

## 45/95 A Prayer Book For Australia

(A report from the Diocesan Doctrine Commission.<sup>1</sup>)

Contents	Item
INTRODUCTION	1-5
THE REPORT	6-8
THE DETAILED EVALUATION ON WHICH THIS REPORT IS BASED	9-114
Historical Background	11-39
The Holy Communion: First Order	40-49
The Holy Communion: Second Order	50-95
The Holy Communion: Third Order	96-99
The Holy Communion (with Baptism)	100-102
The Holy Communion: following A Service for Marriage	103-106
The Holy Communion: following Ministry with the Sick	107-108
The Holy Communion: on the Day of a Funeral	109-111
The Holy Communion: Outline Order	112-114
MINORITY REPORT	115-117
ENDNOTES	-

### INTRODUCTION

- In July 1995 the Archbishop of Sydney asked the Diocesan Doctrine Commission "to give consideration to the recently approved *A Prayer Book for Australia*," and to make comments available before Synod convenes in October 1996.
- In 1995 the Synod of the Diocese of Sydney passed Resolution 45/95 -  
 "This Synod, expressing the view that -  
 (a) no prayer book which clearly allows for interpretations or practices contrary to the doctrine and principles of *The Book of Common Prayer* and *The Thirty Nine Articles* should be authorised for use in this Diocese; and  
 (b) any future revision of authorised services in this Diocese should reflect doctrine and principles that are in accordance with God's written word;  
 requests the Diocesan Doctrine Commission to examine *A Prayer Book for Australia* and report to Synod in 1996 on the acceptability of the doctrine expressed therein."
- In 1994 the Synod had passed Resolution 39/94 which, among other things, said -  
 "Synod notes the progress of the General Synod Liturgical Commission in promoting a revised Australian Prayer Book at General Synod in 1995 and -  
 (a) commends the work of the Sydney Diocesan Liturgical Committee in its endeavour to maintain the theological principles of the 39 Articles and *The Book of Common Prayer* in the Experimental Services it has produced;  
 (b) urges that members of General Synod ensure that the theology of any new Prayer Book is consistent with the theological principles of the 39 Articles and *The Book of Common Prayer*, and in particular, ensure that -  
 (i) all orders of Holy Communion (including any alternative form) contain clear, specific, unambiguous, and explicit references to the biblical doctrine of substitutionary atonement, as expressed in the 39 Articles (eg Articles 2 and 31) or the prayer of consecration of *The Book of Common Prayer* ("one full, perfect, sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world"), and  
 (ii) no words or liturgical actions should alter or reinterpret the remembrance of our Lord's once and for all death on the cross (eg by the introduction of the statement "Blessed is He who comes in the name of the Lord..." during the Thanksgiving, or by allowing words of distribution such as "The body of Christ, the Bread of Heaven. Amen. The blood of Christ, the cup of salvation. Amen.")"
- The Doctrine Commission has examined aspects of *A Prayer Book for Australia* [APBA] in relation to the doctrine and principles of *The Book of Common Prayer* of 1662 [BCP], *The Thirty Nine Articles* and the teaching of Holy Scripture. The following Report presents the conclusions reached by the Commission with regard to the services of Holy Communion.<sup>1</sup>

5. The Doctrine Commission has not made a detailed comparison between APBA and *An Australian Prayer Book* (1978). This is because that prayer book was intended as a “means for experiment in liturgy” and for “trial use” (see its Preface); it does not function as an authorised standard of worship or doctrine in this Church. Some comments in this Report may be taken as applying to AAPB as well as APBA. The Doctrine Commission rejects any argument for the acceptance of any doctrine in APBA on the ground that such doctrine may be found in AAPB. Rather, this Report should be seen as contributing to our assessment of the experiment in revision of BCP which has been in process since 1966.<sup>2</sup>

## THE REPORT

6. The Commission welcomes some features of the Holy Communion services in APBA, particularly in the First and Third Orders. It was, however, with the Second Order that the Commission found most difficulty. Furthermore throughout the book this Order has a prominent place, in that wherever Holy Communion may occur with another service, it is the Second Order which is provided. See §100 below.

7. The theological differences from BCP in the APBA Holy Communion services noted by the Commission include the following.

- (a) There is an absence of any clear expression (in APBA Second and Third Order Holy Communion) of the doctrine of God’s wrath. “If we are to speak of salvation in a Christian sense we have also to seek more clarity about the peril in which the world is believed to stand.”<sup>3</sup>  
See §§52-55; 97 below. Cf. §§41; 42(a).
- (b) Unlike BCP, in Second Order APBA and to a lesser extent in the Third Order there is a failure to express adequately the significance of Christ’s death in substitutionary terms.  
See §§54; 97 below. Note however §48.
- (c) There is a weakening of the provision for the confession of sin in some of the Second Order forms of Holy Communion.  
See §§102; 106; 111 below.
- (d) In various ways discussed below the Second Order does not adequately guard against confusing our *response* to God (which has no saving merit) with God’s saving gift to us in the historical death of Jesus Christ (on which alone our salvation depends).  
See §§18-19; 27-30; 70-71; 77-78; 81 below. Cf. §56.
- (e) In the Second Order (and in one prayer of the Third Order), there is a tendency to blur the distinction, