whereby they are taken and received is Faith".

Church Catechism, BCP-1926 p.262.

In Roman Catholic teaching, after the "conversion" called "transubstantiation" the "species" remain - but since these include everything that other Christians would call "bread" and "wine" - with reference to taste, smell, appearance, chemical composition, and so on, it is not clear in what sense they are supposed to be "unreal" or to what extent the faith of Protestants would necessarily be undermined by their being supposed to be so. This is not to dispose of the theological objections to transubstantiation. The writer shares the view that the Roman Catholic teaching as defined at Trent, and reaffirmed in more recent doctrinal statements by the Roman Catholic Church, in the words of Article 28 "overthroweth the nature of a sacrament". The question is whether such an error (assuming it to be an error) makes a common eucharistic faith impossible.

[67] That belief in the Real Presence can co-exist with full recognition of the reality of the sacramental "sign" is indicated in the Anglican-Lutheran statement of 1972 (cited in *Observations*, op. cit. p.6), which said,

Both Communion affirm the real presence of Christ in this sacrament, but neither seeks to define precisely how this happens. In the eucharistic action (including consecration) and reception, the bread and wine, *while remaining bread and wine*, become the means whereby Christ is truly present and gives himself to the communicants. [Emphasis - the writer's]

See "Report of the Anglican-Lutheran International Conversations 1970-1972", authorised by the Lambeth Conference and the Lutheran World Federation, in *Lutheran World*, vol. XIX, 1972, p.393).

[68] See *The Final Report* p.21.

[69] In the indirect symbolic way described above on pp

[70] Response, p.32. A careful and scholarly examination of the issue, based on the expression 'sacrifice of praise' may be found in G.G. Willis, 'Sacrificium laudis', pp73-87 in B.D. Spinks, ed, *The Sacrifice of Praise – Studies on the themes of thanksgiving and Redemption in the Central Prayers of the Eucharistic and Baptismal Liturgies – in honour of Arthur Hubert Couratin, C.L.V.*,- Edizione Liturgiche – 00192 ROMA, 1981, under the headings, 1. "In Scripture", 2. "In the Fathers", 3. "In Liturgical Forms" with 4. "Conclusion".

[71] Justin Martyr, "First Apology" 67 (5) in R.C.D. Jasper & G.J. Cuming, *Prayers of the Eucharist - Early and Reformed*, Collins 1975, p.20,

Then we all stand up together and offer prayers; and as we said before, when we have finished praying, bread and wine and water are brought up, and the president likewise offers prayers and thanksgivings to the best of his ability, and the people assent, saying the Amen; and there is a distribution, and everyone participates in (the elements) over which thanks have been given; and they are sent through the deacons to those who are not present.

[72] Response, p.32. A passage from Lightfoot to this effect is quoted from *The Christian Ministry* in *Dissertations on the Apostolic Age* (1892), pp210f.

[73] *Response* p.32.

[74] *Response* p.32. But these "gifts" are identified in the same early writers with the "body" and "blood" of Christ. Justin Martyr, in his "First Apology" 66 (2),(3) in *Prayers of the Eucharist*, op. cit. p.19, said,

For we do not receive these things as common bread or common drink; but just as our Saviour Jesus Christ, being incarnate through the word of God, took flesh and blood for our salvation, so too we have been taught that the food over which thanks have been given by the prayer of the Word who is from him, from which our flesh and blood are fed by transformation, is both the flesh and blood of that incarnate Jesus.

For the apostles in the records composed by them which are called gospels, have handed down what was commanded them: that Jesus took bread, gave thanks, and said, "Do this for my remembrance; this is my body"; and likewise he took the cup, gave thanks, and said, "This is my blood"; and gave to them alone.

Earlier, Ignatius of Antioch (c.107), referring to certain heretics, said in his letter to the Smyrnaeans (VII, 1), "They abstain from Eucharist and prayer, because they do not confess that the Eucharist is the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ who suffered for our sins, which the Father raised up by his goodness." Loeb Classical Library, *Apostolic Fathers*, 1, Tr. Kirsopp Lake, William Heinmann, 1912 p.259. In his letter to the Romans (VII,3), he said, "I have no pleasure in the food of corruption or in the delights of this life. I desire the "Bread of God", which is the flesh of Jesus Christ, who was of the seed of David, and for drink I desire his blood..."

It follows from this that an oblation of the bread and wine of the Eucharist in early Christian writers implied in some sense an offering of the Body and Blood.

[75] *Response* p.32. The reference here to the "early centuries" is ambiguous. Does it mean the time prior to the systematization of the concept of the Eucharistic Sacrifice by Cyprian (d.258). Or does it mean the early Christian centuries in general (the period of the first four General Councils, whose authority is accepted by Anglicans)? By the fourth and fifth centuries, the doctrine of Eucharistic Sacrifice, universally assumed and taught from the sub-apostolic period, and having its roots in the Institution Narrative itself [see the writer's unpublished B.D. thesis, submitted to the University of Dublin in 1979 and entitled *The Meaning and Role of the Anamnesis in the Anglican Liturgical Tradition*, Chapter 1, "The Biblical Background] was receiving careful exposition from many writers, most notably in the West, Augustine. According to J.N.D. Kelly in his *Early Christian Doctrines* op. cit. pp454, 455, Augustine, in addition to his view of the eucharistic sacrifice as a "similitude" or "memorial" of Calvary, taught the following,

In the first place, it involves a real, though sacramental, offering of Christ's body and blood: He is Himself the priest, but also the oblation [De civ. dei 10,20]. In the second place, however, along with this oblation of the Head, it involves the offering of His members, since the fruit of the sacrifice is, precisely, their union in His mystical body.

Augustine said, in a much quoted passage,

When then the Apostle exhorted us to present our bodies as a living victim...this is the sacrifice of Christians: we who are many are one body in Christ. The Church celebrates it in the sacrament of the altar which is so familiar to the faithful, in which is shown that *in what she offers she herself is offered*.

And,

The most splendid and excellent sacrifice consists of ourselves, His people, This is the sacrifice the mystery whereof we celebrate in our oblation.

Earlier Western writers in the Fourth Century referred to by Kelly include Hilary of Poitiers (c.315-367/8), Jerome (345-420), and Ambrose (c.339-397). Hilary, he says, describes the Christian altar as ‘à table of sacrifice’, and speaks of ‘the sacrifice of thanksgiving and praise’ which has replaced the blood victims of olden days, and of the immolation of the paschal lamb made under the new law. According to Jerome, the dignity of the eucharistic liturgy derives from its association with the passion; it is no empty memorial, for the victim of the Church’s daily sacrifice is the Saviour Himself. Ambrose said,

Now we see good things in an image, and hold fast to the good things of the image. We have seen the chief of the priests coming to us, we have seen and heard Him offering His blood for us. We who are priests imitate Him as best as we can, offering sacrifice for the people, admittedly feeble in merit but made honourable through that sacrifice.

Ambrose’s concept is that of the eucharist as the earthly representation of Christ’s eternal self-offering in the heavenly places and with this is conjoined the suggestion (Kelly, op cit), that He is also immolated on the altar, so that what we receive in communion is the paschal lamb slain on the cross. Ambrose further teaches that the sacrifice of the altar is an efficacious one, for just as Christ offered Himself veritably on Calvary to procure the remission of sins, so in the eucharist He offers Himself *in imagine* to obtain the same end.

J.N.D. Kelly, op cit, pp449-453 summarizes the teaching of Eastern Church Fathers including Cyril of Jerusalem, (c.315-87) who makes an elaborate statement of the sacrificial element in the eucharist:

In agreement with tradition he speaks of it as ‘the spiritual sacrifice’ and ‘the unbloody service’ but he also describes it as ‘the holy and most awful sacrifice’ and ‘the sacrifice of propitiation (*tes thusias..tou hilasmou*) in the presence of which God is entreated for the peace of the churches and our earthly needs generally. Indeed intercession may be offered for the dead as well as the living while the dread victim lies before us, for what we offer is ‘Christ slain on behalf of our sins, propitiating the merciful God on behalf both of them and ourselves’.

Kelly, op. cit. also refers to the teaching of John Chrysostom (c.347-407) later in the century who develops Cyril’s teaching, referring to ‘the most awesome sacrifice (*ten phrikodestaten...thusian*), and to ‘the Lord sacrificed and lying there, and the priest bending over the sacrifice and interceding’. He makes the important point that the sacrifice now offered on the altar is identical with the one which the Lord Himself offered at the Last Supper. He emphasizes this doctrine of the uniqueness of the sacrifice in commenting on the statement in *Hebrews* that Christ offered Himself once:

‘Do we not offer sacrifice daily? We do indeed, but as a memorial of His death, and this oblation is single, not manifold. But how can it be one and not many? Because it has been offered once for all, as was the ancient sacrifice in the holy of holies. This is the figure of that ancient sacrifice as it was of this one; for it is the same Jesus Christ we offer always, not now one victim and later another. The victim is always the same, so that the sacrifice is one. Are we going to say that, because Christ is offered in many places, there are many Christs? Of course not,. It is one and the same Christ everywhere. He is here in His entirety and there in His entirety, one unique body. Just as He is one body, not many bodies, although

offered in many places, so the sacrifice is one and the same. Our high-priest is the very same Christ Who has offered the sacrifice which cleanses it. The victim who was offered then, Who cannot be consumed, is the self-same victim we offer now. What we do is done as a memorial of what was done then...we do not offer a different sacrifice, but always the same one, or rather we accomplish the memorial of it. Christ “offered sacrifice once for all, and thenceforth sat down”.

Kelly, *op cit.*, interprets this as indicating that the whole action of the eucharist takes place in the heavenly, spiritual sphere; the earthly celebration is a showing forth of it on the terrestrial plane. Similar concepts are found in the Cappadocian Father Gregory of Nazianzus (c.329-90) and also Theodore of Mopsuestia (c.350-428)

The considerations set forth above are not affected theologically if some scholars are right in attributing the works of St Cyril of Jerusalem to his successor, John.

[76] Bishop Richard Hanson’s minimizing view of the historical evidence may be found in his *Eucharistic Offering in the Early Church*, Grove Liturgical Study No 19, Grove Books, 1976 and 1979. A different view may be found in Rowan Williams, *Eucharistic Sacrifice – The Roots of a Metaphor*, Grove Liturgical Study No 31, Grove Books, 1982. One may see also, *Essays on Eucharistic Sacrifice in the Early Church – a Sequel to Liturgical Study No 31, Eucharistic Sacrifice the Roots of a Metaphor by Rowan Williams*, Edited by Colin Buchanan, contributors Michael Vasey, David Gregg, Christopher Hancock, Nicholas Sagovsky, Kenneth Stevenson, Rowan Williams, Grove Liturgical Study No 40, Grove Books, 1984.

[77] *Response*, *op. cit* p.32.

[78] *The Didache or Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*, XIV:1-3 “And on the Lord’s Day, gather to break bread and to give thanks, after having confessed your offenses so that your sacrifice [*thusia*] may not be defiled. For this is what the Lord said, ‘In every place and time let there be offered to me a pure sacrifice for I am a great king, says the Lord, and my name is revered among the nations.’ Lawrence J Johnson, *Worship in the Early Church – An Anthology of Historical Sources, Vol One*, Liturgical Press, Collegeville, Minnesota, p.40. This composite book is hard to date, scholarly opinion placing it anywhere between 60 A.D. to the third century. Some parts of it may be much older than others.

[79] *1 Clement* is a sustained plea for the restoration of deposed ministers in the Church at Corinth. Chapter 44:4 refers to their role or function: “For our sin is not small, if we eject from the episcopate those who have blamelessly and holily offered its sacrifices”. See the Loeb Classical Library, *Apostolic Fathers I*, translated by Kirsopp Lake, Heinmann and Harvard University Press, 1912, which gives the original Greek and the English on opposite pages. The Greek is *prosenengkontas ta dora*, lit. “bringing near the gifts”. The verb *prosphero* has strong sacrificial connotations (see entries, *prosphero* and *prosphora* on pp726-7 in Bauer, Arndt and Gingrich, *A Greek English Lexicon of the New Testament and other Early Christian Literature*, the University of Chicago Press, 1957). The “gifts” appear to be the bread and wine of the eucharist. The strongly sacrificial context in *1 Clement* is brought out in Robert J. Daly, S.J., *The Origins of the Christian Doctrine of Sacrifice*, Darton, Longman & Todd, 1978, pp85-86.

[80] The concept of the eucharist as sacrifice is prominent in the writings of Justin Martyr (c.100-c165) although he is scathing about both the pagan and the Jewish sacrifices with which he compares the church's offering. In his *Dialogue with Trypho* 117 1-3, he says,

And so, anticipating all the sacrifices which we offer through this name, and which Jesus the Christ commanded us to offer, i.e. in the Eucharist of the bread and the cup, and which are presented by Christians in every place throughout the world (cf Mal 1:10-11), God himself bears witness that they are pleasing to him...Now that prayers and giving thanks, when offered by worthy men, are the only perfect and pleasing sacrifices to God I also admit. For such sacrifices are what Christians alone have undertaken to offer; and they do this in the remembrance effected by their solid and liquid food whereby the suffering endured by the Son of God is brought to mind.

He also draws in the same work upon the analogy of the cleansed leper's offering in the Old Testament (XLI) to describe the eucharistic sacrifice,

The offering of the fine flour, my friends, which tradition prescribed to be offered on behalf of lepers who were cleansed of their leprosy was a type of the bread of thanksgiving [ie eucharistic bread] which Jesus Christ our Lord commanded us to observe in memory of the suffering he endured for those who are purified from all evils. At the same time, we are to thank God for having created for us the world and all that is within it, for having freed us from the sin in which we were [born]; for having totally destroyed the principalities and the powers, doing so through him who suffered in accord with his will. And so, as I said earlier, God speaks through the mouth of Malachi, who was one of the twelve [prophets] and who said the following concerning the sacrifices from your hands, for from the rising of the sun to its setting my name is glorified among the Gentiles but you profane it"[....]

He goes on to speak about us, the Gentiles, who in every place offer him sacrifices, namely, the eucharistic bread and the eucharistic cup, saying that "we glorify his name but you profane it."

For a comment on this by E.C. Ratcliffe see, B.D. Spinks, "The Cleansed Leper's thankoffering before the Lord: Edward Craddock Ratcliff and the Pattern of the Early Anaphora", pp173-174 in *The Sacrifice of Praise – Studies on the themes of thanksgiving and redemption in the central prayers of the eucharistic and baptismal liturgies, in honour of Arthur Hubert Couratin*, ed. B.D. Spinks, Edizioni Liturgiche – 00192 ROMA, 1981.

See Daly, op cit, p89, and also Hanson, op. cit. pp7,8.

In his First Apology (*apologia*), summing up what he has already said, Justin describes the central part of the eucharistic rite. As in 1 Clement the sacrificial term from the verb *prosphero* is used:

When we have finished our prayer, as I have said, bread is offered (*prospheretai*) and wine and water, and the president sends up, as well as he can, prayers likewise and thanksgivings.

[81] Irenaeus of Lyon (c130-c 202/3) in his *Adversus Haereses* (IV.xvii.4 – xviii. v1, .v4;xviii v.4 and elsewhere), Johnson op. cit Vol 1, pp77-78, 81 is particularly important in that he makes an explicit connection between the bread and wine (the "first-fruits" of

creation) and the Lord's body and blood and links these specifically with the Lord's body and blood in the act of eucharistic sacrifice,

He (Jesus) directed his disciples to offer God the first fruits of his creation, not as if God needed them but so they themselves would not be unfruitful or ungrateful. He took the bread, which is created, and gave thanks saying, "This is my Body." Likewise for the cup, which is part of the creation to which we belong, and he revealed it to be his Blood, and he taught *that it was the new offering of the new covenant* [writer's italics]. It is this very same offering which the Church has received from the apostles and which throughout the world it offers to God who feeds us with the first fruits of his gifts in the new covenant.

Among the twelve prophets it was Malachi who spoke of this beforehand. "I do not find pleasure in you, says the omnipotent Lord, and I will accept no sacrifice from your hands; for from the rising to the setting of the sun my name is glorified among the nations, and in every place incense as well as a pure sacrifice are offered in my name; for my name is great among the nations, says the omnipotent Lord." In this way he very clearly indicates that the former people will cease offering to God, although in every place a sacrifice – one that is pure -will be offered to him, and that his name will be glorified among the nations.[...]

And so the Church's offering, which the Lord taught is to be offered throughout the entire world, is a pure sacrifice in God's sight and pleases him....

There is, then, a heavenly altar toward which our prayers and offerings are directed. There is also a temple, as John in the Book of Revelation says, "And God's temple was opened" As to the tabernacle he says, Behold God's tabernacle in which he will dwell among mortals".

[82] The anamnesis in the difficult to date or place *Apostolic Tradition* ascribed to the early third century Hippolytus reads,

Remembering therefore his death and resurrection, we offer to you the bread and the cup, giving you thanks because you have held us worthy to stand before you and minister to you. And we ask that you would send your Holy Spirit upon the offering of your holy Church; that, gathering them into one, you would grant to all who partake of the holy things for the fullness of the holy Spirit for the strengthening of faith in truth; and that we may praise and glorify you through your child Jesus Christ, through whom be glory and honour to you, with the holy Spirit, in your holy Church, both now and to the ages of ages. Amen.

See *Hippolytus: A Text for Students*, with Introduction, Translation, Commentary and Notes by Geoffrey J. Cuming, Grove Liturgical Study no 8, Grove Books, 1976 p11.

[83] The Liturgy of Addai and Mari – (critically edited) may be found in Bryan D. Spinks, *Addai and Mari – The Anaphora of the Apostles: A Text for Students*, with Introduction, Translation and Commentary, Grove Liturgical Study No 24, Grove Books, 1980, together with the (closely related) Babylonian *Sharar*. With regard to the eucharistic offering, the following prayer is found in *Addai and Mari* (op cit, p.18), as recited by the priest,

You, O Lord, in your unspeakable mercies make a gracious remembrance for all the upright and just fathers who have been pleasing before you in the commemoration of the body and blood of your Christ which we offer to you upon the pure and holy altar as you have taught us...

- [84] What is implicit in earlier writers (for example Irenaeus, above) is made explicit in Cyprian (d 258), for example,

If Jesus Christ, our Lord and God, is himself the high priest of God the Father, and was the first to offer himself as a sacrifice to the Father, and commanded that this be done in his own memory, certainly the office of Christ is carried out by the priest who imitates what Christ did and who in the Church offers a true and full sacrifice to God the Father when he offers it according to what he understands Christ to have offered. [Lr 63, to Cecil, XIV]

And because we mention his passion in all our sacrifices – the sacrifice we offer being the Lord’s passion – we are to do only what he did since, according to Scripture, as often as we offer the cup in memory of the Lord and his passion, we do what corresponds with what the Lord has done. [Lr 63 to Cecil XVII].

For both these passages, see Johnson, op cit, Vol 1, pp170, 171. It would seem fairly clear that Cyprian was speaking sacramentally and not, as some have supposed, trespassing on what was accomplished once for all on Calvary’s cross. In both passages he emphasizes that what is done is done in “memory” of Christ and his sacrifice, which makes a distinction between the original event and the memorial of it: historically, on the cross, and eucharistically, in the offering of the bread and cup which are Christ’s sacramental body and blood.

- [85] There are numerous citations in Jno: Barnes, ed, in *We offer and present Testimonies to Anglican Teaching on the Eucharistic Oblation by XII Classical Theologians of the Church of England*, the second edition, London: The Society of St Peter & St Paul, Publishers to the Church of England, MCMLXXV (1975). For example, Richard Field, (1561-1616), Dean of Gloster (sic),

A man may be said to offer a thing unto God, in that he bringeth it to his presence, setteth it before his eyes, and offereth it to his view, to incline him to do something by the sight of it, and respect had to it. In this sort Christ offereth himself and his body once crucified, daily in heaven, and so intercedeth for us...And in this sort we also offer him daily on the altar, in that, commemorating his death and lively representing his bitter passions endured in his body upon the cross, we offer him that was once crucified and sacrificed for us on the cross, and all his sufferings, to the view and gracious consideration of the Almighty, earnestly desiring, and assuredly hoping, tht he will incline to pity us and she mercy upon us, for his dearest Son’s sake.

From *Of the Church*, 1606.

Another example given is from Henry Hammond (1605-1660), Canon of Christ Church, Oxford, in his *A Practical Ctechism*, 1644,

[The end for which the eucharist was instituted]...a commemoration of the death of Christ, a representing His passion to God, and a coming before Him in His name, first to offer our sacrifices of supplications and praises, in the name of the crucified Jesus, and secondly, to commemorate that His daily continual sacrifice or intercession for us at the right hand of His Father now in heaven.

Daniel Brevint, (1616-1695) Dean of Lincoln said in his *The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice*,

This Sacrifice, which by a real oblation was not to be offered more than once, is by an Eucharistical and devout Commemoration to be offered up every day. This is what the Apostle calls, “to set forth the death of the Lord”; to set it forth I say as well before the Eyes of God his Father as before the Eyes of all men:...the sacrifice, as ‘tis itself and in itself, can never be reiterated; yet by way of devout Celebration and Remembrance it may nevertheless be reiterated every day.

Charles Wheatly (1686-1742, Fellow of St John’s College Oxford, in his famous commentary, *A Rational Illustration Upon the Book of Common Prayer, 1710*, said,

Since the Death of Christ hath reconciled God to Mankind, and his Intercession alone obtains all good things for us, we are enjoined to make all our Prayers in his Name; and as a more powerful way of interceding, to represent to his Father that his Death and Sacrifice by celebrating the Holy Eucharist.

[86] Response pp33-36

[87] *The Final Report*, Elucidation, pp23-24.

[88] Op cit. p.23.

[89] Ibid. The relevant passages are in Justin (c.150) in his First Apology, or defence of the Christian religion, and are to be found in §lxv and §lxvii. The latter reads,

And on the day which is called the day of the sun there is an assembly of all who live in the towns or in the country; and the memoirs of the Apostles or the writings of the prophets are read, as long as time permits. Then the reader ceases and the president speaks, admonishing us and exhorting us to imitate these excellent examples. Then we arise all together and offer prayers; and, as we said before, when we have concluded our prayer, bread is brought, and wine and water, and the president in like manner offers up prayers and thanksgivings with all his might; and the people assent with *Amen*; and there is a distribution and partaking by all of the Eucharistic elements; and to them that are not present they are sent by the hand of the deacons...

The following explanation of the practice in the early church, under the heading of “Primitive Reservation” is given by Charles Harris within a chapter on “The Communion of the Sick, Viaticum, and Reservation in *Liturgy and Worship – A Companion to the Prayer Books of the Anglican Communion* edited by W.K. Lowther Clarke, with the assistance of Charles Harris – a publication of the Literature Association of the Church Union, SPCK 1932 (with many reprints):

In early times the unity of the Church was a matter of deep concern. It was at once expressed and safeguarded by insistence upon the principle of “the one eucharist” Both at Jerusalem (Acts 2:46) and in the Pauline churches (Acts 20:7) the “Breaking of Bread” was the centre of worship and fellowship. St Paul lays special stress upon this point, “For we who are many are one bread, one body; for we all partake of the one bread” (1 Cor 10:16). In the next generation St Ignatius (A.D. 110) writes: “Take heed to have but one eucharist. For there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, one cup unto the unity of his Blood; one altar; as there is one Bishop, along with the Presbytery and Deacons, my fellow- servants; that so, whatever you do, you may do with according to God...Let that be deemed valid eucharist which is celebrated either by the Bishop or to one to whom he has entrusted it! (*Philadelphians*, 4; *Smyrnaeans*, 8).

The idea of a private celebration – at least as a normal practice – is plainly out of keeping such a corporate conception of eucharistic rite as this. Consequently we are not surprised to find in the earliest description of the eucharistic service (that of St. Justin Martyr c. A.D. 155) that the absent, whether sick or whole, communicated from the one altar or table of the Lord. When the President [or Bishop] has given thanks, and all the people have expressed their assent [by saying *Amen*], then those whom we call deacons give to each of those present to partake of the bread and wine with water over which the thanksgiving has been pronounced; and they carry away [a portion] to those who are absent.” And again: The distribution and partaking of those things over which the thanksgiving has been pronounced is made to each one, and [they] are sent to be absent by the hands of the deacons” (*Aol. I. 65,67*).

Whether any other methods of Reservation were in use in Justin’s age is not known. It is certain, however, that by the end of the second century, the laity, both in Africa and in Rome – probably also in other places – were permitted to carry the sacraments away with in suitable receptacles, to communicate themselves at home on days when they were unable to come to church, or when the Eucharistic liturgy was not celebrated. Daily Communion was thus rendered possible; and there is reason to believe that it was extensively practiced.

The sick, however, were not normally communicated in their homes by their lay friends. They were visited daily or at least very frequently by the clergy, from which they probably received the Reserved sacrament and by whom and also frequently anointed.

[90] *The Final Report* , op. cit p.23.

[91] The commentary on Article 28 in E.J. Bicknell *A Theological Introduction to the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England*, third edition revised by H.J. Carpenter, Longmans, Green and Co., 1955, a standard work for theological students at least up to the 1960s in the Church of Ireland, states (pp.403-4) that,

Even the learned Roman Catholic, Father Thurston admits that ‘In all the Christian literature of the first thousand years, no one has apparently yet found a single clear and definite statement that any person visited a church in order to pray before the Body of Christ which was kept upon the altar [Note in Bridgett, *A History of the Holy Eucharist in Great Britain*, p.170]

Bicknell adds,

So, too, the Orthodox Churches of the East reserve the Sacrament, usually on the Altar, with a lamp burning upon it. Not only does the intervention of the Screen and the Holy Doors shut it out from any possibility of adoration by the people, but even those who enter the Sanctuary make no sign of reverence as they pass before it. Only in the West has the cult of the reserved Sacrament been developed. The beginnings of this are to be found in the Middle Ages, but the full growth was accelerated by reaction against the minimizing views of Protestant reformers in lands which did not accept the Reformation.

[92] Bicknell says, p.401,

Reservation purely for the communion of the sick or absent is thoroughly primitive and natural. It is in full accord with the spirit of Scripture and the revealed purpose of Christ and was the custom of the primitive Church. Justin Martyr tells us that a portion “is sent to them that are absent, by the deacons”. In an age of persecution, and when perhaps the majority of Christians were slaves, members were often unavoidably prevented from being present. So, too, the Communion was sent to Christians in prison. Again we read of Christians taking away the consecrated elements in order to communicate themselves at home during the week or carrying them with them on a journey. Tertullian speaks of a Christian woman at home ‘secretly, before all food’ tasting the Lord’s Body. So, too, as late as the time of St Basil the monks in the desert, where there was no priest, communicated themselves with the reserved sacrament. In times of persecution such a practice of private communion was necessary. But it was liable to abuse, and from the fourth century onward the Church took steps to suppress it. We hear also of the Eucharist being sent as a sign of fellowship to distant churches. This custom was familiar to Irenaeus. In the East it was forbidden by the Council of Laodicea in 365, but lasted on longer in the West. Such practices did not commend themselves to the mature judgement of the Church. The practice of reservation continued, but under due restrictions in church. The canon law required that it should be kept under lock and key. According to the first Prayer-Book of Edward VI the sick might be communicated with the reserved sacrament on the same day as a celebration in church. In the second Prayer-Book this permission was withdrawn: there was a very real danger of conveying the sacrament away and using it for superstitious purposes. In 1662 a rubric was added enjoining the consumption in church of all the consecrated elements at the close of the service. The primary purpose of this was to forbid not reservation but the irreverent carrying of the elements out of church for ordinary consumption which the Puritans were quite capable of doing. But indirectly the rubric forbade all reservation, and even the primitive custom of taking away their portion to the sick.

The 1662 rubric remained in the Church of Ireland in the Prayer Books of 1878 and 1926, and read as follows –

And if any remain of the Bread and Wine which was consecrated, it shall not be carried out of the Church, but the Priest, and such others of the Communicants as he shall there all unto him, shall, immediately after the Blessing reverently eat and drink the same.

A possible change occurred with the authorization of the *Alternative Prayer Book* in 1984, when, in the section, *Concerning the Services of the Church*, under paragraph 9 section e the rubric read,

Any of the consecrated bread and wine remaining after communion is to be reverently consumed.

This, it may be seen, did not inhibit the carrying of the bread and wine out of the church for the purpose of the communion of the sick.

The rubric from *The Alternative Prayer Book 1984* is repeated in the 2004 *Book of Common Prayer* in the *General Directions for Public Worship* in paragraph 14 “At the Holy Communion”, section e.

A form for “Holy Communion by Extension (for those unable to be present at the public celebration)” was issued by the House of Bishops and authorized in the Church of Ireland as from 28 February 2007 for a period of seven years (later extended). It was stated that “While this rite is primarily intended for use with those who are sick, it may on occasion be used with individuals who for a reasonable cause cannot be present at a public celebration of the Holy Communion”, and clear guidelines for use were provided. The basis of any such authorization by the House of Bishops lies in the Church Constitution Chapter 1, Section 26 chapter 26 (3), which states,

Any form of service and any lectionary and any catechism which the Liturgical Advisory Committee of the General Synod has recommended for experimental use with a view to its permanent use being authorised by resolution and bill under the provisions of this section may be used without the enactment of a statute from such date for such period, not exceeding fifteen years, as may be appointed by the House of Bishops and notified by the standing committee of the general Synod, subject to the following conditions:

- (a) It shall be certified by the house of Bishops as being in its opinion either contrary to, not indicative of any departure from, the doctrine of the Church of Ireland.
- (b) Any such experimental use shall be under the supervision and control of the Bishop of the diocese or other ordinary.
- (c) In the case of a cathedral which is not parish church, such experimental use shall require the approval of the Dean, the chapter, and the Cathedral importance if any.
- (d) In the case of any other church or place, such experimental use shall require the approval of the incumbent and the churchwardens.

The prescribed period having elapsed in 2014, it would seem to be still possible for bishops, on an individual basis, to permit such a form under the provisions of Chapter Nine of the Constitution, Canon 5:

However, as mentioned above a permanent form was, at the time of writing, to be submitted to the General Synod in the form of resolution and bill. See Appendix XXX

8. The prescribed form of divine service to be used in churches.

(1) The services contained in the Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the sacraments, or such services as may be otherwise prescribed or authorised, and no other, shall be used in churches: provided that there may be used in any cathedral or church.

(a) at any hour or on any Sunday or weekday an additional form of service, provided that such form of service and the mode in which it is used is for the time being approved by the ordinary, and

(b) upon any special occasion approved by the ordinary a special form of service approved by the ordinary: provided that, save with the leave of the ordinary, neither such additional form of service shall be in substitution for any of the services so prescribed.

(2) Members of the clergy may at their discretion make and use variations which are not of substantial importance in any form of service prescribed in the book of Common prayer or elsewhere.

(3) All variations in forms of service and all forms of service used or made under the provisions of this canon shall be reverend and seemly and shall be neither contrary nor indicative of any departure on the doctrine of the Church.

(4) If any question is raised concerning any such variation, or as to whether it is of substantial importance, the same should be referred to the bishop who may give such pastoral guidance, advice or directions as he shall see fit but without prejudice to the right of any person to initiate proceedings in any ecclesiastical tribunal.

[93] *The Final Report*, p23, from the “Elucidation” of the Agreed Statement on Eucharistic Doctrine.

[94] Citation from O.C. Quick, *The Christian Sacraments* p.209.

[95] *The Final Report*, *ibid*.

[96] It could be argued that O.C. Quick’s view is nearer to Lutheran than classic Anglican teaching at this point. It is difficult to reconcile with the rubric enjoining consumption of any consecrated bread and wine after the blessing if the elements are no longer to be regarded as the sacramental Body and Blood of Christ. And it is also difficult to reconcile his view with reservation for the sick since this, by definition, takes place outside the context of the eucharistic celebration, and it would appear to rule out the kind of extended communion practiced in the early church or indeed as was practiced in the Church of Ireland on the basis of the 2007 permission by the House of Bishops who, by their very authorization declared that it is in accordance with the doctrine of the Church. As mentioned above a permanent form was, at the time of writing, to be submitted to the General Synod in the form of resolution and bill. See Appendix XXX

- [97] *Response* pp35-36.
- [98] *Response* p35. In fact there is no reference to the presence as “local” in the relevant canons.
- [99] *Elucidation*, Eucharistic Doctrine, Par 8 p.24.
- [100] *Op. cit.* p.22
- [101] *Op. cit.* p.24
- [102] *Response* p.36. To say, as Article 28 “The Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper was not by Christ’s ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up or worshipped.” is not to say that such developments were *ipso facto* unlawful, although this would indicate that they were and are not mandatory.
- [103] See above [89] Tertullian, arguing against the practice of not attending the eucharist on Stational Days refers to reservation probably in order to communicate later at home:
- Likewise in regard to the stational days, many do not believe that they should attend the sacrificial prayers because receiving the Lord’s body would break their fast. Does the Eucharist therefore free us from a service devoted to God or does it bind us more closely to God? will your station not be even more solemn if you also stand at the altar of God? Each remains intact if you receive the Lord’s Body and reserve it.
- [104] The main authorities for reserving the sacrament on Sundays and bringing it home for personal devotional use are Tertullian, Hippolytus, Novatian and Cyprian. Article “Reservation” in *The New SCM Dictionary of Liturgy and Worship*, Ed Paul F. Bradshaw, SCM, 2002. That reverence is involved is strongly suggested in Tertullian’s *Ad uxorem* 2:5, in Maxwell E. Johnson, Ed, *Sacraments and Worship – Key readings in the history and theology of Christian worship from the New Testament to the present*. SPCK, 2012, p.190.
- Shall you escape notice when you sign your bed, (or) your body; when you blow away some impurity? Will you not be thought to be engaged in some work of magic? *Will not your husband know what it is which you secretly taste before (taking) any food?* And if he knows it to be bread, does he not believe it to be *that* (bread) which it is *said* to be.
- [105] The recognition of the bread and wine as the sacramental body and blood of Christ after consecration is implied in the 2004 Prayer Book in “General Directions for Public Worship” 14e p.77 “Any of the consecrated bread and wine remaining after the administration of the communion is to be reverently consumed.”
- [106] Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, Part III (ca 1271), trans. Fathers of the English Dominican Province (New York, Benziger Bros, 1947) 11:2224-51, Art 4,
- Whether Bread Can be converted into the Body of Christ?...
- I answer that*, As stated above (A2), since Christ’s true body is in this sacrament, and since it does not begin to be there by local motion, *nor is it contained therein as in a place*, as is evident from what was stated above (A.1 ad 2), it must be said then that it begins to be there by conversion of

the substance of bread into itself.

Yet the change is not like natural changes, but is entirely supernatural, and effected by God's power alone....

And this is done by Divine power in this sacrament; for the whole substance of the bread is changed into the whole substance of Christ's body, and the whole substance of the wine into the whole substance of Christ's blood. Hence this is not a formal, but a substantial conversion; nor is it a kind of natural movement: but, with a name of its own, it can be called *transubstantiation*.

[107] Article 25 of the Thirty-nine articles of Religion (*De Sacramentis* – “Of the Sacraments” uses the expression *efficacia signa gratiae* – “effectual signs of grace”, the Latin being of equal authority as the English,

“Sacraments ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they be certain sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace, and God's good will towards us, by the which he doth work invisibly in us and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our Faith in him.” For the full texts, Latin and English, see E. J. Bicknell, *The Thirty-nine Articles*, Third Edition, revised by H.J. Carpenter, Longmans, Third Edition, 1955, p.351.

[108] Hymn 449 *Adoro te devote, latens Deitas*, Church Hymnal, 5th Ed., OUP 2000, v1

Thee, we adore, O hidden Saviour, thee,
who in thy sacrament dost deign to be.
both flesh and spirit at thy presence fail,
yet here thy presence we devoutly hail.

[109] Developments in the faith and practice of the church, including its eucharistic faith and practice are, properly to be judged on their merits, with careful, and where necessary, critical attention to the biblical and historical data.

[110] *Response* p.34.

[111] See above [102]

CHAPTER THREE, ASSESSMENTS PART THREE: THE ARCIC REPORT AND EVANGELICALS

[1] CEEC – THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND EVANGELICAL COUNCIL

The Revd John Scott (1921-2011), who may be described as the doyen of English Evangelicalism and a leading figure in the world-wide Evangelical movement, was responsible for producing a document entitled *Evangelical Anglicans and the ARCIC Final Report – an Assessment and Critique*, on behalf of the Church of England Evangelical Council and issued jointly by the Revd Timothy Dudley-Smith and himself as the co-chairmen of this body.¹ There is no doubt of its representative character, but it is to be regretted that a contribution on such an important subject should have been confined to a sixteen page booklet, of which only pages 6-8 relate specifically to the eucharist. However, although there are limitations of space in this study it is possible to amplify this to some extent by reference to some of Stott's other writings and to those of leading Evangelicals in the twentieth and early twenty-first centuries.²

The tone of this contribution is eirenic and constructive and states that Evangelical Anglicans had followed the work of ARCIC from its first meeting to Jan 1970 with the greatest interest, and had studied each *Agreed Statement* and each *Elucidation* as it had been published.³

Mention was made that in June 1977, after the first Three Statements had appeared, about 100 Evangelical Anglicans had signed an Open Letter, which was addressed to the Anglican Episcopate, on relations between the Anglican Churches and the Roman Catholic, Eastern Orthodox, Old Catholic and Ancient Oriental Churches. In this they had welcomed the fact that “conversations between our Churches on a basis of genuine openness to the Bible” seemed increasingly possible, and expressed their wish to take a full part in such conversations. They also noted with joy that others shared their concern for real and tested theological agreement as a precondition of closer churchly relationships, and their own unwillingness to be hurried into superficiality as they sought this agreement. They indicated four fields in which they thought there was a need for more discussion and deeper agreement, namely, *Scripture and Tradition*, *Justification*, *Church and Ministry*, and *Holy Communion*.⁴

In relation to *Holy Communion* they stated,⁵

Dissatisfied with the declaration of an objective change in the elements, which is made in the Agreed Statement on the Eucharist, we drew attention to Richard Hooker's well known dictum that “the real presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not...to be sought for in the sacrament, but in the worthy recipient of the sacrament.”

This “receptionist” view would seem to be something of an over-simplification of Hooker's teaching, although it indicates the thrust of his eucharistic theology. However, he also said *Eccl. Pol. v.lxvii 12, 11*),

What these elements are in themselves, it skilleth not, it is enough that to me which take them they are the body and blood of Christ.

Christ assisting this heavenly banquet with his personal and true presence doth by his own divine power add to the natural substance thereof supernatural efficacy, which addition to the nature of these consecrated elements changeth them and maketh them to us which otherwise they could not be.

The presupposition of this present study is that what things “are” is determined by their physical constituents, but also by the meaning attached to them, their role or function and the purpose they serve, the latter three constituents being capable of being subsumed under the heading of “significance” as in “This is my body”, and “This cup is the new covenant in my blood.” Insofar as there are ontological implications in a statement of significance in this sense the elements *are* different in the context of their consecration and administration and use. The change is non-physical but, in the sense above, “real”. It may be noted that the significance is that which the church attaches to the bread and wine and derives from the Lord’s own designation of what they mean. And this, in turn provides an objective basis for assessing what they *are*.⁶

The section on the Eucharist is entitled “Salvation and Eucharist” and begins with the statement that “the absence of an Agreed Statement on Salvation in general and Justification in particular is extremely regrettable.” However, a footnote (6) added in the second edition of the booklet affirms “we are thankful that in 1984-5 Justification is one of the main items of the agenda of ARCIC II”.⁷ The outcome of that agenda was the Agreed Statement published as *Salvation and the Church*.⁸ However, reference to the Holy Communion in that document is confined to a single sentence, which reads,

Those who are justified by grace, and who are sustained in the life of Christ through Word and Sacrament are liberated from self-centredness and thus empower to act freely and live at peace with God and with one another.⁹

This being the case, the section on “Salvation and Eucharist”, although on the main issue of the doctrine of justification was to be overtaken by events, still has some relevance to the present situation. The point is made that the sacraments cannot be treated outside the doctrine of salvation and that the ARCIC statement on Eucharistic Doctrine in the Final Report (1970) “suffers from its unnatural isolation from its proper context.”¹⁰

The CEEC document welcomes the strong assertion that “Christ’s redeeming death and resurrection took place once for all in history”, that his death “was the one, perfect and sufficient sacrifice for the sins of the world”, and that “there can be no repetition of or addition to what was then accomplished one for all by Christ.” (*Eucharistic Doctrine*, para.5). However, it is asked,

If Christ’s self-offering was unique and unrepeatable, how can the Church “enter into the movement of his self-offering?” (Para.5).¹¹

The CEEC document says, “We cannot accept this. True, this clause occurs in the context of a discussion about the word “memorial” (*anamnesis*). We endorse the usefulness of the parallel between the passover and the eucharist, in that by the sacramental action a past event is recalled, proclaimed, and made effective in the present. But this falls short of any idea of the Church sharing in the offering itself.”; and an explanatory statement in the *Elucidation* by ARCIC is rejected,

The *Elucidation* tries to help by distinguishing between the historical and the sacramental. It argues that whereas the historical sacrifice of Christ is unrepeatable, yet, “the Eucharist is a sacrifice in the sacramental sense.” But the

sacramental action must be a faithful memorial of the historical action. We have no liberty to import into the former a concept not present in the latter. How can the Church “enter into the movement of Christ’s self-offering” sacramentally if it did not do so historically?¹¹

The apparent ambiguity of the phrase “entering into the movement of Christ’s self-offering” has been much discussed. However, it is hard to account for the once-for-all sacrifice of the cross, unless this in some sense reflects and instantiates, in a unique manner, the relationship of Father, Son and Holy Spirit which is eternal and must be dynamic if it exists at all. There could be neither creation nor redemption without it. But those who are united with Christ, by grace, through faith, must in some sense be drawn within the scope of the eternal self-giving of love which is of the essence of the deity. It is in this context that the eucharistic offering may be viewed in such a manner.

Although the CEEC document rejects the concept (perhaps without understanding it) nonetheless it affirms a fourfold aspect of the relation of the Church to the sacrifice of Christ,

We remember his sacrifice with humble thanksgiving. We partake of its benefits by faith. We proclaim it. And we offer ourselves to him in response to his self-offering for us.¹²

The CEEC document rejects the use of the words “the propitiatory value” of the Eucharist by the Sacred Congregation. However, while this may represent an incautious use of language the concept of propitiation may be taken to be that of the restoration of a relationship. It in no way necessarily infringes upon the once-for-all of what the Son of God accomplished for all humankind on the Cross to say that even those who through faith are the beneficiaries of this event may need on a constant basis to plead this as the basis of their relationship with the Father, through the Son in the power of the Holy Spirit. It was, after all, to those who were already Christians that the apostle said, “Be reconciled to God. For our sake he made him to be sin who knew no sin, so that in him we might become the righteousness of God”. It is the propitiatory sacrifice (as Jeremy Taylor recognized)¹³ that we remember before God in thanksgiving and supplication, and in that (limited) sense “offer” it.

Unease is expressed about the ARCIC treatment of the concept of “transubstantiation” and in particular of the comment on this in the document “Observations” by the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith,¹⁴

We note that the word “transubstantiation” has been relegated to a footnote in the Statement. yet we fear that this dogma continues to be affirmed in alternative terms, for the bread and wine are said to “become” Christ’s body and blood, and this is explained as “a change” [even “a radical change”] in the inner reality of the elements (para 6, note). True, the *Elucidation* helps by assuring us that the verb “become” implies neither a material change nor a limitation of Christ’s presence to the consecrated elements.

In this present work, as indicated above, it is presupposed that the bread and wine of the eucharist remain in the fullest sense what they are, as designated, as seems to be the

Scriptural view as found in 1 Cor 10:16,17 and 1 Cor 11:23-26, in which the use of the word “bread” is unconditional and the same would seem to be implied in relation to the contents of the cup. While there is the evident association of the bread and wine with the “body” and “blood” of Christ both in St Paul’s writing and in the Gospels this needs to be seen in the context of a tradition of attaching particular meanings to the various elements of the Passover, for example, in relation to the unleavened bread, “This is the bread of affliction which our fathers did eat in Egypt”.¹⁵ As indicated above there may be ontological implications in a statement of significance. In this context the word “be” as in “be to us” or “become” have their legitimate role or purpose. The (real) bread and wine become by the Lord’s own designation, his (sacramental) body and blood.

The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not a participation in the blood of Christ? The bread which we break is it not a participation in the body of Christ? Because there is one bread, we who are many are one body, for we all partake of the one bread.

For I received from the Lord what I also delivered to you, that the Lord Jesus on the night when he was betrayed took bread, and when he had given thanks, he broke it, and said, “This is my body which is for you”. In the same way also the cup, after supper, saying, “This cup is the new covenant in my blood. Do this, as often as you drink it in remembrance of me.

For as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup, you proclaim the Lord’s death until he comes.

The CEEC document goes on,¹⁶

Yet even if his presence is not ‘limited’ to the bread and wine, it certainly appears to be localized there. For the *Elucidation* goes on to say that after the eucharistic prayer, to the question of “what is that?” the believer answers “it is truly the body of Christ, the bread of life.” (para 6). *Observations* enforces this, quotes the Council of Trent with approval (‘the wonderful and unique change of the whole substance of the bread into his body and of the whole substance of the wine into his blood, while only the species of bread and wine remain’), emphasizes that the ARCIC statement does not express this ontological transformation of the elements with sufficient clarity, and adds that ‘the adoration rendered to the Blessed Sacrament’ was dogmatically defined by Trent in such a way as to seem incompatible with the statement of the Book of Common Prayer that the sacramental bread and wine “remain still in their natural substances and therefore may not be adored.” (*Observations* B.1.2,3)

Given that Thomas Aquinas, the originator of the doctrine of transubstantiation said that the presence of Christ was not “sicut in loco” – as in a place, it does not seem on what grounds the CEEC document can find fault with the ARCIC documentation which affirms the real presence but does not seek to restrict it. However, the bread and wine as the effectual signs of the presence are necessarily local and are received locally during communion and when reserved are bound to be so in particular places. And their designation as the Body and Blood of Christ is that of the Lord himself.

The comments in *Observations* will be discussed more fully in a later section. With regard to the citation from the “Black” rubric¹⁷ one would say that any reverence paid to

the sacramental bread and wine is precisely because they *are* by Christ's own designation his body and blood and the effectual signs of his presence. And his presence, here locally represented is ever to be adored, in this case "in with and under" the forms of (real) bread and wine.

The CEEC document quotes the Reformer Hugh Latimer with approval. His explanation of the change which takes place at consecration was this:¹⁸

That which before was bread now has the dignity to exhibit Christ's body. And yet the bread is still bread and the wine is still wine. For the change is not in the nature but in the dignity.

This, says the CEEC document¹⁹ corresponds closely to what is called "trans-signification" by some contemporary Roman Catholic theologians, in contrast to "transubstantiation" because the change which takes place is not in the substance of the bread and wine but in their significance: they now have the dignity to represent Christ's body and blood", and this is deemed to preserve the meaning of a sacrament as defined in the Church Catechism which preserves the distinction between symbol and reality whereas transubstantiation "overthrows the nature of the sacrament"(Article 28) by confusing the outward sign with the inward thing signified. Or, it says, as Cranmer expressed it in his *An Answer*

Figuratively he is in the bread and wine, and spiritually he is in them that worthily eat the bread and wine...

However, at no point does the CEEC document unequivocally affirm that there is any sense (in spite of the dominical words) that the bread and wine as consecrated *are* the body and blood of Christ after the manner of a sacrament. This seems to fall short of what Scripture itself affirms and also appears to confuse a "sign" (which may be no more than a conventional signal, unless qualified in some way as by the word "effectual"²⁰) and a symbol (which in some sense participates in the nature of that which it represents²¹).

NOTES ON CHAPTER THREE, PART THREE [1]

¹Timothy Dudley-Smith and John Stott, *Evangelical Anglicans and the ARCIC Final Report – An Assessment and Critique*, Grove Books, 1982 (2nd ed 1985), drafted by John Stott.

²Brian Douglas, *Anglican Eucharistic Theology, Case Studies* (online site with the title *Anglican Eucharistic Theology*). This contains comprehensive citations from a very large and representative selection of writers from the sixteenth to the twentieth centuries, together with a very brief biography of each person and an assessment, specifically, of the doctrines of the Eucharistic presence and sacrifice using the criteria of realism and nominalism. This in turn was a preliminary to a doctoral study entitled, *Ways of Knowing in the Anglican Eucharistic Tradition – Ramifications for Theological Education, Thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy*, University of Newcastle, Australia, 2006 [Online]. His methodology is phenomenological. A full list of those whose writings are cited may be found in the bibliography of this present work under the “Anglican Eucharistic Theology” title above and also online. They include *inter alia*, W.G. Griffith Thomas, Handley Moule, Christopher Cocksworth, James Packer, and John Stott himself.

³*Evangelical Anglicans and the ARCIC Final Report*, op. cit. p.3

⁴Ibid.

⁵Op. cit. p.4.

⁶See above, **Chapter One** and the **Notes to Chapter One**.

⁷*Evangelical Anglicans and the ARCIC Final Report*, op. cit. p.6, third footnote.

⁸ *Salvation and the Church – An Agreed Statement by the Second Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission, ARCIC II*, Published 1987 for the Anglican Consultative Council through the Inter-Anglican Publishing Network and for the Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity by the Catholic Truth Society.

⁹*Salvation and the Church*, op. cit. p.25.

¹⁰*Evangelical Anglicans and the ARCIC Final Report*, op. cit. p.6

¹¹Op. cit. p.7

¹²Ibid.

¹³ Taylor said,

He (Christ) is offered up to God; that is, He is by prayers and the Sacrament represented or offered up to God as sacrificed, which in effect is a celebration of His Death, and the applying it to the present and future necessities of the Church as we are capable³ by a ministry like to His in Heaven. It follows then, that the celebration of this Sacrifice be in its proportion an instrument of applying the proper Sacrifice to all the purposes which it first designed. It is ministerially and by application an instrument propitiatory; it is eucharistical; it is an homage and an act of adoration; and it is impetratory and obtains for us and for the whole Church all the benefits of the Sacrifice, which is now celebrated and applied.

From *The Great Exemplar, the History of the Life and Death of the Holy Jesus*. Part III. Section XV (Discourse xix). Works, ed. R. Heber, Vol.III pp296,297ff. See P.E. More and F.L Cross *Anglicanism – The Thought and Practice of the Church of England, Illustrated from the Religious Literature of the Seventeenth century*, London, SPCK, 1957. p.495.

¹⁴*Evangelical Anglicans and the ARCIC Final Report*, op. cit. p.7

¹⁵In the first instance the designation is Scriptural, “You shall eat no leavened bread with it; seven days you shall eat it with unleavened bread, the bread of affliction – for you came out of the land of Egypt in hurried flight – that all the days of your life you may remember the day when you came out of the land of Egypt.”

With regard to the Passover liturgy the words of the Chief Rabbi, Jonathan Sachs are relevant:

Passover, the Jewish festival of freedom we begin celebrating on Monday night, is extraordinary testimony to the power of ritual to keep ideals and identity alive across the centuries. On it we relive the story of our people, sitting together at home as an extended family as if we were back in the Egypt of the pharaohs, on the night before we are about to go free after long exile and harsh enslavement.

We begin the drama by holding up a matzah, the dry unleavened bread that is one of the key symbols of the festivals, and saying, “This is the bread of affliction our ancestors ate in the land of Egypt. Let all who are hungry come and eat.” A child, usually the youngest present, then asks a series of questions about “why this night is different from all other nights.

The rest of the evening is largely dedicated to answering those questions, retelling the story of the exodus together with acts of eating and drinking that include the bitter herbs of suffering and the wine of freedom. It is history made memory by re-enactment.” [Jonathan Sachs, online blog]

¹⁶*Evangelical Anglicans and the ARCIC Final Report*, op. cit. p.7

¹⁷BCP (2004) p.196. The “black” rubric is discussed more fully in the next sub-section, dealing with the view taken EFIC – the Evangelical Fellowship of the Irish Church – of the *Final Report*.

¹⁸Clearly for Latimer there is no sense that the bread and wine of the eucharist *are* the Lord’s sacramental body and blood. For Latimer’s view see, Brian, Douglas, *Anglican Eucharistic Theology, Case Studies* (published online with the same title), No 1:4 in which extensive quotations may be found.) His view seems to have been that the eucharist is a reminder of Christ’s work and an augmentation of faith, although he says that the eucharist is more than a bare sign.

¹⁹*Evangelical Anglicans and the ARCIC Final Report*, op. cit. p.7

²⁰The sacraments are defined as “effectual signs of grace” (efficacia signa gratiae) in Article Twenty-five, *Of the Sacraments*.

²¹The highly symbolic use of language in the Bible is relevant here. See G.B. Caird, *The Language and Imagery of the Bible*, Duckworth Studies in Theology, Duckworth, 1980; and Northrop Frye, *The Great Code: The Bible and Literature*, Ark Paperbacks, 1982; and also Paul Tillich, *Systematic Theology 3*, SCM, 1963, whose extensive and constructive reflections in symbols are indicated by the references in the Index.

ASSESSMENTS, CHAPTER THREE PART THREE, THE ARCIC REPORT AND EVANGELICALS

[2] THE EVANGELICAL FELLOWSHIP OF THE IRISH CHURCH/THE CHURCH OF IRELAND EVANGELICAL FELLOWSHIP

A document which may be regarded as an Irish counterpart to the English Response to ARCIC discussed in the previous sub-section was produced by the Church of Ireland Evangelical Fellowship in 1984.¹ It is explained by the author/editor Mr Dermot O'Callaghan that it had its origins in a study group within the Fellowship. Papers by the Revd Clive West, Rector of All Saints' parish, Belfast (Historical Background and Ministry) and the Revd John McCammon, Rector of Lisburn Cathedral (Eucharist) formed the basis of the corresponding chapters in the booklet. Mr O'Callaghan (a member of the Church of Ireland Liturgical Advisory Committee), wrote the remaining material and edited the whole.

The paper on Historical Background included a paragraph entitled "Initial Criticism" in which it was stated that the composition of ARCIC was biased – *theologically* in favour of Anglo-Catholics (with only one evangelical representative), *nationally* in favour of white Anglo Saxons and *representationally* in favour of the clergy (with no lay theologians present).² Many of the Final Report's weaknesses, it was alleged, needed to be interpreted in this light.³ It was also pointed out that its terms of reference failed to include the basic doctrine of Justification by Grace through Faith which was "fundamental in the division between the Church of Rome and all Reformed Churches.⁴ However it considered that the new Commission (ARCIC II) had "set its face" to remedy the above shortcomings and others.

Chapter Three of the document, entitled "Eucharist" begins with a paragraph entitled "The Controversy" in which the perceived differences between the churches are set forth,⁵

The argument has centred around the nature of the sacraments - is it the "Lord's Supper" (Article 28) at which we are guests, or in some sense a repetition of Christ's sacrifice which is offered to God by the church through the priest for the sins of the living and the dead? This latter teaching is described in Article 31 as "dangerous". It is incompatible with the doctrine of justification by faith and casts serious doubt on the finished work of Christ Calvary. It gives rise to superstitions about the character of the consecrated bread and wine, the role of the priest and the nature of salvation.

The doctrine of the mass is characterised by the belief that the elements in some sense become the body and blood of Christ passing through the *mouth* to every communicant. The Church of Ireland doctrine is that the body and blood of Christ are present in the hearts of only those communicants who have faith.

ARCIC deals in turn with these two issues – the relation of the Eucharist (the chosen word which avoids "the Mass" and "the Lord's Supper") to Christ's sacrifice on Calvary and the nature of the presence of Christ in the sacrament.

However, the "Lord's Supper" is not the only title for the rite in the Prayer Book, although it undoubtedly has a special position. In the Prayer Book of 1549 (introduced to the Church of Ireland in 1551) the title is "The Supper of the Lord, and The Holy Communion, commonly called The Mass". In the Second Prayer Book (1552) and

subsequent editions in the 1552-1662 tradition this was altered to “The Order for the Administration of the Lord’s Supper or Holy Communion”, and although in the Articles of Religion only “The Lord’s Supper” is used, “Communion” or “Holy Communion” is probably the predominant usage. In the 2004 Prayer Book, which is of course much more recent than the Evangelical Fellowship document, the 1552-1662 title is retained for Holy Communion One, but for Holy Communion Two the title is “The Celebration of The Holy Communion, also called The Lord’s Supper or The Eucharist”.⁶ This may seem to be only a small point, but one can make a case for saying that each of the titles (including several that are not among those listed here) indicates an aspect of eucharistic faith and practice in a non-exclusive manner, and this gives a clue to a broader approach than that which seems to be the case in the EF (Evangelical Fellowship) document. In the latter the “Lord’s Supper” concept of guests at the Lord’s Table is set against one involving “in some sense a repetition of Christ’s sacrifice” (presumably the Mass) but this may be said to be a false dichotomy since it would be hard to find any responsible theologian in the Roman Catholic church who would define the sacrifice of the Mass in terms of a repetition of Calvary. And it would be even harder to find any dogmatic pronouncement on the Eucharist in the Roman Catholic tradition which so regards it, although the language used may occasionally be susceptible to the mistaken impression that this is so.⁷ In this context there is some relevance in the statement in the Preface to the Final Report which speaks about the endeavour to discover each other’s faith as it is today and to appeal to history only for enlightenment, not as a way of perpetuating past controversy.⁸

With regard to the wording of Article 31,⁹ this is unambiguous in its insistence on the once for all aspect of the self-offering of Christ on Calvary, and this is emphasized in almost all the authorized rites of the Holy Communion currently in use in the Anglican Communion. In considering the second half of the Article what needs to be asked is whether or not there can be a way of understanding the eucharistic offering which does not infringe the affirmation of the “once for all”. Many of the greatest authorities in the history of Anglicanism have affirmed this to be so, including several closely associated with the Church of Ireland (for example Bishop Jeremy Taylor¹⁰ and Archbishop John Bramhall¹¹). The nearest thing to an official ruling on the matter in the entire history of Anglicanism is that given by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York in response to the papal document *Apostolicae Curae* (1896)¹² in its condemnation of Anglican Orders as “absolutely null and utterly void”. In the very carefully worded reply entitled *Saepius Officio* (1897)¹³ the archbishops affirmed,¹⁴

We truly teach the doctrine of Eucharistic sacrifice and do not believe it to be a “nude commemoration of the Sacrifice of the Cross” – an opinion which seems to be attributed to us by the quotation made from that Council [Trent]. We think it sufficient in the Liturgy which we use in celebrating the Holy Eucharist, - while lifting up our hearts to the Lord, and when now consecrating the gifts already offered that they may become to us the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, to signify the sacrifice which is offered at that point of the service in such terms as these. We continue a perpetual memory of the precious death of Christ, who is our Advocate with the Father and the propitiation for our sins, according to His precept, until his coming again. For first we offer the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; then next we plead and represent before the Father the sacrifice of the cross, and by it we confidently entreat remission of sins and all other benefits of The Lord’ Passion for all the whole Church; and lastly we offer the sacrifice of

ourselves to the Creator of all things which we have already signified by the oblations of His creatures. This whole action, in which the people has necessarily to take its part with the Priest, we are accustomed to call the Eucharistic sacrifice.

It is appropriate at this point to indicate that the issue of language is important here, the Church of Ireland having, by resolution and bill approved by the General Synod, distanced itself from the very harsh statements found in some of the Thirty-nine Articles. This very comprehensive Declaration¹⁵ is mandated to be included in future printings of the Book of Common Prayer.¹⁶ It was affirmed, *inter alia*,

Historic documents often stem from periods of deep separation between Christian Churches. Whilst, in spite of a real degree of convergence, distinct differences remain, the tone and tenor of the language of the negative statements towards other Christians should not be seen as representing the spirit of this Church today.

The full document is reproduced in Appendix ¹⁷

With regard to the question of the nature of the elements after consecration, these are clearly affirmed in the 2004 Prayer Book to be to us what the Lord declared them to be. For example in Holy Communion Two, Eucharistic Prayer Three the Words of Institution include,¹⁸

Take, eat: this is my body which is given for you;
do this in remembrance of me.
Drink this, all of you; this is my blood of the new covenant,
which is shed for you and for many for the forgiveness of sins.

And then there is the petition in the Epiclesis,¹⁹

Holy Spirit, giver of life,
come upon us now;
may this bread and wine be to us
the body and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ.

At the Breaking of the Bread some words from 1 Cor 10 are used,²⁰

The bread which we break
is a sharing in the body of Christ.
**We being many are one body,
for we all share the one bread.**

And among the three alternative forms of Words of Administration we find,²¹

The body of Christ given for you. **Amen.**
The blood of Christ shed for you. **Amen.**

It would seem clear enough from this that the sacramental body and blood of Christ, that is the bread and wine which by consecration by the priest are so designated, and given this significance, are taken and eaten in the Holy Communion as a means by which Christ Himself is received in the heart by faith.

Under the sub-heading “The Eucharist and Christ’s Sacrifice” the opening sentences in the Agreed Statement on the Eucharist” are said by CIEF to be “excellent”,²²

Christ's death on the Cross, the culmination of his whole life of obedience, was the one, perfect and sufficient sacrifice for the sins of the world. There can be no repetition of, or addition to, what was then accomplished once for all by Christ. [13]

However, what follows is regarded as "more dubious", that the eucharist is a "means through which the atoning work of Christ on the Cross is proclaimed and made effective in the life of the Church" [14]²³

It is admitted that there is a place for "proclamation" [1 Cor 11:26] but the reservation about the language of "making effective" is hard to understand in that the sacraments ordained of Christ are said to be (Article 25 "Of the Sacraments") "effectual signs of grace" and, according to Article 28 "Of the Lord's Supper" the Holy Communion is stated to be "a Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ's death: insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ; and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ". It is also hard to understand how such a mighty operation as effecting such a participation can be said to be only dubiously a means by which the atoning work of Christ on the Cross is "made effective" in the life of the Church.

According to the document the statement in ARCIC that the Church "enters into the movement of (Christ's) self-offering is criticized as being that the sacrament is being defined as something in which we *offer* Christ's *body and blood* to God as a present sacrifice for sins. It states that the historic teaching of the Church of Ireland has been that "we *receive*(ing) these (Thy) creatures of *bread and wine*" as found in what is now Holy Communion One, which is said to be "quite the reverse".²⁴

But it is not necessarily a contradiction to say that there are both "Godward" and "manward" aspects of the eucharist, and even when the former is muted as in Holy Communion One, this does not mean it is non-existent, as the Response by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to the condemnation of Anglican Orders by Pope Leo XIII makes clear in its exposition of the traditional Prayer Book Order for Holy Communion. It somehow appears to be overlooked that the Prayer of Consecration is a prayer, addressed to "Almighty God.."²⁵ and not a statement addressed to the congregation and this, together with the overall frame in the traditional Prayer Book canon of the *Sursum Corda* and *Sanctus* prior to the Prayer of Consecration" and the offering of the "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving" and of "ourselves, our souls and bodies" and the concluding *Gloria in Excelsis* preserves a Godward aspect even in a rite which has a strong manward dimension.

It may be said that the traditional Prayer Book service represents a reaction against the very strongly Godward direction of the pre-Reformation order of service, that modern eucharistic revision restores a balance between the two aspects where, for example, both receive due emphasis in the eucharistic prayers of Holy Communion Two. For example in the *anamnesis* in eucharistic prayer 1 the sacrificial offering is followed by a petition for the gifts,²⁶

Accept through him, our great high priest,
this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving;
and as we eat and drink these holy gifts,
grant by the power of the Holy Spirit
that we may be made one in your Holy Church

and partakers of the body and blood of your Son,
that he may dwell in us and we in him.

The Revd Julian Charley, who represented the Evangelical Constituency in the first ARCIC discussions, admits the problems connected with the phrase about entering into the movement of Christ's self-offering, but also defends it.²⁷ He says firmly that any idea of a human addition to Christ's sacrifice that is being commemorated was not the intention of the drafters. He suggests that the argument is helpfully elucidated by the addition of parentheses as follows:²⁸

In the eucharistic prayer the church continues to make a perpetual memorial of Christ's death, and his members, united with God and one another, give thanks for all his mercies, entreat the benefits of his passion on behalf of the whole church, [in communion] participate in these benefits and [in response] enter into the movement of his self-offering.

He points out that this was how it was explained in the book *Anglican Worship Today*, edited by Colin Buchanan, Trevor Lloyd and Harold Miller (Collins 1980) p.124, the editors being leading Evangelicals, and Harold Miller being at the time of writing Bishop of Down and Dromore, with the further comment, "the progress of thought in the Statement is perfectly clear."

The section on "The Presence of Christ" is very short and relies mainly on the controversial "black" rubric in the Book of Common Prayer (in the 2004 Prayer Book, p.196)

The nature of the so-called "black rubric" is neatly summarized in the relevant entry in More and Cross *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, ed. F.L. Cross and E.A. Livingstone,²⁹

Black Rubric. The name now commonly given to the 'Declaration on Kneeling' printed at the end of the Holy Communion service in the BCP. It is first found in the Book of 1552, when it was inserted at the last moment without Parliamentary authority. The Elizabethan edition of 1559 removed it; but a shortened version was replaced in the Book of 1662, with the significant change that the words "real and essential" were altered to "corporal", thereby indicating that its purpose was rather to guard against transubstantiation and popular medieval ideas of Eucharistic doctrine than to deny altogether Christ's presence in the Sacrament. The expression "Black Rubric" dates only from the 19th century when the practice of printed the BCP with rubrics in red was introduced and the fact that the "Declaration" was not a rubric at all was marked by printing it in black.

It does not appear that this rubric, whose text is given below, has been subjected in recent times to any kind of systematic critique, being for the most part either disregarded or overtaken by events, standing for the reception of communion being widespread in Anglican churches and particularly convenient when "stations" for the administration are provided for the giving of the bread and wine at the communion rail to communicants kneeling or standing. It seems a little strange that a Declaration on Kneeling should be cited as a significant source for the doctrine of the Lord's Presence, but in the present circumstances it is perhaps necessary to be examined for both its level of coherence and its relevance to the ecumenical discussion,³⁰

Whereas it is ordained in this office for the Administration of the Lord's Supper that the Communicants should receive the same kneeling; (which order is well meant, for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgement the benefits of Christ therein given to all worthy receivers, and for the avoiding of such profanation and disorder in the Holy Communion, as might otherwise ensue;) yet lest the same kneeling should by any persons, out of ignorance and infirmity, or out of malice and obstinacy, be misconstrued and depraved; It is here declared, that thereby no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental Bread and Wine there bodily received, or unto any Corporal (orig. 'Real and Essential') Presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood. For the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored; or that were idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians; and the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and is not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one.

It may be noted that the argument about the presence of Christ's body and blood in the eucharist depends upon two assumptions: first, that what is under consideration is his "natural" body and blood and second on the concept of a spatially located deity in a "three decker universe" inclusive of a spatially located heaven. These assumptions have to be rejected, first, on the grounds that a spatially located deity would make God into one (hypothetical) object among many in the universe instead of the creator of space and time independent of the space-time continuum, and second that what is at stake here is not Christ's natural flesh and blood body, which cannot be identified as being in a localized heaven, but his sacramental Body and Blood, present in the eucharist by virtue of the act of consecration which gives them that designation and which have, through this signification, achieved that status in the order of being. It is by no means evident that reverence for the consecrated species considered in their sacramental character as the Body and Blood of Christ is either misplaced or idolatrous. On the contrary, although they cannot, legitimately, be revered as bread and wine, it would seem to be a different matter when they are treated as (sacramentally speaking) his Body and Blood. Such adoration is not of the bread and wine in themselves but of Christ who is effectually represented by the sacrament of himself. And this consideration also answers the argument against what is technically known as "adoration" whether by inward worship of Christ present 'in, with and under' the sacrament or by particular acts of reverence whether or not within the context of a liturgy for that purpose. What is appropriate in particular circumstances must be judged according to the particular traditions and customs and the susceptibilities of those who gather to worship.

NOTES ON CHAPTER THREE, PART THREE [2]

¹Dermot O’Callaghan, *Rome, Canterbury and Armagh – A response to the Final Report of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission*, Church of Ireland Evangelical Fellowship, 1984.

²Op.cit.p.9.

³Ibid.

⁴Ibid

⁵Op.cit. p11

⁶*The First Book of Common Prayer of Edward VI and The Ordinal of 1549 together with The Order of the Communion, 1548*, reprinted entire and edited by Rev Henry Baskerville Walton, with an Introduction by Rev Peter Goldsmith Medd, Rivingtons, London, Oxford and Cambridge, 1870 (unpaginated).

⁷*The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI*, Dent, 1910, p377.

⁸*The Book of Common Prayer* (2004), p.201.

⁹Op. cit. p.786,

Of the one Oblation of Christ finished upon the Cross.

The offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction, for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin, but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guild, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.

That there is no single interpretation of the second part of the article is shown by the comments in E.C.S. Gibson, *The Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, explained with an Introduction*, Second Edition, revised, Methuen & Co, London, 1904, where it is said, (p691f)

Public attention has been recently directed to this statement, and an altogether unreasonable amount of importance has been attached to it in connection with controversies on the validity of Anglican Orders. A desperate attempt has been made in some quarters to represent it as a denial of the Eucharistic sacrifice, whereas the terms in which it is drawn ought to have made it clear to every reader that this could never have been its object. Had it been the intention of its compilers broadly to deny this doctrine, nothing would have been easier than for them to use words which would have conveyed their meaning without any ambiguity. As a matter of fact, however, it is not even ‘the sacrifice of the Mass’ which is condemned, but the *sacrifices of Masses (missarum sacrificia)* and in connection with them a current theory (‘in which it was *commonly said*’; *quibus vulgo dicebatur*) rather than a formal statement of doctrine.

What those who are responsible for the Article had before them was the whole system of private Masses, and the ‘opinion’ which gave such disastrous encouragement to them (besides being the fruitful parent of other superstitions) that ‘Christ satisfied by his Passion for original sin and instituted the mass, in which might be made an oblation for daily sins, both mortal and venial. Whether this dreadful version of the truth was ever authoritatively taught or seriously maintained by theologians is not the question though it has been attributed to more

than one. The words just cited from the Confession of Augsburg are fair evidence that the error was sufficiently widely spread to demand notice; and it alone would account for the emphasis which is laid place over in the Articles or the fact that the death of Christ is the perfect satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both *original and actual*. The Tridentine decrees unfolding private Masses, and laying down the sacrifice of the Mass “is truly propitiatory (*vere propitiatorium*) both for the living and the dead,” were certainly not present in the minds of those who formulated the articles as the subject was only considered at Trent in the autumn of 1560, nearly ten years later.

For other approaches, see E.H. Griffith Thomas, *The Principles of Theology – An Introduction to the Thirty-nine Articles*, Longmans, 1930 (Evangelical), and E.J. Bicknell, *The Thirty-nine Articles*, Third Edition, revised by H.J. Carpenter, Longmans, 1955 (Standard Account, and the prescribed book in the Divinity School in Trinity College Dublin for many years).

^{10, 11}There seems to be a close correspondence between the views of Jeremy Taylor (1613-67) and John Bramhall (1594-1663) the only difference being over the use of the word “propitiation”, but this is more apparent than real. Taylor’s view, given above and elsewhere in this present work was, that “He (Christ) is offered up to God; that is, He is by prayers and the Sacrament represented or offered up to God as sacrificed, which in effect is a celebration of His Death, and the applying it to the present and future necessities of the Church as we are capable by a ministry like to His in Heaven. It follows then, that the celebration of this Sacrifice be in its proportion an instrument of applying the proper Sacrifice to all the purposes which it first designed. It is ministerially and by application an instrument propitiatory; it is eucharistical; it is an homage and an act of adoration; and it is impetratory and obtains for us and for the whole Church all the benefits of the Sacrifice, which is now celebrated and applied.” Bramhall’s view was that, “The Holy Eucharist is a commemoration, a representation, an application of the all-sufficient propitiatory Sacrifice of the Cross..We acknowledge an Eucharistical Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; a commemorative Sacrifice or a memorial of the Sacrifice of the cross; a representative Sacrifice, or a representation of the Passion of Christ before the eyes of His heavenly Father; an impetrative Sacrifice, or an impetration of the fruit and benefit of his Passion by way of real prayer; and lastly an applicative Sacrifice, or an application of His merits unto our souls.” Of particular relevance to the Church of Ireland is the study in Chapter 2:III.c ii in F.R. Bolton’s classic *The Caroline Tradition of the Church of Ireland – with particular reference to Bishop Jeremy Taylor*, published for the Church Historical Society, SPCK, 1958, pp90-103 giving a careful and full account of Irish Caroline Teaching on the eucharistic offering by no means confined to these two authorities. For Taylor and Bramhall, see also, More and Cross, *Anglicanism*, op. cit. no’s 212-214.

¹²*Anglican Orders (Latin) – The Bull of His Holiness Leo XIII September 13, 1896 and the Answer of the Archbishops of England, March 39th 1897*, published for the Church Historical Society, SPCK, 1932. See also, *Anglican Orders – The Documents in the Debate*, edited by Christopher Hill and Edward Yarnold, S.J., Canterbury Press 1997.

¹³*Anglican Orders, op cit.* See also, *Saepius Officio – The Reply of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to the Letter of Pope Leo XIII, 1897*, The Church Literature Association, 1977. §XI, pp19-20.

¹⁵Journal of the General Synod, 2009, Statutes, ppcxi and cxii

¹⁶Journal, op. cit. pcxi “In all future printings of *The Book of Common Prayer* there shall be included the *Declaration*, as set out in the accompanying Schedule, immediately preceding the *Articles of Religion*.

¹⁷See below, p. XXXX

¹⁸BCP 2004, pp216-217

¹⁹Op cit. p.217

²⁰Op cit. p.218

²¹Op cit. p.219 The wording for the Breaking of the Bread and that which is to be said at the administration of the Bread and Wine is identical in all Three Eucharistic Prayers in Holy Communion Two.

²²CIEF op. cit p.11

²³Ibid.

²⁴CIEF p.12

²⁵BCP 2004 Holy Communion 1 p.188

²⁶BCP 2004 Holy Communion 2, eucharistic prayer 1 p.211 In Hebraic thought this kind of construction can mean an offering *consisting* of praise and thanksgiving, an offering whose *motive* is praise and thanksgiving, depending on context, or both of these.

²⁷Julian Charley, *Rome, Canterbury and the Future*, Grove Books 1982, pp17-18; Colin Buchanan, Trevor Lloyd, and Harold Miller, (eds), *Anglican Worship Today* (Collins 1980) p.124; J.W. Charley, *The Anglican-Roman Catholic Agreement on the Eucharist*, Grove Books, 1971.

²⁸*Rome, Canterbury and the Future*, op. cit., p.18.

²⁹*The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, ed. F.L. Cross, Third edition edited by E.A. Livingstone, OUP, 1997, p213. A fuller account is given in J.H. Blunt, Ed, *The Annotated Book of Common Prayer – being an historical, ritual, and theological commentary on the devotional system of The Church of England*, Rivingtons 1866.p.199,

This declaration was first added to the Communion office at the last revision in 1661. It was framed, though with the most important difference in the wording, from the Declaration which, as a sort of afterthought, was inserted in the majority (but not in all copies) of the prayer book issued in 1552. This affirms that ‘no adoration was done or ought to be done, either onto the Sacramental Bread or Wine their bodily received or onto any *real and essential presence* there being of Christ’s natural flesh and blood. It was probably framed by Cranmer, and intended merely as a protest against the doctrine of transubstantiation, and the low notion of a carnal presence which had come to be the interpretation too commonly put on the phrase “real and essential presence.” The declaration of 1552 was “signed by the King”, but it was never ratified by the church, and is wanting in all editions of the Prayer Book from Elizabeth’s Accession to the Restoration. At the Savoy conference the Presbyterians desired its restoration. The bishops replied, “This rubric is not in the liturgy of Queen Elizabeth, nor confirmed by law; nor is there any great need of restoring it, the world being now in more danger of profanation than of idolatry. Besides the sense that it is declared sufficiently in the 28th article of the Church of England” Whilst partly adopting it, their advisers of 1661 under

the influence as it seems the Bishop Gauden, probably at the suggestion of the venerable Gunning made the important change of substituting the word “corporal” for the words ‘real and essential.” Thus they retained the protest against Transubstantiation, whilst they removed all risk of the Declaration, or ‘Black rubric” as it is sometimes called, being misunderstood or even an apparent denial of the truth of the Real Presence.

³⁰BCP 2004 p.188.

CHAPTER THREE, ASSESSMENTS, PART FOUR

PART FOUR, THE RESPONSE OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND TO LIMA (B.E.M. – BAPTISM, EUCHARIST AND MINISTRY) AND ARCIC, TOGETHER WITH THAT OF THE CHURCH OF IRELAND ON LIMA AND OTHER PARTICULAR ANGLICAN RESPONSES.

PART 4 (1) INTRODUCTION

Although the focus of this chapter has been so far on ARCIC, with particular reference to those aspects – notably the eucharistic offering and presence – which have presented notable difficulties as indicated in both official and unofficial Church of Ireland comments and criticisms - the wider context, notably the Lima document – Baptism, Eucharist, and Ministry ‘BEM’, distilling the reflections of the wide range of membership represented by the World Council of Churches and mentioned in Chapter One above in the Notes on the text, needs to be considered. It is possible to consider both Lima and ARCIC together as the Church of England has done in its theologically significant document *Towards a Church of England Response to BEM – ‘Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry’ & ARCIC* (“*The Final Report of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission*”), GS661, 1985¹ Given the length of this report, and the additional material found in the further document, *The Church of England’s Response to BEM – ‘Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry’ & ARCIC* (*The Final Report of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission*), *Supplementary Report*, prepared by the Board for Mission and Unity, GS 747 1986², only that which concerns Eucharist can be considered in this present study. There is a full awareness of the dimensions of the reflections from many ecclesial bodies, including comments from other Anglican churches,³ and the discussions going on between a wide range of churches. From the Anglican point of view there is a whole treasury of material available, in particular on the eucharist, from the period of the Reformation down to the present day, from individual churchmen and scholars as well as from Synods and other official bodies⁴. In the C of E *Response*, attention is drawn in the Introduction to the involvement of the Church of England in a multilateral dialogue stretching back to the first meeting of the Faith and Order Commission in Lausanne in 1927, and to an important stage in the development of the texts leading to BEM in the Accra document, *One Baptism, One Eucharist and a Mutually Recognised Ministry*, 1974.⁵ With regard to the C of E view of ARCIC it is recorded that, following a request from the Anglican Consultative Council in 1977,⁶ the Church of England General Synod, while expressing some reservations and requiring some clarification, it had in 1979 stated that it endorsed the opinion of the Faith and Order Advisory Group that the three Agreed Statements [contained in the Final Report] were “sufficiently congruous with Anglican teaching to provide a basis for further dialogue.⁷ Emphasis was laid on the importance of the concept of “growing together” as a developing ecumenical method, and attention is drawn to certain factors facilitating this, including the insights of biblical scholarship and knowledge of the history which led to the openness to each other’s traditions.⁸ A significant distinction is made between “Response” and “Reception”, the latter involving a long-term process of assimilation and affirmation.⁹

PART 4 (2) ON THE LIMA TEXT (B.E.M.)

Responding to the issue of *The extent to which your church can recognize in this text the faith of the Church through the ages* the C of E Response said:

(i) THE BIBLICAL BASIS FOR THE EUCHARIST

56. The three-part text treats of the institution, meaning and celebration of the eucharist. The first section firmly anchors the eucharist in the biblical record recalling the meals which Jesus shared with his disciples and the Lord's command to continue to eat and drink in remembrance of him. We welcome this biblical basis and with it the opening emphasis upon the eucharist as the gift of God.¹⁰

This present study assumes that the concept of "remembrance" in its full biblical sense is presupposed in some sense in all the references to the eucharist in the New Testament, this being a key concept in the observance of the Passover which is the locus for the institution of the holy communion in the synoptic gospels and may have been assumed by Paul. But there is a question as to what extent this is entirely dependent on the use of the actual word *anamnesis* in the Greek and, most probably, *zikkaron* in the Hebrew or its Aramaic equivalent, given that it only appears in Luke and Paul, and vv19b-20 are omitted in whole or in part in some versions, and this touches upon the scholarly debate about the "longer" and "shorter" version of the Lucan text which is vigorously debated among liturgical and biblical scholars.¹¹

57 A principal source of strength in the text is the central and largest section which sets forth the meaning of the eucharist in relation to the doctrines of the Trinity (as thanksgiving to the Father, as memorial of Christ, and as invocation of the Spirit), of the Church and of eschatology. This particular structure provides a welcome balance and harmony to eucharistic theology. In commenting upon the text this balance has to be kept in mind so that one aspect is not considered in isolation from the others, thus distorting the balance which the text itself is careful to keep.¹²

BEM clearly is dealing with a fully developed theology of the eucharist in the context of fully developed theology of the Trinity, of the Church and of eschatology and this is expressed in the Lima liturgy itself. These fully developed theologies may well be implicit in the writings of the New Testament but they are not to be found there except in embryo. For example the role of the Spirit in the celebration of the eucharist or indeed whatever connection may exist between them, is not to be found in any explicit sense, however important it may be to exercise discernment in this area to have a full understanding of the eucharist itself.¹³

The Holy Communion Two rites in the 2004 edition of the Church of Ireland Prayer Book seems to be strong in all the areas mentioned here and in the relations between them.¹⁴

(ii) EUCHARIST AND WORD

58 The *Response* affirms the BEM statement the "the Eucharist, which always includes both word and sacrament, is a proclamation and a celebration of the work of God". This coheres with the balance in the eucharistic liturgies of the Church of Ireland, where a comprehensive Ministry of the Word is provided for in the traditional order of service (Holy Communion One) as well as in the modern form (Holy Communion Two). The fuller forms of the Eucharistic Prayer in Holy

Communion Two also emphasize that the eucharistic is a proclamation and a celebration of the work of God in Christ, and this is particularly marked in the second of the three prayers.¹⁵

59 The *Response* commends the BEM affirmation that the eucharist is the central act of the Church's worship and ought therefore to be celebrated weekly on the Lord's Day, and acknowledges that the enrichment that has come to Anglicans from the renewal of eucharistic life.¹⁶ From a Church of Ireland perspective it is much to be regretted that the frequency of the eucharistic celebration falls short of the ideal in many places.¹⁷

(iii) EUCHARIST AND SACRIFICE

60 The *Response* affirms the BEM description of the eucharist as the "great sacrifice of praise" and states that the "spiritual sacrifice" in Israel's tradition replaced the material sacrifices of the Temple and the Psalms are full of the idea of sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving. The Christian sacrifice of praise is made possible as BEM says "on through Christ, with him and in him".¹⁸ But to what extent does the "Response" go beyond the evidence that the sacrificial system in the Temple was fully maintained for as long as the Temple itself continued to exist? In many ways Herod's Temple, which was the one known to Jesus and his disciples, represented the highest point of this tradition, although the Old Testament itself contains much witness against the misuse of the system, and Christian polemic such as is to be found in the Epistle to the Hebrews and in much early anti-Jewish writing stressed the inadequacy of animal offerings and substituted for this the once for all voluntary oblation of Jesus on Calvary's cross.¹⁹ And the *Response* seems to have missed the point that a "sacrifice of praise" or thanksgiving can in Hebrew signify a sacrifice consisting of praise of thanksgiving, or one whose motive is praise or thanksgiving or even both.²⁰

61 However, it is affirmed that [although] "what is remembered in the eucharist, that once for all event, is not repeated and yet the recalling of that event within the liturgy is the Church's effective proclamation of God's mighty act of promise."²¹

62 The thought is further developed, in terms of the biblical memorial is that "by this sacrifice of thanksgiving the Church prays that, on the ground of the merits and death of Christ, not only the congregation present but the whole Church may receive remission of sins and all other benefits of his passion."²²

63, 64 Some caution is expressed in the *Response* about interpretations of the biblical word *anamnesis* that are said to suggest Calvary is repeated or that "we ourselves in the act of remembering make effective those benefits of Christ's sacrifice."²³

65 The view is expressed in the *Response* that what is recollected in the eucharist through the power of the Holy Spirit, is not only the sacrifice of Calvary but the total Christ-event from the creation by the Logos to the consummation of the Kingdom. This may well be true, and indeed is fully expressed in many modern forms of the eucharistic liturgy, but it is clearly important not to lose the biblical emphasis, that "as often as you eat the bread and drink the cup you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes" (1 Cor 11:26).²⁴

66 The *Response* welcomes the use of the concept of *anamnesis* to bring together two hitherto opposing views, allowing the church to use confidently the language of sacrifice in a context of the recital of all the mighty acts of God in Christ while relying on the power of the Holy Spirit to make efficacious the sacrifice offered once for all on the cross. It is by no means certain that such a development has in fact occurred since BEM appeared and it may well be that a certain negativity about BEM's approach may be discerned among those who were not particularly involved in the process which led to the appearance of the document.²⁵

67 The point is made that the biblical notion of sacrifice is "exceedingly wide". In a footnote to the *Final Report* or ARCIC this variety of meanings is referred to. "For the Hebrew sacrifice was a traditional means of communication with God. The Passover, for example, was a communal meal; the Day of Atonement was expiatory; and the covenant established communion between God and man" (The Final Report, E5). The *Response* adds that "There is thus no single biblical view of sacrifice and the New Testament writers use the concept in various ways. So Paul, in Romans 3 talks of "expiation" and the effects of Christ's death as comparable to expiatory sacrifice. Hebrews points rather to the Day of Atonement, likening the sacrifice of Christ to the sacrificial animal rather than the scapegoat; the Gospel of John uses the idea of the Passover sacrifice to elucidate the death of Christ on the cross." It quotes, apparently, with approval the commentary included with the BEM text which states,

It is in the light of the significance of the eucharist as intercession that references to the eucharist in Catholic theology as "propitiatory sacrifice" may be understood. The understanding is that there is only one expiation, that of the unique sacrifice of the cross, made actual in the eucharist and presented before the Father in the intercession of Christ and of the Church for all humanity.²⁶

This statement, which is not a part of the text of BEM itself is not without difficulties, for example in the apparent equation between the terms "propitiation" or "propitiatory" and "expiation" – which are not the same thing. And the use of the word "actual" might suggest an apparent view that the unique sacrifice of the cross is only "made actual" when the eucharist is celebrated, whereas the sacrifice of the cross is the "accepted sacrifice" as was pointed out many years ago by the Anglo-Catholic writer, A.G. Hebert.²⁷

(iv) EUCHARIST AND THE HOLY SPIRIT

68 The *Response* approves the strong emphasis on the power of the Holy Spirit in BEM, as active in the whole eucharistic celebration and, it believes, witnesses to the faith of the Church through the ages. The way in which the central section of the text develops pneumatological aspect of the eucharist as invocation of the Holy Spirit is welcomed. This invocation is, it is claimed "rightly both upon the community and upon the elements of bread and wine. The *Response* welcomes the important balance bringing together the emphases of east and west and avoiding the presence of Christ being concentrated too narrowly upon the moment of consecration."²⁸

This declaration is not without its difficulties. For one thing while the emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit would be generally accepted in the church of today not everyone would go so far as to welcome a direct invocation on the elements of bread and wine, and this is avoided in the texts in the Church of Ireland's 2004 edition of the Book of Common Prayer.²⁹ With regard to the so-called "moment of consecration" a recovery of the ancient (biblical) principle of "consecration by thanksgiving" gets around some of the problems although this does not, of itself invalidate there being a focal point within the Prayer of Consecration, as in the traditional Western Latin rite and in the 1662 Book of Common Prayer, or, as in Eastern Orthodoxy where the invocation of the Holy Spirit is a (possibly non-exclusive) key to the accomplishment of the consecration.³⁰ If there is a focal point in the act of baptism, it would seem to follow that one cannot necessarily exclude the possibility of a focal point in the setting apart of the bread and wine for their sacred meaning, purpose and use.³¹

(v) EUCHARIST AND PRESENCE

69 The *Response* indicates that it is only within the context of the presence of the crucified and risen Christ in the whole celebration that the relation between the elements of bread and wine and that presence are discussed.³² It recognizes that although the text of BEM talks of "the real presence of Christ" it never states any view of the unique mode of that presence in the eucharistic species.³³ However, it approves the very carefully balanced sentence linking together the presence of Christ and the faith of the individual, "While Christ's real presence in the eucharist does not depend on the faith of the individual, all agree that to discern the body and blood of Christ, faith is required".³⁴ It may be said that although the mystery of the eucharistic presence is such that it can never be fully expressed or accounted for, nonetheless it is not necessarily a virtue not to think about what may or may not be said. In this respect it is like other great mysteries of the faith, such as the relationship between the divinity and humanity of Christ which exercised the minds of so many of the church's greatest thinkers in the fourth and fifth centuries A.D.³⁵ and that relationship could, as at the Council of Chalcedon, be encapsulated in such a way as to indicate where a correct mode of thought was to be found and error was to be avoided, even if the fulness of truth could in the nature of things never be fully comprehended nor fully expressed.³⁶ This raises the question as to whether the characteristically Anglican avoidance of the issue is in all respects a virtue. The existence of the categorical statements in the Church Catechism would seem to suggest otherwise.

70 Paragraph E15 and Commentary E15 are cited with approval in the *Response*. "It is in virtue of the living word of Christ and by the power of the Holy Spirit that the bread and wine become the sacramental signs of Christ's body and blood."³⁹ They remain so for the purpose of communion".³⁷ The issue of reservation is covered in par (vi). The commentary points to the existence of various views ranging from those who affirm the presence without attempting to explain it through to others who "have developed an explanation of the real presence which, though not claiming to exhaust the significance of the mystery, seeks to protect it from damaging interpretations."³⁸

71 It is pointed out in the *Response* that the *Final Report of ARCIC* appears to go beyond this convergence of the *Lima Text* with its much stronger statement “Communion with Christ in the eucharist presuppose his true presence, effectually signified by the bread and wine which, in this mystery, become his body and blood.”³⁹ Problems arising from this, it is thought, are resolved by the *Elucidation*, which says, “What is here affirmed is a sacramental presence in which God uses realities of this world to convey the realities of the new creation: bread of this life becomes the bread of eternal life.” (the *Final Report*, *Elucidation* p 21, par. 6). The *Response* states that it would seem sufficient and faithful to the belief of the Church throughout the ages to uphold the real presence of Christ in the eucharist and his body and blood truly received in the bread and wine without demanding further agreement on the mode of that presence in the elements. However, it would seem helpful to attempt to discern, biblically and theologically the nature of the terms “body” and “blood” and the relationship between a physical presence and a sacramental presence and also to look at the various uses of “body” which can mean the physical body which Jesus had in his human existence on earth, his sacramental body at the Last Supper and in the Eucharist, and his ecclesial body, the church of which he is the Head. It is the view of this present study that the various uses, though related, need to be distinguished and that many of the problems in eucharistic theology have arisen precisely because this has not invariably been done.⁴⁰

(vi) RESERVATION

72,73 As noted above the *Response* underlines the importance of the carefully worded BEM statement, “It is in virtue of the living word of Christ and by the power of the Holy Spirit that the bread and wine become the sacramental signs of Christ’s body and blood. They remain so for the purpose of communion”. Diversity of practice is acknowledged including reservation for communion of the sick. And it recommends the practice of consuming any of the eucharistic elements not required for the purpose of communion (which it is thought, has helped to keep Anglicans united). However, the issue of reservation for devotional purposes is not faced either in BEM or here. Nor is the question of whether it is always practical to consume all the elements and possible solutions to the problem alluded to.⁴¹

(vii) EUCHARIST AND THE KINGDOM

74 The *Response* views very favourably the emphasis on the kingdom of God in BEM and affirms that a particularly fine example of the advantage of the five aspects of the central section of the eucharist text with its Trinitarian, ecclesiological and eschaological sections is seen in the constant echo of the incorporation of the world into the eucharistic action; from the standpoint of creation, redemption and mission. The eucharist is declared to be the feast where the Church may recognize the signs of renewal already at work in the world, where, united with Christ in a special way, it prays for the world. The eucharist is the centre from which Christians go out renewed by the power of the Spirit to act as servants of reconciliation in a broken and divided world. This concern for the world is not an optional extra in (the) agreement on the eucharist but rightly belongs as an integral part of (the) common belief about the eucharist. The

anamnesis of Christ which lies at the heart of the eucharist entails a new ethical stance for all who participate. The finality of Christ's mission in the reconciliation of all things determines the life and conduct of the Church and of the individual believer. It may be noted that although all this arises from the teaching of Christ on the kingdom which is a fundamental part of the message of the Gospels the linkage of this with the eucharist is something which reflects a developed doctrine which may be regarded as implicit rather than explicit in the documents of the New Testament.⁴²

75 The *Response* welcomes the BEM statement "All kinds of injustice, racisms, separation and lack of freedom are radically challenged when we share in the body and blood of Christ" The extended text is said in the *Response* to identify various threats to the integrity of the eucharistic fellowship. Among these attention is correctly drawn to eucharistic division as subverting the essential sign character of the Church to the world and therefore making less effective the Church's witness and evangelism.⁴³

76,77 Integrity, the *Response* says, demands penitence for 'inconsistent' behaviour before approaching the eucharist, and as a consequence of it renewed commitment to a world in process of transformation. But, as the eucharist is already itself a celebration of forgiveness it is important to avoid giving the impression that perfection is already required of worshippers. One aspect of the BEM text which the *Response* would like to see strengthened is therefore what is said about the eucharist and the forgiveness of sins. "This theme", it says, "is present but does not receive the emphasis it deserves in ecumenical agreement."⁴⁴

(viii) EUCHARIST AND THE CHURCH

What is said here in the *Response* deserves to be cited in full.

Finally, as in the baptism section so also in the Eucharist section, the question of the relation of the Eucharist to the nature of the church is never far from the surface stop it remains for future work to build upon the emerging ecclesiology. As each baptised Christian partakes in the Eucharistic celebration, the central act of the churches life, so the body of Christ is strengthened and given new life stop further, it is in the eucharistic celebration, with the *anamnesis* of the Christ event, that the identity of the Christian community is formed. In the eucharist we are united with one another and with all the company of heaven. And, as the sacrament of is shared with the sick and imprisoned, they are one with the worshipping community. We welcome the emphasis that eucharistic celebrations have always to do with the whole church, and the whole church is involved in each local eucharistic celebration. Further the minister who presides, in the name of Christ, bears witness to the fact that each particular local community is related to other local communities in the one universal church. In all of this we see the way in which baptism, eucharist and ministry are integrally bound together within the mystery of the one church. We recognise the implications of this for the communion of the churches. If each local community is part of the wider Church it cannot live its life disregarding the interests and concerns of other local churches. Consequently, on the basis of the converging theological agreement we must work harder for the unity of Christians in one Eucharistic fellowship.⁴⁵

Among concluding reflections in their assessment of the eucharistic section of the Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry document, the Church of England response says,

We have no hesitation in saying of this statement in it Anglicans can recognise the faith of the church through the agents. We welcome in particular are currently balanced Trinitarian aspect of the text, the use of *anamnesis* held closely together with an understanding of the work of the Holy Spirit, the emphasis upon the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist linked with the need of faith to discern that presence, the stress on prayer and intercession, the relation of the eucharist of the life of the world and the insistence on the centrality of the eucharist in the life of the church...We believe the churches may be drawn even closer together as they develop a common understanding of the eucharist and sacrifice and will be forced to ask what consequences this theological agreement must have for eucharistic fellowship.⁴⁶

It would be very difficult to dissent from any of this in a Church of Ireland view of the eucharist.

NOTES ON CHAPTER THREE PART FOUR (1), (2)

¹The document was the work of the Faith and Order Advisory Group (FOAG) of the Church of England, chaired by the then Bishop of Chichester, the Rt Revd Dr Eric Kemp and containing a number of significant figures in its membership, including the Revd Canon Dr G.V. Bennett, the Very Revd D. Edwards, Canon A.T. Hanson, the Rt Revd Mark Santer, the Revd Professor S.W. Sykes (up to 1984) and having as a consultant, the Revd Canon Professor, H. Chadwick. A noted ecumenist, Mrs Mary Tanner, was the Secretary. It did not in itself constitute a final judgement of the Church of England on either the Lima document or the ARCIC Report, but, as its name suggests, marked a stage in a process of assessment. Its value in the present context relates to its careful theological reflection upon the issues involved.

²This successor document records the favourable Synodical Response to BEM and ARCIC embodied in a comprehensive set of resolutions passed at the February 1985 meeting of the General Synod of the Church of England, and also records five motions to the same effect sent to the diocesan synods.

³The Section Report on Ecumenical Relations presented to the Lambeth Conference of 1988, and documented in *The Truth Shall Make You Free – The Reports, Resolutions & Pastoral Letters from the Bishops* (ACC 1988), p.137, says, under the heading, “International Theological Conversations”,

We have had the privilege of studying the reports which have come from five different sets of theological conversations since the last Lambeth Conference. These are the multilateral conversations carried on between many different Churches under the auspices of the World Council of Churches, and the bilateral dialogues which have taken place between the Anglican Communion and respectively the Lutheran, Orthodox, Reformed and Roman Catholic Churches. In addition, we learnt of the beginning of a new dialogue with the Oriental Orthodox Churches. Representatives of all these Churches were present and contributed much to our understanding. [The initiatives referred to are listed in the bibliography on pp151-2 of the Lambeth Report.

⁴An enormous online resource is provided by Brian Douglas in his *Anglican Eucharistic Theology* containing careful summaries with lengthy quotations from representative leading Anglicans from the sixteenth to the twenty-first centuries, in four sections,

§1 The period of the Reformation up to 1662 (44 entries)

§2 The Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries (28 entries)

§3 The Nineteenth Century (32 entries)

§4 The Twentieth and Twenty-first Centuries (28 entries)

This makes 132 entries in all. This treasure-trove of historical evidence on the Anglican theology of the eucharist is both in general and in particular highly relevant to the present study, concentrating, as it does on the doctrines of the eucharistic presence and sacrifice. There is an assessment of each entry in terms of the “realism” or “nominalism” of each person concerned and whether, in the editor’s view this “realism” or “nominalism” is “moderate” or “immoderate.” However, it is necessary to remember that there are other aspects and themes in the theology of the eucharist apart from those given such comprehensive treatment in this particular online publication. For example, the study by

Thomas O'Loughlin, *The Eucharist – Origins and Contemporary Understandings*, Bloomsbury, T & T Clark, 2015, focuses attention primarily on the concept of the sacred meal and all that goes with it.

⁵*Response*, pp4-6

⁶*Ibid.*

⁷*Ibid.*

⁸Op. cit. pp6-8. It is pointed out that “Agreements reached in words in the convergence process must be carried by, and be expressive of, the life of communities which are themselves growing together and proclaiming the Gospel together. Convergence has to be in word and in life... For this reason the ‘process of convergence’, the ‘growing together’, cannot remain with the few select theologians who are members of the commission.”

⁹Op. cit. pp8-9 The *Response* says that “the Vancouver Assembly helpfully distinguished between official responses given within a short time-space and a much longer and deeper process of reception. Reception is a long range and far reaching process in which the whole Church seeks to recognise and affirm confidently the one faith in and through the words of an ecumenical text. This reception process cannot be hurried. More and more people at all levels of the church’s life must be drawn into the reflective and interpretative process, so that agreements reached first by theologians and then affirmed by synods, become part of the life of the whole people of God. Moreover, if the different communions are to be drawn together, joint exploration and appropriation of the texts must be encouraged, wherever possible. The need for widespread reception has implications for the translation and explication of texts which are often technical and condensed. For if the content and spirit of the texts remain open only to the few, they will only be received by the few. Further, the theological agreement expressed in the texts needs to be interpreted and embodied in every aspect of the church’s life, in the language, symbols and imagery of its worship, in architecture and in educational programmes. Such agreement must not remain at the level of the intellect but must influence the way churches proclaim the Gospel and promote justice, peace and love.”

¹⁰Op. cit p.25

¹¹For example, Paul F. Bradshaw, *Reconstructing Early Christian Worship*, SPCK 2009, pp13-18

¹²*Response*, op. cit. p.25

¹³This is one facet of the development of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, in which the deity of the Holy Spirit was late in recognition, and the development of the characteristic Eastern emphasis on the role of the Spirit in the eucharist is hard to trace. However, in one of the hymns of St Ephrem the Syrian (d. 373), ‘On faith, 1:73, 1 we find the following remarkable concept of the Spirit and the Presence:

In your Bread there is hidden the Spirit who is not consumed,
in your Wine there dwells the fire that is not drunk,
the Spirit is in our Bread, the Fire in your Wine,
a manifest wonder which our lips have received.

Paul F. Bradshaw and Maxwell E. Johnson, *The Eucharistic Liturgies – Their evolution and interpretation*, SPCK, ACC 87, Alcuin Club Collections 87.

Theodore of Mopsuestia (c.350-428), also from Syria, in Lecture 16 in which parts of the liturgy are described says,

The bishop must ask and beseech God that the Holy Spirit should come, and that grace should come thence upon the bread and wine offered, that they may be known to be truly the body and blood of our Lord, the memorial of immortality.

He prays that the grace of the Holy Spirit may come upon all gathered together, that they may be united as into one body by partaking of the body of our Lord ... and that they may be one in concord, peace and well-doing.

R.C.D. Jasper and G.J. Cuming, *Prayers of the Eucharist – Early and Reformed*, Collins 1975, p.76

A Coptic inscription of the 8th century A.D., confirmed by a fragmentary Greek translation of the 6th century A.D. includes the following invocation in its account of the eucharist:

We pray and beseech you to send your Holy Spirit and your power on these (your?) (gifts) set before you, on this bread and this cup, and to make the bread the Body of Christ and (the cup the blood of the) new (covenant) of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

British Museum Tablet 54036 cited in Jasper and Cuming, *op.cit.*, p.39.

All the classic texts of the Eastern Church, such as the Liturgy of St John Chrysostom have an epiclesis of the Holy Spirit upon the bread and wine.

A comprehensive treatment of the the early centuries may be found in John H. McKenna, *Eucharist and Holy Spirit – the Eucharistic Epiclesis in 20th Century Theology*, *Alcuin Club Collections No 57*, Part One “The Historical Heritage”.

¹⁴*The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church according to the use of the Church of Ireland together with the Psalter or Psalms of David pointed as they are to be sung or said in Churches and the Form and Manner of Making, Ordaining and Consecrating of Bishops Priests and Deacons*, Dublin, The Columba Press, by Authority of the General Synod of the Church of Ireland, 2004, pp201-221. The Biblical basis is emphasized by the centrality of the Institution Narrative in the three Eucharistic Prayers provided and by the structure of the eucharistic canon, inclusive of the ‘Taking’ of the bread and wine, ‘The Great Thanksgiving’ said over them, ‘The Breaking of the Bread’ and ‘The Communion’ (the latter corresponding to the Lord’s ‘giving’ of the bread and wine. The doctrine of the Holy Trinity is indicated in the movement in each of the three prayers from Father to Son to Holy Spirit with the Trinitarian doxology at the end. Eucharistic Prayer Three is unique in being addressed in turn to the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, the doxology being addressed to ‘Father, Son and Holy Spirit, Blessed Trinity’. All of the prayers are in the first instance addressed to the Father in thanksgiving, all contain words which express the memorial, and all in some sense invoke the Holy Spirit, although not directly on the elements. In all of them the concept of the church is expressed and conveyed, as in Eucharistic Prayer Two: ‘Through him (Christ) you have sent upon us your holy and life-giving Spirit and made us a royal priesthood called to serve you for ever.’ ‘Renew us by your Holy Spirit, united us in the body of your Son, and bring us with all your people into the joy of your eternal kingdom.’ The eschatological element is also to be found

clearly expressed as in the anamnesis in Eucharistic Prayer One: “We remember his passion and death, we celebrate his resurrection and ascension, and we look for the coming of his kingdom.” In the Seasonal Addition in Eucharistic Prayer Two for Ascensiontide it is said of Christ, “He has passed beyond our sight, not to abandon us but to be our hope, that where he is we might also be and reign with him in glory”. And in an acclamation in Eucharistic Prayer Three it says, “Praise to you, Lord Jesus Christ: dying you destroyed our death, rising, you restored our life; Lord Jesus, come in glory.”

¹⁵ ‘Father, with this bread and this cup, we do as our Saviour has commanded: we celebrate the redemption he has won for us; we proclaim his perfect sacrifice, made once for all upon the cross, his mighty resurrection and glorious ascension; and we look for his coming to fulfil all things according to your will.’

¹⁶This development was part of the outworking of the Liturgical Movement in churches of the Anglican Communion, through such publications as A.G. Hebert’s *Liturgy and Society – the function of the church in the modern world*, Faber and Faber, 1935, and his *The Parish Communion – A Book of Essays*, edited A.G. Hebert, SPCK, 1937 together with the (related) witness of the organization “Parish and People”. The activities of the offshoot of this organization in the Church of Ireland, “Irish Parish and People” is covered in the writer’s doctoral thesis, ‘The Theological Implications of Recent Liturgical Revision in the Church of Ireland’; Open University, 1987, pp105-107, 153-155.

¹⁷Witness the number of churches in the Diocese of Armagh at the time of writing which have a celebration of the Holy Communion confined to the canonical minimum of once a month and on major festivals.

¹⁸Of which a good example is the doxology at the conclusion of Eucharistic Prayer One in Holy Communion Two in the 2004 edition of the Book of Common Prayer:

Through the same Jesus Christ our Lord,
by whom, and with whom, and in whom,
in the unity of the Holy Spirit,
**all honour and glory are yours, Almighty Father,
for ever and ever. Amen.**

¹⁹Hebrews 9:11-14 “But when Christ appeared as a high priest of the good things that have come, then through the greater and more perfect tent (not made with hands, that is, not of this creation) he entered once for all into the Holy Place, taking not the blood of goats and calves but his own blood, thus securing an eternal redemption. For if the sprinkling of defiled persons with the blood of goats and bulls and with the ashes of a heifer sanctifies for the purification of the flesh, how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without blemish to God, purify your conscience from dead works to serve the living God.” Hebrews 10:4 “For it is impossible that the blood of bulls and goats could take away sins”.

The early Christian document, found in Codex Sinaiticus called *The Epistle of Barnabas* affirms (3:4) “For he has made plain to us through all the Prophets that he needs neither sacrifices nor burnt-offerings nor oblations, saying in one place [Psalm 51:19] “What is the multitude of your sacrifices to me? says the Lord. I am full of burnt offerings and desire not the fat of lambs and the blood of bulls and goats, not even when you come to appear before me. For who has required these things at your hands? Henceforth shall you

tread my court no more. If you bring flour, it is vain. Incense is an abomination to me. I cannot away with your new moons and Sabbaths.” Loeb Classical Library, *Apostolic Fathers 1* Translated by Kirsop Lake, Heinmann and Harvard University Press, 1965, p.345. [English translation here modernized]. The whole of the epistle of Barnabas (probably the work of a Christian, perhaps in Alexandria, writing at some time between A.D. 70 and 150) is a polemic against the Jews, ‘explaining animal sacrifices, the distinctive enactments of the Mosaic Law, and the material Temple as mistakes due to Jewish blindness and denying that they were ever God’s will. See entry in the *Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, Third Ed, edited by E. A. Livingstone, OUP, 1997 p.159.

²⁰Hebrew is deficient in adjectives and this is got around by attaching nouns to one another in what is called the “construct” relationship. All such expressions tend to be inherently ambiguous. To make things more complicated from the standpoint of liturgical English Cranmer’s use of “praise and” thanksgiving seems designed to stress the idea of an offering consisting of praise and thanksgiving. The Hebrew could mean that, and it would fit in with a current of dismissal of the sacrificial system because of the manner in which it was deemed to have been abused, for example Psalm 40:6 ‘Sacrifice and offering you do not desire; but you have given me an open ear. Burnt offering and sin offering you have not required.’ But it is quite difficult to find the expression “sacrifice of thanksgiving” in the Cranmerian sense in the Old Testament although grammatically it can mean this. On the contrary it is customarily a means of designating a particular kind of sacrifice as in Leviticus 22:29, 30 “And when you sacrifice a sacrifice of thanksgiving to the Lord, you shall sacrifice it so that you may be accepted. It shall be eaten on the same day, you shall leave none of it until morning. I am the Lord.” A combination of the two thoughts of a sacrifice whose motive is thanksgiving but refers to a particular kind of offering, and the thought that it is an offering which in some sense consists of thanksgiving, may be found in Psalm 107:20, 21 ‘Let them thank the Lord for his steadfast love, for his wonderful works to the sons of men! And let them offer sacrifices of thanksgiving, and tell of his deeds in songs of joy.’ In the liturgy of the church then the expression “sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving” may refer specifically to the offering of praise and thanksgiving or it may mean that the motive for the liturgical oblation is praise and thanksgiving or may imply both senses,

²¹If the key word in Eucharistic Prayer One in Holy Communion Two is “remember” then that in Eucharistic Prayer Two is “proclaim”:

Father, with this bread and this cup,
we do as our Saviour has commanded:
we celebrate the redemption he has won for us;
we proclaim his perfect sacrifice,
made once for all upon the cross,
his mighty resurrection and glorious ascension;
and we look for his coming
to fulfil all things according to your will.

²²There is an echo here of Cranmer’s liturgy, as in Eucharistic Prayer One in the 2004 edition of the Book of Common Prayer in the first post-communion prayer:

We thy humble servants entirely desire thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, most humbly beseeching thee to grant that, by the merits and death of thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in his blood, we and all thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of his passion.

²³ It is not clear where and by whom any suggestion of a repetition of Calvary is to be found, although it is possible that incautious formulations of the theology of eucharistic sacrifice may lay their authors open to such a mistaken interpretation. On the other hand, it seems evident that the Lord's command to "do this in remembrance of me" implies that this is an ecclesial action in which the once for all sacrifice is remembered before God in thanksgiving and supplication, and that any dominical response to this comes within the scope of answered prayer.

²⁴ In other words the theology of the cross must be central to what we understand the eucharist to be although this is most meaningful when set within the larger context of all that God in Christ accomplished for our salvation. A good example of this is eucharistic prayer two in Holy Communion Two of the 2004 edition of the Book of Common Prayer - largely identical with its parent prayer in *An Australian Prayer Book 1978*, The Standing Committee of the General Synod of the Church of England in Australia, Sydney, published by the Anglican Information Office, St Andrews House, Sydney Square, NSW, 2000. The full version, of this "Prayer of Thanksgiving and Consecration with Seasonal Additions, which are included in the 2004 Prayer book but not the Alternative Prayer Book, 1984) may be found on pp167-171 of the original edition). A very full rehearsal of the mighty acts of God in Christ may be found on pp212 to 214 of the 2004 Prayer Book. The centrality of the cross, linked as it is to the resurrection and glorious ascension is to be found in the anamnesis on p.215,

Father, with this bread and this cup,
we do as our Saviour has commanded:
we celebrate the redemption he has won for us;
we proclaim his perfect sacrifice
made once for all upon the cross,
his mighty resurrection and glorious ascension;
and we look for his coming
to fulfil all things according to your will.

²⁵ The Evangelical scholar David Gregg in his *Anamnesis in the Eucharist*, Grove Liturgical Study No 5, p. 31 questions the necessity to verbalize an "anamnesis" and no really appropriate way to do it. But he then concedes that "there is a whole range of possibilities, all with perfectly legitimate liturgical parentage, and wide current provenance, available as alternatives here. In regressive order of 'propriety'.... they are: (a) those that refer to Christ's death only; (b) those that refer to his death *and* to the parousia; (c) those that give a general reference (i.e. to 'him', or to 'our redemption'); (d) those that give a composite reference to various aspects of his total existence, but confine the focus of any verb of 'proclamation' or 'commemoration' to his death only; (e) those that give a composite and completely indiscriminate reference to all these aspects." This last alone, he claims, stands out as *completely* inimical to the findings of the Semitic evidence. However, the present writer would argue that the function of the *anamnesis* is to express as far as possible the *totality* of what God in Christ has accomplished for the

redemption of humankind - ‘do this in remembrance of *me*’ – not ‘do this in remembrance of *my death*’ which is somewhat broader than the Pauline emphasis, but given the centrality of the theology of the cross to the Christian understanding of redemption it is right that this should be the central focus of the liturgical act of remembrance, but not excluding the broader context, it not being biblical, for example to separate the death of Christ from his resurrection and ascension – this cannot meaningfully be done. As the mystery of Christ is always greater than our capacity to put it into words, it is reasonable that wording that expresses varied emphasis upon the act of remembrance should find expression in the different liturgies of the Church, as for example, complementary approaches of the three eucharistic prayers in Holy Communion Two in the 2004 Prayer Book. The present writer in his B.D. Thesis, *The Meaning and Role of the Anamnesis* (TCD 1979) Chapter One includes a critical review of Gregg’s argument, essentially acknowledging the significance of the evidence from Hebrew and Greek of Gregg’s work but disagreeing in some respects from the conclusions drawn from this. A sharp critique of the Lima understanding of the memorial concept may be found in the Conservative Evangelical writer, Colin Buchanan in *ARCIC and LIMA on Baptism and Eucharist, including the LIMA Eucharistic Liturgy*, in the Grove Worship Series No 86, Grove Books 1983.

²⁶*Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, Faith and Order Paper No 111, World Council of Churches, Geneva, 1982, (Commentary 8) p.11.

²⁷A.G. Hebert, *Apostle and Bishop –A Study of the Gospel, the Ministry and the Church-Community*, Faber and Faber, 1963, Chapter VII, ‘Sacrifice and Eucharist’, p.106, ‘The basic affirmation of the Christian faith is that God raised Jesus Christ from the dead. This is the same thing as to say, in sacrificial language, that his sacrifice is the *Accepted Sacrifice*; he is the Lamb of God, once offered in sacrifice, who takes away the sin of the world; his is the one, full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice for the sin of the world. But the Eucharist is a sacrificial action; his words at the Last Supper are in sacrificial language.’

²⁸A significant defect in the 1662 Holy Communion is the lack of any reference to the Holy Spirit in the Prayer of Consecration, rendering it, in effect, ‘Binitarian’ rather than ‘Trinitarian’, a situation probably not anticipated by Thomas Cranmer who appears to have thought of what has been since 1662 described as the ‘Prayer of Consecration’, the Communion of the People, (the Lord’s Prayer and) the Prayer of Oblation and/or the Prayer of Thanksgiving as a single whole, concluding in doxology in which all three Persons of the Holy Trinity are mentioned.

²⁹ Eucharistic Prayer One,

Accept through him, our great high priest,
this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving;
and as we eat and drink these holy gifts,
grant by the power of the life-giving Spirit
that we may be made one in your holy Church
and partakers of the body and blood of your Son
that he may dwell in us and we in him.

The Holy Spirit here enables the congregation to be partakers of the body and blood of Christ but is not invoked upon the bread and wine of the Eucharist.

Eucharistic Prayer Two,

Renew us by your Holy Spirit,
unite us in the body of your Son,
and bring us with all your people
into the joy of your eternal kingdom.

The Holy Spirit is not explicitly connected with the elements although the mention of them in the previous paragraphs suggests an implied relationship, but there is no invocation of the Holy Spirit upon them.

Eucharistic Prayer Three,

Holy Spirit, giver of life,
come upon us now:
may this bread and wine be to us
the body and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ.

The invocation is upon the worshippers. However, the sequence of thoughts seems to imply that the bread and wine being to the worshippers the body and blood of Christ is the work of the Holy Spirit.

³⁰The significance of thanksgiving in this regard is shown in the use of the title “The Great Thanksgiving” before the three eucharistic prayers in the 2004 Prayer Book (p.209). Its role as at least a component of consecration is shown in the form on p.240 “When the Consecrated Elements are insufficient,

If either of the consecrated elements is insufficient, the presiding ministers adds further bread and or wine, silently, or using the following words:

Father,
having given thanks over the bread and the cup
according to the institution of your Son Jesus Christ,
who said, Take, eat, this is my body.
and/or
Drink this, this is my blood.
We pray that this bread/wine may be to us his body/blood,
to be received in remembrance of him.

The link between thanksgiving and consecration was signified in the experimental Church of Ireland Order Holy Communion 1967” where the title, “Thanksgiving and Consecration” was used. C.O. Buchanan, *Modern Anglican Liturgies 1958-1968*, OUP 1968 p.185. However, this was not the case with the traditional Prayer Book rite, now ‘Holy Communion One’ in the 2004 Prayer Book. The Prayer of Consecration is not eucharistic, although mention is made in the Words of Institution of the Lord having “given” thanks over the bread and the cup (separately), and thanksgiving in more general terms is found within the context of the eucharist in the form of the *Gratias agamus*, “Let us give thanks unto our Lord God” with the response “It is meet and right so to do”, and the wording of the Pre-Sanctus, “It is very meet, right and our bounden duty, that we should at all times, and in all places, give thanks unto thee, O Lord, Holy Father, Almighty Everlasting God.” The addition (in 1662) of the title “The Prayer of Consecration”, the incorporation of the (imitative) manual acts including the laying of the hand upon the bread and the cup, and the Great Amen at the conclusion of the prayer,

point to something very akin to a “moment of consecration”, however far this may have been from the intention of Thomas Cranmer in the liturgy of 1552. This is one of the places where apparently small changes made in 1662 have, potentially at any rate, far-reaching theological implications. This was reinforced, prior to 2004 by the rubric in previous editions of the Prayer Book,

If the consecrated Bread or Wine be all spent before all have communicated, the Priest is to consecrate more, according to the Form before prescribed; beginning at Our Saviour Christ in the same night, etc., for the blessing of the Bread; and at Likewise after supper, etc. for the blessing of the Cup.

³¹Although the concept of a “moment of consecration” is problematical it is hard to avoid the impression that there is, normally, what might be termed a focal point in the eucharistic prayer (termed in the experimental service ‘Holy Communion 1967’ the prayer of “Thanksgiving and Consecration” which retained the traditional manual acts dating from 1662. C.O. Buchanan, ed. *Modern Anglican Liturgies 1958-68*, OUP, 1968, p.186). In Holy Communion One in the Prayer Book of 2004 p.188 the prayer is called “The Prayer of Consecration” again along with the manual acts which mimic rather than re-create in the liturgy, the Lord’s actions of Taking and Blessing, Breaking and Giving but in so doing identify what is happening in the utterance of the prayer by the priest with what was done by Jesus at the Last Supper. The crucial point seems to be the recitation of the Narrative of Institution with the setting apart of the bread and wine for their sacred meaning, purpose and use. The renaming of this section of the canon as the “Prayer of Consecration” and the insertion of the manual acts and of the Amen seems to have been a deliberate decision by the revisers of 1662 and to have involved a distancing from the theology and practice of Thomas Cranmer in his Prayer Book of 1552. This is not to say that Cranmer did not have a rationale for his second order. Bishop Stephen Neill, a highly respected Evangelical scholar and former missionary in a notable article entitled “The Holy Communion in the Anglican Church” (Chapter III p.52 in *The Holy Communion – A Symposium* by David Cairns, G. Ronald Hower, S.C. Neill, E.G. Rupp, E.C Ratcliff, Gerald Vann, F. Fownley Lord, Edited by Hugh Martin, SCM, 1947), said,

The Consecration Prayer which comes immediately after [the Prayer of Humble Access] is short, and ends abruptly, as it seems, with the words of institution as uttered by our Lord in the Upper Room, and on this follows immediately the Communion both of priest and people. There can be no doubt that this was deliberately done; Consecration and Communion are one inseparable act, and, as in the Upper Room Christ distributed the Bread and Wine as soon as He had blessed them, so here, the faithful come forward, as soon as Christ’s word of power has been spoken, to receive the gift of His Body and Blood. They receive as individuals, but they are not left alone in their individuality; they are to realize themselves now as the one Body of Christ into which by faith and sacrament they have been incorporated. When all have received, the Lord’s Prayer, the prayer of the family is said aloud by all. In the Prayer of Oblation (to which a Thanksgiving is now set as an alternative) they offer themselves, as a single body, to God, in union with the one sacrifice of Christ, which they have beheld of which in Communion they have been partakers, and which must be endlessly renewed in them, the Body of Christ on earth, until his Kingdom is fulfilled.

It may be in this explanation lies the answer to the puzzling feature of the 1552 Order of Service that there is no reference to the Holy Spirit in what later was to be designated the “Prayer of Consecration”, in this way the central prayer of the entire rite being in effect Binitarian rather than Trinitarian. However, there are references to the Holy Spirit in the doxologies to both eucharistic prayers which on this reading belong integrally to the sequence outline above.

Not all commentators are equally favourable to the 1552 canon even as reinterpreted in the 1662 liturgy. Dr Emmanuel Amand de Mendieta, probably the most learned and ecumenically minded convert from the Roman Catholic to the Anglican tradition since the Reformation, had this to say about his first encounter with the 1552-1662 arrangement in E.A. Mendieta, *Rome and Canterbury – A Biblical and Free Catholicism*, London, 1962, p.99.

During a three-week period of intense religious preparation, I was able to acquire a fairly detailed knowledge of the faith and doctrine of the Church of England, and to familiarize myself with the Book of Common Prayer, especially with the 1662 rite of Holy Communion. I found it sufficiently satisfactory – to weigh my words – in spite of its lacunas and silences, not so speak of the regrettable mutilation of the great Eucharistic prayer or Canon.

³² This implies a ‘high’ doctrine of the Word as well as a ‘high’ doctrine of the sacrament, which may be stated in the form that there is a Real Presence of Christ in his Word (read and preached) as well as in the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper (duly administered). This is represented visually in many Anglican churches by the pulpit (usually on the north side) and the altar being carefully balanced so as to indicate equality of status. The custom of standing for the reading of the Gospel is also significant in this regard.

³³ Dr de Mendieta (see above ³¹) in his eirenic and ecumenical exposition of the Anglican faith, *Anglican Vision*, E.A. de Mendieta, SPCK 1971, Chapter Five “The Catholic Faith”, makes a fundamental distinction between faith and theology, both of which have a valued place, and also in Chapter Six, between theological principles and theological theories and systems, and it is under the latter that he discusses the nature of the eucharist and expresses his belief in the possibility of a E.A. de Mendieta, SPCK 1971, Chapter Five “The Catholic Faith”, makes a fundamental distinction between faith and theology, both of which have a valued place, and also in Chapter Six, between theological principles and theological theories and systems, and it is under the latter that he discusses the nature of the eucharist and expresses his belief in the possibility of a *synthesis* not of Roman Catholicism and Protestantism but of those theological principles which both hold in common and which they will recognize they will hold in common. This is clearly highly relevant not only to ARCIC but also to the wider constituency represented by the Lima discussions and the document Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry.

³⁴ This could be said to be an attempt to resolve a difference between “subjective” and “objective” understandings of the eucharistic presence. The Articles of Religion define sacraments as *efficia signa gratiae* (“effectual signs of grace”) which not only represent but also convey that which they represent, so that the bread and wine, duly consecrated, are the Body and Blood of Christ after the manner of a sacrament.

³⁵ J.N.D. Kelly, *Early Christian Doctrines*, London, Adam and Charles Black, Second Edition, 1960, Chapters IX to XI.

³⁶The Chalcedonian Confession of Faith (Council of Chalcedon, 451) includes,

Wherefore, following the holy Fathers, we all with one voice confess our Lord Jesus Christ, one and the same Son, the same perfect in manhood, truly God and truly man, the same consisting of a reasonable soul and body, of one substance with the Father as touching the Godhead, the same of one substance with us as touching the manhood, *like us in all things apart from sin*; begotten of the Father before the ages as touching the Godhead, the same in the last days, for us and for our salvation, born from the Virgin Mary, the *Theotokos*, as touching the manhood, one and the same Christ, Son, Lord, Only-begotten, to be acknowledged in two natures, without confusion, without change, without division, without separation; the distinction of natures being in no way abolished because of the union, but rather the characteristic property of each nature being preserved and concurring into one Person and one substance (*hupostasis*), not as if Christ were parted or divided into two persons, but one and the same Son and only-begotten God, Word, Lord, Jesus Christ; even as the Prophets from the beginning spoke concerning him, and our Lord Jesus Christ instructed us, and the Creed of the Fathers has handed down to us.

J. Stevenson, ed., *Creeds, Councils, and Controversies – Documents illustrative of the history of the Church A.D.337-461*, SPCK, 1966, p.337. The Greek text may be found in T.H. Brindley, *The Oecumenical Documents of the Faith, The Creed of Nicaea, the Epistles of Cyril, the Tome of Leo, the Chalcedonian Definition*, Revised with Introduction and Notes, by F.W. Green., pp191-3.

³⁷*Response*, p.29

³⁸*Response* p.28

For the concept of mystery as understood in the Eastern Orthodox Church, see Vladimir Lossky, *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church*, James Clarke & Co., London, 1944, English translation, 1957; and, as applied specifically to the sacraments, see the entry, “mysteries” in *The Blackwell Dictionary of Eastern Christianity*, edited by Ken Parry, David J. Melling, Dimitri Brady, Sidney H. Griffith & John F. Healey, Blackwell, 1999, pp332-3.

³⁹*Response* pp28,29.

⁴⁰For Jesus’ physical body, which is implied by the whole concept of the incarnation (John 1:14), there are most obviously, the references in the passion narratives to his being maltreated (Mt 26:67,68; Mark 14:65; Luke 22:63, 64; John 18, 22; Mt 26:67; Mark 14:65; Luke 22:63; John 19:1; and crucified, Mt 27:26, 35; Mark 14:15, 15;24; John 19:18 and to the burial of his body Mt 27:58-60; Mark 15:43-46; Luke 23; 50-53. Then, there is in the Easter narratives an emphasis upon the physicality of the resurrection (Mt 28;6,9; Mark 16:6,7; Luke 24:3; John 20:11-18 The Lucan account in Acts 1:1-11 of the Ascension implies that this body was taken up into a spatially located heaven and such literalism was to create problems for eucharistic theology. There has been a similar literalism in an absolute identification of the eucharistic “body” with the physical “body” of Jesus. For example Ignatius of Antioch in his Letter to the Smyrnaeans 6, said, “They (the Docetists) abstain from the Eucharist and prayer because they do not admit that the Eucharist is the flesh of our saviour Jesus Christ, which suffered for our sins, which the Father in his goodness raised up.” Describing the eucharistic body as “sacramental”

affirms both the symbolic nature of the relationship between the Lord's physical body and his eucharistic body in a way which neither confuses the two nor detracts from the reality of the Lord's presence "in, with and under" the form of bread (and wine). The third use of the concept of the "body", namely with reference to the Lord's ecclesial body (Romans 12: 3-5; 1 Cor 12: 4-30, esp. v.27; Ephesians 4: 1-16, esp. vv 12, 15-16, "Now you are the body of Christ and individually members of it" is also clearly symbolic but in no way less real.

It may be noted that the force of the Declaration on Kneeling (known as the "Black" rubric), BCP 2004 p.196 depends on the concept of a localized heaven,

Whereas it is ordained in this Office for the Administration of the Lord's Supper that the Communicants should receive the same kneeling; (which order is well meant, for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgement of the benefits of Christ therein given to all worthy receivers, and for the avoiding of such profanation and disorder in the Holy Communion, as might otherwise ensue;), yet, lest the same kneeling should by any persons, either out of ignorance and infirmity, or out of malice and obstinacy, be misconstrued and depraved; it is here declared, That thereby by adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental Bread or Wine there bodily received or unto any Corporal Presence of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood. For the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adore; (for that were idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians;) and the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in Heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one.

Eucharistic piety is directed towards the bread and wine as the sacramental Body and Blood, not at the bread and wine as they are in themselves; and this would seem to be entirely legitimate. And the question of where the natural body and blood of Christ are is irrelevant since the elements, by virtue of their consecration are the "sacramental" Body and Blood, and not the flesh and blood of the incarnate Son of God, which they certainly represent but are not identical to. The elements *are* the Body and Blood of Christ by means of their being effectual signs of the life of Christ who died for all upon Calvary's cross and is communicated to and share with the faithful in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. They are the dominically appointed symbols of the Real Presence of Christ in the eucharist. The nature of the Presence is sacramental, not literal, and is given and received only after an heavenly and spiritual manner (Article 28, *Of the Lord's Supper* BCP 2004, p.785).

⁴¹The "General Directions for Public Worship" in the 2004 Prayer Book 14e state, "Any of the consecrated bread and wine remaining after the administration of the communion is to be reverently consumed." This may not always be immediately practical. Even with the assistance of lay persons if a large amount of consecrated wine is left over there may be legal issues to do with the consumption of alcohol if either priest or assistants have to travel on immediately (for example, if the priest has further services, perhaps of holy communion to conduct).. Also, on large occasions in cathedral churches a miscalculation of the number of likely communicants leaves a large residue far too great to be reverently consumed. It is not unknown for the wine to be poured out reverently in a churchyard. However, it would not appear unreasonable to reserve the consecrated bread, if it be in wafer form in a suitable container in a secure and suitable place and also any excess

consecrated wine. In this way the sacramental species would in due course be “reverently consumed”.

⁴²However there is precedent for St Paul’s strictures on the conduct of communicants in 1 Corinthians 11:17-31.

⁴³There is a clear linkage between the unity of the church and the significance of the eucharist in 1 Cor 10:17, “Because there is one bread, we who are many are one body, for we all partake of the one bread.” and the passage cited above from 1 Cor 11 also applies on account of the divisions in the Church at Corinth.

⁴⁴The misreading of 1 Cor 11:27-32 which has put many people off from making their communion on the grounds of their being “unworthy” is a case in point. The treatment of the forgiveness of sins in the 2004 Prayer Book relates it to the once for all sacrifice of Christ on Calvary which is “remembered” in the eucharist according to the command of Jesus. In Eucharistic Prayer Two, in the first eucharistic prayer it says in relation to the Father, “in your love and mercy you freed us from the slavery of sin, giving your only begotten Son to become man and suffer death on the cross to redeem us: he made there the one complete and all sufficient sacrifice for the sins of the whole world: he instituted and in his holy Gospel commanded us to continue, a perpetual memory of his precious death until his coming again”.

In eucharistic prayer two it says “In obedience to your will your Son our Saviour offered himself as a perfect sacrifice, and died on the cross for our redemption. Through him you have freed us from the slavery of sin and reconciled us to yourself, our God and Father.” During Eastertide it adds, “For he is the passover Lamb who was offered for us and has taken away the sin of the world. By his death he has destroyed death and by his rising to life he has restored to us eternal life.” Holy Communion One affirms that God’s only Son Jesus which was given “to suffer death upon the Cross for our redemption; who made there (by his one oblation of himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world; and did institute and command us to continue, a perpetual memory of that his precious death until his coming again.”

⁴⁵*Response* pp31 Although this present study is necessarily restricted to the eucharist the inter-relationship between baptism, eucharist and ministry has been borne in my throughout.

⁴⁶*Response* pp31-32.

CHAPTER THREE PART 4 (3) THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND RESPONSE TO THE FINAL REPORT OF THE ANGLICAN-ROMAN CATHOLIC INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION.

In commenting upon the eucharistic text the Church of England's *Response* noted that ARCIC had adopted a method different from the one used by the Faith and Order Commission in the *Lima Text*.¹ The latter statement was a more comprehensive one on the understanding of the eucharist while, in the *Windsor Statement* ARCIC devoted attention to two main areas of past difference: the relation of the eucharist to the sacrifice of Christ; and the presence of Christ in the eucharist.² The *Lima Text* provided an important background against which to set the 'substantial agreement' reached in the ARCIC statement.

EUCCHARIST AND SACRIFICE

It is affirmed that the *Windsor Statement*, like the *Lima Text* could hardly have stressed more emphatically that Christ's sacrifice on Calvary was once-for-all.³ At the same time the text insisted that the atoning work of Christ is both proclaimed and made effective in the Church in the present through God's gift of the eucharist, the biblical word *anamnesis*, memorial, being used to describe the relation between the once-for-all sacrifice of Christ on Calvary and the eucharist.⁴ It is stated that although in the past some discussion of *anamnesis* had appeared to go far in the direction of suggesting either that Calvary is repeated, or that the worshippers, rather than the Holy Spirit in the Church, make effective the benefits of Christ's sacrifice through their act of remembering, it was believed that ARCIC had been careful to guard against both of these dangers.⁵ The *Response* affirms that in using *anamnesis* to describe the eucharistic sacrifice ARCIC was consonant with the faith of Anglicans as witnessed to by the liturgical texts of the Church of England.⁶

It is affirmed that it is in the light of the biblical concept of *anamnesis* that the assertion that "(Christ's members) ...enter into the movement of his self-offering"⁷. The *Response* acknowledges that some had found this statement problematic, but maintains that the words of the *Windsor Statement* and the Elucidation imply a solidarity of Christ with his Church and the Christians in Christ whereby in our whole Christian life we participate in his self-offering to the Father, sacramentally expressed in the eucharist.⁸ It is stated that our relation to the Father is grounded in the Son's relation to his Father and comes to perfection through our union with the Son and his relation to the Father. Christ's action is held to be all-sufficient and inclusive and [worshippers] are drawn into the Son's relation to the Father as God's adopted children. Indeed, it is stated, that it is through baptism that we are incorporated into Christ and are joined him in his death, resurrection and ascension and therefore with his self-offering to the Father. We do not believe that we make any intercession apart from that which we make in, with and through Christ. It is acknowledged that there are differences of emphasis among Anglicans, and these are outlined.⁹

In a further elucidation the *Response* says¹⁰,

This offering of ourselves finds its actual liturgical expression in the celebration of the same Eucharist which is the effectual proclamation of God's mighty act in Jesus. Just as God accepted Jesus' self-offering on the cross, so he accepts the duty and service of the church in the eucharist, because of that one and unrepeatable sacrifice. There is, therefore, an irrevocable connection between the once-for-all

sacrifice of Christ and the worship of the church, the eucharist both stemming from and being made effective by Christ's self offering. It is in this sense that the church is drawn into the self offering of Christ.

Attention is drawn in the *Response* to similar thinking to be found in the Roman Catholic-Lutheran dialogue in *The Eucharist* 1978¹¹, and in the Anglican-Reformed dialogue, *God's Reign and our Unity*¹².

EUCCHARIST AND PRESENCE

The *Response* draws attention to the disquiet that was felt by some Anglicans over what the text appeared to them to be saying about the presence of Christ, particularly as this was expressed in par 6 of the *Windsor Statement*, 'Communion with Christ in the eucharist presupposes his true presence, effectually signified by the bread and wine which, in this mystery become his body and blood'¹³. This, it is said, was not followed by any statement of how the bread and wine became his body and blood: indeed the weight of the text is upon the reality of the presence and not upon the notion of how change takes place. The word *transubstantiation* is not employed in the text but is referred to in an explanatory footnote affirming that the term should be seen as affirming the *fact* of Christ's presence and of the mysterious and radical nature of how change takes place¹⁴.

Despite the following assertion that "in contemporary Roman Catholic theology it is not understood as explaining *how* the change takes place, there were those who are concerned that the use of "become" and "radical change" were to be understood in a material sense and therefore made it doubtful whether the Windsor statement could be described as Anglican teaching. Attention was drawn to this in the official response of the Church of England (*Response by the Church of England to the agreed statements by the Anglican Roman Catholic international commission.*)¹⁵

The Elucidation has, however, made the intention of the Windsor statement clear. It states what is not meant¹⁵,

Becoming does not here imply material change. Nor does the liturgical use of the word implying that the bread and wine become Christ's body and blood in such a way that in the Eucharistic celebration His presence is limited to the consecrated elements. It does not imply that Christ becomes present in the Eucharist in the same manner that he was present in his earthly life. It does not imply that is *becoming* follows the physical laws of this work.

Rather, "*become*" can only be understood within the concept of the "sacramental order"; that is, that order in which the realities of faith, which are real themselves independently of the existence of the faith of the believer, become present in visible and tangible realities of the earthly order, and are apprehended by faith¹⁶.

The *Response* affirms that it is sufficient and faithful to the belief of the church through the ages to uphold the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist and his body and blood truly received in the bread and wine without any further agreement on the mode of that presence in the elements. It says, "As Anglicans, we are glad that, as in our own liturgical texts, no one theory of change is being set forward in the *Final report* but rather the bread is broken, wine poured out, in representation of Christ Paschal sacrifice and we receive them not as mere bread and wine but as the body and blood of Christ. Hence we believe that in this ARCIC is consonant with the faith of Anglicans and with the two principal emphases contained within our tradition."¹⁷

RESERVATION AND VENERATION

In the *Elucidation* both reservation and veneration are seen as acceptable only when understood as an extension of the eucharist itself.¹⁸ The *Response* affirms that there is no disagreement that consecration of the elements is for reception in communion, and that the one we adore in the eucharist is the Saviour himself as he comes to us in the sacrament of his body and blood, the difference lying between “those who fear that the link between reservation and communion is weakened if the elements are used as vehicles for the adoration of Christ apart from communion and those who see the adoration of Christ (not, of course, of the elements apart from Christ) as an enrichment of their devotion to Christ who comes to us in the eucharist.”¹⁹ The *Response* emphasizes that Anglicans require the practice of consuming any of the eucharistic elements not needed for communion.

The conclusion reached by the authors of the *Response* is that the *Windsor Statement* together with its *Elucidation* “has reached agreement on the two essential points where Anglicans and Roman Catholics have diverged in the past, namely on the relation of the eucharist to the sacrifice of Christ and on the understanding of the presence of Christ in the eucharist.” They affirm that they can say with the Commission, “this is the Christian faith of the Eucharist”. Moreover, they believe the *Final Report* on the Eucharist to be “consonant in substance with the faith of Anglicans”.²⁰

However, they make one reservation namely that they would have liked to have seen emphasized somewhere in the agreement the relationship between the eucharist and the world.²¹

The entire *Response* was intended as a follow-up in depth to an earlier response of the Church of England entitled, perhaps rather confusingly in the circumstances, *The Response of the Church of England to the ARCIC Statements*, GS 394, CIO, 1979. It was followed in turn by a publication of the Board for Mission and Unity of the General Synod of the Church of England, © The Central Board of Finance of the Church of England entitled *The Church of England's Response to BEM & ARCIC, Supplementary Report* containing both Diocesan voting on all the issues involved (not just the eucharist) and motions which were to come before the Church of England's General Synod, which were in general favourable to BEM and ARCIC. This *Supplementary Report*, although interesting in relation to the Church of England, adds little to the theological discussion in the document examined and summarized above. It is clear that the endorsement in *Towards a Church of England Response* of the theology of the eucharist in the ACIC Final Report and the subsequent *Elucidation* goes a good deal beyond the cautious and even critical treatment of the issues in the Church of Ireland as contained in the relevant C of I report, entitled *The Response of the General Synod of the Church of Ireland to the Final Report of ARCIC-I*, May 1986, APCK/OUP 1987. Most of these documents are out of print and very hard to obtain, and it is for this reason that the present study has, as far as is practical in the circumstances, summed up their contents using their own words as acknowledged in the text.

In commenting upon the eucharistic text the Church of England's *Response* noted that ARCIC had adopted a method different from the one used by the Faith and Order Commission in the *Lima Text*.¹ The latter statement was a more comprehensive one on the understanding of the eucharist while, in the *Windsor Statement* ARCIC devoted attention to two main areas of past difference: the relation of the eucharist to the sacrifice

of Christ; and the presence of Christ in the eucharist.² The *Lima Text* provided an important background against which to set the 'substantial agreement' reached in the ARCIC statement.

EUCCHARIST AND SACRIFICE

It is affirmed that the *Windsor Statement*, like the *Lima Text* could hardly have stressed more emphatically that Christ's sacrifice on Calvary was once-for-all.³ At the same time the text insisted that the atoning work of Christ is both proclaimed and made effective in the Church in the present through God's gift of the eucharist, the biblical word *anamnesis*, memorial, being used to describe the relation between the once-for-all sacrifice of Christ on Calvary and the eucharist.⁴ It is stated that although in the past some discussion of *anamnesis* had appeared to go far in the direction of suggesting either that Calvary is repeated, or that the worshippers, rather than the Holy Spirit in the Church, make effective the benefits of Christ's sacrifice through their act of remembering, it was believed that ARCIC had been careful to guard against both of these dangers.⁵ The *Response* affirms that in using *anamnesis* to describe the eucharistic sacrifice ARCIC was consonant with the faith of Anglicans as witnessed to by the liturgical texts of the Church of England.⁶

It is affirmed that it is in the light of the biblical concept of *anamnesis* that the assertion that "(Christ's members) ...enter into the movement of his self-offering"⁷. The *Response* acknowledges that some had found this statement problematic, but maintains that the words of the *Windsor Statement* and the Elucidation imply a solidarity of Christ with his Church and the Christians in Christ whereby in our whole Christian life we participate in his self-offering to the Father, sacramentally expressed in the eucharist.⁸ It is stated that our relation to the Father is grounded in the Son's relation to his Father and comes to perfection through our union with the Son and his relation to the Father. Christ's action is held to be all-sufficient and inclusive and [worshippers] are drawn into the Son's relation to the Father as God's adopted children. Indeed, it is stated, that it is through baptism that we are incorporated into Christ and are joined him in his death, resurrection and ascension and therefore with his self-offering to the Father. We do not believe that we make any intercession apart from that which we make in, with and through Christ. It is acknowledged that there are differences of emphasis among Anglicans, and these are outlined.⁹

In a further elucidation the *Response* says¹⁰,

This offering of ourselves finds its actual liturgical expression in the celebration of the same Eucharist which is the effectual proclamation of God's mighty act in Jesus. Just as God accepted Jesus' self-offering on the cross, so he accepts the duty and service of the church in the eucharist, because of that one and unrepeatable sacrifice. There is, therefore, an irrevocable connection between the once-for-all sacrifice of Christ and the worship of the church, the eucharist both stemming from and being made effective by Christ's self offering. It is in this sense that the church is drawn into the self offering of Christ.

Attention is drawn in the *Response* to similar thinking to be found in the Roman Catholic-Lutheran dialogue in *The Eucharist* 1978¹¹, and in the Anglican-Reformed dialogue, *God's Reign and our Unity*¹².

EUCHARIST AND PRESENCE

The *Response* draws attention to the disquiet that was felt by some Anglicans over what the text appeared to them to be saying about the presence of Christ, particularly as this was expressed in par 6 of the *Windsor Statement*, ‘Communion with Christ in the eucharist presupposes his true presence, effectually signified by the bread and wine which, in this mystery become his body and blood’¹³. This, it is said, was not followed by any statement of how the bread and wine became his body and blood: indeed the weight of the text is upon the reality of the presence and not upon the notion of how change takes place. The word *transubstantiation* is not employed in the text but is referred to in an explanatory footnote affirming that the term should be seen as affirming the *fact* of Christ’s presence and of the mysterious and radical nature of how change takes place¹⁴.

Despite the following assertion that “in contemporary Roman Catholic theology it is not understood as explaining *how* the change takes place, there were those who are concerned that the use of “become” and “radical change” were to be understood in a material sense and therefore made it doubtful whether the Windsor statement could be described as Anglican teaching. Attention was drawn to this in the official response of the Church of England (*Response by the Church of England to the agreed statements by the Anglican Roman Catholic international commission.*)¹⁵

The Elucidation has, however, made the intention of the Windsor statement clear. It states what is not meant¹⁵,

Becoming does not here imply material change. Nor does the liturgical use of the word implying that the bread and wine become Christ’s body and blood in such a way that in the Eucharistic celebration His presence is limited to the consecrated elements. It does not imply that Christ becomes present in the Eucharist in the same manner that he was present in his earthly life. It does not imply that is *becoming* follows the physical laws of this work.

Rather, “*become*” can only be understood within the concept of the “sacramental order”; that is, that order in which the realities of faith, which are real themselves independently of the existence of the faith of the believer, become present in visible and tangible realities of the earthly order, and are apprehended by faith¹⁶.

The *Response* affirms that it is sufficient and faithful to the belief of the church through the ages to uphold the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist and his body and blood truly received in the bread and wine without any further agreement on the mode of that presence in the elements. It says, “As Anglicans, we are glad that, as in our own liturgical texts, no one theory of change is being set forward in the *Final report* but rather the bread is broken, wine poured out, in representation of Christ Paschal sacrifice and we receive them not as mere bread and wine but as the body and blood of Christ. Hence we believe that in this ARCIC is consonant with the faith of Anglicans and with the two principal emphases contained within our tradition.”¹⁷

RESERVATION AND VENERATION

In the *Elucidation* both reservation and veneration are seen as acceptable only when understood as an extension of the eucharist itself.¹⁸ The *Response* affirms that there is no disagreement that consecration of the elements is for reception in communion, and that the one we adore in the eucharist is the Saviour himself as he comes to us in the sacrament of his body and blood, the difference lying between “those who fear that the

link between reservation and communion is weakened if the elements are used as vehicles for the adoration of Christ apart from communion and those who see the adoration of Christ (not, of course, of the elements apart from Christ) as an enrichment of their devotion to Christ who comes to us in the eucharist.”¹⁹ The *Response* emphasizes that Anglicans require the practice of consuming any of the eucharistic elements not needed for communion.

The conclusion reached by the authors of the *Response* is that the *Windsor Statement* together with its *Elucidation* ‘has reached agreement on the two essential points where Anglicans and Roman Catholics have diverged in the past, namely on the relation of the eucharist to the sacrifice of Christ and on the understanding of the presence of Christ in the eucharist.’ They affirm that they can say with the Commission, ‘this is the Christian faith of the Eucharist’. Moreover, they believe the *Final Report* on the Eucharist to be “consonant in substance with the faith of Anglicans”.²⁰

However, they make one reservation namely that they would have liked to have seen emphasized somewhere in the agreement the relationship between the eucharist and the world.²¹

The entire *Response* was intended as a follow-up in depth to an earlier response of the Church of England entitled, perhaps rather confusingly in the circumstances, *The Response of the Church of England to the ARCIC Statements*, GS 394, CIO, 1979. It was followed in turn by a publication of the Board for Mission and Unity of the General Synod of the Church of England, © The Central Board of Finance of the Church of England entitled *The Church of England’s Response to BEM & ARCIC, Supplementary Report* containing both Diocesan voting on all the issues involved (not just the eucharist) and motions which were to come before the Church of England’s General Synod, which were in general favourable to BEM and ARCIC. This *Supplementary Report*, although interesting in relation to the Church of England, adds little to the theological discussion in the document examined and summarized above. It is clear that the endorsement in *Towards a Church of England Response* of the theology of the eucharist in the ACIC Final Report and the subsequent *Elucidation* goes a good deal beyond the cautious and even critical treatment of the issues in the Church of Ireland as contained in the relevant C of I report, entitled *The Response of the General Synod of the Church of Ireland to the Final Report of ARCIC-1*, May 1986, APCK/OUP 1987. Most of these documents are out of print and very hard to obtain, and it is for this reason that the present study has, as far as is practical in the circumstances, summed up their contents using their own words as acknowledged in the text.

NOTES ON CHAPTER THREE PART FOUR (3)

¹*Response*, p.69.

²Ibid.

³Ibid, Par 183.

⁴*Response*, pp69-70, Par 184. It is noteworthy that although the biblical concept of *anamnesis* features not only here but in other approaches to the understanding of the eucharist, detailed accounts of its appearance and use and its background in Hebrew texts are rare. A helpful linguistic analysis appears in D. Gregg, *Anamnesis in the Eucharist*, Grove Liturgy Study No 5, Grove Books, 1976, and a critical examination of this may be found in Chapter One of the present writer's B.D. Dissertation, "The meaning and role of the Anamnesis in the Anglican Liturgical Tradition", unpublished, 1979. There is a copy in the Library of Trinity College Dublin. There is a much wider study in Max Thurian, *The Eucharistic Memorial*, in two volumes, dealing respectively with the Old and New Testaments and stressing the sacrificial significance associated with the concept. These were published in translation by Lutterworth in 1960 and 1961. A recent study by Peter Atkins, entitled *Memory and Liturgy — the Place of Memory in the Composition and Practice of Liturgy*, Ashgate 2004. This has little to say on the sacrificial aspect, but as a general study of the central role of memory in the liturgy and spirituality of the church is helpful and valuable.

⁵Ibid, Par 184. One has to go to great lengths to find any authoritative teaching that there is in any sense a repetition of Calvary, although some loose expressions, may have given rise to such a concept. And on the other hand the role of the Holy Spirit in the eucharistic memorial may sometimes have been neglected. It is however, the case, that in the eucharist the once for all sacrifice of Christ on Calvary's cross is remembered before God in the thanksgiving and intercessions for the benefits which flow from his offering and this is necessarily something which is done by those who are obeying the command of Jesus to "do this" in remembrance of him. Within this matrix is contained the irreducible essence of the eucharistic sacrifice. ⁶This confident assertion might be questioned by those, mostly Conservative Evangelical scholars and churchmen, who tend to have problems with anything more than a minimal approach to the understanding of the "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving" Even the altogether excellent study by Christopher J. Cocksworth, *Evangelical Eucharistic Thought in the Church of England*, C.U.P. 1993 tends to skirt around the issue.

The use of the expression, "enter into the movement of his self-offering" may be described as a "hostage to fortune" on the part of ARCIC, as it has given rise to almost endless debate. Julian Charley, the sole Evangelical representative on the ARCIC 1 team, said in his theological commentary,

Christ's offering of himself to the Father provides a pattern for sacrificial self-offering by us; but it does more than that, it is also God's inescapable demand upon us for our self-offering and the eucharist communicates the demand to us. In this sense the church "enters into the movement of his self-offering."

Julian W. Charley, *The Anglican-Roman Catholic Agreement on the Eucharist — The 1971 Anglican-Roman Catholic Statement on the Eucharist with An Historical Introduction and Theological Commentary*, 1971, Grove Booklet on Ministry and Worship No. 1, p.18. ⁸*Response*, Par 185, p.70

⁹*Response*, Par 186, pp70-71.

¹⁰*Response*, Par 187, p.71

¹¹"Response, Par 188, p.71.

¹²Ibid.

¹³The word "become" is characteristic of modern Roman Catholic use (see the Eucharistic Prayers, Two, Three and Four". The formula "be to us" is the equivalent in modern Anglican use, as for example in Eucharistic Prayer Three in the 2004 Prayer Book (p.217),

Holy Spirit, giver of life,
come upon us now;
may this bread and wine be to us
the body and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ.

The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments... according to the use of the Church of Ireland, The Columba Press, 2004.

In the Church of England's, *Common Worship*, Order One, on p.185, it says in Prayer A,

Accept our praises, heavenly Father,
through your Son our Saviour Jesus Christ,
as we follow his example and obey his command,
grant that by the power of the Holy Spirit
these gifts of bread and wine
may be to us his body and his blood.

See also Prayers B, G and H.

Common Worship — Services and Prayers for the Church of England, Church House Publishing, 2000.

Only one of six eucharistic prayers in *The Book of Alternative Services of the Anglican Church of Canada*. In Eucharistic Prayer 6 on page 209 it says,

Father,
we pray that in your goodness and mercy
your Holy Spirit may descend upon us,
and upon these gifts,
sanctifying them and showing them
to be holy gifts for your holy people,
the bread of life and the cup of salvation,
the body and blood of your Son Jesus Christ.

The Book of Alternative Services of the Anglican Church of Canada, Anglican Book Centre, Toronto, 1985.

Ecumenically, the *Methodist Worship Book*, a fixed formula among the seasonal and ordinary orders for holy communion is,

Send down your Holy Spirit
that these gifts of bread and wine
may be for us the body and blood of Christ.

In other eucharistic prayers belonging to the various churches, there is either no corresponding formula, or a rather different formulation of the relationship of the bread and wine to the Body and Blood of Christ, or the concept is implied or understood but not specifically expressed.

¹⁴This is very much the position of classic Anglican divines. For example, John Bramhall, Archbishop of Armagh, 1661-1663 who said the Anglicans of his day rested in the words of Christ, "This is my Body" — "leaving the manner to Him that made the Sacrament". In another place he quotes the medieval canonist Durandus, "Motum sentimus, modum nescimus, Praesentiam credimus"*. This, he says "was the belief of the Primitive Church, this was the Faith of the ancient Fathers, who were never acquainted with these modern questions *de modo* which edify not..." The position presupposed in this present study is that the declaration of Christ is, in the first instance, a statement of significance — "this is what the bread and wine in this context signify". However, a statement of significance can have ontological implications in that a change in meaning, a change in purpose, and a change in function and role can imply a change in what is designated, a change in what something *is* even where, as in the case of the bread and wine of the eucharist, the physical characteristics are unaltered.

*The emotion we feel, the manner we do not know, the Presence we believe".

¹⁵*The Final Report*, p.21.

¹⁶*Response*, Par 191, p.72

¹⁷*Response*, Par 192, p.73

¹⁸*Response*, Par 193, p.73

¹⁹*Response*, Par 193, pp73-74

CHAPTER THREE PART 4(4) THE RESPONSE OF THE CHURCH OF IRELAND AND OTHER ANGLICAN CHURCHES TO BEM [AND ARCIC]

It is not possible, with the resources available for the present writer to do more than sample. In the case of ARCIC, the Church of Ireland and Church of England responses has been dealt with above and are not reproduced here. With regard to the other Anglican Churches published material on ARCIC, insofar as it exists, is not to hand, although the overall Anglican response as witnessed to by the Reports of the relevant Lambeth Conferences together with those of the Anglican Consultative Council (meeting in between the Conferences) are considered below in Part Five of the current chapter.¹

With regard to Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry (BEM) some Anglican Responses, including that of the Church of Ireland appeared in *Churches respond to BEM* edited by Max Thurian, the first two volumes of which were published as "Faith and Order Papers" 129 and 132 by the World Council of Churches in 1986, namely,

The Church of Ireland

Anglican Church of the Southern Cone

Anglican Church of Australia

Anglican Church of Canada

Scottish Episcopal Church

Episcopal Church, USA

Church of North India (Ecumenical)

Church of South India (Ecumenical)

Priority will be given to the Church of Ireland's own response, and, in relation to the others a summary of the most relevant comments.

The Church of Ireland

The Church of Ireland's response may be found in *Churches respond to BEM* pp61-79 and also as Appendix C of the Standing Committee Report in the Journal of the General Synod of the Church of Ireland pp90-99, where it is described as "Comments" by the Standing Committee. There is no specific resolution relating to it in the record of proceedings so it would appear that it was included by implication by the approval of the Standing Committee Report.²

What is particularly helpful in the Church of Ireland approach is the manner in which it sets BEM within the context of the ongoing ecumenical ecclesiastical context. This introduction taken together with specific comments on the eucharist is sufficiently significant to be reproduced verbatim below (and identified by being enclosed between two sets of asterisks).³ However, helpful this official Church of Ireland statement may be, it is not itself entirely immune from comment and criticism as in the reflections that follow the reproduction of the statement below:

.....
To put Lima in perspective, we need to look both backwards and forwards. In the first instance, it will be seen as representing the fruit of over 50 years of patient ecumenical study, beginning from the first Faith and Order Conference held in Lausanne in 1927. But

this statement is not the terminus to which interchurch dialogue has been striving. Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry are not simply matters of doctrinal concern; they touch deeply on the whole life, worship and witness of the church. Lima therefore represents a stage an important stage — in via towards the final goal when all the churches will not only have achieved doctrinal agreement but will have reached the point of living and acting in visible unity. It must help us to look deeply at the doctrine and practice of our own church as the condition of contributing positively in an ecumenical dimension. Although it describes itself as an agreed statement, Lima is not intended to be a formula of agreement, to which all the parties involved can fully subscribe. In this respect it differs from bilateral statements such as the ARCIC report. As the preface admits, and as any church member will immediately realize, total consensus is not yet possible between all the participating bodies. The WCC consists of some 300 members, representing a wide range of confessional traditions. The Faith and Order Commission also includes theologians of the Roman Catholic and other churches which do not belong to the WCC itself.

The purpose of Lima may therefore be regarded primarily as *descriptive* i.e. it sets out side by side the differing convictions and practices of the churches in regard to Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry. It aims also to draw out the considerable degree of theological convergence which has emerged, and it underlines the fact the churches, even where there is a wide diversity of practice, have already reached "a large measure of theological agreement".

That's theologians of such widely differing traditions should be able to speak so harmoniously about Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry is unprecedented in the modern ecumenical movement (p. ix)

The text of the document indicates the major areas of convergence; it appeals for them to be recognised and developed as a means of growing together into the deeper experience of Christian unity.

These convergences give assurance despite much diversity in theological expression the churches have much in common understanding of the faith. The resultant text aims to become part of a faithful and sufficient reflection of the common Christian Tradition on essential elements of Christian communion. In the process of growing together in mutual trust, the churches must develop these doctrinal convergences step by step, until they are finally able to declare together that they are living in communion with one another in continuity with the apostles and the teachings of the universal church.

This Lima text represents the significance theological convergence Faith and Order has discerned and formulated.

Lima, however, is realistic enough to recognise that many difficulties in belief and practice still need to be resolved. These differences are indicated chiefly in the *commentaries* that are added alongside the text. This raises an important question of the church in formulating an official response. What is the status of the commentaries? Are they an integral part of the total document? Do they carry an equal weight with the text itself?

For example, some Anglicans may find difficulty with the commentary on the Eucharist (8 p.11)

It is in the light of the significance of the Eucharist as intercession that references to the Eucharist in Theology as "propitiatory sacrifice" may be understood. The understanding is that there is only one expiation, that of the unique sacrifice of the cross, made actual in the eucharist and presented before the Father in the intercession of Christ and of the church for all humanity.

In the light of the biblical conception of memorial, all churches might want to review the old controversies about sacrifice and deepen their understanding of the reasons why other traditions than their own have either used or rejected this term.

This committee itself finds no objection to this viewpoint; indeed it welcomes the attempt to find rapprochement between Catholic and Protestant understandings of the eucharist. But while drawing attention to such a statement on the grounds that it might not find unanimous approval, we will again point out that it belongs not to the text itself, but is one of the commentaries. As to the text itself, because it is largely descriptive in character and concerned with theological convergence there is little or nothing in it with which we would want positively to disagree. Such reservations as we would have centre round details of emphasis. For example, Baptism, Section 1, dealing with the institution of baptism in the New Testament records, concludes with the sentence; "The churches today continue this practice as a rite of commitment to the Lord who bestows his grace upon his people. We would not disagree with this statement but we would seek the primary emphasis on baptism in the New Testament as representing our Lord's commitment to his church rather than our commitment. But the chapter as a whole represents a balanced theology of baptism, and all that we wish to infer here is that there are certain statements with which we would not be entirely happy, if taken out of context.

We have begun this report by indicating that certain reservations arise in mind, but we would wish to stress that these are of a minor character. We find Lima a very positive document, admirable in its comprehensiveness, its honesty of approach, and its economy of style. As an effort in reconciliation, it deserves serious consideration. It does not attempt to cover over differences, nor is it superficial in searching for areas of agreement. Lima claims that the basis for all joint examination of differences is "the tradition of the gospel testified in Scripture, transmitted in and by the church through the power of the Holy Spirit". This is the stance of the Preamble to our own Constitution which says that our doctrinal criteria are primarily scripture and the profession of faith of the primitive Church. It is also worth noting that the ARCIC dialogue is "founded in the Scriptures and on the ancient common tradition" (Common Declaration of Pope Paul the VI and Archbishop Ramsey of Canterbury). Thus there is established the basic pattern of belief and practice, and as it is on this basis that convergence between differing theological viewpoints begins to appear. Much of the strength of Lima seems to us to lie in its summaries of the New Testament evidence. These provide a concise conspectus of New Testament theology, that should prove valuable to clergy, students, teachers and others.

One other feature in Lima's methodology is noteworthy. It recognizes that the controversies between the churches on baptism, eucharist and ministry are deep rooted in history; they were formulated in the language and categories of the past. Lima believes that many of our historical controversy are susceptible to reconciliation through the changes in the atmosphere of Christian life in the 20th century. As the churches seek to carry out the task of mission and renewal in the world, they are asking how their patterns

of baptism, eucharist and ministry are fitted to meet this task. Further, with the notable development of biblical and patristic studies, liturgical renewal, and not least with the ecumenical progress, many of our former controversies are being seen in a new light.

In other words what Lima appears to say to the churches is that as we live in a time of change, it is also a time of the ecumenical opportunity. Hence the urgency for the church to recognize the importance of this document and respond to it not only in an official written statement but at the deeper levels of the churches life.

Eucharist

In this chapter the Eucharist is expanded in a manner that is characteristic in contemporary theological and liturgical circles. Drawing its inspiration from recent biblical, patristic and liturgical scholarship, it is eirenic in its approach and successfully transcends the old divisive controversies. In the broad scope of its exposition, it should extend the eucharistic vision of many church members. By the same token it is possible that many will find its general approach too cerebral and too remote from the sacramental experience of the ordinary church member. It includes much that is essentially theological interpretation, not directly based on the evidence of the New Testament. While rightly drawing out the centrality of the eucharist Lima seems to be in **danger of claiming for it much that is to be predicated of the Christian life in general.** Once again we would not wish positively to dissociate ourselves from the statements of the text, but we think that in this case there is a degree of over-emphasis that would be alien to the mind of the average congregation.

The Chapter begins with a brief survey of the New Testament evidence. One important text that appears to be overlooked in accordance with the contemporary trend is First Corinthians 11:26 — the Eucharist as a proclaiming of the Lord's death - which would appear to be central in the Prayer Book interpretation. Also in line with contemporary exegesis much is made of the link between the eucharist and the other meals of Jesus during his earthly life - a link which seems to us to have minimal significance in our understanding of the sacrament.

Lima attempts to avoid the old controversies that centred around the categories of presence and sacrifice. It does so by concentrating attention on the Eucharist as anamnesis or memorial. Anamnesis is seen as having a dynamic significance. It is not only calling to mind of what is past. It is the "living and effective sign of his sacrifice, accomplished once for all on the cross and still operative on behalf of all humankind". Christ himself is present in this anamnesis so that the Eucharist is essentially the action of Christ himself. (Similarly the ARCIC report insists on Christ himself being present *and active* in the Eucharistic celebration. Lima lays stress on the unique and unrepeatable character of Christ's sacrifice. (cf. again ARCIC). We cannot think that it has been entirely successful in reinterpreting the Catholic description of the Eucharist as propitiatory sacrifice (see above).

Anamnesis also refers to the content of the preached Word. The celebration of the eucharist includes and is reinforced by the proclamation of the Word.

An important section of this chapter is devoted to the role of the Holy Spirit. It appeals for restoration in the liturgy of the epiclesis or invocation of the Spirit on the community *and* the elements. Some of us hold that this goes beyond our tradition and is unnecessary. The suggestion that the whole action of the Eucharist has an epiclectic character would seem

to be more in line with the emphasis in our own formularies on the *spiritual* character of the service as a whole.

We find much to approve in the way that Lima keeps the Eucharist firmly anchored in the reality of the church's life in the world. The community reconciled in the eucharist becomes in turn the instrument of reconciliation. The sharing of the eucharist challenges us to fight against injustice and oppression. The love of Christ which we experience sends us out in the service of human need.

The final section on the celebration of the Eucharist includes a list of the elements that might be expected to be included in the liturgy. The Order for the Celebration of the Holy Communion in the Alternative Prayer Book 1984 measures up satisfactorily to the requirements laid down.

It is affirmed that the true president at every Eucharist is Christ himself and that in most churches this presidency is signified by an ordained minister. Why we find that there is much to approve in this paragraph (29) we should require it to be given stronger definition, together with some reference to episcopal ordination.

The commentary on paragraph 28 refers to the use at the eucharist in some churches of local food and drink rather than the bread and wine commanded by Christ. We cannot accept the suggestion that under normal conditions this might be a feature which could be regarded as changeable according to the decision of the church.

In assessing the first part of the Church of Ireland comment one would wish to point out that although the Statement is *descriptive* it also indicates norms of theological understanding derived from Scripture and Tradition, which may be regarded as having an authority derived from their expression of a common understanding and also their inner coherence which brings in the use of Reason.⁵ With regard to the *Commentaries* published with the Lima document these may be regarded as explanatory of the understanding of those who have written them. Neither the text of Lima nor the derivative commentaries can be held to be fully authoritative for any particular churches except to the extent to they refer either to what is already held authoritatively by them or that come to be fully endorsed by the authorities competent to make such decisions within such bodies.⁶

With regard to the second part of the C of I document, namely that relating in particular to the eucharist, it seems odd to criticize the Lima document for being "too cerebral" and "too remote from the sacramental experience of the ordinary church member".⁷ This, it appears to the present writer, to fall short of recognizing the integral relationship between theology and liturgy in the life of the church. The maxim *Lex orandi lex credendi* indicates that liturgy itself is packed with theological implications so that the way one prays is the way one believes, and the opposite, namely, *lex credendi lex orandi* indicative of the way in which liturgy embodies the faith of the church is equally significant. The present writer's doctoral thesis, *The Theological Implications of Recent Liturgical Revision in the Church of Ireland*, OU, 1987, pp829 specifically attempts to explore this relationship, particularly in relation to *The Alternative Prayer Book, 1984*, which in ways that related to the sacramental experience of the ordinary church member was of profound importance for both theology and praxis. The appearance of the 2004 edition of the *Book of Common Prayer* carried this a stage further. It is hard to avoid an impression of a not-unusual

prejudice against systematic thinking on the part of even senior members of the Church of Ireland.⁸

With regard to the Pauline interpretation of the eucharist, in 1 Cor 11:26, the concept of "proclamation" is prominent in Eucharistic Prayer Two in the current Prayer Book ("An Alternative Order" in *The Alternative Prayer Book, 1984*)⁹ in which not only does the word "proclaim" appear in a prominent position but the prayer as a whole contains a rehearsal of the mighty acts of God in Christ. It is not clear to what extent anything comparable to this exists in Holy Communion One (the traditional Prayer Book rite). The reference in what follows to the "average congregation" seems to overlook the possibility that the congregation itself may need to be more fully informed and to experience of formation in an improved eucharistic teaching and practice.¹⁰

With regard to possible solutions to the issue of a "propitiatory" sacrifice, this should probably be regarded as additional to and to some extent separate from the general case of a tradition that the eucharist is to be regarded as a sacrifice which goes back to the earliest days of the Christian church and may be said to be implicit in the eucharistic words of the Lord Jesus.¹¹ It is difficult to find any significant examples of a non-sacrificial understanding of the eucharist in the first fifteen hundred years of the church's existence (with the possible exception of Minucius Felix, who, however, was speaking of the relationship between the church's offering of worship and that of animal sacrifice and so has nothing to do with the matter under discussion)¹².

With regard to the role of the Holy Spirit in the eucharistic celebration the Church of Ireland comment seems in some danger of perpetuating a significant fault in the traditional Prayer Book rite, namely that there is no mention of the Holy Spirit whatsoever in the Prayer of Consecration, which is consequently Binitarian rather than Trinitarian¹³. A Trinitarian Church must have Trinitarian liturgies, and to have no mention either of thanksgiving in a *Eucharistic* (thanksgiving) Prayer, as in Holy Communion One, or of the Third Person of the Holy Trinity are grave faults indeed." It is fortunate that such thinking is not to be found in the modern forms of the Eucharistic Prayers in the Prayer Book of 2004, all of which have a Trinitarian structure and specific mention of the Holy Spirit in the third section of each Prayer. Indeed, the *Third Eucharistic Prayer* contains the unique feature of an addressing of each Person of the Holy Trinity directly and in turn and being brought up to the conclusion by an address of the "Father, Son and Holy Spirit, Blessed Trinity" in the totality of his triune Being.¹⁵

However, one can agree with the comment that the whole liturgy should have an epicleptic character, and this is to some extent underlined by the traditional opening of Anglican liturgies of the Eucharist with the Collect for Purity (now most commonly said collectively)⁶. There is a reference to the Holy Spirit in the doxologies of the post-communion prayers in Holy Communion One, and in the post communion prayer "Almighty God,..." in Holy Communion Two:⁷

**Almighty God,
we thank you for feeding us with the spiritual food
of the body and blood of your Son Jesus Christ.
Through him we offer you our souls and bodies
to be a living sacrifice.
Send us out in the power of your Spirit
to live and work to your praise and glory. Amen.**

And the blessing normally has a Trinitarian character.¹⁸

Anglican Church of the Southern Cone.¹⁹

This assessment, concentrating on what are deemed to be its weak points is highly critical of B.E.M. One concern is that over multilateral conversations which may lead to multiple interpretations, namely that each participant interprets the documents from his own perspective without reaching substantial agreement." However, without minimizing this difficulty it may be said that the eucharistic mystery is such that it attracts a variety of legitimate interpretations.²¹ Contemporary biblical scholarship draws attentions to the diverse theologies contained within the New Testament itself, but which may be said to be convergent on the disclosure of God in Christ.²² Diverse interpretations are not necessarily all wrong interpretations.

The critique also draws attention to the difficulty of dogmatic definitions in an era of philosophical pluralism and cultural diversifications. Such may well be the case but the exploration of common ground whose starting point is biblical and historical may well continue to be fruitful in the field of liturgical theology.²³ Those engaged in both bilateral and multilateral conversations between the churches often become aware of the far reaching significance of what they hold in common, even where serious divergences still persist. The document calls for "realism", stating correctly that Jesus Christ is the focus of all theological reflection but questioning whether, for example, Augustine and Luther shared the same faith. This is a good question, although not of immediate relevance to the matter under discussion, but the answer must be that the breadth of the liturgical and theological inheritance of the whole church is such that diverse theologies do not necessarily undermine the commonality of the faith.²⁴

There are complaints about the methodology used in B.E.M. and a distinction is drawn between "descriptive metaphysics" and "prescriptive metaphysics".²⁵ Undoubtedly there is much in the document that is descriptive, but it is descriptive of what those who belonged to the various churches at Lima regarded either as directly representative of their own understandings or tolerant of the diversity. An openness to what other Christians think and do is a pre-requisite for the ecumenical enterprise without necessarily implying a relativizing of the truth.

Historical considerations include a questioning of the hermeneutics of the New Testament quotations used in B.E.M. Clearly the question of context is important and one cannot assume that one can "read-off" biblical statements without any regard for the circumstances in which they originated.

The Cone document alleges that statements from different schools of thought may have been laid side by side without achieving a synthesis, e.g in the first two sentences in B2, "Baptism is the *sign* of new life... it *unites* the one baptized with Christ and with his people" It is asked, "How does a sign effect the union presupposed in the second sentence"? This is a surprising question given that that Thirty-nine Articles of Religion state specifically in Article 25:²⁶

Sacraments ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they be sure witnesses and *effectual signs of grace* (efficacia signa gratiae) and of God's good will towards us, *by the which* he doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen

and confirm our Faith in him.

And also, Article 27, *Of Baptism*²⁷

Baptism is not only a sign of profession, and mark of difference, whereby Christian men are discerned from other that be not christened, but it is also a sign of Regeneration or new Birth, whereby, *as by an instrument* (tanquam per instrumentum) they that receive Baptism rightly are grafted into the Church; the promises of forgiveness of sin, and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visible *signed and sealed* (visibilter obsignantur) faith is confirmed: and grace increased by virtue of prayer unto God.

The traditional Prayer Book rite of Baptism combines the subjective (faith) and the objective (grace), and so does Confirmation, in which, it has been said we come "to confirm" and we come "to be confirmed".²⁸ And so does the modern form to be found in the 2004 Prayer Book under the heading "Christian Initiation Two".²⁹

A similar line of approach may be found in relation to the eucharist.

Specifically on the eucharist the document questions the manner in which the different names for it are given since they have doctrinal implications for particular church traditions; the use of the five headings is questioned, and the use of "memorial" to translate "anamnesis". This is questionable as a careful study of the linguistic terms makes it probable that *eis anamnesin* is best taken as a Greek equivalent of *lezikkaron*. All the possible equivalents are in any case derivatives of the biblical root z k r which is the key "memory" word in Hebrew even if its various derivatives have slightly different associations and emphases, and, depending on context can mean everything from "being reminded of to "remembering before" all of which are thoroughly biblical and have a proper place in our understanding of the eucharistic memorial, including its sacrificial aspects.³⁰ The "Cone" document regards opposition to the practice of reservation for the purpose of adoration as non-negotiable, a position which may reflect a too circumscribed understanding of the doctrine of eucharistic consecration.³¹

The Anglican Church of Australia

The 1985 session of the general Synod of the Anglican Church of Australia gave consideration to a report on the WCC publication baptism Eucharist and Ministry and passed resolution 19/85 in the following terms³²

that the response to the baptism, Eucharist and Ministry document is reported to this general Synod be adopted as the official response of this church, and that it be forwarded to the world Council of churches faith and order commission, with notification to the Anglican consultative Council, and that the faith and order commission be further as to explore fully:

1. What is the relationship between Scripture, tradition and context in determining apostolic faith and practice?
2. In both ways is the Holy Spirit at work in creation i.e. in the physical world and what role does our material life, sacraments and the holy spirit play in the consummation of the kingdom?
3. Given the central collection and the New Testament between Christ's death and the rest and the Eucharist, how is the cross relate to - qualify all the other concerns

brought into the discussion of the Eucharist? The same question would apply to baptism.

It is noted that the preface of BEM indicates that the main text indicated the major areas of theological convergence; the added commentaries either indicating historical differences that had been overcome or identified disputed issues. It is stated that the Australian response was based principally upon the Text rather than the Commentary, but the authors said it must be noticed that the lying side-by-side of unresolved issues required response of a different kind to that which would be given to a statement which set out complete agreement between its compilers.³³

It was stated that the faith of the church through the ages could be recognised in BEM, though of course this statement was made perforce from an Anglican standpoint. Where BEM evoked special support, or appeared to require some modification, this was noted in the response.³⁴

Eucharist (paragraphs 12-18 in the response): It was stated,

12. Our response to the statement on the Eucharist is again one of general endorsement with qualifications as undernoted. In responding to this statement and noting the plurality of traditions within Anglicanism, we have, as mentioned in the Introduction, looked for those positions we preserve within our own church. The following general comments are made.
13. The question has been asked as to whether the significance of the Eucharist has been widened to such an extent, e.g., "The Great Thanksgiving to the Father for everything accomplished in creation, redemption and sanctification. For everything accomplished by God now in the church and in the world...", that the fundamental New Testament emphasis on the proclaiming of Christ's death has been obscured.³⁵
- 14 The weight placed on *anamnesis* (E.1, E.5 ff) needs examination in view of the unresolved discussion in New Testament studies on this word and its place in scriptural thought.³⁶
15. The place of the epiclesis needs further consideration. There are no explicit New Testament statements on this and the statement made in E.14 Commentary about "early liturgies" need some clarification as to the period and place of the liturgies there referred to. However, we recognise that within our own church there are those who would wish to see a greater epiclectic emphasis in the Eucharistic liturgy.³⁷
16. The presentation of the bread and wine has no explicit New Testament foundation. Again we note that there are those within our own church who would see the presentation or offertory as a significant part of Eucharistic worship.³⁸
- 17 As touching the Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, the Anglican tradition has encompassed the views of those who see Christ's presence is being specifically linked with the elements and those who see Christ's presence has been found in the faithful reception of those elements. This latter viewpoint does not appear to find expression in the E section of BEM, save, possibly, in E.15 and Commentary.³⁹
18. In this section as qualification to the general endorsement mentioned above, it is submitted that the points in the preceding paragraphs 15 - 17 need to be the subject of further theological reflection and discussion.

However, its conclusion the Australian document explicitly affirmed, "We recognize in this paper, subject to the comments made in this response, the faith of the Church throughout the ages. In particular we value its treatment of the plurality of Christian tradition with its many ambiguities and tensions."⁴⁰

This review by The Anglican Church of Australia is notable for its balance and fairness. With regard to the point made in §13 it may be noted that the principal Eucharistic Prayer in *An Australian Prayer Book, 1978* contains a comprehensive rehearsal of the mighty acts of God in Christ, beginning with creation all all things "through the eternal Word with the perfect sacrifice by which the Son and Saviour offered himself and died upon the cross for our redemption..."⁴¹ In the *anamnesis* this is set within the context of the resurrection and ascension and the expectation of his coming again⁴²:

Father, with this bread and this cup,
we do as our Saviour has commanded;
we celebrate the redemption he has won for us.
we proclaim his perfect sacrifice
made once for all upon the cross,
his mighty resurrection and glorious ascension:
and we look for his coming
to fulfil all things according to your will.

It may be seen that it is perfectly possible to retain the scriptural emphasis upon the centrality of the Saviour's death on the cross for us and for all people while at the same time setting it in its proper context of the totality of creation and redemption and the fullness of what God has done for us in Christ.

This order of service was adopted by the Church of Ireland and was incorporated as "An Alternative Order" within *The Alternative Prayer Book, 1984*, pp145-148, and later, with the seasonal additions that belonged to it, incorporated into the 2004 edition of *The Book of Common Prayer* as Eucharistic Prayer Two in Holy Communion Two (pp212-215).⁴³

The emphasis on the Offertory as representing the life and work of the congregation in the bringing of the bread and wine to the altar has tended to be downplayed in later developments in Eucharistic liturgies, Archbishop Michael Ramsey in a noted passage having drawn attention to the danger of Pelagianism.⁴⁴

As discussed earlier in this present work it is important to recognize that the presence of Christ is not, strictly speaking local, but *we are*, and so, necessarily, are the effectual signs of his presence, namely the bread and wine of the eucharist, which are to us Christ's Body and Blood and are necessarily the visible foci of his non-local presence.⁴⁵ Recognition of and apprehension of Christ's presence as effectually represented by the sacramental signs must necessarily take place within the hearts and minds of the participants. This in no way detracts from the objectivity of the presence as represented by the bread and wine of the eucharist which are consecrated for their special meaning and purpose and to that extent *are* what they stand for. In the act of communion they are the means by which we are fed "with the spiritual food of the body and blood" of Christ.⁴⁶

The Anglican Church of Canada.

Although at the time of writing a survey of attitudes was incomplete, the Anglican Church of Canada was able to report a very warm welcome for BEM which had been used for baptismal preparation classes for parents, godparents, and candidates; for confirmation classes; for interdenominational marriage preparation groups; for parochial studies of liturgical change and annunciation policy; for courses in theological colleges and lay training programmes; for clergy study programmes, both Anglican and interdenominational; for theme studies at diocesan synods, and so on." In all parts of the church, lay people had been involved actively and enthusiastically, so that BEM had been received, not only as a theological statement, but as a significant expression of the Christian faith for all. It is explicitly stated that the Anglican Church of Canada indeed recognised the historic faith of the Church in the Lima document. Not only, it states, was the consensus for the most part consistent with the accepted Anglican patrimony of Scripture, tradition, reason, BEM was faithful to the received creedal statements of the undivided church, outlined the sacraments in ways which Anglicans had always acknowledged, and preserved the threefold ministry, particularly the historic episcopate. The sacramental theology of BEM had been seen as good. While the documents did not develop a theory of sacramental efficacy, it did express an excellent balance between God's action, the role of the sacramental signs, and the faith of the church and the recipients. Sacraments were clearly seen to be both signs of faith and means of grace. They were also clearly seen as liturgical actions and acts of the church."

On the Eucharist it is stated that, according to the particular theological background and orientation of the individual, some Anglicans found either too much, or too little, said in Baptism Eucharist and Ministry about the presence of Christ in the elements. The emphasis on epiclesis not only restored the importance of the role of the Holy spirit in the operation of the sacraments, but also made it clear that the sacraments were prayer-actions and not mechanical means of grace.⁵⁰ It was within this overall context that the issue of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist and the role of the elements needed to be worked out. With regard to the issue of using elements other than bread and wine the Anglican Church, while recognising the problem posed for cultures for which bread and wine were either not available or not acceptable, had opted for promoting the unifying bond of the historical symbols, rather than trying to find cultural equivalents.⁵¹ The convergence expressed in the Eucharist section was welcomed and the use of strong biblical language was noted favourably. In general the use of *anamnesis* as the working term had met with approval.⁵² Some would question the treatment of "sacrifice" but most of those who had studied both documents note that BEM dealt with the subject in a more felicitous manner than did the ARCIC *Final Report*. There were some continuing issues, both for Faith and Order and for the Anglican church, concerning the disposal of the elements and the epiclesis on the elements. While affirming the presence of Christ in the Eucharist, Anglicanism allowed for some range of opinion about the exact nature of that presence.⁵³ This was an ongoing issue for the Anglican Church of Canada, in its liturgical expression, pastoral experience and spirituality. Despite the divergence of opinion the church remained one communion, and it was hoped that the church might perhaps gain from its experience in this matter.

Scottish Episcopal Church"

The response of the Scottish Episcopal Church may be described as very positive. The comments on the Eucharist were as follows:

The second part, headed "Eucharist", of the report, "Baptism Eucharist and Ministry", which is not directed towards the solution of current obstacles on the way to Christian unity, represents a devotional and doctrinal consensus deeper and wider than the first and third parts — a consensus which the Episcopal Church warmly welcomes, and recognises as sufficient agreement, on Eucharistic faith and practice, for unity.

We accord a special welcome to Section 13 and the commentary upon it, and draw attention to the compatibility with this of the ARCIC Final Report's statement on the Real Presence (pp 14 -16 and 20 — 22) It is of the nature of the sacrament that the outward and visible sign and the inward and invisible grace given are inseparable. The Episcopal Church sees in the first view expressed in the commentary on Section 13 a reflection of its own understanding and practice.

The Episcopal Church recognises the second part on Eucharist of this report is sufficient agreement, on Eucharistic faith and practice, for unity.⁵⁵

The Episcopal Church, having made the under noted provision in the Scottish Prayer Book, endorses section 32,⁵⁶

According to long-existing custom in the Scottish Church, the presbyter may reserve so much of the consecrated Gifts as may be required for the Communion of the Sick and others who could not be present at the celebration in church. All that remaineth of the holy sacrament, and is not so required, the Presbyter and such other of the communicants as he shall then called unto him shall, after the Blessing, reverently eat and drink.

It also states,

The Canon law of the Episcopal Church directs that,⁵⁷

In every congregation the Holy Communion shall be celebrated, when in the opinion of the Bishop it is reasonably practical, at least on every Lord's Day and on the great festivals.

The Episcopal Church desires this to be so throughout the Anglican Communion and throughout the Christian church, not as a pre-requisite to unity, but as the corollary of the Eucharist's nature as the central act of the Church's worship.⁵⁸

Episcopal Church, USA⁵⁹

The response of the Episcopal Church says that Episcopalians will welcome this agreed statement:

We see in it an expression of the faith and mission of the church through the ages. **In BEM** a wide **and** significant range of agreement has been reached by theological representatives of the world's major churches. Much if not all of the statement falls within classical guidelines of the Chicago-Lambeth Quadrilateral. We rejoice in the convergence of belief which this document represents, and be regarded as a major step which the World Council of churches has sponsored in the work of healing and reconciliation. We accept with joy the challenges this text addresses to us and to other churches.

Our overall highly positive response is, however, conditioned by several reservations.

We would identify one general issue with respect to the process of the churches reception of the BEM. We understand reception to mean not just the assent of church hierarchies and theologians, although this aspect is important. We also include the integration and incorporation of this text into the ongoing life of the Christian community.⁶¹ This kind of reception means not only the affirmative vote of general convention, but also the continuing study and appropriation of the statement in the life of the Episcopal Church and other churches. We wish the document had been clearer about the necessity of this dynamic process of reception.

Eucharist

On the whole this section was well received, with a strong sense that many difficult aspects of eucharistic theology and practice were well and responsibly handled. Especially praised were the positions on the centrality of the Eucharist and the appropriateness of frequent at least every Sunday celebration.

We commence the section on the Eucharist as sacrifice (1 .A.4) because it deals honestly with the point at issue. It does not gloss over the issues, but transcends the usual terms of the controversy.

We noted the discussion of the presence of Christ in the Eucharistic elements (1 .C.1 5) but suggested that deepening of the text is called for. For instance we found no clear reference to Christ's presence in the elements for communion. We suggest that account needs to be taken of the mode of presence, duration (e.g. only for the act of union?), And purpose of the presence (e.g. for the community Eucharistic meal and immediate Communion of the sick only?).⁶²

In BEM we welcome the reference to proclamation of the Word in the Eucharist, but would like to see a deepened and expanded exposition of the intrinsic integral relation between Word and Sacrament.

We suggest that merely to say as 111.29 does, that most churches have ordained persons as presidents of the eucharistic assembly is not adequate. This is required in the Episcopal Church, and the statement raises questions of the meaning of ordination polity of some other churches.⁶³

We acknowledge the situations exist when the elements used in the Eucharist or other than bread and wine. Such usage represents a serious issue to be discussed with Christians of other cultures.⁶⁴

Church of the Province of New Zealand⁶⁵

The following is the New Zealand statement on the Eucharist:

The section on the Eucharist, pages 10 to 17, has three main divisions (1) the institution of the Eucharist; (2) the meaning of the Eucharist and (3) the celebration of the eucharist

We find the whole section of the eucharist a useful and comprehensive statement. Its contents lead us to consider that our Anglican Church in New Zealand "can recognize in this text the faith of the Church through the ages." The text certainly nowhere calls in question what we may call "Anglican attitudes with regard to the eucharist" and to that extent is acceptable.

We make some comments, however, on some details of the text. Much that is in the first section on the institution of the eucharist belongs, we consider, to the section on the meaning of the eucharist rather than to the actual ministry of Jesus and to his institution in a narrow sense. For instance, what the church has received is the account of the happenings on the night before Jesus' death at the meal with his disciples and from that account has constructed the eucharist that we celebrate in our various churches." We are of the opinion that in this opening division emphasis and interpretation that have been part of the church's understanding of the eucharist are claimed to proceed from Jesus himself. The first division requires a closer look at the institution of the Eucharist in the New Testament, from the words of Jesus to the practice of the early church⁶⁷ (e.g. in 1.1 The sentence beginning "Christians see the eucharist..." would be better placed in Section II on the meaning of the Eucharist).

We draw attention to the commentary on Section 8. Paragraph 8 gives prominence to intercession in the liturgy and the comment claims that it is in the light of the significance of the Eucharist to intercession that references to the eucharist in Catholic theology as "propitiatory sacrifice" may be understood. The understanding is that there is only one expiation, that of the unique sacrifice of the cross, made actual in the eucharist and presented before the Father in the intercession of Christ and of the church for all humanity. In our view this statement is not as satisfactory as the statement in Section 5: "The Eucharist is the memorial of the crucified and risen Christ i.e. the living and effective sign of his sacrifice and Section 8 itself: "The Eucharist is the sacrament of the unique sacrifice of Christ".⁶⁸

Attention is drawn to this statement in section 13 that Jesus said over the bread and wine of *the Eucharist*: "This is my body... 'This is my blood'... This language is perhaps misleading. We would prefer to say "over the bread and wine of *the last supper*". The last supper has a uniqueness the present wording obscures.⁶⁹

There is a useful commentary on Section 14 which ends with the two sentences "The invocation of the Spirit was made both on the community and on the elements of bread and wine (in the early liturgies). Recovery of such an understanding may help us overcome difficulties concerning a special moment of consecration." Our own liturgical revision is consistent with this understanding.⁷⁰

In Section 19 we note with approval the last sentence: "In so far as a church claims to be a manifestation of the whole church, it will take care to order its own life in ways which take seriously the interests and concerns of other churches." Yet we find it strange that nothing at all is said about intercommunion. The Church of the Province of New Zealand welcomes baptized communicant members of other churches at the eucharist.⁷¹

In Section 20 some members of the commission would prefer the wording "the eucharist involves the believer in what Christians regard as the central event of the world's history"

The next section we would comment on is Section 27 with its list of the items that belong to the eucharistic liturgy. The item on the *anamnesis* needs expansion to include the ministry and teaching of Jesus and to that extent is not as satisfactory as Section 6 earlier, which gives a better coverage of what is meant by the *anamnesis*.⁷² This also applies to Section 1 which restricts *anamnesis* to death and resurrection only.

The final commentary on the text is made with regard to Section 28. This raises the question of the use of elements other than bread and wine, e.g. local food and drink, at the celebration of the eucharist. We agree with the conclusion that: "Further study is required concerning the question of which features of the Lord's Supper were unchangeably instituted by Jesus, and which features remain **within** the church's competence to decide."⁷⁴ This may well be raised within our own province which includes the diocese in Polynesia.

Church of North India⁷⁵

The response of the Church of North India begins with a statement of general agreement with the principles of the Lima statement:

1. The Church of North India, being a United Church, including within itself former Anglicans, Baptists, Brethren, Disciples, Methodists (British and Australasian), Presbyterians and Congregationalists combined in the United Church of Northern India, finds that the WCC document, "Baptism, Eucharist and **Ministry**" **generally agrees with its faith and order. We do not find anything in the document that** contradicts our understanding on these topics. We recognise in it the core of the Christian faith relating to these areas of life. The reference in Section 6 on "Ministry" to the churches' engaging in the effort to overcome differences concerning the ordained ministry recalls our own experiences in the negotiations that led to the formation of the CNI and the early years of the church's life. We believe that the document can become the basis for bilateral and multilateral discussions and negotiations leading to many areas of cooperation and common life, possibly leading to intercommunion. The statements in the text avoid emotionally loaded phrases and express their meaning in new and acceptable terminology helping the CM and other churches to think afresh, to think and to grow together.

2. We believe that the Church of North India can use with benefit the text in many ways. Such use will be the ongoing process of "reception" in and by the church that goes beyond formal action by official agencies and bodies. We consider the following as the more important ways in which the text can be used:

- a) In *catechesis*. The text can become the basis of teaching, discussions and preaching. This will not only lead our congregations into a deeper understanding of their faith, but will also bring them closer to Christians of other denominations.
- b) The Lima liturgy can be celebrated in intrachurch as well as interchurch situations.⁷⁶
- c) The Church of North India sees this text as more than a theological document in an academic sense. It is a text which has to be received with thanksgiving, and use prayerfully. Not as a final and perfect statement of the truth, but as a door that invites us to pilgrimage into unity in Christ. Affirmative responses to the BEM from the churches and an effective process of "reception" in them will help the churches to think and review the traditional formulations of faith (which were often shaped in contexts of controversy) along the lines proposed in this document.

Eucharist

- 1) From the standpoint of the Church of North India the statement on the eucharist is very good. It contains all the elements which form an integral part of the CNI liturgical tradition. In addition to this the statement on the eucharist

contains new insights which can further enrich the eucharistic liturgies of the CNI.

- 2) *The "real presence" in the Eucharist:* the CNI appreciates and commends this statement for its careful avoidance of such controversial terms as "transubstantiation", "transignification", etc, and focuses attention on the central significance and experiential aspect of the eucharist in terms of the "real presence" of Christ in the sacrament, which is likely to be acceptable to most of the WCC member churches as a common understanding of the Eucharist.
- 3) *Missionary aspect of the Eucharist:* We note the significant focus on the "missionary" aspect of the eucharist in sections 17 and 26 and the comment in 26, "In so far as Christians cannot unite in fellowship around the same table to eat the same loaf and drink from the same cup their missionary witness is weakened at both the individual and corporate levels"
- 4) *Baptism and Eucharist with reference to salvation:* In this statement salvation is closely related with both baptism and Eucharist, and rightly so (B2 and E2). When we have parallel statements without their interrelationship being explained it can lead to confusion e.g. "Baptism is a sign of participation in Christ's death and resurrection...the experience of salvation from the flood... and liberation into new humanity" B2; "Every Christian receives this gift of salvation through Communion in the body and blood of Christ" (E2).
- 5) *Oneness of the eucharist and oneness of baptism:* E21 speaks of "solidarity in the eucharistic communion of the body of Christ and responsible care of Christians for one another." Just as the section on baptism speaks of the oneness of baptism (one baptism) as the sacrament which unites all Christians so the section on the eucharist should stress more clearly the oneness of the eucharist as the sacrament which can unite all Christians in spite of the variety of ways in which it is celebrated.
- 6) *Who can come to the Lord's table?* This question is answered in the statement only by implication by reference to the church.
- 7) *The meal aspect:* we appreciate the emphasis on the meal aspect rather than on the elements of the bread and the wine.⁷⁷

Church of South India⁷⁸

This response goes straight into consideration of each of the areas of Baptism, Eucharist, and Ministry", and has this to say about the eucharist:

We are in agreement with the statement made in the document regarding the institution and meaning of eucharist and reiterate the recommendations made.

1. We would like to make the following comments on Section II: the meaning of the Eucharist. Here two very pertinent and significant questions were raised:

- Is eucharist exclusive or inclusive? Why should it exclude the unbaptised, the baptised but not confirmed and the children? If the parents with their children come to the altar *as a family* to take part in the holy communion, why allow only the parents are not the children?

If an earnest, devoted Hindu seeker comes to the holy table, are we justified in denying the holy sacrament to him?⁷⁹ Why do non-Christians desire eucharist so much, why they do not show the same desire regard to baptism?⁸⁰

- It was felt that the BEM document does not seem to bring out clearly the salvific dimension. The total work of Christ, his self offering for the salvation of all people is not clearly brought out in paragraphs 2 and three. Is not participation in the eucharist, a participation in the whole struggle of the people, a sharing in the trials and tribulations, sufferings and strivings of the people?

-The eucharist as thanksgiving to the Father.

We agree that eucharist is the great sacrifice of praise by which the church speaks on behalf of the whole creation. Therefore, the celebration is of the whole people of God. Hence the participation of the people should be maximum, i.e. in singing responses, offering the elements, intercessions, etc

The anamnesis as anamnesis or memorial of Christ.

We recognize the fact that the celebration of the holy communion is the church's effective proclamation of the mighty acts and promises of God, and therefore, Christ acts through the joyful celebration of his church, as representation and anticipation.

The eucharist as invocation of the Spirit.

We agree with the statement that the whole action of the eucharist has an invocational character, because it depends upon the work of the Holy Spirit. Hence the consecration of the elements need not be assigned to any particular moment within the body of the service.

Here again, some important questions were raised. Are the words of the institution indispensable?⁸¹ How are we to understand the *real* presence of Christ?" What is *unique* about Christ's presence in the eucharist?⁸³ Is not Christ present in the whole worship?" In every action of ours? In every life situation of ours?⁸⁵ Is not acknowledging the presence of Christ in our brother, in our neighbour, as important as the presence of Christ in the Eucharist?⁸⁶

The commission strongly felt that all these reflections could be added to the section on *anamnesis*.

The eucharist as communion of the faithful.

By his participation the believer is involved in the central event of world's history in terms of mission, in the ongoing history of the world. This must be made explicit with reference to the Ministry of the word, intercessory prayers, the final act of praise and the sending.

The communion aspect should be stressed all the way. The eucharist has to do with *community*: but how often has it been the main cause, if not the only one, of divisions and bickering is? We need to realise that until and unless the *whole* church is present in the eucharist, it cannot be eucharist.

Elements in the eucharist The symbol should be obvious and meaningful.⁸⁷ We have no problem with any type of bread, but it may be difficult to take the coconut water and say: "This is the blood of Christ."

Solidarity

Eucharist is an expression of the solidarity of the local community.

At the communion table, the believers, while they take part in the eucharist, affirm that the barriers of caste, class and socio-economic divisions are broken down by Christ. There is no distinction between the rich and poor, high cast and the low caste, the educated and the uneducated at the table.

All take part in the Communion with a sense of oneness in Christ. This experience of brotherhood and solidarity is as relevant and meaningful as ever to us in the Indian context. This aspect could be brought out clearly in the statement on the eucharist.⁸⁸

NOTES ON CHAPTER THREE, PART FOUR (4)

¹See below, Chapter Three, Assessments Part Four, "The Lambeth Conference and ARCIC together with the Anglican Consultative Council.

²This kind of approval by implication was also to be employed in relation to the General Synod's official Response to ARCIC on Mary, the work of a special committee chaired, successively, by Bishop Peter Barrett (Ossory) up to his resignation from the church's ministry and by Bishop (later Archbishop) Michael Jackson (Clogher, then Dublin and Glendalough). On the basis of the discussions and of the working papers produced by the members (which, regrettably, have never been published), the entire Response was drafted by the present writer and submitted to the Standing Committee of the General Synod which approved it with one minor amendment and included it in its annual Report to Synod. All the comments made from the floor of the house were favourable and the Response was approved in effect by implication along with the rest of the Report. The present writer would have greatly preferred a separate submission to Synod, and approval by a specific motion to that effect. See the Report of the Standing Committee, Appendix D, 2006, Journal of the General Synod, 2006. pp166-198, entitled "Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ – The Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission, An Agreed Statement, 2005.

³From "To put Lima in perspective..." to "according to the decision of the church."

⁴From "In assessing the first part of the Church of Ireland comment..." to "Trinitarian character"

⁵Scripture, Tradition and Reason are three traditional pillars of the Anglican theological method, associated in the first instance, with Richard Hooker (c1554-1600). A very valuable contribution to the study of the relationships between the concepts may be found in William Marshall, *Scripture, Tradition and Reason – A selective view of Anglican theology through the centuries*, The Columba Press? APCK, 2010. On page 19 he says,

It is difficult to treat scripture, tradition and reason separately in the contribution they each make to what is believed. Scripture is usually regarded as the supreme member of the triad, yet the supremacy of scripture is based on reason. For example, Hooker argued that traditions outside the Bible cannot be regarded as necessary to salvation, not simply "because they are not in scripture, but because they are neither in scripture, nor can otherwise sufficiently by any reason be proved to be of God" (*Ecclesiastical Polity*, xiv,5). He also maintained that reason and the witness of the church through the ages support the authority of the Bible (*ibid.*, III viii 14) Reason is necessary for the interpretation of the Bible, and so is tradition, especially in matters of church order (*ibid.*, III viii 16, II vii 3).

⁶For example, the churches of the Anglican Communion are fully autonomous, and, although a common understanding is to some extent maintained through such agencies as the ministry of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Anglican Consultative Council, and the Lambeth Conferences, and by what have been called "Bonds of Affection", ultimately decisions of faith and order are made by the supreme local authority, in the case of the Church of Ireland, the General Synod, consisting of the House of Bishops (*ex officio*) and the House of clergy and laity, (elected by the Diocesan Synods triennially). There are two lay persons to every member of the clergy.

⁷See above. It is noteworthy that other parts of the Anglican Communion do not necessarily hold such a pessimistic view. For example, the Anglican Church of Canada in its response

affirmed that "In all parts of the church, lay people have been involved actively and enthusiastically, so that BEM has been received, not only as a theological statement, but as a significant expression of the Christian faith for all." See below under "Anglican Church of Canada".

⁸Bishop Stephen Neill, in one of his books, recorded being asked by Karl Barth, "What role would you say is played by theology in the life of your Church?". This remains a relevant question.

⁹"The Ministry of the Sacrament – An Alternative Order, pp59-61 in the Alternative Prayer Book 1984 – according to the use of The Church of Ireland, by authority of the General Synod of the Church of Ireland, Collins, 1984 was subsequently incorporated into the 2004 Prayer Book as Eucharistic Prayer Two including the seasonal additions inexplicably omitted from the Alternative Prayer Book. This eucharistic prayer, which focused on the concept of "proclamation" was requested by Evangelical members of the Liturgical Advisory Committee and approved by all. It was composed for use in the Church of England in Australia, and appeared in An Australian Prayer Book, for use together with The Book of Common Prayer, The Standing Committee of the General Synod of the Church of England in Australia, Sydney, 1978 as the principal eucharistic prayer in Order Two in that book, pp148- 8. A full explanation of it appeared in *When we Meet for Worship*, by the secretary of the Australian Liturgical Commission, Gilbert Sinden, SSM pp64-93. The person most principally concerned with its creation was Dr Evan Burge. He said to the present writer that the prayer was not considered specially "Evangelical" in Australia but was a form of the eucharist for the whole church. The entire book was later, in effect superceded by A Prayer Book for Australia – for use together with The Book of Common Prayer (1662) and An Australian Prayer Book (1978), Liturgical Resources authorised by the General Synod, Broughton Books 1995.

¹⁰The present writer's contribution to understanding of the liturgical tradition of the Church of Ireland consists of an online publication as Resource material on the official Church of Ireland website, of his *The Book of Common Prayer (2004) – Commentaries-*, by Michael Kennedy, Church of Ireland Publishing 2011. This consists of commentaries on all the authorized services of the Church of Ireland, including the contents of the 2004 Prayer Book available as at the time of its launch in the presence of the Archbishop of Armagh, at the 2011 meeting of the Church of Ireland's General Synod. The five main commentaries are those on Morning and Evening Prayer and the Litany; The Eucharist; Christian Initiation, Pastoral Ministry and The Ordinal. At the time of writing it was due an updating to include resource material published online by the Liturgical Advisory Committee and some modifications to the 2004 Prayer Book itself, approved by the General Synod.

There is a foreword by the late Canon Brian Mayne.

¹¹Following the tradition in the Synoptic Gospels, Matthew, Mark and Luke that the Last Supper was a Passover meal it may be said that this was a meal upon a sacrifice performed on

the previous day and may be designated as a *sacrificial meal*. The terminology of "body" and "blood" would appear to be sacrificial in character. The eucharistic memorial

represented by the expression, *eis anamnesin* can have the significance of a sacrificial act, reflecting, as it most probably does, an underlying Hebrew *lezikkaron*. Even the general word "do" (*poieite* in Greek, *`ahsah* in Hebrew, can, according to context have a sacrificial association. So it is not necessarily fanciful to recognize what the sixteenth century Reformers including Luther tended to miss, namely that the roots of a doctrine of the eucharistic sacrifice are to be found in the dominical words themselves. For a critical examination of the points at issue, the present writer's "The meaning and role of the anamnesis in the Anglican Liturgical Tradition", his B.D. thesis for Trinity College Dublin, 1979, Chapter One is relevant, containing as it does not only of an examination of the work of Joachim Jeremias on this point (in his *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*) but a critical appraisal of the scholarly and helpful linguistic researches of D. Gregg's *Anamnesis in the Eucharist*, Grove Liturgical Study No 5, Grove Books 1976. What may be the earliest explicit reference to the eucharist as a "sacrifice" is to be found in the hard-to-date document, the *Didache*, XIV vvl-3,

And on the Lord's Day gather to break bread and to give thanks after having confessed your offences so that your sacrifice may be pure. But let no one who has a difference with a comrade join you till they are reconciled so that your sacrifice not be defiled. For this is what the Lord said, "In every place and time let there be offered to me a pure sacrifice for I am a great king, says the Lord, and my name is revered among the nations. Text in Lawrence J. Johnson, *Worship in the Early Church – An Anthology of Historical Sources*, Liturgical Press Collegetown Minnnesota, 1979, p.40. The word in the Greek original is *thusia*.

Another very early reference is that in 1 Clement, a letter from Clement of Rome to the Church at Corinth, c. A.D. 96. Reproving the latter for their temerity in deposing their leaders from their liturgical office, it is said,

It is no small sin on our part if we eject from the episcopacy those who without blame and with holiness have presented [to God] the offerings (*Gk prosenengkontas to dora*, lit. "bringing near the gifts"). Blessed are presbyters who have finished their journey and whose life has come to a fruitful and perfect end; they need not fear being removed from the place assigned them. For we see that some of them, in fact, despite their good behaviour, you have removed from the functions they exercised with honour and beyond reproach. Text in Johnson, op cit. p44.

The contents and precise significance of the sacrifice are not specified, but it is clear that what are offered are the bread and wine ("gifts"). There is no suggestion in these very early texts that the sacrifices are "propitiatory". For a discussion of what "propitiation" and "expiation" mean in the eucharistic context, see Chapter Three "Assessments" Part 7 (1) below.

¹² Arguing with pagans, Minucius Felix (2nd or 3rd Century) said,

Do you think that we are concealing what we worship since we have neither temples nor altars... So it is that whoever cultivates innocence petitions God; whoever cultivates righteousness offers to God; whoever refrains from deceit makes propitiation to God, whoever snatches someone from danger slaughters the richest victim. These are our sacrifices, these are God's rite. Text in Johnson, cop. Cit. p112.

¹³It could be that Archbishop Cranmer, the architect of the Book of Common Prayer in his 1552 rite thought of everything that occurred between the Sursum Corda "Lift up your hearts" and the two post-communion prayers as a unity with the administration of communion taking place within this overall context. In this way there is a reference to thanksgiving in what follows the Sursum Corda and the Gratias agamus where the priest says,

It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty, that we should at all times, and in all places, give thanks unto thee, O Lord, Holy Father, Almighty Everlasting God.

And there are references to the Holy Spirit in the doxologies of the post communion prayers, the first one reading,

Through Jesus Christ our Lord; by whom and with whom, in the unity of the Holy Spirit, all honour and glory be unto thee, O Father Almighty, world without end.

BCP 2004 pp186, 189. However, in 1662 the reordering of the service made the passage beginning, "Almighty God, our heavenly Father..." into "The Prayer of Consecration" ending in "Amen" and in this way it became the principal prayer in the Eucharist but with no reference to its being a "eucharistic" (thanksgiving) prayer and no reference to the Holy Spirit.

¹⁴Trenchant criticisms of the traditional Prayer Book rite were made in the pre-Lambeth 1958 document *Principles of Prayer Book Revision*. These will be considered below in Assessments, Part Five, "The Lambeth Conference and ARCIC together with the Anglican Consultative Council."

¹⁵The structure of all three eucharistic prayers in Holy Communion is Trinitarian, passing from the Father to the Son and to the Holy Spirit, and concluding in a trinitarian doxology.

¹⁶This prayer originated in a draft of what was destined to become "Prayer H" in the Church of England's *Common Worship*, pp204-5. The story of its creation and evolution may be found in Colin Buchanan, *Common Worship, Eucharistic Prayer H (in order one) – an unauthorized account*, reprinted from Ushaw Library Bulletin and Liturgical Review, no 13, September 2000. The Liturgical Advisory Committee of the Church of Ireland largely rewrote it, emphasizing the aspect of congregational participation present in the original but with some alterations in the responses and adding the very powerful conclusion,

Thanks be to you, our God, for your gift beyond words **Amen. Amen. Amen.**

However the particular originality in the Church of Ireland version lies in the addressing of the Three Persons of the Holy Trinity in turn, which, as the present writer remembers it, was the suggestion of the Very Revd John Paterson, Dean of Christ Church Cathedral, Dublin. Addressing a eucharistic prayer to the Son is not without precedent, but this particular arrangement is very unusual if it exists at all in the liturgical history of the Church and is a very special feature.

¹⁷The use of the Collect for Purity as an integral part of the rite is a distinctive feature of the Anglican service. In the Sarum liturgy it formed part of the priest's personal preparation. It appears in the Leofric MS and also in the Sacramentary of Alcuin, and is

attributed to St Gregory, Abbot of Canterbury c.780. The Latin original underlying "all desires known" was *omnis voluntas loquiter* – "to whom every wish is eloquent".

¹⁸BCP 2004 pp189,190, 221.

¹⁹BCP 2004 pp191, 221

²⁰Churches respond to BEM, Vol I op. cit.,pp54-60

²¹Op. cit. p.54.

²²See the exploration of the concept of "Mystery" in H.R. McAdoo and Kenneth Stevenson, *The Mystery of the Eucharist in the Anglican Tradition*, Foreword by Rowan Williams, The Canterbury Press, 1995. Jeremy Taylor is cited on page 5 from the Introduction to his *The Worthy Communicant* (1660) as follows,

As we approach "this great mysterious feast and magazine of grace" we are made aware that "Christ comes to meet us, clothed with a mystery: he hath a house below as well as above...the Church and the holy table of the Lord ... the word and the sacrament, the oblation of bread and wine, and the offering of ourselves".

Archbishop Thomas Cranmer himself called the communion "these holy mysteries" with which the worshippers are fed who have duly received them, which are "the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood of ... our Saviour Jesus Christ. BCP 2004 p.190, the second Post-Communion Prayer.

²³W.G. Kümmel, in his magisterial *Theology of the New Testament*, SCM 1974 seeks to exhibit the convergence between the teaching of Jesus, of John and of Paul and describes this as "unity in multiplicity" p322. The concepts of unity and diversity from the standpoint of critical biblical scholarship are fully explored in James D.G. Dunn, *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament – An Enquiry into the Character of Earliest Christianity*, SCM/Trinity Press International, Second Edition, 1990.

²⁴As maintained by Max Thurian in his Introduction to BEM in "The Churches respond to BEM, op. cit, Vol 1, pp1,2

The interest taken in the Lima document shows, if any demonstration is needed, that ordinary Christians, lay people as well as clergy, remain keenly alert to the problems of the faith and to the way the church answers these problems today. Even if some churches feel obliged to maintain a certain reserve towards it, the Lima document exists as the harvest of a long and patient process of reflection recognised by over 100 theologians representing all the Christian confessions in Lima in January 1982 as ripe of presentation to all the churches. Since that historic day, the Lima document has become a key text rather for all Christians. In the ecumenical dialogue between Christians it is now no longer possible to discuss Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry without making this document the basis of reflection.

This document shows that when Christian set out together to probe their common faith with the firm resolve to continue probing until they have rediscovered their visible unity, by the grace of the Holy Spirit something happens. This "conciliar" effort to recover our unity in the faith is the price to be paid for the renewal of the Christian life. Ecclesial communities refusing to make this effort and the sacrifices it entails and preferring to rest content with their confessional traditions

would certainly be in danger of failing to experience the renewal which is indispensable for their growth.

²⁵ Thurian, again, op.cit. p.2

What the churches are invited to experience and undertake, therefore, is an authentic ecumenical conversion the enrichment of their own spiritual tradition from the patrimony of others, a surrender of all that separates them from the others... What we are invited to do is not to judge the Lima document in the light of distinctive confessional traditions but rather to expose ourselves to the judgement and stimulus of those aspects of the faith of the undivided church of which this document reminds us.

²⁶ *Churches Respond to BEM, Vol 1 op. cit* p.56. It can be argued that a document arising from prolonged theological interaction reflects this in its descriptive contents., and, as far as possible, given that the process is ongoing as indicating where common ground is believed to have been discovered. As the World Council of Churches does not have authority for dogmatic or liturgical decision-making it would not be reasonable for the Lima document to be highly prescriptive, and churches representative of a very specific inheritance, in the case of the Southern Cone, Conservative Evangelicalism, might not be well pleased with all that might be set forth in such a manner as the mainstream view of the churches world-wide.

²⁷It's hard to avoid the conclusion here of a lack of awareness of what Anglican Christians have historically theologically recognized in the formularies inherited from the Reformation and still fully authoritative in some (but not all) Anglican churches.

²⁸BCP 2004 pp353-356. In Christian Initiation One the candidates *confirm* their baptismal vows under the heading of "The Renewal of Baptismal Promises" and they are "are confirmed" under the heading "Confirmation Prayer and the Laying on of hands", and the subsequent rubrics which refer to "those to be confirmed" and "the newly confirmed."

²⁹BCP 2004 pp382-291. In Chistian Initiation Two the candidates make together with the congregation *The Profession of Faith* and then proceed to *The Confirmation* through prayer and the laying on of hands by the bishop who prays that the Lord will *confirm* them.

³⁰ The five names for the eucharist which the *Southern Cone* response complains about are the Lord's Supper, the Breaking of Bread, the Divine Liturgy, the Holy Communion, the Mass. It is puzzling that "The Eucharist" (Thanksgiving) is not mentioned among them, although it comes after a section of the BEM document entitled "The Institution of the Eucharist". Of the others given as examples, the first two are directly biblical (1 Cor 11:20, *kuriakon deipnon*), (Acts 2:42 *klasei tou artou*), the third appears as a verb in the early Christian document 1 Clement (44, *leitrougesantas*), the term "communion" is used in the AV translation of 1 Cor 10:16 as a rendering of *koinonia*, and the Mass is derived from the dismissal at the end of the traditional Roman Catholic liturgy *Ite, missa est* the word in its origin having in essence no doctrinal content whatsoever except in the implication that the worshippers are being sent forth. In the 2004 Prayer Book the titles "Holy Communion", "Lord's Supper" and "The Eucharist" are to be found with reference to Holy Communion Two on p.201. Holy Communion One has "Lord's Supper" and "Holy Communion". The word "Mass" is widely used in Lutheran churches on the continent and so cannot be held inherently to imply content opposed to a

Reformed theology in the Lutheran sense. With regard to *eis anamnesin* the Evangelical scholar D. Gregg in his *Anamnesis in the Eucharist*, op cit opts for *lezikkaron* as the most likely term for which *eis anamnesin* is the Greek equivalent.

³¹*Churches Respond to BEM* op.cit p.59. Reservation for the purpose of adoration is a western rather than an eastern tradition, and so cannot, without qualification, be considered a necessary part of catholic faith and order. But wherever Christ is, there it is appropriate that he be adored, the reserved sacrament being the effectual sign of his presence, notwithstanding the condemnation of "The Romish Doctrine" concerning, *inter alia*, "Worshipping and Adoration" in Article 22 of the Thirty-nine Articles. It is not clear what "The Romish Doctrine" is to be taken to mean, but it may probably be taken to refer to the bread and wine considered not as the Lord's sacramental Body and Blood, but in their natural essences which to worship would seem to represent a confusing of the creation with the creator.

³²*Churches Respond to BEM, Vol 2, op cit. pp32-25.*

³³ Several Responses bring up the question of unresolved issues being placed side-by-side. However, it needs to be remembered that ecumenism is a process, and BEM represents the stage reached by 100 theologians representing a huge range of churches and ecclesial communities and the release of it did not indicate that they thought all the matters under discussion had been fully resolved. And the views of the various churches needed to be taken into consideration – and this was where the particular Responses, of which only some Anglican ones appear here, were making a significant contribution to carrying the work forward. Helpful in this regard are also several World Council of Churches publications, including, *Ecumenical Perspectives on Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, Faith and Order Paper 116, WCC, 1983, edited by Max Thurian, consisting of substantial theological contributions on the convergence texts. The papers, including one by Max Thurian, entitled *The eucharistic memorial, sacrifice of praise and supplication* were prepared by scholars who had themselves been involved in the study here reviewed the development of the texts and evaluated them from the perspective of different doctrinal and theological traditions.

The whole of Max Thurian's contribution is highly relevant to the present study. It cannot be given in full, but the introductory sentence indicates the concept of the eucharistic sacrifice from early source material including some that has already been cited above,

When the tradition of the Church calls the eucharist a "sacrifice" it is not with the intention of making it the one act of religious worship even the most remarkable and most spiritual among others. The eucharist is the unique sacrament of the unique sacrifice of Christ; it is the sacrifice of praise and supplication of the church, and it makes the believer a sacrifice acceptable to the Father by the power of the Spirit.

As was announced by the prophecy of Malachi, a prophecy frequently referred to by the fathers of the church to designate the eucharist, "I have no pleasure in you... And I will not accept an offering from your hand. For from the rising of the sun to its setting my name is great among the nations, and in every place incense is offered to my name, and a pure offering." (Mal 1-10-11) In one of the earliest references (along with the Gospels) to the eucharist, the *Didache*, we

read: "And on the Lord's Day come together and break bread and give thanks, after confessing your transgressions, that your sacrifice may be pure. Let no one that has a dispute his fellow come together until they be reconciled, that your sacrifice may not be defiled. For this is what was spoken by the Lord, In every place and time offer me a pure sacrifice; I am a great king says the Lord; and my name is wonderful among the Gentiles."

Justin, in the *Dialogue with Trypho*, quotes the same text from Malachi: "He then speaks of those Gentiles, namely us, who in every place offer sacrifices to Him, i.e. that the bread of the eucharist and also the cup of the eucharist, affirming... that we glorify his name... Still in the second century, Irenaeus of Lyons refers to this prophecy Malachi of about the pure sacrifice: "The oblation of the Church, therefore, which the Lord gave instructions to

be offered throughout the world, is accounted with God a pure sacrifice and is acceptable

to him; not that he stands in need of the sacrifice from us, but that he who offers is himself glorified in what he does offer, if his gift is accepted... And the church alone offers this pure oblation to the Creator, offering to him, with giving of thanks, things taken from his creation".

Another useful publication was *Growing Together in Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, a Study Guide by William H. Lazareth, Faith and Order Paper No 114, World Council of Churches, 1983.

³⁴ Churches Respond to BEM, op. cit., p.33.

³⁵ The understanding of the eucharist as the proclamation of the Lord's *death* until he comes is biblical and Pauline (1 Cor 11:26). It does not thereby mean that setting this in the wider context of the rehearsal of all that God has done for us in Christ will necessarily detract from the special significance of his sacrificial death. There is a good balance in the eucharistic prayers in the Church of Ireland's 2004 Prayer Book in Holy Communion Two. Echoing Cranmer, Eucharistic Prayer One affirms "he made there [on the cross] the one complete and all-sufficient sacrifice for the sins of the whole world." In the anamnesis the indissoluble connection between the Lord's passion and death and his resurrection and ascension, and the remembering of this until his coming again, is well expressed,

Therefore Father, with this bread and this cup we do as Christ your Son commanded:

**we remember his passion and death,
we celebrate his resurrection and ascension,
and we look for the coming of his kingdom.**

In Eucharistic Prayer Two, the emphasis upon the Lord's death is in no way obscured by its being set in the context of all that God has done for us in Christ. It says,

In obedience to your will
your Son our Saviour offered himself as a perfect sacrifice,
and died on the cross for our redemption.
Through him you have freed us from the slavery of sin and
reconciled us to yourself our God and Father.

In Passiontide and Holy Week there is a seasonal addition which reads,

For he is the true Passover Lamb
who was offered for us
and has taken away the sin of the world.

And this is augmented in Eastertide by the words,

By his death he has destroyed death and
by his rising to life
he has restored to us eternal life.

In the anamnesis the sacrifice is again central, although in so way dissociated from the resurrection and ascension and the coming at the end of time,

Father, with this bread and this cup,
we do as our Saviour has commanded:
we celebrate the redemption he has won for us; we
proclaim his perfect sacrifice,
made once for all upon the cross,
his mighty resurrection and glorious ascension; and
we look for his coming
to fulfil all things according to your will.

Granted that the function of the anamnesis is to express succinctly what the church understands it is doing in remembrance of Christ, what is given here cannot properly be dissociated from the totality of what is said in the eucharistic prayer.

Eucharistic Prayer Three is succinct but still emphasizes the message of the cross,

In Christ you shared our life
that we might live in him and he in us.
**He opened wide his arms upon the cross
and, with love stronger than death, he
made the perfect sacrifice for sin.**

In what is the nearest thing to an anamnesis in this prayer it is said,

Praise to you, Lord Jesus Christ:
dying, you destroyed our death,
rising, you restored our life;
Lord Jesus, come in glory.

³⁶For the general biblical context, see Max Thurian, *The Eucharistic Memorial*, Part One, the Old Testament, and Part Two, the New Testament, Lutterworth Press, translated by J.G. Davies, *Ecumenical Studies in Worship*, No's 7 and 8. The chapter headings and sub-headings give an idea of the remarkable scope of this study,

Part One:

Introduction,

1. The Memorial and the Passover,
- II. The Memorial as a Liturgical Term

III. The Memorial of the Passover and of Unleavened Bread.

The Passover

Unleavened Bread.

IV. The Memorial of the Meal Offering.

The Various Sacrifices

The Oblation or Meal Offering

The Shewbread

The Sacrifices of the Poor, the Sick and of Sinners.

V. The Memorial in the Liturgy.

The Ephod and the Breastplate.

The Prayer of Intercession

The Liturgical Vestments

The Robe of the Ephod and the Trumpets

Liturgical Music in the Eucharist

Beauty in the Liturgy as a Memorial of God's marvelous Acts

Images and the Eucharist.

VI. The Memorial of Prayer

The Intercession of the Angels and the Communion of Saints

The Prayer of the Incense and of Lights

Prayer "in the name of...."

Appendix

PART TWO

I. The Memorial in the New Testament.

The Memorial of Sin to obtain Forgiveness.

The Memorial of Prayer and Charity

The Memorial of the Saints

"Making Remembrance"

II. The Words of Christ at the Last Supper

The Anamnesis of the Mysteries

The Blessing of the Elements

The Breaking of the Bread

The Separation of the Elements

The Blood of the Covenant

The Remission of Sins

The Present Reality of the Sacrifice

The Proclamation of the Cross

The Eschatological Entreaty

III. The Eucharistic Sacrifice

The Sacrament of the Sacrifice

The Presentation of the Sacrifice

The Sacrifice of Thanksgiving

The Sacrifice of Intercession

The Eucharistic Sacrifice and Justification by Faith

The Heavenly Intercession

The Church's Offering

IV. The Real Presence

The Calvinistic Doctrine of the Real Presence

Theses concerning the Real Presence.

Conclusion
Appendix.

For a detailed examination of the Biblical languages in relation to the concept of the memorial,

D. Gregg, *Anamnesis in the Eucharist*, Grove Liturgical Study No 5, Grove Books, 1976.

For the contribution of one of the greatest of twentieth century New Testament scholars,

Joachim Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, SCM, 3rd edition, 1964, tr from the German. Chapter Headings,

I Was the Last Supper a Passover Meal?

II. The Account of the Last Supper within the Framework of the Passion Narrative and as an Independent Tradition.

III. The Influence of Worship upon the Transmission of the Eucharistic Texts.

IV. The Oldest Text of the Eucharistic Words of Jesus

V. The Meaning of the Eucharistic Words of Jesus.

For the concept that memory is a major factor in the composition and practice of liturgy drawing on recent research into how the brain and memory function points the way to how liturgy can best meet the needs of worshippers,

Peter Atkins, *Memory and Liturgy – the Place of Memory in the Composition and Practice of Liturgy*, Ashgate, 2004.

³⁷This complaint has to a large extent been overtaken by events, since the role of the Holy Spirit, whether or not it is technically an “epiclesis, is a significant aspect of most modern Anglican liturgies, even those which come from churches where a direct calling of the Holy Spirit upon the elements is not part of their theological tradition and remains absent. In the case of the Church of Ireland, Eucharistic Prayer One, which is entirely home-grown, includes,

“...grant that by the power of the life-giving Spirit that we may be made one in your holy Church and partakers of the body and blood of your Son, that he may dwell in us and we in him.”

Eucharistic Prayer Two (from the Anglican Church of Australia) makes no mention of the connection between the Holy Spirit, but relates the Spirit rather to the life of the Church, but in the place where the epiclesis would be expected,

“Renew us by your Holy Spirit, unite us in the body of your Son, and bring us with all your people into the joy of your eternal kingdom”

[It may be noted that Thanksgivings Two and Three in “The Holy Communion – Second Order” in the more recent *A Prayer Book for Australia, 1995* while retaining the essentials of the 1978 Order as Thanksgiving One, relate the Holy Spirit and the act of communion.]

Eucharistic Prayer Three (a creative reworking of Prayer H of the Church of England), is however clearly an invocation of the Holy Spirit on the worshippers to enable the bread and wine to have the significance of the body and blood of Christ in such a manner that the ontological implications of this are evident,

“Holy Spirit, giver of life, come upon us now; may this bread and wine be to us the body and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ.”

³⁸The Parish Communion movement sought to make a connection between liturgy and life through the bringing up of the bread and wine (the bread often home-baked) to the altar by members of the congregation in recognition that, symbolically speaking this represented the life and work of those who were participating in the eucharist. This concept, although having a limited validity attracted the criticism not only of Conservative Evangelicals, by, for example, Colin Buchanan in *The End of the Offertory – An Anglican Study*, Grove Liturgical Study No 14, Grove Books, 1978. but also by representative figures from within the Catholic tradition of Anglicanism. For example, in an often quoted passage from Michael Ramsey, then Bishop of Durham, later, Archbishop of York, then Archbishop of Canterbury,

One of the dangers of the parish Communion lies in the doctrine of sacrifice. Here there is too often a most alarming lopsidedness. The new movement places much emphasis upon the offertory, as the offering to Almighty God of the bread and wine as the token of the giving to him of the people’s common life. Appropriate ceremonial brings out this moment in the rite: lay folk carry the elements in procession from the back of the church, and lumps of coal and other objects may be brought to the church to reinforce the point. The point is indeed a true and Christian one, for though its place in the New Testament is a little obscure it finds vivid expression in St Irenaeus (e.g. *Adv. Haer. IV.xvii.5; xviii.1*). The idea of sacrifice is taught in many parishes in connection with the offering of bread and wine in the offertory and ourselves, our souls and bodies, in the prayer after the Communion.

By itself, however, this sort of teaching about sacrifice can be a shallow and romantic sort of Pelagianism... For we cannot, and we cannot, and we dare not offer aught of our own apart from the one sacrifice of the Lamb of God.

Dr E.L. Mascall in an article “The Offertory in the Eucharist in Parish and People (autumn 1957 number 21, pages 16-17) said,

It is... vital to understand that the offertory is the preparation for the oblation and is not the oblation itself. There is, I feel sure, a very close connection between this lack of understanding in some parish Communion circles and the naturalistic attitude to the Eucharist to which the Archbishop of York Dr Ramsay has called attention.

While Dr Ramsey could see a legitimate place for the concept, in general there has been a movement away from Gregory Dix’s identification of the offertory and the “taking” as the first of four actions in the Eucharistic canon, and this is reflected in the arrangements in *The Eucharist Two* in the 2004 Prayer Book of the Church of Ireland. However, one of the four prayers that may be said after the bread and wine have been placed on the table is that from

1 Chronicles 29: 11,14, which says in scriptural words that cannot be faulted,

Lord, yours is the greatness
and the power and the glory
and the victory and the majesty;

for all things come from you
and of your own we give you.

And the use, at *The Preparation of the Gifts* from the Roman Missal of the following words which appear to conform to the parameters of the passage from 1st Chronicles, is widespread among Anglicans, sometimes with minor modifications,

Blessèd are you, Lord, God of all creation.
Through your goodness we have this bread to offer,
which earth has given and human hands have made.
It will become for us the bread of life.

Blessed be God for ever.

Blessèd are you, Lord, God of all creation.
Through your goodness we have this wine to offer,
fruit of the vine and work of human hands.
It will become our spiritual drink.

Blessed be God for ever.

³⁹The problem with “receptionism” as a Eucharistic doctrine is that it appears to minimize the objectivity of the gift, embodied in the elements which, following consecration, are deemed to be the sacramental body and blood of Christ in accordance with the dominical words at the Last Supper. Although it is a view that is representative of a school of Eucharistic thought in Anglicanism it may be described as inadequate because of its one-sidedness in an area where it is reasonable to expect a careful balance between the subjective and the objective. It seems unlikely that it would ever command support in an ecumenical document representing the views of the community of world churches. It would, in all probability be unacceptable not only to Eastern Orthodox and Roman Catholic Christians but also to Lutherans (to the extent that they follow the teaching of their own found father). However, it is legitimate for the Australian Anglicans to indicate their concern over this matter.

⁴⁰One of the most helpful contributions to the question of the multiple inheritance of the Christian Church is that by Bishop Lesley Newbigin, *The Household of God* in which he identifies three strands in the biblical basis of the doctrine of the church which he terms “Catholic”, “Evangelical” and “Pentecostal”. Perhaps the term “charismatic” might be subsumed under ‘Pentecostal’. These strands are to be found in varying ways and to different extents in all the churches, including the Anglican, where the entire history of Anglicanism could be understood in terms of the inter-relationship between these tendencies, sometimes fruitfully, often highly competitive. John R.H. Moorman, in his *The Anglican Spiritual Tradition*, Darton, Longman and Todd, 1983 deals with this historically, not least in his Prologue which imagines what was involved for a typical priest going through the experience of the changes in the reigns of Henry VIII, Edward VI, Mary, and Elizabeth. Rowan Williams, in his “Anglican Identities”, Darton, Longman and Todd, 2004, deals with this through the prism of the contributions of various individuals ranging from Hooker to J.A.T. Robinson. Bishop Stephen Neill, in his contribution to *Holy Communion – A Symposium*, ed by Hugh Martin, SCM, 1947, says in Chapter Three “The Holy Communion in the Anglican Church”, said that “the feature of Anglican Church life which probably strikes the non-Anglican visitor most forcibly is its ritual and liturgical diversity. If our visitor were to pass direct from a simple Communion in a country church in Ireland to High Mass in a High Anglican church in

London, he might be pardoned for wondering whether it was the same service he was attending, and whether there could be any fellowship at all between the two worshipping assemblies” and exemplifies this with a detailed comparison. This was, of course written before the unifying effect of modern liturgical revision with its many agreements of both structure and theological understanding.

⁴¹ Op. cit. pp145-148

⁴² Op. cit. p.147

⁴³ The Seasonal Additions (the equivalent of proper prefaces, only distributed within the Eucharistic prayer, were not printed in the *Alternative Prayer Book, 1984* – serious omissions, but are an integral part of the version in *The Book of Common Prayer, 2004*.

⁴⁴ See above, Note 38.

⁴⁵ Without necessarily subscribing to the Lutheran concept of consubstantiation, which is hard to disentangle from Luther’s doctrine of ubiquity, there is much to be said for their formula of Christ’s presence “in, with, and under” the outward and visible signs of bread and wine. The expression is to be found in the *Formula of Concord (1577)*.

⁴⁶ BCP 2004 p.221.

⁴⁷ *Churches Respond to BEM, op. cit., pp36-47*

⁴⁸ Op. cit. p.37

⁴⁹ Op. cit. p.38.

⁵⁰ Op. cit. p.39

⁵¹ Ibid.

⁵² Ibid.

⁵³ *Churches Respond to BEM, o. cit., pp43-44*

⁵⁴ Op. cit. p.48.

⁵⁵ Op. cit. p.49

⁵⁶ Ibid. This anticipates more recent developments in the Anglican Communion, including the Church of Ireland in the form entitled, “Holy Communion by Extension (for those unable to be present at the Public Celebration”, which is available online on the Church of Ireland website.

⁵⁷ Op. cit. p.54.

⁵⁸ Ibid.

⁵⁹ Op. cit. p.57

⁶⁰ Ibid. The Lambeth Quadrilateral (approved at the Lambeth Conference of 1888) states from the Anglican standpoint the essentials for a reunited Church, as follows,

A. The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as ‘containing all things necessary to salvation’, as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith.

B. The Apostles’ Creed, as the Baptismal Symbol; and the Nicene Creed, as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith.

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.

D. The Historic episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of his church.

⁶¹ Op. cit, pp58,59

⁶²The issue of the purpose of such extended communion was under consideration by the House of Bishops and by the Liturgical Advisory Committee (LAC) at the time of writing.

⁶³So far as the ordination issue is concerned, the Church of Ireland has since the time of Lima signed up to the Porvoo Agreement with the Lutheran Churches of Scandinavia recognizing the ministry of those churches whether or not they have maintained unbroken a tactual form of the transmission of apostolic succession. And it has also entered into an agreement of ministerial recognition with the Methodist Church in Ireland.

⁶⁴The use of elements other than bread and wine remains, at the time of writing, an unresolved issue in the Anglican Communion.

⁶⁵*Churches Respond to BEM, Vol II*, op. cit. p.63

⁶⁶This statement tends to underestimate the interaction of the liturgies of the Church and the biblical narratives of institution. Max Thurian, in his Foreword to the first volume of his *Eucharistic Memorial* (op. cit) describes his work as an essay in “liturgical theology” and says it is a study in biblical theology “which seeks to provide a firm basis for the Eucharistic liturgy in the great Judaeo-Christian tradition represented by the Scriptures. But, if the Christian liturgy is based upon biblical theology, it does illuminate, in its turn, certain aspects of the Scriptures, since it is nothing else than the Word of the Father and of the Son, heard, sung and prayed in the Holy Spirit by the Church. The relation between the Bible and the liturgy, the constant transition from one to the other, provides the Church with inexhaustible themes for meditation and leads the faithful to a faith nourished by contemplation.” Op. cit. p.5.

⁶⁷Much modern Eucharistic scholarship is involved in a critical examination of this area, for example, Paul F. Bradshaw, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship*, SPCK 2002; Paul F. Bradshaw, *Reconstructing Early Christian Worship*, SPCK, 2009; Paul F. Bradshaw and Maxwell E. Johnson, *The Eucharistic Liturgies – Their evolution and interpretation*, SPCK 2012 (originally Liturgical Press, Collegeville, Minnesota).

⁶⁸The issue of the “propitiatory sacrifice” is examined more fully in Assessments, Part VII (1) below.

⁶⁹*Churches Respond to BEM II*, op. cit. p.66

⁷⁰Ibid. However, the consecration may be focused in various ways, depending upon particular church traditions which may not necessarily be mutually exclusive.

⁷¹Once again, there has been a considerable movement in some churches, including the Anglican since Lima. The Church of Ireland admits members of other Christian churches in good standing to receive Holy Communion, and in some churches and cathedrals where there are many visitors this is often spelt out verbally or in writing.

⁷²The concern of the Church of the Province of New Zealand seems to be the opposite to that expressed in some other Responses where the worry is rather that of spreading too widely that which is commemorated to the supposed neglect to the showing forth of the Lord’s death until he comes.

⁷³Ibid.

⁷⁴The Church of the Province of New Zealand perceives the importance of the issue of the adaptation of the Eucharistic elements within its own boundaries, but opts for caution, one assumes recognizing that it turns to some extent on what the intention of Jesus was at the Last Supper, and how the dominical command is to be obeyed.

⁷⁵*Churches Respond to BEM*, II, op. cit., p.69.

⁷⁶This raises the question of to what extent the Lima Liturgy is to be regarded as a one-off for a particular ecumenical occasion and to what extent is it something which can be meaningfully use within a particular denomination on an occasional basis. Study of Lima at successive meetings of the Glenstal Ecumenical Conferences in Ireland led to a departure in the form of a liturgy not tied to the particular threefold theme of Lima but aimed at providing something that the churches in Ireland could recognize as representative of their particular traditions. This, the Glenstal Liturgy was used at the monastery in 1986. A full account is given in the present writer's doctoral thesis *The theological implications of recent liturgical revision in the Church of Ireland*, Open University, 1987, pp591-197, 623.

⁷⁷There has been much emphasis on the meal aspect of the eucharist in recent liturgical study. It is, of course, implied in the Eucharistic title, "The Lord's Supper", and is supported in the biblical narratives in the Synoptic Gospels and Paul. It is a particular focus of Thomas O'Loughlin, *The Eucharist – Origins and Contemporary Understandings*, T & T Clark, 2015. and is a major theme in Paul F. Bradshaw and Maxwell E. Johnson, SPCK 2012, Chapters 1 & 2.

⁷⁸*Churches Respond to BEM*, II, p.74

⁷⁹ There have been more recent signs of tendencies in the United States and elsewhere of a willingness to welcome non-baptized people to holy communion, while maintaining a very strict baptismal discipline. While special circumstances sometimes exist it is hard to avoid the conclusion that there is an inversion of the historic order of baptism as the sacrament of initiation and holy communion as the sacrament of continuation, and this would require justification from a biblical and historical point of view.

⁸⁰Given the very hostile attitude to the decisive commitment implied by baptism traditionally from the Hindu community it would seem that in the context in which the question has arisen an answer is implied.

⁸¹It is at least possible that the words of institution were not invariably used (or perhaps not used at all, in the earliest liturgies of the Church) and this may be implied by St Paul having to remind the Christians at Corinth what the holy communion was about. It has been questioned whether the Syriac liturgy of Addai and Mari originally had an institution narrative and it is not clear that there was one even in the fourth century in Jerusalem where there is no clear evidence of it in the liturgical instruction given in the lectures ascribed to St Cyril of Jerusalem.

⁸²Richard Hooker's contribution is perhaps relevant here, and must be taken in its totality:

Take therefore that wherein all agree, and then consider by itself what cause why the rest in question should not rather be left as superfluous than urged as necessary...the sacrament being of itself but a corruptible and earthly creature must needs be thought an unlikely instrument to work so admirable effects in man, we are therefore to rest ourselves altogether upon *the strength of his glorious*

power who is able and will bring to pass that the bread and cup which he giveth us shall be truly the thing he promiseth.

What these elements are in themselves it skilleth not, it is enough that to me which take them they are the body and blood of Christ, his promise in witness hereof sufficeth, his word he knoweth which way to accomplish; why should any cogitation possess the mind of a faithful communicant but this, "O my God thou art true, O my soul thou art happy!" (v. lxvii. 7, 12).

The real presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not therefore to be sought for in this sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the sacrament.

All three quotations are from the Evangelical scholar, Bishop Stephen Neill in his classic *Anglicanism*, Penguin 1958, pp123-124. He is of the opinion that the final quotation is not, as it may appear, minimal or receptionist. "He is maintaining that the Sacrament cannot be understood, if it is broken up into separate and isolated parts. It can be understood only if it is considered in its complex totality as oblation, consecration, and communion. We cannot theologically think of the Gift, unless we at the same time think of the Giver, and of those who devoutly and thankfully receive." It is, however, hard to follow Hooker entirely in his view of the elements which the Lord himself designated as his "Body" and "Blood", and may therefore be considered as a sacramental representation and mode of his presence among his people. Where Christ, through the effectual signs of his presence, is, there he is to be honoured, and there he is rightly and properly adored.

⁸³What would seem to be unique about the Lord's Eucharistic presence is that it is sacramental in character. But this in so way denies other modes of his presence, in the Word read and preached, and in the neighbour that must be served.

⁸⁴Ibid.

⁸⁵Ibid.

⁸⁶Ibid. Worship, for the Christian, must involve the acknowledgement of God's infinite worth and he is worthy of all honour and all thanksgiving, and all praise. But the service of the other for whom Christ died has a priority equal to that according to which he gave his life on the cross. In effect we are speaking of the Summary of the Law the rehearsal of which is an integral part of the Eucharistic liturgy. (BCP 2004) p202.

⁸⁷The symbolism of the bread, apart from its obvious suitability of representing the Bread of Life, also ties in with the declaration at the beginning of the Haggadah in the observance of the Passover, clearly of enormous antiquity because it is in Aramaic, the language of Jesus and the apostles rather than the classic Hebrew of the Old Covenant, "This is the bread of affliction that our fathers ate in the land of Egypt. All who are hungered – let them come and eat: all who are needy – let them come and celebrate the Passover. Now we are here, but next year may we be in the land of Israel! Now we are slaves, but next year may we be free men! Jesus action in interpreting the Passover bread as referring to himself -"This is my body"- and to the wine as an indication of his sacrificial offering, of which one version is "This cup is the new covenant in my blood" is so charged with meaning that there are clearly problems in using elements which are not imbued with such significance.(Luke 14:20; 1 Cor 11:25).

CHAPTER THREE, ASSESSMENTS, PART 5
THE EUCHARIST AND LAMBETH, WITH PARTICULAR REFERENCE TO
THE 1958 LAMBETH CONFERENCE AND POST 1958 DEVELOPMENTS,
INCLUDING THE GENERAL RESPONSE OF THE BISHOPS TO ARCIC.

Successive Lambeth Conferences held at approximately ten year intervals had the Book of Common Prayer on the agenda from the very first meeting in 1867 up to 1958, the latter being seminal in its contribution to the development of modern liturgy in the Anglican Communion.¹ On a number of occasions prior to 1958 there was a mention of the Prayer Book in the Encyclical Letter addressed to all the member churches, and in most cases there were specific resolutions on the subject matter. In a preparatory Report for the Lambeth Conference of 1958 entitled *Prayer Book Revision in the Church of England* the relevant texts were cited in an Appendix under the heading, ‘Lambeth Conferences and the Book of Common Prayer’.² In a helpful introduction to this it is indicated that discussion of the Prayer Book by the eight conferences preceding that date had centred round five main topics which could be briefly indicated as follows,³

- A. The Book of Common Prayer as a standard of doctrine: the importance of local variations being consistent with its spirit and principles.
- B. The dangers connected with unilateral action in revision on the part of a single province or diocese.
- C. The procedure to be adopted for the revision of local prayer books.
- D. The principles to be observed in the revision of local prayer books.
- E. Particular recommendations for the revision and enrichment of the Book of Common Prayer.

It may be noticed that there was a tendency throughout to speak of ‘The Book of Common Prayer’ as it is was a single entity, and it is hard to escape the impression that whatever additions or modifications were being contemplated the starting point, although unstated, seems to have been the 1662 Prayer Book of the Church of England.⁴ However, if this was the case it seems that it may have been overlooked that at least so far as the eucharist was concerned there was not one but two historic traditions which had existed side by side for centuries. Attention was called to this divergence in an important contribution to the Anglican Congress at Minneapolis by the American liturgical scholar Dr Massey Shepherd⁵, indicating that that there was one strand of eucharistic tradition deriving its arrangement and ethos from Archbishop Cranmer’s Second Prayer Book of 1552 which, as modified in 1559 and again in 1662 was still the official Eucharistic liturgy of the Church of England. And this was followed also at the time of speaking by the Churches in Wales, Ireland, Canada, Australia, and New Zealand.⁶ On the other hand, he pointed out that there was a second strand of tradition represented by the Scottish Prayer Book of 1637, associated with the name of Archbishop Laud though not the work of his hands, which had returned to the pattern of the First Prayer Book of 1549.⁷ The Book was abortive, however, and never came into general use.⁸ It was taken up by the Non-Jurors of the eighteenth century and, with some changes made as a result of their studies in the Eastern liturgies, it contributed to the shaping of the Scottish Liturgy of 1764⁹ which in turn was taken to the Episcopal Church of America by its first bishop who had been consecrated, after the American revolution, by the non-juring Scots. In the twentieth century this liturgy had been substantially adopted by the Church in South

Africa, in India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon, and later, by the Church in Japan.¹⁰ The Liturgy of 1549 itself had been officially authorized by the Church of the Province of the West Indies, and the newly formed Church of South India had likewise adopted a liturgy of this type.¹¹ The basic difference between the two types of Eucharistic liturgy, Professor Massey had said, was centred in the oblation, whether it was made before or after communion. On this question there had been strong differences of opinion, for it raised a very fundamental theological issue, debated since the time of the Reformation; namely, the nature and character of the Eucharist as a sacrifice.¹²

Another important preparatory document issued before the Lambeth Conference of 1958 was that entitled, *Principles of Prayer Book Revision - The Report of a Select Committee of the Church of India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon appointed by the Metropolitan to Review the Principles of Prayer Book Revision in the Anglican Communion*.¹³ This very comprehensive document, which had a Foreword by the Archbishop of Canterbury, included a detailed examination of the existing revisions of the Book of Common Prayer. There was a section on the Holy Communion service, in which there was a review of Anglican developments, an examination of what are termed 'Deficiencies of 1662, a study of significant points in recent revisions, and consideration of two criticisms, viz that the changes involved deviation from Anglican Standards with particular reference to the anamnesis and the epiclesis and that recent developments in liturgical study had not been adequately heeded.¹⁴ A number of other issues were discussed including matters of particular interest and concerned in the mission field of the C.I.P.B.C. and the (United) Church of South India.

Such a very full document cannot be fully examined in the present study, but some matters of relevance to later liturgical developments following Lambeth 1958 and some theological points which in certain ways anticipated the discussions leading to the ARCIC report much later following the massive changes associated with the Second Vatican Council in the Roman Catholic Church are here as briefly as possible summarized.¹⁵

In a very full and careful presentation of the history of the Prayer Book eucharist from Cranmer onwards, with attention drawn to the principles of both the 1549 and 1552 rites the importance of the witness of the Caroline divines of the seventeenth century from Lancelot Andrewes onwards is emphasized, in particular their development of a fuller and richer eucharistic theology. They were concerned to restore the order of prayers as found in 1549, which the compilers themselves had regarded as an interim rite designed to test reaction to change.¹⁶

In particular the absence from the central eucharistic prayer of any expression of the Godward aspect of the rite as the Church's memorial in which it commemorates and pleads the one Sacrifice of Christ seemed to the Caroline divines a serious departure from the tenor of the ancient liturgies. The line of development through the abortive Scottish Liturgy to that of the Scottish liturgy of 1764 resulted for the first time in any part of the Anglican Communion of a fully authoritative sanction being given to the idea that the supreme act of Christian worships consists in offering the eucharistic Sacrifice in union with Christ's continual presentation of His Sacrifice in heaven.¹⁷

Under the heading of "Deficiencies of 1662" the Report pointed to the vastly increased knowledge that had been gained in modern times by discovery and research of the liturgical documents of the first four centuries, and from the enquiry of Biblical scholars into the basic ideas underlying the institution of the Eucharist. The most conspicuous

defects, to which a comparison of the rites which had been or were still in use in other branches of the Church and Biblical research pointed most emphatically, were three in number, namely,

1. The absence from it of any formula for making a memorial before God of the saving events commemorated, which was a meaning once again widely attached to the Scripture usage of the Greek word *anamnesis* and was intimately connected with the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist.¹⁸

2. Its lack of fullness and balance in the presentation of the work of redemption by its concentration on the death of Christ alone without any reference to the resurrection, exaltation, and second coming;¹⁹

3. The meagreness, apart from the Preface and Sanctus, of the eucharistic element in a prayer which originally developed out of the thanksgiving uttered by our Lord at the Last Supper.²⁰

These defects, the Report said, had been further emphasized by the missionary expansion of Anglicanism to all the corners of the earth which had brought new demands by way of adapting our liturgical heritage to environments very diverse from that in which it was formed.

However, it recorded one outstanding merit to which fresh testimony had been borne by the Liturgical movement at what was then the present day. In the primitive Church one great purpose of the ceremonial of the Liturgy was to express the *corporate* character of the Eucharist as the common act of the Body of Christ. In the West during the Middle Ages a variety of factors combined to undermine appreciation of the Liturgy as a communal act of worship, so that the Mass became a sacrifice offered by the celebrant on behalf of the Church instead of a sacrifice offered by the Church in its corporate unity. The Reformers, the document affirms, rediscovered the congregation, and the church of the twentieth century owed it to them and the Anglican Church was equipped with a Liturgy which enabled and encouraged her children as members of a worshipping community.²¹ The idea, which St Paul regarded as of such fundamental importance (1 Cor 10:16) that the effect of Communion was to knit together in one body those who partook of the one bread, found memorable expression in the Thanksgiving.

In its review of all what were then recent revisions of the eucharist there was a desire to bring out the significance of the Offertory. What were termed the exaggerated emphasis on the financial aspect characteristic of the 1662 sentences had been drastically reduced and the offering of the bread and wine as well as the alms had been an integral part of the rite. The observance of the recommendation in C.I.P.B.C. and C that the bread and wine on Sundays be brought to the celebrant by two chosen members of the congregation would ensure the active participation of the laity, as members of a priestly body, in the ceremony, so recalling the impressive ceremonial at the Offertory in the primitive Liturgy when the bread and wine required for the Sacrament was selected from the offerings of the people.^{22/}

With regard to the Prayer of Consecration, as well as welcoming the restoration of its unity through the moving of the Prayer of Humble Access in several revisions, and also the emphasis on the fact that the eucharistic prayer was an expansion of the thanksgiving uttered by Our Lord at the Last Supper, which was a “blessing” of God for His gifts and not a blessing invoked upon the bread and wine.²³

With regard to the Anamnesis it was pointed out that all revisions without exception contain an anamnesis, thereby restoring to the Prayer of Consecration that rounded recital of the redemptive activity of Christ the lack of which was termed one of the most conspicuous deficiencies of 1662.²⁴

A brief history of the transferring of the Epiclesis or invocation of the Holy Spirit, (where it existed) to an “Eastern” position following the Anamnesis following an initiative by the Scottish Bishops in 1764 and in this way giving the Consecration Prayer a Trinitarian pattern.²⁵

A transferring of the Prayer of Oblation, and the Lord’s Prayer from the 1662 position to the position of 1549 preceding communion is mentioned with the self-oblation attached to the Prayer of Thanksgiving is highlighted. This it was thought fitted in with the concept which St Augustine was accustomed to emphasize that it was in and through Communion with Christ the Head that the Church as His Mystical Body offered itself to the Father.²⁶

The document then proceeded to deal with two criticisms of these developments (a) that the changes involved deviation from Anglican standards and (b) that recent developments in liturgical study had not been adequately heeded. With regard to (a) there is very full treatment of the anamnesis.²⁷ Two key statements are that it is undeniable that Archbishop Cranmer deliberately excised from the Canon of 1549 those phrases in the Latin Mass which echoed the doctrine (of the eucharistic offering) first unambiguously expounded by Cyprian in the third century A.D.²⁸ but it also said,

Nevertheless, how little those who use Cranmer’s liturgy are necessarily committed to his theology was signally demonstrated when, after the condemnation of Anglican Orders in 1896 by Leo XIII in the Bull *Apostolicae Curae*, The English Archbishops in their reply *Saepius Officio* stated, “we truly teach the doctrine of the eucharistic sacrifice...For first we offer the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; then next we plead and represent before the Father the Sacrifice of the Cross, and by it we confidently entreat remission of sins and all other benefits of the Lord’s passion for the whole Church.”²⁹

With regard to (b) the treatment is also helpful from an historical viewpoint, but in making a distinction between a “consecratory” epiclesis and a “communion” epiclesis two mainly separate lines of approach were left unresolved reflecting the divisions that emerged during the controversies over the ill-fated 1928 Church of England Prayer Book.³⁰ Only in much more recent revisions of the eucharist has it proved possible to produce forms that particular Anglican churches such as the Church of Ireland seem able to live with.³¹ The issue of what constitutes eucharistic consecration was at stake and also the concept of a “moment of consecration”³².

With regard to the results of liturgical study and research the document underlines the discovery that there was no a single Apostolic Liturgy which was best represented by the surviving liturgies of the Syro-Byzantine family.³³ It was affirmed that all the available evidence pointed to a great diversity of practice in the third and fourth centuries and the deceptive uniformity of the classical liturgies was now attributed to assimilation by borrowing in the late fourth and fifth centuries. Such features as the developed Epiclesis and the traditional way of using the Institution Narrative were in consequence now recognized to be in no sense primitive.³⁴

Reference was made to the labours of such scholars as Dom Gregory Dix³⁵ and it appeared that the shape of the primitive liturgy was a very different shape from that which was postulated by the older school of liturgists. Two points in particular had been emphasized, namely:

1. That Our Lord's Prayer at the Last Supper was a Jewish thanksgiving-blessing and the primitive Eucharistic Prayer was an expansion of this³⁶; and
2. That the essential structure of the rite consisted in the four actions recorded in the New Testament accounts of the institution – taking, blessing, breaking, and giving³⁷.

There seemed to be in the document some degree of hesitation at what were deemed to be the radical implications of such thinking. However, one has to bear in mind that the preparatory Lambeth 1958 documents belong to a stage at which, although a number of Anglican Prayer Books had at that stage been enriched by changes and developments in the eucharistic rites of the churches, mainly a development of the 1549-1637-1764 type, this only represented a beginning of the flowering of modern liturgical revision and the theology underlying the work of liturgists in the particular churches of the Anglican Communion.

A very full explanation of the history of Prayer Book revision (actual and attempted) in the Church of England may be found in the preparatory report, mentioned above, *Prayer Book Revision in the Church of England – a Memorandum of the Church of England Liturgical Commission*, LC 1958/2, London, SPCK, 1958.³⁸ This traces the history of the developments which led to the failure of the 1928 Prayer Book to gain parliamentary support and also the subsequent history of the contents of the book. Also very helpful is a summary of theological and other changes since 1928 which were affecting future Prayer Book Revision in England. Some Guiding Principles for Future Prayer Book Revision were set forth.³⁹

The Lambeth Conference of 1958 marked a turning point in the entire history of liturgical revision and reform in the Anglican Communion. A major sub-division of the Conference concerned itself with what was called 'Progress in the Anglican Communion'; and sub-committee thirty-two members chaired by Dr George Simms, Archbishop of Dublin and with the distinguished liturgist Bishop Leslie Brown of Uganda as its secretary concerned itself with the Book of Common Prayer.⁴⁰ Archbishop Simms was later to be appointed chairman of the newly-formed 'Liturgical Advisory Committee' on its formation in 1962,⁴¹ and he retained this position during his ten years as Archbishop of Armagh up to his retirement in 1979.⁴²

It is stated in the Introduction that the subject with which the sub-committee was charged, the Book of Common Prayer, was fundamental to all the subjects which the Conference was considering, for the Prayer Book was the public expression of the worship of God in the Anglican Communion, and it was on the worship of God, creation's secret force, that all human activity depended. Worship then was the first concern of the Church, and it must be the worship of whole Church, priests and people together bringing to God every human interest and activity and problem and conflict to be taken into his will and used for his purposes.

Reference was made to the place of the Book of Common Prayer of 1662 in the life of the Anglican Communion relating to which the underlying assumption, and often the declared principle, had been that this should remain as the basic pattern, and indeed as a bond of unity in doctrine and worship for the Communion as a whole. However, it was acknowledged that in accordance with Article Thirty-four of the Thirty-nine Articles, every particular or national Church had authority to ordain, change, and abolish, ceremonies or rites of the Church ordained only by man's authority, so that all things be done to edifying, a number of new Prayer Books had appeared in the Communion, and in practically every case there had been a revision, more or less adventurous, of the 1662 service of Holy Communion. It was recognized that the church had entered a period of liturgical change, with all the advantages and disadvantages of such a time.⁴³

On the basis of its discussions the sub-committee came up with comments intended as serve as guidelines in such a situation, which were given as follows,⁴⁴

Features in the Books of Common Prayer which are essential to the safeguarding of the unity of the Anglican Communion

1. Use of the Canonical Scriptures.
2. Use of the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds.
3. Orders of Holy Baptism with water and the threefold Name.
4. Orders of Confirmation by the Bishop, by prayer with the laying-on of hands.
5. Orders of Holy Communion, with use of bread and wine and explicit intention to obey our Lord's command.
6. Forms for Episcopal Ordination to each of the three Holy Orders by prayer with the laying on of hands.

Features in the Books of Common Prayer which are most effective in maintaining the traditional doctrinal emphasis of the worship and witness of the Anglican Communion

1. Forms of worship in the vernacular.
2. Wholly *common prayer*; avoiding official private prayers of the celebrant while the people are otherwise engaged; avoiding prayer which cannot be heard by the congregation, and for communicants at every celebration.
3. Services easy for the people to follow and therefore with a restrained use of seasonal variations.
4. The importance of both Word and Sacrament in worship is recognized, a due balance being kept between them. This involves provision for the regular celebration of the Holy Communion and the extensive use of Holy Scripture in the Offices and Holy Communion. Similarly in many Prayer Books Baptism is required to be administered in the course of Morning or Evening Prayer, thus providing a setting of psalms and lessons for the sacramental act.
5. The use of one of the historic Creeds, recited by all, at the principal popular services of Mattins, Holy Communion, and Evensong.
6. The reading of the Old Testament, as well as of the New, in lessons of approximately equal length at the Offices of Mattins and Evensong.

7. The use of the Psalms as the normal vehicle of common praise and meditation.
8. The honouring of the Saints without invocation.

Suggested modifications or additions for the further recovery of other elements of the worship of the Primitive Church

1. Exhortations have a legitimate function in the liturgy but they should be shorter and fewer.
2. The present corporate expressions of penitence need to be modified both in length and language.
3. More extensive provision of litanies, with shorter clauses, for corporate intercession, thanksgiving, and adoration; with the discouragement of long strings of collects or other prayers for this purpose.
4. The recovery of the "People's Prayers" at the Eucharist by breaking up the Prayer for the Church into sections, each followed by congregational response or into a litany with short clauses.
5. The Offertory, with which the people should be definitely associated, to be more closely connected with the Prayer of Consecration.
6. The events for which thanksgiving is made in the Consecration Prayer are not to be confined to Calvary but include thanksgiving for all the principal "mighty works of God", especially the resurrection and the ascension of our Lord, and his return in glory.

Under the heading of "The Holy Communion Service" the hope was expressed that it was now possible to work towards a liturgy which would win its way throughout the Anglican Communion. The Committee did not suggest a return to the rigid and legalistic ideas of uniformity which prevailed for some centuries. It was recognized that even in the Sacrament of Unity there was a place for variations of rite to meet local situations and needs. What was urged was the possibility of a basic pattern for the service of Holy Communion which would commend itself to all provinces.⁴⁵

It was for this reason that there appeared to be a need for a Committee representative of all parts of the Anglican Communion which would be asked to work towards the production of an outline of the structure of the Holy Communion service. There would, it was recognized, be difficulties in giving effect to this suggestion, but it was thought that these could be overcome. It would mean that the revising authorities in the different provinces would have the opportunity of seeing their work in relation to the whole Anglican Communion.⁴⁶

In the Committee's judgement it was regrettable that there should be any necessity for alternative rites within a single province, but it recognized that circumstances sometimes made this inevitable, at least for a period. It considered that, however, that a province might find it advisable to test new liturgical work for limited periods under the control of the ordinary.⁴⁷

Still in connection with the eucharist careful consideration was given to the Scriptures, Sermon and needs of Catechumens. It recommended that an Old Testament Lesson be provided for the Ante-Communion on Sundays the readings

being chosen with a view to their correspondence with the epistle or Gospels. The three readings might be separated by psalms or portions of psalms, chosen if possible so that they might underline or develop the theme of the lessons. The function of the preacher as the interpreter of God's Word might be better emphasized if the sermon at the principal Sunday Eucharist immediately followed the reading of the three lessons, with the Nicene Creed succeeding it as the response of faith to the whole Ministry of the Word. The restoration of the Gloria in Excelsis to its original position before the collect would enable catechumens to experience a note of adoration.⁴⁸

A substantial part of the sub-committee's work was devoted to the theological issue of the eucharistic sacrifice. Dr Massey Shepherd's comments at the Anglican Congress at Minneapolis in 1954 reminding his hearers that basically there were two Eucharistic liturgies in the Anglican Communion stemming respectively from the Prayer Books of 1549 and 1552 expressive of two approaches to the problem of the eucharistic sacrifice were quoted.⁴⁹ It felt that the tensions between these two approaches needed to be resolved. The Committee believed this to be possible as a result of new knowledge gained from biblical and liturgical studies. Several paragraphs are devoted to a Scriptural exposition of the sacrifice of Christ on the cross. Proceeding to the liturgy it was said,⁵⁰

In our baptism we were united with him by the likeness of his death (Rom. 6:5) and in the Eucharist we are inviting him as we eat his Body and drink his Blood (John 6:56). So we come to the Father in and through Jesus our great high priest. We have nothing to offer that we have not first received, but we offer our praise and thanksgiving for Christ's sacrifice for us and so present it again, and ourselves in him, before the Father. We are partakers of the sacrifice of Christ (1 Cor 10:16), and this is shown forth by our sacrifice of praise to God continually through Christ, and by our life of service and suffering for his sake in the world. We ourselves, incorporated in the mystical body of Christ, are the sacrifice we offer. Christ with us offers us in himself to God.

And in a very significant statement, the committee endorsed the words of Dr A.G. Hebert, S.S.M.⁵¹

"The Eucharistic sacrifice, that storm-centre of controversy, is finding in our day a truly evangelical expression from the "Catholic" side, when it is insisted that the sacrificial action is not any sort of re-immolation of Christ, nor a sacrifice additional to his one sacrifice, but a participation in it. The true celebrant is Christ the high priest, and the Christian people are assembled as members of his Body to present before God his sacrifice, and to be themselves offered up in sacrifice through their union with him. This, however, involves a repudiation of certain mediaeval developments, notably the habitual celebration of the Eucharist without the Communion of the people; or the notion that the offering of the Eucharist is the concern of the individual priest rather than of the assembled Church; and above all, any idea that in the Eucharist we offer a sacrifice to propitiate God. We offer it only because he has offered the one sacrifice, once for all, in which we need to participate.

It may be seen that in this 1958 declaration there is, in effect, an anticipation of what was later to be affirmed by both Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry (B.E.M.) and ARCIC. However, it would appear that what they said was over-optimistic in that the

Evangelical constituency has tended to have difficulties with the Godward aspect of the eucharist regarding it primarily in the light of a gift from God to man rather than an offering of man to God. Since this was an is the basic thrust of the 1552-1662 rite (now Holy Communion One in the 2004 Prayer Book) it had its defenders among some who would not normally be regarded as Evangelical Christians.⁵²

The committee had some irenic words to say on the subject of the Epiiclesis,⁵³

Whether or not an invocation of the Holy Spirit upon the worshippers all upon the elements of both is to be included in the prayer of consecration, it is to be remembered that the Holy Spirit informs and vivifies the whole right and that the so-called collect for purity as in consequence a profound theological significance.

Turning finally to the subject of eucharistic consecration, the committee said,⁵⁴

We desire to draw attention to a conception of consecration which is scriptural, primitive and goes behind subsequent controversies with respect to the moment and formula of consecration. This is associated with the Jewish origin and meaning of *eucharistia* and may be called consecration through thanksgiving. To bless anything and to pronounce the thanksgiving over it or not two actions but one.

“Everything created by God is good. And nothing is to be rejected if it is received with thanksgiving; for then it is consecrated by the word of God and prayer (1 Tim. 4:4,5).

Thanksgiving unveils the glory and generosity of the Creator and the original meaning and purpose of creation. It releases man’s response to what has been done for him in redemption and sets free the love implanted in him.

“The word of God accepted by the people of God coming back to God from the lips of those giving thanks, actually sanctifies the creatures over which it is pronounced”.

Prayer Book Revision was the subject of four resolutions passed by the entire Lambeth Conference:

73. The Conference welcomes contemporary movement towards unanimity in doctrinal and liturgical matters by those of differing traditions in the Anglican Communion as a result of new knowledge gained from biblical and liturgical studies, and is happy to know of parallel progress in this sphere by some Roman Catholic and Reformed theologians. It commends the Report of the subcommittee on the Book of Common Prayer on this subject to the careful study of all sections of the Anglican Communion.⁵⁵

74. The Conference, recognising the work of Prayer Book Revision being done in different parts of the Anglican Communion,

(a) calls attention to those features in the Books of Common Prayer which are essential to the safeguarding of our unity: i.e. the use of the Canonical Scriptures and the Creeds, Holy Baptism, Confirmation, Holy Communion, and the Ordinal;⁵⁶

(b) notes that there are other features in these books which are effective in maintaining the traditional doctrinal emphasis and ecclesiastical culture of Anglicanism and therefore should be preserved;⁵⁷

(c) and urges that the chief aim of Prayer Book Revision should be to further that recovery of the worship of the primitive church which was the aim of the compilers of the first prayer books of the Church of England.⁵⁸

75. The Conference commends to the study of the whole Anglican Communion the counsel on Prayer Book Revision given in the report of the subcommittee on the Book of Common Prayer.

Under the heading of “The Holy Communion Service”, the Conference said,

76. The Conference requests the Archbishop of Canterbury, in co-operation with the Consultative Body, to appoint an Advisory Committee to prepare recommendations for the structure of the Holy Communion service which could be taken into consideration by any Church or Province revising its Eucharistic rite, and which would both conserve the doctrinally balance of the Anglican tradition and take account of present liturgical knowledge.⁵⁹

The post-Lambeth developments in liturgical revision have been well documented by the Conservative Evangelical liturgist Colin Buchanan (later Bishop of Aston), the texts of the eucharist being given in a series of publications in succession to Bernard Wigan’s pioneering *The Liturgy in English* (1962). These were *Modern Anglican Liturgies 1958-1968*; *Further Anglican Liturgies 1968-1975*; *Latest Anglican Liturgies 1976-1984*, and *Anglican Eucharistic Liturgies, 1985-2010*.⁶⁰ Explanatory introductory material, especially in the first two that he edited, is particularly helpful to those wishing to trace the history of the matter,⁶¹ and there is a useful summary up to the eve of the groundbreaking Inter-Anglican Liturgical Consultation, meeting in Dublin in 1995 which will be looked at in detail in Chapter Three, Part Seven (1) of the present study.⁶² It will be seen that the Report of the Prayer-Book sub-committee endorsed by the Lambeth Conference of 1958 was seminal, in that it gave the green light for liturgical revision throughout the Anglican Communion.⁶³ It is not a coincidence that the Church of Ireland was to authorize the appointment of a “Liturgical Advisory Committee (LAC) in 1962 which was to be responsible for both the Alternative Prayer Book of 1984 and the 2004 Book of Common Prayer and the production of a great deal of resource material for use with the latter.⁶⁴ The Revd (later Canon) Edgar Turner, one of the Church of Ireland’s foremost liturgists, was appointed to the committee at its inauguration and was still involved (in his final years as a Consultant) up to his deeply regretted death in 2016.⁶⁵ The current writer was elected in 1986 and was still a member (currently co-opted) at the time of writing (2018).⁶⁶

Bishop Colin Buchanan identified two members of the Lambeth sub-committee, who were symbolic of changing attitudes at the time of Lambeth 1958, namely the then Dean of Lincoln, the Rt. Revd Colin Dunlop, who is listed among the bishops at Lambeth, and Leslie Brown, Bishop of Uganda, who was to become Secretary of the group and was to hold the same position on the sub-committee which produced the Lambeth Conference Report itself. He said a large part of the recommendations of the group reflected principles on which the South India Liturgy had been created. He had attempted in *Modern Anglican Liturgies, 1958-68 pp8-21* to spell out both the dependence of the group on South India, and the later effects of the same principles on *A Liturgy for Africa*

(to a large extent the work of Bishop Brown) and the first pan-Anglican structure report.⁶⁷

As explained by Colin Buchanan, there were two “structure documents”, dating from 1965 and 1969. The first arose from Lambeth 1958 and was produced by four persons, with the Most Revd. Leslie Brown, then Archbishop of Uganda, responsible for the drafting. The second arose from a consultation on liturgy which followed the Lambeth Conference in August 1968 and was drafted by Dr Ronald Jasper and Bishop Leslie Brown, by that time Bishop of St Edmundsbury and Ipswich. The guidance given by these successive documents was of a general character but the thinking behind them had a significant influence, for example upon “Holy Communion 1972” the first form of the eucharist in modern English in the Church of Ireland, which was issued for trial use. The excellence of this rite was shown by the extent to which it was incorporated into the form of the eucharist in the Alternative Prayer Book of 1984 (with, as an alternative to this, a form from the Church of England in Australia). In its definitive version it appeared as Eucharistic Prayer One in Holy Communion Two in the 2004 Prayer Book of the Church of Ireland, and, at the time, of writing, was the Prayer most commonly used.⁶⁸

Two other initiatives from this period are mentioned by Bishop Colin Buchanan. In October 1983 a sub-group of the Primates’ Meeting (an innovation in the structure of episcopal authority in the Anglican Communion). The Primates had been considering whether the introduction of new eucharistic liturgies affected the Communion’s traditional sense of identity. The sub-group wrote a report on the question, “How does the Anglican Communion retain its traditional sense of identity?” which went to the Lagos meeting.⁶⁹

The bishops returned to the issue at the 1988 Lambeth Conference, and a section to which Colin Buchanan acted as secretary worked on principles of liturgical renewal, one section of which dealt with the eucharist under the heading “Meeting and Mission”. It read,

We do not attempt here to discuss technicalities of the eucharistic rites. Instead we note that in the Eucharist the church unites in the praises of God, receives God’s holy word, expresses her life in the Spirit, sustains the mutual fellowship of her members, recommits herself to Almighty God, and, from this holy feast, returns to the world to fulfil God’s mission. Eucharist is a locus for mutual sharing and Ministry for the building up of the church. The Eucharist may include: various teaching methods to minister the word, drama, dance, extempore prayer, groups for study or intercession, healing ministries, weddings, and other public activities of the local Christian community. Christian mission is itself vitiated if the Church’s eucharistic practice does not in fact build up the people of God.⁷⁰

This was followed by a brief mention of agapes or love-feasts, and of presidency at communion and of lay distributants.⁷¹

As will be dealt with more fully in Chapter Three of the present work, Part 7 (1) by 1993 that there was a secure, if skeletal, structure of international Anglican liturgical “consultations”, including the affirmation and support of the joint meeting of the primates and the Anglican Consultative Council at Cape Town in January 1993. The consultations were true gatherings of liturgists, from all six continents. By 1991 there had been for full consultations, one every two years its 1985. The 1985 and 1991 meetings had handled initiation questions the 1987 meeting issues of the role of the laity in worship along with questions of the structure of the IALC, and following the 1989 one the problem of Inculturation. The Eucharist had not been considered in itself, but was put on the agenda

for the next full IALC at Dublin in 1995. It was at the 1995 Consultation in Dublin, which the present writer attended, that the next major step forward took place.⁷²

With regard to Lambeth and ARCIC the following resolution (No 33) was passed by the Lambeth Conference of 1968 under the heading, **The Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission,**⁷³

The Conference:

1. welcomes the work of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission which was set up jointly by the Lambeth Conference of 1968 and by the Vatican Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity;
2. recognizes in the three Agreed Statements of this Commission [Eucharistic Doctrine, the Windsor statement, 1971, Ministry and Ordination (Canterbury 1973, and Authority in the Church, Venice 1976)] a solid achievement, one in which we can recognize the faith of our Church, and hopes that they will provide a basis for sacramental sharing between our two Communion if and when the finished Statements are approved by the respective authorities of our Communion;
3. invites ARCIC to provide further explication of the Agreed Statements in consideration of responses received by them;
4. commends to the appropriate authorities in each Communion further consideration of the implications of the Agreed Statements in the light of the Joint Preparatory Commission (the Malta Report received by the Lambeth Conference 1968 – see page 134 of its report), with a view to bringing about a closer sharing between our two Communion in life, worship, and mission;
5. asks the Secretary General of the Anglican Consultative Council to bring this resolution to the attention of the various synods of the Anglican Communion for discussion and action;
6. asks that in any continuing Commission, the Church of the South and the East be adequately represented.

This was to bear fruit, so far as the Church of Ireland was concerned, in *The Response of the General Synod of the Church of Ireland to the Final Report of ARCIC-I*, May 1986, APCK, 1987, whose eucharistic reflections are considered above in Chapter Three, Assessments, Parts One and Two.

NOTES ON CHAPTER THREE, PART FIVE

¹Full texts up to 1920 in Davidson of Lambeth, Archbishop, Compiler and Director, *The Six Lambeth Conferences 1867-1920*, SPCK, 1920, 1929, and subsequent Conferences are covered by *Lambeth Conference 1930, Encyclical Letter from the Bishops with the Resolutions and Reports*, SPCK, 1930; *Lambeth Conference 1948 - Encyclical Letter from the Bishops together with the Resolutions and Reports*, SPCK, 1948.

²*Prayer Book Revision in the Church of England - A Memorandum of the Church of England Liturgical Commission*, LC 1958/2, London, SPCK, LC 1958/2, London, Appendix 2 pp42-55.

³Op. cit. p.42

⁴For example, in the Encyclical letter of 1948 the bishops said, (Op. cit. p.53)

Our organized life will rightly be influenced by local colour and national culture, and will, in consequence, develop varied characteristics. But within this diversity it is essential to maintain such a unity of faith and order as will preserve its unity of purpose and spirit. We find the authoritative expression of that faith and order in the Book of Common Prayer, together with the Ordinal. This book is the heritage of the whole Communion, and, while revisions of it are made to suit the needs of different Churches, it provides our accepted pattern of liturgical order, worship, and doctrine which is to be everywhere maintained.

⁵The Revd Professor Massey H. Shepherd, "Our Anglican Understanding of Corporate Worship", pp68-84 in Dawley, P.M., *Report of the Anglican Congress, 1954*, SPCK 1955, esp. pp77-78.

⁶Op. cit.

⁷Op. cit.

⁸Op. cit.

⁹Op. cit.

¹⁰Op. cit.

¹¹Op. cit.

¹²Op. cit.

¹³SPCK 1957 LC 1958/3

¹⁴Op. cit, pp34-58.

¹⁵For the fruits of the Liturgical Movement in the Roman Catholic Church see the *Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy* pp 137-170 in *The Documents of Vatican II* ed. Walter M Abbott, S.J. and Very Rev. Msgr Joseph Gallagher, Geoffrey Chapman, 1967. Valuable commentaries on the texts of the revised

¹⁶Op.cit p.35.

¹⁷Ibid.

¹⁸Op. cit p.37

¹⁹Ibid. This is a concern not only with Anglican revisers of the liturgy but was important in ecumenical conversations as well. On the other hand, the centrality of the once for all offering has been a central feature of liturgies of the 1552-1662 kind, and remains a concern of the Evangelical constituency. More recent liturgical revision for example, Eucharistic Prayers One and Two in the 2004 Prayer Book have shown that a balance can be achieved between a biblical emphasis on the showing forth of Christ's death (evident in both the synoptic narratives of the Last Supper and in St Paul's teaching in 1 Cor

11:26) but which sets this in the context of the totality of the work of Christ for our redemption which includes the resurrection, ascension and the second coming.

²⁰It's hard to account for this omission, although the exclusive emphasis in the medieval church in the West on the words of institution as the means of consecration meant that the very important eucharistic element tended to be overlooked and, although Cranmer's doctrine of consecration may be described as minimal his emphasis was more upon thanksgiving for communion than thanksgiving over the bread and the cup as a means by which they were "eucharistized". And there is no doubt that the whole history of salvation tended not to be in view so far as the eucharist was concerned.

²¹The theology of the church as a worshipping community is implied in the second post-communion prayer in Holy Communion One (2004 BCP p.190),

Almighty and everliving God, we most heartily thank thee, for that thou dost vouchsafe to feed us who have duly received these holy mysteries with the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and dost assure us thereby of thy favour and goodness towards us; *and that we are very members incorporate in the mystical body of thy Son, which is the blessed company of all faithful people*, and are also heirs, through hope, of thy everlasting kingdom, by the merits of the most precious death and passion of thy dear Son.... [Writer's italics]

However, the 1552-1662 liturgy is not notably congregational as may be seen in a comparison with modern orders of service which are much more interactive, this being, for example, a particular emphasis in eucharistic prayer three in the 2004 Prayer Book.

²²All emphasis on the Offertory as bringing the life and work of the congregation before God in the bringing up of the bread and wine by representative members of the church was a particular feature of the Parish and People Movement with which A.G. Hebert was especially associated. There was, during the 1950s a Church of Ireland offshoot of this in the form of "Irish Parish and People", and the history of this is dealt with very fully by the present writer in his doctoral thesis, *The Theological Implications of recent liturgical revision in the Church of Ireland*, especially on pages 105-107, 153-158. The concept has been sharply criticized by Evangelicals, for example, Colin Buchanan in his Grove Liturgical Study (14), *The End of the Offertory -An Anglican Study*, Grove Books, Nottingham, 1978 and also from a very different perspective by the late Archbishop Michael Ramsey, who feared Pelagian tendencies. Care has been taken in liturgical revision to avoid the identification by Dom Gregory Dix in *The Shape of the Liturgy* of the Offertory and the biblical "Taking" - the first of the four dominical actions of taking and breaking, blessing and giving. However, that the concept is not redundant is shown, scripturally, in the provision of 1 *Chronicles 29,11,13,14* in Holy Communion One as an Offertory Sentence (2004 BCP p.194) and a shortened form, omitting v 13 in Holy Communion Two (p.208). The latter reads,

Lord, yours is the greatness
and the power and the glory
and the victory and the
majesty; for all things come
from you and of your own we
give you.

²³Op. cit p.43. In the Church of Ireland's Holy Communion One, the Prayer of Humble Access remains in its traditional 1552-1662 position before the Prayer of Consecration, but has been made congregational. In Holy Communion Two, it may be used before the Peace (p.207), although in theory this should only occur when the Penitence comes after the Prayers of the People and Humble Access follows. It is widely omitted altogether in celebrations of Holy Communion Two.

What is said here about the significance of the thanksgiving seems to fall short, to some extent of the insight that in biblical thought to say a blessing of God over the elements in effect blesses them. (This nuance is represented in the modern Hebrew version of the New Testament produced by the United Bible Societies, 1976 which says literally, "The Cup of Blessing which we are blessing *over it* or *upon it* or *concerning it*" The point is missed in the version produced by The Society for Distributing the Hebrew Scriptures, UK/USA which says literally, "The cup of blessing which we are blessing".). The Greek text uses *eulogia* the translation of which is "blessing", However, the Greek text of 1 Cor 11:26 "having given thanks" uses *eucharistic*. There seems to have been a shift towards the latter over time, hence the term "Eucharist". The *Jewish New Testament* tr David H. Stern, Jewish New Testament Publications 1989 has in 1 Cor 10:16 "The cup of blessing over which we make the b'rakhah" (blessing), and in 1 Cor 11:24 has "and after he had made the b'rakhah". In the *Jewish New Testament Commentary* by the same author it says with reference to 1 Cor 10;16,

"The cup of blessing." The third cup of the Passover *Seder* is called the "cup of blessing"; and since vv16-21 are about the Lord's Supper which is based on the Last Supper that Yeshua ate, which was a Passover meal, this may be the meaning. Or, because of the following phrase, **"over which we make a b'rakhah** (Hebrew for "blessing") it may refer to a special blessing beyond the normal blessing over wine, said in order to consecrate the wine and make it "be", for our **sharing** (or communion"), the Messiah's bloody sacrificial death (lit. "blood"...).

The Amplified Bible renders 1 Cor 10:16 as "The cup of blessing [of wine at the Lord's Supper] upon which we ask [God's] blessing, does it not mean [that in drinking it] we participate in *and* share a fellowship (a communion) in the blood of Christ (the Messiah)?"

H. Conzelman in his commentary *I Corinthians* underlines the semitic character of the 1 Cor 10 passage, p.171 "His (Paul's) dependence on the tradition appears in the expression "cup of blessing". It derives from the practice at Jewish meals, as is already indicated by the non-Greek form of expression (the use of the genitive, the meaning of *eulogia*, blessing..."

²⁴Op. cit pp 43-44. The role of the anamnesis (= "remembrance"), as its name suggests is to express, summarily, what is meant by the command of Jesus to "do this in remembrance of me". Given that the significance of the memorial act is such that any particular formulation will never be able to signify more than a partial insight into the eucharistic mystery and never its totality, it must be clear that there is room for legitimate variety not only between eucharistic prayers, but, specifically between the memorial paragraphs that form a highly significant part of all such prayers. Moreover, other parts of each eucharistic prayers may be significant in their interpretation, for instance the epiclesis, and even other parts of the rite. An example of the latter is the manner in which self-offering is in many rites within the Anglican Communion to be found mainly in the

post-communion prayer or prayers. As a very broad characterization the three main eucharistic prayers in Holy Communion Two in the 2004 edition of the Book of Common Prayer according to the use of the Church of Ireland it could be said that eucharistic prayer one focuses especially upon the concept of "remembrance" itself; eucharistic prayer two focusses on the concept of "proclamation" and eucharistic prayer three on the concept of the sacrifice of thanks and praise. These are not in any way mutually exclusive, but are rather complementary and go a long way towards justification of having more than one such prayer. Cranmer's liturgy of 1552, followed by 1662 has no such explanatory paragraph, his idea, apparently, being that the dominical command is fulfilled not by saying what it is but by doing what is commanded, which appears in holy communion one to be the act of communion The present writer's B.D. thesis (Trinity College Dublin 1979), entitled "The meaning and role of the anamnesis in the Anglican Liturgical Tradition," discusses the issue in terms of the published Anglican liturgies from the time of the Reformation up to the time of the completion of the thesis. Particular flashpoints in inter-Anglican discussion and debate have been the question of an explicit offering of the bread and the cup and of an epiclesis not only upon the worshippers but upon the elements of bread and wine. A paper read to the Armagh Clerical Union by the present writer in October 2008 entitled "Eucharistic Prayers in the Book of Common Prayer" is also relevant. This was specifically on the Eucharistic Prayers in the 2004 Prayer Book of the Church of Ireland.

²⁵Op. cit pp44-45.

²⁶Op. cit pp45-46. The transfer in Church of England churches of the Prayer of Oblation to a position before communion gave rise to what came to be termed the "Interim" rite. Its merit was its restoration of the unity of the eucharistic prayer, but it cannot be said that it fulfilled the function of an anamnesis, containing as it did only the ambiguous expression unaided "this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving". It has been in practice superseded by several series of eucharistic prayers at various stages of liturgical revision, the landmarks in the Church of England being the *Alternative Service Book of 1980* and *Common Worship* (2000).

²⁷Op cit pp47-50

²⁸Op cit p.49

²⁹Op. cit pp49-50

³⁰For a summary of the history leading up to the abortive 1928 Prayer Book of the Church of England and its subsequent use, see *Prayer Book Revision in the Church of England*, LC 1958/2 cited above and in the bibliography, pp.6-17. For a very full account see Donald Gray, *The 1927-28 Prayer Book Crisis*, No's 60 and 61 in *Alcuin/GROW Joint Liturgical Studies*, 2005, 2006.

³¹For example, in Holy Communion Two, eucharistic prayer one:

Accept through him our great high priest,
this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving:
and as we eat and drink these holy gifts,
grant by the power of the life-giving Spirit
that we may be made one in your holy Church
and partakers of the body and blood of your Son,
that he may dwell in us and we in him:

The link with the act of communion itself is particularly important in this formulation.

³²A concern to avoid a "moment of consecration" would appear to underlie the disappearance of mandatory manual acts within the prayer of consecration. The "taking" as in Holy Communion Two, typically is a separate and distinct act preliminary to the "blessing/thanking" and the "breaking" is a separate and distinct act preliminary to the "giving" of the act of communion. But even if the eucharistic prayer as a whole implies a "consecration by thanksgiving" there is no necessary reason why there may be focal points within it, such as a lifting of the bread a handsbreadth above the altar/table in a paragraph relating to the bread and a similar lifting of the cup in a paragraph relating to the wine, as in eucharistic prayer one in the 2004 Prayer Book p.210. Nor is there any reason why a further lifting either sequential or simultaneous of the bread and the cup during the doxology may not symbolically connect the elements with the praise of God in the eucharistic offering.

³³Liturgical studies have greatly advanced in the years since Lambeth 1958, and the deconstruction of such liturgical analysts as Dr Paul Bradshaw has moved things far beyond the rather simplistic views that once held sway. Even the move from the seeking of a common ancestor of the liturgical prayers of the church to a concern with the "shape" of the liturgy, as in Dix' famous book has itself been to some extent superceded by a recognition of a diversity that reaches far back into the history of the early church.

³⁴For example, the earliest texts of the Syrian *Liturgy of Addai and Mari* appear to have lacked an institution narrative and the epiclesis is undeveloped.. [For the text together see Lawrence J. Johnson, *Worship in the Early Church - an Anthology of Historical Sources*, Vol 2, Liturgical Press, Collegville, Minnesota, No 79 pp296. A critical analysis and commentary on Addai and Mari and the closely related Babylonian Sharar may be found in Bryan D. Spinks, Ed., *Addai and Mari - the Anaphora of the Apostles: a Text for Students, with Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*, Grove Liturgical Study No 24, Grove Books, 1980. Also the *Mystagogical Catecheses* attributed to Bishop Cyril of Jerusalem (but possibly by his successor, John) in the fourth century make no mention of an Institution Narrative [F.L Cross, Ed, *St. Cyril of Jerusalem, Lectures on the Christian Sacraments - The Procatechesis and the five Mystagogical Catecheses* SPCK 1951, esp pp72-74 where there is a clear and comprehensive account of the eucharistic prayer - with a strong epiclesis but without anything suggestive of Words of Institution. [The Institution Narrative is treated separately from the liturgy itself at the beginning of section 5 of the narrative],

³⁵Especially, Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, Dacre Press, Westminster, passim. See note above,³³

³⁶ A critical study of the origins of the eucharistic prayer with particular reference to blessings may be found in L. Ligier, "The Origins of the Eucharistic Prayer - From the Last Supper to the Eucharist" pp161-185 in *Studia Liturgica*, Vol 9: 1973, Number 4. He makes no mention, however, of the Lord's Prayer in this connection.

³⁷Although the question of "shape" has continued to be significant, the formulation has been refined to some extent. While it is not necessary to disconnect the concepts of offertory entirely from the "taking", as for example in C.O. Buchanan, *The End of the Offertory - An Anglican Study*, Grove Liturgical Study No. 14, Grove Books, 1978 - the elements may be brought to the celebrant for him to take them, the primary meaning of the "taking" is that of a necessary, but subordinate preliminary to the blessing/thanksgiving, and the "breaking" of the bread may be regarded as a necessary, but subordinate preliminary to the "giving" of the bread and wine in the act of

communion. This means that the two primary actions are those of "blessing/thanksgiving" and "giving".

The development of thinking in the Church of Ireland on the fourfold shape is indicated by changes in the headings within the eucharistic canon:

HOLY COMMUNION 1972

THE TAKING OF THE BREAD AND WINE
THE THANKSGIVING OVER THE BREAD AND WINE
THE BREAKING OF BREAD
THE GIVING OF THE BREAD AND WINE

THE ALTERNATIVE PRAYER BOOK 1984

THE TAKING OF THE BREAD AND WINE AND THE GIVING OF THANKS
THE BREAKING OF BREAD
THE GIVING OF BREAD AND WINE

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER 2004

THE TAKING OF THE BREAD AND WINE
THE GREAT THANKSGIVING
THE BREAKING OF THE BREAD
THE COMMUNION

³⁸As cited.

³⁹Op. cit. pp13-17.

⁴⁰*Lambeth Conference 1958, The Encyclical Letter from the Bishops together with the Resolutions and Reports*, SPCK and Seabury Press 1958, pp2.62 to 2.63; 2.78 to 2.98.

⁴¹Journal of the General Synod, 1962, ppcxxvii, cxxviii. For the history and context of liturgical revision in the Church of Ireland from 1962 to 1987 see the present writer's doctoral thesis, *The Theological Implications of Recent Liturgical Revision in the Church of Ireland* (OU 1987), Chapters Three and Four.

⁴²Journal of the General Synod 1962 to 1979. Archbishop George Simms was succeeded as Chairman of the Liturgical Advisory Committee by Archbishop John Armstrong.

⁴³1958 Lambeth Conference Report, op. cit. p.2.79.

⁴⁴Op. cit p.2.80 to 2.81.

⁴⁵Op. cit pp2.81 to 2.82.

⁴⁶The role of the Inter-Anglican Liturgical Consultations will be dealt with below. Although not an official body it has come to be fully recognized and for many years, at the time of writing, has fulfilled much of the task of the world-wide Anglican liturgical committee requested at Lambeth 1958.

⁴⁷It would seem that the Lambeth sub-committee was hankering after a vanished uniformity. Alternative eucharistic prayers within an overall liturgical structure, are, at the

time of writing, increasingly a norm. In the case of the Church of Ireland an alternative Prayer from the Anglican Church in Australia was added for the Alternative Prayer Book of 1984. From 2004 there have been three main forms; the first, the lineal descendant of "Holy Communion 1972, a native Church of Ireland product; the second, the 1978 Australian Prayer with the seasonal additions printed (which had not been the case in 1984), and the third a creative re-write of Prayer H of the Church of England.

⁴⁸Essentially what was suggested here was wifely carried into effect, although the value of the note of praise in the Gloria in Excelsis is in no way tied to the particular case of catechumens.

⁴⁹Op. cit (Note 5 above).

⁵⁰The logic of the much argued about "and so present it again" is quite clear. Everything in the eucharistic prayer is addressed to God the Father through Jesus Christ in the power of the Holy Spirit. Minimally, to make mention of the once for all sacrifice of Christ in praise and thanksgiving presents it verbally, and whatever is "present" is in this sense "offered". There are, necessarily, repeated remembrances but these are of the one sacrifice of Christ. The working definition used throughout this present work is that in the eucharist we "remember before God in thanksgiving and supplication the sacrifice once made by our Lord Jesus Christ". This is accomplished not only in words but in the liturgical act of remembrance when we "do" this in memory of his self-offering upon the cross. What we "do" is encompassed by the taking and blessing, breaking and giving of which the eucharist consists.

⁵¹It is regrettable that the words of Fr Bebert proved in practice to be over-optimistic as shown in the phenomenal battles in the Church of England, for example over a proposed offering of the bread and cup, intended for the Series Two liturgy. Such a verbal offering, although it has ample precedent, going back to the liturgy of Hippolytus (probably in the third century A.D., although it is a composite document making it hard to date), is not in any sense necessary to a valid eucharist, but may be taken as indicating the Godward reference of the eucharistic memorial which is fundamental to a right understanding of it and is a "remembering before God" It may be added that the necessary corollary of a manward reference is included in the wording because it is the worshippers who do the "remembering". Colin Buchanan, in his autobiographical *An Evangelical among the Anglican Liturgists*, Alcuin Club Collections 84, SPCK 2009 describes his own resistance to the proposed text (Chapter Three, pp3-16 "The new communion service - reasons for dissent").

⁵²As above. As an example of a rather "low" approach to the eucharistic offering by Anglican scholars who would not be classified as "Evangelical", Hanson and Fuller in their rather polemical *The Church of Rome -A Dissuasive*" SCM 1948, p. 20, having discussed the issue of Anglican orders, state,

And there is, quite apart from efficacy, a great difference between the Roman Priest's interpretation of his office and that of the Anglican Priest - at any rate if the latter is loyal to his Prayer Book. The Roman Catholic priest exists primarily to *offer to God* the sacrifice of the Mass, whereas the Anglican priest exists primarily to *administer to men* the word and sacraments, the Anglican Communion being an essentially different service from the Roman Mass.

One cannot help wondering whether the authors were familiar with the Response of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to the condemnation of Anglican Orders by Pope

Leo XIII in which, as outlined above, they affirmed explicitly that "We truly offer the eucharistic sacrifice" and explained from the 1662 Prayer Book the grounds on which they made that assertion. There may, admittedly, be a difference in emphasis involved although this applies more to liturgies of the 1552-1662 tradition than to those of the 1549-1637-1764 line of development, and most modern Anglican liturgies have a balanced approach to the matter supported by ecumenical agreements such as that represented in the *Final Report*.

⁵³The very widespread use of the Collect for Purity at the beginning of the eucharistic rite is a distinctively Anglican tradition, and valuable not only in the limited terms of the preparation of the people for their communion, but in the wider sense to which attention is drawn here in the 1958 document. Historically, in the Sarum rite it formed part of the priest's personal preparation. It appears in the Leofric MS and also in the Sacramentary of Alcuin, and is attributed to Gregory, Abbot of Canterbury, c.780 A.D. The Latin original underlying "all desires known" was *omnis voluntas loquitur* - "to whom every wish is eloquent".

⁵⁴The restoration of the "Prayer of Thanksgiving and Consecration", as it may be called, is a signal feature of modern eucharistic revision. However, while the norm may be that "the whole prayer consecrates" this does not necessarily exclude certain focal points in the prayer, not least the Words of Institution. This becomes evident in the provision made in the 2004 Prayer Book for occasions "When the Consecrated Elements are insufficient" (p.240) where it says,

If either of the consecrated elements is insufficient, the presiding minister adds further bread and wine, silently, or using the following words:

Father,

having given thanks over the bread and the cup
according to the institution of your Son Jesus Christ,
who said, Take, eat, this is my
body. *and/or*

Drink this this is my blood.

We pray that this bread/wine also may be to us his
body/blood, to be received in remembrance of him.

⁵⁵It is highly significant that the sub-committee's report on the liturgy was so explicitly recognized and commended by the entire Conference in Resolutions, 73, 74, 75, and 76.

⁵⁶It may be noted that the wording of Resolution 74 (a) is close to that of the Lambeth Quadrilateral which defines the essentials of the Anglican position as Bible, Sacraments, Creeds and Ministry.

⁵⁷See Lambeth 1958 Report p.2.80 - 2.81.

⁵⁸A significant aspect of the aim of Thomas Cranmer and of the English Reformers was to bring the doctrine of the liturgy into line with what they believed to be a more biblical mode of thought. The appeal to antiquity ("The primitive church") came into its own with the Caroline Divines in the seventeenth century, not least in the Church of Ireland as witnessed to by F.R. Bolton, *The Caroline Tradition in the Church of Ireland*, SPCK, 1958. The recovery of insights from the early history of the liturgy was a major theme of the Liturgical Movement both in the Roman Catholic and in Anglican churches. See A.G. Hebert, Ed., *The Parish Communion*, SPCK, 1937, reprinted 1954; and, A.G. Hebert,

Liturgy and Society The Function of the Church in the Modern World, Faber and Faber, 1966. A more recent account of the Liturgical Movement may be found in Geoffrey Wainwright, *Ecumenical Convergences*, Chapter 28 in *The Oxford History of Christian Worship*, Ed., Geoffrey Wainwright and Karen B. Westerfield Tucker, OUP 2006, and also in John R.K. Fenwick and Bryan D. Spinks, *Worship in Transition: The Liturgical Movement in the Twentieth Century*, Edinburgh: Clark,; New York: Continuum, 1995. For an understanding of the worship of the early Church, there is highly-favourably reviewed, Andrew McGowan, *Ancient Christian Worship - Early Church Practices in Social, Historical and Theological Perspective*. For a highly critical assessment of the Liturgical Movement in the Roman Catholic Church, there is Aidan Nichols, O.P., *Looking at the Liturgy - A Critical View of its Contemporary Form*, Ignatius Press, San Francisco, 1996. A brief account of the movement is given in J.H. Srawley, *The Liturgical Movement - Its Origin and Growth*, Alcuin Club Tracts XXVII, A.R. Mowbray & Co., 1954.

⁵⁹Lambeth 1958 Report, op. cit., p.76.

⁶⁰For publishing information see the bibliography at the end of this study.

⁶¹See Roger T. Beckwith, "The Pan Anglican Document", Chapter 3, pp22-32 in *Modern Anglican Liturgies, 1958-68*, ed. C.O. Buchanan, and also the appendices to Chapter One pp26-31 entitled "The Second Pan-Anglican Document" dealing with the structure and contents of the Eucharistic Liturgy and The Daily Office, in *Further Anglican Liturgies, 1968-1975* ed. C.O. Buchanan. See also, For this post-Lambeth Conference 1958 period the following publications are also relevant: C.O. Buchanan, *Anglican Eucharistic Liturgy 1975-1985*, Grove Liturgical Study No 41, Grove Books, 1985; with the document prepared for the Anglican Consultative Council-6 in 1984, op. cit pp24 and also the document "Appendix to Liturgy 1973-84, Primate's Meeting October 1983, Report of the sub-group on the question 'How does the Anglican Communion retain its traditional sense of unity?', op cit pp30-32

⁶²See below, pp

⁶³Leading to a long process, for which, to anticipate, the following documents are relevant: David Holeton and Colin Buchanan, *A History of the International Anglican Liturgical Consultations 1983-2007*, Joint Liturgical Study No 63 for the Alcuin Club and The Group For Renewal of Worship, 2007; Paul Gibson, "International Anglican Liturgical Consultations: A Review", pp235-250, in *Studia Liturgica*, Vol 29, 1999, Number 2; *The Truth Shall Make You Free - The Lambeth Conference 1988, the Reports, Resolutions & Pastoral Letters from the Bishops, published for the Anglican Consultative Council, 1988. Lambeth and Liturgy 1988 - The Lambeth 1988 Statement on Liturgy, Edited with Introduction and Commentary*, pp 66-74, C.O. Buchanan, Grove Worship Series, 106, Grove Books, 1989.

⁶⁴For the events leading up to the setting up of the Church of Ireland's Liturgical Advisory Committee and its early years, see the present writer's doctoral thesis, *The Theological Implications of Recent Liturgical Revision in the Church of Ireland*, (OU 1987), Chapter Two, "Origins" and Chapter Three "History and Context (1)".

⁶⁵John Mann, Ed., *Edgar Turner at 90 - A Memoir by some friends*, The Columba Press 2010, especially "Edgar the Liturgist" pp78-89 by Bishop Edward Darling, former Chairman of the Liturgical Advisory Committee.

⁶⁶The present writer's doctoral thesis - see Note 64 above - includes the history of liturgical revision in the Church of Ireland from 1962 to 1987.

⁶⁷The church owes a considerable debt to Bishop Colin Buchanan for his exceptional diligence in the publication of relevant material at every stage of Anglican liturgical revision and reform.

The present writer was present for the completion of the process which had led to the *Alternative Prayer Book* 1984 and resulted in *Alternative Occasional Services*, 1993, and for the ten years of preparation leading to the 2004 edition of the *Book of Common Prayer*, and for the years of production of Resource Material for use with the latter. His own productions included my *Commentaries* on all the authorized services of the Church of Ireland, launched at the General Synod of 2011 in the present of the then Archbishop of Armagh, the Most Revd Alan Harper, and published online in the "Resources" section of the official Church of Ireland website. More recently his work on the "Commemorations" of Saints of the Irish Church and others (BCP 2004, pp22-23) has led to the online publication in 2017 of fully worked out orders of services for all those listed in the Prayer Book and preserves the work of the Most Revd Dr George Simms, Archbishop of Armagh and former chairman of the Liturgical Advisory Committee and Canon Brian Mayne whose booklet on the figures commemorated together with suitable prayers have gone out of print

⁶⁸As cited in the main text.

69C.O. Buchanan, *Anglican Eucharistic Liturgy, 1975-1985*, Grove Liturgical Study No 41, Grove Books, 1985, pp30-32, "Appendix to Liturgy 1973-84: Primates Meeting October 1983, Report of the sub-group on the question 'how does the Anglican Communion retain its traditional sense of unity?'"

⁷⁰Op. cit. p.73.

⁷¹Op. cit. pp 73, 74.

⁷²Resolution 16 said,

ADVISORY BODY ON PRAYER BOOKS

Resolved that this Joint Meeting of the Primates of the Anglican Communion and the Anglican Consultative Council, in reference to Resolution 18 of the Lambeth Conference of 1988 (requesting the appointment of an Advisory Body on Prayer Books of the Anglican Communion), endorses the general recommendation made in the Report of the Co-ordinator for Liturgy and in particular the recommendation that the various Conferences, Councils, and Provinces of the Anglican Communion recognise and use these Consultations as the appropriate channels through which liturgical issues can be discussed and liturgical norms discerned; and Requests the Co-ordinator for Liturgy to facilitate work in this area. [The Revd Paul Gibson was the Co-ordinator for Liturgyl.

See, *A Transforming Vision - Suffering and Glory in God's World, Cape Town 1993*, The Official Report of the Joint Meeting of the Primates of the Anglican Communion and the Anglican Consultative Council, Published for the Anglican Communion by Church House Publishing, 1993.

More recently a new constitution was approved for the IALC which has strengthened its official standing within the Anglican Communion.

The IALC originated informally as a group of Anglicans who had attended a meeting of the internationally renowned *Societas Liturgica*, and it became the practice for the new

body to have their own separate meeting before or after the Societas meetings. The membership was self-selected, and at first was predominantly European, but over the years an increasing proportion of those attending were financed and sent by the liturgical commissions of Anglican provinces, and it was made possible for a number of Third World representatives to be present. Issues considered included Children and Communion, Liturgical Formation, Inculturation, and a return to Christian Initiation. It was agreed that the next full Conference, scheduled to take place in Dublin would consider all aspects of the Eucharist, and this happened in 1995. There was a significant interaction during this period with meetings of the Anglican Consultative Council, and the Primates' Meetings. A landmark was the Lambeth Conference of 1988 at which the Rt Revd Colin Buchanan was secretary of the "Renewal in Liturgy" working group which made a significant Statement on Liturgy, which dealt with the following issues:

THE RENEWAL OF THE CHURCH IN LITURGY:

The Heart of Worship, Worship and Mission, The Universality of Worship, Local Expression of the Liturgy, Liturgy Comes Alive, Non-verbal sharing in Liturgy, and Silence.

BAPTISM, Worship for all Ages, Confirmation of those Baptized in Infancy, Baptism of Adults, The Laying on of hands after Baptism of Adults, Preparation, Testimony, and Reaffirmation of Baptismal Vows.

rites of RECONCILIATION;

EUCCHARIST: MEETING AND MISSION, THE AGAPE

PRESIDENCY AT THE EUCCHARIST DISTRIBUTION OF COMMUNION NON-

EUCHRISTIC WORSHIP, A COMMON LECTIONARY, ORDINATION

This carried forward the work of Lambeth 1958 in the liturgically changed circumstances of thirty years later during which there had been much liturgical revision and reform in most parts of the Anglican Communion.

CHAPTER THREE, ASSESSMENTS, PART 6 (1) (2)

ROMAN CATHOLIC RESPONSES TO ARCIC

There is, necessarily, a degree of overlap in the contents of the first four documents to be examined in these pages - "Observations"¹, "Response of the Bishops' Conference of England and Wales"², "One Bread, one Body"³, and the supposedly definitive "The Catholic Church's Response to the Final Report of ARCIC 1"⁴. For convenience and to avoid confusion, these will be referred to below as "Observations", "Bishops' Conference", "One Bread, one Body", and "Response". The final document is the reply of ARCIC II, "Clarifications"⁵ to the questions raised in the "Response" of which the sections dealing with the eucharist will be examined here.

In making this present assessment the terms of reference of the Anglican-Roman Catholic Dialogue which appear in the *Common Declaration* of Pope Paul VI and Michael Ramsey, Archbishop of Canterbury, of 24th March 1966, it is stated that they intended "to inaugurate between the Roman Catholic Church and the Anglican Communion a serious dialogue which, founded on the Gospels and on the ancient common traditions, may lead to that unity in truth, for which Christ prayed"⁶. It seems reasonable, on the basis of this, to subject not only ARCIC itself but any statements made by either church to the criteria of "the Gospels" and of "the ancient common traditions". Dogmatic statements which go beyond such criteria may, not unreasonably be thought to be outside the terms of reference of the dialogue itself. In the Preface to the *Final Report* the first Commission said that "From the beginning we were determined, in accordance with our mandate, and in the spirit of Phil. 3:13 'forgetting what lies behind and straining forward to what lies ahead'" to discover each other's faith as it is today and to appeal to history only for enlightenment, not as a way of perpetuating past controversy."⁷ Further down it said, "In the Statement *Eucharistic Doctrine* (Windsor 1971) we went so far as to claim 'substantial agreement' which is consistent with 'a variety of theological approaches within both our communions.'⁸ It did in fact prove necessary in response to critical questions arising from the text to produce a substantial "Elucidation" (1979)⁹ which is getting on for twice as long (8 1/2 pages rather than 5 pages) as the original statement - and this would appear to illustrate some of the difficulties involved.

(1) "OBSERVATIONS ON THE FINAL REPORT"

This document, dated March 1982, contains the comments made by the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (formerly the "Holy Office") of which the Prefect was Cardinal Joseph Ratzinger, later to become Pope Benedict XVI. In its "Overall Evaluation" the Congregation gives full recognition to the positive aspects of the work accomplished by ARCIC which it describes as "exemplary"¹⁰, praising the quality of the doctrinal rapprochement achieved, in a serious attempt at a converging interpretation of the values considered as fundamental by both sides, and also the fact that ARCIC had been attentive to a certain number of observations which the SCDF had previously made about the Windsor, Canterbury and Venice statements, and had made an effort to respond satisfactorily in two series of elucidations on Eucharistic Doctrine - Ministry and Ordination (1979)¹¹ and on Authority in the Church (1981)¹². Under the heading of "Negative Aspects" attention is drawn to the methodology of adding elucidations rather than revising the original statements, resulting in a lack of harmony and homogeneity which could lead to different readings and to an unwarranted use of the Commission's texts.¹³ Then, there was an ambiguity in the phrase "substantial agreement" which seems

by ARCIC to signify "very extensive" but "not complete".¹⁴ There is also, in the view of SCDF the possibility of a twofold interpretation of the texts in which both parties can "find unchanged the expression of their own position."¹⁵ Moreover, it is claimed that when members of ARCIC speak about "the consensus we have reached" (cf Eucharistic Doctrine, Windsor, 1971), it is not clear whether this means the faith really professed by the two communions in dialogue or a conviction which the members of the Commission have reached and to which they want to bring their respective coreligionists.¹⁶ It would have been useful, SDF suggests, had the ARCIC indicated their position in reference to the documents which had contributed significantly to the formation of the Anglican identity, *The Thirty-nine Articles of Religion*, *Book of Common Prayer*, and the *Ordinal* in those cases where the assertions of the Final Report seemed incompatible with these documents.¹⁷

SCDF then turns finally to "doctrinal difficulties noted by the SCDF"¹⁸ In relation to the eucharist as sacrifice it questions ARCIC on its use of the term *anamnesis* since this had been the object of controversy in the past and is an explanation open to a reading which does not include the essential aspect of the mystery.¹⁹ It asks what is meant by the ARCIC affirmation, with regard to the eucharistic sacrifice that the church "enters into the movement of [Christ's] self-offering"²⁰, and says that it would have been helpful to make clear that this real presence of the sacrifice of Christ, accomplished by the sacramental words, that is to say by the ministry of the priest saying "in persona Christi" the words of the Lord, includes a participation of the Church, the Body of Christ, in the sacrificial act of her Lord, so that she offers sacramentally in him and with him his sacrifice.²¹ Moreover, the propitiatory value that Catholic dogma attributes to the Eucharist, which is not mentioned by ARCIC, is precisely that of this sacramental offering (and cites both the Council of Trent and Pope Paul II) in support of it.²² With regard to the doctrine of the Real Presence the SCDF welcomes the formulation by ARCIC which affirms it, for example, "Before the Eucharistic Prayer, to the question: 'What is that?' the believer answers: "It is bread." After the Eucharistic Prayer to the same question he answers, "It is truly the body of Christ, the Bread of life".²³ But it is claimed that other formulations do not seem to indicate adequately what the [Roman Catholic] Church understands by "transubstantiation" ("the wonderful and unique change of the whole substance of the bread into his body and whole substance of the wine into his blood, while only the species of bread and wine remain" (Council of Trent).²⁴ In the following paragraph [cited here in full] the SCDF said,²⁵

It is true that the Windsor statement said in a footnote that this must be seen as "a mysterious and radical change" effected by a change in the inner reality of the elements". But the same statement speaks in another place of "a sacramental presence *through bread and wine*", and Elucidation (6b) says "His body and blood are given through the action of the Holy Spirit *appropriating bread and wine* so that they become the food of the new creation". And we also find the expressions "the association of Christ's presence of the consecrated elements" (no 7) and the "association of Christ sacramental presence with the consecrated bread and wine" (no 9). These formulations can be read with the understanding that, after the Eucharistic prayer, the bread and wine remain such in their ontological substance, even while becoming the sacramental mediation of the body and blood of Christ* In the light of these observations, therefore, it seems necessary to say that the substantial agreement

which ARCIC so carefully intended to present should receive even further clarification.

*In a footnote the CDF says one might also recall in this regard the Anglican-Lutheran statement of 1972, which reads:²⁶ "Both Communion affirm the real presence of Christ in this sacrament, but neither seeks to define precisely how this happens. In the eucharistic action (including consecration) and reception, the bread and wine, while remaining bread and wine, become the means whereby Christ is truly present and gives himself to the communicants."

Finally, in relation to reservation and adoration of the Eucharist, the SCDF points out that Elucidation (No 9) admits the possibility of a divergences not only in the practice of adoration of Christ in the reserved sacrament but also in the "theological judgements" relating to it.²⁷ But the adoration rendered to the Blessed Sacrament is the object of a dogmatic definition in the Catholic Church (Council of Trent).²⁸ A question could arise here about the current status in the Anglican Communion of the regulation called the "Black Rubric" of the *Book of Common Prayer* "the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their natural substances and therefore may not be adored".²⁹

Without trespassing more than is necessary on what will be covered in section (4) below, there are several comments that can be made at this stage:

The Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith is primarily concerned, as its name suggests with matters of doctrine. It is not the body which is concerned primarily with ecumenical relations and may not have fully understood the nuances of inter-church dialogue where the partners concerned, without in any way compromising the faith and order of the ecclesial bodies to which they belong, are highly sensitive to matters relating to the use of language. The SCDF in "Observations" does refer to a "patient and exacting dialogue in order to overcome doctrinal difficulties which were frankly acknowledged, with a view to restoring full communion between the Catholic Church and the Anglican Communion." But as a body which traditionally has a disciplinary role in the life of the Roman Catholic Church it is hard to avoid the impression of a tendency to pass judgement without realizing the problems involved in finding an appropriate mode of common expression that is "founded upon the Gospels and on the ancient common traditions." The quotation of dogmatic decisions from a period many centuries after the Gospels were written and the ancient common traditions emerged, while legitimate from a strictly denominational point of view, do not necessarily do much to advance common understanding of what may positively be said by both churches concerned. This having been said, some valuable points are made, for example about the untidiness of the ARCIC documents where Elucidations have been added rather than there being any modification of the original text. The term "substantial agreement" is not clear in this context, and may be variously assessed. The possibility of a twofold interpretation of the texts is present in all ecumenical dialogues and is probably at its most acute in common statements between the Roman Catholic and other Christian churches because of the greater difference, historically and dogmatically, between them. While it is legitimate, from the Roman Catholic perspective, to ask how the ARCIC statements relate to the interpretation of Anglican Formularies it does seem that such a consideration lies outside the terms of reference of the Commission whose considerations were to be "founded on the Gospels and the ancient traditions". It may be added that the difficulty mentioned here was also evident on the Anglican side as the Church of Ireland's Response (1986),³⁰ considered

earlier in this present work, clearly shows. In relation to the doctrine of the eucharistic sacrifice, the expression about the Church "entering into the movement of [Christ's] self-offering" has seemed to some Anglicans to be ambiguous,³¹ but there are ways of expressing the meaning of the doctrine without defining it in strictly Roman Catholic terms.³² The same thing applies to the terminology about the doctrine of the Real Presence, which, from an Anglican point of view is not tied to the definition of transubstantiation which is itself open to question from a biblical and traditional perspective.³³ Some matters are unresolved within churches, and the issue of reservation and adoration of the Eucharist is clearly one of these for Anglicans.³⁴ It does not seem to have been fully evident to the SCDF that a church which like the Anglican is comprehensive in character could never simply sign up to Roman Catholic dogmas on a variety of issues. It must be said that issues such as the "propitiatory" character of the eucharistic sacrifice³⁵ and the ontological character of the real presence³⁶ are not susceptible to an easy resolution although the present writer, from within a Church of Ireland perspective holds view on both issues which he believes to be faithful to a biblical and traditional view of things.³⁷

NOTES ON CHAPTER THREE PART SIX (1)

¹Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith, *Observations on The Final Report of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission*, Incorporated Catholic Truth Society, London, 1982.

²Bishops Conference of England and Wales, *Response to the Final Report of ARCIC 1*, Catholic Media Office, 1985.

³Catholic Bishops' Conferences of England & Wales, Ireland, and Scotland, *One Bread One Body - A teaching document on the Eucharist in the life of the Church, and the establishment of general norms on sacramental sharing*, Catholic Truth Society, London, and Veritas Publications, Dublin, 1998.

⁴The Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity, *Response to the First Anglican/Roman Catholic International Commission - The Catholic Church's Response to the Final Report of ARCIC 1, 1991*, online.

⁵The Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission, Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity, *Clarifications of certain aspects of the Agreed Statements on Eucharist and Ministry of the First Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission, together with a letter from Cardinal Edward Idris Cassidy, President, Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity*, Anglican Consultative Council and the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity, Church House Publishing and Catholic Truth Society, 1994.

⁶*Common Declaration of His Holiness Paul VI and His Grace Michael Ramsey, Archbishop of Canterbury, Par 5*, Monastery of St Paul, Thursday, 24th March 1966, Libreria Editrice Vaticana, online.

⁷Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission, *The Final Report*, CTS/SPCK, 1982 pp1,2.

⁸Ibid. p.2

⁹*The Final Report*, pp17-25.

¹⁰ "Observations" is unpaginated, but this was on page one of the main text.

¹¹ As in ⁹ above.

¹² *The Final Report*, pp68-78.

¹³ This procedure is undoubtedly unsatisfactory, so much so that a committee of the Commission for Ecumenism of the Catholic Diocese of Rockville Centre (Long Island, New York) which had been in conversations on ARCIC with a similar commission in the Episcopal Diocese of Long Island, having produced evaluations of the three sections of the Final Report, included with these a revised text of each statement. This revision was undertaken (1) to produce one unified Statement from each Statement with Elucidation or, in the cast of the Authority Statements, from two statements and the Elucidation of the first; and (2) to illustrate what such a Statement would need to affirm in order to embody accurately and adequately the defined faith of the Catholic Church on the doctrine in question. This revision was published with the title "ARCIC-1 Revisited" by the Catholic Press Association of the Diocese of Rockville Centre, 1985. The Chairman of the Commission for Ecumenism of this diocese who wrote the Preface to this document was one Daniel S. Hamilton. This was an interesting exercise, although to explore fully the

value of the methodology a similar document would need to be produced by an Anglican group of theologians of ecumenical stature. It would have been helpful to all commentators had ARCIC-1 produced such a unified and integrated statement themselves based upon their own statements together with the elucidations.

¹⁴“Observations”, op. cit. second page.

¹⁵ Op. cit., second and third page.

¹⁶ Op. cit., third page.

¹⁷ This issue also concerned the Church of Ireland, hence Section B of the official “Response” of 1987, entitled, “The ARCIC *Final Report*, considered in relation to the Preamble and Declaration, and the Articles of Religion of the Church of Ireland.” Neither “Observations” nor the Church of Ireland “Response” mention the Church Catechism as a source of eucharistic doctrine which is odd since it contains the historic definition of a sacrament and specific teaching on the Holy Communion (2004 Prayer Book pp 268-270:

What meanest thou by this word Sacrament?

I mean an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us, ordained by Christ himself, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof.

How many parts are there in a Sacrament?

Two, the outward visible sign, and the inward spiritual grace.

Why was the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper ordained?

For the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, and of the benefits which we receive thereby.

What is the outward part or sign of the Lord’s Supper?

Bread and Wine, which the Lord hath commanded to be received.

What is the inward part, or thing signified?

The Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord’s Supper.

After what manner are the Body and Blood of Christ taken and received in the Lord’s Supper?

Only after a heavenly and spiritual manner and the mean whereby they are taken and received is faith.

What are the benefits whereof we are partakers thereby?

The strengthening and refreshing of our souls by the Body and Blood of Christ, as our bodies are by the Bread and Wine.

What is required of them who come to the Lord’s Supper?

To examine themselves, whether they repent them truly of their former sins, steadfastly purposing to lead a new life; have a lively faith in God’s mercy through Christ, with a thankful remembrance of his death; and be in charity with all men.

However, it needs to be said that the terms of reference of ARCIC refer to the bible and ancient traditions, and not to a detailed comparison of the formularies of the Roman Catholic and Anglican Churches in relation to each other. What ARCIC appears to have attempted to do was to explore common ground and to express this are of agreement in

language that, as far as possible, avoided historic controversies. It seems at least doubtful whether this methodology was fully understood by SCDF.

¹⁸ “Observations” pages four and five.

¹⁹ The close connection between the biblical concept of “remembrance” and sacrifice, fully documented in, for example, Max Thurian’s two volume *The Eucharistic Memorial*, Lutterworth, E.T. 1960, 1961, and Joachim Jeremias’ *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*”, SCM, revised edition 1966, seems to have escaped the attention of SCDF. The foundations of the doctrine eucharistic sacrifice are to be found in these words, regardless of whether or not one goes fully along with Jeremias’ contention, although with some support from the original Greek, that the dominical command is to be interpreted as “that God may remember me” and is to be understood in an eschatological sense. The occasion of the institution of the eucharist at the Last Supper was, according to the Synoptic Gospels, the celebration of the Passover, which was a meal upon a sacrifice, and it would seem therefore that the context of the eucharistic words, “remembrance” (*eis anamnesin* = *lezikkaroni* or Aramaic equivalent), “body” (*soma* = prob. *bsari*. in Hebrew, or equivalent in Aramaic), “blood”, “my covenant blood” (*to haima mou tes diathekes* = *dam habriith*), is sacrificial and carries sacrificial connotations. In other words, the Institution Narrative is saturated with the language of offering and cannot be fully understood without it. A non-sacrificial understanding of it would appear, therefore, to be unbiblical.

²⁰ “Observations” page four. It is true that this expression is a little opaque, However, it is clear that the earthly ministry of Jesus was one of sacrificial conformity to the will of God, culminating in the once-for-all oblation of Calvary. As it says in Hebrews 10: 5f,

Consequently, when Christ came into the world, he said, “Sacrifices and offerings you have not desired, but a body you have prepared for me; in burnt offerings and sin offerings you have taken no pleasure. Then I said, ‘Lo, I have come to do your will, O God,’ as it is written of me in the roll of the book”

When he said above, “You have neither desired nor taken pleasure in sacrifices and offerings and burnt offerings” (these are offered according to the law), then he added, “Lo, I have come to do your will.” He abolishes the first in order to establish the second. And by that will we have been sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.

It is difficult to see what basis there might be for the Lord’s sacrificial ministry unless it may be regarded as an expression, within time, of the eternal self-giving which is of the essence of the Holy Trinity; and those who are Christ’s on earth enter into the movement of this self-giving love, and this becomes particular and actual in a special way in their participation of the eucharist in which there is a “making present of an event in the past” namely what Jesus accomplished once and for all upon the cross of Calvary.

²¹ It may reasonably be said that the expression “in persona Christi” is not actually required by any of the biblical accounts of the Lord’s Supper. It is not clear from Holy Scripture that there was any class of persons who, exclusively, had grace and power to preside at the eucharist, a reasonable assumption being that this was done by the most senior person present or by another senior figure. This would seem to be compatible with the norm of Jewish practice, then and now, at the Passover. And, in the sub-apostolic period, it appears that visiting prophets rather than local ministers, were those who, in

effect, acted as celebrants, as in the Didache XI where it is said, “But allow the prophets to give thanks as they will”. This in no way detracts from the value of having those whose ministry has come to be designated as that of the Word and Sacraments, and this is implied also in the Didache, XIV when immediately after designating the eucharist as a “pure sacrifice” it says “Appoint therefore for yourselves bishops (overseers) and deacons worthy of the Lord...for they also minister to you the ministry of the prophets and teachers”.

²² SCDF refers emphatically to the propitiatory value that Catholic dogma ascribes to the Eucharist.” However, if there is a question mark against the whole concept of “propitiation” in the New Testament, this would affect not only the appropriateness of so designating the self-offering of Christ himself, but also any oblation of the Church at the eucharist “in memory of him”. The use of the word ‘propitiation is one upon which varying views are held by leading biblical scholars. R. Abba, in *The Interpreters Dictionary of the Bible*, Abington, 1962, Vol 3, deals with the concept under 1. Terminology a. In biblical Hebrew, b. In LXX (Septuagint” Greek and c. In New Testament Greek and 2. In the Old Testament a. In human relationships and b.. Propitiation and Sacrifice and 3. In the New Testament (with an attached bibliography.. Under “Propitiation and Sacrifice” he says,

Some have regarded Hebrew *sacrifice* as essentially a piacular gift by which the wrath of God is appeased. This view has claimed support from, e.g., David’s reaction to the idea that God might have prompted Saul to harass him: “May he [God] accept an offering” (lit. “Let him smell an offering”); 1 Sam 26:19; cf Gen 8:21; Exod 29:25). But the only clear instances of such a propitiatory conception of sacrifice is Mesha’s offering of his son to Chemosh (2 Kings 3:27); and this was the act of a pagan king. In Israel, the burnt offering is not necessarily a propitiatory gift, as has been maintained; it is more probably an expression of devotion to God. And David’s words may well refer to the normal expiation through sacrifice of some inadvertent sin.

In general, at least, OT sacrifices are not propitiatory but expiatory. God is frequently the subject, but never the object of the key cultic term C P R: it is used of God’s “expiating” (i.e. “covering” or “erasing”) man’s sin, but never in the sense of man’s propitiating God. This is in line with the prophetic teaching that God’s favour cannot be bought. The three occasions when the verb CH L H in the sense of ‘propitiation’ is used with reference to God (Zechariah 7:2; 8:22; Mal 1:9) are exceptional and apparently deliberate. Its use in Zech 7:2 and Mal. 1:9 is distinctly contemptuous - ie. Yahweh is not to be “propitiated”. And in Zech 7:2 it is pagan peoples who come to “propitiate” him.

And under “In the New Testament, Abba says,

Nowhere in the New Testament does the idea of propitiation occur. When the term appears in the King James Bible it renders one of the derivatives of *hilaskesthai*. The LXX translators, however, generally use the words of the *hilaskesthai* class to express the divine removal of guilt or defilement and clearly regard their pagan meaning of propitiating the Deity as inappropriate to the religion of Israel. Since, therefore, the LXX usage is determinative for the NT writers, the use of the word “propitiation” in the King James Version is erroneous and misleading. In each case “propitiation” should be substituted as in the RSV, by “expiation”. There is no idea

in the New Testament of the wrath of God being propitiated by the sacrifice of Christ. It is God in Christ who reconciles the world to himself (2 Cor 5:19).

For a full discussion of the Greek terminology, see the entries by *Büchsel* on the words *hileos*, *hilaskomai*, *hilasmos*, *hilasterion* pp300-323 in Vol III of the *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*, Ed Gerhard Kittel, translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley, Eerdmans, 1965.

Given the uncertainty of the whole concept of “propitiation”, despite its appearance in Holy Communion One p.186, its requirement by the SCDF takes us beyond what must of necessity be incorporated into an ecumenical agreement on the doctrine of the eucharist (in spite of its being described as “Catholic dogma”), and this seems to depart from the principle of trying to find a form of terminology to which the participating churches can give their assent as representing the faith they severally profess.

²³This could be described as a rather superficial comment since Anglican formularies, which are assented to by even the most committed upholders of the doctrine of the Real Presence, make clear that the “outward and visible” sign in the eucharist is “bread and wine, which the Lord has commanded to be received”, and may be so referred to as indeed St Paul did when he said, “the bread that we break is a sharing in the body of Christ”. See Catechism BCP 2004, p770, 1 Cor 10: 16, although the Catechism does go on to say that the inward part or thing signified is “The Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed [really and truly] taken and received by the faithful in the Lord’s Supper.”

²⁴In no way do the Anglican formularies give any credence to the view that after consecration “only the species of bread and wine remain”. This is not required by any defensible doctrine of the Real Presence.

²⁵ The language of ARCIC appears opaque in relation to the “mysterious and radical change” which effects a “change in the inner reality of the elements”. As maintained throughout this present work, a change in what the elemental signs signify, in the purpose they serve, in the role they play and the function they perform may be understood in ontological terms, given that a statement of significance may have ontological implications; but nothing further than this seems to be required by the biblical evidence relating to the institution of the Holy Communion. Moreover, an emphasis on *significance* seems appropriate given that the Passover liturgy, as it has come down to us, contains an interpretation of the unleavened bread used in that celebration. The use of Aramaic (the language of Jesus and the apostles) may indicate a very great level of antiquity for this formula, found at the beginning of the recital of the Haggadah,

This is the bread of affliction that our fathers ate in the land of Egypt. All who are hungered - let them come and eat: all who are needy - let them come and celebrate the Passover. Now we are here, but next year may we be in the land of Israel! Now we are slaves, but next year may we be free men!

It is evident that the profound symbolism involved does not require a literal identification with the bread eaten at the original Passover, any more than that the bread of the eucharist is to be understood as literally the flesh of the earthly body of Jesus on the night before he died.

²⁶This would seem to be a legitimate point by the SCDF, and it is clearly unsatisfactory that representatives of the Anglican tradition should, in effect, be saying different things to different people. The Anglican-Lutheran statement seems fully in accordance both with the scriptural evidence and Anglican teaching. The eucharistic bread and wine are, as insisted upon by the General Directions for Public Worship (BCP, 2004, p.77) to be treated with reverence. Par 14e says, “Any of the consecrated bread and wine remaining after the administration of the communion is to be reverently consumed.” and the significance of the consecration is indicated in the form “When the Consecrated Elements are insufficient “(BCP 2004, p.240,

Father,
having given thanks over the bread and the cup
according to the institution of your Son Jesus Christ,
who said, Take, eat, this is my body.
and/or
Drink this, this is my blood.
We pray that this bread/wine also *may be to us* his body/blood
to be received in remembrance of him.

Even if the additional consecration is made in silence, as permitted by the rubric, the words given above give the church's understanding of what consecration signifies, namely that the bread and wine of the eucharist *are to us* the body and blood of Christ.

²⁷The primary purpose of consecration is that the bread and wine of the eucharist may be taken and eaten, and there is a strong case for permitting the reservation of the elements as consecrated for their special meaning and purpose for the purpose of communicating the sick. Reservation in the church for later consumption, perhaps as indicated by a lighted lamp may serve as an effectual sign of the Lord's real presence and may be helpful to those who may wish to pray before what has been reserved, and there does not seem to be any obvious reason why devotions to the Christ whose presence is indicated in the manner described should not take place. However, such practices have no direct foundation in the biblical source material, and it is not entirely clear when they became widespread, even the West. Particular forms of paraliturgy such as Benediction mark a further step, and are found only among a minority of Anglicans. It is not unreasonable that some (probably most) Anglicans prefer to confine their eucharistic devotion to attendance at and full participation in actual celebrations of holy communion and do not necessarily feel it is incumbent upon them to be involved in particular practices which are to be found within the Roman Catholic Church, but only to a very limited extent outside its boundaries, even in the great churches of the East, whether in communion with Rome or as a part of Eastern Orthodoxy.

(2) RESPONSE OF THE BISHOPS' CONFERENCE OF ENGLAND AND WALES.¹

The ARCIC *Final Report* was taken very seriously by the (Roman Catholic) ‘Bishops’ Conference of England and Wales’, which followed the process leading to it from a very early stage. In this ‘Response’ they said that already in 1972 they were able to agree with their Theology Commission that the Windsor Agreement contained “nothing contrary to the Catholic faith”.² Then, after a number of meetings in which they had been able to study the *Final Report* as a whole and not merely as a series of separate unrelated Statements they were responding to the request of Cardinal Willibrands to send a considered judgement on the work done, above all as to whether it was consonant in substance with the faith of the Catholic Church and to express their view on the agenda for the next stage of the discussion. They felt, in general, that their Response would have particular significance in the continuation of this dialogue between the two Communion, especially in the land in which the Anglican Communion found its centre and where good relations between the Churches had become a matter of common experience.³ They commended the *Final Report* as a truly outstanding contribution to this dialogue, and readily upheld the process undertaken by the Commission as an example of what could be achieved by joint study and how these studies could be a practical basis for growth in unity.⁴ Arising from this they said that they recognized in the *Final Report* much that was an affirmation of their Catholic faith, especially in relation to the true nature of the Church. In their judgement as to how far these statements were in harmony with their faith, they would point out anything which they considered to be inadequate in its treatment or expression. However, they were fully committed to a resolution of these difficulties and offered their response as a contribution to this process.⁵

Considering what they called fundamental points they turned first to the expression ‘substantial agreement’ which was the aim of the Commission in relation to central doctrines. The *Final Report* claimed that differing degrees of agreement had been achieved, and specifically in relation to the Eucharist and Ministry ‘substantial agreement’ had been reached, and by this it was understood that the documents represented not only an agreement between all members of the Commission, but also an agreement on all essential matters where it (the Commission) considered that doctrine admitted no divergence.⁶ In coming to a judgement on the claims made by the Commission the Bishops’ Conference wished to underline the importance of reading the Statements in the light of the Elucidations and of noting the sequence in which the documents were published in order to avoid unnecessary misunderstandings.⁷ In relation to methodology it was pointed out that this was specific to ARCIC and had been commended by Pope John Paul II, and was welcomed by the Bishops’ Conference.⁸ It was characterized by a joint endeavour to explore the common tradition and achieved an understanding of the context in which concepts arose, how this coloured their meaning and what remained open to further development. It brought about a shared understanding of revelation as expressed in historically conditioned formulae. The bishops commended this methodology as entailing a serious attempt to develop patterns of thought and language which gave profound and precise expression of the shared faith.⁹ There remained the delicate and difficult task of specifying the relationship between diverse theologies and the fundamental truths of faith to which Christians must be committed. They acknowledged “a variety of theological approaches within both our Communion” These approaches, they thought, need not be mutually exclusive in the expression of truth.

Indeed, they perceived that, in their understanding of the Word of God, differing theological expressions often could be complementary. At the same time they were concerned to ensure that the relationship of authoritative formulae to the truths they sought to convey should not be weakened, despite the contingent element in all such formulae. The methodology of the Commission has enabled it to claim a real convergence in doctrine and this claim was presented to the judgement of the two churches. An open and continuing dialogue concerning matters of faith, such as the Commission itself conducted, would remain a vital part of the process of coming to this judgement. The Bishops' Conference committed itself to the strengthening of the atmosphere of trust essential for such dialogue. In relation to the concept of *koinonia* regarded by the Commission as fundamental to all its statements, the Bishops' Conference welcomed this approach to the ecclesiological question, recognizing its biblical roots and pointed to the central role it played in the Dogmatic Constitution of Vatican II, *Lumen Gentium*.¹⁰ It also stated that the emphasis on the local church had greatly enriched its understanding of the mystery of the presence there of the Church of Christ, and mentioned the role of a universal primacy as a sign and source of unity in the universal *koinonia* which is the communion of communions.¹¹

The bishops said that the basis laid in the statement gave a very rich and dynamic view of the Eucharist and allowed them to explore areas of past controversy with a practical sense of the centrality of the Eucharist in the life of the church. Proceeding to a critical focus on particular points *the eucharist as sacrifice* was considered.¹² The bishops affirmed that in this statement, the identity of Christ of the church in offering sacrifice was secured both by the concept of *koinonia*: "we are his members", and by the use of the notion of memorial (anamnesis) in its strong and traditional sense: "his sacrifice recalled and proclaimed is made effective here and now." This maintained the uniqueness, the once-for-all character, and absolute sufficiency of the historical sacrifice of Jesus and the presence of that unique sacrifice in the sacramental and mysterious manner in the eucharistic celebration. They quoted the declaration that "we enter into the movement of Christ's self offering", his self-giving to the Father and his fellow men.¹³ This was a true expression of the Catholic faith. With regard to the doctrine of the *real presence* the statement clearly maintains the substantial nature of the change of the bread and wine is clearly asserted by the repeated use of the word "become" as in the statement that "they become his body and blood", by reference to the transforming action of the Spirit, by use of the language of change in the footnote on transubstantiation, and by the description of the role of faith within the individual.¹⁴ In the light of this the bishops accepted the statement as an expression of catholic faith in the real presence. In a number of places the statements about sacrifice and real presence see the Church's celebration as an effective proclamation of God's mighty deeds in Christ. This is a further way in which Catholic faith is affirmed. With regard to further consideration what needed to be said more forcibly was that the Eucharist is offered to the Father by the whole Christ, head and members, in the power of the Spirit.¹⁵ The present text, by concentrating on the Eucharist as gift to the Church, gave it an emphasis that was too passive in tone.¹⁶ The bishops took the view in this treatment of the Eucharist there was also insufficient reference to the resurrection of Christ. But in contemporary theology and in the Catholic tradition the resurrection is an important and enriching element in the understanding of the Eucharist. Reference to the *resurrection* as taking place "once and for all in history is inadequate for the understanding of the Lord's Passover to the Father and as a basis for appreciating the celebration of the Eucharist. In the Eucharist, the bishops affirmed, we assemble as the

body of Christ, the risen head, and worship him, through, with, and in him. Reference to Calvary is secured by our present union with the risen Lord. The significance of memorial is strengthened by such considerations.¹⁷ It was also stated that the question of *reservation* and *adoration* needed to be taken up again.¹⁸ The bishops were aware that some Anglicans practiced reservation. They knew that others accord adoration to the sacrament within the celebration. But their unease at the lack of shared appreciation was intensified by the very negative statement even after elucidations, that others still find any kind of adoration of Christ in the reserved sacrament unacceptable.¹⁹ The doctrinal implications of this position needed to be examined closely. They said this because reservation for Catholics was a sign of Christ's abiding presence in the church and as a much loved focus of devotion. The Elucidation, they said went some way in elaborating the footnote on transubstantiation.²⁰ Many Catholics were unhappy it was said about the relegation of this point to a footnote, because they felt it was only there that the explicit language about change was used. They did not insist on the language of transubstantiation nor advocate any one theological/philosophical attempt to explain it, but further examination of the notion, begun in the Elucidation, was important for the continuing dialogue between the two churches.²¹

In evaluating the *Response* of the Bishops' Conference one may express appreciation of the care and trouble taken over it, which seems to have involved the whole episcopate concerned. One notes also the positive tone and the concentration on essentials and that manner in which the principles of ARCIC 1 have been applied to their document on the eucharist and to the Elucidation. The contents seem to have been very fully understood and indeed assimilated. The methodology of ARCIC is approved and the bishops seem to have been at one with the commendation of it by Pope John Paul II. The key part played in the thought of ARCIC on the eucharist by the biblical concept of *koinonia* is fully recognized. The affirmations of the achievement of ARCIC 1 are generous and full.

In the Critical Focus applied by the bishops not only to the documents on the eucharist but to those on Ministry and Ordination and to Authority in the Church, there is a concentration on what seem to the bishops to be the crucial issues, what ARCIC has said on the subject of the eucharistic sacrifice being fully affirmed and set within the context of a strong affirmation of the "uniqueness, the once-for-all character, and absolute sufficiency of the historical sacrifice of Jesus", the presence of that unique sacrifice being in a "sacramental and mysterious manner in the eucharistic celebration by which "we enter into the movement of Christ's self-offering, his self-giving to the Father and his fellow men. With regard to the "real and true presence of Christ" much stress is laid on the emphasis on "becoming".²² The stress on the Church's celebration as an "effective proclamation of God's mighty deeds in Christ" is particularly close to the approach of Eucharistic Prayer Two in the Church of Ireland's 2004 edition of the Book of Common Prayer.²³

However, one might question the extent to which the Church's offering and that of Christ on Calvary's cross are so identified with one another that any difference between them is not apparently fully recognized. Although there is a *unity* between them based on Christ being both priest and victim at Calvary and also in the Eucharist, it needs to be said that there is also a *difference* because the "remembrance" of something, however effectual is not the same as the original event that is in this way "remembered".²⁴ Similarly the relationship between Christ and his sacramental Body and Blood can not be that of absolute identity since the sacrament is the effectual sign by which Christ is represented

and is not transmuted into Him.²⁵ The change, which is ontological, has to do with the significance of the bread and wine as consecrated, their purpose, and their function and role but does not involve a total transformation into something which they are not, leaving supposedly only an outward similitude.²⁶ Such a view, as indicated above, is not in accordance with the evidence of the New Testament itself.²⁷ It is rather difficult to understand the criticism that the tone of the statement is too passive. After all, according to the Windsor statement,²⁸ “In the eucharistic prayer the church continues to make a perpetual memorial of Christ’s death, and his members, united with God and with one another, give thanks for all his mercies, entreat the benefits of his passion on behalf of the whole Church, participate in these benefits and enter into the movement of his self-offering.” All churches are heirs to particular understandings of their heritage and that of the Roman Catholic Church is one of a particularly strong concentration on the eucharist as sacrifice, perhaps to the neglect of other aspects of the eucharistic mystery.²⁹ A proper view is one which balances the Godward and manward emphases and values them both.³⁰ Such a balance is well represented in the Holy Communion Two rites of the Church of Ireland, as well as other rites within the Anglican liturgical tradition, and needs to be maintained.³¹

The bishops take the view that in the treatment of the eucharist there is ‘insufficient reference to the resurrection of Christ’ But ARCIC says that ‘On the one hand, the eucharistic gift springs out of the paschal mystery of Christ’s death *and resurrection*, in which God’s saving purpose has already been definitively realized. On the other hand, its purpose is to transmit the life of the crucified and risen Christ to his body, the Church, so that its members may be more fully united with Christ and with one another.’³² There is also the eschatological paragraph in which ARCIC affirms that ‘The Lord who thus comes to his people in the power of the Holy Spirit is the Lord of glory. In the eucharistic celebration we anticipate the joys of the age to come. By the transforming action of the Spirit of God, earthly bread and wine become the heavenly manna and the new wine the eschatological banquet for the new man: elements of the first creation become pledges and first fruits of the new heaven and earth.’³³ It is evident that ARCIC is speaking here of the risen and ascended Christ who “ever lives to make intercession for us”, although this could have been made more explicit, as it is in one way or another in most Anglican liturgies.

With regard to *reservation* and *adoration* this has been discussed under (1) above. A church such as the Anglican which straddles the Catholic - Protestant divide, is bound to have fault-lines and the divergence between the different schools of thought here is not surprising given the well-known position of the Anglican Reformers. However, all Anglican churches have hymn-books which express in various ways devotion to Christ who is present to us in the eucharistic mystery.³⁴ The particular cult of the Blessed Sacrament which is a significant part of the Roman Catholic tradition, is a comparatively late development³⁵ as is, in particular, the ceremony of Benediction,³⁶ and cannot be regarded as a *sine qua non* of the practice of the eucharist, however much it is valued by those who use it as is the custom of reserving the sacrament in church not only for ministry to the sick but also for devotional purposes. But, as ARCIC 1 says warningly, “any dissociation of such devotion from (the) primary purpose, which is communion in Christ of all his members, is a distortion in eucharistic practice.”³⁷

NOTES ON CHAPTER THREE PART SIX (2)

¹Bishops' Conference of England and Wales, *Response to the Final Report of ARCIC I*, Catholic Media Office, London, 1985.

²The generally positive tone of the *Response* contrasted favourably with the niggling negativity of the SCDF "Observations", although it did contain a section entitled "critical focus" which indicated a need for further reflection, met in due course by ARCIC-II's *Clarifications*.

³*Response*, p.3.

⁴Op, cit, pp3,4.

⁵ Op. cit. p4.

⁶Ibid.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Op. cit. pp4,5

⁹ Op. cit. p.5

¹⁰ Op. cit. pp5,6

¹¹ Op. cit.

¹² Op. cit. p7

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ It should, however be noted that the word "become" is not characteristic of Anglican liturgies, where the furthest limit would seem to be the language of "be to us" as in Eucharistic Prayer 3 of Holy Communion 2 of the Church of Ireland (BCP, 2004 p.217.) See also p.240 where the issue is the provision when the consecrated elements are insufficient:

Father,
having given thanks over the bread and the cup
according to the institution of your Son Jesus Christ,
who said, Take, eat, this is my body,
and/or
Drink this, this is my blood.
We pray that this bread/wine also *may be to us* his body/blood
to be received in remembrance of him.

¹⁵The Anglican theologian E.L. Mascall, in his seminal, *Corpus Christi*, revised and enlarged edition, Longmans, Green and Co., 1965 p.183 says that "in the Eucharist the Whole Christ offers the Whole Christ".

¹⁶This is a rather questionable statement, given that the treatment of "gift" which has to do primarily with the God-to-man aspect of the eucharist is treated in the *ARCIC Final Report* under the headings of "Christ's Presence in the Eucharist" and "Gift and Reception". This follows the section on "Anamnesis and Sacrifice" which has to do primarily with the man-to -God aspect which has to do with offering.

¹⁷This also is a rather questionable statement, not only for the reasons given further down in the main text below but also because of the emphasis laid on the resurrection in modern Anglican liturgies. For example in the First Eucharistic Prayer in the Church of England's *Alternative Service Book, 1980*, Clowes, SPCK, CUP, Hodder & Stoughton, OUP, Mowbray, pp130-132 it was affirmed,

For he is your living Word;
through him you have created all things from
the beginning,
and formed us in your own image.
Through him you have freed us from the slavery of sin,
giving him to be born as man and to die
upon the cross;
you raised him from the dead
and exalted him to your right hand on high.

There are no fewer than four proper prefaces for Easter, of which the first read,

And now we give you thanks because you raised him gloriously from the dead. For he is the true Paschal Lamb who was offered for us and has taken away the sin of the world. By his death he has destroyed death, and by his rising again he has restored to us eternal life.

And in the anamnesis in this prayer, it read,

Therefore, heavenly Father, we
remember his offering of himself
made once for all upon the cross,
and proclaim his mighty
resurrection and
glorious ascension.
As we look for his coming in glory,
we celebrate with this bread and this
cup his one perfect sacrifice.

In the Holy Communion Two liturgies in the 2004 Prayer Book of the Church of Ireland there are emphatic references to the resurrection in all three eucharistic prayers, quite apart from seasonal material for the great Fifty Days of the Easter celebration.

¹⁸This issue is discussed again in the final paragraph of the main text in the current section (below).

¹⁹As above.

²⁰It cannot, however, be assumed, that any but a small minority of Anglicans would define the Real Presence in terms of the doctrine of transubstantiation, although the word itself, if simply indicating a change in what the bread and wine of the eucharist *are*, by virtue of consecration, may not necessarily be regarded as critical. What matters, in accordance with the Church Catechism and Article 28 of the Thirty-nine Articles is that the reality of the bread and wine must not be compromised. A change in the significance of the bread and wine, and of the purpose they serve and the role they perform following consecration by no means requires that they cease in any way to have all the characteristics of bread and wine and are correctly so designated. They are sacramental realities as the "Body" and "Blood" of Christ while remaining what they originally were and continue to be.

²¹ Op. cit., p.8.

²²See above ¹⁴, a consideration that appears to have been overlooked by ARCIC.

²³ See, not only the rehearsal of the mighty acts of God in Christ in eucharistic prayer 2 on

pp212-215 (inclusive of the seasonal additions) but also the use of the key word "proclaim" in the anamnesis,

Father, with this bread and this cup,
we do as our Saviour has commanded:
we celebrate the redemption he has won for us;
we proclaim his perfect sacrifice,
made once for all upon the cross,
his mighty resurrection and glorious ascension; and we look for his coming
to fulfil all things according to your will.

²⁴This, in the opinion of the present writer is a key issue which does not appear to have surfaced in the ARCIC discussions. If it is true, as the Roman Catholic tradition maintains that there is an identity between the original sacrifice and that of the eucharist based on the consideration that in both there is the same Priest (Christ) and the same Victim (Christ) it must also be maintained that there is a difference between them, given that the original sacrifice occurred two thousand years ago, and the eucharist is being celebrated in many and various ways and at many and varied locations two thousand years later. However powerful the concept of *anamnesis* is the "remembrance" of something is not in any absolute sense identical with the original occurrence of that which is being "remembered". The most that can be said in this regard is that there can be a re-living of the event, as in the declaration made in the Passover Haggadah, "In every generation one is obliged to see himself as though he himself had actually gone forth from Egypt". This is eloquently set forth in the commentary by Rabbi Joseph Elias in *The Haggadah, Mesorah Publications, Third Edition, 1980, p,XIX*,

The Torah calls our sacred days *moadiym*, days of encounter with God. Each of our holy days carries a Divine message, based on its historical significance; thus *Pesach* conveys the message of our liberation from Egypt. But these messages do not come to us from the distant past - rather, we are brought face to face with the historic event that gave rise to the holiday.

This is difficult for us to understand, for we are used to considering time as stretching out in a long line from a dim past, gone forever, to an unforeseeable future that we cannot anticipate; therefore the events of the Exodus from Egypt, seem to us to lie far back in our history. In reality, however, as the days and seasons pass us by, we are not moving ahead in a straight line, leaving the past behind us. We are moving in a circle, or, better, a spiral - and thus, year after year, we always again pass through the same seasons, past the same historical moments of encounter with God that our fathers experienced, so it is that when we thank God for the miracles that shaped our history, we do not speak of great events of *those days* but *at this time* - we are still participants today.

This kind of thinking should be at the forefront of the Christian observance of the Church's Year, focused on the Triduum, the three days of the death of Jesus, but on every occasion when every eucharist is celebrated by priest and people.

²⁵Given that the term "body" of Christ has the meaning of (1) the Lord's *physical* body that he had on earth, and (2) his *sacramental* body in the eucharist and (3) his *mystical* body, the church, it is evident that these are related but not identical. It is the view of the present writer that much of the difficulty of eucharistic theology has arisen from confusion between these categories, as when, for example, Ignatius of Antioch (c. 112

A.D.) said, in his opposition to the Docetists, "They abstain from the Eucharist and prayer because they do not admit that the Eucharist is the *flesh* of our saviour Jesus Christ, which suffered for our sins, which the Father in his goodness raised up." (H. Bettenson, ed., *Documents of the Christian Church*, OUP, 1946 and numerous reprints, p.105). A case can be made that a literal identification of the eucharistic bread with the Lord's physical body diminishes rather than enhances the symbolism involved. What one may say is that the Lord's physical body is *represented* in the eucharist and that the Lord's bread is the *effectual sign* of the Lord's Body and is rightly so designated, sacramentally speaking.²⁶ It would be hard to find reasons for disagreeing with the proposition that such a transmutation would overthrow the nature of a sacrament (Article 28). The doctrine of the Real Presence in no way depends upon such a view.

²⁷ Jesus, "took bread" Mark 14:22//Mathew, Luke. It is described as "bread" in St Paul's reminder to the Christians at Corinth about the nature of the eucharist, 1 Cor 11:26. "For as often as you eat this *bread* and drink the cup, you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes." cf 11:27; cf 11:28. Similarly in 1 Cor 10:16 he says, "The *bread* which we break, is it not a participation in the body of Christ? Because there is one *bread*, we who are many are one body, for we all partake of the one *bread*"

²⁸ *Final Report*, p.14.

²⁹ An examination of the pre-Vatican 2 Ordinary of the Mass gives an extraordinary impression of an almost exclusive emphasis upon the offering of sacrifice. See, *The Roman Missal in Latin and English according to the latest Roman Edition*, Introduction and Liturgical Notes by the Right Reverend Abbot Cabrol, O.S.B., The Talbot Press, Dublin and Cork, Eighth (revised) edition, 1931, pp20-46.

³⁰The eucharistic prayer, as its name suggests, is essentially a prayer of thanksgiving (and consecration) and is addressed to the Father. But the communion of the people, is a ministry of giving and receiving. (Holy Communion Two in the 2004 Prayer Book, pp208-221.

³¹Ibid.

³²*The Final Report, op. cit. p.14*

³³ Op. cit. p.16.

³⁴There is a need for caution in citing hymns for doctrinal reasons - the contents of hymn-books are not necessarily scrutinized line-by-line theologically in the same way as the liturgies of the church. However, it may be said that when, as in the Church of Ireland, an official hymn-book is authorized by legislation of the General Synod, then the contents of what it approves are not irrelevant to an understanding of the faith of the church. A further caution is in relation to the hymns being the language of poetry, and this means that not everything that might be cited is necessarily to be understood literally.

In the case of the Church of Ireland, its long series of official hymn-books has led to the replacement of the (very fine) Church Hymnal 5 of 1960 by the Church Hymnal 6 of 2000. Among hymns with a bearing on eucharistic theology of the presence and sacrifice the following are of particular interest:

398 "Alleluia, sing to Jesus"

400 "And now, O Father, mindful of the love"

403 "Bread of the world, in mercy broken"

410 "Dearest Jesus, at your word"

411 "Draw near and take the body of the

Lord"
 413 "Father, we thank thee who hast
 planted"
 418 "Here, O my Lord, I see thee face to
 face"
 420 "I am the bread of life"
 422 "In the quiet consecration"
 425 "Jesus, thou joy of loving hearts"
 426 "Jesus, to your table led"
 427 "Let all mortal flesh keep silence"
 429 "Lord Jesus Christ, you have come to us"
 431 "Lord, enthroned in heavenly splendour"
 432 "Love is his word"
 433 "My God, your table here is spread"435 "O God, unseen, yet ever near"
 437 Pt 1 "Now, my tongue, the mystery
 telling"
 Pt 2 "Therefore we, before him bending"
 438 "O thou, who at thy eucharist didst pray"
 439 "Once, only once, and once for all"
 443 "Sent forth by God's blessing"
 444 "Soul of my Saviour"
 445 "Soul, array thyself with gladness"
 446 "Strengthen for service, Lord"
 449 "Thee we adore, hidden Saviour, thee."
 450 "Upon thy table, Lord, we place."

³⁵ It would seem to have been not unrelated to the controversy over the teaching of the 11th century Berengarius of Tour the condemnation of which gave an impetus to a very "realistic" concept of the eucharistic presence.

³⁶The institution of the Feast of Corpus Christi on the Thursday after Trinity Sunday in 1264 marked an important stage of the process. It is not clear where and when the particular ceremony of Benediction emerged, but this seems to have become increasingly popular from the seventeenth century onwards. (Article, "Benediction" in Addis. W., and Arnold, T., *A Catholic Dictionary*, Virtue & Co., Ltd, Tenth Edition, 1928.). The devotion known as "Exposition" of the Blessed Sacrament - of forty hours adoration of the sacrament exposed to the public view, seems to have had a sixteenth century origin, and, like Benediction, was very popular at least up to the liturgical changes consequent to the Second Vatican Council (1961-65).

³⁷Given that devotion to the Blessed Sacrament in the form of a cult seems to have flourished most when the primary purpose of the institution of the Eucharist, namely, the act of communion, was at a low ebb, there would appear to be a strong case, from the Anglican point of view to concentrate on increasing communicant life, not least through more frequent celebrations of the Holy Communion, rather than developing extra-liturgical or para-liturgical forms of devotion to the Blessed Sacrament itself.

CHAPTER 3, ASSESSMENTS, PART 6 (3). ONE BREAD, ONE BODY

One Bread One body is a teaching document on the Eucharist in the life of the church, and the establishment of general norms on sacramental sharing, produced by the Catholic bishops' Conferences of England and Wales, Ireland, and Scotland in 1998.¹

In Part One: Introduction² it says that the Catholic bishops are eager "to maintain the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace" and to speak the truth in love. It is affirmed that an understanding of the Eucharist is essential to the search for Christian unity - there can be no full unity among Christians that does not embrace unity in the Eucharist, and no full unity in the Eucharist without a shared understanding of all that the Eucharist contains and signifies. The bishops say that taking part in the Mass is the hallmark of the Christian. For Catholics now, as in the past, the Eucharist is the source and summit of the whole Christian life. It is the vital centre of all that the church is and does because at its heart is the real presence of the crucified, risen and glorified Lord, continuing and making available his saving work among us. The bishops say that the Eucharist is a mystery to be pondered and revered. With regard to the relationship between the Roman Catholic church and other churches they say that they look forward to continuing dialogue. Official dialogues between the Catholic Church and other Christian communities have been very fruitful, there has been growing agreement about many aspects of the mystery of the Eucharist, and the bishops are glad to make use of the results of these dialogues in the document. Most Christians in our countries, they say, are now conscious of being 'not strangers but pilgrims', aware of our divisions and yet committed to finding a way forward together. It is above all at the Eucharist that Christians feel most acutely of the pain of their divisions. As bishops they say that they experience that situation themselves, and that they are gladly and irrevocably committed to growing in unity with their fellow Christians until they reach full Communion and can celebrate Eucharist together as one visible church of Christ. Christians are one band of pilgrims but continued disunity obscures God's invitation to all humanity to share his life, and makes the gospel harder to proclaim. There is much need for mutual forgiveness between Christians, re-examining together the past and 'the hurt that the past regrettably continues to provoke even today' and as Catholic bishops they repent of and ask forgiveness for any responsibility they have for the continued divisiveness of Christ's disciples in their countries. They reaffirm and seek to share their catholic faith in the mystery of the Eucharist. This faith embraces the making present of Christ saving death and resurrection, the real presence of Christ in the blessed sacrament, and the inseparable bond between the mystery of the Eucharist and mystery of the Church. The fundamental principles of the Catholic faith remain ever the same. Norms, however, to govern sharing of the sacraments between Catholics and other Christians can be developed and changed over time, on the basis of the Church's deepening understanding of that faith. In establishing these norms they are responding to the recommendation in the *Directory for the Application of Principles and Norms on Ecumenism* published in 1993 by the Pontifical Council for promoting Christian Unity. The bishops express a keen desire to safeguard the integrity of the Eucharist in particular and say that it is of special concern to them when someone receives the sacrament he or she knows and desires what the church means by that sacrament. It is right to expect that anyone who received holy Communion in the Catholic Church should manifest Catholic faith in the Eucharist.

Comment

In assessing this document it has to be borne in mind that this is primarily an internal document of the Roman Catholic Church, although one with considerable ecumenical implications, both doctrinally and practically, for members of other Christian communions such as the Anglican. From a Church of Ireland standpoint there is much in this introduction that seems fair and reasonable, but one comes immediately up against the difficulty that the entire document is written from the standpoint not only of the faith and order of the Roman Catholic Church being a norm for its own members, but also, implicitly and sometimes explicitly, a supposed norm for all Christians. While appreciating the importance of churches in ecumenical discussion and negotiation being true to themselves, it needs to be remembered that the view that the Roman Catholic communion is in some ultimate sense “the” one, holy, catholic and apostolic church, is not, in fact accepted by any other Christian communion, whether Eastern Orthodox, Anglican, Reformed, Lutheran, Methodist or whatever. The Church of Ireland, according to the terms of its most fundamental constitutional document, the (Preamble and) Declaration prefixed to the Church Constitution, expresses its self-understanding in the words, “Ancient, Catholic and Apostolic” and “Reformed and Protestant”.³

In **Part Two: Our Catholic Faith**⁴: it is stated that Catholic faith in the Eucharist and Catholic faith in the Church are two essential dimensions of one and the same mystery of faith; and under the subheading of **Christ our Saviour, Source and Centre of Communion** they affirm that “to believe in God to enter the ‘we’ of the family of God.” The mystery of salvation is a mystery of Communion. God wills to draw humanity into communion with himself and with one another so as to share his life, the life of the Holy Trinity. This community will be complete only in the final fullness of the kingdom of God, but it is already visibly present here and now in the Body of Christ, his church. Sharing in common the life of God who gives himself to us in love, we are able to be one as the Father and the Son are one.

Comment

Once again, the word “Catholic” would not be identified by the Church of Ireland as the equivalent of “Roman Catholic”, and the “Catholic” faith would be regarded as signifying the universal faith, as, for example, understood by Venerentius of Lerins in the fourth century, “that which has been believed, always, everywhere, and by all.”⁵ However, the statement about the mystery of salvation which is also a mystery of communion is one which Anglican Christians can affirm.⁵

Under the subheading **The Church, Sacrament of salvation** and focussing on **The Church and the Sacraments**⁶ the document says that Christ’s invisible presence is made visible and tangible for us through special sacramental signs. A sacrament is far more than simply a signpost pointing for something greater elsewhere. Each sacrament is an effective sign which makes present what it signifies. Sacraments are “specific ways in which, by the power of the Holy Spirit, the risen Jesus makes his saving presence and action effective enough in our midst”. The bishops point out that the word sacrament is also used of the church itself which is described by the Second Vatican Council as “the universal sacrament of salvation”. In Christ, the Church “as a sacrament or instrumental sign of intimate union with God and of the unity of all humanity” Each of the seven sacraments, they say, can be fully understood only within the setting of the visible community of the Church. Baptism is “the gateway to life in the Spirit and the door which

gives access to the other sacraments” It is a point of departure, a sacred beginning to membership of the Pilgrim church. It is directed towards “acquiring of fullness of life in Christ”, “a complete profession of faith” within the visible unity of church, and finally “a complete participation in Eucharistic communion”. The Church is most fully and visibly itself when it gathers for the Eucharist.

Comment

The concept of the Church itself as “universal sacrament of salvation” is helpful as giving an overall context for particular sacraments, although the Revised Catechism, currently authorized for use in the Church of Ireland, makes a distinction between sacraments in the fullest sense of the word, in other words Baptism and Holy Communion and “sacramental ministries of grace” which have some, but not all the characteristics of sacraments.⁷

Under the heading **The Catholic Church and other Christians: full and partial Communion**⁸ it is stated that Christ’s church is a communion, a community whose members share or hold in common the divine life and the mystery of salvation: “one Lord, one faith, one baptism”. The Catholic Church claims, in all humility, to be endowed with all the gifts with which God wishes to endow his church all the invisible and visible elements needed by the body of Christ for its life of discipleship and mission. This is what is meant by the firm conviction that the one church of Christ “subsists in the Catholic Church”, that the fullness of the means of salvation, the entirety of revealed truth, the sacraments and the hierarchical Ministry are found within the Catholic communion of the church. These means of grace of thre to serve our Communion with each other in Christ, to keep us open and listening to one another in the spirit of truth, and bring us into conformity with the Father’s will. Christians are in “full Communion” with the Catholic Church when they hold in common *all* the gifts of grace with which Christ has endowed his church. The fullness of Communion which we claim is not only a gift, but also a challenge to the Catholic Church from the Lord: to become more fully and truly in its life and work what it already is by God’s free gift of grace. This claim still means, however, that’s the one holy catholic and apostolic Church of Christ is to be found in its fullness, though imperfectly, in the visible Catholic Church as it is here and now.

Comment

One would have to say here that it is the universal church which is “endowed with all the gifts which God wishes to endow his church”. However, no particular church can be unequivocally identified with the church universal, but may be regarded as a partial and inadequate realization of the concept which is necessarily imperfect on this side of the eschaton. The present writer’s view is that the attempt to identify among the various Christian bodies a single entity to be called the “catholic” Church has not been credible since the separation of the Eastern and Western parts of the Church conventionally marked by the mutual excommunications of the year 1054.⁹ Some hundreds of years before the Reformation, it sadly became evident that the universal or catholic church of the early centuries (an identifiable body although an imperfect one) had itself divided, and that exclusive claims on behalf of East or West could not reasonably be described as capable of being sustained. And the claims of the Papacy to a divine right to govern the Church such as were made by medieval churchmen, including several popes, are not acceptable to other Western churches, such as the churches of the Reformation any more than by Eastern Orthodoxy, whether Greek or Russian.¹⁰ A universal “presidency in love” speaking to and for the church is one thing. A divinely instituted universal jurisdiction,

endowed even with a certain infallibility, is quite another.¹¹

The bishops affirm¹² that the Catholic Church rejoices in the many elements of holiness and truth to be found in other Christian communities: “the written word of God; the life of grace; faith hope and charity, with the other interior gifts of the Holy Spirit and visible elements too”. All of these properly belong to the one Church of Christ. Our common baptism is the sacramental bond of unity between us and Catholics readily recognize the real though partial communion existing between all the baptized, There are varying degrees of communion, depending on how much Christians share together in the mystery of salvation and the means of grace.

Under the heading **The Eucharist** and the sub-heading **The Eucharist and the Word of God**¹³, it is stated that the Church never ceases to present to the faithful the bread of life, taken from the one table of God’s Word and Christ’s body. It is by hearing God’s Word that the Church is built up and grows. The Catholic Church finds the roots of its teaching on the Eucharist in the Scriptures, always read within the living Tradition of the whole Church.

The meaning of the Eucharist is rooted in the faith of the people of the Old Testament, especially in the doctrine of covenant. There were close links in Jewish thought between “covenant”, “sacrifice”, and “communion meal”. In the Book of Exodus (24:1-11) God’s new relationship) with his chosen people is sealed with the pouring of blood (sacrifice) and the eating together of some of the sacrificial food (communion). Moses said of the blood, “Behold the blood of the covenant which the Lord has made with you”. The blood was sprinkled upon the altar (symbolising God) and the people, a powerful expression of the unity of life which God establishes between himself and Israel. By eating the sacrificial food together, the people were made one as they shared the blessing of God. The fundamental Covenant which spans the Old Testament and the New Testament remains the same: “I will be their God and they shall be my people.” Unity with God and unity with each other belong together. Only those ready to enter fully into God’s covenant could share together in the communion sacrifice. To participate in the ‘communion’ is to commit oneself to God and to the people he makes his own. Through the prophets, God promised his people ‘a covenant of peace’, writing his law on their hearts. Our Christian faith is that Jesus Christ is the Mediator of this new covenant. At the Last Supper, Jesus echoed the words of Moses: “This is my blood of the covenant”, or “This cup is the new covenant in my blood which will be poured out for you”. By sharing together the cup of blessing, the cup of the eternal salvation, we enter together into this new covenant established by the pouring out of his blood upon the cross. Jesus is the Anointed One, the Messiah, or Christ’ who, provides us with the new Manna, the bread of life the sacrificial gift of his own body and blood.

The Synoptic Gospels (*Matthew, Mark and Luke*) and St Paul understood the Last Supper as Jesus’ celebration of the Passover with his disciples. John’s Gospel preserved the Passover theme by setting the death of Jesus at the moment the Passover lambs were being slain in the Temple. Jesus’ death is that of *the* Passover Lamb, the Suffering Servant of God, led like a lamb to the slaughter. Jesus is the Lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world, the one whose life given for us and poured out for us brings healing and peace. By taking part in the Eucharist, we are united with the living Christ in his work of reconciliation.

Comment

From an Anglican perspective this summary of the Scriptural basis of the eucharist is unexceptional and would be echoed both in liturgies (including those of the Church of Ireland) and in eucharistic teaching.¹⁴ However, one caveat would seem to be appropriate in that St Paul makes no mention of the Passover in his exposition of the Lord's Supper in 1 Cor 11: 23-26. The reference he does make to the Passover in this epistle makes no explicit connection with the eucharist although it does seem to be a relationship waiting to be made, "Christ our passover has been sacrificed for us, therefore let us celebrate the feast. Not with the old leaven of corruption and wickedness, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth" (1 Cor 5:7,8 where the thought seems to be of the Christian life as a 'feast'). However, in Holy Communion Two in the 2004 Prayer Book, the "Taking of the Bread and Wine" (p.208) may be preceded by the words, "Christ our passover has been sacrificed for us therefore let us celebrate the feast."¹⁵

The Eucharist as the Memorial of Christ's Sacrifice¹⁶

The bishops affirm that the word "Amen" has the Hebrew root meaning of firmness and sureness. When it is said during the Mass – above all our "Great Amen" at the end of the Eucharistic Prayer signifies that we proclaim that we believe what has been said, that we unite ourselves to that prayer and that we are committed to all that it means.

The "Amen" at the reception of communion when the words "The Body of Christ" and the "Blood of Christ" is an affirmation of the real presence of the Body and Blood of the Lord. It is at one with the great "Amen" and confesses our readiness to enter into all that Christ has achieved for us by his death and resurrection, the gift of salvation made present for us here and now as we celebrate Mass together. The celebration of the Eucharist makes sacramentally present the whole mystery of salvation. The Mass is the sacrament of salvation, the memorial of the sacrificial death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. We say "Amen" to this truth of faith when we receive Holy Communion. We believe that this once-for-all event becomes effectively present for us through the power of the Holy Spirit every time the Mass is celebrated. According to the bishops this 'sacrificial' understanding of the Eucharist needs renewed emphasis, and the difference between the Mass and what is termed a "Communion Service" at which there is a sharing of Christ's body and blood consecrated at a previous Eucharist is stressed.

Comment

What is positively affirmed here is, properly speaking, the eucharistic faith of all Christians. However, there are issues here which seem to have been to some extent not fully faced. For example, despite what is said later in the document the communicants at most celebrations of the eucharist in the Roman Catholic Church characteristically receive in one kind only, namely the bread. They do not hear the words "The Blood of Christ" spoken to them because they are not offered the cup.¹⁷ This is a serious matter, ecumenically, and also biblically since the words said by the Lord at the Last Supper was not only "take, eat", but "Drink this, all of you"¹⁸. However true it may be that the whole Christ may be received in one kind only (which may be a necessity in certain circumstances such as an infectious illness)¹⁹ there appears to be no basis whatsoever for not doing what the Lord clearly intended to be the general practice, namely a sharing in both his sacramental Body and his sacramental Blood. It is not enough for this to be affirmed as an aspiration. For it not to happen in general practice would seem to be, in the view of the present writer, uncatholic. Another issue is that which still appears to be

widespread that communion at many masses is given from the reserved sacrament rather than from the bread that has been consecrated at the particular celebration which the communicants are attending.²⁰ It is recognized that a renewal of what has been reserved for extended communion may be necessary for the sake of keeping the bread fresh, but such a consideration would in no way justify the majority of communicants being denied the sacrament which has just been set apart for its special meaning and purpose. Such a practice would appear to undermine the unity and coherence of the eucharistic action in which consecration and communion are organically related and should not normally be separated.²¹

The bishops affirm that the word “memorial” is rooted in the Last Supper, when “Jesus gave the Passover meal its definitive meaning.” It was used by the ancient Fathers of the Church, by the great medieval theologians and by the Council of Trent as a way of expressing the relation between the once-for-all sacrifice of Christ and our celebration now of the eucharist. Catholic use of the word “memorial” in the Eucharist involves *making effectively present here and now* an event in the past. The ARCIC words are reaffirmed that “in the celebration of the memorial, Christ in the Holy Spirit unites his people with himself in a sacramental way so that the Church enters into the movement of his self-offering.” It is a living sacrifice of praise. Because of the Church’s intimate communion with Christ, as a body to its head, the Eucharistic sacrifice is offered to the Father by the ‘whole Christ’, head and members together. It is an action of the whole Church. The bishops claim that the sacrifice of Christ and the Eucharistic sacrifice are one single sacrifice. The table of the Lord is the altar of his sacrifice. It is recalled that the sacrificial nature of the Mass was solemnly proclaimed by the Council of Trent and reaffirmed by the Second Vatican Council. It continues to be carefully presented in the revised Order of Mass promulgated by Pope Paul VI in 1969 (the *Missa Normativa*), and especially in the Eucharistic Prayers of the *Roman Missal*. With regard to the ordained ministry it is affirmed that Christ presides in and through the visible ministry of bishop or priest.

It is stated that ‘only a validly ordained priest can be the minister who, in the person of Christ, brings into being the sacrament of the Eucharist’. It is therefore essential that the one who presides at the Eucharist be known to be established in a sure sacramental relationship with Christ the high priest, through the sacrament of holy orders conferred by the Bishop in the recognised apostolic succession. The Catholic Church is unable to affirm this of those Christian communities rooted in the Reformation. Nor can we affirm that they have retained “the authentic and full reality of the Eucharistic mystery.” This is why reciprocity in sacramental sharing is not possible with these communities, whereas the same difficulty does not arise in the Eastern churches. It is also why reconciliation of ministries is so essential to the full reconciliation and visible unity of Christians. However there can be celebration of the Eucharist truly gives grace even when it is not possible to have the full sharing that comes through receiving Holy Communion. The traditional idea of *spiritual* communion is an important one to remember and reaffirm. The invitation often given at Mass to those who may not receive sacramental communion – for example, children before their First Communion and adults who are not Catholics – to receive a “blessing” at the moment of Communion emphasizes that a deep spiritual communion is possible even when we do not share together the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ.

Comment

Although the definition of the ‘memorial’ here would command wide assent, the ambiguity of the words “enter into the movement of his self-offering” has already been noted.²² The claim that the sacrifice of Christ and the Eucharistic sacrifice are one single sacrifice needs to be carefully qualified. On the one hand there is a unity between the original “once for all” and the repeated offerings of the celebration of the eucharist based on the Lord Jesus Christ being both priest and victim in both²³. On the other hand there is clearly a difference between an original event and the ‘remembrance’ of it which establishes a very important distinction between them.²⁴ The first is what originally and historically happened and the second is the ‘remembering before God’ of that event in thanksgiving and supplication. Churches of the Reformed tradition are careful to preserve that distinction, even although it allows, for example in “high” Calvinism, and in some Anglican liturgical writing, for the concept of “pleading” the sacrifice.²⁵

Even those churches which, like the Anglican, retain a “high” doctrine of ministry (one of the four pillars of the “Lambeth Quadrilateral” being that of the **historic episcopate and the ministry of bishops, priests and deacons**, together with the remaining three, namely the **Holy Scriptures** as containing all things necessary to salvation **the sacraments of Baptism and Holy Communion**, and the **ecumenical Creeds**, Apostles’ and Nicene)²⁶ it should not necessarily be assumed that the ministry of a non-episcopally ordained minister of another denomination is to be regarded as invalid. It seems to be overlooked that in the New Testament, in a Christian context the words *hierous* (priest) and *hierateuma* (priesthood) are used of Christ or of the Church as a whole²⁷, and never of a particular role or function and never of any particular group of persons within the Church designated as “priests”, nor is there any evidence whatsoever that eucharistic presidency is in any way restricted to such a group. Technically, the Lord Jesus Christ was presiding at the Last Supper in a “lay” capacity as do the heads of households at the Passover within Judaism to this day²⁸, and this might be said to provide a precedent for churches, such as the Methodist, which allow “lay” celebration under certain circumstances. It is significant that in the Pauline churches, although there is evidence in Acts of the appointment of senior persons (“elders”) the eucharistic presidency is not mentioned in the list of ministerial gifts in 1 Cor 12 where “to each is given the manifestation of the Spirit for the common good”²⁹. Nor in the Epistle to the Ephesians which mentions “apostles, prophets, evangelists, pastors and teachers” whose role is “to equip the saints for the work of ministry, and for building up the body of Christ” (Eph 4:11) is there any suggestion that only these may preside, although it is a reasonable enough assumption that at the common meal of which the eucharist formed a part, the more senior people would do so.³⁰ The development of a stable ministry seems to have been a sub-apostolic event, although it may have had to be contended for as in 1 Clement (A.D. 96) where the existing ministry, which was now clearly eucharistic, had to be defended against the Corinthian Christians who had deposed it.³¹ Although a threefold order of bishops, priests and deacons is both assumed and defended in the letters of Ignatius of Antioch (c.112 A.D.)³² it is notable that alone among them there is no mention of a bishop in the letter to the Church at Rome, where the leadership may have remained collective and it is at least possible that moniscopacy had not yet been established.³³ There is some evidence that a threefold pattern was not universal for some time in the Church, and that at Alexandria the successor to a bishop (‘Pope’) was ordained by presbyters and not by bishops standing in the kind of succession referred to here in the document.³⁴ The bishops seems

also to have overlooked that those exercising *episcopus* (“oversight”) in the principal churches of the Reformation tradition, provide for eucharistic presidency through ordination which admits them to the ministry of the Word and Sacrament. A considerable divergence from the Roman Catholic position is implied for example by the Porvoo Agreement, between Anglicans and Scandinavian Lutherans, some of which had a manual succession going back to the pre-Reformation era, but others of which maintained a succession of office, which was deemed quite sufficient for a complete recognition of churches and their ministries.³⁵ At the time of writing several Lutheran clergy had served as priests in the Church of Ireland. The Church of Ireland – Methodist Covenant, as it was implemented by specially passed legislation in which there was mutual recognition of ministries from the outset³⁶, although all future Methodist Presidents were to have Church of Ireland episcopal participation in the laying on of hands with prayer so that they were deemed to have episcopal status. An even bolder mutual recognition took place when the South India reunion between Anglicans, Methodists, Presbyterians, and Congregationalists in 1947 involved a total integration of ministries (rather than the much more cautious arrangements in the recent Church of Ireland – Methodist legislation)³⁷. So, even those who, like the present writer, uphold not only the legitimacy of a representative priesthood within the church, and also the historic succession of bishops but also the desirability of such an ordering of the church³⁸ do not necessarily see this as an absolute *sine qua non* of the existence of a church let alone the validity of ministries³⁹. In conclusion it must be said that the offering of a “blessing” during the Mass to those who are not in full communion with the Roman Catholic Church, while welcome as a gesture of ecumenical goodwill, falls very far short of what a developing ecumenical relationship actually requires.

Under the heading of **The Eucharist and the Presence of Christ**⁴⁰ the bishops affirm that Jesus Christ promised to remain with his disciples until the end of time, and he is with us in many different ways. He is present through the word of God. He is present in the sacraments. The whole life and work of the church is sustained by the promise of the continual, real and living presence of its risen Lord. The church community itself is the sacrament of Christ’s presence in the world. Christ is present of a special way in the poor, the sick and the imprisoned, and must be recognised there. All these forms of presence are linked with one another, and cannot be separated.

The supreme form of Christ’s presence is in the mass. There too the risen Christ is present and active in various ways, offering his church special gift of himself: it is the same Lord who through the proclaimed word invites his people to his table and through his minister presides at that table, and who gives himself sacramentally in the body and blood of his Paschal sacrifice.

Pope Paul the Sixth wrote of Christ sacramental presence in the Eucharist: “It is called the real presence, not in an exclusive sense as though other forms of presence were not real, but by reason of its excellence. It is the substantial presence by which Christ is made present without doubt, whole and entire, God and man. In the Eucharist, we become one body with Christ in his sacrificial giving of himself to the Father. We are also united in deep Communion with each other through our common sharing in the same Lord. What Christ said of the bread and wine of the Last Supper is still true today through the ministry of his priests: “This is my body, “This is my blood”. Through the great Eucharistic prayer of thanksgiving, the bread and wine become the body and blood of Christ by the action of the Holy Spirit, so that in Communion we eat the flesh of Christ

and drink his blood. Catholics believe that Christ in the Eucharist is ‘truly, really and substantially present’. By the consecration of the bread and wine, there takes place a change of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord, and the whole substance of the wine into the substance of his blood. Catholics believe that Christ in the Eucharist is truly, really and substantially present. By the consecration of the bread and wine, that takes place a change of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord, and on the whole substance of the wine into the substance of his blood this happens in a way surpassing understanding, by the power of the Holy Spirit. The word substance is not used in Catholic teaching in any material sense, but rather as a way of referring to the inner reality stands under what we see and touch and taste. We receive the whole Christ when receiving holy Communion either under the form of bread or under the form of wine, but Catholics are encouraged to desire Communion under both kinds in which the meaning of the Eucharistic banquet is more fully signified. Christ is present in this special way whether or not we believe in him or open to him his presence does not depend on the individual’s faith in order to be the Lord’s real gift of himself to his church and stop but as in any relationship of Mark, is offering of himself has to be met by faith in the life-giving encounter and deep personal Communion is to take place. Although Catholics rightly emphasise the conversion of the bread and wine in the Eucharist, it is ultimately the conversion of human hearts that is God’s loving will.

The very act of coming to Mass on Sunday is the proclamation of our faith and commitment and witness to the world. We also strongly encourage daily Mass and Holy Communion when this is possible because God then feeds us with bread from heaven each day of our pilgrim journey, as he fed his people each day with manna in the desert. Speaking of the reservation of the “Blessed Sacrament” this is a sign of Christ’s abiding presence in the church and the much loved focus of devotion. As bishops we wish strongly to encourage prayer before the Blessed Sacrament: this includes extended periods of exposition, benediction and personal visits to the church of prayerful adoration.

Comment

There is again, much that can be affirmed as part of the universal or “catholic” Christian faith. That there is a Real Presence of Christ in the Word as well as in the Sacrament is implied by the practice of standing for the reading of the Gospel to hear the words of Christ as if directly spoken by him to its hearers, a custom which is universal in Anglicanism, and is found specifically in the 2004 edition of the Book of Common Prayer in the Church of Ireland. It is also helpful to have an emphasis upon the unity of the various modes of the presence of Christ including that of the Church community as a sacrament of Christ in the world. Clearly, the historic Christian faith includes the centrality of the eucharist. There is a need, however, to avoid too narrow a focus on the role of the presiding minister which is, of course, highly significant but it is the whole church which “celebrates” and not just the person traditionally called the “celebrant”. The papal comment that forms of Christ’s “real presence” apart from the eucharist are not “unreal” is well spoken. However, despite the real progress made in relation to the nature of the eucharistic presence in, for example, the “Final Report”, the language of “change” from a non-Roman Catholic standpoint does need to be carefully safeguarded against any suggestion that the bread and wine of the eucharist are not themselves ‘real’. They become the sacramental ‘body’ and ‘blood’ of Christ, symbolically, and as indicated elsewhere such a statement may have ontological implications, but there is nothing

whatever in the language of the New Testament which indicates that in their capacity as bread and wine they become “unreal”. Such a view implies a literalism which is not necessarily biblical, and is not required for a full and comprehensive doctrine of the Real Presence of Christ in the eucharist.

The point has already been made above that it is not enough for the Roman Catholic Church to affirm the value of communion in both kinds without this actually happening as a general rule, for this is something which is truly normative if the words and actions of Jesus at the Last Supper are to be taken as in any real sense as a model. It should not be regarded as something which happens only on particular occasions but needs at least to be available at every celebration of the eucharist except in special circumstances. The doctrine of concomitance signifies that it is possible to make one’s communion in one kind. But it in no way establishes that such an arrangement should be regarded as the normal arrangement– in any church.

The emphasis on the conversion of human hearts is helpful and is confirmed biblically and in some historical eucharistic writings, notably those of St Augustine in the concept of self-offering, which is to be found also in Anglican eucharistic texts in the form of the offering of “ourselves, our souls and bodies” in the first post-communion prayer in Holy Communion One in the 2004 Prayer Book (p189) and in the offering of “our souls and bodies to be a living sacrifice” in the post-communion prayer beginning “Almighty God” in Eucharistic Prayer Two (p221). The penitential sections in both forms are also relevant.

The reservation of the Blessed Sacrament for devotional purposes is a particular feature of the Roman Catholic Church which is also significant for some Anglicans, although the focus on the eucharistic bread seems to make it difficult to justify separation of the elements whose significance is conjoined in the biblical narratives of the institution of the Holy Communion by Christ himself. Nonetheless, whether separately or conjoined the elements as consecrated may be deemed an effectual sign of the Lord’s presence.

Under the heading **Holy Communion and Full Communion**⁴¹ the Mass is described as “deeply personal, but never private”. It is a hallowed means towards healing divisions and deepening unity. The healing power of the Mass is important for Catholics gathered together in worship. The offering to each other of the ‘kiss’ or sign of peace before receiving Holy Communion expresses something of this. Each celebration of Mass is one Eucharistic moment in the life of the Church from East to West, and through the ages. This unity of the universal Church is a communion in truth, in love and in holiness. It is rooted in sharing the same faith and in our common baptism, in the Eucharist, and also in communion with the bishops of the Church united with the Bishop of Rome. The Eucharistic Prayer for Masses for Various Needs and Occasions includes the words ‘Strengthen the bonds of our communion with N. our pope, N. our bishop, with all bishops, priests and deacons, and all your holy people’. These three signs and sources of unity – shared faith, shared Eucharist and shared ministry – belong together. Full participation at a Catholic Mass through reception of Holy Communion normally implies full communion with the Catholic Church itself. Reference is made to the Catholic rite of receiving a baptized Christian from another denomination into the Catholic Church. Baptism means that a person is already in partial communion with the Catholic Church. The final rite of welcome is called ‘Reception into *Full* Communion, and the climax of that rite is the reception *for the first time* of sacramental communion at the Catholic Eucharist. The Eucharist is a Sacrament of Initiation. The bishops say that this

deepened communion brought about by the Holy Spirit in the Eucharist includes not only that with the members of the pilgrim Church here on earth but “also between these and all who, having passed from this world in the grace of the Lord, belong to the heavenly Church or will be incorporated into her after being fully purified.” In the Eucharistic Prayer, we ask for a share in the fellowship of Mary, the Mother of God, the apostles, the martyrs and all the saints, and we pray to be made worthy to share eternal life with them.” We are united with the angels and the saints in the heavenly liturgy as we worship God, and we pray: “When our pilgrimage on earth is complete, welcome us into your heavenly home, where we shall dwell with you for ever. There, with Mary, the Virgin Mother of God, with the apostles, the martyrs and all the saints, we shall praise you and give you glory through Jesus Christ your Son.” At the end of Mass we are sent forth in peace to love and serve the Lord, in deeper communion, we hope with each other and with the whole Church. We receive the body of Christ so that we may go forth as the Body of Christ into the world, the living sacrament of his presence in the midst of others. There is an intimate and inseparable link between Mass and mission, between worship and way of life. It is also stated that the celebration of the Eucharist commits us to the poor and should flow into social action, a truth eloquently expressed in the *Eucharistic Prayer for Masses for Various Needs*. A section entitled **Reconciliation and the Anointing of the Sick**⁴² speaks of being forgiven by God and, at the same time, reconciled with the Church, and of renewal of communion with Christ and renewal of full communion with his Church (which) go hand in hand. Christ continues to touch those who are seriously ill or frail through old age with the gift of the Holy Spirit, and of the importance of being kept in touch with the community of the Church in our sickness.

Comment

The healing power of the eucharist is brought out in Holy Communion One in the 2004 Prayer book in the words of administration which speak of the preservation of our “body and soul” to everlasting life.⁴³ The Church of Ireland Prayer Book also provides a comprehensive form of Ministry to those who are Sick and two forms for setting the laying on of hands and/or anointing within the (optional) context of a celebration of the Holy Communion, the second form, entitled “A Celebration of Wholeness and Healing” being particularly comprehensive.⁴⁴ The forms of healing, providing *inter alia* for Penitence and Reconciliation, and Reconciliation, as well as the Laying on of Hands, special Prayers, Readings and Preparation for Death recognize the importance of this aspect of ministry including a suitable adaptation of the Eucharist for this purpose.⁴⁵

The exchange of the Peace is also an integral Part of Holy Communion Two, as in other Anglican Churches, which is situated more appropriately before the Offertory rather than immediately before the administration according to the biblical principle of ‘First be reconciled to your brother, and then offer your gift’.⁴⁶

That the eucharistic celebration is one with the celebrations of all times and all places is well expressed by the bishops, although their vision is limited to the churches of East and West and fail to make any recognition of the churches of the Reformation, in particular those, which, like the Anglican, explicitly affirm their faith in the “one, holy, catholic and apostolic church” through the use of the Nicene Creed in their liturgy.⁴⁷ Their emphasis on communion with the bishop of Rome is a feature of the Roman Catholic Church which has described itself officially and definitively, as ‘one, holy, catholic, apostolic *and Roman*’.⁴⁸ In a divided church, communion with the Bishop of Rome cannot be regarded

as a *sine qua non*, and in spite of the best efforts of ARCIC-2 there would appear to be an insuperable barrier to this in papal claims of both infallibility and jurisdiction, neither of which appear to have any biblical basis in spite of the many places where the role of Peter is signified.⁴⁹ St Paul, for example, in 1st Corinthians, clearly regards Peter as one of several church leaders each of whom makes his own contribution to the well-being of the church.⁵⁰ The suggestion that baptized Christians of other denominations who go through the prescribed procedure to become Roman Catholics are making their communion for the first time is highly questionable and would not be accepted by any of the churches of the Reformation, and specifically by the Church of Ireland, which claims to be “Ancient, Catholic and Apostolic” as well as “Reformed and Protestant”.⁵¹ The many and various grounds alleged over four centuries against the validity of Anglican Orders,⁵² ranging from the mythical “Nags Head Fable” to the argument in *Apostolicae Curae* of Pope Leo XIII (1896) of a supposed “Defect of Intention” are contested, the only intention, biblically speaking, required of any church being that of following the Lord’s command to “do this in remembrance of me”; although there are varying degrees of insight into the significance of the Greek expression *eis anamnesin* against its Hebrew background, probably *lezikkaron*.⁵³ The remainder of this section with its emphasis upon the communion of saints (an article of creedal faith) is well expressed by the bishops but finds its due place in Anglican liturgies including those of the Church of Ireland.⁵⁴ In general it needs to be said, clearly, that one does not need to be in a specific relationship with the bishop of Rome to be in communion with the Church as a whole, and there is a need to recognize what has been rightly called “The Catholicity of Protestantism” in a significant Free Church document.⁵⁵

In **Part Three** of the Bishops’ Document entitled **Together yet divided**⁵⁶ it is recognized that any discussion of sacramental sharing sharply focuses our attention on Christian disunity and passes on to the discussion of “Mixed Marriages” affirming that “in marriage a new community is created”. When a Christian not in full communion with the Catholic Church marries a Catholic that person is already in partial communion with the Catholic Church through Baptism. A new form of communion, still partial and incomplete, is brought about through the sacrament of marriage. A couple in a mixed marriage may well have a strong desire to receive Communion together. It is pointed out that there are many different ways of participating in the Eucharist even for those unable for one reason or another to be admitted to Holy Communion, and this is true in a special way for married couples and their children, for example “spiritual communion” and receiving a blessing. In a section on **Separated and divorced Catholics at the Eucharist**.⁵⁷ Being separated or divorced does not in itself mean that a person may not receive Holy Communion. Priests and deacons must also show a special pastoral care for people involved in a new relationship where one or both of the partners has been validly married before. However, “The Catholic Church has reaffirmed her practice of not admitting to Holy Communion people who have divorced and remarried.” They are, however welcome to participate in the Mass as fully as their state of life allows. With regard to **Spiritual need: personal and ecclesial**⁵⁸ the situation of “other Christians” who long for Holy Communion, or for Reconciliation and the Anointing of the Sick, cannot celebrate these sacraments in their own Christian community is discussed. The Church seeks to respond with sensitivity to the spiritual needs of the baptized. The general principle remains that sharing fully the sacramental life of the Catholic Church is acceptable only among those who share its oneness in faith, worship and ecclesial life. Given the spiritual importance of the sacraments, however, access to them maybe permitted or even commended “in certain

circumstances, by way of exception, and under certain conditions. Spiritual nourishment is always ecclesial: it involves the visible community of the Church. Sharing communion with the visible Catholic Church, even for other Christians, when, in situations of grave and pressing need, they are admitted to the sacraments. Only the full reconciliation of Christians can make formal the full sharing together of the Sacrament of Unity.

Comment

Clearly, what is presented here marks a considerable advance on what would have prevailed prior to the Second Vatican Council and subsequent ecumenical developments, and this much deserves to be recognized. However, the resistance of the Roman Catholic church generally to permitting those involved in inter-church marriages to communicate together falls far short of what their spiritual situation so often requires, and contrasts with the openness of the Church of Ireland towards the Roman Catholic partner in such unions. With regard to the situation of those divorced and remarried, this involved prolonged and difficult discussions within the Church of Ireland which seeks to maintain the principle of marriage as a lifelong commitment with the reality of the irrevocable breakdown of some marriages.⁵⁹ The current provision which provides for careful enquiry, a special service of preparation, the considered advice of the bishop, and then, all things having been agreed the actual marriage ceremony⁶⁰ would appear to offer a model both theologically sound and pastorally adequate in a way that goes far beyond what the Roman Catholic Church is prepared to admit. Such a divergence marks a continuing division which shows no immediate sign of being likely to be overcome, including, as it does, differences over the crucial issue of admission to communion. However, the provision, in certain other circumstances of the (exceptional) admission to Holy Communion and other rites of the Roman Catholic church is to be welcomed so far as it goes.

Part Four: General Norms⁶¹ deals in some detail with the practical outworking of the principles already set forth in the bishops' document, which refers to the *Directory*⁶² on such matters. A distinction is made between norms concerning Christians from Eastern Churches, the other concerning Christians from Churches and ecclesial communities of the West. However, while insisting on the restrictions already outlined the bishops quote with approval the words of Pope John Paul II "It is a source of great joy to note that Catholic ministers are able, in certain particular cases, to administer the sacraments of Eucharist, Reconciliation and Anointing of the Sick to Christians who are not in full communion but who greatly desire to receive these sacraments, freely request them and manifest the faith which the Catholic Church professes with regard to these sacraments." At the same time, such sharing can only be "by way of exception" The Codes of Canon Law and the *Directory* do not allow regular reception of Holy Communion by Christians not in full communion with the Catholic Church.

With regard to sacramental sharing with Christians from Eastern Churches, Roman Catholic clergy are permitted to administer communion to Eastern Christians if they spontaneously ask for these sacraments and are properly disposed. In certain carefully prescribed circumstances it is possible for a Roman Catholic to receive communion in an Eastern Orthodox church. With regard to sacramental sharing with Christians from other Churches and ecclesial communities this is permitted to baptized Christians if there is a danger of death or if there is some other grave and pressing need. This may at times

include those who ask to receive them on a unique occasion for joy or for sorrow in the life of a family or an individual. The latter might include Baptism, Confirmation, First Communion, Marriage, Ordination and death. With regard to a mixed marriage, even when the bride or groom is indeed admitted to Holy Communion at a “nuptial Mass”, it is not envisaged that this be extended to relatives and other guests not in full communion with the Catholic Church. Matters related to the giving of communion are decided on an individual basis and are not governed by categories of persons. Conditions laid down in canon law are restated, including that a person manifest catholic faith in the sacrament desired, and that the person be properly disposed.

With regard to a **norm on Catholics approaching ministers of other Churches and ecclesial communities**⁶³ it is stated that in the case of the Eastern Churches, it is lawful for Catholics to receive the sacraments in such situations from a minister of an Eastern Church, this is not the case with those Christian communities which find their roots in the Reformation. A Catholic seeking those sacraments must do so “only from a minister in whose Church those sacraments are valid and from one who is known to be validly ordained according to the Catholic teaching on ordination.” The bishops say to members of the Catholic communities in our countries that it is not possible for Catholics to receive Holy Communion, or the sacraments of Reconciliation and Anointing of the Sick from ministers of the Anglican Communion (the Church of England, the Church of Ireland, the Church in Wales, the Scottish Episcopal Church) the Church of Scotland or other faith communities rooted in the Reformation.

Comment

In the light of the statement above, the bishops’ summary which follows, which appeals for adherence to the norms, falls far short of what the situation requires, namely a re-thinking of the whole issue of the “validity” of holy orders. Undoubtedly there was a huge shift in emphasis at the time of the Reformation, but it is clear from the evidence that this has not necessarily prevented a strong adherence of some Anglicans to the doctrines of the eucharistic presence and offering.⁶⁴ Ultimately, it is a matter which must be judged by Holy Scripture and all Anglican liturgies conform to that fundamental norm, both in relation to the doctrine of ministry and to that of the eucharist. Even for those who are thoroughly familiar with the extraordinary twists and turns of the argument over Anglican orders, as indeed the present writer is, it is hard to understand how the tremendous words spoken in the historic Prayer Book ordinal can reasonably be regarded as inadequate for the purpose for which they were provided⁶⁵:

Receive the Holy Ghost for the Office and Work of a Priest in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained. And be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of God, and of his holy Sacraments; In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

And a liturgy of the Eucharist, citing the dominical words as its authority, and doing what Jesus did at the Last Supper, must, in the present writer’s view of necessity be a valid Eucharist, and this applies to all authorized services within the Anglican Communion from the sixteenth to the twenty-first centuries. There would, therefore appear to be no adequate basis for the refusal of the Roman Catholic authorities to admit Anglicans to Holy Communion as a norm or to allow members of that faith to receive communion in

churches in which the Anglican liturgy is celebrated by priests (male and female⁶⁶) of the Church of God who happen to be Anglicans.

NOTES ON CHAPTER THREE PART 6 (3)

The methodology of this section, given the importance of the document and the need to give it the attention it deserves is essentially that of a precis, keeping as close as possible to the actual words used so as to ensure accuracy of representation followed by Comments after each portion of the abbreviated original text.

¹ *One Bread One Body – A teaching document on the Eucharist in the life of the Church, and the establishment of general norms on sacramental sharing*, Catholic Bishops' Conferences of England and Wales, Ireland, Scotland, 1998

²Op. cit pp7-11

³*The Book of Common Prayer*, by authority of the General Synod of the Church of Ireland, The Columba Press, 2004, p.776. For a detailed exposition of these categories as applied to the Church of Ireland see The Revd Michael Charles Kennedy, M.A., B.D., *The Theological Implications of Recent Liturgical Revision in the Church of Ireland*, submitted (to the Open University) for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, April 1987, unpublished, Chapter One, Part One pp11-17, 43-52. The full text of the Preamble and Declaration are also to be found in Appendix A of the thesis, of which there is a copy in the Representative Church Body, Rathgar, Dublin 14. See also the (unpublished) document, "The Preamble and Declaration", prepared for Diocesan and Parish Readers in training by the same author.

⁴Op. cit. pp12-47

⁵See *The Church as Communion – An Agreed Statement by the Second Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission, ARCIC II*, Church House Publishing, Catholic Truth Society, 1991.

⁶Op cit. p14f

⁷ Q 41 How many sacraments has Christ, in the Gospel, appointed for his Church?

A. Christ in his Gospel has appointed two sacraments for his Church, as needed by all for fullness of life, Baptism and Holy Communion.

Q 42 What other sacramental ministries of grace are provided in the Church?

A. Other sacramental ministries of grace are confirmation, ordination, holy matrimony, the ministry of absolution, and the ministry of healing.

⁸Op. cit. p.17f

⁹H. Burn-Murdoch, *The Development of the Papacy*, Faber and Faber, 1954, Chapter LIV "Separation of the Greek from the Latin Church, A.D. 1054", pp300-304. He emphasizes that this was a process. Since the conversion of Constantine, Constantinople had only been intermittently in communion with Rome; out of the 464 years before the Council of Nicaea (II) in the eighth century, they had been out of communion for 203, and in the next century came the Photian Schism. As recently as 1009 too, the patriarch of Constantinople had struck off his diptychs a pope who pronounced it error to deny the *Filioque* clause in the Western version of the Nicene Creed. Chapter LV, 'Reunion attempted' traces the attempts of two Byzantine emperors for reunion of the East with Rome, but their efforts came to naught, including the Council of Florence, A.D. 1439. Although both the Roman Catholic and the Eastern Orthodox Churches claim to the exclusion of the other to be the in effect the universal or Catholic Church it would seem

to be clear that the Catholic Church itself was divided in two by this enduring schism and that this remains the case. And a strong case can be made that the universal Church itself was further divided within itself by the schisms consequential to the Reformation. With regard to the catholicity of Anglican Christianity, the question and answer in the Revised Catechism are as follows:

Q21 What is the Anglican Communion?

A The Anglican Communion is a family of Churches within the universal Church of Christ in full communion with one another, maintaining apostolic doctrine and order, and accepting the Archbishop of Canterbury as chairman of the Lambeth Conference of bishops, and as first among equals.

This definition remains valid in spite of divisions over such issues as the ordination of women and same-sex relationships.

Q20 What is the Church of Ireland?

The Church of Ireland is catholic and reformed and derives from the ancient Church of this land. It proclaims and holds fast the doctrine and ministry of the One, Holy, Catholic, and Apostolic Church.

¹⁰Burn-Murdoch indicates (op. cit. p.300) the irreconcilable notions of the Roman primacy which underlay all the disagreements. It was never doubtful that Rome was the first of the patriarchates and enjoyed a primacy of “firstness” among them. Moreover its bishop had for many centuries been regarded as a particular successor of St Peter. But Rome interpreted its primacy in a sovereign and autocratic sense; although Easterns sometimes gave this lip service, their actions continually belied it.

¹¹The First Vatican Council (A.D.70), in the dogmatic constitution *Pastor aeternus* asserted a view of papal jurisdiction based on the position of St Peter which goes far beyond what the Scriptural evidence, taken in its totality, is capable of justifying and which remains unacceptable to both the Eastern Orthodox and Protestant Churches including the Church of Ireland. This document is far too long to quote extensively, or to discuss fully in the current work on the doctrine of the eucharist, but the following passage from Chapter Three is highly relevant:

Hence we teach and declare that, by the appointment of our Lord, the Roman Church possesses a superiority of ordinary power over all other Churches, and that this power of jurisdiction of the Roman Pontiff, which is truly episcopal, is immediate; to which all, of whatever rite and dignity, both pastors and faithful, both individually and collectively, are bound, by their duty of hierarchical subordination and true obedience, to submit, not only in matters which belong to faith and morals, but also in those that appertain to the discipline and government of the Church throughout the world, so that the Church of Christ may be one flock under one supreme pastor through the preservation of unity, both of communion and of profession of the same faith with the Roman Pontiff. This is the teaching of Catholic truth, from which no one can deviate without loss of faith and salvation.

There is a helpful examination of the papal document in Chapter Seven of E.A. Mendieta, *Rome and Canterbury*, Herbert Jenkins, 1962, Chapter Seven “The Ultramontane Dogmas of the Vatican Council”, pp150 to 178. Dr de Mendieta, reckoned in his day to be the finest patristic scholar in Europe and a former monk of the Benedictine Abbey of Maredsous, was probably the most distinguished member of the

Roman Catholic Church to join the Church of England since the Reformation, and became a Canon of Winchester and a noted ecumenist. His *Anglican Vision* SPCK 1971, set forward his concept of what the Church, catholic and reformed, ought to be.

The present writer would point to the problems with the Matthaean text (Mt 16:13-20) with its promises to Peter. This undoubtedly bears marks of its being an early text suggesting derivation from an Aramaic original. However, its authority is weakened not only by the essential power of “binding and loosing” being given to the remainder of the apostles in Chapter 18: 18-20 but also in the significant fact that the Petrine promises are not found at all in Mark’s Gospel (on which Matthew’s seems to be partly based) or in Luke’s gospel, and this puts a question mark over the extent to which it may be claimed to be directly from the lips of Jesus. The position of Peter in Matthew is examined at great length by the Lutheran Scholar Arlo J. Nau, *Peter in Matthew – Discipleship, Diplomacy, and Dispraise*, The Liturgical Press, Minnesota, 1992 which makes a strong case for the view that Matthew builds up the position of Peter, only to cast him down. In First Corinthians (1:10-17; 3:1-9) Paul, who speaks of himself as having “the care of all the churches”, regards Peter as one leader among several, including himself and Apollos, there seeming to have been parties at Corinth supporting the claims of each of these three men, and he regards them as fellow-workers in the service of the Gospel. There is no hint of a Petrine office of jurisdiction here, nor in Acts, where Peter is prominent in the early chapters but in which the crucial Council of Jerusalem in Acts 15 is presided over by James, the Lord’s brother, not Peter, and it is James who pronounces judgement at the end of the meeting (v.10 *ego krino* “I judge”).

With regard to the infallibility claimed for the Pope at Vatican One when he speaks *ex cathedra*, this needs to be seen in the context of infallibility also claimed by the Roman Catholic Church for ecumenical councils and for the *consensus fidelium* of the whole Church. This is not necessarily the best model for an understanding of how the Holy Spirit leads the Church into all truth and is hard to sustain without the aid of an elaborate and unconvincing casuistry. A better model would appear to allow for human error, both official and unofficial, collective and personal, and to affirm that the Holy Spirit leads the Church into all truth *in spite of its errors*, a way of looking at the issue that coheres well with the actual course of Church history including the actual errors of several Popes in the era of the early Church (Liberius, Honorius and Vigilius). The 39 Articles of Religion explicitly state that “General Councils may err” Article 21 and this position is explicitly upheld in *The Response of the General Synod of the Church of Ireland to the Final Report of ARCIC-1*, SPCK, 1986, which also deals with the post 1970 ARCIC documents, *Authority 1* and *Authority 2*. A significant piece of work from within the Roman Catholic Church itself, by J. Robert Dionne, *The Papacy and the Church – a Study of Praxis and Reception in Ecumenical Perspective*, Philosophical Library, New York, 1987, pp524, shows the difficulties that arise when a supposedly infallible church has to change its mind, for example on the issue of liberty of conscience.

¹²Op. cit p.18f

¹³Op. cit p.19f

¹⁴BCP, 2014 p213, for an explicit mention of the Passover, Eucharistic Prayer Two, Seasonal Additions,

In Passiontide and Holy Week

For he is the true Passover Lamb
who was offered for us
and has taken away the sin of the world.

In Eastertide as above with the addition,
By his death he has destroyed death
and by his rising to life
he has restored to us eternal life.

There are references to Jesus as the Passover Lamb in the two forms of the Agnus Dei Holy Communion Two, p.220,

Jesus, Lamb of God, have mercy o us.

Jesus, bearer of our sins, have mercy on us.

Jesus, Redeemer of the world, grant us peace.

Lamb of God you take away the sin of the world, have mercy on us.

Lamb of God, you take away the sin of the world, have mercy on us.

Lamb of God, you take away the sin of the world, grant us peace.

¹⁵ BCP, 2004, p208

¹⁶ Op. cit p.21f

¹⁷It is not unknown for the chalice to be so narrow that it would be virtually impossible to communicate a congregation from it.

¹⁸Matthew 26:27.

¹⁹This is provided for in the 2004 Book of Common Prayer in the “Ministry to Those who are Sick”, Notes, Section Two:

HOLY COMMUNION Christians unable to receive Communion in their local church because of illness or disability are encouraged to ask for the sacrament.

In case of need Holy Communion may be celebrated in hospital or at home. The full forms of either Holy Communion One or Two may be used or the shorter form provided on pages 442-445.

Communion is normally received in both kinds separately, but may be by intinction or in either kind. (See Canon 13(5)).

A form for Holy Communion by extension is provided and is likely to be made permanent.

²⁰It is difficult to characterize such a practice as anything other than a misuse.

²¹The principle is in fact enunciated in the “General Instruction on the Roman Missal”, Introduction, 56 (h), “It is most desirable that the faithful should receive the body of the Lord in hosts consecrated at the same Mass and should share the cup when it is permitted. Communion is thus a clearer sign of sharing in the sacrifice that is actually being celebrated”.

²²It is assumed by the present writer that the relationship between Father, Son and Holy Spirit is a dynamic one and that worshippers at the eucharist are caught up within this dynamic of self-offering.

²³ St John Chrysostom (c347-407) wrestled with this issue, but cannot be said to have brought to it a great deal of clarity. He said (in Heb.Hom.xvii,3),

What then? Do we not offer daily? Certainly we offer thus, making an *anamnesis* of His death. How is it one and not many? Because it was offered once, like that which was carried into the holy of holies...For we ever offer the same Person, not to-day one sheep and next time a different one, but ever the same offering. Therefore the sacrifice is one. By this argument then, since the offering is made in many places, does it follow there are many Christs? Not at all, for Christ is everywhere one, complete here and complete there, a single Body. Thus, as when offered in many places He is one Body and not many bodies, so also there is one sacrifice, One High-priest is He Who offered the sacrifice which cleanses us. We offer even now that which was then offered, which cannot be exhausted. This is done for an *anamnesis* of that which was then done, for "Do this" said He "for the *anamnesis* of Me". We do not offer a different sacrifice like the high-priest of old, but we ever offer the same. Or rather we offer the *anamnesis* of the sacrifice.

²⁴ The distinction is implied in the last sentence of St John Chrysostom's oration, although he does not seem to recognize this.

²⁵ Among Anglicans the concept is found most particularly in followers of the Oxford Movement, for example in Bright, Keble, Phillpot, Pusey, and Staley.

²⁶ The Lambeth Quadrilateral is defined as follows in the Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church:

A slightly revised edition of the four Articles agreed upon at the General Convention of the (Anglican) Protestant Episcopal Church held at Chicago in 1886. In this revised form the Articles were approved by the Lambeth Conference of 1888 as stating from the Anglican standpoint the essentials for a reunited Christian Church. The text of the Articles is as follows:

"A. The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as containing all things necessary to salvation", and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith.

"B. The Apostles' Creed, as the Baptismal Symbol; and the Nicene Creed, as the sufficient statement of the Christian Faith.

"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.

"D. The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the Unity of His Church."

A slightly revised edition of the four Articles agreed upon at the General Convention of the (Anglican) Protestant Episcopal Church held at Chicago in 1886. In this revised form the Articles were approved by the Lambeth Conference of 1888 as stating from the Anglican standpoint the essentials for a reunited Christian Church. The text of the Articles is as follows:

"A. The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, as containing all things necessary to salvation", and as being the rule and ultimate standard of faith.

"B. The Apostles' Creed, as the Baptismal Symbol; and the Nicene Creed, as the sufficient statement of the Christian Faith.

"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.

"D. The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the Unity of His Church."

The present writer's study document with the same title (unpublished) contains an exposition of the four points.

²⁷For example, the reference to Christ as the "high priest" in Hebrews 8:11,

For it was fitting that we should have such a high priest, holy, blameless, unstained, separated from sinners, exalted above the heavens. He has no need, like those high priests, to offer sacrifices daily, first for his own sins and then for those of the people; he did this once for all when he offered up himself.

And to the priesthood of the Church in 1 Peter 2:4, 9

Come to him, to that living stone, rejected by men but in God's sight chosen and precious; and like living stones be yourselves built into a spiritual house, to be a holy priesthood, to offer spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God through Jesus Christ... But you are a chosen race, a royal priesthood, a holy nation, God's own people, that you may declare the wonderful deeds of him who called you out of darkness into his marvelous light.

²⁸The Passover lambs were slaughtered and offered at the Temple at Jerusalem, and cooked and eaten in households where the Passover meal took place in the context of the liturgical remembrance of the deliverance of the Children of Israel from slavery in Egypt and the Exodus. The senior male person present, a "lay" person, usually the head of the household, presided, as Jesus did over the band of disciples, and although the sacrificial system ceased because of the destruction of the Temple, this continues to be the case to the present day.

²⁹1 Cor 12:7, cf 1 Cor 12:11 "All these (gifts) are inspired by the one and the same Spirit, who apportions to each one individually as he wills." The concept here is charismatic in character.

³⁰Although the "elders" (*presbuteroi*), from which we get the English words "presbyter" and (shortened) "priest" were appointed "with prayer and fasting" (Acts 14:23) there is no suggestion anywhere in the New Testament that the leadership of the church was endowed with a unique power to turn the whole substance of the bread and wine into the whole substance of the Body and Blood of Christ. It is the concept that this is necessary that has created the inter-church difficulties about the recognition of orders. However, it seems entirely legitimate, when persons (male and female) are being ordained by the bishop with prayer and the laying on of hands to pray that they may be given "grace and power" to fulfil (the totality of) the ministry to which they are called, as may be seen in the Ordinal Two in the 2004 Prayer Book of the Church of Ireland. And while the designation of the consecrated elements as the sacramental "Body" and "Blood" of Christ is in the first instance a matter of their significance for the worshippers (to use the words

of several liturgies of the eucharist what they "are to us"), as argued throughout this present work, there are ontological implications in a statement of significance. The present writer would not favour the authorization of "lay" celebration, but this is not on the grounds that such is impossible but rather that a person being appointed or permitted to exercise the ministry of the Word and Sacraments, which is also a pastoral responsibility is appropriately "called" to this ministry, approved by due process, trained, and commissioned through ordination, consisting of the laying on of hands with prayer.

³¹1 Clement xliii, xlv as cited in H. Bettenson, Documents of the Christian Church OUP (1943 and many reprints), p.89,

...And so, as they [the apostles] as they preached in the country and in the towns, they appointed their first-fruits (having proved them by the Spirit) to be bishops and deacons (overseers and ministers) of them that should believe. And this was no novelty, for of old it had been written concerning bishops and deacons; for the Scripture says in one place, "I will set up their bishops in righteousness and their deacons in faith" (Is lx.17).

Our Apostles knew also, through our Lord Jesus Christ, that there would be strife over the bishop's office. For this reason therefore, having received complete fore-knowledge, they appointed the aforesaid, and after a time made provision that on their death other approved men should succeed to their ministry...

³²Ignatius of Antioch, in his Epistle to the Smyrnaeans, c.viii, Bettenson, op. cit pp89,90, wrote,

Avoid divisions as the beginning of evils. All of you follow the bishop as Jesus Christ followed the Father, and follow the presbytery as the Apostles; and respect the deacons as the commandment of God. Let no man perform anything pertaining to the church without the bishop. Let that be considered a valid eucharist over which the bishop presides, or one to whom he commits it. Wherever the bishop appears, there let the people be, just as, wheresoever Christ Jesus is, there is the Catholic Church. It is not permitted either to baptize or hold a love-feast apart from the bishops. But whatsoever he may approve, that is well-pleasing to god, that everything which you do may be sound and valid.

³³Early tradition ascribes a succession from the martyred Saint Peter and Paul, to Linus, Anencletus and Clement. But, with regard to the latter, the great nineteenth century scholar-bishop, Lightfoot remarks of the letter that came to be ascribed to him,

Not only have we no traces of a bishop of bishops, but even the very existence of a bishop of Rome itself could nowhere be gathered from the letter. Authority indeed is claimed for the utterances of the letter in no faltering tone, but it is the authority of the brotherhood declaring the mind of Christ by the bishop, not the authority of one man, whether bishop or pope.

³⁴W. Telfer, "Episcopal Succession in Egypt", *Journal of Ecclesiastical History*, III (1952) maintains that presbyteral consecration of bishops obtained in Egypt, and indeed that no less a person than the Pope of Alexandria, Alexander, whose qualification, according to Telfer "including no imposition of living episcopal hands", took a leading part in the Council of Nicaea (325 A.D.). Telfer takes the view that the great Bishop Athanasius was the first man to be made pope of Alexandria with the imposition of episcopal hands (art. cit. p.11), and that as late as the year 328. Succession in the early

period was valued especially for the transmission of the authentic teaching ("tradition") of the Church, and later concerns that 'without a laying on of hands by one who has himself had episcopal orders, a valid ministry could not exist, does not seem to have featured in the latter sense.

³⁵See the Common Statement (available online) for the terms of the Porvoo agreement. Prior to this the Church of England was in full communion with the Church of Sweden, but not with the other Scandinavian churches, and there seems to have been something of a *reductio ad absurdum* in an attitude which implied that the Church in Sweden had a fully valid ministry and whose members therefore received Holy Communion but also implied doubt as to all the Lutheran Christians in the in every respect similar neighbour church in Norway. It is considerations of this kind which put a question mark against a tradition which indicates that a valid ministry (and a valid eucharist depending on it) can only exist where an unbroken manual succession of the laying on of hands with prayer, has been maintained (and using the right kind of terminology with the right kind of intention). The succession, where it exists, may be valuable as an effectual sign of the church's -unity synchronically and diachronically, but that does not necessarily imply that the church cannot exist without it or where the sue-cession itself is doubtful or impossible to prove. The church essentially comes into existence through a dialectic of grace and faith, which, because there is a living God, does not depend absolutely on particular historical forms of ministry.

³⁶Journal of the General Synod of the Church of Ireland, 2014, Statute Chapter 1 ppcxxx-cxxxii under the heading "To provide for interchangeability of ministry between the Church of Ireland and the Methodist Church in Ireland", it was (*inter alia*) stated that...the Church of Ireland shall (a) consider any presbyter of the Methodist Church who is in full Connexion with the Conference of the Methodist Church in Ireland, as being equivalent to those ordained priest within the Church solely for the purposes of being considered for or appointed to any role which necessitates being in priest's orders within the Church and (b) consider any President or former President of the Methodist Church in Ireland, who is in full Connexion with the Conference of the Methodist Church in Ireland, as being equivalent to those ordained bishop within the Church solely for the purposes of being considered for election and translation into a vacant see with the Church, or any other role which necessitates being in priest's orders within the Church"

³⁷One notes in the legislation given above the relatively limited purposes for which the full recognition of Methodist ministry are envisaged.

³⁸Broadly speaking there are three positions within Anglicanism with regard to the historic threefold ministry in the apostolic succession:

- (1) That it is of the **bene esse** of the Church – in other words desirable and acceptable but not necessarily more than a domestic rule for the Anglican churches;
- (2) That it is of the **plene esse** of the Church – in other words in some sense part of the fullness of ministry within the Church and potentially, at least, something which the whole Church should have; but not necessarily making an unfavourable judgement on the reality and the efficacy of non-episcopal ministries;

- (3) That it is of the **esse** of the Church, in other words absolutely essential to ensure a valid ministry and even the continuation of a divinely ordered Catholic Christianity.

The present writer's view is that the first option is both too limited and too utilitarian, that the second is to be ecumenically commended as a ministerial norm and an effectual sign of the church's unity and continuity though by no means absolutely essential to it, and is sufficiently important, as in the Lambeth Quadrilateral, to be regarded as a basis for full mutual recognition in the sense of the actual reunion of churches. The third option, although still held by some Anglican clergy of a "catholic" disposition, is rarely maintained in its full rigour as in the Roman Catholic communion. It may be noted that there is nothing whatsoever to inhibit Anglican clergy and lay members from receiving the sacrament of the Lord's Supper of non-episcopal ministers if they are welcome to do so and it accords with their own liturgical and theological position.

³⁹Essentially, what is necessary, for example when the Holy Communion is being celebrated, is the intention "to do what the Christian church does" in obedience to the dominical command to "do this in remembrance of me" and the actual following of this command in the taking, blessing, breaking and giving of the bread and wine as the sacrament of Christ's body and blood.

⁴⁰Op. cit p.31f

⁴¹Op. cit p.37f

⁴²Op. cit p.44f

⁴³BCP 2004, p.188

⁴⁴BCP 2004, pp457-464.

⁴⁵BCP 2004, pp440-456

⁴⁶BCP 2004, p.207.

⁴⁷BCP 2004, pp183, 205.

⁴⁸ The Irish Constitution of 1937 correctly describes the Roman Catholic Church in this way in Article 44, apparently after a suggestion was made that each church should be called by whatever it called itself, hence, "Holy Catholic Apostolic and Roman Church" in section three. The term was used in the Dogmatic Constitution of the First Vatican Council, as, in Latin, "Sancta Catholica Apostolica Romana Ecclesia".

⁴⁹Dogmatic Constitution of the First Vatican Council, *Pastor aeternus*, Chapter III, "On the Power and Nature of the Primacy of the Roman Pontiff" and Chapter IV "Concerning the Infallible Teaching of the Roman Pontiff". For the text see *The Church Teaches*, Documents of the Church in English Translation, St Louis (U.S.A.) and London, B. Herder Book co., 1957. There is also a much earlier translation by Cardinal Manning.

⁵⁰1 Cor 3:1-9, 21-23.

⁵¹ See the Preamble and Declaration prefixed to the Constitution of the Church of Ireland, 1870, BCP 2004, pp776-777.

⁵²See Paul F. Bradshaw, *The Anglican Ordinal – Its History and Development from the Reformation to the Present Day*, Alcuin Club Collections 53, SPCK, 1971, Chapters 5, 8, and 9 for 'Roman Catholics and the Ordinal' and 11 and 12 for 'The Ordinal and Reunion: Ordination Rites.' This is necessarily dated in relation to post-1971 developments but contains a very full account of the controversy with the Roman Catholic Church. For an exposition of *Apostolicae Curae* from within the Roman

Catholic Church, see Francis Clark, *Anglican Orders and Defect of Intention*, Longmans, 1956. For a modern assessment, see *Essays on the Centenary of Apostolicae Curae 1896-1996*, with an English translation of the Document and the Anglican Response, edited with an introduction by R. William Franklin, Foreword by Hugh Montefiore, Mowbray, 1996. For the original documents in Latin, see *Anglican Orders (Latin) – The Bull of His Holiness Leo XIII, 1896, and the Answer of the Archbishops of England, 1897*, Published for The Church Historical Society, SPCK, 1932. See also, *Anglican Orders – the Documents in the Debate*, edited by Christopher Hill and Edward Yarnold, with Foreword by the Co-Chairmen of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission, Canterbury Press, 1997. For a very different approach to that traditional in the Roman Catholic Church see George H. Tavard, *A Review of Anglican Orders – The Problem and the Solution*, Theology and Life Series 31, The Liturgical Press, Minnesota, 1990.

⁵³The matter is examined in several chapters of his (unpublished) B.D. dissertation, “The Anamnesis in the Anglican Liturgical Tradition”, TCD, 1979.

⁵⁴As in the words leading up to the Sanctus in Holy Communion One, “Therefore with Angels and Archangels, and with the whole company of heaven we laud and magnify thy glorious Name, evermore praising thee and saying” and similar wording in Holy Communion Two, eucharistic prayers one and two. See also the entire Calendar of the Church of Ireland, especially the propers of All Saints’ Day, BCP 2004, pp20-21, 303-327. The Collect of All Saints’ Day reads,

Almighty God,
you have knit together your elect
in one communion and fellowship
in the mystical body of your Son Christ our Lord:
Grant us grace so to follow your blessed saints
in all virtuous and godly living
that we may come to those inexpressible joys
that you have prepared for those who love you;
through Jesus Christ our Lord. **Amen.**

⁵⁵*The Catholicity of Protestantism*, by R.N. Flew and Rupert Davies, a study from a Free Church perspective of the concept of Catholicity, at the invitation of the then Archbishop of Canterbury (Fisher) along with two other studies, from the Catholic and Evangelical schools of thought in the Church of England, Lutterworth, 1950.

⁵⁶Op. cit pp48f

⁵⁷Ibid.

⁵⁸Ibid

⁵⁹Legally speaking, Church of Ireland clergy already had the right to solemnize the marriage of divorced people in the United Kingdom, but the General Synod, prior to the passage of the relevant legislation had never approved of this or made any regulations as to how this was to be accomplished.

⁶⁰The relevant statute passed by the General Synod of 1996 gave guidance as to procedure, including referral to the bishop for his opinion in each particular case but without prejudice to the already existing legal right in the United Kingdom.

⁶¹ Op. cit., p60f

⁶² Par 96 says,

According to the teaching of the Second Vatican Council, the doctrine that 'common worship' should signify the unity of the Church generally rules out sacramental sharing, but the gaining of grace may sometimes commend it. The then Secretariat for the Promotion of Christian Unity established norms for such sharing in several documents, including the *Ecumenical Directory* (1967), the *Instruction on admitting other Christians to Eucharistic Communion in the Catholic Church* (1972), and a Note *interpreting the Instruction on admitting other Christians to Eucharistic Communion under certain circumstances* (1973). The current *Directory for the Application of Principles and Norms on Ecumenism* refers to the second and third of these documents in the establishing of norms. Canon 844 of the *Code of Canon Law*, canon 671 of the *Code of the Eastern Churches*, and articles 104, 122-125, 129-132 and 159-160 of the *Directory* form the foundation of the norms which we establish in this document. We also refer our Catholic community to the *Catechism of the Catholic Church* (nos. 1398-1401) and to Pope John Paul's encyclical letter *Ut unum sint*.

⁶³Op. cit. p66f

⁶⁴ For example, Bishop Lancelot Andrewes, Bishop Jeremy Taylor, Archbishop John Bramhall, to take three seventeenth examples.

⁶⁵BCP 2004, p.537. Modern forms in Ordination Services Two, are as follows (although what is cited below is only a portion of each of the two ordination prayers),

First Form

Here the bishops and priests lay their hands on the head of each candidate as the bishop says

Pour out your Holy Spirit upon your servant...
for the office and work of a priest in your Church,

The bishop then continues

Give to *these your servants* grace and power
to fulfil the ministry to which they are called,
to proclaim the gospel of your salvation;
to minister the sacraments of the new covenant;
to watch over and care for your people;
to pronounce absolution and to bless them in your name.

Second Form

[Laying on of hands with the same words as above]

Fill them with grace and power that *they* may fulfil your call
to be *messengers* and *stewards* of the Lord,
to watch over and care for those committed to *their* charge,
and to join with them in a common witness to the world.

Pour out your Spirit, Lord.

Set *them* among your people to proclaim boldly the word of salvation,
and to share in Christ's work of reconciliation.

Together with them may they offer spiritual sacrifices

acceptable in your sight,
and celebrate the sacraments of the new covenant.

Pour out your Spirit, Lord.

As this is the only place where the offering of “spiritual sacrifices” is mentioned in the Prayer Book, it clearly has theological significance.

It seems appropriate to mention here an exchange of letters, from Johannes Cardinal Willebrands, President of the Secretariat of Christian Unity with the Co-Chairmen of ARCIC II referring to the work of ARCIC and the issue of Anglican orders. It was accepted that the mutual recognition and reconciliation of ministries could be properly studied only as a part, a vital part, of the whole process of reconciliation between the two communions. Again, the Secretariat knew and shared the view of the Commission that such a study could not be a purely historical one, whether of the events of the sixteenth century or of the circumstances in which Leo XIII’s Bull *Apostolicae Curae* had been prepared and promulgated. Leo’s decision, he said, rested on a doctrinal basis, a judgment that the doctrine concerning eucharist and priesthood expressed in and indeed controlling the composition of the Anglican Ordinal of 1552 was such as to lead to defects both in the sacramental form and in the intention which the rite itself expressed. Because of this he maintained that the rite in the Ordinal could not be considered an adequate means for the conferring of the Sacrament of Order. Thus his decision that the orders thus conferred were invalid rested above all on what he described as the “nativa indoles ac spiritus” (“native character and spirit”) of the Ordinal as a whole. Pope Leo saw this “nativa indoles” as indicated by the deliberate omission from the 1552 Ordinal of all references to some of the principal axes of Catholic teaching concerning the relationship of the Eucharist to the sacrifice of Christ and to the consequences of this for a true understanding of the Christian priesthood. He judged such omissions to reflect a denial of these essentials of Catholic teaching. Cardinal Willibrands referred to the promulgation of new rites of ordination in the *Pontificale Romanum* of Pope Paul VI. In the Anglican Communion many member-Churches had introduced new Ordinals, while at the same time retaining some use of that of 1552-1662. In all this he saw reflected something of the theological developments in both Communion since the time of *Apostolicae Curae*. He also drew attention to the ARCIC I’s declaration that “It believes that our agreement on the essentials of eucharistic faith with regard to the sacramental presence of Christ and of the sacrificial dimension of the eucharist, and on the nature and purpose of priesthood, ordination, and apostolic success, is the new context in which the question should now be discussed.” If at the end of the process of evaluation the Anglican Communion as such was able to state formally that it professed the same faith concerning essential matters where doctrine admits no difference and which the Roman Catholic Church also affirms are to be believed and held concerning the Eucharist and the Ordained Ministry, the Roman Catholic Church would acknowledge the possibility that in the context of such a profession of faith the texts of the Ordinal might no longer retain that “native indoles” which was at the basis of Pope Leo’s judgement. That is to say that of both Communions were so clearly at one in their faith concerning the Eucharist and the Ministry, the context of the discussion would indeed be changed. In that case such a profession of faith could open the way to a new consideration of the Ordinal and of subsequent rites of ordination introduced in Anglican Churches), a consideration that could lead to a new evaluation by the Catholic Church of the sufficiency of these Anglican rites as far as concerns future ordinations. Such a study would be concerned with the rites in themselves, preceding at

this stage from the question of the continuity in the apostolic succession of the ordaining bishop.

This letter evoked a courteous and positive response from the co-chairmen of ARCIC 11 saying that the issues concerned were being looked into, and they also said, “Our goal is full ecclesial communion. Full visible communion between our two churches cannot be achieved without mutual recognition of sacraments and ministry, together with the common acceptance of a universal primacy, at one with the episcopal college in the service of *koinonia*.”

Although appreciating the goodwill clearly evident, there are unresolved issues here, namely that, for most Anglicans, and assuredly almost all members of the Church of Ireland, the Anglican Ordinal in its traditional form is regarded as absolutely adequate for the purpose of the transmission of holy orders, since its character is entirely Scriptural and covers the entirety of priestly ministry – “the Office and Work of a Priest in the Church of God” and the faithful dispensing of “The Word of God and of his holy Sacraments”, the ordinations being performed by bishops whose succession has been carefully maintained (the question of the absolute necessity of this having been covered above). Given the manner in which the complete office of a priest is expressed in modern rites of Anglican ordination such as those in Ordination Services Two in the Church of Ireland, especially when taken in full and not in the abbreviated versions given above, it would be hard to find any rational basis for withholding from them a recognition which is unconditional and complete, and in the opinion of the present writer, nothing less than this could even begin to be considered adequate. And with regard to the final aim and object expressed by the Co-Chairmen of ARCIC-2 the “Universal Primacy” they spoke of would not command the support of Anglicans world-wide, and very definitely not of the General Synod of the Church of Ireland if it were to involve universal papal jurisdiction or infallibility. From his own direct experience of having been a member of the General Synod for twenty-eight years, the present writer doubts whether a single vote, clerical or lay could be found in favour of such a concept or in the House of Bishops.

⁶⁶An unsatisfactory aspect of the response of the Co-Chairmen of ARCIC-2 (above) was their reference to the ordination of women in some parts of the Anglican Communion in terms of “a fresh and grave obstacle” to reconciliation of ministries, an obstacle which is held to be found up with the doctrine of ministry. Admittedly, this was written prior to the Anglican Churches of England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales having passed legislation to permit the ordination of women as priests (and, later, in several cases, though in the case of the Church of Ireland the admission of women to the episcopate was part of the same legislation as that for priests) It is, in the writer’s opinion entirely inadequate to regard women’s ministry solely in the light of an “obstacle”. Those churches which have taken the decision, now, at the time of writing, including all four of the churches in the British Isles, have done so in the clear conviction that this is a legitimate development which enhances rather than undermines the historic ministry of the Church, and one which many ecumenists (including the present writer) supported despite the nature of the challenge that this necessarily places to the Roman Catholic Church. One thing needs to be understood, that there can be no question in the Church of Ireland of having a two-tier ministry of those who approve and those who disapprove of this development as discrimination against women is specifically outlawed. Canon 22 explicitly says,

Men and women alike may be ordained to the holy order of deacons, of priests, and of bishops, without any distinction or discrimination on grounds of sex, and men and women so ordained shall alike be referred to and known as deacons, priests or bishops.

It is also hard to see any sense of reality in the proposal by Cardinal Willibrands that in the case of a review of Anglican ordinations by the Roman Catholic Church future ordinations (only) might be regarded as valid. Such a division of Anglican clergy into (supposedly) “valid” priests and those (for many years to come) “invalid” ones would be hugely divisive in theory and intolerable in practice. If, as, the present writer maintains, catholicity has to do (*inter alia*) with “wholeness” such an arrangement would be incompatible with wholeness within Anglican Christianity, creating far more difficulty than even the most divisive of other issues seems to have done. And the non-recognition of the validity of any ordinations carried out by fully authorized Anglican rites remains unacceptable as it has since the time of the Reformation, as set out unambiguously in Article 36 of the 39 Articles of Religion approved in the year 1571:

36. Of Consecration of Bishops and Ministers

The Book of Consecration of Archbishops and Bishops and Ordering of Priests and Deacons, lately set forth in the time of Edward the Sixth, and confirmed at the same time by authority of Parliament, doth contain all things necessary to such Consecration and Ordering: neither hath it any thing, that of itself is superstitious and ungodly. And therefore, whosoever are consecrate or ordered according to the Rites of that Book, since the second year of the aforementioned King Edward unto this time, or hereafter shall be consecrated or ordered according to the same rites, we decree all such to be rightly, orderly, and lawfully consecrated and ordered.

At the time of writing all ordinations in the Church of Ireland are currently taking place according to the forms in Ordination Services Two. But Ordination Services One remain in the Book of Common Prayer and by their existence bear witness to the historic faith and order of the Church from the time of the Reformation onwards; and there remain a number of clergy who were ordained according to these rites which are to continue to be regarded as having been entirely adequate for the purpose.

ASSESSMENTS, CHAPTER THREE PART SIX (4) THE DEFINITIVE ROMAN CATHOLIC RESPONSE.

In a document entitled *Response to the First Anglican/Roman Catholic International Commission, The Catholic Church's Response to the Final Report of ARCIC I* (1991)¹ it is important to appreciate that this is a response to the whole of the Final Report, covering not only the Eucharist, but the three inter-related areas of Eucharist, Ministry and Ordination and Authority and the Church. Although this may be described as “definitive” as in the title given above, it was recognized that the ecumenical process was ongoing and that significant work was being done by ARCIC II which in fact proceeded to make a further response entitled *Clarifications* which will be examined in the next section. A significant development was to be the ordination of women to the priesthood in England, Ireland, Scotland and Wales, a protracted process, led by the Church of Ireland which passed legislation in 1990 to admit women at priests and bishops unconditionally and without any provision for opting-out, although it was not until 2013 that the first woman bishop was appointed in Ireland.² This clearly had implications for ecumenical relations, notwithstanding that there had been approved women priests in the Anglican Communion since 1974.

As this current project is focussed upon the Eucharist, this will continue to be the primary issue in these assessments, while at the same time recognizing that other aspects of the Anglican-Roman Catholic dialogue are relevant to the totality of the relationship between the two communions.

In a **GENERAL EVALUATION**³ it is stated that the Catholic Church gave a warm welcome to the Final Report of ARCIC I and expressed its gratitude to the members of the International Commission responsible for drawing up the document, and regarded it as a significant milestone not only in relations between the Catholic Church and the Anglican Communion but in the ecumenical movement as a whole. But it went on to warn that it judges that it was not yet possible to state that substantial agreement had been reached on all the questions studied by the Commission. There remained between Anglicans and Catholic important differences regarding essential matters of Catholic Doctrine. It was explained that the Response was the fruit of a close collaboration between the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith and the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity which was responsible for the dialogue, and this was explained in a following “Explanatory Note”.

[COMMENT]

It is clearly legitimate for each of the churches involved in this particular partnership to express, separately, through appropriate authorities their assessment of the Final Report. But it would have to be said that the language used, though entirely courteous, presupposes a claim to finality in the judgements of the Roman Catholic Church which is not the position of Anglicanism. It is evident, not only in this document, but also in the previously examined “Observations” that the mind-set and judgement of the Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith (formerly the Holy Office) under the then Cardinal Ratzinger (later Pope Benedict XVI) would be likely to differ significantly in emphasis from that of the Pontifical Council for Christian Unity which was the body actively involved in ecumenism. The treatment by Roman Catholic authorities of some leading theologians⁴ and indeed many others whose views did not tally fully with the Doctrine of the Faith authorities does not appear to resemble the kind of freedom largely

taken for granted within the Anglican Communion, and in spite of controversies, some of which are serious and capable of dividing the Communion is, in general, exercised within a context of respect.

[EXPLANATORY NOTE]⁵

With regard to Eucharistic Doctrine it is not that the members of the Commission were unable to achieve the most notable progress toward a consensus. Together they affirm “that the eucharist is a sacrifice in a sacramental sense, provided that it is made clear that this is not a repetition of the historical sacrifice; and areas of agreement are also evident in respect of the real presence of Christ. “Before the eucharistic prayer to the question, “What is it?” the believer answers, “It is bread”. After the eucharistic prayer to the same question he answers: “It is truly the body of Christ, the bread of life”. It is stated “The Catholic Church rejoices that such common affirmations have become possible. Still, as will be indicated further on, it looks for certain clarifications which will assure that these affirmations are understood in a way that conforms to Catholic Doctrine.”

COMMENT

What seems to be lacking here and elsewhere is the very great significance attached, biblically speaking, to the “once for all” of the sacrifice of Christ on Calvary’s cross, and emphasized in Protestant theology. Although the concern in the Epistle to the Hebrews is with the relationship between the unique character of the sacrifice of the cross as compared with the repeated offerings of the sacrificial system within Judaism,⁶ nonetheless the *ephapax*, the “once for all”, has profound implications for the church’s understanding of the relationship between the one sacrifice and the many eucharistic offerings which characterize the practice of the church. Anglican liturgies have traditionally expressed this exclusivity in the most emphatic way, as for example in the Prayer of Consecration in Holy Communion One in the 2004 Prayer Book (the traditional service, deriving from the liturgies of 1552-1662),⁷

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, who of thy tender mercy didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the Cross for our redemption, who made there (*by the one oblation of himself once offered*) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world; and did institute, and in his holy Gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory of that his precious death, until his coming again.

Similar language is used in Holy Communion Two in eucharistic prayers one and two in the 2004 Prayer Book:⁸

Eucharistic Prayer One

This refers to the Father “giving your only begotten Son to become man and suffer death on the cross to redeem us: he made there the *one complete and all-sufficient sacrifice for the sins of the whole world*: he instituted and in his holy Gospel commanded us to continue, a perpetual memory of his precious death until he comes again.

Eucharistic Prayer Two in the *anamnesis* says,

Father, with this bread and this cup,
we do as our Saviour has commanded:
we celebrate the redemption he has won for us

*we proclaim his perfect sacrifice,
made once for all upon the cross,
his mighty resurrection and glorious ascension;
and we look for his coming
to fulfil all things according to your will.*

It is regrettable that similar wording is not normally to be found in liturgies of the Roman Catholic Church. and this may be regarded as a serious deficiency, which, had it been remedied at the time of the Reformation might have helped spare divided Christians several centuries of argument and controversy. The emphasis being so strongly on the present offering in each mass⁹ it is hard to believe that worshippers were or are characteristically conscious of the one all-sufficient sacrifice which was once offered and is efficacious for the salvation of all peoples everywhere who make the response of faith. The right things have been said on the matter in ARCIC, but it is not clear, at least to the present writer, that the “once for all” has much reality for worshippers outside the context of an ecumenical agreement. With regard to the much-quoted declaration of what the “believer” says before and after the consecration of the elements, it is certainly not the case that Anglicans in general would go on to agree that the bread and wine, in any but a purely exterior sense, no longer exist. On the contrary most Anglicans, even of the most “catholic” tendency would tend to take it for granted, that the sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ is constituted of **real** bread and wine, and this coheres with the teaching of the Prayer Book Catechism and the Liturgy.¹⁰ It seems evident that some people tend to read far too much into the rather striking words of ARCIC at this point.

It is stated that, with regard to the Eucharist, the faith of the Catholic Church would be even more clearly reflected in the Final Report if the following points were to be explicitly affirmed:¹¹

- that in the Eucharist, the Church, doing what Christ commanded His Apostles to do at the Last Supper, makes present the sacrifice of Calvary. This would complete, without contradicting it, the statement made in the Final Report, affirming that the Eucharist does not repeat the sacrifice of Christ, nor add to it.

Comment

It would seem desirable to indicate that any “making present” of the sacrifice of Calvary is by way of remembrance and to avoid any expressions which might seem to indicate that the Church has power or control over past events including those of the Last Supper.¹¹

The Response adds,¹²

- that the sacrifice of Christ is made present with all its effects, thus affirming the propitiatory nature of the eucharistic sacrifice, which can be applied also to the deceased. For Catholics “the whole Church” must include the dead. The prayer for the dead is to be found in all the Canons of the Mass, and the propitiatory character of the Mass as the sacrifice of Christ that may be offered for the living and the dead, including a particular dead person, is part of the Catholic faith.

Comment

It would seem desirable to indicate that any such offering takes the form of the remembrance before God of the sacrifice of Christ on Calvary in thanksgiving and

supplication, but also that the Church has no power or authority over Christ or his once for all offering, and it is in this context that any prayer for the departed must be situated. Problems with the concept of “propitiation”, in spite of its mention on Holy Communion One, have been discussed in an earlier part of this study. Prayer for the Departed, including that offered within the context of the eucharist, is to be found in most Anglican liturgies, though often in an optional manner.

The Response goes on to agree¹³ that it is stated that the affirmations that the Eucharist is “The Lord’s real gift of himself to his Church and that the bread and wine “become” the body and blood of Christ” can certainly be interpreted in conformity with Catholic faith. But they are insufficient, however, to remove all ambiguity regarding the mode of the real presence which is due to a substantial change in the elements. The Catholic Church holds that Christ in the Eucharist makes himself present sacramentally and substantially when under the species of bread and wine the earthly realities are changed into the reality of his Body and Blood, Soul and Divinity.

Comment

It would seem desirable to indicate that the language of “becoming” in no way necessarily indicates a displacement or replacement of the reality of the sacramental species, which forms no part of the Anglican tradition of faith and is indeed explicitly contradicted in the historic Anglican Church Formularies. However, there are ontological implications in a statement of significance, and by means of the change of meaning and function, role and purpose, the bread and wine of the eucharist *are* to that extent and in that manner different from what they previously were.

On the question of the reservation of the Eucharist, the statement that there are those who “find any kind of adoration of Christ in the reserved sacrament unacceptable” creates concern from the Roman Catholic point of view. This section of *Eucharistic Doctrine: Elucidations* seeks to allay any such doubts, but one remains with the conviction that this is an area in which real consensus between Anglicans and Roman Catholics is lacking.

Comment

It would seem important to indicate that Anglican Christianity is not monolithic and that Catholic, Evangelical, and Charismatic elements are to be found in its makeup. Even those, who like the present writer find great value in the reservation of the sacrament as an effectual sign of the Real Presence of Christ do not think it realistic to imagine that all their fellow Anglican believers would necessarily agree with this. There are fault-lines within Anglicanism, and there is no way that Anglican Christianity can be turned into a unitary body. This has not happened historically, and it will not, in the future. As Anglicans have, to a greater or lesser extent, learned to live together with difference, so any church entering into communion with the Anglican churches must themselves be ready to engage in this way with a very diverse family of church.¹⁴

As the statements on Ministry and Ordination have a bearing on the study of the eucharist they are included here for consideration. It is claimed that the Final Report would be helped if the following were made clearer:¹⁵

- that only a validly ordained priest can be the minister, who in the person of Christ, brings into being the sacrament of the Eucharist. He not only recites the narrative of the institution of the Last Supper, pronouncing the words of consecration and imploring the

Father to send the Holy Spirit to effect through them the transformation of the gifts, but in so doing offers sacramentally the redemptive sacrifice of Christ.

Comment

It is clearly within the competence of any church to declare who its ministers are, and in the opinion of the present writer, to determine in what manner the ministry is to be ordered within that denomination and how those appointed are to be set apart for the purpose. The question of whether or not the celebration of the eucharist is under any circumstances to be performed by those who have not been ordained for such a function is also, in the writer's view, a matter to be decided by the authorities acting in the name of the church and in accordance with what is perceived to be the Lord's will in this matter. It is, the present writer believes, possible to hold a very high doctrine of ministry which would normally restrict the celebration of the eucharist to one who has been ordained to the priesthood of the universal church but without regarding it as ontologically impossible for one not so ordained to perform such a role (as happens to a very limited extent, for example, in the Methodist Church, with which in Ireland, the Church of Ireland has a covenant relationship and arrangements in certain circumstances for the mutual recognition of ministers.)¹⁶ The Church of Ireland has never permitted lay celebration and is most unlikely ever to do so, but it does not appear that it has through any resolution of the General Synod refused to recognize the efficacy of lay celebration when (as in the Methodist Church) it occasionally occurs. This would make it very difficult, if not impossible to accede to the demand in the Response.

There is one curious feature of the declaration of what the priest does, namely that Eucharistic Prayer 1 (the traditional Roman rite)¹⁷ does not contain any "imploping the Father to send the Holy Spirit to effect through the [words of consecration] the transformation of the gifts," and in so doing to offer sacramentally the redemptive sacrifice of Christ. It would appear that something is being demanded here that has been absent from the Roman Catholic Church itself for more than a thousand years prior to the liturgical changes consequent upon the Second Vatican Council, and which, by this standard, was both liturgically and theologically deficient throughout this period.

The *Response* continues,¹⁸

- that it was Christ himself who instituted the sacrament of Orders as the rite which confers the priesthood of the New Covenant. This would complete the significant statement made in *Ministry and Ordination* 13 that in the Eucharist the ordained minister "is seen to stand in sacramental relation to what Christ himself did in offering his own sacrifice". This clarification would seem all the more important in view of the fact that the ARCIC document does not refer to the character of priestly ordination which implies a configuration to the priesthood of Christ. The character of priestly ordination is central to the Catholic understanding of the distinction between the ministerial priesthood and the common priesthood of the baptized. It is moreover important for the recognition of Holy Orders as a sacrament instituted by Christ, and not therefore a simple ecclesiastical institution.

[COMMENT]

The distinct order of priest as conferred by ordination has to be understood in the context of the treatment of the priesthood of all believers in the New Testament, in which the specific language of priesthood is used only in two senses, that of Christ and that of the

Church which is a royal priesthood, and there is no evidence whatsoever in the New Testament that this terminology was used exclusively of any group of persons within the Church. The language of priesthood can only be justified by regarding those who are designated as holding such an office as **representative** both of Christ and of the Church and not of Christ only as seems to be implied in the Response.¹⁹ In the present writer's view the use of the language of priesthood for the second order of ministry is a legitimate development, but should not be taken as implying a radical distinction between those who are designated (presbyters or) priests and those who belong to the universal priesthood. It may be added that the **oversight** exercised by the bishop is representative of that committed to the whole church and that the ministry of **service** exercised by the deacon is representative of the service to which all Christians are called and of which the deacon, ideally, is the model or pattern. As with the eucharist what the priest *is* is determined by the role and function he performs, as a minister in the full sense of the Word and Sacrament, the purpose this serves and the significance his ministry has both for himself and for those to whom he ministers as representing Christ and the priesthood of the whole Church. In this sense ordination does make a difference and to this extent only he or she *is* other than a non-ordained lay person. He or she does, however, in a very real sense continue to belong to the *laos* or people - a term from which the English word "laity" derives.

There is no evidence in the New Testament of any institution by Christ of Holy Orders as a sacrament. In the Church of Ireland's Revised Catechism ordination is included among the "sacramental ministries of grace" which have some but not all of the characteristics of a sacrament, in this case lacking any actual institution by Christ.

The Response affirms²⁰ that the Commission itself had, in *Ministry and Ordination: Elucidation 5*, referred to the developments within the Anglican Communion after the setting up of ARCIC 1, in connection with the ordination of women. The Final Report stated that the members of the Commission believed that the principles upon which its doctrinal agreement rested were not affected by such ordinations; for it was concerned with the origin and nature of the ordained ministry and not with the question of who or who could not be ordained. The view of the Catholic Church in this matter had been expressed in an exchange of correspondence with the Archbishop of Canterbury²¹, in which it was made clear that the question of the subject of ordination is linked with the nature of the sacrament of Holy Orders. Differences in this connection must therefore affect the agreement reached on *Ministry and Ordination*.

Comment

At the time this Response was issued (1991), the Church of Ireland had already passed legislation through its General Synod admitting women as priests (and bishops) on the same terms as men.²¹ No constitutional provision was made for any persons of parishes to opt out of this agreement. Since then, the Church of England, the Church in Wales and the Episcopal Church in Scotland have all admitted women to the ministry, and at the time of writing, the Church of England alone was believed to have over 5000 ordained women serving in its ministry, and, currently, more women than men had been accepted for training for the first time for fifteen years, and after long delays had admitted women as bishops. It is quite clear that this is to be regarded as an established feature of all four churches in the British Isles as well as in other parts of the Anglican Communion, such as the United States, Canada, Australia and New Zealand. The women priests (and bishops)

are here to stay. They are not going to go away. They will continue to exercise the ministry to which they have been called and to which they have been commissioned by the laying on of hands with prayer by the bishop (in the case of Episcopal ordination, by several bishops) assisted by those already in the priesthood. There can be no grounds for regarding this development as merely provisional. It must be regarded as a permanent part of the Anglican concept of the threefold orders of bishops, priests or presbyters and deacons in the Church of God. The refusal of the Roman Catholic Church to recognize women priests and bishops is, so far as ecumenism is concerned, similar in effect to that of its non-recognition of all Anglican clergy for the past four hundred years, and that is something to which Anglicans are accustomed.

The relevant canon in the Church of Ireland (22, **The Ordination of Women**) reads,²³

Men and women alike may be ordained to the holy order of deacons, of priests, or of bishops, without any distinction or discrimination on grounds of sex, and men and women so ordained shall alike be referred to and known as deacons, priests or bishops.

The section of the Response on the question of the Apostolic Succession is of less immediate relevance to the theology of the eucharist and will not be dealt with here.

NOTES ON CHAPTER THREE, PART SIX (4),

¹Page references given here are to the online version, printed out in A4.

²The Most Revd Pat Storey, Bishop of Meath and Kildare from 2013. Bishops of Meath traditionally rank immediately after the Archbishops of Armagh and Dublin and are titled Most Revd",

³Online version, pl

⁴See John L. Allen, Jr Cardinal Ratzinger - The Vatican's Enforcer of the Faith, Continuum, 2000,, Chapter Seven, "The Enforcer".

⁵Op. cit, p.1.

⁶Epistle to the Hebrews Chapters 7-10. For example, from Hebrews 7:26-28,

For it was fitting that we should have such a high priest, holy, blameless, unstained, separated from sinners, exalted above the heavens. He has no need, like those high priests, to offer sacrifices daily, first for his own sins and then for those of the people; he did this once for all when he offered up himself. Indeed, the law appoints men in their weakness as high priests, but the word of the oath, which came later than the law, appoints a Son who has been made perfect for ever.

⁷2004 Prayer Book p.188

⁸Op. cit pp210, 215.

⁹The most extreme instance being in Eucharistic Prayer IV where the stark offering of "his body and his blood" is hard to find a precedent for in liturgies both ancient and modern. It may, however, be noted, that there appears to have been a toning down, post-Vatican Two of the language of the traditional Roman canon in the prayer *Unde et memores*, which read,

Wherefore, O Lord, we thy servants as also thy holy people, calling to mind the blessed passion of the same Christ thy Son our Lord, and also his rising up from hell, and his glorious ascension into heaven, do offer unto thy most excellent majesty, of thine own gifts bestowed upon us a pure +victim, a holy +victim, a spotless +victim, the holy + Bread of eternal life and the Chalice +of everlasting salvation.

¹⁰The traditional Prayer Book Catechism (2004 Prayer Book pp766-770), which is still the only form of catechism fully approved by legislation of the General Synod of the Church of Ireland, says, plainly

What is the outward part or sign of the Lord's Supper?

Bread and Wine, which the Lord hath commanded to be received.

What is the inward part of thing signified?

The Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper.

The bread and wine of the eucharist are explicitly and unmistakably so described in Holy Communion One (2004 Prayer Book p.188) where it says in the Prayer of Consecration,

Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee; and grant that we receiving *these thy creatures of bread and wine*, according to thy Son our Saviour

km Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood. 110p. cit. p.4.

"The Eucharistic Prayer is, just that, a prayer offered in faith, but not claiming any authority over the events commemorated, save that of remembrance before God in thanksgiving for the saving acts described and in supplication for the benefits that flow from the once for all sacrifice of Christ on Calvary's cross.

¹³Op. cit. p.4

¹⁴Op. cit. pp4,5

¹⁵Such diversity may be deemed necessary in churches which attempt to embrace within themselves the totality of the Christian tradition. James D.G. Dunn in his noteworthy, *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament* (SCM, Second Edition, 1990) points to the diversity to be found in the theologies to be found in Holy Scripture itself. The New Testament church was anything but tidy. Bishop Leslie Newbigin, in a classic work, *The Household of God*, SCM, 1953, indicated that so far as the doctrine of the Church was concerned, "catholic", "evangelical", and "pentecostal" elements were to be discovered in the New Testament and that all were necessary to a full account of a biblical account of the theology of the Church. A Christian Church as comprehensive as the Anglican is bound to contain within itself many different emphases, not all of which are fully compatible so that the church must learn and relearn to live with diversity, however unwelcome this may be to more authoritarian ecumenical partners.

¹⁶Op. cit. p.5

¹⁷Journal of the General Synod, 2014, Statute Chapter One, *To provide for interchangeability between the Church of Ireland and the Methodist Church in Ireland*, pp cxxx-cxxxii

¹⁸Op cit p.5.

¹⁹Ibid.

²⁰Op. cit. p.5

²¹[Not available at the time of writing]

²²Journals of the General Synod for 1988, 1989, 1990, 1991. In summary a Select Committee was set up in 1988 "to consider the theological, practical, and other implications of the Ordination of Women Priests and Bishops to serve in the Church of Ireland, and the liturgical changes and legal procedures required fully to implement the resolution passed in 1976; the Committee to report to the General Synod in 1989. The words "and bishops" were added through an amendment put forward by the Very Revd John Paterson (an opponent of women's ministry) and the present writer (a supporter of women's ministry) on the grounds that priesthood and episcopate belonged together theologically and ought not to be separated. In 1989 a most comprehensive report, setting forth the theological implications for and against. Although the Church of England put forward a number of documents on the same topic over the years it is doubtful whether any or all of them matched the coherence and relevance of this Church of Ireland report which was in its main part, very succinct (pp222-248). The necessary liturgical amendments were listed separately. The first reading of the bill to admit women as priests and bishops was passed by the required two-thirds majorities, that in the House of Clergy by a small margin over the two-thirds. In 1990 the remaining stages of the bill were

passed, with very tight voting among the clergy up to and including the third reading (usually a formality). The bill therefore became law and a statute of the Church of Ireland. In 1991 the House of Bishops produced a resolution, not intended to undermine the legislation but to assist pastorally and practically opponents of the measure. It said, "It is hereby affirmed that they should suffer no discrimination or loss of respect in their membership or in their ministry by reason of their bona fide held views, nor should such views constitute any impediment to the exercise of Ministry in the Church of Ireland", and it was proposed and seconded that Synod received and affirmed this Statement. Although there was much sympathy with the sentiments it was felt that this could be misused as a basis for undermining the legislation, at least in part, and an amendment deleting the word "and affirms" from the Statement was passed by Synod and voted for by the present writer, leaving "notes" and "receives". The Very Revd John Paterson (a personal friend) immediately resigned his prestigious position as one of the four honorary secretaries of the General Synod. It is worth recording that in practice the admission of women as priests proceeded smoothly, and a number of opponents changed their minds over a period of time. Personal friendships were maintained throughout the process which had been a very lengthy one beginning with a resolution accepting the idea in principle passed by the General Synod in 1976 subject to the enactment of the necessary legislation (which failed in an attempt to implement it in 1980). Voting by the House of Bishops is strictly secret, but was in fact nine to three in favour and the three voting against, including the then Archbishop of Dublin, later ordained women as priests. The first woman so ordained in Christ Church Cathedral Dublin was the Revd Ginnie Kennerley, where the Very Revd John Paterson was Dean, who showed his customary graciousness in making the arrangements although he did not attend the ordination.

²³Church Constitution, Section Nine, Canon 22.

ASSESSMENTS, PART SIX (5) CLARIFICATIONS ON EUCHARIST AND MINISTRY

The full title of this, the final substantial contribution to the discussions arising from ARCIC-1 in the aspects of eucharist and ministry, has the full title of *Clarifications of certain aspects of the Agreed Statements on Eucharist and Ministry of the First Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission together with a letter from Cardinal Edward Idris Cassidy, President, Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity*,¹ published in 1994, and constituting an attempt to meet the reservations expressed in the official Roman Catholic Response examined in the previous sub-section. It began with **A Statement**² by the Co-Chairman of ARCIC II, Bishop Mark Santer and Bishop Cormac Murphy-O'Connor which recalled the first principles of the ARCIC dialogue. It pointed out that the Commission's method had been determined by the *Common Dialogue* between Archbishop Michael Ramsey of Canterbury and Pope Paul VI in 1966.³ This had spoken of "a serious dialogue which, founded upon the Gospels and on the ancient common traditions, may lead to that unity in truth, for which Christ prayed." The method was understood by ARCIC as an endeavour "to get behind the opposed and entrenched positions of past controversies" and the deliberate avoidance of the "vocabulary of past polemics, not with the intention of evading the real difficulties that provoked them, but because the emotive associations of such language have often obscured the truth" It was recalled that when Pope John Paul II had received the members of ARCIC in audience at Castel Gandolfo in 1980 he had observed that the method of ARCIC had been "to go behind the habit of thought and expression born and nourished in enmity and controversy to clothe it in a language at once traditional and expressive of the insights of an age which no longer glories in strife". The co-chairmen claimed that the Provinces of the Anglican Communion had given a clear "yes" to the agreements on eucharist and ministry. This was not entirely correct given that the official Church of Ireland "Response" had said that it considered that the terms and implications of part (b) of the ACC-5 Resolutions concerning the *Final Report* were so broad and related to only part of what 'agreement in faith' would have to entail, that it was not possible realistically to answer with a general "Yes" and requesting further consideration of certain issues, namely (1) the status of Contemporary Theology in relation to the official doctrines of the two communions, (ii) the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews in relation to the all-sufficient sacrifice of Christ and (iii) the relationship of Scripture to Tradition.⁴ Given the substantial nature of the Church of Ireland document it is unsatisfactory that no recognition was given to it in the Statement of the Co-Chairmen of ARCIC-2. Reference was made, however, to the specific issues raised in the Response of the Catholic Church which "would need greater clarification from the Catholic point of view." The document *Clarifications* had been submitted to the same (Roman Catholic) authorities from whom the request had come, and the text was now reproduced along with the assessment communicated in a letter from Cardinal Cassidy in which the "clarifications" were judged to have "indeed thrown new light on the questions" so that, as the Cardinal said, "the agreement reached on Eucharist and Ministry by ARCIC-1 is thus greatly strengthened and no further study would seem to be required at this stage. However, it was recognized that there remained a serious disagreement between the Roman Catholic Church and the Anglican Communion about the ordination of women to the priesthood.⁵ *Clarifications* however itself, although in essence a constructive and positive document, is not unsusceptible to a serious and critical examination, and is not necessarily the last word on the subject matter from an Anglican point of view.

Proceeding to the document itself, there is a helpful paragraph recalling that the Commission had been inspired by two official statements of the Roman Catholic Church⁶. The first came from the address by Pope John XXIII at the opening of the Second Vatican Council, when he said: “The substance of the ancient doctrine of the deposit of faith is one thing, and the way in which it is presented is another.” The second statement was para.17 of *Unitatis Redintegratio* which, in speaking of East and West, included the words, “sometimes one tradition has come nearer than the other to an apt appreciation of certain aspects of a revealed mystery, or has experienced them in a clearer manner. as a result, these various theological formulations are often to be considered as complementary rather than conflicting”. It was claimed on behalf of ARCIC II that in their study of Eucharist and Ministry they discovered beneath a diversity of expression and practice a profound underlying harmony. This harmony was not broken when an element of the truth is more strongly affirmed in one tradition than in another, in which nevertheless it is not denied. Such was especially the case with eucharistic adoration.

[SUMMARY]

Under the heading of **Eucharist**⁷ clarification had been asked concerning the essential link of the eucharistic memorial with the *once-for-all* sacrifice of Calvary which it makes sacramentally present. It is stated that in the mind of the Commission the making present, effective and accessible of the unique historic sacrifice of Christ did not entail a repetition of it. In the light of this the Commission affirmed that the eucharist is truly a sacrifice, but in a sacramental way, was part of the eucharistic faith of both our communions. As had been stated in the Elucidation on Eucharistic Doctrine 5: “The Commission believes that the traditional understanding of sacramental reality in which the once-for-all event of salvation becomes effective in the present through the action of the Holy Spirit, is well expressed by the word *anamnesis*. We accept this use of the word which seems to do full justice to the semitic background. Furthermore it enables us to affirm a strong conviction of sacramental realism and reject mere symbolism.”⁸

[COMMENT]

The position here certainly is representative of the Catholic tradition within Anglicanism, and is that held by the present writer. But it is not necessarily held in the same way and to the same extent by the Conservative Evangelical tradition, or if so, only by a minority within it. The learned and scholarly examination of *Evangelical Eucharistic Thought in the Church of England*⁹, by Christopher J. Cocksworth, CUP, 1993, produced a year before *Clarifications* would indicate a variety of ways of looking at the significance of the word *anamnesis*, as may be seen in Chapter 10, entitled, “Evangelicals and ecumenical statements on the Eucharist”. The truly massive collection of case studies of the teaching of Anglican divines from the sixteenth to the twenty-first centuries, published online under the title *Anglican Eucharistic Theology*¹⁰ shows a multi-faceted approach, of which many contributions could be and are summed up as “moderate realism”, but a number of leading figures would stand much further in the Reformed tradition, as indeed Thomas Cranmer, the original architect of the Book of Common Prayer certainly was. It is understandable that the ARCIC members wished to meet the reservations expressed on behalf of the Roman Catholic Church and did this in a manner which reflected their own understanding (and that of the Evangelicals who contributed to it as members of the Commission).¹¹ But in doing so they may have underestimated the diversity of eucharistic

theology within the Anglican Communion of which the Evangelical Constituency forms an important part.

While it does seem appropriate in Trinitarian churches to recognize the significance of a role for the Holy Spirit in the eucharistic memorial, it needs to be realized that this is a theological development, however justified, and is not to be found explicitly in the Institution Narratives of the New Testament.

Not only is a “strong sacramental realism” not characteristic of all Anglicans, but the rejection in *Clarifications* of what is termed “mere symbolism” would appear to be both unbiblical and not fully in accordance with the formularies of the more traditional Anglican Churches, including both the Church of England and the Church of Ireland, where the word “sign” is to be found in the Church Catechism¹², and “effectual sign” in the Articles of Religion¹³. The bible is full of symbolism, a symbol being a very emphatic form of signification, and a description of the bread and wine of the eucharist as “symbols” is very far from being “mere”. The symbolism of the “effectual signs” goes to the heart of the matter and is indeed the basis of any ontological implications.

[SUMMARY]

With regard to the verification of “the propitiatory nature of the eucharistic sacrifice, which can be applied also to the deceased” *Clarifications* pointed to the use of this term in the traditional Prayer Book service (Holy Communion One in the 2004 Prayer Book), in which 1 John 2:1,2 is one of the “Comfortable Words”. “If anyone sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is the propitiation for our sins”.¹⁴ However, this refers to the propitiation achieved by the once for all sacrifice of Christ and is not in Holy Communion One applied to the eucharist - which is described (in the Prayer of Consecration) as a “perpetual memory” of that his precious death, until his coming again.¹⁵ The Final Report is cited in support of the view that through the eucharist “the atoning work of Christ on the cross is proclaimed and made effective” and the Church continues to “entreat the benefits of his passion on behalf of the whole Church” The first post-communion prayer in Holy Communion One is cited for its reference to “this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving” and its petition “that by the merits and death of thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in his blood, we and all thy whole church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of his passion”.

[COMMENT]

A “catholic” view can be read into all this, and is by many Anglicans who historically, have used Cranmer’s rite without necessarily sharing his theology which envisaged the elimination of the traditional teaching on both the Real Presence and the Eucharistic Sacrifice.¹⁶ Anglicans are not, by definition “Cranmerians” and it may be argued that if the Real Presence and the Sacrifice are inherent in the eucharist, biblically speaking, the wording of the traditional Prayer Book rite may be interpreted in this way as for example in the writings of the Caroline Divines, such as John Bramhall and Jeremy Taylor in the seventeenth century¹⁷, and the Archbishops of Canterbury and York with regard to the eucharistic sacrifice in their reply to Pope Leo XIII’s *Apostolicae Curae*.¹⁸ Biblically, a “sacrifice of praise” can mean an offering *consisting of praise* or one whose *motive* is praise or *both*, and by implication a “sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving” can be read in either or both ways. But the language of Holy Communion One, in spite of the significant changes made in the revision of 1662, can still be read in a Cranmerian sense, and therefore remains ambiguous, and the doctrine that *Clarifications* wished to affirm is not

necessarily the sense that was originally intended in the traditional Prayer Book Rite.¹⁹

Such confusing considerations are largely absent from modern rites (Holy Communion Two in the Church of Ireland) which have tended to be fresh compositions based on generally accepted liturgical principles, although some traditional prayers such as the Collect for Purity and the Prayer of Humble Access are to be found in them usually as slightly modified. In the present writer's opinion the Church of Ireland rites, while open to a variety of legitimate interpretation have avoided the kind of ambiguity found in some other Anglican liturgies, not least those of its sister Church, the Church of England. The aim of the LAC was to produce orders of service that could be "owned" by the members of the Church of all schools of thought, and the success of this would appear to be indicated by the very large majorities (often attaining unanimity or near unanimity) in the legislative procedure followed for authorization, all the bills being passed by comfortable margins, even those such as baptism and holy communion where very different opinions were to be found and had been only too evident at a much earlier stage in Church of Ireland liturgical revision, specifically that which had led to the authorization of the *Alternative Prayer Book* of 1984.²⁰

[SUMMARY]

Returning to *Clarifications* there is the further difficulty, referred to in an earlier subsection that the term "propitiation" is not necessarily the best translation of words of the *hilasmos* class, and this whole issue will be considered further in Chapter Three, Part 7 (1).

Clarifications draws on the use of the phrase "the whole church" to indicate commemoration of the departed. Once again, this may be considered by those who are not fully committed to Cranmer's theology as a reasonable and natural understanding of the expression. However, Cranmer systematically and deliberately excised prayer for the departed (found in the 1549 Prayer Book) in his revision of 1552²¹, and it is probable that the expression "the whole church" meant for him "the whole church on earth" as in the "Prayer for the Church Militant"²¹ earlier in the rite. The matter therefore not as clear-cut as *Clarifications* supposes.

With regard to the request for certitude that **Christ is present sacramentally and substantially** when 'under the species of bread and wine these earthly realities are changed into the reality of his Body and Blood, soul and divinity' *Clarifications* after a careful examination of the language of the Council of Trent about "soul and divinity", made the bold claim that "even if the word "transubstantiation" only occurs in a footnote, the *Final Report* wished to express what the Council of Trent, as evident from its discussion, clearly intended by the use of the term."²²

[COMMENT]

In this present study the position has been consistently maintained that there are ontological implications in a statement of significance. This means that there is a legitimate sense in which there may be said to be a change in what the elements in the eucharist *are* by virtue of their taking on a fresh significance, purpose, role and function through consecration by which they become the Lord's *sacramental* Body and Blood. But to claim that the Anglican formularies legitimize a view identical with transubstantiation even if put in different words, is hard to reconcile with what, for example, Article 28 explicitly says. The aggressiveness of the wording of some of the

articles is something from which the Church of Ireland has explicitly distanced itself in a statement to be included in all future printings of the Prayer Book, but this does not necessarily invalidate the essentials of the critique contained in the Article,²³

Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord cannot be proved by holy Writ, but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions.

As argued throughout this study, the context of the Lord's words was that of the celebration of the Passover²⁴ (which is explicitly the case with the Synoptic Gospels although John, for his own theological reasons, places the Last Supper on the Day of Preparation), within which there has been a tradition of interpretation of the elements of the Passover meal, as in the Recital of the Haggadah, "This is the bread of affliction (*lachma anya*, Aramaic) that our fathers ate in the land Egypt"²⁵ This is hugely meaningful, and symbolically, but not literally, true for the worshippers; and it is entirely legitimate to understand the Lord's interpretation of the bread and wine as his Body and Blood in a similar way. The change is in the first instance, that of significance, and if the language of change is legitimately to be used (as the present writer argues it may be) it must be in a manner which avoids the strictures of Article 28, every person in Holy Orders in the Church of Ireland assenting, in general terms, to the Thirty Nine Articles of Religion at their ordination and on entering into office, for example as a curate assistant or rector of a parish.²⁶ Scripture itself indicates that the bread of the eucharist continues to be called "bread" in the eucharistic context in for example First Corinthians chapters ten and eleven,²⁷ although it is particularly, symbolically, designated as the Lord's Body (together with the cup of wine representing his Blood); and there is no basis in the New Testament for regarding it as ceasing to be in the fullest sense, bread. It is, in the literal sense bread before the consecration, and bread after the consecration, but with the huge difference that it is now the sacrament of Christ's Body as the wine is the sacrament of his Blood. There also must necessarily be a distinction between what is outwardly and visibly present and what is inwardly and truly represented, the terms "body" and "blood" indicating the life of Christ himself upon which those who come to the Lord's Table feed inwardly and spiritually.²⁸ The word "body", as in the Lord's "body" can mean the *physical* body which he had on earth²⁹ and which was nailed to the cross. It can mean the *sacramental* body which is received at Holy Communion³⁰, and it can mean the *ecclesial* body³¹, since the Church is also the Body of Christ.

[SUMMARY]

With regard to the **reservation of the sacrament**, mention is rightly made of reservation for communion of the sick, the dying and the absent, although the term 'extended communion' is used in the Church of Ireland and the word "reservation" does not appear, nor are any aspects of the cult of the Blessed Sacrament authorized in this church.³² There are varying approaches in different parts of the Anglican Communion and in accordance with particular forms of churchmanship and this needs to be recognized in an ecumenical context. However, as *Clarifications* points out the strong affirmation that "the Christ whom we adore in the Eucharist is Christ glorifying the Father" (Elucidations 8) clearly shows that in the opinion of the authors of that document there need be no denial of Christ's presence even for those who are reluctant to endorse the devotional practices associated with the adoration of Christ's sacramental presence. Attention is drawn to the

rubrics in Anglican Prayer Books enjoining the reverent treatment of the sacrament immediately after communion³¹ and in relation to the consumption of what remains of the consecrated bread and wine.³² And the prayer authorized, for example in the Maundy Thursday in the Church of Ireland Prayer Book in both traditional and modern forms, expresses a legitimate form of sacramental devotion, a slightly tidied-up version of which is,³³

O God,
who in this wonderful sacrament has left us a memorial of your cross and passion;
Grant us so to reverence these sacred mysteries of your body and blood
that we may perceive within ourselves
the fruits of your redemption;
who lives and reigns with the Father and the Holy Spirit,
one God, now and for ever. **Amen.**

MINISTRY AND ORDINATION³⁴

[SUMMARY]

With regard to the question of only a “validly ordained priest” celebrating the eucharist, it is pointed out that “crucial to the ARCIC agreement is the recognition that the ordained ministry is an essential element in the Church and that it is only the episcopally ordained priest who presides at the eucharist. This is, in general, the case, and has been carefully adhered to from the period of the Reformation up to recent times. However it is notable that there is no mention of the manner in which the united Church of South India was brought about by all four participating churches, Anglican, Presbyterian, Methodist and Congregationalist fully accepting one another and their ministries from the outset without reordination.³⁵ In a sense a similar situation exists with the Scandinavian Lutheran churches under the *Provoo*³⁶ agreement in which all the bishops, and consequently all the priests ordained by them were accepted from the outset regardless of which Lutheran bishops were in the manual succession or not, succession in office being regarded in this case as sufficient. As the *Porvoo Agreement* took place in 1992 one presumes that at least the Anglican members of ARCIC II were aware of it when they produced *Clarifications* in 1994, and it is surprising that no mention was made of it. The implication is that while the normal transmission of grace and power of orders is through bishops deemed to be in the historic succession which includes the manual, this is not now to be regarded as absolutely essential. And the mutual acceptance of ministries already referred to between the Church of Ireland and the Methodist Church in Ireland³⁷ is another example of ecumenical initiatives which have set aside such traditional systems. However, it may be said that the outcome in the longer term actually tends to extend such systems through mutual ordinations of those in episcopal orders.

With regard to the institution of the sacrament of orders, which confers the priesthood of the New Covenant, ARCIC II avoided saying that this was instituted directly by Christ³⁸ but affirmed that after the resurrection the Holy Spirit conferred upon the apostolic group what was necessary for the accomplishment of their commission. “They in turn were led by the Lord to choose collaborators and successors who, through the laying on of hands, were endowed with the same gift of God for ministry in the Church.”³⁹ ARCIC II then went on to draw the conclusion that the sacramental ministry was something positively intended by God and derived from the will and institution of Jesus Christ.⁴⁰ They do, however admit that a distinction needed to be drawn between what Jesus is recorded as

saying and doing, and his implicit intentions which might not have received explicit formulation till after the Resurrection, either in words of the risen Lord himself or through his Holy Spirit instructive the primitive community.

[COMMENT]

It is hard to avoid the word “tendentious” in relation to this concluding passage, as it ignores the essentially charismatic ordering of the church in the Pauline expositions in Romans 12, 1 Corinthians 12 and, whether fully Pauline or not, in Ephesians 4. It is clear that although there are leadership roles and functions, of which the more prominent are mentioned by name,⁴¹ this is within the context of the bestowal of the Holy Spirit upon the whole church, and not upon one exclusive group within the church. For “as in one body we have many members, and all the members do not have the same function, so we, though many, are one body in Christ, and individually members one of another. Having gifts that differ according to the grace given to us, let us use them...” Romans 12:4-6; Now “you are the body of Christ and individually members of it. And God has appointed in the church first apostles, second prophets, third teachers, then workers of miracles, then healers, helpers, administrators, speakers in various kinds of tongues.” 1 Cor 12:27-28. For “grace was given to each of us according to the measure of Christ’s gift” Eph. 4:7. It is not particularly easy to work out the relationship of this emphatic teaching to the appointment of elders (presbyters) mentioned in Acts and elsewhere. But what is clear is that the one function which is nowhere mentioned anywhere in the New Testament is that of **presiding at the eucharist**. It is, as *Clarifications* states, affirmed in St John’s Gospel that the “Holy Spirit...will teach you all things, and will remind you of everything I have told you.”⁴² But the only convincing model of interpretation for this expression, since not everything that happens in the church is in accordance with God’s will - as is manifest in the two thousand years’ history of the church to date - is that one must add the proviso, “in spite of” the church’s errors. The present writer would maintain that the evolution of a representative ministry, representative that is, of Christ and the Church is a sound one, well conceived and worthy of perpetuation, but it cannot, in the light of the Pauline passages above, which are central to a New Testament understanding of the Church and its ministry, be an exclusive group with an exclusive power of producing the sacrament, which is neither mentioned in the rather comprehensive listing of ministries, nor implied as necessary in any absolute sense, much as it may be valued not least by those who have the privilege of being ordained to the ministry of the Word and Sacrament in the celebration of the Holy Communion. The ministry of presbyter-bishops and deacons, standing in a succession of some sort as mentioned in the early Christian document 1 Clement (A.D.96)⁴³ and the later threefold ministry of bishops, priests or presbyters and deacons, is witnessed to in the seven letters of Bishop Ignatius of Antioch (c.112 A.D.),⁴⁴ certainly went through a process of development, and may be said to have proved its worth, in terms of stability and continuity; but perhaps such an evolution has tended to monopolize the ministry of the church and to hinder forms of mutual service within the Body of Christ which have come to the fore again comparatively recently, not least through Charismatic renewal, in the late twentieth and twenty-first centuries.

In his letter of March, 1994 to the co-chairmen of ARCIC II Cardinal Cassidy continued to express concern that the adoration of the Reserved Sacrament is normal for both Orthodox and Greek-Catholics.⁴⁵ He said that the document *Clarifications* does not seem to make clear that this can be said unreservedly and uniformly for Anglicans.⁴⁶ I think it has to be said that this is the way things are; but the eucharistic hymns in Anglican

prayer-books make clear how much the eucharist itself means to all Anglicans, including those who would not emphasize in a particularized way the doctrines of the Real Presence and the Eucharistic Sacrifice in the manner in which it would tend to be done by those who incline most to the “catholic” tradition of Anglicanism. It is, however, notable that hymn-books used by Anglicans of all traditions of worship include even hymns by St Thomas Aquinas as in,

Thee, we adore, O hidden Saviour, thee,
who in thy sacrament dost deign to be;
both flesh and spirit at thy presence fail,
yet here thy presence we devoutly hail.
(Church Hymnal 5, No 449, Church of Ireland)

As for those who are ordained priests in Anglican Churches, it would be difficult to find a more comprehensive concept of their service within the Body of Christ, than is to be found in the modern version of the Ordinal in the 2004 Book of Common Prayer (pp563-573). It needs to be added that all Anglican priests recognize their orders as valid, whether bestowed by means of the traditional (Ordinal One) Order of service or the modern (Ordinal Two) in the Church of Ireland, and that there would be no reason to accept even a suggestion of reordination or in some cases conditional ordination as a means to the achievement of the reunion of the church. The essentials of ecclesiastical existence, Bible, Sacraments, Ministry and Creeds are all there even if, in an imperfect world, they are necessarily all imperfect.

NOTES ON CHAPTER THREE PART SIX (5) “CLARIFICATIONS”.

¹Published for the Anglican Consultative Council and the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity, by Church House Publishing and the Catholic Truth Society.

²Op. cit pp1-3

³*Common Declaration of His Holiness Paul VI and His Grace Michael Ramsey, Archbishop of Canterbury*, Monastery of St Paul, Thursday 24th March, 1966.

⁴*The Response of the General Synod of the Church of Ireland too the Final Report of ARCIC-1*, May 1986. APCK and OUP, 1987, Synodical Resolution inside the front cover. See also the *Journal of the General Synod*, 1986.

⁵Statement, p.3 Documents relating to the issue of Women Priests may be found in *Women Priests: Obstacle to Unity? Documents and Correspondence, Rome and Canterbury, 1975-1986*, Catholic Truth Society, 1986. This very sad exchange comprised *Inter Insigniores - Declaration of the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith on the question of the admission of women to the ministerial priesthood, 1976; Intersigniores: Official Communion by the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith; Correspondence between Canterbury and Rome, 1975-6, An exchange of letters between Donald Coggan, Archbishop of Canterbury, and Pope Paul VI; Correspondence between Canterbury and Rome, 1984-6 sub-titled An exchange of letters between Robert Runcie, Archbishop of Canterbury, Pope John Paul II and Cardinal Jan Willebrands, President of the Vatican Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity*. Of particular interest is that Archbishop Runcie (correctly in the opinion of the present writer) speaks of the priesthood as representative both of the Church and Christ, while Cardinal Willebrands emphasizes that of the representation of Christ, apparently regarding the representation of the Church as secondary in character.

⁶*Clarifications, op. cit p.4.*

⁷*Ibid.*

⁸Op. cit p.5.

⁹The author became Bishop of Coventry from 2008.

¹⁰This massive work contains extracts from 132 representative Anglican theologians from the sixteenth to the twentieth centuries and assessments of the doctrinal position of each one.

¹¹Notably on ARCIC-2 The Rt Revd Michael Nazir-Ali, General Secretary, Church Missionary Society, UK and the Revd Dr Charles Sherlock, Senior Lecturer, Ridley College, Melbourne, Australia.

¹²Church Catechism

Question What meanest thou by this word Sacrament?

Answer I mean an outward and visible *sign* of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us, ordained by Christ himself, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof.

Question How many parts are there in a Sacrament?

Answer Two, the outward visible *sign*, and the inward spiritual grace.

Question What is the outward part, or *sign* of the Lord's Supper?

Answer Bread and Wine, which the Lord hath commanded to be received.

Question What is the inward part of thing *signified*?

Answer The Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper.

Articles of Religion

Article 25, Of the Sacraments.

Sacraments ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they be certain sure witnesses, and *effectual signs of grace* and God's good will towards us, by the which he doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our Faith in him.

¹⁴BCp (2004) p 186. The set of four 'Comfortable Words' as the name suggests is significant more as a kind of further reassurance following the absolution rather than a doctrinal statement with a specific connection to the eucharist.

¹⁵Op. cit. p.188.

¹⁶Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury, *A Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ*, 1987 edition published by Focus Christian Ministries Trust and Harrison Trust, Books Three and Four for his treatment of the Real Presence and the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

¹⁷P.E. More and F.L. Cross, Eds, *Anglicanism - The Thought and Practice of the Church of England illustrated from the Religious Literature of the Seventeenth Century*, SPCK, 1957, For the Eucharistic Presence, see for Bramhall p.485. For the Eucharistic Sacrifice see for Jeremy Taylor, p.495. Bramhall, after a lengthy argument says, 'This is the reason why we rest in the Words of Christ *This is my Body*, leaving the manner to Him that made the Sacrament. We know that it is Sacramental, and therefore efficacious, because God was never wanting to His own ordinances and did not set a bar against himself; but whether it be corporeally or spiritually (I mean not only after the manner of a Spirit, but in a spiritual sense); whether it be in the soul only, or in the Host also; and if in the Host whether by Consubstantiation or Transubstantiation; whether by Production or Adduction, or Conservation or Assumption, or by whatsoever other way bold and blind men dare conjecture; we determine not.'" and, citing Durandus he added '*Motum sentimus, Modum nescimus, Praesentiam credimus*. Taylor, in a long and famous passage says, *inter alia*, "As Christ is a Priest in heaven for ever and yet does not sacrifice Himself afresh not yet without a Sacrifice He be a Priest, but by a daily ministration and intercession represents His Sacrifice to God and offers Himself as sacrificed, so He does upon earth by the ministry of His servants. He is offered to God; that is, He is by prayers and the Sacrament represented or offered up to God as sacrificed, which in effect is a celebration of his Death, and the applying it to the present and future necessities of the Church as we are capable by a ministry like to His in Heaven."

¹⁸*Saepius Officio - The Reply of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to the Letter Apostolicae Curae of Pope Leo XIII, 1897*, The Church Literature Association, 1977.

¹⁹Classical Hebrew is deficient in adjectives and the adjectival effect is achieved by linking nouns together in the "construct" state, which necessarily leads to an ambivalence of meaning which depends on context for its elucidation.

²⁰The detailed information is to be found in the relevant Journals of the General Synod, although the actual voting is recorded only where the numbers are significant.

²¹In the 1549 liturgy the following words appear in the “Prayer for Christ’s Church”

We commend unto thy mercy (O Lord) all other thy servants, which are departed hence from us, with the sign of faith, and now do rest in the sleep of peace: Grant unto them, we beseech thee, thy mercy, and everlasting peace, and that, at the day of the general resurrection, we and all thy which be of the mystical body of thy Son, may altogether be set on his right hand, and hear that his most joyful voice, “Come unto me, O yet that be blessed of my Father, and possess the kingdom, which is prepared for you from the beginning of the world: Grant this, O Father, for Jesus Christ’s sake, our only mediator and advocate.

In the 1552 liturgy the prayer has become one “for the whole state of Christ’s Church militant here in earth” and all mention of the deceased has been removed. Only in 1662 was this in a very limited sense remedied by the addition of the words,

And we also bless thy holy Name for all thy servants departed this life in thy faith and fear: beseeching thee to give us grace so to follow their good examples, that with them we may be partakers of thy heavenly kingdom: Grant this, O Father, for Jesus Christ’s sake, our only Mediator and Advocate. **Amen.**

See also the relevant parts of the Burial Office in 1549 and 1552.

²²The comment of the Church of Ireland *Response* is apposite in its comment on the *Final Report*, “Any interpretation in terms of the traditional Roman Catholic definition as given in *Mysterium Fidei* would raise serious obstacles to compatibility with the Preamble, Declaration, and Articles of Religion”.

²³See the exposition of Article 28 in the standard Anglican work, E.J. Bicknell, *A Theological Introduction to the Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England*, Third Edition revised by H.J. Carpenter, Longmans, Green and Co where “transubstantiation” is discussed on pp396ff.

²⁴See the parallel passages in Matthew, Mark, and Luke, in H.F.D. Sparks, *A Synopsis of the Gospels*, Part 1 “The Synoptic Gospels with the Johannine Parallels”, 1964, 1970, and for John, Part Two, “The Gospel According to St John with the Synoptic Parallels”, Adam and Charles Black, 1974.

²⁵C. Roth, *The Haggadah*, The Soncino Press, 1975, p9. A footnote says, “Recital of the Haggadah. The passage above is amongst the very oldest in the Haggadah. It is written, not in Hebrew, but in Aramaic - the language actually spoken among the Jewish people in Palestine in the centuries immediately before and after the beginning of the Christian era.”

²⁶See the *Constitution of the Church of Ireland*, 4:14, “Declaration for Subscription, (2) “I solemnly declare that - I assent to the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, and to the Book of Common Prayer, and of the Ordering of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. I believe the doctrine of the Church of Ireland, as therein set forth, to be agreeable to the Word of God; and in public prayer and administration of the sacraments I will use the form in the said Book prescribed, and none other except so far as shall be allowed by the lawful authority of the Church”

²⁷1 Cor 10: 16-17; 1 Cor 11:23-26.

²⁸ Revised Catechism 53 “What is meant by receiving the Body and Blood of Christ?”
“Receiving the Body and Blood of Christ means receiving the life of Christ himself, who was crucified, died and rose again, and is now alive for evermore.”

²⁹Mark 15:45 “He granted the body to Joseph”..

³⁰Mark 14:22 “Take, this is my body”.

³¹Ephesians 4:12 “building up the body of Christ.”

³²Even ARCIC itself is aware of the pitfalls as noted in the Church of Ireland “Response” where it quotes ARCIC, as follows,

If veneration is wholly dissociated from the eucharistic celebration of the community it contradicts the true doctrine of the eucharist

Any dissociation of such devotion from this primary purpose, which is communion in Christ of all his members, is a distortion in eucharistic practice.

³³The versions given on pp368-9 in the 2004 Prayer Book are contain minor infelicities, rare among Collects old or new in this book.

³⁴*Clarifications*, p.8.

³⁵A Church especially associated with Bishop Leslie Newbigin who strongly defended its theological basis and its procedure for reunion based on mutual acceptance from the outset.

³⁶Details in Wikipedia.

³⁷Journal of the General Synod, 2014, Statute Chapter One p.cxxxv

³⁸*Clarifications*, p.9

³⁹Op. cit. p.9

⁴⁰Op. cit. p.10

⁴¹For example, in Ephesians 4:11f

And his gifts were that some should be apostles, some prophets, some evangelists, some pastors and teachers to equip the saints for the work of ministry, for building up the body of Christ, until we all attain to the unity of the faith and of the knowledge of the Son of God, to mature manhood, to the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ...

⁴²John 14:25-26, *Clarifications* p.9

⁴³Full text in Greek and English in Kirsopp Lake, *Apostolic Fathers I* in the Loeb Classical Library, p1ff.

⁴⁴Full text as above, pp165f.

⁴⁵*Clarifications* pp12,13.

⁴⁶*Ibid.* However, as cited in the Church of Ireland’s *Response to The Final Report*, E.J. Bicknell in the Introduction to his *Thirty-nine Articles* said,

Even the Roman Catholic Father Thurston admits that ‘In all the Christian literature of the first thousand years, no one has apparently yet found a single clear and definite statement that any person visited a church in order to pray before the Body of Christ which was kept upon the altar.’ So too, the Orthodox Churches of the East reserve the

Sacrament, usually upon the Altar, with a lamp burning before it. Not only does the intervention of the Screen and the Holy Doors shut it out from any possibility of adoration by the people, but even those who enter the Sanctuary make no sign of reverence as they pass before it. No one can deny the belief of the Eastern Churches in the Real Presence, but here, as so often, they preserve ancient tradition. Only in the West has the cult of the reserved sacrament been fully developed.

CHAPTER THREE, ASSESSMENTS, CHAPTER THREE
PART SEVEN (1)
CURRENT ANGLICAN THINKING ON THE EUCHARIST:
THE INTER-ANGLICAN LITURGICAL CONSULTATION, 1995

A seminal moment in the history of Anglican thought and practice in the late twentieth century was the holding of the Fifth International Anglican Liturgical Consultation in Dublin in 1995 which was attended by no less than seven members of the Liturgical Advisory Committee, including Bishop Edward ("Ned") Darling, Chairman; and the Revd Tom Gordon (later Dean of Leighlin), The Revd Martha Gray-Stack, the present writer; Canon Brian Mayne (former Dean of Waterford, and later Rector of the Lecale Group of Parishes which included Downpatrick Cathedral), who was later to be the Editor of the 2004 Prayer Book; The Revd Harold Miller (later Bishop of Down and Dromore and chairman of the LAC after Bishop Darling); The Very Revd John Paterson (Dean of Christ Church Cathedral, Dublin). The subject-matter of this large and successful conference was "The Eucharist in Anglicanism Today". The Report of the Consultation, edited by the David Holeton, is entitled, *Our Thanks and Praise - The Eucharist in Anglicanism Today - Papers from the Fifth International Anglican Liturgical Consultation*, Anglican Book Centre, Toronto, 1998.¹

The Report includes an **Introduction** by David Holeton; a "**Dublin Lecture: Issues Concerning the Anglican Eucharist in the Twenty-first century**" by the eminent American liturgist, Louis Weil; "**Preparatory Documents**" and "**Study Documents**" reflections on "**Implications across the Communion**" and the all-important, "**The Dublin Documents inclusive of Principles and Recommendations**": "**Working Group Papers**":

I. Eucharistic Theology,

II Ministry, Order and the Eucharist,

III The Structure of the Eucharist

IV Eucharist: Ritual, Language and Symbolism and

V. Liturgical and Eucharistic Renewal

These are followed by "**A Study Guide to the Dublin Principles and Recommendations**" It may be seen that there was an inter-relationship between all the aspects of the liturgy of the eucharist so comprehensively covered the conference; and ideally, the Report needs to be read as a whole and with attention to all the sections, covered above. However, since this present study is concerned primarily with the doctrine of the eucharist this will be the focus of the current section but with reference where necessary to other aspects of the Report which may have a bearing upon theology.

INTRODUCTION²

In his **Introduction**, the Revd David Holeton, Chair of the Consultation, traced the development of eucharistic thought and practice from the Lambeth Conference of 1948 to 1995, including the gradual move away from the 1662 Prayer Book as the standard of faith and order in the Anglican Communion so far as liturgy was concerned. Important stages were the Lambeth Conference of 1958 and the liturgical consultation held after the Toronto Anglican Congress of 1963 and the document, "The Structure and Contents of the Eucharistic Liturgy and the Daily Office" and the recommendations of the Limuru

Conference of the Anglican Consultative Council. The formation of the IALC (International Anglican Liturgical Consultation) was a significant step forward and it had been agreed during its fourth meeting (on Christian Initiation) in Toronto in 1991. that the next Conference should be on the Eucharist. In August 1993 a preparatory conference had been held at Untermarchtal which addressed some of the basic issues in eucharistic renewal in the life of the Anglican Communion. Much of the work for this meeting had been published as *Revising the Eucharist: Groundwork for the Anglican Communion*, (Alcuin/GROW Liturgical Study, Bramcote, 1994)³ a document that was intended to enable widespread discussion in the Communion in preparation for the Fifth International Liturgical Consultation scheduled to be held in Dublin in August 1995. Holeton stated that "The Principles and Recommendations of the Consultation" would help establish a context for Anglican eucharistic renewal in the coming years. The Papers of the five working groups reflected varying degrees of consensus, both within the groups themselves and within the Consultation as a whole. It was of considerable significance, however, that a subject like eucharistic sacrifice, which for so long had been at a stalemate in some parts of the Communion and a source of division within many provinces, had been addressed, and the resulting discussion had given signs of a common way forward - thanks in part to a return to biblical sources and the insights of a wide variety of other churches.

THE DUBLIN LECTURE⁴

In his Dublin Lecture, entitled "Issues Concerning the Anglican Eucharist in the Twenty-First Century" Louis Weil referred to changes occurring since a previous lecture, also given in Dublin, by Dr Massey Shepherd in May 1969 and entitled "The Dimension of Liturgical Change". He averred that the church was caught up in an enormous shift of perspective at every level of the Church's life. At the time of Dr Shepherd's lecture the American church had been caught up in Prayer Book revision. It was as though the revision of the texts (the continuing re-arrangement of Archbishop Cranmer's materials and, increasingly, the introduction of new, so-called contemporary language texts) was the entire scope of liturgical reform. He said that the Prayer Books authorized in the various provinces in recent decades represented the end of a model of liturgical evolution which had dominated the church's understanding of the liturgy since the Reformation - which was one of clerical authority over the liturgy. Professor Shepherd had called for a much more radical approach to liturgical revision reflecting the life situation in which the church now lived.

Under the general heading of **1. "The Scope of Eucharistic Celebration"**⁵ Dr Weil addressed three issues which were baptism as it related to the church's understanding of the assembly, the nature of the eucharistic prayer and some issues related to culture which he regarded as complementary.

In relation to **A. "The Nexus between Baptism and the Assembly"**⁶ he spoke of a recovery of a "baptismal ecclesiology," an understanding of the Church in terms of the identification of all its members with the paschal mystery of Jesus Christ, and through that with the common life of the body of Christ. The whole assembly in its whole action is the primary sign of the priesthood of Jesus Christ; the whole baptized assembly is the primary minister of Christ in its place. He said that what he was suggesting was that the social framework, the attention given to shared study (what might be called the catechetical aspect of the community's life), the proclamation of Scripture and preaching grounded in it - all of these aspects of the assembly's activity were ways in which the community manifested its baptismal identity; all of those were constitutive of the full meaning of the eucharistic

celebration.

[COMMENT]

Although the concept of a “baptismal ecclesiology” is valuable in drawing attention to the ecclesial dimension of baptism, it may need to be balanced and complemented by what may be called a “eucharistic ecclesiology” focusing attention on the ecclesial dimension of the eucharist. Both are needed in a mature theology of the church as the Body of Christ.

In relation to **B. "The Eucharistic Prayer within the Whole Rite"**⁷ Weil said that as against a tendency within the Roman Catholic tradition to have a eucharistic piety exclusively focused on the words of institution and the elevations, although certainly understanding the words to be our link with the dominical institution and so continuing to serve as the scriptural focus of the eucharistic action, generally, Anglicans representing the entire range of our tradition would want to claim the eucharistic prayer as an integral whole rather than a momentary focus within it. In recent decades there had been an extraordinary level of study on the structure and theology of the eucharistic prayer. This had served the church in deepening our insight into the eucharistic prayer as not merely a formula of consecration but as a living proclamation of the church's faith. But had we not stopped short in this recovery and failed to reclaim the whole of the prayer within the larger framework of the eucharistic action? Early eucharistic prayers, as researched by Dr Geoffrey Cuming were of extreme brevity compared to those in later rites of East and West, including Cranmer's. Modern rites have to a considerable extent been based on fourth century models. Weil observed what he believed to be the dominance of the role of the presider in modern rites which implied a primacy that dwarfed the liturgical roles of other ministers and reduced the assembly to little more than observer status. Cuming had suggested that the constituent parts of the prayer might occur at appropriate places in the whole rite so that their particular theological weight might be more effectively realized, and the presider's prayer might no longer be expected to carry the whole meaning. However, Weil's primary concern was to find appropriate ways to reclaim the eucharistic celebration as an integral whole.

[COMMENT]

While the emphasis on the eucharistic prayer as an integral whole is helpful as a corrective to any tendency to elevate some particular part of it, whether, for example the Words of Institution or the Epiclesis, to an independent status. However, this does not necessarily preclude the possibility of a focal part within the prayer which may be deemed to have a consecratory effect within the context of the prayer in its entirety. It has been assumed throughout this present work that it lies within the competence of the church to decide what the form of consecration is to be, and this may, as in Holy Communion One, be the Institution Narrative, or, normatively, in Holy Communion Two, the eucharistic or thanksgiving prayer which may nevertheless have a focus in the Words of Institution with appropriate ceremonial as in various forms of the Western tradition. But this does not necessarily mean that the institution narrative itself is an absolutely essential part of the prayer of thanksgiving-and-consecration, given that there appear to be ancient orders of service which do not have it.

It is hard to go the whole way with Louis Weil's declamation against the role of the Presiding Minister (bishop or priest). In some of the earliest documents known to us, namely the seven letters of Ignatius of Antioch (c.112 A.D.) it is clear that there is a particular presiding person (normally the bishop) surrounded by his priests (presbyters) and assisted by the deacons.⁸ As eucharistic practice developed particularly when larger congregations

became possible, a number of ancillary functions emerged, all strengthening the sense of a corporate remembering before God the Father in thanksgiving and supplication of the once for all sacrifice of Christ on Calvary's cross, the articulation of this a function of the eucharistic prayer, with its particular focus on the church's obedience to the dominical command to "do this" in remembrance of him.

Louis Weil's emphasis on the brevity of examples of the very early eucharistic prayer is significant in that a short prayer, such as eucharistic prayer 3 in the 2004 Prayer Book may bear a wealth of meaning. However, given that the earliest prayer tended to be *ex tempore* it is somewhat hazardous to generalize on the basis of the few written examples that have come down to us from a slightly later date. One wonders what his evaluation would have been of the statement in Justin Martyr's First Apologia that the president "give thanks *at length* that we are deemed worthy of these things at his hand. When he has completed the prayers and thanksgivings all the people present assent by saying, "Amen".⁹ The wording suggests that the length may have been quite considerable.

In relation to C. "**The Culture of Clericalism**"¹⁰ Weil drew attention to the widespread discussion of the inculturation of the liturgy. Our classical models were not only characterized by a certain fixity of their authorized texts, but also by a clerical control of the development of these rites and certainly of any proposed revision of them.

[COMMENT]

There may be a limited truth in what Weil says here. It is evident that the clergy, as the principal liturgical officers of the church, and especially the bishops, have had, and will continue to have a considerable input into the development of liturgical texts and the mode of liturgical celebrations. But so far as the revision of the liturgy is concerned most Anglican churches, including the Church of Ireland carry out their revision under the authority of Synods, or their equivalent, consisting of the bishops, elected members of the clergy and elected representatives of the laity. In the General Synod of the Church of Ireland there are two members of the clergy for every elected member of the laity and this has been the case since disestablishment under the Irish Church Act of 1869. The detailed work of revision is carried out by bodies appointed by the relevant Synod and consisting of both members of the clergy and laity, as with the Liturgical Advisory Committee of the Church of Ireland. At a local level much depends upon the liturgical understanding of the rectors of parishes and their willingness to make use of lay talent for various liturgical functions, such as lesson reading, leading prayers, bringing up the elements, serving and administering holy communion under the direction of the Presiding Minister. Inculturation is, however, an important area which receives its due focus in the Working Group reports and in ongoing discussions relating to such areas as the elements to be used in the eucharist in cultures where, for example, bread is not the staple food of the area nor is the fruit of the vine its characteristic alcoholic festive drink.

Under the heading II "**The Focus of Eucharistic Ministry**"¹¹ Weil said that we needed to see all our *particular* ministries, whether ordained or not, as diverse expressions of our shared baptismal identity - *diverse* because the gifts of the Holy Spirit are diverse and complementary. Ordination, he said, is the Church's response to the discernment that God has given a person particular gifts of communal and pastoral leadership. The proclamation of the eucharistic prayer is far more than the reciting of a formula to produce a sacrament. It articulates the community's shared, baptismal faith. The eucharistic prayer is the Church's prayer, not an expression *of power over* but of *service*

to the people of God.

[COMMENT]

Undoubtedly the leadership of the church as modeled on the Good Shepherd must be *pastoral*. But it is significant that in the *Our Thanks and Praise* documentation there seems a rather strange reluctance to acknowledge that an important aspect of the same leadership is that it is also *liturgical* in character.

It is reductionist to suggest that the eucharistic prayer has been no more than “the reciting of a formula to produce a sacrament.” If the consecration is deemed, in some liturgies such as the 1662 Holy Communion and its derivatives, to be accomplished through the recitation of the Words of Institution, this, where it exists, is a most solemn liturgical act performed with the utmost seriousness and with a full recognition of what it portends. It is no more appropriate to describe this as if it is just a bare “recitation” than it would be to make the same criticism of the act of baptism, which undoubtedly is accomplished by a formula which accompanies the pouring of water, “...I baptize you in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Amen”.¹² If this form of words is agreed by all to be sufficient for one of the two Sacraments of the Gospel to be accomplished it is hard to see by what principle this is to be disallowed in principle for the second of the two Sacraments of the Gospel. To follow the biblical principle of “consecration through thanksgiving” as is done in most modern liturgies (except, for example, the modern language form of the 1662 Order of Service, authorized for use in the Church of England) may be highly desirable and may help avoid many of the liturgical problems which have created difficulties for several centuries past, but the latter cannot be regarded as the only mode of consecration of the elements, and the other modes, such as that found in the traditional Prayer Book service is not to be denigrated.

PREPARATORY DOCUMENTS¹³

All of the preparatory documents are highly relevant to a study of the eucharist in the totality of its significance, shape, contents, and use. However, this current project has been intended from the beginning to focus upon the theology of the eucharist and so the document selected for particular examination is that which seems the most relevant.

Particularly helpful is the paper by Professor William Crockett on "**Eucharistic Theology and Anglican Eucharistic Revision**".¹⁴ Professor Crockett outlined his presuppositions as follows. First, there is the unity of theology and rite. Eucharistic theology ought not to proceed in abstraction from reflection on eucharistic rites. Second, eucharistic theology ought to develop within the broader framework of Trinitarian and Christological reflection and in the context of a theology of church and sacraments. The eucharist is a community meal, a symbolic ritual action celebrating the death and resurrection of Jesus Christ in which Christians are nourished for present discipleship in anticipation of the banquet in the coming reign of God. The eucharistic action holds together these past, present, and future aspects in a dynamic tension. Because the eucharist nourishes discipleship, there is an intimate connection between eucharistic theology, ethics and justice. The eucharistic action is a dynamic unity in which a number of traditional themes or elements can be identified (e.g., presence and consecration, memorial, sacrifice and offering; the role of the Spirit and the epiclesis, the eschatological perspective), but these cannot be distinguished, according to Crockett as individual "moments" in the celebration. The structure of the eucharist "is more like a musical score, or the script of a play" than a series of "component parts". The basic structure of the eucharist is "word" and "table". Under the heading of "The Structure of the

Eucharistic Prayer" he cited the ground-breaking paper - "Eucharistic Prayers, Past, Present and Future" by Professor Thomas Talley, published in *Revising the Eucharist: Groundwork for the Anglican Communion*, ed D.R. Holeton (Alcuin/GROW Liturgical Study 27), Bramcote, 1994. Talley's thesis was that the classic structure of the eucharistic prayer common to all its variants is the pattern of thanksgiving, followed by supplication, that theological reflection on the eucharist ought to begin here, and that the obscuring of this structure has been the source of the major problems in Western theology, for example, the emergence of the idea of a "moment of consecration," a distorted view of eucharistic sacrifice and offering, and an obscuring of the role of the Spirit and the epiclesis in the eucharistic celebration. He claimed that the role of the institution narrative/anamnesis in the Greek tradition of eucharistic prayer is proclamatory. He said that the shift from thanksgiving/proclamation to supplication in this tradition occurs after the anamnesis. This follows the pattern of Jewish models which are of thanksgiving/supplication type. He noted the eschatological emphasis in both Jewish and early Christian liturgies. He traced the process by which in the West, the institution narrative and the anamnesis came to be interpreted in a supplicatory context giving rise to the concept of a "moment" of consecration. He claimed that Cranmer's liturgies of 1549 and 1552 followed the Western pattern, although his elimination of the epiclesis and the anamnesis was only reversed when Scottish and American liturgies restored the eucharistic prayer as a whole. The Western pattern of the eucharistic prayer, with its shift from thanksgiving to supplication after the Sanctus rather than after the anamnesis, was, according to Talley, at the root of the theological problems that had developed in the West in relation to the eucharistic rite; the problems of a "moment of consecration"; the thorny issues of memorial, sacrifice and offering; and the problem of the role of the Spirit and the epiclesis in the eucharistic celebration.

Turning to the question of "Consecration" Crockett says that in early liturgies, "consecration", "offering" and "communion" were not identified as three isolated moments in the liturgical celebration, but as different aspects of a dynamic liturgical action. "Consecration" did not take place at a particular moment in the rite (whether the institution narrative or the epiclesis), but through the whole prayer action of thanksgiving in which the redemptive work of Christ was recalled and proclaimed, culminating in the act of communion.

It is a disputed question whether Cranmer's eucharistic texts assume a theology of consecration at all. There seems to have been a shift in the Elizabethan period reflected both in the small but significant changes between 1552 and 1559 and in the theologies of John Jewell and Richard Hooker. From Jewell and Hooker onwards, the classical Anglican understanding of consecration is that the elements are "sanctified" or "set apart" from a "common" to a "holy use" for the purpose of communion.

On supplementary consecration Crockett pointed out that no provision was made for it in the Prayer Books of 1549 and 1552 and that it first appeared in Canon 21 of 1604 and was incorporated into the 1662 Prayer Book. He said that the whole idea, at least by recitation of the Institution Narrative was that it assumed a moment of consecration in the rite which could be repeated. Moreover, it obscured the role of the institution narrative as proclamatory rather than a formula of consecration. If, on the other hand, he argued, the entire eucharistic action were to be viewed as a unity, the question arose whether the practice of supplementary consecration was consistent with a renewed theology of consecration.¹⁵

[COMMENT]

This highly competent summary of the *status questionis* of the revision of the liturgy is hard to fault and constituted a very good lead-in to some of the discussions at the Conference. However, the polemic against a “moment of consecration” does need to be qualified by the consideration that in the rite of Holy Baptism, which may be administered within a substantial liturgy, the act of baptism itself, is accomplished in a moment by the pouring of water on the forehead and the use of the words “...I baptize you in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Amen”. And one must ask again, if it is possible for a vital liturgical function, namely the administration of the sacrament of baptism may be accomplished *in a moment* and by means of a simple act allied to a formula, why should it be regarded as out of order for the consecration of the bread and wine of the eucharist to be accomplished in a few words with suitable liturgical gesture through the recitation of the Institution Narrative? Many exceptionally important events are accomplished in a moment or two by, for example, the “I will” of the marriage ceremony, and the brief words of the Marriage Vows.¹⁶ What matters is the significance of what is done, and the mode may well vary as it does between Holy Communion One in the 2004 Book of Common Prayer and Holy Communion Two.

With regard to the issue of “**Memorial, Sacrifice and Offering**”¹⁷ Crockett recognized that this had been the most controversial aspect of eucharistic theology in Anglicanism, and there was a need to recover the roots of the sacrificial dimension in the tradition and to try to untie some of the knots in the historical controversy. He points out that the use of sacrificial language to describe the eucharist is to be found very early in the *Didache*, in Justin Martyr, and in Irenaeus; and that the eucharist is already described as a sacrifice of thanksgiving. In the third century the theme of sacrifice begins to appear in the eucharistic prayer itself, for example, in *The Apostolic Tradition*, ascribed by some to Hippolytus, where the sacrificial theme is to be found in both the anamnesis and the epiclesis:¹⁸

Remembering therefore his death and resurrection, we offer to you the bread and the cup, giving you thanks because you have held us worthy to stand before you and minister to you. And we ask that you would send your Holy Spirit upon the offering of your holy Church; that, gathering her into one, you would grant to all who receive the holy things (to receive) for the fullness of the Holy Spirit for the strengthening of faith in truth.

Crockett said that in the anamnesis the phrase "giving you thanks" qualifies the meaning of "we offer you the bread and the cup" so that the model in the background here is that of a sacrifice of thanksgiving. In the epiclesis, the phrase "the offering of your holy Church" does not refer exclusively to the elements but refers to the eucharistic action as a whole that culminates in the act of communion. This close link between offering and communion is characteristic of communion-sacrifice.

Crockett drew attention to the connection in early Christian reflection between the eucharist and the sacrifice of Christ, which was expressed in three ways. The eucharist was called a sacrifice, first of all, because it celebrates the anamnesis of Christ's death. A second line of reflection connected the eucharist with the eternal pleading of Christ's sacrifice in heaven. In Augustine there is the perspective that the Church itself is offered in the eucharist in union with Christ, its head. In the patristic period, therefore, the term "sacrifice" was used of the eucharist as a descriptive metaphor for the action of thanksgiving-memorial as a whole.

It is not possible to give the whole of this section of Crockett's essay except in summary, but he drew attention to the medieval emphasis on the mass as a sacrifice (he said a "new"

sacrifice) for the living and the dead, which in turn led to the sharp reaction against the eucharistic sacrifice in the sixteenth century Reformers. He mentioned the recovery of the sacrificial dimension of the eucharist in seventeenth and eighteenth century Anglicanism in the sense of a commemorative sacrifice together with a renewed emphasis on the Augustinian dimension. He also drew attention the sacrificial emphasis in the hymns of John and Charles Wesley. However, the eucharistic doctrine of the Anglo-Catholics in the Nineteenth century evoked an Evangelical response which denied it in language echoing that of the Reformation, and this had continued up to the time of writing. He mentioned the influence of BEM and the modern ecumenical movement. With regard to contemporary writing he mentions the eirenic approach of the Evangelical Christopher Cocksworth and the rapprochement in the Church of England represented by the Series Two and Series Three orders for Holy Communion and that in the Alternative Service Book (ASB). He mentioned the work of Kenneth Stevenson in his *Eucharist and Offering* who called the eucharist "a sacrifice of proclamation". The latter's categories include the "story" of salvation as the "context" of the eucharist, the action of the eucharist as the "response" to this story, and the elements as the "gifts" that have a significant role in the eucharistic action.

Crockett states that in early Christian tradition, the language of sacrifice in connection with the eucharist was understood metaphorically as descriptive of the eucharistic action as a whole, not of a particular moment of "offering" in the rite and expressed the hope that such an approach might lead to a common understanding among "catholics" and "evangelicals" in the Anglican Communion.

[COMMENT]

Dr Francis Clark, a massively learned Jesuit priest, and sometime Professor of Theology at the Pontifical Gregorian University, Rome, and at Heythrop College, Oxfordshire, made a significant contribution to study of divergence of liturgical thinking between the Anglican and Roman Catholic churches in his *Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation* (second edition, Blackwell, 1967).¹⁹ Although invariably courteous his book published originally shortly before the election of Pope John XXIII and the calling of the Second Vatican Council, with a revised edition after the Council was over. was sharply critical of Anglican attacks on the Mass as a sacrifice, and this makes uncomfortable reading for Anglicans. In Part One he examined "The case against the pre-Reformation Church, and the facts of the Reformation conflict over the Mass", and in Part Two he presented "A detailed study of the doctrinal errors about the sacrifice of the Mass said to have been current in the late middle ages. In considering the significance of these past controversies" his method was to base each chapter upon a quotation, apparently in each case from an Anglican writer containing an accusation which he wished to counter for example in Chapter XI "The heretical teaching that the Mass was a propitiatory sacrifice independent of that of the cross, and the theory of a new redemption deplored by Bishop Gardiner. In Chapter XII he chose a reference to a supposed "crude and objectionable mode of expression" of those who said that the Mass was the same sacrifice as that of Calvary. Whether this mode of approach is helpful is to some extent questionable, but it does suggest in the light of the evidence presented and the counter-arguments advanced by Dr Clark, that caution needs to be exercised in any endorsement of the accusations made by the Reformers and others in the four centuries since about the teaching of the medieval and post-medieval Roman Catholic Church - of which William Crockett's mention of a supposed "new" sacrifice is a small but significant example. However, this in no way implies that the emphases in Roman Catholic teaching are flawless.²⁰ As

consistently argued in this present work, if it is true that there is a unity between the sacrifice of Calvary and that of the eucharist based on Christ himself being Priest and Victim in both and in that limited sense making it the "same" sacrifice, there is also a difference between the historical event of Christ's once for all sacrifice and the Church's "remembrance" of that historical event which makes for the two being "distinct" and separate. This may be a paradox, but Christian theology is characterized by paradoxical statements, such as God being Three in One and One in Three, and Jesus being both God and man. The apparent contradiction of the paradox may be necessary to the safeguarding of the fullness of truth.

With regard to "**The Role of the Spirit and the Epiclesis**"²¹ Crocket stated that the evident origin of the epiclesis in the eucharistic prayer was the supplicatory section of Jewish prayers of blessing. As already noted the content of the supplication in Jewish prayer forms is for the restoration of Jerusalem, or the "future of Israel". The supplication had, therefore, a distinctly eschatological note. It was concerned for the gathering of Israel as a community in the end time. In the earliest Christian eucharistic prayer forms, this eschatological note is retained but now the prayer is for the gathering of the Church into the kingdom. In the *Apostolic Tradition* of Hippolytus, the theme of the gathering of the Church is retained, but now the epiclesis becomes an invocation of the Spirit.

No conclusion, he thought, could be determined as to whether the epiclesis in Hippolytus is directed towards the elements or towards the communicants. He cited Thomas Talley to the effect that the distinction between a "consecratory" and a "sanctificatory" epiclesis is a recent one, and it is anachronistic to import it back into early liturgical texts. He maintained that it was better to interpret the epiclesis in Hippolytus as directed towards the whole eucharistic action. He would argue that today it was best to interpret the epiclesis in relation to its origin as an eschatological supplication for the gathering of the community into the kingdom. He saw the epiclesis not in a narrow sense as directed towards the elements or towards the communicants, but as an opening out of the thanksgiving/proclamation section of the eucharistic prayer with its Christological focus towards supplication for the fulfilment of God's promise through the work of the Spirit, thereby completing the Trinitarian movement of the prayer. The recovery of the epiclesis in contemporary Anglican revision of the eucharistic prayer was a matter of profound theological significance, because it represented not only the retrieval of the full classical structure of the eucharistic prayer in its movement from thanksgiving/proclamation to supplication, but it also enabled the retrieval of the full Trinitarian pattern of eucharistic praying that gathers the assembled community up into the whole sweep of God's work in creation, redemption, and promise. The recovery of the epiclesis also helped, he thought, to overcome the dualism of spirit and matter, which was endemic in post-Cartesian, Western-Enlightenment thought. He criticized the insertion of a "split" epiclesis before and after the institution narrative in the contemporary English Anglican and Roman rites as perpetuating a theology of consecration which sees the institution narrative as the moment of consecration. In the context of this theology, he said, the epiclesis before the narrative is directed towards the elements, and the epiclesis following the narrative is directed towards the communicants. This fundamentally obscured the movement from thanksgiving/proclamation to supplication, characteristic of the classic structure of the eucharistic prayer. He said that if Talley was right, then the invocation of the Spirit ought to follow on from the institution narrative/anamnesis in a movement from thanksgiving/proclamation to supplication. It could then be seen that the epiclesis was

related to the whole theological movement of the prayer and to the eucharistic action as a whole, rather than narrowly focused on the elements or the communicants. The epiclesis could then open up the vision of the fulfilment of God's promise, the transformation of the whole creation through the work of the Spirit.

Finally, Crockett dealt with "**The Eschatological Perspective, speaking of 'Eucharist, Ethics and Justice'**".²² He drew attention to the wider themes of the eucharist in place of a narrow focus on presence and sacrifice and cited the BEM document favourably in this regard, paramount of which was the eschatological perspective. He also spoke of the importance of inculturation. The liturgical rite needed to open up for the assembly an alternative vision to that of post-Enlightenment Western society, a vision grounded in the creative and redemptive action of God as disclosed in Jesus Christ, and opening up towards the promise of God's reign through the work of the Spirit.

[COMMENT]

This section of Crockett's paper is important as a reminder, if such be needed, that the theology of the eucharist is something much broader and fuller than the particular issues of presence and sacrifice which have been so sharply contested in inter-church relations from the time of the Reformation onwards, and are still, in spite of the best efforts of ecumenists by no means fully resolved. The role of the Holy Spirit in the eucharist is one area of importance and the eschatological aspect, represented by the Pauline 'until he comes' (1 Cor 11:26) is another.

STUDY DOCUMENTS²³

Of the six Study Documents, three, especially the first, are particularly significant with regards to the doctrine of the eucharist - "**Eucharist, Sacrifice and Atonement: The 'Clarifications' of ARCIC**" by Charles Sherlock; "**Is Eucharistic Sacrifice a Culturally Relative Issue?**" by Kenneth Stevenson, and "**Sacrifice in African Traditional Religion as a Means of Understanding Eucharistic Theology**" by Solomon Amusan.

As a Conservative Evangelical member of ARCIC 2 Sherlock was involved in the production of *Clarifications* - which has been examined in a Assessments Chapter Three (5). The first part of his paper is a useful summary of ARCIC 1, its Elucidation, the CDF "Observations" and the Roman Catholic "Response" and he notes especially Cardinal Cassidy's comment on *Clarifications* that "no more study is needed at this time." His intention in "**Eucharist, Sacrifice and Atonement**"²⁴ was to explore two inter-related lines of approach to eucharistic sacrifice, revolving around the key idea of propitiation which, he claimed, lay at the heart of Rome's *Response* and ARCIC's *Clarifications*. He argued for the importance of distinguishing sacrifice, atonement, and propitiation, especially in relation to the eucharist, as different yet closely related experiential metaphors for the divine work of salvation and its application.

Under the heading of "**Sacrifice in the Scriptures**"²⁵ he identified four kinds of sacrifice in Leviticus 1-7: the *olah* or whole-burnt-offering, whose basic meaning is *dedication*: as this animal is wholly burned up and its smoke ascends, so do the worshippers offer themselves to God; *minhah* or cereal offering, whose basic reference is *thanksgiving for harvest*: the offering from the harvest (especially that of the first-fruits) is a thankful recognition that all food comes from God. the *shelamim* or peace offering ("offering of well-being" in recent translations which celebrates (but does not establish)

peace with God and one another through a communal sharing in a meal: it is "sacrificial" since it is a costly meal, never to be eaten lightly; the *asham* and *hattath*, "sin" and "guilt" offerings, which deal with *unwilling* religious and civil wrong: they do not remove sin "with a hard heart and a high hand" but their performance, associated with every ritual, indicates the worshippers' recognition of their unworthiness before God, yet their coming in faith to do as God has commanded.

He pointed out the *absence* in these texts of the motif of atonement, although *kippur* occurs under *olah* these rites do not accomplish anything Godward. They do however express what he called "three-dimensional prayer" - dedication, thanksgiving, celebration, repentance and the humility of faith.

Atonement, on the other hand is to be found in Leviticus 16, *yom kippur*. "Real" sins are being dealt with by being confessed over the head of one goat, which is not offered on the altar but dispatched into the wilderness to die "naturally" - only God can remove sin. The second goat is the "sin-offering", and its blood is smeared on the Ark; but its body is then burned outside the camp, not on the altar.

Propitiation, he said, derives from the Hellenistic *hilask-root* which has the sense of the one who offers sacrifice, appeasing an angry deity in order to keep the god at a distance. Such a concept is not to be found in the Hebrew Bible, where it is the Lord who takes the initiative in salvation and forgiveness, not Israel. In the LXX (Septuagint) the various *hilask-root* terms are associated with the Day of Atonement, with the High Priest as the subject. In the four New Testament texts which use the term *hilaskomai* ("propitiate") God is the subject not the object. We do not initiate propitiation.

The text 1 John 4:10 "In this is love, not that we loved God, but that he loved us and sent his Son to be the atoning sacrifice for our sins" indicates that the divine motive for such acting was of love, not revenge or being appeased, although, Sherlock said that the powerful sense of deliverance from divine wrath, even by God, remains. The point was that the Old Testament cult "worked" due to divine grace, not human effort, as the "shadow" of the only "true" atoning act, that of Christ crucified and ascended. He noted that the New Testament writers continue to use the language of sacrifice for all sorts of ministry, but the language of atonement only for Christ himself. The New Testament writers employed a wide range of metaphors from everyday life to illuminate the reality they knew by experience but could not explain, metaphors drawn from the marketplace, courts, battle-field, household life, philosophy - and from cultic rites which involved sacrifice. He made a distinction between eucharistic *sacrifice* and eucharistic *atonement* the latter being absolutely excluded.

[COMMENT]

No examples are adduced for any authoritative teaching in any church which indicates eucharistic *atonement*, although the distinction between this and *eucharistic sacrifice* is a fundamental part of Sherlock's thinking. However, it may legitimately be affirmed that what is "remembered before God in thanksgiving and supplication" - the working definition of eucharistic sacrifice in this present study - is precisely the once for all atoning sacrifice of Christ on Calvary's cross and in that strictly limited sense only it may be said to be "offered".

The Passover, Sherlock noted, was a key to understanding the eucharist in that each enactment does not bring the past into the present, but takes participants back to the

unique, historical deliverance of Israel. He cited David Gregg to the effect that "We are as if there" not "It is as if here". He mentioned that in Jewish tradition, seen in the Passover Haggadah it is through thanksgiving "blessing of God" (the *berakah* tradition) and this is indicated by the present day use of the "Prayer of Thanksgiving" rather than "Prayer of Consecration"

[COMMENT]

It seems to the present writer that "We are as if there" and "It is as if here" are two sides of the one coin, the key words being "as if". In any re-living of historical events, they themselves remain historical but through the act of remembrance are "as if here", and we are "as if there". And he himself said at as interpreted against the background of the Passover deliverance can be said to "make available in the present" the unique atoning self-offering of Christ, who continues to be our advocate now.

With regard to the terminology of the "Prayer of Thanksgiving" (*eucharistic prayer*) because this is the means by which the bread and wine of the eucharist are consecrated, the eucharistic prayer may be understood as a prayer of thanksgiving-and-consecration.

Under the heading of "**Sacrifice and the Eucharist**"²⁶ Sherlock recognizes that Cranmer's placing of John 2:2 immediately before the Sursum Corda was significant, "If anyone sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is the propitiation for our sins", thus allowing that what Christ uniquely did is now available in the present as a "perpetual memorial".

Having made again the distinction between eucharistic sacrifice and eucharistic atonement he said that the eucharist (and other Gospel means of grace) can properly be spoken of as a sacrifice in all of the Levitical senses, in each can through faith - dedication, thanksgiving, celebrating peace, and acknowledging our need of forgiveness and restoration (social as well as with God). As interpreted against the background of the Passover deliverance can be said to "make available in the present" the unique atoning self-offering of Christ, who continues to be our Advocate now. However, it can not be said to have any *independent* "atoning" action, which he seemed to think was part of the medieval doctrine of the "sacrifice of the mass". He claimed that the distinction he insisted upon, which is a valid one, was encapsulated in *Clarifications*.

[COMMENT]

It may well be that there are examples of the use of language within the Catholic tradition, then and now, which lend themselves to the interpretation that Sherlock feared, but it is difficult to find confirmation that this is –or has been - part of the defined doctrine of any church.

With regard to the distinction between eucharistic sacrifice and atonement, it seems to be present writer that the very great historic emphasis on the "once for all" in Anglican liturgies from the Reformation onwards was and is a sufficient safeguard against what so concerned Sherlock (and many other Evangelical writers with him back to Cranmer and the Reformers), and this is fully covered in the liturgies contained in the 2004 Prayer Book.

Kenneth Stevenson, in his paper "**Is Eucharistic Sacrifice a Culturally Relative Issue?**" discussed the relationship of History and Eternity in the eucharist.²⁷ With regard, specifically, to the eucharistic sacrifice he identified the Offertory and the Memorial part

of the Eucharistic Prayer as the two areas most concerned. With regard to the former he cited the recurrent phrase in the offertory prayers in the *Book of Alternative Services* of the Anglican Church of Canada, "Receive all we offer you this day" and said that this comprises a whole amalgam of thoughts, aspirations, and intercessions. And they become focused on the bread and the wine, the gifts to be consecrated as the food of the Lord's Supper. With regard to the anamnesis, he quoted Jeremy Taylor as follows, speaking of Christ,²⁸

Since it is necessary that he hath something to offer so long as he is a priest, and there is no other sacrifice but that of Himself offered upon the cross, it follows that Christ in heaven perpetually offers and represents that sacrifice to His Heavenly Father, and in virtue of that obtains all good things for His Church.

And he also recalled the words of a hymn (250 in the Church Hymnal of 1960), of which the first two verses read,²⁹

We hail thy presence glorious
O Christ our Great High Priest,
O'er sin and death victorious
at thy thanksgiving feast;
As thou art interceding
for us in heaven above,
the Church on earth is pleading
thy perfect work on earth.

Through thee in every nation
Thine own their hearts upraise,
Offering one pure Oblation,
one sacrifice of praise:
with thee in blest communion
the living and the dead
are joined in closest union,
one Body with one Head.

With regard to the Heavenly Intercession of Christ he cited Archbishop Michael Ramsey as follows, commenting on Heb. 7:23-25³⁰

It may help us if we recall the verb which the Epistle to the Hebrews uses in describing the prayer of the ascended Christ. The verb means "to be with" or "to encounter" rather than to plead or speak or make petitions. Jesus is ever with the Father with the world on his heart. May we think of our own prayer as being for a while consciously with the Father, no more and no less than that? If we think of prayer thus we may find that the many aspects of prayer are embraced within the act of being in God's presence.

Speaking of the quest for integration and wholeness Stevenson said that the notions of memorial (of the past), renewal of covenant (in the present) and anticipation (of the future) may provide a framework for a fresh approach to this dislocated world, where the pain and sense of loss that are felt deeply at personal and corporate levels, create a climate in which people know that they are ultimately meant for healing and wholeness and can celebrate the truth. In the very elements of the eucharist, the bread and wine, are to be found the results of dying and rising, the corn being crushed and baked with yeast,

the vines being crushed and fermented. The cross is near to these natural processes, with their eternal meanings drawn into them by the eucharist.

He also discussed "green" issues and the eucharist and the connection between the Spirit and the cross. He answered his own question, "Is eucharistic sacrifice a culturally relative issue?" by saying, firmly, "No!" We - the human race - are the culturally a relative part of the equation. Within the Anglican part of this story, there are important riches that can continue to provide the resources on which to draw, as we, alongside our fellow Christians, walk out of the past, through the present, into the future - God's future. Tradition can never be normative. But the metaphor of sacrifice is simply unable to depart from the eucharistic table.

[COMMENT]

The relationship of past, present and future in the eucharistic memorial is particularly carefully represented in Holy Communion One in the 2004 Prayer Book, and this was a deliberate construct, first found in the trial use "Holy Communion 1972" from which the present order is derived,³¹

Therefore, Father, with this bread and this cup
we do as Christ your Son commanded:
we remember his passion and death,
we celebrate his resurrection and ascension,
and we look for the coming of his kingdom.

With regard to what is said in reply to the title, perhaps Stevenson's most important word is "metaphor" since the entire Christian use of the language of sacrifice is derived metaphorically from the sacrificial systems of antiquity, in particular that of the Old Testament.

Solomon Amusan contributed a paper entitled "**Sacrifice in African Traditional Religion as a Means of Understanding Eucharistic Theology**".³² He declared that in African traditional religion, sacrifice meant primarily the slaughter of an animal as an offering to God or deity for the purpose of homage or propitiation. He described two categories of sacrifice, particularly among the Yoruba: those which were meant to avert calamity or atone for offences, and those to celebrate feasts. The first category, that of atoning or averting calamities, includes propitiatory sacrifice, preventive sacrifice, substitutionary sacrifice, and foundation sacrifice; while the second category, that of feasts, includes thanksgiving communion sacrifice and votive sacrifice.

Amusan gave an example from the Ita-Ogbolu community of Ondo state in Nigeria where traditionally sexual sin within certain degrees of relationship incurred the death penalty for the person responsible. Later the sacrifice of a goat redeemed the offender, and the blood of the slaughtered goat was put on the forehead of the offender to show this. He regarded this as a substitutionary sacrifice which could be seen as an analogy for the self-sacrifice of Christ on the cross, by which our sins have been forgiven. Africans, he said, in general, and Nigerians in particular, knew the gravity of sacrifice as a means of atonement, including human sacrifice which was given prominence in early times. It was offered wherever it was believed expedient that someone should die as a sacrifice of appeasement in order that the community might be saved. In some cases, it was believed that the victim was to represent the people before and carry their petitions to, the higher power... [He] was an ambassador. This, Amusan said, was the main reason why the

Nigerian Christians hold Jesus' sacrifice to be superior to any other sacrifice. His blood is superior to the blood of goats or any human being offered in sacrifice. Christ's sacrifice was holy, perfect, and without blemish. It is complete and eternal. Being a self-sacrifice, it is voluntary; and being voluntary from an innocent person, it is unblemished and eternal.

Amusan gives an example from tradition of a person who offered himself as both priest and victim where a human sacrifice was required. The idea of *substitution*, he said, runs through all kinds of sacrifices in the African traditional religion, which had a corresponding notion in biblical sacrifices. With regard to *propitiation*, it was also significant in this tradition although he pointed out that the definition of winning the favour of someone who is angry by some pleasing act is almost inapplicable to the Christian doctrine, given that we are speaking about the nature of God, who cannot be bribed, but who can only forgive or annul sin out of sheer grace. Amusan said that the term "expiation" involves "propitiation" as a result of substitution, Christ's death being substitutionary in the sense that he died in our stead, as our substitute. So far as exposition is concerned he felt that a typological method of interpretation is relevant here, with examples from the Old and New Testaments. He maintained that for African Christians, the substitutionary sacrifice of Christ was the anti-type and prototype of the substitution sacrifice in the African traditional religion. So far as the two categories of sacrifice mentioned above were concerned, the first, propitiatory or atoning, had been fulfilled by Jesus himself; and the Church, in appreciation of the first category, offers the second category; thanksgiving/communion and votive sacrifices to celebrate the liberation of the Church by Jesus. He affirmed that to interpret Christian liturgical theology in terms of the culture of the people seemed to be the best way to develop a contemporary theology of the eucharist. It would be intelligible to people if their former religious rites were seen as types of the new in Jesus Christ.

[COMMENT]

The value of Amusan's contribution is that it provides us with an example of *theological* inculturation without which *liturgical* inculturation, with which he was also involved, would not be meaningful.

WORKING GROUP PAPERS³³

The Consultation had met 6-12 August 1995, at the Church of Ireland Education College in Rathmines (Dublin). Members had come to work on a task earlier proposed by the Steering Committee of the Consultation, to define the principles and standards which would influence the eucharistic rites which the provinces of the Communion would adopt in the course of the next round of revision of liturgical texts, principally for use in Sunday worship.

The following headings were proposed for discussion.

Eucharistic Theology. The development of a comprehensive theology of the eucharist within the broad framework of a theology of church and sacraments (including eschatological, paschal mystery, and ethical dimensions) within which traditional Anglican points of tension would be addressed, e.g., the role of the Spirit, offering, consecration, sacrifice, presence.

Ministry, Order, and the Eucharist. The ecclesiological issues, i.e., the relationship of the eucharist to both the universal and the local church and the implications of this relationship for practice, i.e., Who may participate? Who may minister? Who may

preside? How may the eucharist be extended? How may the eucharist be shared in ecumenical contexts?

The Structure of the Eucharist. The structure of the whole rite as well as the structure of the eucharistic prayer; the function of the structure in conserving the tradition and the extent to which that tradition may responsibly be stretched; proposed common eucharistic prayers and possible models; a review of the guidelines proposed by Lambeth 1958 for provinces revising their eucharistic liturgy.

Ritual, Language, and Symbolism. The symbolic nature of the eucharistic assembly and the inherent symbolism of the eucharistic action; the implications of symbolism for the use of space, for iconography, inculturation, inclusivity, vesture, gesture, and other ritual actions; the essential components of the eucharist, its symbolic character, and the significance of the symbols and their relationship to cultural contexts.

Education and Spirituality. Liturgical education for eucharistic renewal in both practice and spirituality, the resources available and required, and curricula designed for teaching programs on liturgy.

Groups addressed the agreed task and prepared statements in relation to these discussion points. They reported at intervals to the plenary session of the Consultation. The following statements, subsequently edited for publication, were presented to the Consultation. The agreed Principles and Recommendations, developed and proposed by an appointed group on the basis of the process of the whole conference, were amended and adopted by the Consultation.

The concern in this publication is with Eucharistic Theology, and the findings of the relevant working group, are given below. Given the composite nature of the contributions it would be difficult to summarize and so is given in full (verbatim), followed by Comments, and accompanied in the following section by the customary Notes. There is a particular difficulty for the present writer in that he was a member of this Working Group and so to a large extent feels himself committed to it, although not uncritically*. To a significant extent, therefore, the text has been allowed to speak for itself and the Comments have been kept to a minimum. A number of the points made were anticipated in the preparatory and study documents and will be referred to in the Notes, and some attempt will be made to avoid unnecessary duplication.

*It would be true to say that while the documents produced by the Working Groups produced a broad consensus on the topics discussed within them, and certainly in the case of the section on Theology, was the product of a great deal of writing and re-writing, no-one was expected to sign up to every last word of them. It was not the same as the Agreed Statements produced in official documents in particular dialogues between Christian churches.

I Eucharistic Theology³⁴

A The Doctrine of the Trinity³⁵

1. Central to the Christian faith is the revelation of the triune God of love. All Christian worship is the work of God the Holy Trinity, who enables human beings, made in God's image, to return thanks and praise. Eucharistic theology, however, is often discussed as though it were simply a Christological, or at best, a "binitarian" issue.

2. Eucharistic worship reflects our status as created beings using bread and wine, fruits of

God's creation, to realize our status as those redeemed, baptized in the three-fold Name and as Christ's body animated by the Holy Spirit. All three Persons of the Trinity are properly to be acknowledged throughout the eucharistic celebration. Similarly, eucharistic theology should be seen within the wider context of Trinitarian theology.

3. The eucharist celebrates the Father's bestowing of divine grace on the community of believers in the Church through the combined ("perichoretic") interaction of the Son and the Spirit. Through the Son, the Church knows God as Father and knows God as creator and gives thanks for creation. It gives thanks for the incarnation and redemption through the Son and rejoices in its sanctification and recreation by the Spirit.

4. To participate in the eucharist is incarnational. It involves a bodily response, both corporately and individually. It is with our hands and mouths that we take, eat and drink the sacramental signs of the body and blood of Christ. The eucharistic bread and wine are offered to us to be eaten and drunk so that Christ may dwell in us. When Christ "shares his bread with sinners," we praise God for the fuller revelation each new participation brings us. Our devotion and love thus engendered and nourished are evidence of the Spirit's joyful moving in us.

5. It is the triune God whose presence and fellowship we have when we take, eat and drink the body and blood of Christ. When in the eucharist we make the memorial (anamnesis) of the one sacrifice of Christ, it is none other than the self-giving love of the Trinity which is proclaimed and experienced.

6. The Western eucharistic rites have not always given full expression to our Trinitarian faith. The classical forms of the eucharistic prayer in the East have an explicitly Trinitarian structure which became lost in the West. It is not found in the Roman Canon, nor was it part of the awareness of most of the Reformers. More recently, we have: returned to the pre-Cappadocian custom of addressing the eucharistic prayer to the Father, through the Son, in the Spirit. But belief in the unity of being, in technical language the *homousia*, of the Three Persons means that each may be addressed directly in public prayer, as much as in hymns and private prayers.

7. There is a strong case not only for continuing the present trend of giving an explicitly Trinitarian structure to the eucharistic prayer, but for making explicit in at least some new prayers the equality of being of the three Persons. The grace as the opening greeting or the beginning of the *Sursum corda*; a Trinitarian form of absolution; post-communion prayers and solemn three-fold blessings are examples of where this may be achieved.

8. This could be further achieved by including devotional prayers and hymns which are addressed to Christ and to the Holy Spirit, such as the *Veni Creator*, "Be present, be present, O Jesus..." (C.S.I.), and the *Agnus Dei*. In much recent liturgical revision, such devotional prayers have been discouraged. However, in many parts of the Anglican Communion the laity regard such devotions as extremely important in expressing deeply felt spiritual needs and beliefs.

9. The restoration of a Trinitarian structure for the eucharistic prayer in historic as well as contemporary Anglican texts has included the restoration of an invocation (*epiclesis*) of the Holy Spirit. Modern scholarship understands the "deep structures" of the prayer to embrace thanksgiving and supplication. In the Jewish models from which the Christian prayers grew, the supplication is for the restoration of Jerusalem or the future of Israel. In early Christian prayers, this becomes prayer for the gathering of the Church into the

kingdom. The link between this eschatological perspective and the work of the Spirit is made explicit in Romans 8. In Christian prayer, therefore, the supplication became an explicit invocation of the Holy Spirit. The epiclesis later came to be interpreted as an invocation upon the elements of bread and wine or upon the communicants or both, but it is better understood in its earliest forms as invoking the Spirit upon the whole life of God's people as expressed in the eucharistic action. Difficulties which many Anglicans have felt with an epiclesis in this part of the eucharistic prayer may be transcended if the invocation avoids a narrow focus on the elements or the communicants. The thanksgiving and proclamation section with its twin foci of God as creator and redeemer may be opened up towards supplication for the fulfilment of God's promise through the work of the Spirit. The recovery of the epiclesis thus enables the church to enter into the full Trinitarian pattern of eucharistic praying. The assembled community is gathered into the whole sweep of the Triune God's work in creation, redemption, and promise. Thus, we are given a vision of the transformation of the whole creation.

10. To sum up, our eucharistic prayers may more explicitly express belief in the equal divinity and involvement of the Son and Spirit with the Father and make it clear that, in the eucharistic mystery, we encounter the mystery of the triune God.

[COMMENT]

It seems likely that it was a comment by the present writer which gave rise to the remark about a "binitarian" concept, since it was pointed out that the Prayer of Consecration in the historic Prayer Book (Holy Communion One order of service) contains no reference whatever to the Holy Spirit, and this in an explicitly Trinitarian church! However, it was accepted that the traditional Prayer Book is not the only Prayer of Consecration with a weakness in this area, and the traditional Roman Mass was also instanced. In general, there was a very strong consensus about the need for more explicitly Trinitarian references in the liturgy, and that eucharistic theology had to be seen in the broad context of a Trinitarian understanding.

With regard to the devotional material to be used within the administration of Communion, this can take many forms. The Agnus Dei had already reappeared in the Church of Ireland's Alternative Prayer Book of 1984 and was to come in two different versions in the 2004 Prayer Book. Properly speaking it is a *confractorium* originally sung during the breaking of the bread for as long as this took.

All three eucharistic prayers in Holy Communion Two in the 2004 Prayer Book are Trinitarian in shape, eucharistic prayer three having the unique feature of the three Persons of the Holy Trinity being directly addressed in turn followed by the doxology (concluding in the Sanctus) being offered the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, Blessed Trinity. With regard to the equality of Persons this is emphasized in the provision for Trinity Sunday, which seems sufficient. Trinitarian formats appear as options in the section of penitence and similarly in the provisions for a solemn blessing found in resource material recommended by the Liturgical Advisory Committee.

It is accepted in the 2004 Prayer Book that the deep structures of the eucharistic prayer embrace thanksgiving and supplication and that within the Trinitarian context the *epiclesis* has an important role to play (normally in conjunction with the anamnesis). It appears to have an *enabling* role in Holy Communion Two, with explicit connections to what the sacramental body and blood are deemed to be and are to us in eucharistic prayers one and three but only a *general* significance in eucharistic prayer two.

B. Thanksgiving and Blessing³⁶

1. Thanksgiving is a fundamental concept of the Christian life and finds a special place in baptism, the eucharist, and in other rites of the Church. In relation to the Holy Communion, we ought to see the entire rite as eucharistic; thanksgiving permeates every aspect of it. It is within this context that we see the significance of the eucharistic prayer (of thanksgiving/consecration). The scope of this thanksgiving (which itself derives from the Lord's giving of thanks at the Last Supper) is comprehensive and embraces creation and salvation history (centered on the self-giving of Christ) as well as eucharistic consecration.
2. We would encourage provinces as a matter of policy to offer a range of complementary eucharistic prayers which in their very complementarity can embrace or point to the whole range and depth of eucharistic theology, without any one prayer having to bear the whole weight of meaning. Thanksgiving for Christ's saving work, centered on the cross, must find expression in all eucharistic prayers.
3. In relation to the structure of the eucharistic prayer, we see this as consisting essentially of thanksgiving and supplication, recognizing that the one is intimately related to the other.
4. We would draw attention to the inter-related character of the traditional parts of the eucharistic prayer inclusive of the opening dialogue (derived to some extent from Jewish sources), thanksgiving to God for his work in creation, the rehearsal of the mighty acts of God in Christ, the institution narrative, the anamnesis, the epiclesis of the Holy Spirit, petitions, and doxology.
5. The institution narrative is part of the series of mighty acts which we remember. Rather than being a formula for consecration, it is best understood as the mandate for the performance of the eucharistic action, and the promise of Christ's presence.
6. The post-communion prayer(s) may take up the theme of thanksgiving for communion but need not necessarily be restricted to this. Together with the dismissal, for example, such prayer may articulate the sending out of the community in mission and service.
7. We would draw attention to the value of hymns with the theme of thanksgiving for use at the eucharist. We would emphasize the devotional character of hymns in interpreting the liturgy as well as in nourishing piety,
8. The concept of consecration by thanksgiving has a wider application than the eucharist itself. In relation to persons, we see this as exemplified in ordination prayers, and in relation to material gifts in the blessing of the baptismal water.
9. Generous quantities of the eucharistic elements should be placed upon the table to reflect the generosity of God who gave his only Son for us. Supplementary consecration should be avoided as far as possible, but if it is required, then any words used should not be seen as an independent liturgical act but should clearly refer to the eucharistic prayer. Whatever is done and said at this point should take seriously both the nature of the sacrament and the sensibilities of the faithful.
10. Thanksgiving for what God in Christ has accomplished once for all on the cross anticipates what God still has in store for us and for the whole creation of which the eucharist is the foretaste and pledge.

[COMMENT]

With regard to the provision of diverse eucharistic prayers to bring out more fully the treasury of meaning to be found in the Holy Communion, it may be mentioned that the amount of space given to the mighty acts of God in Christ within each eucharistic prayer varies. For example, in Holy Communion Two in the 2004 Prayer Book, Prayer One relies on proper prefaces to accomplish the specifics of such commemoration and this section is itself brief, and Prayer Three is succinct and very focused. Only in Prayer Two is there more fully a rehearsal of salvation history, itself enlarged by the use of seasonal additions which serve the purpose of proper prefaces, and, although there is a reference in this to creation as well as salvation, as in Prayers One and Three, all of the events described relate specifically to Christ or to the later life of the church i.e. "You have called us into the fellowship of (...) all your saints..." There is no reference to the Old Testament understood as a 'Book of the Acts of God'. However, a positive effect in Prayers One and Two is that the eucharistic prayer becomes creedal, and this raises the question of to what extent there needs to be the use of any creed at the Holy Communion except on Sundays and holy days? In relation to the inter-related character of the traditional parts of the prayer, these remain highly significant even where some of the relevant passages are very brief. For example, in Eucharistic Prayer Three the paragraph corresponding to the anamnesis is mainly congregational, and reads,³⁷

Praise to you, Lord Jesus Christ.

Dying, you destroyed our death,

Rising, you restored our life;

Lord Jesus, come in glory.

C The Presence of Christ in the Eucharist³⁸

1. The Lord Jesus Christ promised that whenever two or three gather in his name he would be in their midst. The risen Lord is present throughout the eucharistic celebration. Christ's presence is to be discerned in the assembly and in the proclamation of God's word. Christ's forgiveness is declared and received in faith, and his peace is proclaimed and exchanged among the people.

2. The mystery of Christ's presence is given unique expression, to be discerned by faith, in the whole sacramental action when bread and wine are taken, "eucharistized," distributed, and consumed, in remembrance of him.' This remembrance or anamnesis is no mere mental recollection but effects a real encounter with the Lord in his saving acts, especially his atoning death and victorious resurrection. In appointing bread and wine as the visible and tangible means of the presence of his body and blood, the Lord affirms that participating in the sacrament allows the faithful communicant truly to feed upon his sacrificial life.

3. In the sacrament of his body and blood, our Lord comes as saviour, brother, friend, and healer. His life and his presence are to be found here, recognized by faith, and gratefully acknowledged. Through the presence of the risen Lord, the communicant is fed as a member of the family of God and strengthened by the grace of the Holy Spirit.

4. The identification of the bread and wine with Christ's body and blood is to be understood, in his own words, as related to the acts of eating and drinking as he commanded, and to receiving by faith with thanksgiving the benefits of his saving death

and resurrection. It is desirable, therefore, that the words used in the administration of the sacrament do not reflect a static and limited view of the personal presence of Christ, but rather a recognition of an encounter in grace with the living Lord.

In the words of Richard Hooker, "What these elements are in themselves, it skilleth not, it is enough that to me which take them they are the body and blood of Christ," and "Christ assisting this heavenly banquet with his personal and true presence doth by his own divine power add to the natural substance thereof supernatural efficacy, which addition to the nature of those consecrated elements changeth them and maketh them that to us which otherwise they could not be" (Eccl Pol. v.lxvii, 12, 11).

[COMMENT]

In section 2 above we may discern Dix's famous "fourfold shape" of the eucharist, sometimes described as "taking", "blessing/thanking" "breaking", and "giving". Although all these actions are dominical it is not clear to what extent actual liturgies ever conformed to this, and there are a number of problems with it, in particular Dix's identification of the "taking" with the offertory, something which has tended to be avoided in modern liturgies, in which the "taking" is a preliminary to the "blessing/thanking", and the "breaking" is a preliminary to the "giving" of the elements. Reference to these actions is significant not only in terms of the practicalities of eucharistic presidency but also in their provision of a context for the eucharistic prayer itself of which the two main parts are thanksgiving and supplication. And there is the overall context of the two main parts of the eucharist as a whole, consisting of Word and Sacrament.

One can make a case that the reference to "remembrance", rather muted in this document at a time when the memorial was to a very large extent a focus of eucharistic thought and practice is lacking in fullness here, and its corporate character is not emphasized. Essentially, we are speaking of a corporate act of remembrance, the concept itself being understood in a very strong sense. Such an emphasis, which is a feature of modern eucharistic liturgy is a necessary corrective to the individualism seen in a great deal of eucharistic piety. This could also be deemed a weakness in Holy Communion One, the traditional Prayer Book rite in which, although the use of "we" rather than "I" is general, seems at its heart – namely the administration – to be a matter of each individual person making his or her communion. Such individualism seems to be implied even in the quotation from Richard Hooker given as a footnote in the document.

D. Sacrifice³⁹

The Power of Sacrifice⁴⁰

I. Sacrifice is a central theme in the Bible and in Christian tradition. It points to the cost of obedience, even to death on a cross. In Christ is revealed the self-giving love of God, love which gives of God's own self. Through the Spirit, this love reaches into the heart of human living and dying, calling forth the faithful witness of those who follow Christ even to death. It is seen in the living sacrifice of dedicated self-offering which serves others. Sacrifice was an integral part of the everyday life of ancient Israel, as it is of much of African life and of the life of other cultures today. Even in modern secular societies, sacrificial ideas continue. For example, parents "make sacrifices" for their children; athletes, to win prizes; and soldiers, in the bloody business of war. Sacrificial imagery is not nice: it entails cost, passion, blood, sweat, and screams. It also calls forth extremes,

whether of enthusiastic celebrations or life-giving loyalties. It can also fuel dangerous ideological extremes and encourage abuse. Sacrifice is a concept full of power!

2. How then does sacrifice relate to Christian faith? God in Christ has done what we could not do for ourselves. Taking on our fragile form, Christ entered into the depth of our predicament to restore us to God. Freely giving up his own self, he was given over to suffering and death so that we might live. In this passion, Christians have come to see expressed the self-giving love of God, a love which took the first steps towards us. In trying to express the profound truths represented here, the Scriptures take up a whole range of images from life—the battlefield, courtroom, market, and household, for example. Prominent among these are sacrificial concepts, drawn from both the life of Israel and the Graeco-Roman world. These concepts are often transformed in their Christian use. This rich range of imagery points clearly and decisively to Jesus Christ, crucified and risen, as the Way in and through whom sins are forgiven, relationship with God is restored, and the promise through the Spirit of a new creation is anticipated.

2 See Ian Bradley, *The Power of Sacrifice* (London, 1995).

[COMMENT]

These expository paragraphs are helpful in making the concept of sacrifice meaningful in a world which is full of suffering, some of it voluntary, on behalf of others. And the thought of innocent suffering is one that troubles very many people.

Sacrifice and Atonement⁴¹

3. The language of sacrifice in the Scriptures covers a wide range of ideas. It cannot be brought under a single definition or concept, since it was performed with a variety of different rites and these rites express a variety of motivations. None of these practices initiated a relationship with God nor provided for the forgiveness of sins. They were means of furthering and deepening the covenant relationship initiated by God, which was to be lived out in a sacrificial, just lifestyle of obedience to God's law.

4. The depth of what relationship with God entails is seen in the rites of the day of atonement, which provided annually for the restoration of a disobedient people. What is striking about these rites is that they break out of the usual categories and customs of sacrifice. Neither of the two animals involved is burned on the altar: the one over which Israel's sin is confessed dies in the wilderness; the one from which a few drops of blood are taken into the Holy of Holies is burned outside the camp. There is a profound mystery indicated here. How the Holy One forgives sin remains unknown, but the reality of forgiveness is proclaimed with deep seriousness. It is these - rites which Hebrews takes up in seeking to plumb the depths of Christ's atoning work. Christ takes on the role of both animals, and that of the high priest, bringing his own blood into the holy place of God's own presence (Heb. 9-10). The language of atonement thus has a unique function in pointing to Christ, interpreting for us the meaning of his saving action in restoring us to communion with God.

In the Hebrew Scriptures there were two kinds of gift-sacrifices: holocausts ('olah), and vegetable or cereal offerings (minhah). To make a "whole burnt offering" ('olah) was to dedicate oneself to God at significant cost, an idea taken up by Paul in speaking of Christians as "living sacrifices" (Rom 12:1-2). The gift of God's well-being was celebrated in the "peace meal" (sh'iamim) of a community, while "cereal offerings" (minhah) were made in grateful thanks for the bounty of harvest. In order that the people

might approach God with confidence, "sin" (hatta'th) and "guilt" ('risham) offerings dealt with unwitting religious and civil wrongs. Israel's identity as a people was commemorated in the annual passover rites, involving a range of sacrificial acts.

Yom kippur (Lev. 16).

5. Other New Testament writers describe such notions of atonement in terms of "hilasterion," rites which in the Graeco-Roman world were thought to appease angry deities. The performing of these rituals held the hope that the gods concerned would cease to take an interest in those so involved. Such ideas, dangerous and revolting as they were in the light of the revelation of God to Israel, were common in the world of the first-century church, which dared to take them up to express the profound depth of God's act of reconciliation in Christ. In so doing, at least two transformations were made to the hilasterion concept: the initiative is spoken of as lying with God, not the worshipper (cf. Rom. 3:25), and its motive is changed from one of appeasement to self-giving love. "In this was love, not that we loved God, but that God loved us, and sent his Son to be the 'hilasterion' for our sins" (1 John 4:10). Such an act of atonement has two closely related aspects: it requires a response—"beloved, if God loved us so much, we ought also to love one another"—and it was made "not for us only, but also for the sins of the whole world" (1 John 2:2).

The term "hilasterion" is difficult to translate. "Expiation," the removal of an offence, does not bring out the change of personal relationships involved. "Propitiation," on the other hand, while describing a relationship, is so tied up with ideas of appeasement as to be distorting. Moreover, neither word conveys much to many English speakers today. "Atoning sacrifice" is perhaps the best modern equivalent, picking up the use of hilasterion to refer to the "mercy seat" in Hebrews 9:5.

[COMMENT]

It is helpful that the difficulty of translating the biblical words for atonement, particularly in the New Testament, is faced here, and the present writer's reservations about 'propitiation' have been expressed earlier in this current work. It may not be without significance that it is difficult to find any authoritative modern translation of the Bible which uses the words 'propitiate', 'propitiation', although one takes the point that atonement has a personal dimension, and is not to be understood as a kind of impersonal transaction.

*Eucharistic Sacrifice*⁴²

6. When the language of sacrifice is applied to the eucharist, it should be clearly distinguished from the language of atonement. What the Son of God did in his taking of our flesh, and free self-giving in death, was to make full atonement for the sins of the whole world. As the Book of Common Prayer puts it, "he made there by his one oblation of himself once offered, a full, perfect and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world." The images here may be mixed, but they make it unambiguously clear that Jesus Christ did wholly and completely for the human race what we could not do. He died for our sins, and lives to restore us to God. Any idea of "eucharistic atonement" would detract from the completeness of Christ's atoning work. In and through the Spirit of grace, however, we are called to respond to Christ in sacrificial self-giving, a response focused and expressed in the "perpetual memorial of that his precious death until his coming again." It is from this perspective that the eucharist may

properly be described as a "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving." "Eucharistic sacrifice" is our glad response to God in Christ.

This distinction can also be illustrated from the experience of societies where sacrifice continues as a regular part of daily life. For example, in Nigeria some tribes practice two basic types of sacrifice: acts of appeasement, and feasts of - thanksgiving for the successful outcome of the act. This carries analogies with the rites of Israel, and is useful for distinguishing between the finished work of Christ and our celebration of it in a sacrificial thanksgiving meal. See Solomon Amusan, "Sacrifice in African Traditional Religion as a means of Understanding Eucharistic Theology," in this volume.

7. The sacrificial images reflected in the Scriptures are taken up in all sorts of ways in Christian life and worship. In the celebration of the eucharist, sacrificial language describes our response to God's self-giving in Christ in a variety of ways.

a) Firstly, the language of sacrifice describes the whole rite, and includes such elements as the offering of prayers, money, food and drink, and other gifts in response to the proclaimed Word of God, and offering ourselves as "living sacrifices" in response to our feeding upon Christ.

b) Secondly, when we not only "say," but "do" as Christ commanded, taking bread and wine, offering thanks, and receiving them, we join in the actions of a sacrificial meal. We "surrender" bread and wine for God's use, eating and drinking at peace with God and one another in Christ's presence.

c) Thirdly, in the great prayer of thanksgiving, we associate the bread and cup with our sacrifice of praise. The particular words used will distinguish the unique atoning work of Christ from our present sacramental sacrifice which commemorates it, but no one formula is necessary. A particular pattern which commends itself to many is the idea that, in the eucharist, the Church continues to look to its great High Priest, the risen Lord who pleads his one perfect and completed atoning sacrifice. This links with the "day of atonement" language of Hebrews noted earlier, and with the present sacrificial dimension of the church's responsive offering of praise and thanksgiving.

8. Historically, and in current ecumenical discussion, the use of the language of "propitiation" in relation to the eucharist has raised significant problems. This is illustrated by the strong support for such language by Roman Catholic authorities, on the one hand, and its equally firm rejection by Christians who espouse the importance of substitutionary atonement, on the other hand. These difficulties can only be overcome by carefully distinguishing between Christ's atoning work on the one hand and the church's eucharistic response on the other hand. It is useful, therefore, to distinguish "eucharistic atonement" from "eucharistic sacrifice." The former blurs the "primary" atoning work of Christ with the church's "secondary" appropriation of its benefits and must be rejected. If this distinction is clearly made, the way is left open for using the language of "eucharistic sacrifice" as a rich way in which the atoning passion of the living Christ is sacramentally remembered before God and lived out in passionate lives of self-giving love.

9. It is recognized that, in the modern world, language about sacrifice, especially when expressed in terms of self-giving, can be perceived as oppressive. Victims of abuse—one ethnic group by another, children abused by adults (physically, emotionally, and sexually), women and men by their partners—can experience the language of sacrifice as a reinforcement of their oppression and even as implying that God or the Gospel requires

them to endure it. For this reason, great care and sensitivity is required in the way in which we use such concepts.

[COMMENT]

There is an ever-present danger of the misuse of the language of “substitution”, which in sermons and hymns can go far beyond what Scripture implies. Clearly, there is an element of “substitution” when something is done by one person on behalf of another, and there is also a legitimate sense in which people have been known to take upon themselves the consequences of the wrongdoing of others; and this is seen to a supreme degree in the unrepeatable self-offering of God in Christ on Calvary’s Cross. But it is not difficult to slip from this into the concept of the appeasing of an angry deity who has to punish someone and does this to Jesus in place of doing it to us. It is difficult to describe such a concept as other than sub-Christian and there would be no place for such a concept in the liturgy of the Church.

*E. Memorial: Memory, Time, and Redemption*⁴³

1. When Jesus commanded his disciples to "do this in remembrance of me" (1 Cor. 11:25), they responded by drawing the eucharist into their own corporate memory." It is here that the Church finds its God-given identity re-affirmed, an identity initiated by God and inaugurated at baptism.

2. Much attention has been focused in the human sciences on the "collective unconscious" as the context for individual and community growth. When, in the eucharist, the church celebrates the memorial of our redemption, the community brings into consciousness the story of salvation with all its saving power. "Memory" here is a dynamic concept which looks back to the cross and forward to the end of all things. This approach can enlarge our understanding of the eucharist as an "anamnesis" of God's saving acts. There are several Eastern eucharistic prayers in which the Church "remembers" both the cross and Christ's return in glory. In this way, the eucharist unlocks the memory of God before his people.

3. There are a number of important implications which this approach provides for a renewed understanding of the eucharist.

a) Firstly, it means that the Lord's Supper is both a part of time and history and also a window into eternity, because God's view on us is one that sees history whole, and not partial.

b) Secondly, the memorial itself, the motivation to celebrate the eucharist, is tinged with sacrifice, but always of a secondary, derivative character, because the one sacrifice is that which Christ has offered for us all. This means that our memory, scarred by human sin, can find a new wholeness at that table, as those memories are not only reconciled but redeemed—another costly triumph of Christ in human lives.

c) Thirdly, the eucharist has a specific ministry to human memory, in which the essential movement of sacrifice finds an important place. Local communities and individuals, indeed, the whole church, come before God to offer their memory, which is both broken and redeemed, an offering which is part of Christ’s intercession at the Father’s right hand. So Christians are fed as they move out of the past, through the present, into the future – God’s future.

(d) Fourthly, the meeting of time and eternity at the eucharist provides a means whereby the Christian community offers itself (Romans 12:1) in a way that has been described as

“entering into the movement of Christ’s self-giving to the Father”. What this means is that the people of God are enabled to claim for themselves the implications of Christ’s unique work on the cross at every single eucharist, no matter when, or where, or indeed in what kind of circumstances it takes place. Indeed, that very universal provision is yet one more characteristic of the all-pervading grace of God himself.

' See Augustine, *On the Trinity* 14.

[COMMENT]

It is helpful to set the eucharistic memorial within the context of human memory, and this ties in with a more recent study by Peter Atkins, entitled, *Memory and Liturgy* (Ashgate, 2004). However, there is also a continuing need to focus attention upon the particular kind of liturgical remembering which takes place in the eucharist within which individual remembering is subordinated to the corporate act of liturgical memorial as mandated by Jesus.

F. Creation, Re-Creation and Eschatology.⁴⁴

F. Creation, Re-creation, and Eschatology

1. The purpose of God in history is to sustain the created world and women and men made in God's image. Creation itself is the work of the Trinity; the Father creates through the Son and the Spirit.
2. The Church at the eucharist is a microcosm of the creation as it celebrates the divine purpose both in creation and in redemption. The Church voices with creation and on behalf of creation the divine praises.
3. As material things become the vehicles of divine grace, so we are recalled to our responsibility to the creation, to care for and exercise stewardship towards the resources of the earth. The gifts of bread, wine, water, and other offerings witness to our grateful dependence on God. In Africa, for instance, it is common for a variety of gifts to be presented as symbols of thanksgiving. While it is appropriate that a prayer should be provided for the presentation of the offerings of the people, the preparation of the gifts is preparatory to the main eucharistic action, and such prayer should not trespass on the ground of the eucharistic prayer.
4. The eucharistic celebration manifests the worth of human beings created in God's image and redeemed by God's love. The eucharistic bread and cup are distributed equally to all as sign and symbol of the equal worth of all people in the sight of God. This demonstrates the dignity bestowed by God on all as sons and daughters, and celebrates the forgiveness, acceptance, and empowering wrought through Christ's sacrifice. The missionary power of the sacrament lies in this demonstration of the free grace of God offered to all people.
5. Although the Church witnesses to the goodness of God in creation, the disintegrating effect of rebellion against God means that, along with human enslavement to sin and death, in St. Paul's words, the creation itself is in "bondage to decay." The Gospel is cosmic in its scope, embracing the salvation of humanity, but also the hope of the liberation of the creation from its bondage to share "in the glorious liberty of the children of God" (Rom. 8:21). The gift of the Spirit is a deposit guaranteeing this inheritance, the first-fruits of God's new creation in Christ. The eucharist celebrates and proclaims the victory of Christ over sin and death, The invocation of the Spirit on the action of the

eucharist is a pledge of the transformation of the communicants, and also of the transformation of all creation, as gifts of God's creation become our spiritual food. The epiclesis embraces petition for the unity of the Church through the Spirit; this is both a prayer for the present and for the eschatological gathering of all the people of God in Christ.

6. The eucharist is therefore an eschatological sign of God's new creation in Christ by the power of the Spirit. In this sense, it is intimately linked to baptism. Baptism is the primary sacrament of the making of the eschatological community. In baptism, Christians are born again and re-imaged; they become a new creation. The eucharist calls out and renews the baptized community. It celebrates the kingdom values and demands of love, justice, and mercy and prefigures the feast of the kingdom in which those values find their ultimate and perfect expression. It challenges Christians to live the present in anticipation of the future, and to respond as instruments of that future. It witnesses to the strand in the Gospel tradition that points to the eschatological vindication of the poor and oppressed, and so presents to the Church the divine mandate for justice.

[COMMENT]

The focus of this present study had necessarily been on certain very contentious areas of eucharistic doctrine, especially presence and sacrifice. It is particularly helpful that the 1995 document of the Working Group on the Theology of liturgy broadened its horizons to speak of the eternal purpose of God for the whole of humanity and to recover the eschatological element which was present in the understanding of the eucharist from the earliest period of the church's history, and to attempt to have a vision of the kingdom, for which we so constantly pray not only in the Holy Communion, but whenever we say the Lord's Prayer. And the imagery of the "feast" is helpful in that the eucharist is essentially a sacred meal enabling an experience of fellowship in Christ which is an anticipation of heaven.

PRINCIPLES AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The 'Principles and Recommendations' were approved by the Conference as a whole, following circulation of a draft version. It may be seen that these are of a very general character and necessarily lack the detail of the reports of the Working Groups.

1. In the celebration of the eucharist, all the baptized are called to participate in the great sign of our common identity as the people of God, the body of Christ, and the community of the Holy Spirit. No baptized person should be excluded from participating in the eucharistic assembly on such grounds as age, race, gender, economic circumstance, or mental capacity.

[COMMENT]

To some extent the approach here usefully complements the emphasis upon a 'baptismal ecclesiology' which tends to overlook the significance of the eucharist in expressing and maintaining the identity of the Church as a corporate entity.

The second part of this statement is revolutionary in that it would place infant communion on the same theological basis as infant baptism, such as this appears to have existed in the early Church and still is standard practice in Eastern Orthodoxy but not in Roman Catholicism nor in the Churches of the Reformation. It tends to establish a principle that sacramental initiation is complete in baptism which tends to leave confirmation as a pastoral rite with little initiatory significance. But, given that the Revised Catechism, permitted in the Church of Ireland, regards confirmation as one of the "sacramental ministries of grace", it does appear,

in the laying on of hands with prayer, to have at least a quasi-sacramental significance, and it would also be difficult to maintain that a renewal of baptismal vows has no implications within the totality of the process of becoming a Christian. Perhaps the best way of resolving the issue is to say that baptism is the effectual sign of the totality of initiation but that the rite of confirmation or its equivalent expresses and enables some aspects of the baptismal mystery to be more fully expressed and assimilated. This remains of obvious relevance in the case of the confirmation of those baptized in infancy.

2. In, through, and with Christ, the assembly is the celebrant of the eucharist. Among other tasks it is appropriate for lay persons to play their part in proclaiming the word, leading the prayers of the people, and distributing communion. The liturgical functions of the ordained arise out of pastoral responsibility. Separating liturgical function and pastoral oversight tends to reduce liturgical presidency to an isolated ritual function.

[COMMENT]

The concept of the assembly as “the” celebrant of the eucharist is problematic as the assembly consists of members of the church (plural). All of these are involved in the “celebration” and those who have specifically been entrusted, as priests, with the eucharistic presidency do so not only in relation to the particular assembly but as representative ministers of the whole church and of Christ who is the Priest and Victim in every celebration. The ambiguity of the declaration is shown in the post-conference discussion, involving Bishop Colin Buchanan as to whether it gives authority to “lay” celebration. The consensus seems to have been that this was not what was in view.

The link between pastoral responsibility and liturgical function is one which is evident in the Ordination Rites of the Church (Ordination Services One and Two in the 2004 Prayer Book). But there are many circumstances in which the link cannot be fully expressed, an obvious example being where retired clergy are taking services in various places on an occasional basis and no longer have pastoral responsibility in a parish.

3. The Church needs leaders who are themselves open to renewal and are able to facilitate and enable it in community. This should affect the liturgical formation of laity and clergy, especially bishops as leaders of the local community. Such continuing formation is a priority and adequate resources for it should be provided in every province.

[COMMENT]

Much depends upon the priority given to liturgical formation by those in leadership positions both at provincial and at diocesan levels.

4. In the future, Anglican unity will find its liturgical expression not so much in uniform texts as in a common approach to eucharistic celebration and a structure which will ensure a balance of word, prayer and sacrament, and which bears witness to the catholic calling of the Anglican Communion.

[COMMENT]

The principle of a common approach to eucharistic celebration and a structure that ensures balance of word, prayer and sacrament, not only has been increasingly implemented within Anglicanism, but also may be seen in the family likeness between eucharistic rites in a number of different denominations, partly as the fruit of the theological agreement embodied in Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry (B.E.M.). Some liturgical borrowing as in the use by the Church of Ireland of the main form of the eucharistic in *An Australian Prayer Book* of 1978 for its Eucharistic Prayer Two has also taken place. The emphasis on the “catholic calling” underlines the character of Anglican Christianity as an embodiment of the “catholic” or

universal church.

5. The sacrificial character of all Christian life and worship must be articulated in a way that does not blur the unique atoning work of Christ. Vivid language, symbol, and metaphor engage human memory and assist the eucharistic action in forming the life of the community.

[COMMENT]

There appear to be two separate issues here, first of the safeguarding of the “once for all” of the sacrifice of Christ on Calvary’s cross as that in which in Christ God was reconciling the world to himself, and second, the manner of celebration which is not a matter simply of the reading of texts but of imaginative and meaningful liturgical acts.

6. In the eucharist, we encounter the mystery of the triune God in the proclamation of the word and the celebration of the sacrament. The fundamental character of the eucharistic prayer is thanksgiving, and the whole eucharistic prayer should be seen as consecratory. The elements of memorial and invocation are caught up within the movement of thanksgiving.

[COMMENT]

It is satisfactory that the Trinitarian emphasis in the report of the Working Group on the theology of the eucharist has been taken out, together with the use of the word “mystery” in the proper sense. However, the Trinitarian structure of the eucharistic prayer is not mentioned here.

7. The embodied character of Christian worship must be honoured in proclamation, music, symbol, and ritual. If inculturation is to be taken seriously, local culture and custom which are not in conflict with the Gospel must be reflected in the liturgy, interacting with the accumulated inculturation of the tradition.

[COMMENT]

Although the way in which local customs and circumstances can affect the celebration of the liturgy was discussed at the Working Group on theology, the only extensive treatment was that by Solomon Amusan. A number of issues remained to be sorted out, in particular whether the use of bread and wine where not the local festive food should invariably be used, is not one where much progress has been made.

8. The eucharistic action models the way in which God as redeemer comes into the world in the Word made flesh, to which the people of God respond by offering themselves – broken individuals – to be made one body in Christ’s risen life. This continual process of transformation is enacted in each celebration.

[COMMENT]

The analogy of the incarnation is helpful, although there needs to be caution lest the concept of the eucharist as an “extension of the incarnation”, with all its attendant problems should reappear.

9. Celebrating the eucharist involves both reaffirming the baptismal commitment to die to self and be raised to newness of life and embodying that vision of the kingdom in searching for justice, reconciliation, and peace in the community. The Spirit who calls us into one body in Christ equips and sends us out to live this divine life.

[COMMENT]

It is helpful to have the connection between baptismal and eucharistic theologies underlined in this way; and it is also good to stress the service of God in the world so that his kingdom may come, “on earth as in heaven”, as we live out our Christian lives

NOTES ON PART 7 (1)

¹There seem to have been seventy-two participants as well as a few additional people from the Church of Ireland who were present at one time or another including Archbishop Robin Eames and various helpers at the Church of Ireland celebration of the eucharist.

²Op. cit. p.7f

³This very valuable publications comprised two Conference Papers and fifteen Short Essays on Particular Issues, subject areas relevant to the theology of the eucharist including;

"Eucharistic Prayers, Past, Present and Future" by Thomas Talley.

"Issues around Ministry and Eucharist" by Paul Bradshaw and John Gibaut

"Eucharistic Consecration, the Role of the Institution Narrative in the Eucharistic Prayer"

"Supplementary Consecration" by William Crockett.

"Penance and the Eucharist" by David Holeton.

"The Epiclesis and the Role of the Holy Spirit in the Eucharistic Prayer" by David Kennedy.

"Communion without a Priest?" by Harold Miller and Philip Tovey

"The Eucharistic Species and Inculturation" by Juan Quevedo-Bosch

"Mission and Liturgy" by Charles Sherlock

"Offering and Sacrifice" by Kenneth Stevenson and Bryan Spinks.

⁴*Our Thanks and Praise*, Op. cit. p.15f

⁵Op. cit. p.17f

⁶Op. cit. p.18.

⁷Op. cit. p.19f

⁸The Epistle of Ignatius of Antioch to the Philadelphians, IV, 1, in the Loeb Classical Library, *Apostolic*

Fathers I, tr. Kirsopp Lake, Heimann and Harvard University Press, 1912 and numerous reprints, p143,

Be careful, therefore, to use one Eucharist (for there is one flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, and one cup, for union with his blood, one altar, as there is one bishop with the presbytery and the deacons my fellow servants) in order that whatever you do you may do it according unto God.

⁹Apologia 1 lxxv, H. Bettenson ed., *Documents of the Christian Church*, OUP, 1943 and numerous reprints, pp93-4

¹⁰*Our Thanks and Praise*, op. cit. p.22f

¹¹Op. cit. p.24f

¹²BCP 2004, p.368, Par 5,

EMERGENCY BAPTISM. In the case of urgent necessity it is sufficient to name the candidate and pour water on the person's head, saying,

... I baptize you in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit.
Amen

Suitable prayers and the Lord's prayer should be said.

¹³*Our thanks and Praise*, op. cit. p33f

¹⁴Op. cit p35f

¹⁵The Church of Ireland's solution to the problem of supplementary consecration is as follows (BCP,

2004 p240,

When the Consecrated Elements are insufficient

If either of the consecrated elements is insufficient, the presiding minister adds further bread or wine, silently, or using the following words:

Father,

having given thanks over the bread and the cup
according to the institution of your Son Jesus Christ,
who said, Take, eat, this is my body.

and/or

Drink this, this is my blood.

We pray that this bread/wine also may be to us his body/blood,
To be received in remembrance of him.

to be received in remembrance of him.

This could be termed "consecration by addition", and even when the addition is silent, the action is to be understood according to the prescribed wording.

¹⁶BCP 2004, pp419-420.

¹⁷*Our thanks and Praise*, op. cit. p.41f

¹⁸Lucien Deiss, *Early Sources of the Liturgy*", p40.

¹⁹Dr Clark, reduced to lay state but in good standing with his church was later Reader in Religious Studies in the Open University and was the present writer's internal supervisor and principal examiner for the latter's doctoral thesis entitled, *The Theological Implications of Recent Liturgical Revision in the Church of Ireland*, 1987. His conservative stance was evident not only in his *Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation*, op. cit, but in his earlier, *Anglican Orders and Defect of Intention*, Longmans, Green & Co. 1956. The present writer's divergence from him relates not to matters of historical fact but to theological presuppositions such as those outlined in relation to the eucharist at the beginning of this study. Different presuppositions lead necessarily to different conclusions'.

²⁰Significant in this regard are statements of the faith which in the form in which they are made are liable, to say the least, to misinterpretation. For example there is a statement from the documents of Vatican 2, *Sacrosanctum Concilium*, 47 which says,

At the Last Supper, in the night in which he was betrayed our Saviour instituted the Eucharistic sacrifice of his body and blood, by which he would *perpetuate the sacrifice of the cross* through all ages until his coming, and thereto entrust to his beloved spouse, the Church, a memorial of his deeds and resurrection.

The sacrifice of the cross took place once and for all, and it is difficult to see in what sense it can legitimately be said to be "perpetuated" by the church As the finished sacrifice, eternally presented before the Father, by the Son, "who ever lives to make intercession for us" its efficacy remains undiminished and depends upon what he has done and is doing rather than upon what the church does. The church's memory of the sacrifice is, however dependent upon the commemoration which lies at the heart of the eucharist when it is remembered before God in thanksgiving and supplication in obedience to the command to "do this in remembrance of me".

In another text, *Lumen gentium*, 28 the Council likewise affirmed that the priests of the new

testament "re-present and apply the one sacrifice of the new testament, until the Lord shall come again: the sacrifice namely, of Christ in his offering of himself once for all to the Father as the spotless victim." It is helpful that the "once for all" is mentioned here but the eucharistic offering does not "do" anything to the sacrifice, but remembers it before God when it is proclaimed by the church.

A third text, from *Presbyterium Ordinis*, 2 affirms that "Through the ministry of the priests, the spiritual

sacrifice of the faithful is perfected, being united with the sacrifice of Christ, the only mediator, which through the hands of the priests is bloodlessly and sacramentally offered in the Eucharist, in the name of the whole Church, until the Lord himself comes again." But the offering is not only "in the name of the whole Church, but is made *by* the whole church, clergy and laity in the one Body, and it is not the exclusive preserve of those in priests' orders. The priests can do this only in a representative capacity.

²¹*Our Thanks and Praise*, op. cit. p.46f

²²Op.cit. p.49f

²³Op. cit. p.115f

²⁴Op.cit.p.117f

²⁵Op. cit. p.121f

²⁶Op cit. p.126f

²⁷Op. cit. p.129f

²⁸Op. cit. p.129f²⁸ Jeremy Taylor, *The Worthy Communicant* (London, 166) p.75

²⁹*Our Thanks and Praise*, op. cit. pp134-5

³⁰ Michael Ramsey, *Be Still and Know: A Study in the Life of Prayer* (London, 1982) p.74

³¹ 2004 Prayer Book p.210 The word "recall" was used originally but "remember" was agreed upon for incorporation into the *Alternative Prayer Book 1984* and passed from there to the new Prayer Book. ³²*Our Thanks and Praise*, op. cit. p.141f.

³³Op. cit p.264f

³⁴Op. cit. p.265f

³⁵Op. cit. p.265f

³⁶Op. cit. p.268f

³⁷2004 Prayer Book, p.267

³⁸*Our Thanks and Praise*, op. cit. p.269f

³⁹Op. cit p 271.

⁴⁰Ibid.

⁴¹Op. cit. p.272

⁴²Op. cit. p.273

⁴³Op. cit. p.276.

⁴⁴Op. cit. p.277

⁴ ⁵Op. cit. pp261-263.

**CHAPTER THREE, ASSESSMENTS,
PART 7(2)
CURRENT ANGLICAN THINKING ON THE EUCHARIST:
RECENT ANGLICAN LITURGICAL THINKING**

PREQUEL

One of the leading Anglican theologians of the second half of the twentieth century was the Evangelical missionary and scholar, Bishop Stephen Neill, whose admirable books, for example, *Christian Faith Today* and *Anglicanism* are still, in the present writer's view, well worth reading. Although he was not primarily a liturgist he reflected a lot on this area and contributed an article on "The Holy Communion in the Anglican Church" to a proto-ecumenical publication edited by Hugh Martin under the title *The Holy Communion — A Symposium* (SCM 1947)¹, part of which may serve as a useful starting point to much more recent Anglican liturgical thinking. This covered both what Anglicans had in common among themselves and also identified some of the divergences, which may be said to have been part of the problem ever since, and not only among Anglicans but in terms of the ecumenical movement. He said that there would be very few Anglicans who would not agree to the following propositions:²

1 The Holy Communion was instituted by Christ Himself for the perpetual remembrance of His death and passion. St Paul has rightly understood the mind of Christ; in the celebration of the Eucharist the Church of Christ is carrying out a command and purpose of our Lord Himself.

2 Holy Communion, like Baptism, is *generally necessary to salvation*. This means, not that it is impossible to be saved without it — otherwise it would be necessary to deny the salvation of all Quakers and members of the Salvation Army, as those bodies have abandoned the Christian Sacraments — but that it is intended for all men, and that those who neglect it do so at their own peril and to their own great spiritual loss.

3 The Holy Communion is *a means of grace*; that is, it is not a process of self-edification, in which the initiative is taken by the worshipper, it is a gift, in the giving of which the initiative is taken by God.

4. The gift, or inward part, or thing signified I the Holy Communion is the Body and Blood of Christ, which are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper (*Church Catechism*). When it comes to precise theological definition of the nature of the gift, the means by which it is conveyed, and the sense in which it is received, differences of opinion are revealed; all are at one in the conviction that the gift in the Eucharist is Christ Himself — it is Christ, the Son of God, in all the power of His risen manhood, who comes to dwell with the believer.

5 "The Body of Christ is given, taken and eaten, in the Supper, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner. And the means whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is faith." (Article XXVII). This does not mean that the gift is *created* by the faith of the received, still less that its reality depends on the particular feelings of the individual at the time of receiving it; the gift depends only on the goodwill of God towards man, sealed in the new covenant through Christ's Blood; but it cannot be received by man except through the operation of the Holy Spirit, who conveys all God's gifts to men, and that grace can become effective only where man presents himself to God in humble and adoring faith.

6 By means of reverent participation in the Holy Communion, faith is established, the forgiveness of sins is assured to the penitent, the soul is strengthened and inspired to

follow Christ more nearly, and to serve Him more faithfully.

7 In the service of Holy Communion, the fellowship of Christians in the Church is set forth and made real by the participation in the one Bread and the one Cup; and in the unity of the Sacrament the self-offering of the Church to God, in oneness with the perfect sacrifice of Christ, is made visible and effective.

With regard to the divergence between what he called, "the two wings of the Anglican Communion", in so far as disagreement was more than a difference of emphasis, this would, he thought, be confined to two points only. He summarized these as follows:³

1 *The nature of the presence of Christ in the Sacrament.* Those who adhere to one tradition affirm that it is impossible to localize the presence of Christ in the Holy Communion. Even St Thomas Aquinas states that Christ is not present in the Sacrament *ut in loco*, as in a place. We should, therefore, it is contended, associate the presence of Christ with the whole of the liturgical action in preparation, consecration, communion, oblation, all considered as a single individual act; the presence is that of the living Christ, meeting His worshipping Church, and giving to it the gift of Himself; this presence cannot be confined to or identified with the elements of Bread and Wine, and cannot be held to exist in space and time, otherwise than in the whole act of worship by which the Church is made partaker of Christ. The other school of thought does identify the presence of Christ with the sacred elements, after consecration rightly called the Body and Blood of Christ; through consecration, the physical substances are taken up into the eternal purpose of God, just as the Incarnation the Son of God took to Himself a physical body to manifest Himself within His Church, and it may rightly be said that He is present *under the forms of Bread and Wine*. Before the Consecration, Christ is present as Spirit; after it, He is present personally, and in a sense in which He was not present before. In a Church where the Sacrament is reserved, that Presence continues, and those who approach Christ there draw nearer Him than they can do in any other place.

[COMMENT]

From the standpoint of this present study it would certainly be affirmed that the presence of Christ is presupposed in the celebration as a whole, and there is a Real Presence of Christ in the Word as well as in the Sacrament. The word "in" here does not imply spatial location, but implies that the worshippers, who *are* locally situated, can experience the presence of Christ as Christ's Word is read and preached and the Sacrament is consecrated and distributed. With regard to the latter, it is not, as Bishop Stephen Neill seems to imply that the presence of Christ is ever anything other than "personal", rather that the mode of his eucharistic presence is specifically associated with the Bread and Wine which, as consecrated, are the effectual signs of that presence. The Bread and Wine of the eucharist are given primarily, to be taken and eaten, this being a spiritual meal, but reservation for devotional purposes is a representation of a presence "in with and under" the outward and visible signs of the inward and spiritual gift.

[TEXT]

2. *The nature of the Eucharistic Sacrifice.*⁴ All are agreed that there can be no repetition of the sacrifice of Christ. That was offered once for all, a full perfect and sufficient propitiation for the sins of all men. But there are divergent views as to the nature of the sacrifice offered by the Church in the Holy Communion. On one view, the sacrificial emphasis is threefold, but the sacrifice offered by the Church is single. First, the sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross is made present and contemporary by the consecration of the elements; this is wholly and entirely God's gift of grace to man; there is no sense

in which man offers Christ to the Father. Second, through Communion man receives the benefit of the sacrifice of Christ, and is made partaker of His death and resurrection (This corresponds to the *peace offering* of the Old Testament Law). Third, the members of the Church, now made one afresh with Christ and one another, offer themselves to God to be a lively, holy and acceptable sacrifice to Him. (This correspondence to the *burnt offering* of the Old Testament). The other school, while accepting the Evangelical doctrine just stated, would say that it does not go far enough. Christ's sacrifice on the Cross was offered once for all; yet Christ is still an high priest, He ever liveth to make intercession for His people and is always in the presence of God presenting and pleading His sacrifice on our behalf. What Christ is doing in the heavenly places, the Church in the Eucharist is always doing on earth. There can be no re-enacting of what Christ did on Calvary; but there can be a re-presentation of it upon earth, and in a pleading of the merits of His sacrifice in the presence of God. Since in the Eucharist Christ is actually present, it is possible to speak of the Church as offering Christ to the Father; it is He who is Himself the offering in the eucharistic sacrifice, and that sacrifice is effectual for the cleansing of sin and the setting forward of the cause of the Kingdom of God on earth.

[COMMENT]

The phrase "offering Christ to the Father", used twice by Bishop Stephen Neill, is potentially misleading as it might suggest the mistaken idea that the church can "do" something to Christ. The missing link here is "remembrance" which does not appear anywhere in the bishop's account, which, biblically speaking, is a sacrificial term signifying "remembering before", an ecclesial act in which we offer/present by remembering the once for all sacrifice of Christ on Calvary's cross before the Father in thanksgiving and intercession, this memorial act being accomplished by the Holy Spirit, the eucharistic memorial being an expression in the here and now of the Holy Communion of the eternal relationship of the Holy Trinity, Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. The language of eucharistic sacrifice is not only implied in the dominical words themselves to "do this in remembrance" but is explicitly found in references to the eucharist from the end of the first century onwards, the denial of it except in the most limited sense, being a feature of the Reformation.

RECENT ANGLICAN LITURGICAL THEOLOGY

1 Evangelical Eucharistic Thought in the Church of England,⁵ Christopher J.Cocksworth.

Christopher Cocksworth (at the time of writing, Bishop of Coventry), produced this irenic account of a theology of the eucharist at once evangelical and ecumenical, in 1993. It contains an historical survey, the recent period and a theological analysis, all from the standpoint of an "open" Evangelical. There is only space in this study for an examination of the third section of his book covering "The Eucharist as Sacrament", "The Eucharist as Presence", and "The Eucharist as Sacrifice".

[TEXT]

With regard to "**The Eucharist as Sacrament**"⁶ he speaks of "Justification by faith and the unique experience of the eucharist". He is concerned that Evangelical sacramental history has often been marked by the anomaly of allowing a relatively high potential to the Eucharist in Evangelical theology, whilst restricting it to a relatively low place in practice and says that in much nineteenth-century and twentieth-century writing such theology has emphasized the priority of the Word to such an extent that the Sacrament

was forced into practical redundancy. However, he notes that even J.C. Ryle's antipathy towards the priority given to the Sacrament in Tractarian theology and Ritualistic practice did not stop him from claiming that every "believing communicant" would "find a special presence of Christ in his heart, and a special revelation of Christ's sacrifice of his body and blood to his soul." He seeks to indicate a correspondence between the experience of the Eucharist as unique in Evangelical tradition and the apostolic experience of the Eucharist which helps to justify the claim that it should be dogmatically and practically treated as, in Wesley's words "the grand channel of God's grace." His route to do this is by a careful examination of the Lucan narrative of the resurrection appearance on the way to Emmaus and the Johannine discourse on the bread of life. With regard to Luke Cockswoth said that Luke seems to be reflecting the experience that the fullest apprehension of the reality of God's grace in the crucified and risen Christ is to be expected when the proclamation of the Word is consummated in the breaking of the bread. With regard to the Johannine discourse Cockswoth endorsed the generally accepted view that it falls into two parts. In the first (vv. 25-50), symbolic and sapiential categories are prominent: Jesus is described as the bread of life in whom we must believe. In the second (vv51-59) sacramental categories are dominant: the bread is said to be Christ's flesh and we are told that his flesh is to be eaten. He takes the view that these themes are interpenetrative throughout the passage. This means that on the one hand, the Eucharist is not seen as the only means of union with the saving presence of Christ but, on the other, it is seen as a particular form in which Christ makes himself available to those who are drawn to him by the Father.

[COMMENT]

This seems to the present writer to be a convincing account of the biblical evidence cited, reflecting critical Lucan and Johannine scholarship and showing clearly its relevance to the understanding of the eucharist without getting bogged down in the many contrasting theories about the two passages concerned.

[TEXT]

Looking at the relationship between **Word and Sacrament**⁷ Cockswoth examines the approaches of Edward Schillebeeckx and Karl Rahner and then how the theme is handled in the theology of Thomas Torrance. While expressing some Evangelical reservations about the teaching of the first two, he finds in them helpful pointers to the solution of the problem of explaining and justifying the experience of the Eucharist as the highest means of grace. The first, he says, is their concern to ground the Sacrament in the salvific event of Christ and, therefore, to ensure that the categories employed are fully personal ones. The second is their understanding of the Eucharist as a real act of the living Christ on the basis of his past history and in the context of our present history. The third is their appreciation that this happens in the Church and by means of the Church. The fourth is their insistence that because of the incarnational, historical, and ecclesiological character of God's salvation, the event in which it meets us cannot be merely existential, inward and individual but must be manifested, experienced and expressed in tangible, visible, and concrete forms. The fifth is Miner's delineation of the different phases in the life of God's gracious Word which involve it in varying degrees of realization and intensity. He says the same five emphases are present in the theology of Thomas Torrance but they are framed in a such a way as to avoid the criticisms previously expressed. He says he is not claiming that the Eucharist provides an exclusive ontological reality but rather suggesting that it is given a unique functional force and, therefore, a level of ontological

intensity not ordinarily to be found in the other moments of Christ's activity in the Church.

[COMMENT]

It is hard to do justice to the quality of Cocksworth's exposition in summary form and there is much that is a most positive and helpful line of approach. However, the present writer has a couple of reservations, first in the insistence that the categories of eucharistic discourse in relation to the salvific events of God in Christ must be fully personal. It would certainly be true to say that such terms should be *primarily* personal, but there may well be a place for more abstract expressions. This has, historically, been the case not only in sacramental theology but in the very fundamentals of the church's faith in Jesus as God and man and in the doctrine of the Holy Trinity. The language used, for example, at the Council of Nicaea with its necessary use of the abstract term *homoousios* is a particularly important for the safeguarding of biblical truth, although the term itself is found nowhere in Scripture as its opponents were not slow to point out. Another example is the language used in the Chalcedonian definition of faith which declared that Christ is one Person in two Natures, the Divine of the same substance as the Father, the human as the same substance as us, which are united *without confusion, without change, without division, and without separation*. Similarly, while expressing the truth that the eucharistic presence and offering are those of the risen and ascended Christ, such truths may need to be safeguarded by the use of theologically technical terms. In addition the use of the (very abstract) expression "a level of ontological intensity" is not obviously very clear in its implications, and may be used by him to avoid the affirmation that there is a *change* in what the bread and wine of the eucharist *are* by virtue of their consecration as effectual signs of the Lord's Body and Blood.

With regard to **The eucharist as presence**.⁸ Cocksworth says that the tragedy of Evangelical eucharistic theology is that whilst it has used well its positive resources for affirming the reality of Christ's presence in other spheres of its spirituality, when it has approached the Eucharist it has, at times, turned those resources into polemical negations which have seemed to reduce the reality of the eucharistic presence. With regard to **faith and the eucharistic event**⁹, comparing Evangelical and modern Roman Catholic thinking he says that Roman thought is merely seeking to re-express the doctrine of transubstantiation in categories which make contemporary sense; it does not want to abandon the doctrine. Reformed theology is still critical of the underlying philosophical and theological grammar which means that the literal (rather than analogical) identification of the sign and the signified is left intact in the new translation. However, the shift in emphasis away from either the causal efficacy of the rite itself or its effect on the participants, towards the fact of the salvific encounter with Christ's presence in the Eucharist, means that there is a common concern to rediscover and to re-express the real heart of both the doctrine of transubstantiation and the Reformers' reaction to it - that is, the reality of God's saving gift of Christ's presence with his people.

[COMMENT]

In general this is well said, although there needs to be greater clarity on what is meant by the identification by the Lord himself of the bread and wine of the eucharist with his

Body and his Blood. The term "transubstantiation" is not the essence of the problem — it may be taken as an indication of the change of being consequent upon the change of signification and all that goes with it — of the role and function and purpose of the bread and wine as effectual signs of the Lord's Body and Blood, which, taken together indicate the life of Christ given for us. There must, however, from a non-Roman Catholic point of view, be no suggestion that the bread and wine have ceased to be such on account of their consecration in order to represent Christ under the forms of his sacramental Body and Blood, and it does appear unlikely that there is any way to ensure that the churches — Roman Catholic and non Roman Catholic can be brought to full agreement on this.

[TEXT]

Cocksworth posits a general framework of **grace — faith — Church**.¹⁰ It is, he says, important to make clear that the saving presence of Christ is the content of each stage of the process — in the giving of the grace, in the receiving of the grace and in the contextualizing of the exchange in the being and act of the Church.

[COMMENT]

However, while the matrix within which the church as a community of faith comes into existence is the human response to the proclamation of the Gospel of grace, there also needs to be a recognition that the sacraments of the Gospel — Baptism and Holy Communion are themselves both means of grace and expressions of faith by which the membership of the Church, which is in itself the mystical Body of Christ is established and maintained.

[TEXT]

Speaking of the eucharist in terms of **presence — form — faith**,¹¹ it is, Cocksworth says, in the various contexts which God has set that he gives the saving presence of his Son to our receiving faith, within which the eucharist has a special place. He warns specifically against a situation in which the eucharistic action is often located in the subjective depths of response (faith) rather than the objective heights of gift (grace), a problem he thinks, with much eighteenth and nineteenth century Evangelical thinking. He is concerned that if the essential eucharistic action occurs as the individual remembers and believes in Christ's death, and thereby feeds on him by faith, then the external eucharistic rite and particularly the elements are ultimately superfluous, for the same action can take place without them. He quotes Wesley with approval when he says,¹²

The outward sign of inward grace
Ordained by Christ receive:
The Sign transmits the Signified
The grace is by the means applied.

Cocksworth says that as the Church gathers around the Lord's Table in remembrance of him, believing that this is no ordinary meal in which bread and wine are for the nourishment of the body, but is truly the Lord's Supper, in which bread and wine are a "participation in the body and blood of Christ", we are confronted with the ontological reality of Christ's gift of himself which we may either welcome by faith or reject to our judgement. To welcome the gift by faith means that we must be open to the unconditional terms on which the gift is given — to come "not with any works, or

powers, or merits of one's own, but by faith alone" as Luther said. And as we do so Christ will dwell in our hearts.

[COMMENT]

It is, no doubt, significant that while in classical hymnody the emphasis is on the objectivity of the gift, in much eucharistic piety of the period mentioned by Cocksworth it is much more on the subjectivity of the worshipper.

For example, in the great hymn from the Liturgy of St James (427 in Church Hymnal 5 of the Church of Ireland) the emphasis is entirely on Christ's presence and the eucharistic gift:

Let all mortal flesh keep silence
and with fear and trembling stand,
ponder nothing earthly minded,
for with blessing in his hand
Christ our God to earth descendeth,
our full homage to demand.

King of kings, yet born of Mary,
as of old on earth he stood,
Lord of lords, in human vesture_
in the body and the blood_
he will give to all the faithful
his own self for heavenly food.

And there is the equally great hymn *Pange lingua* by St Thomas Aquinas, (CH 5 437) which includes the words,

Now, my tongue, the mystery telling
of the glorious body sing,
and the blood, all price excelling,
which the whole world's Lord
and King,
in a virgin's womb once dwelling,
shed for this world's ransoming.

Therefore we, before him bending
this great sacrament revere:
types and shadows have their ending
for the newer rite is here;
faith, our outward sense befriending,
makes our inward vision clear.

One may contrast with this, the subjectivity of CH 5, 396

According to thy gracious word,
in meek humility,
this will I do, my dying Lord,
I will remember thee.

Thy body, broken for my sake,
my bread from heaven shall be,
thy testamental cup I take,
and thus remember thee.

It would appear that the only function of the bread and wine of the eucharist here is to remind worshippers of the death of Christ so that they may "remember" him.

[TEXT]

Speaking of **The Humanity of Christ and the Eucharistic Event**¹³, under the sub-heading of *Participation in Christ's humanity* and the arguments among the Reformers about it Cocksworth says that it needs to be stated with absolute clarity that we deal with the whole Christ in the Eucharist. We relate to the person of Christ in his divine humanity, his deified corporeality and his God-man entirety. In relation to *Participation in Christ's humanity at the Eucharist*¹⁴ he is critical of what he terms a tendency amongst Anglican Evangelicals to focus on the Cross rather than the ascension — on proclaiming his death as the beginning of our salvation rather than on celebrating and deepening our participation in his presence before the Father as the ongoing experience of our salvation. Hence, the elements are seen as symbols of the crucified body and blood of Christ rather than as the gift of his glorified presence. With regard to the eschatological dimension of the eucharist he says that just as in the *anamnesis* of his death, the power of the past is present and active amongst us, so in the anticipation of his *parousia* the power of his future is also present and active among us.

[COMMENT]

In this present era (post-resurrection and prior to the second coming) Christians are suspended between the "not yet" and the "but already" represented in the Pauline theology as on the one hand "proclaiming the death" of Christ and yet looking forward "till he comes" in the eucharistic celebration. This paradox must remain at the centre and heart both of our eucharistic theology and of the praxis of our commitment "do this" in remembrance of him.

[TEXT]

With regard to **The Eucharist as Sacrifice**,¹⁵ Cocksworth links the Reformers' rejection of the medieval understanding of the Mass as a sacrifice to a sustained exegesis of the Pauline teaching in Romans of justification by faith. On the Cross Christ offered a perfect sacrifice and thereby effected a complete Atonement. His sacrifice does not need to be offered by the priest in the Mass as a propitiatory sacrifice for the remission of sins; rather, its efficacy needs to be received by faith. Nonetheless he points out that when describing the process through which the effects of Christ's sacrifice are received by faith, the Reformers, the Puritans and the Wesleys at times talked in terms of offering Christ to the Father. It is, however, noticeable that this is mainly through faith and prayers and only in the Wesleys does it seem to be explicitly a *liturgical memorial* and even here one questions whether a reference to a "daily sacrifice" actually indicates a celebration of the Holy Communion:¹⁶

Do as Jesus bids us do,
Signify his Flesh and Blood,
Him in Memorial shew,
Offer up the Lamb to God.

Ye royal priests of Jesus rise,
and join the daily sacrifice
Join all believers, in his Name
To offer up the spotless Lamb.

Cocksworth maintains that the efficacy of Christ's sacrifice is maintained by his eternal presence before the Father. He quotes Wesley as one who could combine a clear concept of the completeness of the Atonement with a vivid sense of Christ's continuing work. Christ pleads his death to the Father — though not for it to be accepted but for it to be applied. He also shows that Reformed theology in Scotland during the twentieth century, e.g. in Thomas Torrance, has made much use of the idea of pleading Christ's sacrifice, "There in heaven is the ascended Lamb Himself ever before the Face of the Father; here on earth is the waiting Church of sinners, with all saints, showing forth His death and pleading his sacrifice." However, he says that Anglican Evangelicals have found the whole notion somewhat alien, their hesitations relating to the fear that ideas of pleading Christ's sacrifice may imply that it has not been fully accepted by God. But he says that to plead by Christ's sacrifice is to appeal to it as the only ground of our salvation. He accepts the concept in Kenneth Stevenson of calling this a "sacrifice of proclamation", this being the same as calling it a "sacrifice of thanksgiving". He says it is a thanksgiving for the completeness of the Atonement and consequently an intercessory plea that we may fully participate in this new age where God has forgiven our wickedness (Jer. 31:34) and where there is no longer any sacrifice for sin (Heb. 10:18). In this sense therefore, it is no longer a cultic act. Later, he speaks of a "sacrifice of identification" (identical to a "sacrifice of thanksgiving") in which we acknowledge that Christ's death was died for us, and also speaks of a "sacrifice of participation in which we give up our claims to independent self-existence and ask that we may share more fully in the life of Christ within his Church.

[COMMENT]

There is clearly much of value here and in the rest of what Cocksworth speaks of which is too lengthy to summarize and deserves to be read in full. However, while avoiding the word "cult" which has negative connotations, it is clear that the context of the founding of the Holy Communion at the Last Supper took place within the tremendous setting of the liturgical observance of the Passover and that the words used, for example, *eis anamnesin* reflecting probably an underlying *lezikkaron* have a very strong liturgical connection and imply a continuation a liturgical memorial centered upon the once for all sacrifice of Christ, and, according to the Pauline account, to be continued until the *eschaton*. Although there is much to applaud in Cocksworth's approach what seems to be missing, in the present writer's view, is a lack of the full sense of the Eucharist as a "memorial before God", although it is recognized that there is a Godward aspect. Just as the Lord's Summary of the Law puts love of God first and love of our neighbour second, so in the church's obedience to the Lord's command to "do this" in remembrance of him, the Godward aspect is properly speaking, primary and the manward aspect, though hugely important, secondary for those who receive the sacramental body and blood as the Lord's gift from him to them. The failure to give the "before God" its proper weight seems to be present writer to be a main flaw in Evangelical thinking, even when as positive as that represented by Cocksworth's writing.

Dealing with "*Sacrifice, priesthood and eucharistic presidency*"¹⁷ Cocksworth stresses the doctrine of the priesthood of all believers but admits that the theological equality amongst Christians does not mean that there can be no liturgical differentiation. He

approves of a differentiation between status and function such as that found in Cranmer who said that the "difference between the priest and the layman in this matter is only in the ministrations; that the priest, as a common minister of the Church, doth minister and distribute the Lord's Supper unto other and the other receive it at his hands." It is through the ministry of the few, as Calvin taught that Christ creates and maintains the whole.

[COMMENT]

It is accepted in this present study that in the New Testament there is no independent caste of ministry which alone has the power to exercise priestly functions since the whole church is a "holy priesthood" and all its members share in this. It is a biblical principle that "to each is given the manifestation of the Spirit for the common good." However, it is also maintained that those who are appointed to the full ministry of the Word and Sacraments which is also a pastoral ministry and indeed may arise from it, do so in a representative capacity. A priestly ministry is representative in a distinct way of Christ the great High Priest, and it is also representative of the Church which is a royal priesthood and a kingdom of priests. And this is not purely a functional matter as what a person does affects what he or she *is*. Insofar as this involves a role which is significantly different from that of a lay person, the priest necessarily *is* different from a lay person - whose priestly character as a member of the royal priesthood must to some extent remain latent, although under certain circumstances (as for example in the baptizing of a baby in the absence of an ordained person) it may be (temporarily and in special circumstances only) actuated. In other words the act of ordination through prayer and the laying on of hands, has ontological implications which is why "once a priest, always a priest", and a person who has served in this capacity during his or her ministry does not cease to be a priest upon retirement but is deemed to *be* a priest as long as he or she lives. Even if lay persons were (as in the Methodist Church) to be permitted under certain circumstances to preside at the Holy Communion, this would not affect the representative character of those who have been ordained to the full ministry of the Word and Sacrament. The present writer would reiterate that he does not regard so-called "lay" celebration as ontologically impossible but would question whether a person who is likely to perform such an office on a regular basis should not be called, assessed, trained and ordained to such a ministry through prayer and the laying on of hands by the bishop. This latter is the norm of ordination in the whole church, but it would also be the view taken by the present writer that the fullness of the Spirit and the power and authority that go with it is bestowed upon the whole church which is thereby enabled and entitled to have discretion over the manner in which its representative ministers are appointed to their office. He would also hold that such discretion necessarily includes the question of who ordains, and the matter, form, and intention which are required for the purpose of ordination.

[TEXT]

Finally, Cocksworth, in this truly impressive work, deals with the issue of "sacrifice and the elements", and he outlines the problems experienced in the Church of England over the oblation of the elements which are an historic feature of liturgies East and West, but became contentious when an attempt was made to include them in the Series Two *anamnesis* in the form "We offer unto thee this bread and this cup". He praises the formula found for the Series Three service, although a leading Evangelical, Bishop Colin Buchanan commented, with some justification that it "defied analysis". The interpretation of the *anamnesis* in the Common Worship Prayer A service seems at least equally opaque with dual reference to "we remember" and then "we make the memorial". It is not clear whether these are two separate acts with the same meaning, two separate

acts with a different meaning, or one single act with two references which may be mutually interpretative. The Holy Communion Two, Eucharistic Prayer One in the Church of Ireland's 2004 Prayer Book is, in this respect and by comparison, a model of clarity.

He turns finally, to the question of self-offering, which is both biblical and historical (St Paul and St Augustine) and is represented in Anglican liturgies from the Cranmer onwards, and in the Churches of England and Ireland, is normally expressed in the post-communion. This is both a central feature of the response of faith to the grace of God and is also particularly appropriate in relation to the feeding on Christ of the Holy Communion and the response to the grace of the experience of his gift of himself to us. This is clearly not the only possible position, but as it seems to meet with widespread acceptance it is perhaps appropriate to leave it as it is.

2. Eucharist and Offering by Kenneth Stevenson¹⁸

Kenneth Stevenson, a leading liturgist who played a significant part in the 1995 Dublin meeting of the Inter-Anglican Liturgical Consultation (I.A.L.C.) on the working group on theology, published his magnum opus *Eucharist and Offering* (Pueblo) in 1986. His criteria, for the theology of sacrifice, worked out in immense detail on the basis of an encyclopaedic knowledge of the history of liturgy, were and remain unusual, based on the concepts of what he called "story", "gift" and "response". His basic presupposition is that *all* kinds of worship are sacrificial, and he claimed the authority of St John Chrysostom for this even extending to the activity for which he is most famous, namely preaching.

By "story" he meant the solemn recital before God of his mighty acts, culminating in the life and work of Christ.¹⁸ He said that obviously story varies in length and style from one tradition to another. The eastern anaphoras knew of no variety *within* the main prayer, although they varied from one prayer to another in the way the story is recounted. On the other hand, the western medieval rites did vary within the anaphora because of the extended use of preface in pointing up certain principal themes for certain days and occasions. But whether there was invariability with a total recitation of salvation history or variability with a single main idea for the particular occasion, the story is still sacrificial because it highlighted the congregation's commitment to certain activities and spiritual insights that were apposite to the occasion. The sacrifice of praise that the Church offers to God, he said, was not just words, mere words, but a solemn commitment to the God who initiates a relationship with his people in order to renew them, pardon them, and help them to grow in the life of faith.

[COMMENT]

It has to be said that the eucharist consists of Word as well as Sacrament and that through the lectionary the mighty acts of God in Christ are read and preached in the context of the whole story of intervention of God in saving history from Abraham onwards. So it is not confined to the eucharistic prayer in the second half of the rite, but very fully expressed according to the lectionary in use in particular churches at particular times and places. For some years the Church of Ireland (following its sister Church, the Church of England) used a "thematic" two-year lectionary, the full readings being printed out in the Alternative Prayer Book of 1984. Later, this was superseded by the Revised Common Lectionary, used also in the Church of England and in a number of other churches world-wide, which contains a three year course of readings, seasonally related, and including in the period covered by the propers of the

ordinary Sundays of the year, both "continuous" and "related" readings. All these readings may be understood not only in terms of edification and information but as proclamatory and doxological in character as the salvation history is rehearsed before the congregations of the Church.

However, there has been a recovery in much modern liturgy of a rehearsal of the mighty acts of God in Christ within various forms of the eucharistic prayers authorized in particular churches. Eucharistic Prayer One in the Church of Ireland's Holy Communion Two is the most traditional of the three included in the 2004 Prayer Book with variations focused on proper prefaces but also represented in collects, post-communions and blessings elsewhere in the rites which may be used with all three eucharistic prayers. Eucharistic Prayer Two is the most comprehensive, not only in its basic form but in the seasonal additions put in at appropriate parts of the prayer as appropriate, and fulfilling Stevenson's concept of "story" to the letter. Eucharistic Prayer Three is fixed in form but covers in language addressed to each of the three Persons of the Holy Trinity in turn the essentials which need to be covered in the sacrifice of thanks and praise.

By "gift" Stevenson meant the way in which prayers described and treat the bread and wine, whether by offering them or by referring to them explicitly or implicitly as gifts.¹⁹ In his opinion gift was the last of the three criteria to enter the early eucharistic prayer explicitly, and that it was a Greek West Syrian and Roman development, which the later medieval West concentrated on in various ways, including that in the liturgy ascribed to Hippolytus:

Remembering his death and resurrection
we offer this bread and cup and we pray..

The presentation of the gifts, he said, acted as a means of linking the institution narrative with the epiclesis, and it recurred in the Greek West Syrian eucharistic prayers with precisely that logic behind it, sometimes with a reference to the gifts in the epiclesis as "presented here". The Roman liturgy took on a different and more complex structure. But not all anaphoras of antiquity contained an explicit "presentation" of the gifts. The eastern prayers, he pointed out, had a variety about them over their treatment of gift. The development of the Western offertory was an example of a further development of the notion of gift, so that by the time of the Reformation, sacrifice and gift were synonymous and (for all practical purposes) excluded the other criteria. He regarded the offertory as essentially preliminary in character.

[COMMENT]

It has been argued, throughout this present study that the eucharist contains both Godward and manward aspects, and explicit offering of the bread and wine may be seen as expressing the Godward aspect of the rite. However, one wonders to what extent Stevenson, unusually for an Anglican, was so emphasizing the Godward aspect that the manward side was in danger of disappearing from view. The Lord's gift of himself to us in the communion of the people has been an essential aspect of all Anglican rites from the Reformation onwards, and, if, as maintained here, Dix's sequence of "taking", "blessing", "breaking" and "giving" still has validity with regard to the "shape" of the liturgy, both aspects of the liturgy find their appropriate expression within these acts. They are not all of the same importance, the "taking" (not to be identified with the offertory) being a preliminary to the "blessing/thanksgiving" and the "breaking" being a preliminary and a means to the "giving" of the bread and wine to the people as effectual signs of the sacramental "body" and "blood" of Christ. There is, therefore, a "giving" of these gifts to the communicants although they may, explicitly or implicitly have

undergone a presentation as part of the eucharistic "remembering before God".

By "Response" Stevenson meant the way in which the Church described what it was doing in the eucharist.²⁰ More precisely, however, it meant what the Church wanted the eucharist to mean and do as the faithful united themselves to the sacrifice of Christ. He pointed out that sacrifice first appeared as a description of the eucharist in the *Didache* (and not in the prayers themselves) in moral context. The sacrifice must be pure and therefore members of the community must be reconciled with one another. Response, therefore, was the "living sacrifice" of the Church and embraced the supplicatory aspects of the eucharistic prayer in the epiclesis and the intercessions. Intercession was seen as part of the sacrificial activity of the Church as it offered its concerns to God and offered the people of God in love and service.

[COMMENT]

In the present writer's view, it is in the *anamnesis* that the Church expresses its understanding of what it means to obey the dominical command to "do this in remembrance of me" and is therefore the first place to look for the particular emphasis of meaning in any particular rite. The response of the Church to the Lord's command must, in the first instance be to perform the rite itself, consisting, so far as the sacramental part of the order of service is concerned, of the "taking and blessing", "breaking and giving" of the bread and wine with an interpretation of the meaning of this. The response of the worshippers must, in the first instance be to receive holy communion, to take and eat, and to receive and drink the consecrated elements, drawing near with faith and receiving the body of our Lord Jesus Christ, given for us, and his blood which he shed for us, remembering that he died for us, and feeding on him in our hearts by faith with thanksgiving. And another important part of the response is thanksgiving for the gift of the spiritual food of the body and blood and the offering of our souls and bodies to be a living sacrifice, and being sent out in the power of the Spirit to live and work to God's praise and glory.

Story, Stevenson said, provides the *context* of the eucharist. **Gift** describes the *material* of the eucharist. **Response** expresses the *action* of the eucharist. But the criteria are not static, since, they develop, they mingle, they sometimes cancel each other out. In the medieval Roman West, story was banished from the anaphora and became part of the allegorical interpretation of the whole of the Mass; response became the psychological devotion of the faithful; gift took first place in the scheme of things, instanced by the elevation of the host. Some, he said, might regard these developments as legitimate; others might prefer something more primitive and wholesome. But the development took place and resulted in fragmentation. The Reformation resulted in the inevitable pendulum swing against gift, although the notion of offertory rose like a phoenix in some quarters, notably among Laudian Anglicans. The sacrificial aroma, he said, appeared to be remarkably adhesive as a useful metaphor to the eucharist, whether it was there from the start, or reappeared in a different form, or was banished (or downgraded or reinterpreted). What he was suggesting in this study was that once we develop a sense of the sacrificial character of the story and the response, and that the sacrifice is in a true sense spiritual, personal and ethical, then gift will look after itself.

[COMMENT]

There are some puzzling expressions in this passage especially in the reference to the elevation of the host which seems to have been to enable the faithful to behold the eucharistic gift for the purpose of adoration and not, specifically, to express the

eucharistic sacrifice. The eucharistic offering is best visually represented by the "Little Elevation" of both bread and cup in the doxology with which the eucharistic prayer concludes when these are raised together or sequentially above the surface of the altar and then replaced. Following the Amen, the celebrant may bow in recognition of the eucharistic presence in a short period of silent worship in which the living Christ who is represented in the consecration of the elements is acknowledged as Saviour and Lord. He may not be present *ut in loco*, as in a place, but we the worshippers *are*.

3. Reconstructing Early Christian Worship.

The present writer is of course, fully aware of a number of extremely valuable writings on the liturgy in recent years by leading liturgical Anglican scholars, including those of Paul Bradshaw and Bryan Spinks, some of them either specifically on the eucharist or inclusive of discussions of the origins of the eucharist, its historical development, and its use within the Anglican liturgical tradition. However, the emphasis in this present study is on the *theology* of the eucharist, and mention of these is made in the bibliography. The present writer is not unaware of the bearing of these on eucharistic theology, and has, as far as possible allowed for this in his own writing. However, for reasons of space only a few general considerations can be mentioned here, all issues which have been raised in Paul Bradshaw's admirable *Reconstructing Early Christian Worship*.²¹

It has been questioned whether Jesus actually instituted the Holy Communion at the Last Supper, and whether this was in fact the Passover. It is, for example, pointed out that St Paul in First Corinthians did not mention that the Holy Communion was in the context of the Passover. There may be a simple reason for this, namely that St Paul was dealing with the abuse of a regular weekly fellowship meal rather than an annual celebration, such as the Passover was. The Synoptic accounts were in the context of a very full treatment of the last week of the earthly life of Jesus, to which a huge amount of space was given. With regard to the authenticity of the Pauline tradition, it is not just that he had been made aware of what happened at the Last Supper. In recounting it he uses terms which were used by the rabbis to express the transmission of an authentic and, in their minds, absolutely reliable tradition, *qibbel* (receive) and *masar* (pass on) in Hebrew, *paralambano* (receive) and *paradidomi* (deliver, pass on) in Greek. The same pair of words is used in 1 Corinthians 15:3, used of the resurrection. In both cases he is speaking with the utmost solemnity of something which is of vital importance to the congregation at Corinth. There is no reason to suppose that the phrase "from the Lord" means "by direct revelation". It also needs to be remembered that on a short number of years had elapsed since the event described, and critical scholarship does tend to overlook the significance of the faculty of memory, so evident in, to give a present-day example, the reminiscences of members of World War 1 (as recorded) and of World War 2 and other conflicts, such of the Falklands which are obviously seared on the minds of those recounting them. Given the trained retentiveness of the minds of people of biblical times, there does not seem any real reason for doubting that in this case we are dealing with the bedrock of biblical tradition.

This is not to say that there are not puzzles and problems with the differences between the four biblical accounts – in the Synoptic Gospels and Paul, but these are not peculiar to accounts of the Last Supper but are found in the traditions of biblical teaching and in the accounts of the actions of Jesus and their sequence between the Synoptic Gospels, and more, largely, in the differences between them and the eucharistic tradition, if such it is,

in John. And there are also issues, highlighted by Paul Bradshaw in *Reconstructing Early Christian Worship*, such as the absence of an Institution Narrative in St John's Gospel, and the Last Supper not being identified as a Passover in the same Gospel. However, it appears to be a characteristic of John that the placing of events is governed to some extent by theology, as for example in the placing of the crucifixion on the day when the sacrificial lambs were being slaughtered – and this in itself seems to be sufficient reason for the Last Supper not being identified as the Passover as this arrangement makes it a day earlier. The absence of an Institution Narrative may possibly be accounted for by the placing of the eucharistic language in John 6 being placed in relation to the Feeding of the Five Thousand. This enables John to emphasize the concept of Christ as the Bread of Life – the Living Bread – drawing upon language derived from the church's experience of the Eucharist. This is without prejudice to the question of whether or not Ch 6: vv52-58 is part of the original Gospel or is a later addition.

With regard to the Synoptic accounts Bradshaw suggests that there may have been a combination of two traditions, and says, that if we separate the eucharistic sayings and the material in which they are embedded from the rest of the Last Supper narratives what we are left with are accounts of a Passover meal containing eschatological statements by Jesus that are complete in themselves, with and no sign of dislocation, and believes that Mark and Luke copied in the eucharistic tradition as they could make it fit and Matthew has edited the original text for the same purpose. There is also the related problem over the long and short MS versions of the Lucan text. However, that there is editorial work is a "given" in all discussions of the Synoptic problem, and it may well be the case that this has thrown up anomalies in this case. The eucharistic traditions have to come from somewhere and it is hard to see any reason why they might have been invented. Presumably we are speaking here of oral tradition and parts of the Last Supper Narrative may have existed as separate independent units which were combined either from memory or from the merging of texts which had come to be written down.

With regard to the meal, Bradshaw, in common with a number of other recent commentators regards the experience of meal fellowship²² as fundamental to the existence of the early Christian Church, and may be regarded as a continuation of that enjoyed, during the course of his earthly ministry between Jesus and his disciples. He attaches a great deal of importance to the concept of feeding on Christ and less to the sacrificial emphasis. It is, no doubt helpful that the meal aspect, so often neglected in Christian thought and practice, for example in the centuries during which the sacrament was received very occasionally in all churches – Roman Catholic, Orthodox, Anglican, Calvinist, Methodist and others in spite of their official principles. But a revival of frequent communion, where this exists, should not be at the expense of the concepts of presence and sacrifice which appear to be implied by the language of flesh-and-blood, body-and-blood, and especially of remembrance (lezzikkaron) convincingly established by an early generation of liturgical scholars and perhaps now in danger of being overlooked. There are a number of aspects of eucharistic theology, of which these are two. But given the difficulties associated with them in Christian history, it is right that their significance should be teased out not least in an ecumenical context.

A valuable recent contribution to liturgical thought and practice is Peter Atkins, *Memory and Liturgy – The Place of Memory in the Composition and Practice of Liturgy*.²³ It would be a very difficult book to summarize within the parameters of the present study, but the breadth and scope of it is indicated by the chapter titles, Discovering How the

Brain Works; Discovering How Memory Works; Remembering God; God's Memory of us; Remembering Jesus Christ; Corporate Memory; Memories of Sin and Pain; Aids to Remembering; Continuity and Change; Memory Imagination and Hope. Conclusion: Practical Issues for Liturgy. The focus of the totality of this book helps to keep in mind the emphasis of the dominical command to "do this" in remembrance of Him.

5. Andrew B. McGowan, *Ancient Christian Worship - Early Church Practices in Social, Historical and Theological Perspective*.²⁴

This highly acclaimed book by the President and Dean of the Berkeley Divinity School, covers, in an original way such issues as the Origins of Christian Worship, Meal: Banquet and Eucharist; Word: Reading and Preaching; Music: Song and Dance, Initiation: Baptism, Anointing and Foot Washing; Prayer: Hours, Ways, and Texts; and Time: Feasts and Fasts. The part most relevant for the purposes of this study is Chapter Two, Meal: Banquet and Eucharist which picks up on a theme increasingly in prominence in recent liturgical study namely that of the meal fellowship of the early Christians indicated at in the summary of their corporate existence in Acts 2:42, "And they continued steadfast in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, in the breaking of bread and the prayers", and with a eucharistic connection hinted at in the narrative of the two friends on the road to Emmaus, Luke 24:35 "Then they told what had happened on the road, and how he had been made known to them in the breaking of the bread." These forerunners of the Holy Communion, were, as McGowan points out, not merely one sacramental part of a community of worship life but the central act around or within which others - reading and preaching, prayer and prophecy, were arranged.

[COMMENT]

The centrality of the eucharist is something to which Christians have aspired in many church traditions from early times with the meal aspect prominent in the eating and drinking which lie at the heart of it, but sadly neglected through non-communicating attendance, withdrawal from attendance and from infrequent communion sometimes resulting from infrequent celebration. Whatever the practical and logistic and ministerial problems churches which do not have meal fellowship at the heart of their corporate life, however restricted to the absolutely essential sacramental aspect, are lacking in a fundamental part of their ecclesial existence.

Ancient Eating²⁵

***The Banquet*²⁶**

The use of the term "Last Supper" implies that what took place in the Upper Room was a concluding act of the meal fellowship that the Lord enjoyed with his disciples, and this fellowship was given a new lease of life, post-resurrection in what St Paul designated by the word *deipnon* meaning a banquet. McGowan points out that the Christians were also not unique or peculiar in the ancient world in having common meals as a central event. Such banquets, he says, were relatively formal and purposeful events, held often, but nonetheless distinguished from merely incidental eating. He mentions as an example, the famous philosophical feasts of Plato, whose dialogues were often set during the after-dinner conversations of the great Socrates and his associates. In his description of the meals of antiquity there are features which we tend to think of a distinctly Jewish and associate with the Last Supper, such as eating reclining on couches arranged in a U shaped formation. Attention to the social standing of guests, which we also think of in

connection with the New Testament, was a feature of such gatherings. What Christians know as the “mixed chalice” (wine and water) was also used at pagan feasts. An account of the Christian meal by Tertullian (c.200) would have been recognizable in contemporary society although with the counter-cultural refusal to pour out a libation for the Emperor, the crucified Lord being honoured instead.

[COMMENT]

The question of the relationship of the eucharist to the varied cultural norms of the twenty-first century norms is clearly a relevant issue, not only in connection with the choice of the elements in parts of the world where bread is not the staple food and wine is not necessarily the fruit of the vine, but with the more general issue of eating and drinking customs in Western societies. And the question of how “meal-like” the eucharist can be is also a relevant one, apart from such special events as the celebration in a congregation of a Christian Passover.

Ancient Food²⁷ McGowan says that a meal consisting largely of bread and wine (mixed with water, as it almost always was) would not have seemed remarkable to ancient eaters, although a banquet would have involved other foods too. The Last Supper, as a Passover would have included bread and wine also also the other customary foods although the latter are not mentioned but are probably assumed. Grains were staple food across the Greco-Roman world and economics as well as convenience determined that many people at many times - not just at Passover - ate unleavened bread. Smaller amounts of highly seasoned foods such as fish, salt, vegetables, legumes, oil, cheese, sometimes accompanied.

Meat was expensive, and access to it was relative to wealth and power. It was also associated with sacrifice, and much of the meat came via temples, which created problems for Christians.

Wine was also drunk, and not only on special occasions; it completed a standard Greek meal triad of bread (*artos*) side dish or relish (*opson*), and wine (*oinos*) even among the poor. Wine was a focus at banquets for reasons beyond aesthetics or nutrition, since libations (offerings poured onto the ground) or, in Jewish circles, blessings over wine were regularly offered to initiate and sanctify the whole proceedings.

[COMMENT]

It is clear that the Eucharist is based on the fundamentals of the diet of the Greco-Roman world, bread and wine. However, wine not necessarily being available at all fellowship-meals according to some scholars there may have been some eucharists which were based on bread and water rather than bread and wine. It is not clear how the symbolism would have worked, as water is in no way an obvious representation of blood. Given what is said above by McGovern it is hard to believe that bread-and-water eucharists in any way represented the norm. However, the present writer recalls Bishop Wilson of Singapore retelling the story of how he in his celebrations of the eucharist in Shangi prison during the Second World War, used rice grains for bread and, perhaps water for wine under the noses of the guards.

Jewish Meals²⁸

McGowan says that Jesus’ own eating, including his Last Supper, involved sensibilities and rituals specific to Jewish tradition. Jewish tradition, Jewish dining, including

observance of the Mosaic dietary laws, should, however be understood as one part of an ancient Mediterranean banqueting tradition rather than a totally separate reality.

Most scholars are inclined to see the Last Supper as a formal Passover banquet, as the Synoptic Gospels present it. Christians went on celebrating a form of Passover in their new feast of Easter, and used paschal imagery to interpret the death and resurrection of Jesus. This made the the seder at least an important point of reference.

The Jewish Mishnah (c.200) depicts the seder of that time as a complex meal where significant foods were eaten in a specific order, with accompanying discourse. But instead of a meal followed by a *symposion* in the expected Greek manner, the seder involved various cups of wine taken and blessed along the way between courses, with eating and explanations. The repetition of a pattern (wine, food, and conversation) meant that later, the seder became almost a series of "mini-banquets" whose complexity reflects the significance of the feast.

Luke's account of the Last Supper, has, uniquely a cup shared by Jesus before the familiar bread-cup sequence of the Greco-Roman banquet. Did this reflect the complex seder ritual? This is unclear because the seder as depicted in the Mishnah may not have been fully developed, let alone universally observed, at the time of Jesus, and the later rabbinic form may even owe something to the Christian eucharistic tradition and reflect responses to it.

The opening of a meal with blessing of a cup (as in Luke) is, however, a characteristic Jewish tradition attested much earlier and more broadly. Meals described in the Dead Sea Scrolls, which are as old as the Gospels, or older, as well as in the later Mishnah, involve blessings for an opening cup with a characteristic prayer of *berakhah*, "Blessed are you, Lord God, the King of the Universe".

McGowan says that there are other examples of particular Jewish groups close to Jesus' time celebrating meals as a means of expressing and creating bonds of sociation obligation and divine obedience, for example the Qumran community, and the later Mishnah considers proper blessings and other conduct for the common meals of *haburoth*, or associations. However, none of these examples provides a simple model adopted or adapted for Christian use.

[COMMENT]

Considerations of this kind underline the Jewishness of Jesus, which should, one would think, be obvious, but has been helpfully underlined by a series of books by the Jewish scholar of the person of Jesus, Geza Vermes, among them, "Jesus the Jew" (1973, 1983), "The Gospel of Jesus the Jew" (1981); "The Religion of Jesus the Jew" (1993), "Jesus in the Jewish World" (2010); and "The Authentic Gospel of Jesus" (2003), the latter being in effect an extended commentary on the figure of Jesus in the Synoptic Gospels from his particular perspective. Some Christian scholars also pursue this emphasis, for example James H. Charlesworth, "Jesus within Judaism - New Light from Exciting Archaeological Discoveries." Although the New Testament contains some explanations of contemporary Jewish customs, it is reasonable to explain the brevity of the accounts of the institution of the eucharist in the light of the complete familiarity of the original circle of disciples with the totality of the Passover ceremony. The Narrative essentially deals with that which was *different* and not with that which was a given, and in no way contains a description of the whole ceremony. One can make a case for saying that the barrenness

of versions of the eucharist in some Protestant churches stems from this misunderstanding, and may account for some low church resistance to alleged “ritualism”, the Passover, then and now being full of symbolism.

Meals in the New Testament²⁹

Many Suppers³⁰

The ‘Last Supper’ has an especial resonance because of the institution of the eucharist and the circumstances of its occurrence. However, it was evidently not the first supper, and McGowan gives examples of many meals from the period of the Lord’s ministry, including his dining with tax collectors and sinners, receiving hospitality from unlikely characters, using banquets as the venue for teaching, and acting as a generous and miraculous host under unlikely circumstances. These many suppers were an important part of Jesus’ ministry and contributed both to his popularity and to his conflicts. Strictly speaking the ‘Last Supper’ was not the last since stories of the resurrection depict an eating Jesus sharing food with his disciples as a sign of his renewed life (John 21:12-13) and even as the means of revealing his presence and identity (Luke 24:30-31). These narratives, McGowan says, reflect the early Christians’ sense of their community meals as the continuation of a whole series of Jesus’ suppers or banquets, not just a response to or memorialization of one

McGowan points out that in conveying their pictures of the historical ministry of Jesus, the Gospels also reflect the concerns of the Christians a generation or two later (60-100 A.D.), who wrote and received them, and are therefore sources in our quest for the meals of those communities. A good example is the regular pattern of meal blessing that occurs across the Gospel tradition and is particularly prominent in Luke-Acts - a familiar sequence of taking bread, blessing or giving thanks, breaking of bread and distributing it for eating is present, and he cites Luke 9:16; 22:19; 24:30 and Acts 27:34-36.

[COMMENT]

It may be seen from these considerations that while there is correctly for Christians a particular focus on what uniquely happened at the meal fellowship of the Passover on the night before Jesus died, the context of the many meals referred to in the Gospels and continuing in Acts are highly significant with their varied associations, and the memories they evoked among the first generation of Christians. This suggests that not only must the meal aspect of the eucharist be preserved and given due attention and emphasis in the sacramental fellowship of the church, but also that there may be a role for many forms of non-eucharist meal fellowship in the life of the Church, those who have been involved in rural ministry being highly familiar with meals at wedding receptions, at baptisms and confirmations, and especially after funerals either in halls or in people’s homes. And those who normally perform full celebrations of the eucharist in private communions in the homes of those unable to come out to church through age, illness or infirmities, are usually accompanied by some hospitality, often of the simplest kind, from those concerned. There is in fact a kind of sacramentality in the proverbial “cup of tea” and its accompaniments, that should not be underestimated or brushed aside.

*The Last Supper and the Eucharist*³¹

McGowan draws attention to the differences as well as the similarities in the traditions relating to the Words of Institution, in Luke/Paul (the latter in 1st Corinthians) and in Mark/Matthew. Differences include the command to “do this in remembrance” of Jesus being found only in Luke/Paul, and the less explicit identification of the Cup with the blood of Jesus in the same source material, where it is stated, as in 1 Cor 11 “This cup is the new covenant in my blood”, rather than the emphatic, “This is my blood of the covenant” as in Mark and Matthew. Another difference, rather more significant than may first appear is the use of *eulogeo* (“bless”) in Mark/Matthew and *eucharisteo* (“give thanks”) in Luke/Paul. *eulogeo* would reflect the Hebrew *berakah* a well-known genre of Jewish prayer, typically addressed to God (“Blessed are you, Lord our God”...), one whole tractate of the Mishnah being dedicated to the appropriate blessings to offer at various times, including at meals. The *Birkat ha-mazon* an extended prayer based on blessing but giving way to thanksgiving and supplication, became standard at Jewish meals not long after this time. While there were forms of Jewish *hodayah* prayers, these were less closely connected with meals, but ongoing evidence for Christian prayer at meals emphasizes thanksgiving over blessing - as reflected in the prevalence of the term *eucharistia* (“Eucharist”) but first and literally “thanksgiving”. Although the forms of the Narrative appear formulaic, there does not appear to have been an actual recitation of the Narrative in the earliest accounts of the eucharist outside the pages of the New Testament.

[COMMENT]

In common with other recent eucharistic scholarship on the eucharist, McGowan pays little attention to the concept of “remembrance” which is nonetheless a key to the centrality of later emphasis on presence and sacrifice and whose enormous significance was underlined in the writings of a previous generation of liturgical scholars such as Jeremias and Max Thurian. Whether or not the phrase *eis anamnesin* (in “remembrance”) was in the first instance part of the actual ipsissima verba of Jesus or not (which must be an open question given that it is not found in Mark or Matthew) it’s inclusion in Luke and Paul suggests that it was a vital part of the significance of the eucharist for at least some representatives of the early Church, and must not be overlooked. Given that the Last Supper is to be seen within the context of the fellowship meals between Jesus and his disciples it may be that the significance of the dominical command is not so much to initiate some new action but rather to interpret what was going to happen in any case, “When you do this, do it in remembrance of me”. There seems to have been a certain fluidity in understanding represented by the different associations of the words *eulogeo* and *eucharistio* in Greek (*berakah* and *hodayah* in Hebrew) it may be that the meaning of both was subsumed into the eucharist but with an emphasis upon the latter and to some extent a movement away from a more specific Jewish use. The rather reserved language in Paul and Luke which does not identify the wine with the blood explicitly at all, may be understood in the light of the Jewish abhorrence at the thought of drinking blood, and that the obvious parallel to what Jesus said about the significance of the cup may have emerged in some quarters but not immediately in others. It could be that the stark identification, even though symbolic, between the blood of Jesus and the wine, may be a factor in the resistance of some practicing Christians to receiving Holy Communion. McGowan goes so far as to indicate the cup need not be understood as alluding at all to the blood of the sacrifice which was in fact, not drunk, but to the celebratory drinking that would accompany the sacrificial feast (cf. Ps 116:13). However, Paul himself did not

appear to have any problem with the eucharist as a sharing (*koinonia*) in the body and blood of Christ (1 Cor 10:16-21) although this appears to have been understood communally without a very specific emphasis on what the bread and wine of the eucharist were in themselves.

Commensality at Corinth³²

The Corinthian's regular meeting was a eucharistic meal, providing the first clear evidence that eating characterized the earliest Christian gatherings. Directions were given for the conduct of such events, such as each person having a hymn, a lesson, a revelation, a tongue or an interpretation, all these things being intended for building up. McGowan comments that the forms of inspired speech might seem to have little to do with meals or sacraments, but a meal as event was about more than food; eating and drinking at the banquets of associations and coreligionists was also accompanied or followed by discourse among the participants. At least for the better-off participants the meal seems to be have substantial and a lack of sharing with those worse off was one of the many problems in the church at Corinth. There is no indication that Paul wished to separate out what we would describe as the essential ingredients of the eucharist from the actual meal, but rather wished to correct the manner in which the latter was to be conducted.

[COMMENT]

It seems clear from the evidence of First Corinthians that the worship of the Church at Corinth was charismatically ordered, and the fact that the Corinthian Christians had to be reminded of what the eucharist was about would suggest the disadvantages of such a system, as distinct from the liturgical approach of Judaism which even if, at this stage, may not have been as fixed as it was to become, provided a certain stability in prayer and praise. It is regrettable that we do not have more evidence of what happened in those congregations where the earliest Christians were Jewish Christian in character. The absence of order in some modern Anglican churches where the value of the liturgy is discounted, may indicate that a Corinthian lack of shape or structure in worship may not necessarily be the the most enduring form of procedure, although there is certainly room for the *charismata*, the spiritual gifts, of which Paul was to speak so convincingly.

Sacrifice at Corinth³³

The dilemma of early Christians about the hospitality of pagans where the banquet might include meat that had been offered in sacrifice, evoked a careful response from Paul, who proposed that they avoid banquets directly linked to sacrifice (1 Cor. 10:21) but otherwise treat meat itself indifferently (10:25). Participants in any offering, Jewish, Greek or Christian, were partners, Paul argued, in the 'altar', 'cup' or 'table'. Each of these accoutrements functions to describe the whole meal, the experience of sharig it with others, and a shared commitment to the deity. Paul, McGowan says, for the first time offers a 'sacrificial' understanding of the eucharist, not merely in the sense of any relationship constructed between the meal and Jesus' own death or Passover but also in relation to ancient understandings of how shared sacred food created a community of faith. This, he says, does not, however, imply that the meal had an expiatory or propitiatory character; sacrifices had purposes other than the forgiveness of sin.

[COMMENT]

The New Testament era in many ways marked the beginnings of reflection upon what would later coalesce in a common understanding of faith and order in the Church and in shared worship and in the use of the sacraments. However, there is no evidence that Paul had reflected upon the specifics of the sacrificial significance of the word “remembrance” (Greek *anamnesis*, Hebrew probably *zikkaron*), except for his declaration that as often as the worshippers ate the bread which involved a sharing in Christ’s body and drank the wine which involved a sharing in his blood, they “proclaimed” the Lord’s death until he came. This remains an important element in the understanding of the eucharist, and, as McGowan says, Paul’s emphasis on Jesus’ death should be seen in relation to the creation of a new covenant (1 Cor 11:25), which binds him and those who have faith in him celebrated in the Christian meal.

Lack of space prohibits an examination of the post-biblical developments of the meal fellowship of the eucharist up to the Fourth Century A.D. However, in the conclusion to his chapter on Meal: Banquet and Eucharist McGowan says that the meal tradition changed in striking ways even across the first few centuries of Christian history. The detachment of the eucharistic food and drink from an actual banquet with its attendant times, venues, and accoutrements, to be received in token form in separate morning assemblies, was the most important change, and probably happened somewhat later than usually presumed, from the mid- or late second century into the mid-third century. Theologically there were also important shifts - ideas close to that of “real presence” are early and these, in particular notions of sacrificial offering, become clearer and stronger over time, independent of communal eating itself, and had impacts on how person and place, as well as food and drink, played their part in early Christian eating. He does not go along with ideas of a “fall” across early Christian history from commensality to ritual, or from feast to sacrament, but indicates that in fact in the fourth and later centuries there were persistent echoes of meals and banquetting practices in the celebration of the liturgical eucharist.

[COMMENT]

Quite apart from the (very important) theological aspects, there were clearly practical considerations in the increasing difficulties necessarily attendant upon having an actual meal on a weekly basis with anything but a small congregation. In one sense the development to a concentration on the bread and wine in small quantities was inevitable, and this remains the case. However, there remains room for various lines of approach, for example in churches where the bread is baked in turn by different families and brought to the altar to be used in the eucharistic celebration. With regard to the use of “wafer” or common bread, it may be pointed out that it is possible to obtain much thicker and more substantial wafers than the norm, and wine should be of high quality and is properly the fermented juice of the vine. If the original “Last Supper” was in fact the Passover, the bread used would have been unleavened so that the use of wafer bread is closer to the biblical tradition in this respect. The use of common bread may bring the communion closer to the daily norm for communicants although what is commercially produced and purchased may be quite far removed from the authenticity of personally baked bread whether brown or white. There should be no necessary relationship between the kind of bread used and the theology of the eucharist, whether the doctrines of the real presence or of the eucharist are being considered.

NOTES ON CHAPTER THREE, PART SEVEN (2)

¹Op cit, pp49-66

²Op. cit. pp62-63

³Op. cit. pp63-64

⁴Op. cit. pp64-65

⁵Christopher J. Cocksworth, *Evangelical Eucharistic Thought in the Church of England* , CUP, 1993

⁶Op. cit p175f

⁷Op. cit p 184f

⁸Op. cit p 192f

⁹Op. cit p.193f

¹⁰Op. cit pp194-5

¹¹Op.cit p.195f

¹²Op.cit p. 199

¹³Op. cit p.202f

¹⁴Ibid.

¹⁵Op.cit p.211f

¹⁶Op. cit pp211-212.

¹⁷Op. cit p222f

¹⁸Op. cit p217 See below for more on Kenneth Stevenson, *Eucharist and Offering*, Pueblo, 1986.

¹⁹Ibid

²⁰Ibid

²¹Ibid

²²Paul F. Bradshaw, *Reconstructing Early Christian Worship*, SPCK, 2009

²³Peter Atkins, *Memory and Liturgy - The Place of Memory in the Composition and Practice of Liturgy*, Ashgate, 2004.

CHAPTER FOUR: AFTERWORD - A PERSONAL REFLECTION

When the writer began this project - in 1991 - it was conceived as a follow up to his doctoral thesis, *The Theological Implications of Recent Liturgical Revision in the Church of Ireland*, (1987),¹ but to be focused exclusively on the theology of the eucharist from a Church of Ireland perspective². The use of the indefinite article was and is deliberate - given the breadth of theological outlook in the Church of Ireland it is evident that a studies such as this could be written from various points of view, commencing with different presuppositions and arriving, necessarily, at different conclusions.³ The writer's initial understanding of liturgy arose from his growing up in a Church of Tractarian formation, All Saints' Blackrock, under its greatly loved vicar, Canon Harry Dobbs,⁴ and later with his successor Canon Richard Maconchy⁵, which maintained a tradition of worship different from what was customary in most churches in Ireland and maintained in spite of the restrictions imposed by canon law dating from the period of disestablishment, of which the most notoriously symbolic was the absolute prohibition of the placing of a cross on or behind the altar.⁶ This restriction was not removed until 1964 and most of the remaining prohibitions were only modified or removed in legislation of the General Synod of 1974.⁷ His interest in liturgy was stimulated when he was a young student in Trinity College (University of Dublin) in 1957 when he studied the preparatory documents of the Lambeth Conference of 1958 including the seminal "Principles of Prayer Book Revision"⁸, and this became a lifelong interest, stimulated by constant reading and reflection and discussion with similarly interested friends and colleagues in the church's ministry⁹, and expressed in correspondence with the Church of Ireland's Liturgical Advisory Committee (established as a committee of Synod in 1962, and of which he has been a member since 1986)¹⁰, and in an early paper submitted to the Armagh Clerical Union on the subject of liturgical revision. From 1973, when he was appointed an Examining Chaplain to Archbishop Simms (Chairman of the Liturgical Advisory Committee) and taught liturgy to deacons and first year priests and 1974 when he was appointed Warden of Readers in the Diocese of Armagh and personally taught the entire range of subjects to trainee Readers including liturgy he was liturgically involved not only in the ordering of services in his own parish in the parochial group of Lisnadill and Kildarton but in the study of liturgy with those who came to him to be taught. From 1975 until his retirement in 2014 he was an Hon. Clerical Vicar Choral in St Patrick's Cathedral, Armagh, and was involved in the singing of Evensong Sunday by Sunday¹¹ and, as time went on in the ordering of special services, particularly when the Dean was the Very Revd Herbert Cassidy in the 1980s to the early 2000s.¹² He also became a Canon of St Patrick's Cathedral Dublin, from 1992 to his retirement in 2014 and initially this was under the Very Revd Dr Maurice Stewart who had been the lecturer in liturgy in the Church of Ireland Theological College and had supervised and been an examiner for his dissertation in part-fulfilment of the requirements for the higher degree of Bachelor of Divinity in Trinity College, entitled "The meaning and role of the anamnesis in the Anglican Liturgical Tradition. From 1980 to 1986 he was a domestic as well as an examining chaplain to Archbishop John Armstrong who had succeeded Archbishop Simms as Chairman of the Liturgical Advisory Committee. For a number of years he acted as a tutor in several fields including liturgy for those training to enter the Auxiliary Ministry (later termed the Non-Stipendiary Ministry) and also examined in these on behalf of the Theological College.¹³ He then embarked on a five year period of research leading to his Ph.D. from the Open University as mentioned above¹⁴. This massive

project, leading to a thesis of 310,000 words included a history of liturgical revision in the Church of Ireland with particular attention to the Liturgical Advisory Committee up to the time of completion (1987) by which time he had been elected a member. In this capacity he was involved in the production of *Alternative Occasional Services* (1993) containing orders of service designed to be used alongside the *Alternative Prayer Book* (1984), and this was succeeded by his participation in the committee's ten years of labour ending in the publication of the Church of Ireland's *Book of Common Prayer*, 2004. He followed this up by a complete revision of what were originally a set of course notes on the liturgies of the Church of Ireland and this was published online in 2011 in the Church of Ireland's official website under the title of *Commentaries* on all the authorized services of the Church where it remains, in five sections amounting to almost exactly 200,000 words.¹⁴ It is, however, due for an update owing to the work of the LAC in providing Resource material, some of it intended for authorization by the General Synod of the Church of Ireland. In 1991 the present writer had begun work on the present project which proceeded very slowly on account of other commitments. In no way is the delay from 1991 to 2018 regretted as not only did that period cover many significant developments in the liturgical life of the Church of Ireland (and other churches) but it was also a period in which much modern liturgical scholarship was published that could be drawn upon.¹⁵ A significant event was the meeting in Dublin in 1995 of the Inter-Anglican Liturgical Consultation with a focus on the eucharist, which he attended as a member and contributed to the working group on the theology of Liturgy¹⁶. A lifelong ecumenist, he had been an active member of the Student Christian Movement, as an undergraduate and had attended the great "Edinburgh 1958" Conference¹⁷. For many years he attended the annual Glenstal Ecumenical Conferences¹⁸, which included liturgical studies and other addresses by world class authorities including Dr Paul Bradshaw, Dr Donald Kennedy, Dr Eugene Brand, Fr George Tavard, Fr Michael Hurley and Dr Geoffrey Wainwright, and, with other regular members participated in the general discussions leading to agreement upon the Glenstal Liturgy¹⁹, a fully ecumenical order of service, used, with the permission of the various church authorities, and with the Abbot of Glenstal as the celebrant, at the 1986 conference, a lifetime high point for all those who were present belonging to the four main churches in Ireland, Roman Catholic, Church of Ireland, Presbyterian, and Methodist.²⁰ The story of the Glenstal Liturgy is outlined in the writer's doctoral thesis.²¹ Growing up with Roman Catholic friends (one particular family providing him almost with a second home in addition to his own very fulfilling family life), he has had an enduring interest in Anglican-Roman Catholic relations, not least through the ARCIC process. As a member of the Church of Ireland's General Synod he spoke in favour when the Church's official response to the Final Report was being debated²². At a later stage he was a member of the special committee set up to prepare a comparable response to ARCIC on Mary²³ and was responsible, on the basis of its work including papers from all its members, for drafting it in its entirety. With one small amendment from the Standing Committee of the General Synod it was accepted unanimously by the General Synod as part of the Standing Committee Report.²⁴ He has, however, long been of the opinion that the ARCIC documents need to be subjected to a critical but scholarly review and this he has attempted in the present project, his occasional sharp comments being, however, to be seen within the context of an overall commitment to the ecumenical endeavour. At a local level he has long been ecumenically involved and is currently a member of the committee of the "Cathedrals' Partnership" between the Church of Ireland and Roman Catholic Cathedrals. The writer is a founding

member of “Affirming Catholicism Ireland” - an organization that exists to promote loyalty to the faith and order and liturgical heritage of the Church of Ireland and emphasizes its character as a church which in its own words is “Ancient, Catholic and Apostolic” as well as “Reformed and Protestant”.²⁵

It is, no doubt, evident that the present writer is a product not only of his particular interests and studies but of the totality of experience represented in what has been outlined above. At the outset of this project he felt it would be helpful, and not only to himself, to tease out what his own theological presuppositions were and also to make these clear to any potential readers. In practice, throughout the project they have served, though not exclusively, as criteria for assessing the theological positions with which one has engaged. One’s confidence in the position they represent has been strengthened in the prolonged processes which have culminated in the conclusion of the main text, although, as outlined above, one is conscious that others could have written, and might still write, from a very different viewpoints²⁶. One’s first thought was that this afterword might contain a summary of what has been engaged with, chapter by chapter, but one’s feeling is that what has been produced is only truly meaningful in the context of the actual discussion and reiterated time and again in varied ways and in relation to the writings of varied individuals and the groups they represent. It is one’s hope that any engagement with the main text of this project, in whole or in part, may stimulate further discussion and reflection as, in all our churches, we strive for that unity for which Christ prayed within the Church of Ireland itself, and ecumenically. He is more than conscious that in the areas covered by this project there is no such thing as a “last word”, and has been known to describe the study of liturgy as a “moving target” both theologically speaking and in terms of the production of liturgies²⁷. There would appear to be no *terminus ad quem*, not, at least, until the Eschaton²⁸!

NOTES ON CHAPTER FOUR, AFTERWORD

¹Open University, 1987. Only three bound hard copies exist – in the Representative Church Body Library, Rathgar, Dublin 14; at Glenstal Abbey, Murroe, Co. Limerick; and one in the possession of the present writer. It is understood that it is available online as a thesis from the Open University, but shorn of the very important Appendices which were considered, to some extent incorrectly – for example Journals of the General Synod are not copyrighted – to have the potential to infringe copyright. The complete thesis including bibliography runs to 310,000 words.

²The contents of authorized liturgies, their history, and to some extent their use, are presented in the present writer's *Commentaries*, launched at a meeting of the Church of Ireland's General Synod (2011) at which the then Archbishop of Armagh, the Most Revd Alan Harper was present. There is a foreword by the late Canon Brian Mayne, editor of the 2004 Prayer Book. The commentaries run to almost exactly 200,000 words. Apart from a series of sermons (edited and abbreviated) preached in two Cathedrals, St Patrick's Cathedral, Armagh, and St Patrick's Cathedral Dublin there is little about the theology of the eucharist as such, and it is hoped that the present work will serve as a comprehensive introduction to such a theology written from a Church of Ireland perspective, which is, from the writer's standpoint, biblical and historic.

³Every effort has been made to represent fairly and accurately other viewpoints, for example from the Evangelical perspective and also, in the context of an appraisal of the work of ARCIC, on the eucharist from an ecumenical viewpoint. Given that ARCIC has been involved with some of the crucial issues between the Anglican and Roman Catholic churches, a significant amount of attention has been given not only to ARCIC itself, which has a 50% Roman Catholic membership, but to official documents from the Roman Catholic Church as such. It is recognized that "One Bread One Body" is essentially a document for members of the Roman Catholic communion, but its endorsement by the authorities of that church by the hierarchies of England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales gives it a very distinct relevance to the theme and endeavour of this present work.

The enormous range and variety of theological opinion within Anglicanism is well represented in the online resource, published under the heading of *Anglican Eucharistic Theology*, authored by Dr Brian Douglas, which contains careful summaries, including quotations from no less than 236 Anglican divines from Cranmer to Gregory Dix, and focussed particularly on the eucharistic presence although the eucharistic sacrifice is also well represented. The spectrum of writings ranges from the "realist" to the "nominalist", and the present writer is well aware that his own contribution cannot be regarded as more than a very minor and as a personal expression of a particular line of approach to both doctrines, themselves seen in a wider theological context.

⁴Canon Harry Ballinacarrig Dobbs, was Precentor of St Patrick's Cathedral Dublin as well as a remarkably successful Vicar of All Saint's Blackrock from 1914 to his retirement in 1956. Services (full choral) in his little church with a very large choir drew people like a magnet to All Saints. He weathered several storms including threats of prosecution in the Court of the General Synod for alleged ritualistic practices (which would, however, hardly have been deemed noteworthy in churches where a high standard of liturgical worship is carefully maintained).

⁵Canon Richard Maconchy, who succeeded Canon Dobbs was not a “people person” in the same sense, but he was deeply committed to the faith and order of the Church of Ireland with particular emphasis on the liturgy and conscientious in the performance of all his duties. At one time there were three ordinands including the present writer in the men’s section of the choir.

⁶This notorious piece of legislation was part of the attempt by the General Synod following Disestablishment under the Irish Church Act of 1869 to make it impossible to follow the example of the so-called “ritualists” in the Church of England in matters to do with the performance of the liturgy. It was felt by many Irish churchmen to be a matter that brought shame on the Church of Ireland, and it was altered by a courageous initiative in the General Synod of 1964. Further revision of the liturgical canons took place in 1974, and almost all the restrictive legislation of the 1870s was either removed or modified. All Saints, however had a cross at the entry to the chancel, high up, and St Bartholomew’s Church Ballsbridge, having endured a form of legal action amounting to persecution of the incumbent in the 1920s got around the legislation by mounting a cross on a pole *in front of* the altar, thus making a point about the adherence of the Church to belief in Christ crucified and at the same time demonstrating a *reductio ad absurdum* of the said legislation.

⁷See the Report of the Select Committee on the Canons, Journal of the General Synod, 1973, pp246-273 which included a careful examination of the principles involved, the . legislation incorporating some amendments of the 1973 proposals, see the Journal of the General Synod, 1974 ppcxvi-cl. There have been some further changes, including those consequent on the decision to admit women as deacons in 1974 and then as priests and bishops in 1990. A prohibition on the use of candles except where they were necessary for the purpose of giving light (sic) was removed, but an attempt specifically to authorize the use by celebrants of a chasuble failed at the first reading.

⁸A full account of this document insofar as it dealt with the eucharist may be found above pp266-269.

⁹For example a small group of clergy including the present writer and the Revd (later Very Revd) John Paterson and called “The Armagh-Clogher Clergy Study Group” examined the proposals of the Liturgical Advisory Committee in their 1965 Report and made their own to the LAC.

¹⁰The present writer corresponded with the then Hon. Secretary of the Liturgical Advisory Committee, the Very Revd Gilbert Mayes, Dean of Lismore, having been given permission by the committee to have access to all the documentation including minutes from the founding of the committee up to the most recent. The documentation was placed in the Library of the Representative Church Body for the necessary consultation up to the completion of my doctoral thesis in 1987.

¹¹For many years he intoned Choral Evensong single-handed until a rota was worked out under Dean Patrick Rooke involving up to seven Clerical Vicars Choral.

¹²During Dean Cassidy’s term of office he was involved in the drafting process, and the preparation of nearly all the special services, including ordinations of deacons and priests, the consecration of bishops, and such events as a visit to Ireland of the Primate of the Anglican Communion, and the launch of the 2004 Prayer Book.

¹³Examiners were called “Assessors” and he was involved in the areas of Old Testament, New Testament, and Liturgy in all of which he held qualifications at higher degree level through his Trinity College Dublin Bachelor of Divinity Degree.

¹⁴Under the supervision of Dr Francis Clark, Reader in Religious Studies in the Open University (internal) and the Revd Canon Jim Hartin, Principal of the Church of Ireland Theological College and Lecturer in Church History in Trinity College (external). Dr Clark, though laicized had been Professor of Theology at the Gregorian University of Rome and Heythrop College in England and had written on Anglican Orders and on Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation. He acted as the chairman of the three examiners following the submission of the thesis.

¹⁵For examples, see above, Chapter Three, Part Seven (2).

¹⁶See above, Chapter Three, Part Seven (1). alia) full documentation of the event may be found in David R. Holeton, Ed., *Our Thanks and Praise – The Eucharist in Anglicanism Today, Papers from the fifth International Anglican Liturgical Consultation*, The Anglican Book Centre, Toronto, 1998. The membership of the group on Eucharistic Theology comprised, William Crockett (Canada) who was the leader, David Kennedy (England) who was the secretary, Solomon Amusan (Nigeria), Evan Burge (Australia), Ian Darby (South Africa), Daphne Frazer (England), Elson Jakasi, [Kenneth Stevenson (England), Jill Mendham, (Australia), Boone Porter (United States), Charles Sherlock (Australia), Bryan Spinks (United States, originally Church of England), Gianfranco Tellini (Scotland), and the present writer (Ireland). Evan Burge was principally concerned with the Eucharistic Prayer which was adopted for Church of Ireland use in the Alternative Prayer Book (1984) and, in its full form, the 2004 Prayer Book where it serves as Eucharistic Prayer Two. Boone Porter was an authority on Jeremy Taylor. Charles Sherlock was an Evangelical and a member of and an apologist for, ARCIC, Bryan Spinks rates along with Paul Bradshaw as one of the most prolific of Anglican liturgical scholars in the latter part of the twentieth century and into the twenty-first and this continues with, for example, his *The Rise and Fall of the Incomparable Liturgy- The Book of Common Prayer, 1559 -1906*, SPCK, 2017. Kenneth Stevenson, the author of *Eucharist and Offering*, by far the most dynamic person present, brought a Scottish/Scandinavian perspective to the matters under discussion. He and Solomon Amusan later became bishops.

¹⁷The Edinburgh conference whose main meetings and services took place in a packed McEwan Hall was inspiring through the presence of world-famous ecumenists including Visser t’Hooft of the World Council of Churches and Dr Kathleen Bliss. George McCloud, the founder of the Iona Community was also a speaker. The Student Christian Movement was then a mighty force in the universities of the United Kingdom and Ireland and was linked to a wider World Federation. Many of the great British ecumenists were in effect graduates of the SCM the demise of which has had a most unfortunate effect not only upon ecumenism but upon the SCM’s witness to a reasoned and critical faith among university students.

¹⁸The history of the Glenstal Conferences, initially a remarkable ecumenical initiative, is covered from 1964 to 1997 in two booklets, *Glenstal Abbey Ecumenical Conferences 1964 – 1983* by Canon Edgar and Dr Joan Turner, and *Glenstal Ecumenical Conference 1984 – 1997* by Dr Sean Mac Reamoinn.

¹⁹The four persons principally concerned with transformation of the Lima Liturgy into the Glenstal liturgy were Dr John Barkley (Presbyterian), Dean Gilbert Mayes (Church of Ireland), The Revd Robert Nelson, and Dom Placid Murray, OSB (Roman Catholic). It was agreed that Fr Placid's role ceased with the production of the text and that he would not be expected to seek approval for it from the Roman Catholic authorities. He was one of only two known participants who did not communicate at the actual celebration of the liturgy.

See for more information, including the text of the Glenstal Liturgy, the *Glenstal Ecumenical Conference 1984-1997*, op. cit. pp2-27.

²⁰It is very unfortunate that so far as the present writer is aware, the Glenstal Liturgy has never been ecumenically celebrated again, the Roman Catholic Archbishop of Cashel having apparently taken fright at the letters of thanks addressed to him by some of those who had attended it in 1986 and who cited canon law to prevent the Abbot of Glenstal from having a repetition of such an event. At an earlier stage eucharistic liturgies of the various churches had been celebrated at the Conference and many members having made their communion at celebrations of the Roman Catholic liturgy, the then Abbot having said in answer to a query that if the consciences of those attenders compelled them to come forward he would not turn them away!

Very important, from a Church of Ireland standpoint, and relevant to this present work is that the House of Bishops, having been consulted, had given their approval to the liturgy and its celebration, the annotation, provided by Fr Murray making clear that the committee was agreed that the wording of the anamnesis implied that the "offering" that was "brought" was to be understood as Christ's "self-offering" = sacrifice. It follows that such a view of the eucharistic offering was not considered to be contrary to its use by members of the Church of Ireland. The then Church of Ireland Bishop of Limerick, the Rt Revd Edward ("Ned") Darling had explicitly given his permission as ordinary for the liturgy to be used.

²¹Thesis, pp591-597, and related annotation pp618-623, text, Appendix LLL pp781-782.

²²Resolution recorded in the Journal of the General Synod, 1986 p.xc. An amendment, taking a more positive view, supported by the present writer, was lost on a vote by orders.

²³The membership comprised, the Rt Revd Peter Barrett (chairman until December 2005), the Rt Revd (later Most Revd) Dr Michael Jackson, the Very Revd Norman Lynas, the Revd Gillian Wharton, Mrs Paddy Wallace, Mrs Mary Evans, the Revd Sue Patterson, the Revd Dr Maurice Elliott, the Revd Daniel Nuzum (hon. secretary), and the present writer.

²⁴Journal of the General Synod 2006.

²⁵See above, Chapter Two, Part One.

²⁶It is hoped that the publication of the present work will stimulate others to engage with the issues.

²⁷A very recent publication, at the time of writing is that of Stephen R. Shaver, *Eucharistic Sacrifice as a Contested Category: A Cognitive Linguistic Approach*, Joint Liturgical Studies 85, The Alcuin Club and The Group for Renewal of Worship, 2018. This includes not only an introduction to cognitive linguistics, a brief historical survey (regrettably weak on the catholic tradition within Anglicanism) and a survey of the writings of Rita Nakashime Brock and Rebecca Parker, Gordon Lathrop, Robert Daly,

and Sarah Coakley. The contributions open up such areas as a feminist appraisal of the concept of sacrifice and a root and branch attack by one contributor on the whole idea of eucharistic sacrifice. A very highly technical language seems to be part and parcel of the linguistics involved. The present writer's view is that the approaches, while challenging, and containing some valuable insights, cannot be considered to be particularly well-balanced, from a biblical or historical perspective.

²⁸A not unreasonable comment, given that the Pauline account, the earliest available, includes the words "until he comes" (1 Cor 11:26).

APPENDICES - APPNDIX A
THE CONSTITUTION OF THE CHURCH
OF IRELAND

PREAMBLE AND DECLARATION

ADOPTED BY THE GENERAL CONVENTION IN THE YEAR 1870

In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost Amen: Whereas it hath been determined by the Legislature that on and after the 1st day of January, 1871, the Church of Ireland shall cease to be established by law; and that the ecclesiastical law of Ireland shall cease to exist as law save as provided in the “Irish Church Act, 1869”, and it hath thus become necessary that the Church of Ireland should provide for its own regulation:

We, the archbishops and bishops of this the Ancient Catholic and Apostolic Church of Ireland, together with the representatives of the clergy and laity of the same, in General Convention assembled in Dublin in the year of our Lord God one thousand eight hundred and seventy, before entering on this work, do solemnly declare as follows:

1. The Church of Ireland doth, as heretofore, accept and unfeignedly believe all the Canonical Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, as given by inspiration of God, and containing all things necessary to salvation; and doth continue to profess the faith of Christ as professed by the Primitive Church.
2. The Church of Ireland will continue to minister the doctrine, and sacraments, and the discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded; and will maintain inviolate the three orders of bishops, priests or presbyters, and deacons in the sacred ministry.
3. The Church of Ireland, as a reformed and Protestant Church, doth hereby reaffirm its constant witness against all those innovations in doctrine and worship, whereby the Primitive Faith hath been from time to time defaced or overlaid, and which at the Reformation this Church did disown and reject.

II

The Church of Ireland doth receive and approve **The Book of the Articles of Religion**, commonly called the Thirty-nine Articles, received and approved by the archbishops and bishops and the rest of the clergy of Ireland in the synod holden in Dublin, A.D. 1634; also, **The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, according to the use of the Church of Ireland; and the Form and Manner of Making, Ordaining and Consecrating of Bishops, Priests and Deacons**, as approved and adopted by the synod holden in Dublin, A.D. 1662, and hitherto in use in this Church. And this Church will continue to use the same, subject to such alterations only as may be made therein from time to time by the lawful authority of the Church.

III

The Church of Ireland will maintain communion with the sister Church of England, and with all other Christian Churches agreeing in the principles of this Declaration; and will set forward, so far as in it lieth, quietness, peace, and love, among all Christian people.

IV

The Church of Ireland, deriving its authority from Christ, Who is the Head over all things to the Church, doth declare that a General Synod of the Church of Ireland, consisting of the archbishops and bishops, and of representatives of the clergy and laity, shall have chief legislative power therein, and such administrative power as may be necessary for the Church, and consistent with its episcopal constitution.

APPENDIX B

THE “BLACK RUBRIC”

So called because the directions (“rubrics”) printed in the Prayer Book are normally red as suggested by the name, *ruber* = red, this particular one, printed after the Order for Communion from 1552 onwards in the Book of Common Prayer is also called “The Directive on Kneeling” Some changes in wording have occurred as indicated below.

In the 1552 edition of the Book of Common Prayer, the Black Rubric appeared as follows::

Although no order can be so perfectly devised, but it may be of some, either for their ignorance and infirmity, or else of malice and obstinacy, misconstrued, depraved, and interpreted in a wrong part: And yet because brotherly charity willeth, that so much as conveniently may be, offences should be taken away: therefore we willing to do the same. Whereas it is ordered in the book of common prayer, in the administration of the Lord’s Supper, that the Communicants kneeling should receive the holy Communion: which thing being well meant, for a signification of the humble and grateful acknowledging of the benefits of Christ, given unto the worthy receiver, and to avoid the profanation and disorder, which about the holy Communion might else ensue: lest the same kneeling might be thought or taken otherwise, we do declare that it is not meant thereby, that any adoration is done, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental bread or wine there bodily received, or unto any *real and essential presence* there being of Christ’s natural flesh and blood. For as concerning the sacramental bread and wine, they remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored, for that were Idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians. And as concerning the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ, they are in heaven and not here. For it is against the truth of Christ’s true natural body, to be in more places than in one at one time.

The 1662 version was slightly altered and remains the version found in the 2004 edition of the Book of Common Prayer p.196

Whereas it is ordained in this Office for the Administration of the Lord's Supper, that the Communicants should receive the same kneeling; (which order is well meant, for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Christ therein given to all worthy Receivers, and for the avoiding of such profanation and disorder in the holy Communion, as might otherwise ensue;) yet, lest the same kneeling should by any persons, either out of ignorance and infirmity, or out of malice and obstinacy, be misconstrued and depraved: It is hereby declared, That thereby no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental Bread or Wine there bodily received, or unto any *Corporal Presence* of Christ's natural Flesh and Blood. For the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored; (for that were Idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians;) and the natural Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ are in Heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural Body to be at one time in more places than one.

APPENDIX C

Church of Ireland Comment on the Anglican-Roman Catholic Agreed Statement on Eucharistic doctrine to be submitted to the Anglican Consultative Council, 1976.

1. We welcome the substantial measure of agreement which has been reached by the Commission representative of our two Communion as an encouraging step forward, though there remains a considerable divergence between some of the "contemporary Roman Catholic theology" in the Statement and the official authoritative teaching of the Roman Catholic Church. Until this divergence has been resolved it is evident that the "substantial agreement" reached falls short of "full agreement" on several fundamental points.#

We earnestly hope that the Agreed Statement will be widely studied by clergy and laity throughout the Church.

2. We commend the Agreed Statement for its general approach and method, and the Commission's aim "to seek a deeper understanding of the reality of the eucharist which is consonant with biblical teaching and with the tradition of our common inheritance" (Par. 1). The fact of the eucharist is part of Christian faith and practice from the earliest days of the Church, but no one doctrinal explanation has received universal acceptance. We are glad that the Statement, while achieving agreement about the reality of the eucharist and what it is for, at the same time takes note of "a variety of theological approaches within both our Communion" (Par. 12).

We welcome the attempt to find theological language which is *inclusive* and the general avoidance of an exclusive approach. The Statement's declaration that the purpose of the eucharist is "to transmit the life of the crucified and risen Christ to his body, the Church, so that its members may be more fully united with Christ and with one another" (Par. 6), must gain general agreement.

3. We welcome also the emphasis in the Statement on the unique "once for all" character of Christ's death and resurrection and that "there can be no repetition of or addition to what was accomplished once for all by Christ" (Par. 5). We rejoice in the Biblical emphasis of this passage, in accord with much New Testament teaching and, in particular, with the Epistle to the Hebrews, which emphasizes that "He has no need, like those high priests, to offer sacrifices daily, first for his own sins and then for those of the people; he did this once for all when he offered up himself" (Heb. 7.27. R.S.V.). See also Hebrews 9.12; 25f. and 10.12-14.
4. We note the Statement emphasizes that the presence of the Lord in the eucharist is of a *sacramental nature* - "*his* sacramental presence given through bread and wine" (Par. 3); "gives himself sacramentally" (Par. 7); "the sacramental body and blood" (Par. 8). This understanding would appear to be in accord with our definition of sacraments as "effectual signs of grace" (*efficacia signa gratiae*) in Article XXV. We note also that the Statement uses the term "true presence" (Par. 6) as well as "real presence", and emphasizes the *fact* of Christ's presence rather than any attempted definition of 'The mystery of the eucharistic presence' (Par. 8). "Christ is present and active, in various ways, in the entire eucharistic celebration" (Par. 7).

In the light of Anglican rejection in Article XXVIII of "transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of bread and wine)", we appreciate the footnote explaining the way in which some contemporary Roman Catholic theologians understand this

doctrine. The footnote interprets transubstantiation as affirming the *fact* of Christ's presence and not as explaining *how* the change takes place. In this we note its affinity to the teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas, who denies that Christ is locally in the sacrament. (*Corpus Christi non est in hoc Sacramento sicut in loco*. S.T. iii Q Ixxvi A.v.).

We note the comment to the same effect in the Lutheran/Roman Catholic Statement (Missouri 1967): "it can thus be seen that there is agreement on the 'that', the full reality of Christ's presence. What has been disputed is a particular way of stating the 'how', the manner in which He becomes present. Today, however, when Lutheran theologians read contemporary Roman Catholic exposition, it becomes dear to them that the dogma of transubstantiation intends to affirm the fact of Christ's presence and of the change which takes place, and is not an attempt to explain *how* Christ becomes present."

Anglican rejection of the philosophical framework associated with the doctrine of transubstantiation should be taken in conjunction with the refusal of Anglicanism to accept an explanation of the "how" as revealed truth and binding and exclusively definitive.

5. We are gratified that the Statement draws attention to the vital connection between Christ's gift of himself in the Holy Communion and our "response of faith". "When his people are gathered at the eucharist to commemorate his saving acts for our redemption, Christ makes effective among us the eternal benefits of his victory and elicits and renews our response of faith, thanksgiving and self surrender" (Par. 3). "The sacramental body and blood of the Saviour are present as an offering to the believer awaiting his welcome. When this offering is met by faith, a lifegiving encounter results. Through faith Christ's presence ... becomes no longer just a presence for the believer, but also a presence *with* him. Thus, in considering the mystery of the eucharistic presence, we must recognize both the sacramental sign of Christ's presence and the personal relationship between Christ and the faithful which arises from that presence. (Par 8)
6. We note* the emphasis on the activity of the Holy Spirit in the eucharistic liturgy, that it is "by the transforming action of the Spirit of God, earthly bread and wine become the heavenly manna and the new wine," (Par. 11), and that through the prayer of consecration "a word of faith addressed to the Father, the bread and wine become the body and blood of Christ by the action of the Holy Spirit, so that in communion we eat the flesh of Christ and drink his blood" (Par. 10) We note the parallel emphasis in the Dombes Agreement:

"Christ's act being the gift of his body and blood, that is to say, of himself, the reality given in the signs of the bread and wine is his body and blood."

It is by virtue of Christ's creative word and by the power of the Holy Spirit that the bread and wine are made a sacrament and hence 'a sharing of the body and blood of Christ' (1 Cor. 10:16). They are henceforth, in their ultimate truth, beneath the outward sign the given reality, and so they remain, since their purpose is to be consumed. What is given as the body and blood of Christ remains given as his body and blood and requires to be treated as such."

In a footnote at * the Dombes Group of Protestants and Roman Catholics insist that 'This does not mean that Christ is localized in the bread and wine or that these latter undergo any physico-chemical change', and they quote references to Thomas

Aquinas and John Calvin in support (St. Thomas, ST III. 76, 3-5, 111.77, 5-8; Calvin, CHRIST. INST. 1,11, 13; IV.14.18)..

7. The insistence in the Statement on the essential inter-connection between the gift of Christ in this sacrament and the reception of the elements .is welcomed. The Lord's words at the last supper, 'Take and eat; this is my body', do not allow us to dissociate the gift of the presence and the act of sacramental eating" (Par. 9). The identity of the Church as the body of Christ is both expressed and effectively proclaimed by its being centred in, and partaking of, his **body and blood**. In the **whole** action of the eucharist, and in and by his sacramental presence given through bread and wine, the crucified and risen Lord, according to his promise, offers himself to his people" (Par. 3). In accord with this emphasis, and the Commission's aim to follow "biblical teaching" and "the tradition, of our common inheritance" (Par. 1), the Church of Ireland would welcome in the Agreed Statement an explicit recognition of the reception of both **bread and wine** in the communion, in accordance with Christ's institution of the sacrament (Mark 14.23), the teaching of the Apostles (e.g. I Cor. 11.26, "For as often as you take this bread and drink the cup you proclaim the Lord's death until he comes"), and the universal tradition of the Church for over 1,000 years.

We welcome this Agreed Statement as a valuable contribution to that "serious dialogue which, founded on the Gospels and on the ancient common traditions may lead to that unity in truth for which Christ prayed" (Common Declaration of Pope Paul VI and the Archbishop of Canterbury, March 1966).

#Amended at the 1976 Synod by the addition of the words,

(Cf. The Supplement to A new Catechism, 1969, and the Encyclicals **Mysterium Fidei** 1965, and the Credo of Pope Paul VI, 1968).

*Originally "welcome", altered by amendment at the 1976 Synod (Journal of the General Synod 1976 pp CV and CVI This removes the suggestion that the consecration of the bread and wine of the eucharist is necessarily accomplished by the action of the Holy Spirit, other theories being that it is accomplished by the recitation of the Words of Institution or by means of "consecration by thanksgiving".

Apart from amendments given above in par 6 there was no further change made in the Comment and it still stands at the time of writing. However it appears to have been overlooked at the time of the much more comprehensive Response of the Church of Ireland to the ARCIC Final Report published and approved ten years later in 1986. So far as the eucharist is concerned the two may be taken together as a guide to the Church of Ireland's attitude to the ARCIC document enabling an in general appreciative view to be taken however with due attention being given to the more critical approach of the 1986 Response.

APPENDIX D

HOLY COMMUNION BY EXTENSION (FOR THOSE UNABLE TO BE PRESENT AT THE PUBLIC CELEBRATION)

Approved by The House of Bishops and authorized in the Church of Ireland as from 28 February 2007 for a period of seven years and renewed.

While this rite is primarily intended for use with those who are sick, it may on occasion be used with individuals who for a reasonable cause cannot be present at a public celebration of the Holy Communion.

When a member of the community cannot be present at the parish Holy Communion but wishes to receive the Sacrament, it is desirable that the priest, deacon or appropriately trained authorized representative of the community bring the consecrated elements to that person immediately upon completion of the celebration in the church. The continuity between communion and community celebration is thus made clear.

If, however, a person is unable to attend a public celebration for an extended period of time, it is appropriate that the Holy Communion be celebrated with them, members of their family, the parish community, and friends, if possible. In these cases it would be appropriate to involve others in the readings and prayers, using the proper of the day and other appropriate material.

This service may be conducted by a priest, a deacon or lay person authorized by the diocesan bishop.

This form is intended for use with those who for reasonable cause cannot be present at a public celebration of the Holy Communion.

THE GREETING

The minister says

The Lord be with you
and also with you.

These or similar words may be used:

Brother/sister in Christ,
God calls us to faithful service by the proclamation of the word,
and sustains us with the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ.
Let us now call upon God in prayer
hear his word proclaimed,
and receive this holy food from the Lord's table.

THE COLLECT OF THE DAY OR A SIMILAR PRAYER.

PROCLAIMING AND RECEIVING THE WORD

A passage from the Gospel appropriate to the day or occasion, or one of the following passages is read:

God so loved the world that he gave his only Son, so that everyone who believes in him may not perish, but may have eternal life. *John 3.16*

Jesus said, "I am the bread of life; whoever comes to me will never be hungry, and whoever believes in me will never be thirsty." *John 6.35*

Jesus said, "I am the living bread that came down from heaven; whoever eats of this bread will live forever; and the bread that I will give for the life of the world is my flesh. For my flesh is true food and my blood is true drink. Those who eat my flesh and drink my blood abide in me, and I in them." *John 6.51, 55-56*

Jesus said, "Abide in me, as I abide in you. Just as the branch cannot bear fruit by itself unless it abides in the vine, neither can you unless you abide in me. I am the vine, you are the branches. My father is glorified by this, that you bear much fruit, and become my disciples.

As the Father has loved me, so I have loved you; abide in my love." *John 15.4-5a, 8-9*

PENITENCE

Invitation to confession

If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. If we confess our sins, he who is faithful and just will forgive us our sins, and cleanse us from all unrighteousness. 1 John 1: 8,9

**Almighty God, our heavenly Father,
we have sinned in thought and word and deed,
and in what we have left undone.
We are truly sorry, and we humbly repent.
For the sake of your Son, Jesus Christ,
have mercy on us and forgive us,
that we may walk in newness of life
to the glory of your name. Amen.**

Almighty God,
who forgives all who truly repent,
have mercy on you,
pardon and deliver you from all your sins,
confirm and strengthen you in all goodness,
and keep you in eternal life;
through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

A deacon or lay person using the preceding form substitutes *us* for *you* and *our* for *your*.

The Prayer of Humble Access may be said:

**We do not presume to come to this your table, merciful Lord,
trusting in our own righteousness
but in your manifold and great mercies.
We are not worthy so much as to gather up the crumbs under your table.
But you are the same Lord, whose nature is always to have mercy.
Grant us, therefore, gracious Lord,
so to eat the flesh of your dear Son Jesus Christ,
and to drink his blood,
that our sinful bodies may be made clean by his body,
and our souls washed through his most precious blood,
and that we may evermore dwell in him and he in us. Amen.**

THE LORD'S PRAYER

As our Saviour Christ has taught us, so we pray
**Our Father in heaven,
hallowed be your name,
your kingdom come,
your will be done, on earth as in heaven.
Give us today our daily bread.
Forgive us our sins
as we forgive those who sin against us.
Lead us not into temptation but deliver us from evil.
For the kingdom, the power, and the glory are yours now and for ever. Amen.**

or

As our Saviour Christ has taught us, we are bold to say
**Our Father, who art in heaven:
hallowed be thy name,
thy kingdom come,
thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven.
Give us this day our daily bread.
And forgive us our trespasses
as we forgive those who trespass against us.
And lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil.
For thine is the kingdom, the power, and the glory for ever and ever. Amen.**

The minister says

The Church of God, of which we are members, has taken bread and wine and given thanks over them according to our Lord's command.

I now bring these holy gifts that you may share in the communion of his body and blood.
We being many are one body for we all share in the one bread.

The minister who gives the bread and wine says

The body of Christ given for you.
The blood of Christ shed for you.
And the communicant replies **Amen.**

Silence is kept. It may be appropriate to pray for the needs of those present.

PRAYER AFTER COMMUNION

The following thanksgiving or another suitable prayer is said:

**Almighty God,
we thank you for feeding us
with the spiritual food
of the body and blood of your Son Jesus Christ.
Through him we offer you our souls and bodies to be a living sacrifice.
Send us out in the power of your Spirit
to live and work to your praise and glory. Amen.**

THE BLESSING

A priest may say a blessing such as:

The peace of God, which passes all understanding, keep your hearts and minds in the knowledge and love of God, and of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord;
and the blessing of God almighty,
the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit,
be upon you and remain with you always. **Amen.**

When a priest is not present all may say together:

The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ,
and the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Spirit,
be with us all evermore. **Amen.** 2 Corinthians 13:14

Any of the consecrated bread and wine remaining after the administration of the communion is to be reverently consumed.

Guidelines for Clergy and for Lay Eucharistic Ministers

The provision for Holy Communion by Extension allows people who are unable to attend the parish celebration (either Sunday or weekday), to feel part of the greater community of believers who have gathered at the Lord's Table together. The communion should be administered only by the clergy or by authorized lay Eucharistic ministers.

Any lay person administering the Sacrament by extension shall be authorized by the diocesan bishop to carry out this ministry and shall have undertaken training. The precise nature of the training would be decided by the diocesan bishop in conjunction with the parochial clergy, but it would need to include discussion regarding the nature and understanding of the Sacrament of Holy Communion as the Church of Ireland has received it, without detracting from the mystery of the Sacrament and the diversity of devotional opinion which the faithful may hold. Practical training in the administration of the Sacrament would also be necessary.

In addition, the pastoral implications arising from Holy Communion which has been brought from the parish Eucharist, (as opposed to a 'private' celebration with the priest and person) will need to be addressed. Due preparation of the wider community must ensure that this ministry is understood to be an extension of worship and not a social visit.

When the Sacrament should be brought from the Parish Celebration

It is most appropriate that the Sacrament be administered as soon as is practically possible after the celebration of the Eucharist in the church. The time lapsed between the service in the church and the reception in the home/hospital is to be made as short as possible, so that the connection between the celebration and the administration of the Sacrament is clear. The presiding minister may wish to send out lay Eucharistic ministers to administer Holy Communion by extension during the course of the liturgy. The most appropriate point for this would be immediately after the Great Silence. In such cases the communicant in the home may have a sense of sharing in the same service as the community worshipping in the church.

Arrangements shall be made with the parishioners) before-hand so that they may prepare themselves in advance to receive communion, preferably by reading to themselves some of the liturgy actually being used in the church. The exact time of communion by extension should, as far as possible, be consistent week by week or month by month.

Persons who should receive this ministry

1. Those who are ill, at home.
2. Those who are in hospital. This would include patients unable to attend a service in a hospital chapel but who would desire to receive communion in the ward immediately after such a service.
3. Those who are housebound or confined to nursing or residential care.

The desire of a communicant to have a 'full' celebration of the Eucharist should always be respected.

General guidelines

At the actual celebration of the Eucharist, only sufficient of the consecrated elements as is necessary for communion by extension should remain; otherwise, what is left should be consumed as normal. This will demand some planning before-hand by the presiding minister.

At the time of bringing the Sacrament by extension, the elements should be carried in a dignified and reverent manner, for example in a private communion set or a bread box/pyx and a small flagon which should be placed in a small cloth bag or pouch.

At the time of the communion, the elements should be placed on a corporal, on an appropriate surface (i.e. a small table). It may be appropriate also (where custom allows), to place a small cross and/or candle in view of the person(s) to receive communion.

At the conclusion of the rite, the Eucharistic minister must consume all the remaining consecrated elements and cleanse the vessels with water.

Only the rite of Holy Communion by Extension provided by the Church of Ireland should be used

Necessary vessels and materials for Holy Communion by Extension

Small flagon for consecrated wine]	from a
Small flagon for water]	private communion set
Small chalice & paten]	
Corporal & purificator		
Small Cross & candle (where appropriate)		
Bible		
SMALL Prayer Book(s) or Holy Communion by Extension card(s)		
^ Stole (where customary for the priest or deacon)		

PUBLIC WORSHIP
WITH HOLY COMMUNION BY EXTENSION

This rite is intended for use where the provision of a full celebration of Holy Communion by a priest is not possible in a parish church, chapel or cathedral.

In all cases the Liturgy of Extension shall be attended by the same Deacons or appropriately trained Lay Ministers, authorised by the diocesan bishop, who will lead the Liturgy of Reception in the church or churches where Holy Communion is being distributed.

After placing the consecrated bread and wine on the Holy Table the Deacon or Lay Minister leads the Liturgy of Reception from the reading desk or lectern.

Great care must be taken to ensure that any of the consecrated bread and wine remaining after the administration of the Communion is to be reverently consumed at the end of the service (or at the end of the service in the last church where the same elements are being used).

Suitable air tight and water tight containers must be used when bringing the elements between churches.

Deacons and Lay Ministers should ensure that suitable linens such as corporals, veils and purificators are available in the churches to which they are bringing Holy Communion.

The Holy Table shall be prepared by the receiving congregation as would normally be the custom for the celebration of Holy Communion.

LITURGY OF EXTENSION

TO BE USED IN THE CHURCH WHERE THE CELEBRATION TAKES PLACE

The following form of words are said by the priest to the Deacon or Lay Minister who will take the holy sacrament to another/other church (es)

These words are used after the Greeting and before the Collect for Purity.

As we gather *today* we celebrate the Eucharist in communion with our brothers and sisters in Christ at... *church(es)*. The holy sacrament will be brought to them from our celebration so that they too may share in this Holy Communion.

May they experience God's presence and know the joy of our fellowship with them.

Immediately after the Great Silence the Deacon or Lay Minister stands before the priest who says

.... I send you in the name of God,
Father, Son and Holy Spirit,
to carry this holy sacrament to the people at... *church(es)*.

Assure them of our love and our participation with them in worship and prayer in this Eucharist

LITURGY OF RECEPTION
TO BE USED IN THE CHURCH
WHERE HOLY COMMUNION IS TO BE DISTRIBUTED

The consecrated bread and wine are placed on the Holy Table on a fair white linen cloth before the beginning of the service which is led from the reading desk or lectern.

The Gathering of God's People

THE GREETING

The Lord be with you
and also with you.

or

Grace, mercy and peace
from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ
be with you all
and also with you.

or, from Easter Day until Pentecost:

Christ is risen!
The Lord is risen indeed. Alleluia!

After the Greeting and before the Collect for Purity the Deacon or Lay Minister says:

In union with those who have celebrated the Eucharist at... church [this] day, we seek God's grace in Holy Communion.

For as often as we eat this bread and drink the cup in obedience to his command, we proclaim the Lord's death until he comes.

or

The risen Christ walked with his disciples, opened to them the scriptures and made himself known to them in the breaking of bread.

We welcome you to this service
to hear God's holy word and receive the sacrament of Christ's body and blood.

May the Lord, who has called us, unite us in love and faith,
that we may walk as his disciples and follow wherever he calls.

or

Christ welcomes all who come into his presence, whether you are young or old, rich or poor whether you are joyful or sad, weak or strong, you are welcome.

Christ calls his people to be baptized
and nourishes them with the bread of life and the cup of salvation.

He invites us to come to his table to be his guests, so that he may send us out to be his presence in the world.

The prayers of penitence may take place at this point or before or after the Intercessions.

The Commandments may be read (and should be read during Advent and Lent), or The Beatitudes (pages 223-224), or The Summary of the Law:

Hear what our Lord Jesus Christ says:

You shall love the Lord your God with all your heart and with all your soul and with all your mind.

This is the first and great commandment.

And the second is like it.

You shall love your neighbour as yourself

On these two commandments depend all the law and the prophets. *Matthew 22:37-39*

**Lord, have mercy on us,
and write these your laws in our hearts.**

The Confession is introduced with appropriate words, such as:

God so loved the world that he gave his only Son Jesus Christ, to save us from our sins, to intercede for us in heaven, and to bring us to eternal life.

Let us then confess our sins in penitence and faith, firmly resolved to keep God's commandments and to live in love and peace:

Silence

**Almighty God, our heavenly Father,
we have sinned in thought and word and deed,
and in what we have left undone.
We are truly sorry and we humbly repent.**

**For die sake of your Son, Jesus Christ,
have mercy on us and forgive us,
that we may walk in newness of life
to the glory of your name. Amen.**

The Deacon or Lay Minister uses these words in place of The Absolution.

Merciful Lord,
grant to your faithful people pardon and peace, that we may be cleansed from all our sins, and serve you with a quiet mind; through Jesus Christ our Lord. **Amen.**

Suitable penitential sentences may be used instead of the confession and absolution (pages 224- 236 in the Book of Common Prayer) with these responses:

Lord, have mercy.

Lord, have mercy.

Christ, have mercy.

Christ, have mercy.

Lord, have mercy.

Lord, have mercy.

GLORIA IN EXCELSIS

This canticle may be omitted in Advent and Lent and on weekdays which are not holy days. Other versions of this canticle may be used, or when appropriate another suitable hymn of praise.

**Glory to God in the highest,
and peace to God's people on earth.
Lord God, heavenly King,
almighty God and Father,
we worship you, we give you thanks,
we praise you for your glory.**

**Lord Jesus Christ, only Son of the Father,
Lord God, Lamb of God,
you take away the sin of the world:
have mercy on us;
you are seated at the right hand of the Father, receive our prayer.**

**For you alone are the Holy One,
you alone are the Lord,
you alone are the Most High,
Jesus Christ, with the Holy Spirit,
in the glory of God the Father. Amen.**

THE COLLECT OF THE DAY

*The Deacon of Lay Minister introduces the Collect, allowing a short space for silence, and the people respond to the Collect with their **Amen**.*

Proclaiming and Receiving the Word

THE FIRST READING *is normally from the Old Testament*

At the end the reader may say

This is the Word of the Lord
Thanks be to God.

THE PSALM

'Glory to the Father...' may be omitted.

THE SECOND READING *is normally from the New Testament*

At the end the reader may say

This is the Word of the Lord
Thanks be to God.

THE GRADUAL

A canticle, psalm, hymn, anthem or acclamation may be sung.

Stand

THE GOSPEL READING

The Gospel Reading is introduced by the following words:

Hear the Gospel of our Saviour Christ, according to ... chapter... beginning at verse...

Glory to you, Lord Jesus Christ.

and concludes with:

This is the Gospel of the Lord.

Praise to you, Lord Jesus Christ

THE SERMON *is preached here or after the Creed*

THE NICENE CREED

The Nicene Creed is said on Sundays and principal holy days. The Creed may be omitted on ordinary weekdays or on festivals which are not principal holy days.

**We believe in one God,
the Father, the Almighty,
maker of heaven and earth,
of all that is, seen and unseen.**

**We believe in one Lord, Jesus Christ,
the only Son of God,
eternally begotten of the Father,
God from God,
Light from light,
true God from true God,
begotten, not made,
of one Being with the Father.
Through him all things were made.
For us and for our salvation
he came down from heaven,
was incarnate by the Holy Spirit of the Virgin Mary,
and was made man.
For our sake he was crucified under Pontius Pilate;
he suffered death and was buried.
On the third day he rose again
in accordance with the Scriptures;
he ascended into heaven
and is seated at the right hand of the Father.
He will come again in glory to Judge the living and the dead,
and his kingdom will have no end.**

**We believe in the Holy Spirit,
the Lord, the giver of life,
who proceeds from the Father and the Son,
who with the Father and the Son is worshipped and glorified,
who has spoken through the prophets.
We believe in one holy catholic and apostolic Church.**

**We acknowledge one baptism for the forgiveness of sins.
We look for the resurrection of the dead,
and the life of the world to come. Amen.**

THE PRAYERS OF THE PEOPLE

The Intercessions will normally include prayer for: the universal Church of God the nations of the world the local community those in need

and remembrance of and thanksgiving for, the faithful departed.

When appropriate, the prayers may be more focussed on one or two themes.

Prayers may be read by a deacon or lay person, or may be in silence with biddings, or may be in the form of open prayer, where members of the congregation contribute.

If a versicle and response are required after each section, one of the following may be said or sung:

Lord, in your mercy:
hear our prayer.

or

Lord, hear us:
Lord, graciously hear us.

or

Kyrie eleison.

At the end of the Intercessions the following may be used when appropriate:

Merciful Father,
**accept these our prayers
for the sake of your Son,
our Saviour Jesus Christ. Amen.**

or other suitable words or

Accept our prayers through Jesus Christ our Lord, who taught us to pray:
Our Father...

If the Lord's Prayer is used at this point in the service, it is not used after the Great Thanksgiving.

If the Penitence comes at this point of the service it may be followed by:

THE PRAYER OF HUMBLE ACCESS

**We do not presume to come to this your table, merciful Lord,
trusting in our own righteousness
but in your manifold and great mercies.
We are not worthy so much as to gather up the crumbs under your table.
But you are the same Lord,
whose nature is always to have mercy.
Giant us, therefore, gracious Lord,**

**so to eat the flesh of your dear Son Jesus Christ,
and to drink his blood,
that our sinful bodies may be made clean by his body,
and our souls washed through his most precious blood,
and that we may evermore dwell in him and he in us. Amen.**

THE PEACE

The Deacon or Lay Minister says

In communion with the whole Church of God,
and with our sisters and brothers at... *church(es)*
let us rejoice that we are called to be part of the body of Christ.

Though we are many, we are one body,
because we all share in the one bread.

The peace of the Lord be always with you.
And also with you.

It is appropriate that the congregation share with one another a sign of peace. This may be introduced with the words:

Let us offer one another a sign of peace.

A hymn is sung

PREPARATION FOR COMMUNION

The Deacon or Lay Minister, standing at the prayer desk/lectern says

When Jesus was at the table with his disciples, he took bread, blessed and broke it, and gave it to them. Then their eyes were opened, and they recognised him; and he vanished from their sight. They said to each other, "Were not our hearts burning within us while he was talking to us on the road, while he was opening the scriptures to us?" That same hour they got up and returned to Jerusalem; and they found the eleven and their companions gathered together.

All say

**Blessed are you, God of those who hunger and thirst,
for you give us our food in due season.
You nourish us with your word, which is the bread of life.
You strengthen us with your Spirit, the new wine of your Kingdom.
In Christ you are food for the hungry, refreshment for the weary.
Blessed are you, our Creator and Redeemer.
Blessed be God for ever.**

THE LORD'S PRAYER

The Deacon or Lay Minister says

As our Saviour Christ has taught us, so we pray

**Our Father in heaven, hallowed be your name,
your kingdom come, your will be done,
on earth as in heaven.
Give us today our daily bread.
Forgive us our sins
as we forgive those who sin against us.
Lead us not into temptation but deliver us from evil
For the kingdom, the power, and the glory
are yours now and for ever. Amen.**

or

As our Saviour Christ has taught us, we are bold to say

**Our Father, who art in heaven:
hallowed be thy name,
thy kingdom come,
thy will be done, on earth as it is in heaven.
Give us this day our daily bread.
And forgive us our trespasses
as we forgive those who trespass against us.
And lead us not into temptation,
but deliver us from evil.
For thine is the kingdom, the power, and the glory
for ever and ever. Amen.**

THE COMMUNION

The Deacon or Lay Minister moves to the Holy Table and says

The Church of God, of which we are members,
has taken bread and wine
and given thanks over them
according to our Lord's command.

These holy gifts have been brought to us that we too may share in the communion of
the body and blood of Christ.

If not already used, all may say

**We do not presume to come to this your table,
merciful Lord,
trusting in our own righteousness but in your manifold and great mercies.
We are not worthy so much as to gather up the crumbs under your table.
But you are the same Lord,
whose nature is always to have mercy.
Grant us, therefore, gracious Lord,
so to eat the flesh of your dear Son Jesus Christ,
and to drink his blood,
that our sinful bodies may be made clean by his body,
and our souls washed through his most precious blood,
and that we may evermore dwell in him and he in us. Amen.**

The Deacon or Lay Minister says

Draw near with faith.

Receive the body of our Lord Jesus Christ which he gave for you and his blood which
he shed for you.

Remember that he died for you,
and feed on him in your hearts by faith with thanksgiving.

The Deacon or Lay Minister and people receive Communion.

*Any of the consecrated bread and wine remaining after the administration of the Communion
is to be reverently consumed except where they are being brought to another church on the
same day.*

THE GREAT SILENCE

*When all have received communion the Deacon or Lay Minister and the people keep silence
for reflection.*

GOING OUT AS GOD'S PEOPLE

A hymn may be sung here or before the Dismissal.

PRAYER AFTER COMMUNION

The appropriate Post Communion Prayer (pages 241-336 of the Book of Common Prayer), or the following may be said:

Father of all, we give you thanks and praise,
that when we were still far off
you met us in your Son and brought us home.
Dying and living, he declared your love, gave us grace, and opened the gate of glory.
May we who share Christ's body live his risen life; we who drink his cup bring life to
others; we whom the Spirit lights give light to the world.
Keep us firm in the hope you have set before us, so we and all your children shall be
free, and the whole earth live to praise your name; through Christ our Lord **Amen.**

All say

**Almighty God,
we thank you for feeding us with the spiritual food
of the body and blood of your Son Jesus Christ
Through him we offer you our souls and bodies to be a living sacrifice.
Send us out in the power of your Spirit
to live and work to your praise and glory. Amen.**

DISMISSAL

The Deacon or Lay Minister says

May the Almighty and merciful God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit, bless
us and keep us. **Amen.**

Go in peace to love and serve the Lord in the name of Christ. **Amen.**

From Easter Day to Pentecost:

Go in the peace of the Risen Christ. Alleluia!
Alleluia! Thanks be to God. Alleluia! Alleluia!

APPENDIX E

Declaration

[On the formularies of the Church of Ireland, 2009]

The Church of Ireland is part of the one, holy, catholic, and apostolic Church, worshipping the one true God - Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. It professes the faith uniquely revealed in the Holy Scriptures and set forth in the catholic creeds: which faith the Church is called upon to proclaim afresh in each generation. Led by the Holy Spirit, it has borne witness to Christian truth in its historic formularies - the Thirty-nine Articles of Religion, the Book of Common Prayer, the Ordering of Bishops, Priests and Deacons and the Declaration prefixed to the Statutes of the Church of Ireland (1870).

These historic formularies are a definition of the faith as proclaimed by the Church of Ireland, and thus form an important part of the inheritance through which this Church has been formed in its faith and witness to this day. The formularies that have been passed on are part of a living tradition that today must face new challenges and grasp fresh opportunities.

Historic documents often stem from periods of deep separation between Christian Churches. Whilst, in spite of a real degree of convergence, distinct differences remain, the tone and tenor of the language of the negative statements towards other Christians should not be seen as representing the spirit of this Church today.

The Church of Ireland affirms all in its tradition that witnesses to the truth of the Gospel. It regrets that words written in another age and in a different context should be used in a manner hurtful to or antagonistic towards other Christians.

The Church of Ireland seeks the visible unity of the Church. In working towards that goal this Church is committed to reaching out towards other Churches in a spirit of humility and love, that together all Christians may grow towards unity in life and mission to the glory of God.

[BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER, 2004, INCLUDED IN 2018 REPRINT P.794]

APPENDIX F

THE MEANING AND ROLE OF THE ANAMNESIS:

A PAPER BY THE REVD DR MICHAEL KENNEDY 1979, REVISED AND UPDATED, 2017, 2020*

By the *anamnesis* is meant that part of the great prayer of thanksgiving and consecration of the Eucharist which expresses what the church believes itself to be doing in response to the command of Jesus to “do this in remembrance” of him. In liturgies of the traditional type, immediately after the words of institution, comes a paragraph along the lines of the following (my example comes from the Scottish liturgy of 1929), “Wherefore, O Lord, and heavenly Father, according to the institution of thy dearly beloved Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, we thy humble servants do celebrate and make here before thy Divine Majesty, with these holy gifts, which we now offer unto thee, the memorial thy Son hath commanded us to make; having in remembrance his blessed passion, and precious death, his mighty resurrection, and glorious ascension; rendering unto the most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same, and looking for his coming again with power and great glory...”

To discover the basic theology of any rite of the Eucharist, a key place to look is at the form of its *anamnesis*. Thus in eucharistic prayer one of the Roman Catholic Church the nearest thing to the old pre-Vatican two rite, we read,

“Father, we celebrate the memory of Christ, your Son. We, your people and your ministers, recall his passion, his resurrection from the dead, and his ascension into glory; and from the many gifts you have given us we offer to you, God of glory and Majesty, this holy and perfect sacrifice, the bread of life and the cup of the eternal salvation. Look with favour on these offerings and accept them as you once accepted the gifts of yourself and Abel, the sacrifice of Abraham, our father in faith, and the bread and wine offered by your priest Melchizedek. Almighty God, we pray 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, let us be filled with every grace and blessing...”

One may compare with this the *anamnesis* in eucharistic prayer one in the Church of Ireland’s Book of Common Prayer, 2004 (as above)

Therefore, Father, with this bread and this cup we do as Christ your Son commanded: we remember his passion and death, we celebrate his resurrection and ascension, and we look for the coming of his kingdom.

And, that in eucharistic prayer two,

Father, with this bread and this cup, we do as our Saviour has commanded: we celebrate the redemption he has won for us; and we proclaim his perfect sacrifice, made once for all upon the cross, his mighty resurrection and glorious ascension; and we look for his coming to fulfil all things according to your will.

A feature of modern liturgy is the provision of a number of alternative eucharistic prayers which serve to illuminate different aspects of the eucharistic mystery. The Church of England’s *CommonWorship* has no less than eight. Of the Church of Ireland’s modern forms of the eucharist the key words are, in eucharistic prayer one, “remember”, in eucharistic prayer two “proclaim” and in eucharistic prayer three, “sacrifice of thanks and praise”.

And this brings us back to the Bible. What is the significance of the Lord’s command to “do

this in remembrance of me?” Why do we find the Greek word *anamnesis* here instead of the more commonly used, *mnemosunon* What Hebrew or Aramaic original is to be understood as underlying what we find in the Greek New Testament? How did the early Church understand our Lord’s command, and did they understand it correctly? Are Catholic Christians right in thinking that obedience to the command of Jesus consists of making an act of oblation, or are Protestants correct in believe that worshippers are meant merely to think of his death as reminded by the token of his passion? Or is there some position intermediate between these two which more nearly approximates to the idea which underlies the evidence of the New Testament?

A thorough examination of the biblical evidence is to be found in a convenient form in the Grove Liturgical Booklet by D. Gregg, *Anamnesis in the Eucharist*. I am not in agreement with everything that he says, and in particular question the extent to which his conclusions follow from his evidence! But there are, in my opinion, a number of valid points made in his essay:

First, the verb *poieite* “do” (plural). This would seem to be the equivalent of the Hebrew *‘asah* which can mean “offer”, but here almost certainly has the more general significance of “perform this action”. Obedience to the Lord’s command therefore involves a *liturgical action*. “Remembrance” in this context does not mean something purely psychological taking place, just in the mind, but it involves the performance of a ceremony. The Holy Communion is an *act of memorial*.

Second, the Greek construction *eis anamnesin* “in remembrance” must go back to one of the Hebrew norms (or its Aramaic equivalent) derived from the root *zkr*. Four possibilities, derived from a study of the Septuagint and other Greek versions of the Old Testament, are suggested, *azkarah hazkir*, *zeker*, and *zikkaron*. Although these are all from the one root, *zkr* they do have distinct meanings.

‘azkarah appears in the Old Testament to designate a specifically material object, used cultically to “cause something to be remembered”, most characteristically the “handful” taken from the cereal offerings and burnt by fire. It is usually translated by *mnemosunon* rather than *anamnesis*.

hazkir, in the form *lehazkir* is found in the titles of Pss 38 and 70, meaning “for a memorial” and this is translated in the Septuagint as *eisanamnesin*. But this norm form is very unusual in writings contemporary with the New Testament and hence is unlikely to be the one we are looking for.

Zeker designates that aspect of God or man by which he is known or remembered - that is to say his reputation, renown, and after a man’s death, especially, the memory of what he was. It always refers to something that is non-material, but continuing, abiding, and never-ceasing unless and until it is actively blotted out. But there is no instance of it being translated by *anamnesis*, hence it is unlikely to be the word underlying the command of Jesus at the Last Supper.

It will be seen that we have already implicitly rejected both that concept which sees the essence of the eucharist in the presentation of a material oblation and that which sees it as consisting in a purely mental act of remembering. Such concepts may not be altogether ruled out as *secondary* meanings, but in the light of the linguistic considerations certainly do not appear plausible as the *primary meaning*. However, we do need to bear in mind that since all die memory concepts go back to a single Hebrew root *zkr* it may be pressing the evidence too far to make *absolute* distinctions between them.

We are left with one Hebrew word *zikkaron* to consider as the most likely equivalent of *anamnesis* in the accounts in the Last Supper (in Luke and Paul). Gregg says that it designates “something”

which directs the attention of those who perceive it (so that it constitutes a commemoration) to a prior reality from which the *zikkaron* itself derives. This “something” may be a cultic *object*, and we see here a link with *‘azkarah*. Or it may be a cultic *act* performed to commemorate an event. Or it may be a *written* record, preserving (and therefore commemorating) words spoken, lists of names, or facts of history.

In our particular context it is unlikely to represent a cultic object, because it would then most probably have been translated by *mnemosmn* rather than anamnesis. Where *anamnesis* is used it seems to signify a cultic act as in Numbers 10:10 where that of blowing the silver trumpets is referred to. Moreover, in the Hebrew writings most nearly contemporary with the New Testament *zikkaron* seems to be used most often with the meaning of *cultic act*. It was only after the destruction of the Temple in A.D. 70 that the meaning most often related to *written records*.

The word *zikkaron* is in fact used in the Passover *Haggadah* in the very place where the Cup of the Blessing is being blessed, and appears to indicate there *acommemorative* cultic act.

A further interesting consideration arises at this point. If the Eucharist is, as has been suggested, a commemorative cultic act, who does the “remembering” - is it *us* - or *God* - or *both us and God*? Obviously, insofar as we are performing the commemorative act, *we* are “remembering”. But Jeremias has pointed out that while the formula *eis anamnesin* and its variations were not infrequently used in the Judaism of Jesus’ time with reference to human remembering, by far the more frequent practice was to use it and its equivalents for *God’s remembrance*. When something is recalled before God, it has a purpose, it is intended to effect something: that *God may remember* mercifully or “punishingly”. The Passover passage already mentioned spoke of the “remembrance of the Messiah,” and Jeremias interprets this as referring to the appearance of the Messiah, which means the bringing in of the parousia. He would translate “do this in remembrance of me” as “do this that *God* may remember me”, so that the Father, remembering the Messiah, may cause the kingdom to break in by the the paFOusia (“coming”).

If this is correct (and it does not appear to command widespread support, despite the evidence Jeremias adduces), one could suggest as a paraphrase of the dominical command, the following,

Perform the liturgical act (of taking, blessing, breaking, and giving the bread, and of taking, blessing, and giving the wine, with the appropriate words of interpretation) as a means of remember the sacrificial death of Jesus before God the Father. Do this in thanksgiving for the sacrifice that has been accomplished, and in supplication for the coming in of the kingdom, when God “remembers” his Messiah.

If one finds this definition and interpretation of the Eucharistic action both too cumbersome and too hypothetical, one might, in the light of the scriptural and linguistic evidence already considered adopt as an alternative, that the Eucharist “is a remembering before God in thanksgiving and supplication of the once for all sacrifice of Jesus by means of the liturgical act of taking and blessing/thanking, breaking and giving.” It is this latter definition which is presupposed in the remainder of this essay, although for convenience it might be further simplified to “a remembrance before God in thanksgiving and supplication of the once for all sacrifice of his Son Jesus Christ”.

If the remembrance of Jesus is accomplished by means of a liturgical act, can it be said in any sense to be a sacrifice? In the unanimous opinion of the early church, it was. The *Didache*, one of the earliest Christian documents outside the New Testament calls it a *thusia* - sacrifice. 1 Clement, written perhaps in A.D. 96 speaks of Christian ministers as those *poiounlestasprosporas* “making the offerings”. Thomas Talley notes that at a veiy early stage, the verb *eucharistein*

(thanking) assumes a primacy over the more to be expected *etdagein* (blessing) with reference to the service which originated in the Passover with its predominant “blessing” of God. He can only account for this by the assumption that the early Christians wished to emphasise the sacrificial character of their rite as the Hebrew equivalent of *eucharistia*, thanksgiving, had a strong sacrificial connotation. The *zebhak todah* was one of three sacrifices of the Communion type in the Old Testament in which a repast was shared with God. Part of the sacrifice was consumed on the altar and part returned to the one who offered, to be enjoyed with his friends. It thus combines the notions of meal and sacrifice.

The early church made much use of Malachi 1:11 as a foreshadowing of the Eucharist for “from the rising of the sun to its setting my name is great among the nations, and in every place incense is offered in my name, and *apure offering*-, for my name is great among the nations, says the Lord of hosts.”

Justin Martyr, early in the second century viewed the offering of fine flour by those purified from leprosy as a foreshadowing of the eucharistic bread. Later in the second century Irenaeus spoke of the presentation of the bread and wine to God as the first instalments or “firstfruits” of the creation, which will one day be wholly rejuvenated.

Liturgical texts as such are lacking until that of the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus, (conventionally dated as 215 A.D.), but one finds even at this early stage that the classic remembering-we offer has already been firmly established,

Remembering, therefore, his death and resurrection, we offer to you this bread and this cup, giving you thanks because you have held us where the stands before you and minister to you.

It should be noted, however, that the exact significance of this offering of the bread and wine remains obscure, although Irenaeus appears to connect it with the eucharist as a pure offering,

He took the bread, which is created, and gave thanks, saying, “This is my Body.”

Likewise for the cup, which is part of the creation to which we belong, and he revealed it to be his Blood, and he taught that it was the new offering of the new covenant.”

However, it is not until Cyprian in the mid-third century that we get an explicit statement connecting this Eucharistic oblation with the passion of Jesus. He says, “the Lord’s passion is the sacrifice we offer.” We should it here that there is no implication in Cyprian of a “repeated” or “new” sacrifice of Christ. He means no more than that we remember before God the Father in thanksgiving and supplication the sacrifice once made.

It would appear that the development of the Eucharistic prayer so as to include the institution narrative led naturally to an *anamnesis* in which the church’s understanding of the dominical command could be verbalised, and since the Eucharist was understood to be in some sense a sacrifice, one finds that the language of sacrifice is used. One theological consequence of this was that the doctrine of Christ as both priest and victim of the sacrifice came to the fore, particularly in the fourth century A.D., all the patristic authorities affirming this in almost identical terms: St Ephraim, St. Gregory Nazianzus, Epiphanius, St John Chrysostom, Theophilus of Alexandria, St. Ambrose, St. Augustine and others.

At the same time the *anamnesis* itself underwent a process of development in that there was a tendency to elaborate that which was remembered. Hippolytus had referred just to the death and resurrection but the liturgy of St John Chrysostom reads,

We therefore, remembering of this saving commandment and all the things that were done for us: the cross, the tomb, the resurrection on the third day, the ascension into heaven, the session of the right hand, the second and glorious coming again; offering you your own from your own, in all and through all, we offer you also this reasonable and bloodless sacrifice... One can perhaps justify this development on the grounds that Jesus did say “do this in remembrance of *me*” rather than “do this in remembrance of *my death*”, although clearly the showing forth of the Lord’s death is central to what the Eucharist is intended to accomplish as in the declaration of St Paul in 1 Cor 11:26 “For as often as you eat this bread and drink the cup you proclaim the Lord’s death until he comes.” Dix criticises this change, however, on the rather different grounds that the old eschatological concepts of the church being in the last age was breaking down, and was being replaced by a new concept of historical time.

The mediaeval church, following on the lines laid down in the patristic period, thought of itself as offering Christ as a sacrifice, “a pure host, a holy host, an immaculate host, the holy bread of the eternal life, and the cup of perpetual salvation.” The Reformers, rejecting any derivative and secondary sense in which Christ and his passion could be said to be “offered”, said “No. Christ has already been offered, once for all. All that we can do is appropriate by faith the benefits of what has been accomplished once for all.” This change in concept rapidly found liturgical expression, as can be seen in the earliest editions of our own Prayer Book. The 1549 book, introduced in the Church of Ireland on Easter Day 1551, which has often been mistakenly regarded as enshrining a supposedly “Catholic” viewpoint in fact reflects a concept of making a memorial of the once for all sacrifice by performing the rite commanded by Jesus, and by offering praise and thanks. The wording of the *anamnesis* is the same of that in the Scottish rite quoted at the beginning of this paper with a significant omission of any oblation of the bread and the cup. The 1552 rite was even more radical, and the *anamnesis* disappeared. Cynics might take the view that Cranmer and his colleagues had so deprived the memorial of all its meaning that there was no longer anything to express: but this would probably be going a little bit too far. Cranmer’s view was that that the fulfilment of the command to “do this in remembrance of me” was the reception of Communion, and the act of Communion immediately followed the recitation of the Words of Institution.

The words “sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving” are retained in the 1552 order, but it is clear that Cranmer means by them merely a sacrifice which *consists* of praise and Thanksgiving rather than one whose *motive* is praise and thanksgiving. The essential meaning of the Eucharist for Cranmer is the continual mental remembering of the Lord’s passion and death, and his theology is well summarised in 1552 words of administration:

Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for the and feed on him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving.

Drink this in remembrance that Christ’s blood was shed for thee, and be thankful.

His 1552 rite, which represents most accurately his mature view, deletes in a significant manner the statement that, “we thy humble servants do celebrate, and make before thy divine Majesty, with these thy holy gifts, the memorial which thy Son hast commanded us to make.”

A further sign of Cranmer’s definitive position is seen in the transference of the “oblation”, traditionally, as seen above, an integral part of the *anamnesis*, to a position *after* the communion, where it has remained a mere optional alternative to the Prayer of Thanksgiving in the traditional Prayer Book service, Holy Communion One. And instead of an oblation of *Christ*, there is substituted an “offering of ourselves, our souls and bodies.”

In his writings he distinguished sharply between a propitiatory or merciful sacrifice such as Christ offered to God for us, and sacrifices of laud, praise, and thanksgiving which we ourselves offer to God by Christ. The traditional order of mass, he said, “is neither a sacrifice propitiatory, nor yet a sacrifice of laud and praise, nor in any wise allowed before God, but is abominable and detestable.”

It would appear at first sight that the Catholic and the Reformed views of the eucharistic memorial were totally opposed and that there could be no common ground between them. J.J. Hughes in his impressive book *Stewards of the Lord* argued that a way forward out of the doctrinally impasse might have been found by returning to the Thomist doctrine that “the sacramental representation of the passion is itself the sacrifice of the mass” rather than by looking for a special act of oblation of Christ in the “eucharist (which could be said to laid itself open to accusations of an additional or new sacrifice) but he could find such a doctrine only in the few writers, notably Cajetan and Schatzgeyer (on the continent) and Cuthbert Tunstall (in England). To some Lutheran envoys in 1538 Tunstall wrote,

We are astonished that anyone should object to the mass being called a sacrifice, since it has been the custom from antiquity, both among the Greeks and London’s so to describe it. For therein is consecrated the body and blood of the Lord in commemoration of his death ...Therefore, if Christ is priest, sacrifice, and victim, wherever Christ is there is a victim, there is our sacrifice. And if in the sacrament of the altar there is present the true body of Christ and the true blood of Christ, how can one, while maintaining that truth concerning the Lord’s body and blood, deny that therein is our sacrifice?

On the Reformed side the opposition to the traditional doctrinal of the Eucharistic sacrifice was vehement. Cranmer said, “for never no person made a sacrifice of Christ, but he himself only... Wherefore all popish priests that presume to make every day a sacrifice of Christ either must they need to make Christ’s sacrifice bare, and imperfect, and insufficient, or else is their sacrifice in vain which is added to the sacrifice which is already of itself sufficient and perfect.”

However, at his trial at Oxford in 1554 the equally convinced Protestant Ridley made a significant admission when asked, “What say you to that council, where it is said, that the priest does offer an unbloody sacrifice of the body of Christ?” He answered carefully, “I see, it is well said, *if it be rightly understood*, and he doth not lie who saith that Christ be offered.” This would seem to be quite close to the Thomist view and indeed to the theology of the early church. It seems a pity that the Reformers in general, Ridley himself included, were so carried away by their denials of Catholic orthodoxy that they could not appreciate the legitimate and positive content of the inherited liturgy. Ridley, in his *Brief Declaration of the Lord’s Supper*, written in the same year had said that the fathers in writing about the sacrifice of the mass meant nothing more than “the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, than a commemoration, a showing forth and a *sacramental commemoration* of that one only bloody sacrifice, offered up once for all.” The same could have been said about the mass itself which he and his associates had attacked so persistently and vehemently. Even the words quoted at the beginning of this section, about “a pure Host, a holy Host, an immaculate Host” did not necessarily bear an unscriptural meaning.

Dr Massey Shepherd, in a much-quoted address at the Anglican Congress at Minneapolis in 1954, had reminded his hearers that basically there were two Eucharistic liturgies in the Anglican Communion which stem respectively from the prayer books of 1549 and 1552. It would appear that while a significant stream of thought on the subject of the eucharistic memorial had been content to echo the views of the Reformers, there had also, from the 16th century onwards, been another outlook, which expressed itself more in terms of the objective

“memorial before God” of the 1549 rite than in terms of the subjective mental act during communion which the 1552 order seemed intended to express. A number of Anglicans had gone even further, and had taught the doctrine of the eucharistic sacrifice difficult to distinguish from that of traditional Catholicism. As a representative of this latter school one

could quote Herbert Thorndike (1598-1672) Prebendary of Westminster, who went so far as to assert that the eucharist is a propitiatory sacrifice. He claimed, “that the eucharist may be very properly be accounted a sacrifice propitiatory and impetratory both, in this regard - because the offering of it up to God, with and by the said prayers, doth rendered God propitious, and obtain at his hands the benefits of Christ’s death which it represented! - there can be no cause to refuse, being no more than the simplicity of plain Christianity enforceth. And Jeremy Taylor, in the seventeenth century was to teach the same doctrine and that at considerable length in more than one passage.

The varied views of Anglican on the memorial/offering their been well summarised by Bishop Stephen Neill,

All are agreed that there can be no repetition of the sacrifice of Christ. That was offered once for all, a full perfect and sufficient propitiation for the sins of all men. But there are divergent views as to the nature of the sacrifice offered by the church in the Holy Communion. On the one review, the sacrificial emphasis is threefold, but as a sacrifice offered by the church is single. First the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross is made present in contemporary by the consecration of the elements: this is wholly and completely God’s gift of grace to man; there is no sense in which man offers Christ to the Father. Second, through Communion, man receives the benefits of the sacrifice of Christ, and is made partaker of his death and resurrection (this corresponds to the peace offering of die Old Testament Law). Third, the members of the church, now made one afresh with Christ and one another, offer themselves to God to be a lively, holy and acceptable sacrifice to him (This corresponds to the burnt offering of the Old Testament). The other school, while accepting the Evangelical doctrine just stated, would say that it does not go far enough. Christ’s sacrifice on the cross was offered once for all; yet Christ is still an high priest, he ever liveth to make intercession for his people, and is always in the presence of God presenting and pleading his sacrifice on our behalf. What Christ is doing in the heavenly places, the church in the Eucharist is always doing on earth. There can be no re-enactment of what Christ did on Calvary: but there can be a re-presentation of it upon earth, and a pleading of the merits of his sacrifice in the presence of God. Since in the Eucharist Christ is actually present, it is possible speak of the church’s offering Christ to the father; it is He who is himself the offering in the eucharistic sacrifice, and that sacrifice is effectual for the cleansing of sin and the setting forward of the cause of the kingdom of God in the world.

Inevitably, the latter kind of outlook had sought liturgical expression; and while many Anglicans have had content with a “1552” type liturgy, others had persistently sought to go back to “1549” and further. The situation was further complicated by the fact that some Anglicans had combined use of the 1552 liturgy as significantly modified in 1662 with a very advanced theology of the eucharistic sacrifice.

For most of the period between the 16th and 20th centuries the 1552/1662 liturgy was predominant in the Anglican churches. It was established by law in England, Ireland, and Wales; and in the 19th century, when extensive missionary work carried Anglican Christianity to many parts of the world, it was for the most part Cranmer’s second service that went with the missionaries and was used in the colonies.

However, the 1549 type of liturgy was revived in the Scottish services of 1637 and 1764, and passed to the Episcopal Church of America. Often with the addition of an explicit oblation of the bread and the cup in the *anamnesis* it was passed to a number of other Anglican churches, as witnessed to by, for example, the Ceylon Liturgy of 1938, the Indian liturgy of 1960, the

South African liturgy of 1954, the Japanese liturgy of 1959 and the 1959 liturgy of the Church of the Province of the West Indies. And the theology which underlies such a liturgical type was clearly expressed even in the Church of England in the famous reply of the archbishops of Canterbury and York the papal condemnation of Anglican orders (*Saepius Officio*),

We truly teach the doctrine of the eucharistic sacrifice... For first we offer the sacrifice of praise and Thanksgiving; then next we plead and represent before the

Father the sacrifice of the cross, and by it we confidently entreat remission of sins and all other benefits of the Lord's passion for the whole church.

The document *Principles of Prayer book Revision*, published in 1958 in preparation for the Lambeth conference of that year, indicated certain conspicuous defects in the 1662 order for Holy Communion, "to which a comparison of the rites which had been or are still in use in other branches of church, and biblical research concur in pointing for most emphatically...

namely,

The absence from it of any formula for making a Memorial before God of the saving events commemorated, which is a meaning once again widely attached to the Scripture usage of the Greek word *anamnesis* and is intimately connected with the sacrificial aspect of the eucharist.

1. Its lack of fullness and balance in the presentation of the work of redemption by its concentration on the death of Christ alone without any reference to the resurrection, exaltation, and second coming;
2. the meagreness, apart from the Preface and Sanctus, of the Eucharistic element in a prayer which originally developed out of the thanksgiving uttered by our Lord at the Last Supper.

Considerations of this sort to a greater or less extent underlie most more recent revisions, backed from by the recommendations of the working group on the theology of the eucharist by the Inter-Anglican Liturgical Consultation meeting in Dublin in 1995. Almost all revisions attempt to restore the unity of the great Eucharistic prayer, which was first broken up by Cranmer 1552 service. The rites include an *anamnesis* of some sort although the actual content varies significantly. In general there seems to have been an attempt to produce eucharistic prayers that can be "owned" by the full spectrum of membership of the churches, and this is assisted by the inclusion of a choice of prayers reflecting various aspects of the eucharistic mystery. Eucharistic Prayer One of Holy Communion Two in the Church of Ireland's 2004 Prayer Book is widely used in this church, the reservations expressed about an earlier version of it, during the preparation of the *Alternative Prayer Book* of 1984, having long since passed into history.

Therefore, Father, with this bread and this cup we do as Christ your Son commanded: we remember his passion and death, we celebrate his resurrection and ascension, and we look for die coming of his kingdom.

Accept through him our great high priest, this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; and as we eat and drink these holy gifts, grant by the power of the life-giving Spirit that we may be made one in your holy Church and partakers of

the body and blood of your Son, that he may dwell in us and we in him.

The uniqueness of Christ's sacrifice having been fully expressed in the pre-Sanctus, there is a remembrance of his passion and death together with his resurrection and ascension and an anticipation of the eschaton accomplished by the liturgical action with the bread and cup, inclusive of "taking", giving thanks, breaking of the bread, and communion, and this is a remembrance before God of all that he has done for us in Christ in thanksgiving and supplication.

◆This paper was written in 1979 shortly after completion of the higher degree of Bachelor of Divinity (ranking above all the Masters' degrees and after the Ph.Ds) in Trinity College, Dublin. The dissertation, submitted in part fulfilment was on "The Meaning and Role of the Anamnesis in the Anglican Liturgical Tradition", and ran to 35,000 words. It is to some extent summarized here, however, some parts of the original text have long been overtaken by events and so have been omitted or re-written. The Grove Booklet by David Gregg was critically assessed in the dissertation.. The linguistic side of that well-researched document has been drawn upon here for the original and very valuable research on which it was based, particularly important because the Jewish and Old Testament background of the eucharistic words of Jesus has often been overlooked in whole or in part, that concerning the meaning of "remembrance" being highly relevant to a biblically based theology of the eucharist.

THEOLOGY OF LITURGY, EUCHARIST: BIBLIGRAPHY, PUBLISHED

A/

Abbot., W.M., *The Documents of Vatican II With Notes and Comments by Catholic, Protestant, and Orthodox Authorities*, translated from the Latin, Geoffrey Chapman, 1965.

Alcuin Club., *A Directory of Ceremonial*, Alcuin Club Tracts XIII, Mowbray, 1931.

Alcuin Club., *A Survey of the Proposals for The Alternative Prayer Book – Part I The Order for Holy Communion*, Alcuin Club Prayer Book Revision Pamphlets, XII, Mowbray, 1923.

Alcuin Club., Prayer Book Revision Pamphlets X, *Reservation – its Purpose and Method*, Mowbray, 1923, with a letter on Reservation by Walter Howard Frere.

Allen, J.L. *Cardinal Ratzinger – The Vatican’s Enforcer of the Faith*, Continuum, 2000.

Alzati, C., tr. George Guiver, *Ambrosianum Mysterium – The Church of Milan and its liturgical tradition*, Vol 1, Joint Liturgical Studies 44, The Alcuin Club and The Group for Renewal of Worship, Grove Books, 1999.

Alzati, C., tr. George Guiver, *Ambrosianum Mysterium – The Church of Milan and its liturgical tradition*, Vol II, Joint Liturgical Studies 47-48, The Alcuin Club and The Group for Renewal of Worship, Grove Books, 2000.

Anglican-Lutheran International Conversations, the Report of the Conversations 1970-1972, authorized by the Lambeth Conference and the Lutheran World Federation, SPCK, 1973.

Amusan, S., *A Study of Criteria for the Development of a Contemporary Eucharistic Liturgy for the Anglican Church of Nigeria*, Ph.D. Diss., University of Birmingham, 1990.

Amusan, S., “Sacrifice in African Traditional Religion as a Means of Understanding Eucharistic Theology”, pp141-146, in Holeyton, D.R., *Our Thanks and Praise – The Eucharist in Anglicanism Today*, Papers from the Fifth International Anglican Liturgical Consultation, the Anglican Book Centre, Toronto, 1998., Study Document.

Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission, *The Final Report*, Windsor, 1981, CTS/SPCK, 1982.

Amusan, S., *Towards an Authentic Anglican and African Litirgy in Nigeria: An Experimental Liturgy*, D. Min Thesis, San Francisco Theological Seminary (1983).

Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission/ Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity, *Clarifications on Eucharist and Ministry* together with a letter from Cardinal Edward Idris Cassidy, President, Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity, Published for the Anglican Consultative Council and the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity, 1994.

Von Allmen, J., *The Lord's Supper*, London 1969.

Armstrong, J.W., “The Formative Factors in the Emergence of the Holy Communion Office in the Book of Common Prayer” (with a Roman Catholic Comment by Vincent Ryan and a Methodist Comment by Aubrey West), pp56-74 in Michael Hurley, Ed, *Church and Eucharist*, Gill and Son, Dublin and Melbourne, 1966.

Ashby, G., *Sacrifice - its Nature and Purpose*, SCM., 1988

Atherston, A., *Lay Presidency – An Anglican Option*, Grove Worship Series, W208, Grove Books, 2011.

Atkins, P., *Memory and Liturgy – Place of Memory in the Composition and Practice of Liturgy*, Ashgate.

Aulén, G., *Eucharist and Sacrifice*, Oliver and Boyd, Edinburgh, 1956.

Austerberry, D., *Celebrating the Liturgy – A guide for priest and people*, Mowbray, 1980.

- Aveling., J.C.H. and Loades, D.M., McAdoo, H.R., *Rome and the Anglicans*, ed by Hasse, Wolfgang, New York, 1982.
- Avis, P., *Anglicanism and the Christian Church*, T & T Clark, Edinburgh, 1989
- Avis, P., *Ecumenical Theology and the Elusiveness of Doctrine*, SPCK, 1986..
- B/
 Baker., T.G.A., *Questioning Worship*, SCM 1977.
- Baldovin., J.F., *Liturgy in Ancient Jerusalem*, Alcuin/GROW Liturgical Study 9 [Grove Liturgical Study 57], Grove Books, 1989.
- Barnwell., P.S., Cross, C., and Rycraft, A., *Mass and Parish in late Medieval England: The Use of York Spire Books*, 2005.
- Barkley., J.M., “The Eucharist in Presbyterianism”, in a publication without title, undated, and without information about the publisher in the only copy available to the present writer, p.149ff
- Barrett-Lennard., *The Sacramentary of Sarapion of Thmuis*, Alcuin/GROW Liturgical Study 25, Grove Books, 1993.
- Barry, A., *The Teacher’s Prayer Book; being The Book of Common Prayer, with Introduction, Analyses, Notes and a Commentary upon the Psalter*, London, Eyre and Spottiswoode, 3rd edition, undated.
- Bates, W.H., “Thanksgiving and Intercession in the Liturgy of St Mark”, pp109-119 61 in *The Sacrifice of Praise...in honour of Arthur Hubert Couratin*, ed. Bryan Spinks (q.v.) C.L.V. – Editioni Liturgiche – 00192 Roman, 1981.
- Baumstark, A., *Comparative Liturgy*, revised by Bernard Botte, English edition by F.L. Cross, Mowbray, 1958.
- Baxter, P., *Sarum Use – The ancient customs of Salisbury*, Spire Books, 2008.
- Beckwith, R., *Daily and Weekly Worship: Jewish to Christian*, Alcuin/GROW Liturgical Study 1 (Grove Liturgical Study 49), Grove Books, 1982.
- Beckwith, R.T. and Tiller, J.E., *Holy Communion and its Revision* (Latimer Monographs III), Marcham, 1972.
- Beckwith, R.T., *Priesthood and Sacraments*, Latimer monographs 1, Marcham 1964.
- Beckwith, R.T., Ed, *Towards a Modern Prayer Book – the new services examined*, Marcham Manor Books, 1966.
- Berger, P., *A Rumour of Angels*, 1959
- Berger, T., “Breaking Bread in a Broken World: Liturgy and Cartographies of the Real”, in *Studia Liturgica* 36 (2006) pp 74-85
- Bermejo., L.M., "The propitiatory nature of the Eucharist: an enquiry into the early sources", *Indian Journal of Theology* (1972) 21:133-169.
- Bermejo., L.M., *Body Broken and Blood Shed - The Eucharist of the Risen Christ*, Gujarat Sahitya Prakash, India, 1986.
- Bettenson, H., *Documents of the Christian Church*, OUP, 1943ff
- Bieritz, K-H., “Patterns of Proclamation” pp18-33 in *Studia Liturgica*, Vol 15, 1982/1983 Number 1.
- Bird, David, et al., *Receiving the Vision, The Anglican Roman Catholic Reality Today*, Collegeville, MN: Liturgical, 1995.
- Bishops’ Conference of England and Wales., *Response to the Final Report of ARCIC1. Catholic Media Office, 1985.*
- Board for Mission and Unity of the General Synod of the Church of England., *The Church of England’s Response to BEM, Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry (World Council of Churches) & ARCIC, The Final Report of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission, Supplementary Report to GS661*, Board for Mission and Unity, 1986.
- Bolton, F.R., *The Caroline Tradition of the Church of Ireland – with particular*

reference to *Jeremy Taylor*, Published for the Church Historical Society, SPCK, 1958.

Bouyer, L., *Life and Liturgy*, Sheed and Ward, 1956.

Bouyer, L., "Sacrifice, Meal and Memorial" in a publication without title, date or publisher in the only copy available to the present writer.

Blunt, J.H., Ed., *The Annotated Book of Common Prayer, being an Historical, Ritual, and Theological Commentary on the Devotional System of The Church of England*, Rivingtons, 1866.

Bradshaw, P.F., Ed, *A Companion to Common Worship*, Vol 1, Alcuin Club Collections 78, SPCK, 2001

Bradshaw, P.F., "Celebration", Ch 9 in *The Eucharist Today – Studies on Series 3*, ed R.C.D. Jasper, SPCK 1974.

Bradshaw, P.F., *Early Christian Worship – A basic introduction to ideas and practice* – SPCK, 1996.

Bradshaw, P.F., *Eucharistic Origins*, Alcuin Club Collections, 80, SPCK, 2004

Bradshaw, P.F. and Gibaut, J., "Issues around Ministry and Eucharist", Essay 3 in David R. Holeton., *Revising the Eucharist – Groundwork for the Anglican Communion*, Studies in Preparation for the 1995 Dublin Consultation, Alcuin/GROW Study 27, Grove Books, 1994.

Bradshaw, P.F., Ed., *The Canons of Hippolytus*, Alcuin/GROW.

Bradshaw, P.F., Giles, G, and Kershaw, S., "Holy Communion" pp98- 147 Bradshaw, in P.F. *A Companion to Common Worship*, Vol 1, Bradshaw, P.F., Ed, Alcuin Club Collections 78, SPCK, 2001.

Bradshaw, P.F., *Liturgical Presidency in the Early Church*, Grove Liturgical Study No 36, Grove Books, 1983

Bradshaw, P.F., *The Anglican Ordinal – its History and Development from the Reformation to the Present Day*, Alcuin Club Collections, 53, SPCK, 1971.

Bradshaw, P.F., "The Eucharistic Sayings of Jesus" in *Studia Liturgica* 35 (2005) pp1-11.

Bradshaw, P.F., Ed, *The New SCM Dictionary of Liturgy and Worshi*, SCM, 2002.

Bradshaw, P.F., "The Reception of Communion in Early Christianity, in *Studia Liturgica*, 37 (2007) pp164-80.

Bradshaw, P.F., "The Homogenization of Christian Liturgy – Ancient and Modern: Presidential Address, pp1-15 in *Studia Liturgica*, 26 (1996), relating to Societas Liturgica, 1995 Dublin Congress – The Future Shape of Liturgy.

Bradshaw, P.F., "The Liturgical Use and Abuse of Patristics", Ch 10 in Kenneth Stevenson, ed, *Liturgy Reshaped*, SPCK, 1982.

Bradshaw, P.F., *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship – Sources and Methods for the Study of Early Liturgy* (first ed) SPCK, 1992

Bradshaw, P.F., *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship – Sources and Methods for the Study of Early Liturgy*, Revised and Enlarged Edition, SPCK, 2002.

Bradshaw, P.F., *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship*

Bradshaw, P.F., *Reconstructing Early Christian Worship*, SPCK, 2009'

Bradshaw, P.F., "Ubi Eucharistia Ibi Ecclesia – Ecclesiological Reflections on Ministry, Order and the Eucharist", Preparatory Documents, pp51-65 in Holeton, D.R., *Our Thanks and Praise – The Eucharist in Anglicanism Today*, Papers from the Fifth International Anglican Liturgical Consultation, the Anglican Book Centre, Toronto, 1998.

Brilioth, Y., *Eucharistic Faith and Practice*, SPCK, 1961.

Brodie, I., *The Authorised Daily Prayer Book of the United Hebrew Congregations of the British Commonwealth of Nations*, New Edition, Reset and Enlarged under the Direction of Israel Brodie, Chief Rabbi, London, Eyre and Spottiswoode Ltd, 1962

(with many reprints).

Brightman, F.E., *The English Rite – being a Synopsis of the Sources and Revisions of the Book of Common Prayer*, Vol 1, Rivingtons, London, 1915.

Brightman, F.E., *The English Rite – being a Synopsis of the Sources and Revisions of the Book of Common Prayer*, Vol 2, Rivingtons, London, 1915.

Brilioth, *Eucharistic Faith and Practice, Catholic and Evangelical*, tr, A.G. Hebert, SSM, SPCK 1961.

Brooks, P., *Thomas Cranmer's Doctrine of the Eucharist*.

Brown, D., "The Response to ARCIC-1: The Big Questions", *One in Christ* (1991-1).

Douglas Brown, SSM, was Director of the Anglican Centre in Rome, and this was an address given at the Centro Pro Unione in Rome on 23rd January 1992.

Brown, L.W., *Relevant Liturgy*, London, SPCK, 1965.

Buchanan, C.O., *Anglican Eucharistic Liturgy 1975-1985*, Grove Liturgical Study No. 41, Grove Books, 1985.

Buchanan, C.O., *Anglo-Catholic Worship – An Evangelical Appreciation after 150 years*, Grove Liturgical Study No 33, Grove Books, 1983.

Buchanan, C.O., *An Evangelical among the Anglican Liturgists*, Alcuin Club Collections, 84, SPCK, 2009.

Buchanan, C.O., *ARCIC and Lima on Baptism and Eucharist – including the Lima Eucharistic Liturgy*. Grove Worship Series No 86, Grove Books, 1983.

Buchanan, C.O., "Clarifications – ARCIC 2 on Ministry", *News of Liturgy* 244, May 1995 following a critique of *Clarifications* in *News of Liturgy* 243, April 1995.

Buchanan, C.O., *Children in Communion*, Grove Worship Series No. 112, Grove Books, 1990.

Buchanan, Colin., *Did the Anglicans and Roman Catholics agree on the Eucharist? A Revisit of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission's Agreed Statements of 1971 and Related Documents*, Pickwick Publications, Oregon, 10/15/18.

Buchanan, C.O.' Ed., *Essays on Eucharistic Sacrifice in the Early Church*, Grove Liturgical Study No 40, Grove Books, 1984.

Buchanan, C.O., *Eucharistic Consecration*, Grove Worship Series 148, Grove Books, 1998.

Buchanan, C.O., Ed., *Eucharistic Liturgies of Edward VI*, Grove Liturgical Study No 34, Grove Books, 1983.

Buchanan, C.O., *Future Directions for Eucharistic Revision*, pp20-27 in David R. Holeton, *Revising the Eucharist – Groundwork for the Anglican Communion*, Studies in Preparation for the 1995 Dublin Consultation, Alcuin/GROW Study 27, Grove Books, 1994.

Buchanan, C.O., *Common Worship, Eucharistic Prayer H: (in Order One) – an unauthorized account*, reprinted from Ushaw Library Bulletin and Liturgical Review, no. 13, September 2000.

Buchanan, C.O., *Evangelical Anglicans and Liturgy*, Grove Worship Series No 90, Grove Books, 1984.

Buchanan, C.O., Ed., "The Vatican's Judgment on ARCIC 1", *News of Liturgy* 204, Dec. 1991.

Buchanan, C.O., Ed, *Anglican Eucharistic Liturgies, 1985-2010 – the Authorized Rites of the Anglican Communion*, Canterbury, 2011.

Buchanan, C.O., Ed, *Modern Anglican Liturgies, 1958-1968*, OUP, 1968.

Buchanan, C.O., Ed, *Further Anglican Liturgies, 1968-1975*, Grove Books, 1975

Buchanan, C.O., Ed, *Latest Anglican Liturgies, 1976-1984*, Alcuin Club/SPCK, 1985.

Buchanan, C.O., *Eucharistic Consecration*, Grove Worship Series, 148, Grove Books, 1998.

- Buchanan, C.O., *Lambeth and Liturgy 1988 – edited with Introduction and Commentary*, Grove Worship Series No 106, Grove Books, 1989.
- Buchanan., C.O. Ed. *Justin Martyr on Baptism and Eucharist – Texts in Translation with Introduction and Commentary*, Joint Liturgical Studies 64, Alcuin Club and The Group for Renewal of Worship, SCM-Canterbury Press, 2007.
- Buchanan., C.O., *Nurturing Children in Communion*, Grove Liturgical Study No 44, Grove Books, 1985.
- Buchanan., C.O. *The End of the Offertory – An Anglican Study*, Grove Liturgical Study No. 14, Grove Books, 1979.
- Buchanan., C.O., *The Development of the New Eucharistic Prayers of the Church of England*, Grove Liturgical Study No 20, Grove Books, 1979.
- Buchanan, C., and Read, C., *The Eucharistic Prayers of Order One*, Grove Worship Series W158, Grove Books, 2000.
- Buchanan, C.O., “The Position of the President revisited – Exploring an Historical Anglican Bypath”, pp111-126 in *Studia Liturgica*, 35 (2006)
- Buchanan., C.O., *What did Cranmer think he was doing?*, Grove Liturgical Study No 7, Grove Books, 1976.
- Bulley, F., *A Tabular View of the variations in the Communion and Baptismal Offices of the Church of England from the year 1549-1662, to which are added those in the Scotch Prayer Book of 1637*, Oxford, John Henry Parker: Rivingtons, London, 1843.
- Bultmann, R., *Theology of the New Testament*, SCM 1952.
- Bunting, Ian, *Preaching at Communion (1)* Grove Worship Series No. 78, Grove Books, 1981
- Bunting, Ian, *Preaching at Communion (2)* Grove Worship Series No. 79, Grove Books, 1982.
- Burn-Murdoch, H., *The Development of the Papacy*, Faber and Faber, 1954.
- Buxton, R., *Eucharist and Institution Narrative- a study in the Roman and Anglican traditions of the Consecration of the Eucharist from the eighth to the twentieth centuries*, Alcuin Club Collections No. 58, Mayhew-McCrimmon, 1976.
- Buxton, R., “The Shape of the Eucharist: A Survey and Appraisal”, Ch 6 in K. Stevenson, *Liturgy Reshaped*, SPCK, 1982.
- C/
- Cabié, R., *The Eucharist*, The Church At Prayer Volume II, ed. A.G. Martimort, new edition, Chapman, 1986.
- Campion, W.M. and Beaumont, W.J., *The Prayer Book Interleaved with Historical Illustrations and Explanatory Notes Arranged Parallel to the Text*. Rivingtons, 1888.
- Carroll, “*One Bread, One Body: a Liturgical Ecumenical Reflection*”, Unknown and undated publication.
- Catholic Bishops’ Conference of England & Wales, Ireland, and Scotland, *One Bread One Body – A teaching document on the Eucharist in the life of the Church, and the establishment of general norms on sacramental sharing*, 1998 Bishops’ Conference of England & Wales, Bishops’ Conference of Ireland, Bishops’ Conference of Scotland, Co-Published by the Catholic Truth Society, London, and Veritas Publications, Dublin, 1998.
- Cassidy, H., Dean of Kilmore, *It moves all the same – The Alternative Prayer Book of the Church of Ireland as an instrument of Evangelism and Renewal*.
- Cantuar, Robert., *The Worship of the Church – a Report by the Standing Committee*, The General Synod of the Church of England, GS 698, 1985
- Catholic Bishops’ Conference of England and Wales, *One Bread, One Body – A teaching document on the Eucharist in the life of the Church, and the establishment of general norms on sacramental sharing*, Catholic Bishops’ Conferences of England and

- Wales, Ireland, Scotland, 1998
- Chadwick, H., "Anglican Ecclesiology", *One in Christ*, 1995-1, pp32-41
- Chan, S., *Liturgical Theology – The Church as Worshiping Community*, IVP Academic, 2006.
- Chapman, M.E., "Sacrament and Sacrifice in the Theology of the Mass according to Luther, 1513-1526, *One in Christ* (1992? Number unknown).
- Charley, J., *Rome, Canterbury and the Future*, Grove Books, 1982.
- Charley, J., *The Anglican-Roman Catholic Agreement on the Eucharist. The 1971 Anglican-Roman Catholic Statement on the Eucharist with an Historical Introduction and Theological Commentary* Grove Booklet on Ministry and Worship 1. Bramcote Grove Books 1971.
- Charley, J., "The Draft Order for Holy Communion", Chapter 5 in Beckwith, R.T., *Towards a Modern Prayer Book – the new services examined*, Marcham Manor Press, 1966.
- Church Assembly, *Prayer Book Measure, 192- Provisional Draft – subject to further revision by the House of Bishops (issued Feb. 7, 1927)*, London: Church Assembly, Church House, Westminster, and the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1927.
- Church Historical Society, *Anglican Orders (Latin) – the Bull of His Holiness Leo XIII and the Answer of the Archbishops of England*, SPCK, 1932
- Church Literature Association, *Saepius Officio – The Reply of the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to the Letter Apostolicae Curae of Pope Leo XIII, MDCCCXCVII*, The Church Literature Association, Faith House, London, 1977.
- Church of England Liturgical Commission, *Prayer Book Revision in the Church of England – A Memorandum of the Church of England Liturgical Commission*, SPCK, 1958., LC [Lambeth Conference] 1958/2.
- Church of the Province of Southern Africa, *An Anglican Prayer Book, 1989*, Collins, 1989.
- Church, R.W., *The Oxford Movement – Twelve Years, 1833-1845*, London, Macmilland and Co., 1897.
- Church Society, *An English Prayer Book*, OUP, 1994.
- Clark, A., and Davey, C., *Anglican/Roman Catholic Dialogue: The Work of the Preparatory Commission*, OUP, 1974
- Clark, F., *Anglican Orders and Defect of Intention*, Longmans, 1956.
- Clark, F., *Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation*, Basil Blackwell, Second Edition, 1967.
- Clay, W.K., *Liturgical Services – Liturgies and Occasional Forms of Prayer set forth in the Reign of Queen Elizabeth*, edited for The Parker Society, Cambridge: at The University Press, 1847.
- Clifford, C.E., "Reception of the *Final Report: Beyond Strengthened Agreement*, pp130-148 in *One in Christ – a Catholic Ecumenical Review*, Vol XXXII, 1998, No 2.
- Cocksworth, C.J., "Eucharistic theology", Chapter 5 in *The Identity of Anglican Worship*, Eds. K. Stevenson and B. Spinks, Mowbray, 1991
- Cocksworth, C.J., *Evangelical Eucharistic Thought in the Church of England*, CUP, 1993.
- Cocksworth, C., *Prayer and the Departed*, Grove Worship Series 142, Grove Books 1997.
- Colquhoun, F., *The Catechism and the Order of Confirmation*, The Prayer Book Commentaries, Hodden & Stoughton, 1963.
- Connell, D., *The Bread of Life – Pastoral Letter for the period of Eucharistic Renewal, Lent-Easter, 1990*, Veritas, 1990.

- Connell, Martin, F., *Church and Worship in Fifth-Century Rome: The Letter of Innocent I to Decentius of Gubbio*, The Alcuin Club and The Group for Renewal of Worship, Joint Liturgical Studies 52, Grove Books, 2002.
- “Constitution on the Sacred Liturgy” [Sacrosanctum Concilium], pp137-170 in Abbot, W.M., *The Documents of Vatican II*, Geoffrey Chapman, 1967, together with “A Response” by Jaroslav J. Pelican, pp179-182.
- Cope, G, Davies, J.G., and Tytler, D.A., *An Experimental Liturgy*, Ecumenical Studies in Worship, No, 3, Lutterworth Press, London, 1958.
- Cope, G., *Symbolism in the Bible and the Church*, SCM, 1959.
- Council for Christian Unity, *Anglican and Roman Catholic Response to the work of ACRIC 1*, GS Misc 384, 1992.
- Couratin, A.H., “Liturgy”, pp131-240 in *The Pelican Guide to Modern Theology, Vol 2, Historical Theology*, by J. Daniélou, A.H. Couratin, and John Kent., Pelican, 1969.
- Couratin, A.H., *The Service of Holy Communion: 1549-1662*, SPCK, 1963.
- Coventry, J., “The Presence of Christ in the Eucharist”, without title, undated and without information as to publisher in the only copy available to the present writer.
- Cox, L.E., *Cranmer’s Works*, 2 Vols, Cambridge, 1846
- Cranmer, T., *A Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ - with a Confutation of Sundry Errors concerning the same grounded and stablished upon God's Holy Word, and approved by the consent of the Most Ancient Doctors of the Church*, (1550, 1551), published under the title "Cranmer on the Lord's Supper" by Focus Christian Ministries Trust and Harrison Trust, 1987.
- Cranmer, T., “Answer unto a Crafty and Sophistical Cavillation devised by Stephen Gardiner (1551) in his *Works. vol 1, Writings on the Lord's Supper*; Parker Society, Cambridge, 1844.
- Crichton, J.D., *The New Roman Mass and the Anglican Series Three*, in “Alcuin – the Occasional Journal of the Alcuin Club, 1974, pp2-14.
- Crockett, W. R.,, “Eucharistic Consecration, the Role of the Institution Narrative in the Eucharistic Prayer, and Supplementary Consecration, Essay 4 in David R. Holeton, *Revising the Eucharist – Groundwork for the Anglican Communion*, Studies in Preparation for the 1995 Dublin Consultation, Alcuin/GROW Study 27, Grove Books, 1994.
- Crockett, W.R., *Eucharist: Symbol of Transformation*, (New York, 1989).
- Crockett, W.R., “Eucharistic Theology and Anglican Eucharistic Revision” in Holeton, D.R., *Our Thanks and Praise – The Eucharist in Anglicanism Today*, Papers from the Fifth International Anglican Liturgical Consultation, the Anglican Book Centre, Toronto, 1998., Preparatory Documents, pp35-50.
- Holton, D., and Buchanan, C., *A History of the International Anglican Liturgical Consultations 1983-2007*; Joint Liturgical Studies, 63, SCM-Canterbury Press, 2007.
- Cross, F.L., Ed., *St Cyril of Jerusalem – Lectures on the Christian Sacraments*. SPCK, 1951/78
- Culbertson, E., *The Evangelical Roots of the Church of Ireland: James Ussher and the Irish Articles*, Church of Ireland Evangelical Fellowship, 1999.
- Cullman, Oscar., *Early Christian Worship*, SCM 1953, translation of the second edition of *Urchristentum und Gottesdienst*, Zwingli-Verlag, Zürich, 1950.
- Cuming, G.J., *A History of Anglican Liturgy*, Second Edition, Macmillan, [1969], 1982.
- Cuming., G.J., Ed., *Essays on Hippolytus*, Grove Liturgical Study No 15, Grove Books, 1978.
- Cuming., G.J. *He gave thanks: An Introduction to the Eucharistic Prayer*, Grove

- Books, 1981.
- Cuming, G.J. (ed.) *Hippolytus: a Text for Students*, Grove Liturgical Study No. 8, Grove Books, 1976.
- Cuming, G.J., “The Early Liturgies in Recent Research” – pp65-69 61 in *The Sacrifice of Praise...in honour of Arthur Hubert Couratin*, ed. Bryan Spinks (q.v.) C.L.V. – Editioni Liturgiche – 00192 Roman, 1981.
- Dalby, M., *Anglican Missals and their Canons: 1549, Interim Rite and Roman*, Joint Liturgical Studies 41, The Alcuin Club and The Group for Renewal of Worship, 1998.
- Dalby., *Infant Communion – The New Testament to the Reformation*, Joint Liturgical Studies 56, The Alcuin Club and The Group for Renewal of Worship, 2003.
- Dalby., *Infant Communion – Post-Reformation to Present Day*, Joint Liturgical Studies 67, Alcuin Club and The Group for Renewal of Worship, 2009.
- Daly, C.B., and Worrall, A.S., *Ballymascanlon – An Irish Venture in Inter-Church Dialogue*, Christian Journals Ltd, Belfast/Veritas Publications – Dublin.
- Daly. R., S.J., *The Origins of the Christian Doctrine of Sacrifice*, Darton, Longman & Todd, London, and Fortress Press, Philadelphia, 1978. Dillistone, *Christianity and Symbolism*, SCM, 1955.
- Dawley, P.M., *Report of the Anglican Congress, 1954*, London, SPCK, 1955.
- Davies, H., *Worship and Theology in England*, in five volumes (1) *From Cranmer to Hooker, 1535-1600*; (2) *From Andrewes to Baxter, 1600-1690*; (3) *From Watts and Wesley to Maurice, 1690-1850*; (4) *From Newman to Martineau, 1850-1900*; (5) *The Ecumenical Century, 1900-1965*, published between 1961 and 1965, Princeton University Press/Oxford University Press.
- Dearmer, P., *The Parson’s Handbook, containing practical directions both for parsons and others as to the management of the parish church and its services according to the Anglican use, as set forth in the Book of Common Prayer*, Twelfth Edition, Humfrey Milford, London etc. 1932.
- De Candole, H., and Couratin, A., *Re-Shaping The Liturgy – Invitation to a Parish Enquiry*, Church Information Office, 1984.
- De Candole., *The Sacraments and the Church – a study in the corporate nature of Christianity*, Mowbray, 1935.
- Dies, L., Ed., *Early Sources of the Liturgy*, Geoffrey Chapman, 1963
- De Mendieta., E.A., *Anglican Vision*, SPCK, 1971.
- De Mendieta., E.A., *Rome and Canterbury*, Herbert Jenkins, 1962.
- Dendy, D.R.. *The Use of Lights in Christian Worship* (Alcuin Club Collections XLI, SPCK, 1959.
- Denaux, A., “The Anglican-Roman Catholic Dialogue and Its Reception” *Rocznike Teologiczne* 61 (2014) 5-34.
- Denaux, A., *From Malines to ARCIC, The Malines Conversations Commemorated*, Leuven University Press, 1997.
- Dillistone., *Christianity and Symbolism*, SCM, 1955.
- Dionne, *The Papacy and the Church – A Study of Praxis and Reception in Ecumenical Perspective*, Philosophical Library, New York, 1987.
- Dix, G., *The Shape of the Liturgy*, Dacre Press Westminster, Second Ed. 1945.
- Donaldson, G., *The Making of the Scottish Prayer-Book of 1637*.
- Douglas, Brian., “Anglican Roman Catholic International Commission (ARCIC) and the Eucharist: Review and Prospects” *The Journal of Religious History* 36 (2012), pp351-67.
- Dowling, R., “Structure of the Eucharist – Some Discussion Issues, Essay 5 in David R. Holeton, *Revising the Eucharist – Groundwork for the Anglican Communion*, Studies in Preparation for the 1995 Dublin Consultation, Alcuin/GROW Study 27,

- Grove Books, 1994.
- Drury, T.W., *Elevation in the Eucharist – its History and Rationale*, Cambridge: at the University Press, 1907.
- Duchesne., L. *Christian Worship: Its Origin and Evolution* (5th edn of ET or 4th Fr. edn,) SPCK, 1927.
- Duffy, E., *The Stripping of the Altars – Traditional Religion in England 1400-1580*, Yale University Press, 1992.
- Duffy, E., *The Voices of Marebath – Reformation & Rebellion in an English Village*, Yale University Press, 2001.
- Dugmore, C.W., *Eucharistic Doctrine in England from Hooker to Waterland*, SPCK, 1942
- Dugmore, C.W., *The Mass and the English Reformers*, MacMillan, 1958.
- Dunlop, C, *Anglican Public Worship*, SCM 1953, revised edition, 1961.
- Dunn, J.D.G., *Instruments of koinonia in the Early Church*”, *One in Christ* 1989
- Dunn, J.D.G., *Unity and Diversity in the New Testament – An Enquiry into the Character of Earliest Christianity*, SCM/Trinity Press International, Second edition, 1990.
- Dunstan, A., *Interpreting Worship*, Mowbray, 1984.
- E/
- Eeles, F.C., *The Coronation Service – Its History and Meanng,*, London, A.R. Mowbray, 1952.
- Elias, Rabbi Joseph, *The Haggadah – Passover Haggadah / with translation and a new Commentary based on Talmudic, Midrashic, and Rabbinic Sources*, Mesorah Publications, 3rd edition, 1980, with many impressions.
- Empereur, J., *Models of Liturgical Theology*, Alcuin/GROW Liturgical Study 4 (Grove Liturgical Study No 52), 1987.
- Evans, C.F., "The Eucharist and Symbolism in the New Testament", Chapter Four in *Thinking about the Eucharist by members of the Church of England Doctrine Commission* (with a Preface by Rt. Revd I.T. Ramsey), SCM, 1972.
- Evans, C.F., "Symbols and the Eucharist", Chapter Five in *Thinking about the Eucharist*, op. cit.
- Evans, G.R., “Rome’s Response to ARCIC and the problem of confessional identity”, in *One in Christ* (number and date unrecorded). Gillian Evans. an Anglican scholar and writer, taught in the Faculty of History of Cambridge
- Evans, G.R. and Wright, J.R., *The Anglican Tradition – A Handbook of Sources*, SPCK/Fortress, 1991.
- Every, G., *The Mass*, Gill and MacMillan, 1978.
- Every, M., *Liturgical Worship – a fresh look, how it works, why it matters*, Church House Publishing, 2002.
- Everyman’s Library, No. 448, Theology & Philosophy, *The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI*, J.M. Dent & Sons Ltd, 1952.
- F/
- Faith and Order Advisory Group, *Towards a Church of England Response to BEM & ARCIC*, published for the Board for Mission and Unity of the General Synod of the Church of England by CIO Publishing, 1985.
- Fawcett, T.J., *The Liturgy of Comprehension 1689 – An abortive attempt to revise The Book of Common Prayer*, Alcuin Club Collections, No 54, The Alcuin Club. Mayhew-McCrimmon, 1973.
- Fellowship of Saint Alban and Saint Sergius, *The Orthodox Liturgy – being The Divine Liturgy of St John Chrysostom and St Basil the Great according to the use of the Church of Russia*, SPCK, 1968

- Fenwick, J.R.K., *Eucharistic Concelebration*, Grove Worship Series No 82, Grove Books, 1982.
- Fenwick, J.R.K., “*The Missing Oblation*” - *The Contents of the Early Antiochene Anaphora*, Alcuin/GROW Liturgical Study 11 [Grove Liturgical Study 59], Grove Books 1989.
- Fenwick, J and Spinks B., *Worship in Transition – The Twentieth Century Liturgical Movement*. T & T Clark, 1995. [Chapter XII, “Behind the Consensus on the Eucharist”].
- Fischer, B., "Reform of Symbols in Roman Catholic Worship - Loss or Gain?" in K. Stevenson, Ed., *Liturgy Reshaped*, SPCK, 1982
- Flew, R.N., and Davies, R., *The Catholicity of Protestantism*, Lutterworth, 1950.
- Flannery, A., Ed, *Vatican Council II – More Post Conciliar Documents*, Vol 2, The Liturgical Press, Collegeville, 1982, #73 “Instruction on the Eucharistic Prayers for Children’s Masses”, #74 “Instruction on the Eucharistic Prayers for Masses of Reconciliation”, #75 “Decree on the Public Celebration of Mass in the Catholic Church for other deceased Christians”, #77 “On the Mystery and Worship of the Eucharist” [John Paul II, 1980] #78 “Instruction on Certain Norms concerning the Worship of the Eucharistic Mystery. #80 “Permission to use Eucharistic Prayers for Children and for Reconciliation extended indefinitely.”
- Fletcher, J., *Communion in Common Worship – the Shape of Orders One and Two*, Grove Worship Series W159, Grove Books, 2000.
- Foley, Edward, “Engaging the Liturgy of the World: Worship as Public Theology”, in *Studia Liturgica* 38 (2008), pp31-35.
- Forster, Peter, “Some Reflections on the Theological of Thomas Cranmer” in Margot Johnson, ed., *Thomas Cranmer: Essays in Commemoration of the 500th Anniversary of his Birth*, Durham, 1990.
- Franklin, R.W., Ed, *Anglican Orders – Essays on the Centenary of Apostolicae Curae 1896-1996*, Mowbray, 1996.
- Franklin, R.W., “ARC-USA”: Five Affirmations on the Eucharist as Sacrifice”, *Worship* 69 (1995), pp380-90.
- Frederick, J.B.M., *The Future of Liturgical Reform*, Churchman Publishing, 1987.
- Frere, W.H., *Some Principles of Liturgical Reform – A Contribution Towards the Revision of the Book of Common Prayer*, London, John Murray, 1911.
- G/
- Gasquet, A., and Bishop, E., *Edward VI and the Book of Common Prayer*, Revised Edition, Sheed and Ward, 1928.
- Gelineau, J., “Models for the Eucharist Prayer as Praise of All the Assembly”, pp79-87 in *Studia Liturgica* 27 (1997).
- General Synod of the Anglican Church of Canada, *The Book of Alternative Services of the Anglican Church of Canada*, Anglican Book Centre, Toronto, 1985.
- General Synod of the Scottish Episcopal Church, *Scottish Liturgy Eucharist*, 1989.
- Gibaut, J., “Issues Regarding Anglicans. Ecumenism and the Eucharist, Essay 6 in David R. Holeton, *Revising the Eucharist – Groundwork for the Anglican Communion*, Studies in Preparation for the 1995 Dublin Consultation, Alcuin/GROW Study 27, Grove Books, 1994.
- Gibbs, J., and Gassmann, G., *Anglican-Lutheran Dialogue – the Report of the European Regional Commission, Helsinki, 1982*, SPCK, 1983.
- General Synod of the Scottish Episcopal Church, *Scottish Liturgy, Eucharist*, 1989
Representative Church Council of the Scottish Episcopal Church. [Containing the Liturgy 1970 and the Scottish Liturgy, 1982 in ring file format]
- Gibson, E.C.S., *The Thirty-nine Articles of the Church of England, Explained with an*

- Introduction*, Methuen, 1904.
- Gibson, P., and Morris, C., “Preserving Unity at Large Celebrations of the Eucharist”, Essay 7 in David R. Holeton, *Revising the Eucharist – Groundwork for the Anglican Communion*, Studies in Preparation for the 1995 Dublin Consultation, Alcuin/GROW Study 27, Grove Books, 1994.
- Gibson, P., “International Anglican Liturgical Consultations”, pp235-252, in *Studia Liturgica – An International Ecumenical Review For Liturgical Research and Renewal*, Societas Liturgica, Vol 29, 1999, No 2,
- Gittoes, Revd Dr Julie, *Anamnesis and the Eucharist: Contemporary Anglican Approaches*, Ashgate Publishing, 2008.
- Gordon-Taylor, B., and Jones, S., *Celebrating the Eucharist*, Alcuin Liturgy Guides 3, SPCK, 2005.
- Gore, C., *The Body of Christ*”, 1901
- Gray, D., *Earth and Altar – the Evolution of the Parish Communion in the Church of England to 1945*, Alcuin Club Collections No. 68, published for the Alcuin Club by Canterbury Press, Norwich, 1986.
- Gray, D., “Eucharistic Inflation”, pp21-28 in Michael Perham, Ed., *Liturgy for a New Century – Further Essays in Preparation for the Revision of the Alternative Service Book*, SPCK/Alcuin Club, 1991.
- Gray, D., *The Influence of Tractarian Principles on Parish Worship, 1839-1849*, Alcuin, the Occasional Journal of the Alcuin Club, 1984.
- Gray, D., *The 1927-28 Prayer Book Crisis, 1. Ritual, Royal Commissions, and Reply to the Royal Letters of Business*, Joint Liturgical Studies 60, The Alcuin Club and The Group for Renewal of Worship, SCM/Canterbury Press, 2005.
- Gray, D., *The 1927-28 Prayer Book Crisis, 2. The cul-de-sac of the ‘Deposited Book’ ...until further order be taken*, Joint Liturgical Studies 61, The Alcuin Club and the Group for Renewal of Worship, SCM/Canterbury Press, 2006.
- Green, M., “Christ’s sacrifice and Ours”, in J. I Packer, ed, *Guidelines, Anglican Evangelicals Face the Future*”, London, Church Pastoral Aid Society, 1967.
- Green, M., “Eucharistic Sacrifice in the New Testament and the Early Fathers”, in *Eucharistic Sacrifice*, ed J.I. Packer, pp53-83, Church Book Room Press, 1962.
- Gregg, D., *Anamnesis in the Eucharist*, Grove Liturgical Study No. 5, Grove Books 1977.
- Grisbrooke, W.J., “An Orthodox Approach to Liturgical Theology: The Work of Alexander Schmemmann”, pp140-157 in *Studia Liturgica* 23 (1993)
- Grisbrooke, W.J., *Anglican Liturgies of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, SPCK, 1958.
- Grisbrooke, W. Jardine, *The Liturgical Portions of the Apostolic Constitutions: A Text for Students*, Alcuin/GROW Liturgical Study 13-14 (Grove Liturgical Study 61), 1990.
- Grumett, D., “Give Us This Day Our Supersubstantial Bread”, in *Studia Liturgica* 36 (2006) pp201-11
- G.S. Misc. 193, *Concelebration in the Eucharist* (Church House, London)
- H/
Halifax, Lord, ed, *The Conversations at Malines, 1921-25, Original Documents*, London, Philip Allan, 1930.
- Halliburton, R.J., “The Canon of Series 3”, Chapter 8 in *The Eucharist Today – Studies on Series 3*, ed, R.C.D. Jasper, SPCK, 1974.
- Hamilton, D.S., Letter to the Church of Ireland Gazette re ARCIC-1, 6th March 1992, commending the publication *ARCIC-1 Revisited: An Evaluation and a Revision*, Catholic Press Association, Hempstead, New York 1151, USA, 1985.

Hanson, R.P.C., *Eucharistic Offering in the Early Church*, Grove Liturgical Study No 19, Grove Books, 1979.

Hanson, R., and Fuller, R., *The Church of Rome – A Dissuasive*, SMC Press, 1948.

Harford, G., and Stevenson, M., Eds, *The Prayer Book Dictionary*, Pitman, London, 1913.

Hardwick., C., *A History of the Articles of Religion: to which is added A Series of Documents from A.D. 1536 to A.D. 1615* together with Illustrations from Contemporary Sources, London, 1884.

Hardelin., A., *The Tractarian Understanding of the Eucharist*.

Hardy, D.W., Ford, D.F., *Jubilate – Theology in Praise*, Darton, Longman and Todd, London, 1984.

Harrison, D.E.W., *Common Prayer in the Church of England*, SPCK, 1969.

Harrison, D.E.W., and Sansom, M.C., *Worship in the Church of England*, SPCK, 1982.

Hartin, J., “Anglican Eucharistic Doctrine and Liturgy”, without title, undated and without information about publication in the only copy available to the present writer, pp140-148.

Headley, C., *Home Communion – A Practical Guide*, Grove Worship Series W157,

Hebert, A.G., *Liturgy and Society – The Function of the Church in the Modern World*, 1961 edition, Faber and Faber.

Hebert, A.G. Ed., *The Parish Communion*, SPCK, 1937.

Hebert, A.G., *Ways of Worship*, SCM, 1951.

Hefling, C and Shattuck, C., *The Oxford Guide to the Book of Common Prayer – A Worldwide Survey*, OUP, 2006.

Heron, A., *Table and Tradition - Towards an Ecumenical Understanding of the Eucharist*, The Handsel Press, Edinburgh, 1983.

Hicks, F.C.N., *The Fullness of Sacrifice – An Essay in Reconciliation*, Third Edition, SPCK, 1953.

Hill, C., and Yarnold, E., *Anglican Orders – The Documents in the Debate*, Canterbury Press, 1997.

Hill, C., and Yarnold, E., *Anglicans and Roman Catholic: The Search for Unity; The ARCIC documents and their reception*, SPCK/CTS, 1994.

Hill, C., “The Fundamental Question of Ecumenical Method” in *IOne in Christ* (number and date unrecorded). This comment by Christopher Hill relates to the official Roman Catholic “Response” to the *Final Report* of ARCIC.

Hill, H., and Methodios of Thyateira and Great Britain, *Anglican-Orthodox Dialogue – the Dublin Agreed Statement, 1984*, SPCK, 1984. Appendices: *The Moscow Agreed Statement 1976, The Athens Report, 1978*.

Holeton, D.R., and Buchanan, C., *A History of the International Anglican Liturgical Consultations 1983-2007* Joint Liturgical Studies, 63, The Alcuin Club and The Group for Renewal of Worship, 2007.

Holeton, D., and Wallace, C., “Ceremonial, Ritual Gesture and the Eucharist”, Essay 9 in David R. Holeton, *Revising the Eucharist – Groundwork for the Anglican Communion*, Studies in Preparation for the 1995 Dublin Consultation, Alcuin/GROW Study 27, Grove Books, 1994.

Holeton, D.R., “Communion, children, and community”, Chapter 2 in *The Identity of Anglican Worship*, Eds Kenneth Stevenson and Bryan Spinks, Mowbray, 1991.

Holeton, D.R., “Ecumenical Liturgical Consensus: A Bumpy Road to Christian Unity, Presidential Address”, in *Studia Liturgica* 38, (2007) – Societas Liturgica 2007 Palermo Congress, Liturgy and the Public Square.

Holeton, D, Ed., *Findings of the Third International Anglican Liturgical Consultation*,

- York, England – 21-24 August, 1989. [Inculturation, and Structure of Anglican Liturgical Consultations]
- Holeton, D.R., *Infant Communion – Then and Now*, Grove Liturgical Study No 27, 1981.
- Holeton, D.R., *Our Thanks and Praise – the Eucharist in Anglicanism Today*, Papers from the Fifth International Anglican Liturgical Consultation, Anglican Book Centre, Toronto, 1998.
- Holeton, D.R., “Penance and the Eucharist”, Essay 8 in David R. Holeton, *Revising the Eucharist – Groundwork for the Anglican Communion*, Studies in Preparation for the 1995 Dublin Consultation, Alcuin/GROW Study 27, Grove Books, 1994.
- Holeton, D.R., *Renewing the Anglican Eucharist – Findings of the Fifth International Anglican Liturgical Consultation, Dublin, Eire, 1995*, Grove Worship Series 135, Grove Books, 1996.
- Holeton, D.R., Ed, *Revising the Eucharist – Groundwork for the Anglican Communion*, Studies in Preparation for the 1995 Consultation, Alcuin/GROW Liturgical Study 27, 1994.
- Holeton, D.R., “Towards Renewing the Shape of Anglican Eucharistic Liturgy”, pp66-81 in Holeton, D.R., *Our Thanks and Praise – The Eucharist in Anglicanism Today*, Papers from the Fifth International Anglican Liturgical Consultation, the Anglican Book Centre, Toronto, 1998.,
- Houlden, J.L., “Liturgy and her Companions: a Theological Appraisal”, Ch 11 in *The Eucharist Today – Studies on Series 3*, SPCK, 1974.
- Houlden, J. L., "Sacrifice and the Eucharist" in *Explorations in Theology*, 1978, SCM, London, 1972)
- Huff, P., “Separation Incomplete, Communion Imperfect”: Vatican II’s Ecumenical Strategy”, *One in Christ*, pp52-62.
- Hughes, A., *Public Worship and Communion by Extension – Some Pastoral and Theological Issues*, The Alcuin Club and The Group for Renewal of Worship, Grove Books, 2002.
- Hughes, J.J., *Stewards of the Lord*, Sheed and Ward 1970.
- Hurley, M., Ed., *Church and Eucharist*, Gill and Son, 1966.
- I/
Irvine, Christopher, *Anglican Liturgical Identity – Papers from the Prague meeting of the International Anglican Liturgical Consultation*, Joint Liturgical Studies 65, SCM-Canterbury Press, 2008.
- Irvine, C., *Making Present – The Practice of Catholic Life and Liturgy*, Affirming Catholicism, Series Editor, Jeffrey John, Darton, Longmann and Todd, 1994,
- J/
Jacobs, A.J., “The Sacraments of Salvation” pp261-272 61 in *The Sacrifice of Praise...in honour of Arthur Hubert Couratin*, ed. Bryan Spinks (q.v.) C.L.V. – Editioni Liturgiche – 00192 Roman, 1981.
- Jagger, P.J., *The Alcuin Club and its Publications, 1897-1987 – an Annotated Bibliography*, second edition, published for the Alcuin Club by Hymns Ancient and Modern, , Norwich, 1986.
- James, P., *Liturgical Presidency*, Alcuin/GROW Liturgical Study 24, Grove Books, 1993.
- Jasper, R.C.D., *The Development of the Anglican Liturgy, 1662-1980*, London, SPCK, 1999.
- Jasper, R.C.D., and Bradshaw, P.F., *A Companion to The Alternative Service Book*, SPCK, 1980.
- Jasper, R.C.D., and Cuming, G.J., *Prayers of the Eucharist – Early and Reformed*,

- Collins, 1975.
- Jasper, R.C.D., *The Development of the Anglican Liturgy, 1662-1980*, SPCK, 1989.
- Jasper, R.C.D., *The Eucharist Today - Studies on Series 3*, SPCK, 1974.
- Jasper, R.C.D., *The Search for an Apostolic Liturgy*, Alcuin Club Pamphlets XVIII, Mowbray, London, 1963.
- Jeanes, G.P., *The Origins of the Roman Rite, Vol 1* Alcuin/GROW Liturgical Study 20 [Grove Liturgical Study 20], Grove Books, 1991,
- Jeanes, G.P., *The Origins of the Roman Rite, Vol 2* Alcuin/GROW Liturgical Study 42, 1998.
- Jebb, J., *The Choral Service of the United Church of England and Ireland, being an enquiry into The Liturgical System of the Cathedral and Collegiate Foundations of the Anglican Communion*, London, 1843.
- Jeremias, J., *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, 3rd Ed., ET, SCM, 1966.
- Jeremias, J., "The Words of Institution" in a published study, from which title, date and publisher are absent from the available copy, pp18-27.
- John Paul II, *The Holy Eucharist - Letter of the Supreme Pontiff Pope John Paul II to all the Bishops of the Church on the Mystery and Worship of the Holy Eucharist*, Catholic Truth Society, Do519, 1980.
- John Paul II, *Ut Unum Sint*.
- Johnson, Lawrence J., *Worship in the Early Church – An Anthology of Historical Sources*, Liturgical Press, Collegeville, Minnesota, a Pueblo Book, 2009.
- Johnson, M.E., and Phillips, L.E., Eds, *Studia Liturgica Diversa – Essays in Honor of Paul F. Bradshaw*, Studies in Church Music and Liturgy, Pastoral Press, Oregon, 2004
- Johnson, M.E., *Liturgy in Early Christian Egypt*, The Alcuin Club and The Group for Renewal of Worship, Joint Liturgical Studies, 33, Grove Books, 1995.
- Johnson, M.E., "The Loss of a Common Language: The End of Ecumenical-Liturgical Convergence" in *Studia Liturgica* 37 (2007) pp55-72.
- Joynson-Hicks., W., *The Prayer Book Crisis*, London and New York, G.P. Putnam's Sons.
- Jones, C., Wainwright, G., Yarnold, E., *The Study of Liturgy*, SPCK, 1978.
- Jungmann, J.A., *The Early Liturgy – To the Time of Gregory the Great*, tr Francis A. Brunner, Darton, Longman & Todd, 1959.
- Jungmann. J.A., *The Mass of the Roman Rite*, Benziger, New York, 1951.
- Jury, C., *The Catholic Tradition of the Church of Ireland Affirming Catholicism (Ireland)*, ACI Occasional Papers No 2.
- K/
- Kaspar, W., *Harvesting the Fruits; Basic Aspects of the Christian Faith in Ecumenical Dialogue*, London, Continuum, 2009.
- Kavanagh, A., *On Liturgical Theology*, Pueblo, 1984.
- Keldany, H., and Knapp_Fisher, E., eds, "Towards Unity in Truth – A Series of lectures given during Lent 1981 in Westminster Abbey by Christopher Butler, Henry Chadwick, Alan Clark, Edward Knapp-Fisher, members of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission, and Robert Runcie, Archbishop of Canterbury", with a Foreword by Cardinal Basil Hume, Archbishop of Westminster, The Church Literature Association and Fowler Wright Books Ltd, Sept. 1981.
- Kelly, J.N.D., *Early Christian Creeds*, 3rd edition, Longman, 1972.
- Kelly, J.N.D., *Early Christian Doctrines*, Second Edition, London: Adam and Charles Black, 1960.
- Kennedy, M.C., *Clarifications – On Eucharist and Ministry*, Search – A Church of Ireland Journal, Vol 18, No 1, pp56-64.
- Kennedy, M.C., Letter to Bishop Mark Santer (unanswered) re the ARCIC II

- document “Clarifications” and a reply from the Revd Canon Stephen Platten, thanking him for a copy of the letter, dated 18th January 1995 and 31st January 1995.
- Kennedy, D.J. and Mann, D., *Making the Eucharistic Prayer Work*, Grove Worship Series No. 103, Grove Books, 1988.
- Kennedy, D.J., “The Epiclesis and the Role of the Holy Spirit in the Eucharistic Prayer, Essay 10 in David R. Holeton, *Revising the Eucharist – Groundwork for the Anglican Communion*, Studies in Preparation for the 1995 Dublin Consultation, Alcuin/GROW Study 27, Grove Books, 1994.
- Kennedy, D., *Understanding Anglican Worship*, Grove Worship Series 130, Grove Books, 1994.
- Kennedy, M.C., “Clarifications”, Review Article in *Search*, January 1995.
- Kennedy, W.M., *The “Interpretations” of the Bishops - & their influence on Elizabethan Policy (with an appendix of the original documents)*, Alcuin Club Tracts VIII, Longmans, Green & Co. 1908.
- Kiesling, C., "Roman Catholic doctrine and Reformed theology of the eucharistic sacrifice", *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* (1978) 15:416-426.
- Kilmartin, E.J., *The Eucharist in the West: History and Theology*, edited by R.J. Daly, Colledgeville, Pueblo, Liturgical, 1998.
- Kilpatrick, G.D., *Remaking the Liturgy*, The Fontana Library, Theology and Philosophy, Collins, Fontana Books, 1967.
- King, A.A., *Concelebration in the Christian Church*, Mowbray, 1966. [RB Library]
- King, A.A., *Eucharistic reservation in the Western Church*, London, 1965.
- Klauser, T., *A Short History of the Western Liturgy – An account and some reflections*, second edition, OUP, 1979.
- Klawiter, F.C., “The Eucharist and Sacramental Realism in the Thought of St Ignatius of Antioch”, in *Studia Liturgica* 37 (2007), 129-63.
- Kochuparampil, J., “The Missionary Dimension of the Liturgy in the Anaphora of the Apostles Addai and Mari”, in *Studia Liturgica* 36 (2006), pp129-37.
- Kollar, R., “The Anglo-Catholic Campaign against Revision of the Book of Common Prayer: The Hickleton Conference of 1911”, in *Studia Liturgica* 23 (1993) pp194-206.
- Kümmel, W.G., *Theology of the New Testament*, SCM, 1974.
- L/
- Lake, K, [Tr] *Apostolic Fathers*, Loeb Classical Library, Vols 1 & 2, William Heinmann and Harvard University Press 1965.
- Lash, N., “The Eucharist and Community – 1” without title, undated, and with no information about publication in the only copy available to the present writer, pp111-139.
- Lathrop, G. W., “*Koinonia* and the Shape of the Liturgy”, pp65-81 in *Studia Liturgica* 26 (1996).
- Lazareth, W.H., *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry – A Study Guide*, Faith and Order Paper No 114, World Council of Churches, 1983.
- Lewis, E., *Prayer Book Revision in the Church in Wales*, The Church in Wales Proinval Council for Education, 1958.
- Ligier, L., “From the Last Supper to the Eucharist”, in L. Shepherd, ed, *The New Liturgy*, Darton, Longman and Todd, London, 1970.
- Ligier, L., “The Origins of the Eucharistic Prayer”, *Studia Liturgica*, Vol 9: No 4, 1973.
- Lloyd, T., *Children at Communion- How to Involve Children in the Eucharist*, Grove Worship Series W205, Grove Books 2010
- Lloyd, T., Ed., *Lay Presidency at the Eucharist?*, Grove Liturgical Study No. 9. Grove Books, 1977.

Lockton, W., *The Treatment of the Remains at the Eucharist after Holy Communion and the Time of the Ablutions*, CUP, 1920.

Long, J.C., *One Eternal Eucharist of Love*, Ed, C.M. Gray-Stack, Clerk to the Irish Council of Parish and People, Published by the Dean and Chapter of Cashel, 1959.

Love, C., *Justification and Communion – An Ecumenical Study*, [Published at Glenstal Abbey, 1995.

M/

MacCulloch., D., *Thomas Cranmer*, Yale University Press, 1996.

MacDonnell., “A year afterwards – the Vatican Response to ARCIC – a slammed door”? in *One in Christ*, 1993-2, pp113-117.

MacKean., *The Eucharistic Theology of the Oxford Movement – a Critical Survey*, Putnam, London and New York, 1933.

McAdoo, H.R., *Anglican Heritage: Theology and Spirituality*, The Canterbury Press, Norwich, 1991.

McAdoo, H.R., Anglican/Roman Catholic Relations, 1717-1980: “A Detection of Themes” in *Rome and the Anglicans* by J.C.H. Aveling, D.M. Loades, and H.R. McAdoo, pp224-34, New York, 1982.

McAdoo, H.R., “A Theology of the Eucharist – Brevint and the Wesleys”, pp234-256 in *Theology* SPCK, July/August 1994,

McAdoo, H.R., *Jeremy Taylor, Anglican Theologian*, The Church of Ireland Historical Society, 1997.

McAdoo, R.H., *No New Church*, Church of Ireland Printing & Publishing, Dublin, 1945.

McAdoo, H.R., *The Eucharistic Theology of Jeremy Taylor Today*, The Canterbury Press, Norwich, 1988.

McAdoo, H.R., and Stevenson, K., *The Mystery of the Eucharist in the Anglican Tradition*, The Canterbury Press, Norwich, 1995.

McGoldrick, P., “The Eucharistic Prayer” from a publication without title, undated, and without mention of the publisher in the only copy available to the present writer.

McGowan, Andrew B., *Ancient Christian Worship – Early Church Practices in Social, Historical, And Theological Perspective*, Alcuin Club Collections 91, Baker Academic, 2014.

McGowan, A.B., *Ancient Christian Worship – Early Church Practices in Social, Historical, and Theological Perspective.*, Baker Academic, Grand Rapids, Michigan, Alcuin Club Collections 1991, 2014.

McGowan, Anne, *Eucharistic Epicleses, Ancient and Modern – Speaking of the Spirit in Eucharistic Prayer*, Alcuin Club Collections 89, SPCK, 2014.

McGrath, A., *Christian Theology – An Introduction, Second Edition*, Blackwell, 1997.

McCue, J., "The doctrine of, transubstantiation from Berengar through the Council of Trent" in *Lutherans and Catholics in dialogue, III. The Eucharist as sacrifice*, New York, 1967 pp89-124.

McKenna, J.H., *Eucharist and Holy Spirit - the Eucharistic Epiclesis in 20th Century Theology*, Alcuin Club Collections No. 57, Mayhew-McCrimmon, 1975.

Martlett, G., *The Risen Christ and the Eucharistic World*, Collins, 1976.

Martos, J., *Doors to the Sacred*, SCM, 1981.

Martin, H., Ed., *The Holy Communion – A Symposium*, SCM, 1947.

Mascall, E.L., *Corpus Christi - Essays on the Church and the Eucharist*, Longmans, London, Second Edition, 1965.

Mascall, E.L., *The Recovery of Unity*.

Mendham, G., “Language and the Eucharist”, Essay 11 in David R. Holeton, *Revising*

- the Eucharist – Groundwork for the Anglican Communion*, Studies in Preparation for the 1995 Dublin Consultation, Alcuin/GROW Study 27, Grove Books, 1994.
- Meyer, H., and Vischer, L., *Growth in Agreement – Reports and Agreed Statements of Ecumenical Conversations on a World Level*, Ecumenical Documents II, Paulist Press/World Council of Churches, Geneva, Faith and Order Paper No 108, 1984.
- Micklethwaite, J.T., *The Ornaments of the Rubric*, second edition, Alcuin Club Tracts 1, Longmans, Green and Co. 1898.
- Meyers, R.A., “The Common Cup and the Common Loaf”, Essay 12 in David R. Meyers, R.A., Ed. *Children at the Table – The Communion of all the baptized in Anglicanism, Today*, [A Collection of Essays on Children and the Eucharist], The Church Hymnal Corporation, New York, 1995.
- Meyers, R.A., “One Bread, One Cup” pp82-98 in Holeyton, D.R., *Our Thanks and Praise – The Eucharist in Anglicanism Today*, Papers from the Fifth International Anglican Liturgical Consultation, the Anglican Book Centre, Toronto, 1998.
- Miller, H., and Tovey, P., “Communion without a Priest”, Essay 13 in David R. Holeyton, D., *Revising the Eucharist – Groundwork for the Anglican Communion*, Studies in Preparation for the 1995 Dublin Consultation, Alcuin/GROW Study 27, Grove Books, 1994.
- Mitchell, N., *Real Presence – The Work of Eucharist*, LTP (Liturgy Training Programme, Archdiocese of Chicago), 1998.
- Moloney, R., *The Eucharist*, Geoffrey Chapman, 1995.
- Mooreman, J.R.H., *The Anglican Spiritual Tradition*, Darton, Longman and Todd, 1983.
- More, P.E., Cross, F.L., Eds, *Anglicanism – The Thought and Practice of the Church of England, illustrated from the Religious Literature of the Seventeenth Century*, London, SPCK, 1957.
- Morgan, D., *1662 and all that – Commemorating the Third Centenary of the Book of Common Prayer*, London, Mowbray, 1961.
- Moss, C.B., *The Christian Faith: An Introduction to Dogmatic Theology*, SPCK 1957 (originally published 1943).
- Moule, C.F.D., *The Sacrifice of Christ*, London, 1956.
- Moule, C.F.D., *Worship in the New Testament*, Part One, Grove Liturgical Study No 12, Grove Books, 1977 (1961 edition, Lutterworth).
- Moule, C.F.D., *Worship in the New Testament*, Part Two, Grove Liturgical Study No 13, Grove Books, 1978 (1961 edition, Lutterworth).
- Murray, P., Ed, OSB, *Studies in Pastoral Liturgy* 3, Gill and Son, 1967.
- N/
National Assembly of the Church of England, *Book Proposed to be Annexed to the Prayer Book Measure, 192-, Provisional, Subject to further revision by the House of Bishops, (Issued Feb 7th, 1927)*, London, OUP, CUP, Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1927.
- National Assembly of the Church of England, *Revised Prayer Book (Permissive Use) Measure, 1923*, N.A. 84, London: National Assembly of the Church of England/Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, 1923.
- Nau, A.J., *Peter in Matthew – Discipleship, Diplomacy, and Dispraise*, The Liturgical Press Minnesota, 1992.
- Neill, C., and Willoughby, J.M., *The Tutorial Prayer Book – For the Teacher, the Student, and the General Reader*, London, The Harrison Trust, 1912.
- Neill, S.C., *Anglicanism*, Penguin 1958, with revisions 1960.
- Neill, S.C., “The Holy Communion in the Anglican Church”, Chapter III in *The Holy Communion*, edited by Hugh Martin, SCM, 1947.
- Newbiggin, L., *The Household of God*, SCM, 1953.

- Nichols, Aidan, *Looking at the Liturgy – A Critical View of its Contemporary Form*, Ignatius Press, San Francisco, 1996.
- Nissiotis, N, and Vischer, L., Eds, *Towards an Ecumenical Consensus, Baptism, Eucharist, Ministry*, Faith and Order Paper No 84, the World Council of Churches, Geneva.
- O/
- O'Donoghue, N.X., *Liturgical Orientation of the President at the Eucharist*, Joint Liturgical Studies, 83, Alcuin Club and the Group for Renewal of Worship, 2017.
- Ollard, S.L., *A Short History of the Oxford Movement*, first published 1915, Second Edition, revised (Oxford Movement Centenary Edition) 1932, further edition with revised introduction (150th Anniversary Oxford Movement Edition) Mowbray, 1983.
- O'Dwyer, O Carm, Peter, *Towards a History of Irish Spirituality*, The Columba Press, 1995.
- O' Loughlin, T., *The Eucharist – Origins and Contemporary Understandings*, Bloomsbury T&T Clark, 2015.
- O'Malley, B., *A Celtic Primer – The complete Celtic worship resource and collection*, , Canterbury Press 2002.
- Oulton J.E.L., *Holy Communion and Holy Spirit – a Study in Doctrinal Relationship*, SPCK, London, 1954.
- P/
- Pahl, I., “The Paschal Mystery in its Central Meaning for the Shape of Christian Liturgy”, pp 16-38 in *Studia Liturgica* 26, (1996).
- Palmer, W., *Origines Liturgicae, or Antiquities of The English Ritual and A Dissertation on Primitive Liturgies...in two volumes*. Vol 1, Third Edition, 1839., Oxford, at the University Press.
- Palmer, W., *Origines Liturgicae, or Antiquities of The English Ritual and A Dissertation on Primitive Liturgies...in two volumes*. Vol II, Third Edition, 1839., Oxford, at the University Press.
- Parsons, M., *The Holy Communion – An Exposition of the Prayer Book Service*, The Prayer Book Commentaries, Hodder & Stoughton, 1961.
- Paul VI, *The Holy Eucharist - Encyclical Letter of Pope Paul VI "Mysterium Fidei"*, Catholic Truth Society, London, Do355, 1965.
- Perham, M., Ed. *Liturgy for a New Century – Further Essays in Preparation for the Revision of the Alternative Service Book*, SPCK/Alcuin Club, 1991.
- Perham, M., *New Handbook of Pastoral Liturgy*, SPCK, 2000.
- Perham, M., Ed, *Towards Liturgy 2000 – Preparing for the revision of the Alternative Service Book*, SPCK/Alcuin Club, 1989.
- Perham, M., Ed., *The Renewal of Common Prayer – Uniformity and Diversity in Church of England Worship*, Essays by members of the Liturgical Commission of the Church of England, SPCK, 1993.
- Peters, B., *The Anglican Eucharist in New Zealand, 1814-1989*, Alcuin/GROW Liturgical Study 21, Grove Books, 1992
- Phillips, L.E., “The Kiss of Peace and the Opening Greeting of the Pre-anaphoral Dialogue”, in *Studia Liturgica* 23 (1993) pp177-86.
- Pierce, J.M., “The Eucharist as Sacrifice: Some Contemporary Roman Catholic Reflections”, *Worship* 69 (1995) pp394-405.
- Pocknee, C.E. *Liturgical Vesture – Its*
- Pocknee, C.E., *The Christian Altar – In History and Today*, Mowbrays, 1963.
- Pocknee, C.E., *The Parson's Handbook – Practical directions for parsons and others according to the Anglican Use, as set forth in the Book of Common Prayer on the basis of the twelfth edition by Percy Dearmer, D.D., revised and rewritten*, Thirteenth

Edition, OUP, 1965..

Pope John Paul II, *The Holy Eucharist, Letter of the Supreme Pontiff Pope John Paul II to all the Bishops of the Church on the Mystery and Worship of the Holy Eucharist*, Catholic Truth Society, 1980.

Pope Paul VI, *The Holy Eucharist – Encyclical Letter of Pope Paul VI, 'Mysterium Fidei'*, 1965, Catholic Truth Society.

Porter, H.B., “An American Assembly of Anaphoral Prayers”, 181-196.

Porter, H.B., *Jeremy Taylor, Liturgist (1613-1667)*, Alcuin Club/SPCK, 1979.

Power, D.N., “Affirmed from Under: Celtic Liturgy and Spirituality”, pp1-32 in *Studia Liturgica* 27 (1997).

Power, D.N., *Irenaeus of Lyons on Baptism and Eucharist – Selected texts with Introduction, Translation and Annotation*, Alcuin/GROW Liturgical Study 18 [Grove Liturgical Study 65, Grove Books, 1991

Power, D.N., *The Eucharistic Mystery – Revitalizing the Tradition*, Gill and MacMillan, 1992.

Powick, F.M., *The Reformation in England* (OUP, 1941).

Price, C., and Weil, L., *Liturgy for Living*, The Seabury Press, 1979.

Price, T., *Evangelical Anglicans and the Lima Text – As Assessment and Critique*, Grove Worship Series No 92, Grove Books, 1985.

Proctor, F., *A History of the Book of Common Prayer with a rationale of its offices*, Macmillan 1892.

Proctor, F., and Frere, W.H., *A New History of The Book of Common Prayer with a rationale of its offices*, Macmillan, 1965.

Purdy, W., *The Search for Unity – Relations between the Anglican and Roman Catholic Churches from the 1950s to the 1970s*, Geoffrey Chapman, 1996.

Pusey, E.B., *The Real Presence of The Body and Blood of Our Lord Jesus Christ, - The Doctrine of the English Church*, Oxford, 1857.

Q/

Quevedo-Bosch., “The Eucharistic Species and Inculturation”, Essay 14 in David R. Holeton., *Revising the Eucharist – Groundwork for the Anglican Communion*, Studies in Preparation for the 1995 Dublin Consultation, Alcuin/GROW Study 27, Grove Books, 1994.

Quick, O., *Christian Sacraments*, 1927.

Quin, Coslett., *At the Lord's Table*, Lutterworth, 1954.

R/

Ramsey, M., *Be Still and Know: A Study in the Life of Prayer*, London, 1982.

Ratcliff, E.C., “The Communion Service in the Prayer Book” in *E.C. Ratcliff: Reflections on Liturgical Revision*, ed, D.H. Tripp. *Grove Liturgical Study* 22, Grove Books, 1980.

Ratcliff, E.C., “The Holy Communion: Its Beginnings and Early Development”, Chapter I in *The Holy Communion*, edited by Hugh Martin, SCM, 1947.

Rattenbury, *The Eucharistic Hymns of John and Charles Wesley* (London, 1948).

Ratzinger, R., "Is the Eucharist a Sacrifice?", pp35-40 in *Concilium*, Vol 4 No. 3., April 1967.

Reardon, R., and Finch, M, Eds, *Sharing Communion – An Appeal to the Churches by interchurch families*, Collins, 2001.

Reiss, P., *Children and Communion – A Practical Guide for Interested Churches*, Grove Liturgical Series 149, Grove Books, 1998

Reumann, J., *The Supper of the Lord - The New Testament*, Ecumenical Dialogues, and Faith and Order on Eucharist, Fortress Press, 1985.

Riley, A., *The Divine Liturgy in the East – A Manual for the use of English*

- Churchmen attending the Celebration of the Eucharist according to the Rites of the Holy Orthodox Eastern Church*, Mowbray, 1922.
- Roberts, H., *Anglican-Methodist Conversations – Summary and exposition of the official report: Conversations between the Church of England and the Methodist Church*, The Epworth Press and The Church Information Office, 1963.
- Robinson, J.A.T., *Liturgy coming to Life*, London, Mowbray, 1960.
- Rorem, P., *The Medieval Development of Liturgical Symbolism*, Grove Liturgical Study No 47, Grove Books, 1986.
- Ross, M., and Jones, S., *The Serious Business of Worship – Essays in Honor of Bryan D. Spinks*, T & T Clark, 2010.
- Roth, Cecil, *The Haggadah – A new edition with English translation introduction and notes*, The Soncino Press, 1975
- Ryan, D., “The Mass, the Sacrifice of the New Covenant”, pp148-182 in M. Hurley, Ed., *Church and Eucharist*, Gill and son, Dublin and Melbourne, with a Methodist comment by F.E. Hill and a Presbyterian Comment by John A. McFadden.
- S/
- Sacred Congregation for Divine Worship, *Eucharistic Prayers for Masses with Children, and for Masses of Reconciliation* (for experiment and for three years), Liturgical Books, The Talbot Press and Veritas Publications, 1975.
- Sagovsky, N., (Ed.), *Liturgy and Symbolism*, Grove Liturgical Study No. 16, Grove Books, 1978.
- Salaville, S., *An Introduction to the Study of Eastern Liturgies*, London, Sands & Co, 1938.
- Sansom, M., *Why Liturgical Worship Anyway*, Grove Liturgical Study No. 37, Grove Books, 1984.
- Schillebeeckx, E., *The Eucharist*, Sheed and Ward, 1968.
- Schoonenberg, P., "Transubstantiation: How far is this Doctrine Historically Determined?", pp41-47 in *Concilium*, Vol 4 No. 3, April 1967.
- Schulz, H.-, “Patterns of Offering and Sacrifice” in *Studia Liturgica*, pp34-48, Vol 15, 1982/1983, Number 1.
- Schweizer, E., *The Lord's Supper according to the New Testament*, Philadelphia, 1967.
- Seraphim, Hans-Christian., “On the Act of Oblation in the Eucharistic Prayer”, in *Studia Liturgica* 37 (2007) pp234-48.
- Shaver S.R., *Eucharistic Sacrifice as a Contested Category: A Cognitive Linguistics Approach*, Joint Liturgical Studies 85, Alcuin Club and The Group for Renewal of Worship, 2018.
- Sherlock, C., “Eucharist, Sacrifice and Atonement”: The *Clarifications* of ARCIC, in *Our Thanks and Praise, the Eucharist in Anglicanism Today*, ed D.R. Holeton, pp117-28, Toronto, Anglican Book Centre, 1998.
- Shepherd, M.H., “Our Anglican Understanding of Corporate Worship” pp68-84 in *Anglican Congress 1954 – Minneapolis*, SPCK, 1955
- Sherlock, C., “Eucharist, Sacrifice and Atonement: The *Clarifications* of ARCIC, pp117-128 in Holeton, D.R., *Our Thanks and Praise – The Eucharist in Anglicanism Today*, Papers from the Fifth International Anglican Liturgical Consultation, the Anglican Book Centre, Toronto, 1998. Study Document.
- Sherlock, C., “Mission and the Liturgy”, Essay 15 in David R. Holeton, *Revising the Eucharist – Groundwork for the Anglican Communion*, Studies in Preparation for the 1995 Dublin Consultation, Alcuin/GROW Study 27, Grove Books, 1994.
- Sinden, G., *When we meet for worship – A manual for using An Australian Prayer Book 1978*, Lutheran Publishing House, Adelaide, 1978.
- Sines, A., “Let us Celebrate the Feast” – *Holy Communion and Building the*

Community, Braemor Studies Series No 7, Church of Ireland Publishing, 2016.

Smart, D., “The Architectural Setting of the Eucharist”, Essay 16 in David R. Holeton, *Revising the Eucharist – Groundwork for the Anglican Communion*, Studies in Preparation for the 1995 Dublin Consultation, Alcuin/GROW Study 27, Grove Books, 1994.

Smethurst, D., *Extended Communion: An Experiment in Cumbria*, Grove Worship Series No 96, Grove Books, 1986.

Smith, E.J., “Whose prayer will make the difference? Eucharistic Renewal and Liturgical Education, pp99-114, Holeton, D.R., *Our Thanks and Praise – The Eucharist in Anglicanism Today*, Papers from the Fifth International Anglican Liturgical Consultation, the Anglican Book Centre, Toronto, 1998.,

Smith, J.D., *The Eucharistic Doctrine of The Later Nonjurors – A Revisionist View of the Eighteenth-Century Usages Controversy*, Joint Liturgical Studies, 46, The Alcuin Club and The Group for Renewal of Worship, Grove Books, 2000.

Spens, W., *Belief and Practice*,

Sperry-White, G., *The Testamentum Domini*, Alcuin/GROW Liturgical Study 19 (Grove Liturgical Study 66), Grove Books 1991.

Spinks, B.D., *Addai and Mari: A Text for Students*, Grove Liturgical Study No.24, Grove Books, 1980.

Spinks, B.D., *Do this in remembrance of me: The Eucharist from the Early Church to the Present Day*, SCM, 2013.

Spinks, B.D., *Liturgy in the Age of Reason: Worship and Sacraments in England and Scotland 1662-c. 1800*, 2008.

Spinks, B.D., *Luther’s Liturgical Criteria and His Reform of the Canon of the Mass*, Grove Liturgical Study No. 30, Grove Books, 1982.

Spinks, B.D., *Mar Nestorius and Mar Theodore The Interpreter: The Forgotten Eucharistic Prayers of East Syria*.

Spinks, B.D., *Sacraments, Ceremonies and the Stuart Divines: Sacramental Theology and Liturgy in England and Scotland 1603-1662*, 2017.

Spinks, B.D., "The Eucharistic Prayer", Chapter 8 in *The Identity of Anglican Worship*, Eds K. Stevenson and B. Spinks, Mowbray, 1991.

Spinks, B.D., “The Cleansed Leper’s Thankoffering before the Lord: Edward Craddock Ratcliff and the Pattern of the Early Anaphora” pp161-178 61 in *The Sacrifice of Praise...in honour of Arthur Hubert Couratin*, ed. Bryan Spinks (q.v.) C.L.V. – Editioni Liturgiche – 00192 Roman, 1981.

Spinks, B.D., *The Institution Narrative, Eucharistic Prayers and the Anglican Liturgical Tradition*, PDF online.

Spinks, B.D., *The Rise and Fall of the Incomparable Liturgy, The Book of Common Prayer 1559-1906*, Alcuin Club Collections, SPCK, 2017.

Spinks, B.D., *The Sanctus in the Eucharistic Prayer*, 2010.

Spinks, B.D., Ed., *Addai and Mari - the Anaphora of the Apostles: a Text for Students, with Introduction, Translation, and Commentary*, Grove Liturgical Study No 24, Grove Books, 1980.

Rausch, T., “Present State of Anglican: Roman Catholic Relations: An Assessment” in *One in Christ* 1993 – 2, pp118-125.

Spinks, B.D., “The Eucharistic Prayer” Chapter 8 in *The Identity of Anglican Worship*, Eds Kenneth Stevenson and Bryan Spinks, Mowbray 1991.

Spinks, B.D., Ed., *The Sacrifice of Praise - Studies on the themes of thanksgiving and redemption in the central prayers of the eucharistic and baptismal liturgies, in honour of A.H. Couratin*, C.L.V. - Edizioni Liturgiche - Rome, 1981.

Srawley, *The Liturgical Movement – Its Origin and Growth*, Mowbray (for the Alcuin

Club), Alcuin Club Tracts XXVII, 1954.

Stevenson, K.W., *Accept this Offering - The Eucharist as Sacrifice Today*, SPCK, 1989.

Stevenson, K.W., *Do This – The Shape, Style and Meaning of the Eucharist*, Canterbury Press Norwich, 2002.

Stevenson, K.W., ' "Anaphoral Offering": Some Observations on Eastern Eucharistic Prayers' in *Ephemerides Liturgicae* 1980, pp209-228. [Grove Liturgical Study No. 31, p.24n]

Stevenson, K.W., “Is Eucharistic Sacrifice a Culturally Relative Issue?” pp129-140, in Holeyton, D.R., *Our Thanks and Praise – The Eucharist in Anglicanism Today*, Papers from the Fifth International Anglican Liturgical Consultation, the Anglican Book Centre, Toronto, 1998, Study Document..

Stevenson, K.W., *Eucharist and Offering*, Pueblo Publishing Company, New York, 1986.

Stevenson, K.W., *Gregory Dix – Twenty five years on*, Grove Liturgical Study No. 10, Grove Books, 1977.

Stevenson, K.W. Ed., *Liturgy Reshaped*, SPCK, 1982.

Stevenson, K.W., and Spinks, B., “Offering and Sacrifice”, Essay 17 in David R. Holeyton, D., *Revising the Eucharist – Groundwork for the Anglican Communion*, Studies in Preparation for the 1995 Dublin Consultation, Alcuin/GROW Study 27, Grove Books, 1994.

Stevenson, K.W., “Soft Point in the Eucharist”, pp29-43 in Michael Perham, *Liturgy for a new century – further essays in preparation for the revision of the Alternative Service Book*, SPCK/Alcuin Club 1991.

Stevenson, K.W., *Symbolism and the Liturgy I* (Roman Catholic contributors), Grove Liturgical Study No. 23, Grove Books 1980.

Stevenson, K.W., *Symbolism and the Liturgy II* (Non-Roman Catholic contributors), Grove Liturgical Study No. 26, Grove Books, 1981.

Stevenson, K. W., and Spinks, B, Eds., *The Identity of Anglican Worship*, Mowbray, 1991.

Sinden, G., *When We Meet for Worship – A manual for using An Australian Prayer Book 1978*, Bro Gilbert Sinden, 1978.

Snaith, N., *Mercy and Sacrifice – A Study of the Book of Hosea*, SCM, 1953.

Sterne, D.H., *Jewish New Testament Commentary*, Jewish New Testament Publications, USA, 1992.

Sterne, D.H., *Jewish New Testament*, Jewish New Testament translations, Jerusalem, 1989.

Stone, D., *A History of The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, in two volumes, Longmans, Green and Co, 1909.

Stone, D., *The Holy Communion*, Longmans, Green and Co., London, 1914.

Strong, T.B., *Doctrine of the Real Presence*, 1899.

Stewart-Sykes, and Newman, Judith H., *Early Jewish Liturgy – a Sourcebook for use by students of Early Christian Liturgy*, The Alcuin Club and The Group for Renewal of Worship, Joint Liturgical Studies, 51, Grove Books, 2001.

Stott, J., *Evangelical Anglicans and the ARCIC Final Report – An Assessment and Critique*, [Drafted by John Stott on behalf of the Church of England Evangelical Council], C of E Evangelical Council, 1982.

Stringer, Martin D., *A Sociological History of Christian Worship*, CUP, 2005.

Sullivan, F.A., “The Vatican Response to ARCIC-1”, in *One in Christ* (1992, number unrecorded). Fr Francis Sullivan was professor of Ecclesiology at the Pontifical Gregorian University in Rome.

- Sykes, S., and Booty, J., *The Study of Anglicanism*, SCM/Fortress Press, 1988.
- T/
 Talley, T.J., “Eucharistic Prayers, Past, Present and Future”, pp6-19 in David R. Holeton, Ed., *Revising the Eucharist – Groundwork for the Anglican Communion*, Studies in Preparation for the 1995 Dublin Consultation, Alcuin/GROW Liturgical Study 27, Grove Books 1994.
- Talley, T.J., “The Eucharistic Prayer of the Ancient Church”, *Studia Liturgica*, Vol 2: No 3/4 1976.
- Talley, T.J., “The Eucharistic Prayer: Tradition and Development”, Ch 4 in Kenneth Stevenson, Ed, *Liturgy Reshaped*, SPCK, 1982.
- Tarsitano, L.R.. and Toon, P., *Neither Orthodoxy nor a Formulary – The Shape and Content of the 1979 Prayer Book of the Episcopal Church*, The Prayer Book Society of the USA, 2004.
- Tavard, G.H., *A Review of Anglican Orders – The Problem and the Solution*, The Liturgical Press, Collegeville, Minnesota, 1990
- Tavard, G.H., “Considerations on an Ecclesiology of *koinonia*”, *One in Christ*, 1995-1, pp42-51.
- Tavard, G.H., “The *Final Report*, Witness to Tradition”, pp118-129 in *One in Christ – a Catholic Ecumenical Review*, Vol XXXII, 1996, No. 2.
- Temple, W., *Christus Victor*, 1924.
- Temple, W., *Nature, Man and God*, 1934, Gifford Lectures
- The Anglican Church of Australia – *A Prayer Book for Australia, for use together with The Book of Common Prayer (1662) and An Australian Prayer Book 1978*, Liturgical Resources authorised by the General Synod, Broughton Books, 1995.
- The Anglican Church of Canada, *The Book of Alternative Services of The Anglican Church of Canada*, The Anglican Book, Centre, Toronto, 1985.
- The Canon Law Society of Great Britain and Ireland, in English Translation, *The Code of Canon Law*, Collins, 1983.
- The Church of England Liturgical Commission, *Alternative Services, Second Series, Recommended by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to be introduced to the Convocations and the House of Laity*, SPCK, 1965.
- The Church of the Province of New Zealand, *A New Zealand Prayer Book – He Karkia Mihinare o Aotearoa*, Collins, 1989.
- The Church of South India, *The Book of Common Worship*, as authorized by the Synod, 1962, OUP, 1963.
- The English Church Union, *A Suggested Prayer Book, Being the text of the English Rite altered and enlarged in accordance with the Prayer Book Revision proposals made by the English Church Union*, Humphrey Milford/OUP, 1923.
- The Standing Committee of the General Synod of the Church of England in Australia, *An Australian Payer Book – for use together with The Book of Common Prayer, 1662*, The Standing Committee of the General Synod of the Church of England in Australia, Sydney.
- The Standing Liturgical Commission of the Episcopal Church, *Supplemental Liturgical Texts – Prayer Book Studies 30*, The Church Hymnal Corporation, 1989.
- Thomas, W.H. Griffith Thomas, *The Principles of Theology – An Introduction to the Thirty-nine Articles*, Longmans, Green and Co., 1930.
- Thornton, L.S., *The Common Life in the Body of Christ*, Dacre Press, Westminster, 1941.
- Thurian, M., and Wainwright, G, *Baptism and Eucharist – Ecumenical Convergence in Celebration*, Faith and Order Paper no 117, WCC Publications, Geneva/Eerdmans, 1983.

- Thurian, M., *Churches Respond to BEM, Vol 1.*, Faith and Order Paper 129, World Council of Churches, Geneva.
- Thurian, M., *The Eucharistic Memorial, Part I, The Old Testament*, Ecumenical Studies in Worship No. 7, ET J.G. Davies, Lutterworth Press, London, 1960.
- Thurian, M., *The Eucharistic Memorial, Part 2, The New Testament*, Ecumenical Studies in Worship No. 8, ET J.G. Davies, Lutterworth Press, London, 1961
- Thurian, M., "The eucharistic memorial, sacrifice of praise and supplication" in *Ecumenical Perspectives on Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, ed, Max Thurian, Faith and Order Paper 116, World Council of Churches, 1983.
- Thurian, M., Ed., *Ecumenical Perspectives on Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, Faith and Order Paper 116, World Council of Churches, 1983.
- Thurian, M., *The Mystery of the Eucharist - an Ecumenical Approach*, Mowbray, ET 1983.
- Tillard, J.M.R., "Roman Catholics and Anglicans: Is There a Future for Ecumenism?" in *One in Christ – a Catholic Ecumenical Review*, Vol XXXII, 1996, No 2, p106ff
- Tillard, J.M.R., "The Eucharist, Gift of God", pp104-118 in *Ecumenical Perspectives on Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, M. Thurian, (ns on -1984, Woking, England, 1984, SPCK/The Saint Andrew Press Edinburgh, 1984.
- Toon, P., *An Act of Piracy – the Truth behind the Episcopal Liturgy of 1979*, The Prayer Book Society, 204.
- Tovey, P., *Communion Outside the Eucharist*, Alcuin/GROW Liturgical Study 26, Grove Books, 1991
- Tovey, P., *Inculturation – The Eucharist in Africa*, Alcuin/GROW Liturgical Study 7, (Grove Liturgical Study 55), Grove Books 1988.
- Tovey, P., *Public Worship with Communion by Extension – A Commentary*, Grove Worship Series W167, Grove Books, 2001.
- Tovey, P., *The Liturgy of St James as presently used*, The Alcuin Club and The Group for Renewal of Worship, Joint Liturgical Studies, 40, Grove Books, 1998.
- Tovey, P., *The Theory and Practice of Extended Communion*, Liturgy, Worship and Society, Ashgate, 2009.
- Tripp, D.H., Ed. *E.C. Ratcliff: Reflections on Liturgical Revision*, Grove Liturgical Study No 22, Grove Books, 1980.
- Tripp, D.H. ed., "The Thanksgiving: An Essay by Arthur Couratin" pp20-61 in *The Sacrifice of Praise...in honour of Arthur Hubert Couratin*, ed. Bryan Spinks (q.v.) C.L.V. – Editioni Liturgiche – 00192 Roman, 1981.
- Turner, R.E., "Modern Trends in Anglicanism in Eucharistic Thought and Practice", pp 183-211 in Michael Hurley, Ed, *Church and Eucharist*, Gill and Son, Dublin and Melbourne.
- U/
Underhill, E., *Worship*, Collins, The Fontana Library, 1962 (originally published by James Nisbet, 1936)
- "US Catholic Bishops Response to the ARCIC Final Report", pp320-29 in *One in Christ, A Catholic Ecumenical Review*, 1985-4.
- V/
Vann, G., "The Holy Communion in the Roman Catholic Church", Chapter II in *The Holy Communion*, ed. Hugh Martin, SCM 1947.
- Varghese, Dr B., *The Syriac Version of the Liturgy of St James*, The Alcuin Club and The Group for Renewal of Worship, Joint Liturgical Studies, 49, Grove Books, 2001.
- Vasey, Michael, *Reading the Bible at the Eucharist*, Grove Worship Series No 94, Grove Books, 1986.
- Vasey, M., "Scripture and Eucharist" pp147-161, in Holeyton, D.R., *Our Thanks and*

- Praise – The Eucharist in Anglicanism Today*, Papers from the Fifth International Anglican Liturgical Consultation, the Anglican Book Centre, Toronto, 1998.,
W/
- Wainwright, G., “Any Advance on ‘BEM’? – The Lima Text at Twenty Five” in *Studia Liturgica*, Vol 37, No 1, 2007, pp1-29
- Wainwright, G., *Doxology – A Systematic Theology*, Epworth, 1980.
- Wainwright, G., *Eucharist and Eschatology*, Epworth, London, 1971.
- Wainwright, G. and Tucker, Karen B. Westerfield, *The Oxford History of Christian Worship*, OUP, 2006.
- Walton, H.B., *The First Book of Common Prayer of Edward VI and The Ordinary of 1549 together with The Order of the Communion, 1548, reprinted entire, and edited*, Rivingtons, London, Oxford, and Cambridge, 1870.
- Wand, W., Article, “Anglican Eucharistic Theology in the Twentieth Century”, otherwise unidentified.
- Wand, W., *The Development of Sacramentalism*, 1928.
- Ware, K. and Davey, C., Eds, *The Anglican-Orthodox Dialogue – the Mowcow Statement Agreed by the Anglican-Orthodox Joint Doctrinal Commission, 1976 with introductory and supporting material*, SPCK, 1977.
- Warren., *The Liturgy and Ritual of the Celtic Church*, Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1881.
- Wandel, Lee Palmer, *The Eucharist in the Reformation – Incarnation and Liturgy*, CUP, 2006.
- Waterland, D., *A Review of the the Doctrine of the Eucharist*, Oxford, at the Clarendon Press, 1880.
- Wegman, H., *Christian Worship in East and West – A Study Guide to Liturgical History*, T. Shand Publications, 1984.
- Weil, L., “The Dublin Lecture - Issues Concerning the Anglican Eucharist in the Twenty First Century” pp15-31 in Holeton, D.R., *Our Thanks and Praise – The Eucharist in Anglicanism Today*, Papers from the Fifth International Anglican Liturgical Consultation, the Anglican Book Centre, Toronto, 1998.,
- Weil, L., *Sacraments and Liturgy, the Outward Signs – A Study in liturgical Mentality*, Blackwell, 1983.
- West, F., *The Comparative Liturgy of Anton Baumstark*, The Alcuin Club and The Group for Renewal of Worship, Grove Books, 1995.
- Went, J.S., “Koinonia: a Significant Milestone on the Road to Unity” pp22-39 in *One in Christ*, 1996-1
- Wheatly, C., *A Rational Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England: the substance of ever thing liturgical* in Bishop Sparrow, Mr L'Estrange, Dr. Comber, Dr. Nichols, and all former ritualists, commentators, and others, upon the same subject, London, 1871. Originally published in three vols., London, 1746.
- White, J.F., *A Brief History of Christian Worship*, , Abingdon Press, Nashville, 1993.
- White, J.F., *Introduction to Christian Worship*, Third Edition, Revised and Expanded, Abingdon Press, 1980, 1990, 2000.
- Wigan, B., Ed, *The Liturgy in English*, OUP, 1962
- Williams, R., *Anglican Identities*, Darton, Langman and Todd, 2014 and 2014.
- Williams, R., *Eucharistic Sacrifice - The Roots of a Metaphor*, Grove Liturgical Study No 31, Grove Books, 1982
- Willebrands, Cardinal, "Anglican-Roman Catholic dialogue", *One in Christ* (1979) 15:290-304.
- Willis, G.G., *Essays in Early Roman Liturgy*, Alcuin Club Collections No XLVI, published for the Alcuin Club by SPCK, 1964.

Willis, G.G., *Further Essays in Early Roman Liturgy*, Alcuin Club Collections No 50, published for the Alcuin Club by SPCK, 1964.

Willis, G.G., "Sacrificium Laudis", pp73-87 61 in *The Sacrifice of Praise...in honour of Arthur Hubert Couratin*, ed. Bryan Spinks (q.v.) C.L.V. – Editioni Liturgiche – 00192 Roman, 1981.

Wilson, W.G., *Church Teaching – a Church of Ireland Handbook, Revised and Enlarged Edition*, APCK, 1970

Wilson, W.G. and Templeton, J.H., *Anglican Teaching – An Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles*, APCK, 1962..

World Council of Churches "Celebrations of the Eucharist in Ecumenical Contexts: A Proposals from a Group Meeting at Bossey", pp94-101, *Studia Liturgica* 27 (1997).

World Council of Churches, Commission on Faith and Order, *Towards Koinonia in Worship: Consultation on the Role of Worship Within the Search for Unity*, pp1-31 in *Studia Liturgica* 25 (1995).

Wright, C.H.H., Ed., *Cranmer on the Lord's Supper - A Defence of the True and Catholick Doctrine of the Sacrament*, Focus Christian Ministries Trust and Harrison Trust, 1987.

Wyon, Olive., *The Altar Fire*, SCM 1954.

Y/

Yarnold, E., *Anglican Orders – A New Context, Correspondence between H.E. Cardinal J. Willebrands, President of the Vatican Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, and the Anglican and Roman Catholic Co-Chairmen of the Second International Commission, with an Introduction by the Revd Edward Yarnold, S.J.*, London, Catholic Truth Society, 1986.

Young, D., *Welcoming Children to Communion*, Grove Worship Series No 85, 1983.

Young, F., *The Use of Sacrificial Ideas in Greek Christian Writers from the New Testament to John Chrysostom*, Cambridge, Mass., 1979.

- *A critique of Eucharistic Agreement*, SPCK, 1975.
- *Altar Services as proposed in 1928*, London, Eyre and Spottiswoode, (undated)
- *Alternative Prayer Book 1984 – according to the use of The Church of Ireland, by authority of the General Synod of the Church of Ireland*, Collins, 1984.
- *Anglican Orders (Latin) – The Bull of His Holiness Leo XIII, 1896, and the Answer of the Archbishops of England, 1897*, Published for the Church Historical Society, SPCK, 1932.
- *A New Zealand Prayer Book, He Karakia Mihinare o Aotearoa*, The Church of the Province of New Zealand, Te Haahi o te Prowini o Niu Tereni, Collins, 1989.
- Anglican Consultative Council Reports:
 - 1971 *The Time is Now*, First Meeting, Limuru, Kenya, SPCK, 1971
 - 1973 *Partners in Mission*, Second Meeting, Dublin, 1973.
 - 1976 *Report of Third Meeting*, Trinidad, ACC 1976
 - 1979 *Report of the Fourth Meeting*, London Ontario, Canada, ACC 1979
 - 1981 *Report of Fifth Meeting*, Newcastle upon Tyne, ACC 1981
 - 1984 *Bonds of Affection, Proceedings of ACC-6* Badagry, Nigeria, ACC 1984
 - 1987 *Many Gifts One Spirit, Report of ACC-7*, Singapore, ACC 1987
 - 1990 *Mission in a Broken World – Report of ACC-8*. Wales ACC 1990
 - 1993 *A Transforming Vision – Suffering and Glory in God's World*, Cape Town 1993, The Official Report of the Joint Meeting of the Primates of the Anglican Communion and the Anglican Consultative Council, Church House

- Publishing, 1993.
- 1996 *Being Anglican in the Third Millennium*, The Official Report of the 10th Meeting of the Anglican Consultative Council - includes The Virginia Report and The Dublin Liturgical Report, Panama City, Morehouse Publishing 1996.
- 1999 *The Communion We Share, Anglican Consultative Council XI*, Scotland, Morehouse Publishing, 1999.
- 2002 Hong Kong (Online)
- 2005 Nottingham (Online)
- 2009 Kingston, Jamaica (Online)
- 2012 Auckland, New Zealand (Online)
- 2016 Lusaka Zambia (Online)
- *Anglican-Methodist Unity – Report of The Anglican Methodist Unity Commission, 2 The Scheme*, SPCK and The Epworth Press, 1968.
 - *Anglican Orders A New Context- Correspondence between H.E. Cardinal J. Willebrands, President of the Vatican Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity and the Anglican and Roman Catholic Co-Chairmen of the Second International Commission, with an introduction by the Revered Edward Yarnold, S.J.*, Catholic Truth Society, Do574, 1986.
 - Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission; Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity, *Clarifications on Eucharist and Ministry*, The Anglican Consultative Council and the Pontifical Council for Promoting Christian Unity, Vatican City; Church House Publishing and the Catholic Truth Society, 1994.
 - *A Note interpreting the ‘‘Instruction on admitting other Christians to Eucharistic Communion under certain circumstances (1973) RC*
 - *A Prayer Book for Australia – for use together with The Book of Common Prayer (1662) and An Australian Prayer Book (1978)*, Liturgical Resources authorized by the General Synod, Broughton Books, 1995.
 - *A Suggested Prayer Book – Being the text of the English Rite altered and enlarged in accordance with the Prayer Book Revision proposals made by the English Church Union*, OUP, 1923.
 - *A Transforming Vision, - Suffering and Glory in God’s world, The Official Report of the Joint Meeting (Capetown 1993) of the Primates of the Anglican Communion and the Anglican Consultative Council*, Church House Publishing, 1993
 - *Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry*, Faith and Order Paper No 111 of the World Council of Churches, Geneva, 1982.
 - *A Critique of Eucharistic Agreement*, SPCK, 1975.
 - *Being Anglican – in the third millennium (includes The Virginia Report and The Dublin Liturgical Report, Anglican Consultative Council X, Panama City, compiled by James M. Rosenthal and Nicola Currie, Morehouse Publishing, 1996.*
 - *Catechism of the Catholic Church R.C.*
 - Congregation for the Doctrine of Faith (CDF), *The Church as Communion’’*. under the signatures of Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger and Alberto Bovone, as authorized by Pope John Paul II; in *One in Christ* (no. and date unrecorded).
 - Catholic Truth Society, *Anglican Orders – A New Context, Correspondence between H.E. Cardinal J. Willebrands, President of the Vatican Secretariat for Promoting Christian Unity, and the Anglican and Roman Catholic Co-Chairmen of the Second International Commission, with an Introduction by the Revd Edward Yarnold, S.J.*, London, Catholic Truth Society, 1986.

- *Commentary on the Constitution of the Church of Ireland*, Church of Ireland Publishing, 2018.
- *Constitution of the Church of Ireland*, The General Synod of the Church of Ireland, successive editions (updates).
- *Conversations between the Church of England and the Methodist Church – A Report to the Archbishops of Canterbury and York and the Conference of the Methodist Church*, Church Information Office and the Epworth Press, 1963.
- *Certain Sermons or Homilies appointed to be read in churches in the time of Queen Elizabeth of famous memory*, SPCK, 1914.
- *Churches Respond to BEM – Official responses to the Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry Text*, Vol 1, Ed. Max Thurian, Faith and Order Paper 129, pp61-69
- *Common Worship: The Order for the Celebration of Holy Communion, also called The Eucharist and The Lord’s Supper*, Church House Publishing, 2000.
- “Mary: Grace and Hope in Christ – The Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission, An Agreed Statement, 2005, the Church of Ireland Response in the Journal of the General Synod, 2006, Appendix D to the Standing Committee Report, pp166-198
- *Directory for the Application of Principles and Norms on Ecumenism*.
- *Eucharistic Prayers for Masses with Children and Masses of Reconciliation*, Mayhew-McCrimmon, Great Wakering, 1975.
- *Doctrine in the Church of England – The Report of the Commission on Christian Doctrine appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York in 1922*, SPCK, 1938. [Part II: The Church and Sacraments, II. Sacraments (A) Introductory: (a) The General Doctrine of Sacraments, (b) Validity, Note: The Doctrine of Intention; (B) The Two Great Sacraments of the Gospel: 1 Baptism, II The Lord’s Supper or Holy Communion (A) Sacrifice, (b) Priesthood, (C) The Eucharistic Rite. Memoranda: (A) The Doctrine of the Real Presence (B) Receptionism Note: Reservation and Devotions.
- Dogmatic Constitution of the First Vatican Council, *Pastor Aeternus*, text in *The Church Teaches* Documents of the Church in English Translation, St Louis (U.S.A.) and London B. Herder Book Co. 1957.
- *Ecumenical Directory* (1967, RC).
- *Eucharistic Presidency – A Theological Statement by the House of Bishops of the General Synod*, Published 1997 for the General Synod of the Church of England by Church House Publishing, GS1248.
- *Holy Communion by Extension (for those unable to be present at the public celebration according to the use of the Church of Ireland*, 2007, Church of Ireland- *Homilies and Canons* (no surviving information on publishing).
- *Instruction on admitting other Christians to Eucharistic Communion in the Catholic Church* (1972), R.C.
- *Modern Eucharistic Agreement*, SPCK, 1973.
- “Report of the Standing Committee” of the General Synod of the Church of Ireland on the Lima document Baptism, Eucharist and Ministry, Journal of the General Synod, 1985, Appendix C pp.90-99
- *Our Modern Services – Anglican Church of Kenya*, 2002, Uzima, 2002.
- *Prayer Book Revision in the Church of England – A Memorandum of the Church of England Liturgical Commission*, LC 1958/2, London, SPCK, 1958.
- *Principles of Prayer Book Revision – The Report of a Select Committee of the Church of India, Pakistan, Burma, and Ceylon appointed by the Metropolitan to review the Principles of Prayer Book Revision in the Anglican Communion*, LC 1958/3, London, SPCK, 1957.

- *Published ARCIC Papers*, Jan 1985, photocopy. Author and Publisher unknown.
- *Response by the Church of England to the Agreed Statement by the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission*, GS 394.
- “Response of the French Episcopal Conference to the ARCIC Final Report”, *One in Christ – a Catholic Ecumenical Review*, Vol XX1, 1985, No 3, pp329-348 under Ecumenical Notes and Documentation, originally published in *Documentation Catholique*, 1-15 September 1985 no 1902. p.867ff
- *Response of the Holy See to THE FINAL REPORT of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission, 1982 with a statement from the Bishops’ Conference of England and Wales*, CTS, 1991.
- *Response to the Final Report of ARCIC I*, the Bishops’ Conference of England and Wales; the Catholic Media, 1985. Also by the Catholic Truth Society, 1985.
- *Royal Letter of Business, The Orndaments Rubric and Modifications of the Existing Law Relating to the Conduct of Divine Service, Convocation of Canterbury Lower House, First Report of Committee*, OUP, CUP, SPCK, et al., 1909.
- *The Book of Alternative Services – of the Anglican Church of Canada*, Anglican Book Centre, Toronto, 1985.
- *The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments and Other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church Together with the Psalter or Psalms of David, According to the use of The Episcopal Church*, The Church Hymnal Corporation, New York and The Seabury Press, 1979.
- *The Alternative Service Book 1980 – A Commentary by The Liturgical Commission*, CIO Publishing, 1980
- The Anglican Church of Australia, *A Prayer Book for Australia – for use together with The Book of Common Prayer (1662) and An Australian Prayer Book (1978)*, Liturgical Resources authorized by the General Synod, Broughton Books, 1995.
- *The Book of Common Prayer – with the additions and deviations proposed in 1928*, Oxford, (undated).
- *The Divine Liturgy of St John Chrysostom – The Greek Text with a rendering in English*, The Faith Press, Seventh Edition (undated).
- *The English Hymnal*, OUP, 1973.
- “The Eucharist – A Lutheran-Roman Catholic Statement” St Louis, 1967 in *Modern Eucharistic Agreement*, SPCK, 1973.
- *The English Prayer Book 1549-1662*, The Archbishop of Canterbury, C.W. Dugmore, T.M. Parker, E.C. Ratcliff, G.J. Cuming, Published for the Alcuin Club, SPCK, 1963.
- *The Church as Communion – An Agreed Statement by the Second Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission, ARCIC II*, Church House. Publishing, Catholic Truth Society, 1991.
- The Church of South India, *The Book of Common Worship* as authorised by The Synod, 1962, London, OUP, 1963.
- *The Commemoration of Saints and Heroes of the Faith in the Anglican Communion The Report of a Commission appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury*, SPCK 1958 LAC 1958/5
- *The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI*, London, J.M. Dent, 1910, reproduced 1952.
- *The Lambeth Conference 1958 – The Encyclical Letter from the Bishops*

together

with the Resolutions and Reports, SPCK and Seabury Press, 1958.

The Report of the Lambeth Conference, 1978, CIO, 1978.

The Order of the Administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion – with the additions and deviations proposed in 1928, London, Eyre and Spottiswoode Ltd, 1928.

The Orthodox Liturgy being The Divine Liturgies of S. John Chrysostom and S. Basil the Great and The Divine Office of the Presanctified Gifts, together with The Ordering of the Holy and Divine Liturgy, The Office of Preparation for the Holy Communion, The Prayers of Thanksgiving after The Holy Communion, OUP, 1982.

- *The Eucharist: sacrament of unity – An occasional paper of the House of Bishops of the Church of England*, GS Misc 632, Church House Publishing, 2001.
- The Standing Committee of the General Synod of the Church of England in Australia, *An Australian Prayer Book – for use together with The Book of Common Prayer, 1662*, Anglican Information Office (AIO Press), 1978.
- *Thinking about the Eucharist - Papers by members of the Church of England Doctrine Commission*, SCM 1972.
- *The Response of the General Synod of the Church of Ireland to the Final Report of ARCIC-1 May 1986*, APCK and OUP, 1987.
- *The Amplified New Testament*, Zonderman Books, 1975.
- *The Book of Alternative Services of the Anglican Church of Canada*, Toronto, 1985.
- *The Church of England's Response to BEM & ARCIC*, Supplementary Report to GS 661, GS 747, Board of Mission and Unity, Church House, London.
- *The First and Second Prayer Books of Edward VI*, London, J.M. Dent & Sons Ltd, 1910.
- *The Lambeth Conference, 1958 – The Encyclical Letter from the Bishops together with the Resolutions and Reports*, SPCK and Seabury Press, 1958.
- *The Lambeth Conference, 1968 – Resolutions and Reports*, SPCK and Seabury Press, 1968.
- *The Official Report of the Lambeth Conference 1998*, Morehouse Publishing, 1999.
- *The Truth Shall Make You Free – The Lambeth Conference 1988, the Reports, Resolutions & Pastoral Letters from the Bishops*, Church House Publishing, 1988.
- “Towards a common Eucharistic Faith – from the Group of Les Dombes” in *Modern Eucharistic Agreement*, SPCK, 1973
- *Women Priests: Obstacle to Unity? Documents and Correspondence, Rome and Canterbury 1975-1986*, Catholic Truth Society, 1986.
- *Towards an Ecumenical Consensus – Baptism, Eucharist, Ministry, Faith and Order Paper* [World Council of Churches] Geneva, 1977.
- “U.S.A. National Conference of Catholic Bishops: Evaluation of the Final Report of the Anglican-Roman Catholic International Commission”, *One in Christ – a Catholic Ecumenical Review*, Vol XXI 1984 No 4 pp320-329, under Ecumenical Notes and Documentation.

UNPUBLISHED MATERIAL

Crockett, W.R., *Eucharistic Theology and Anglican Eucharistic Revision, Preparatory Paper for the Inter-Anglican Liturgical Consultation of 1995 (Dublin)*.

Kennedy, M.C., *Draft Church of Ireland Response to the Document "One Bread, One Body" produced by the Catholic Bishops' Conference of England & Wales, Ireland and Scotland, 1998, October 1999.*

Kennedy, M.C., *The Meaning and Role of the Anamnesis in the Anglican Liturgical Tradition*, thesis submitted to Trinity College Dublin in part-fulfilment for the higher degree of Bachelor of Divinity, 1979.

Kennedy, M.C., *Memorandum on the document "One Bread, one Body", produced by the Catholic Bishops' Conference of England and Wales, Ireland and Scotland, 1998, dated January 1999.*

Spinks, Bryan D., *Trinitarian Theology and the Eucharistic Prayer*, Preparatory Paper for the Inter-Anglican Liturgical Consultation of 1995 (Dublin)

Kennedy, M.C., *The Theological Implications of Recent Church of Ireland Liturgical Revision*, Essay November 1982.

Kennedy, M.C., *The Theological Implications of Recent Liturgical Revision in the Church of Ireland*, submitted for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Open University, 1987.

Spinks, B.D., *The Institution Narrative, Eucharistic Prayers and the Anglican Liturgical Tradition*, M.S., probably late 1980s, intended to be incorporated into another piece of work? Possibly circulated at 1995 IALC?

INTERNET

Catechism of the Catholic Church, available in PDF on internet.

CatholicBridge.com, *The Catholic Mass in English and Latin*.

CatholicBridge.com, *Text of the New English Catholic Mass*.

http://catholicbridge.com/catholic/catholic_mass_full_text_latin.php

CatholicBridge.com, *Text of the New English Roman Catholic Mass*

http://catholicbridge.com/catholic/catholic_mass_full_text.php

Kennedy, M. C., *Commentaries – The Book of Common Prayer (2004)*,

Church of Ireland Publishing (online), 2011.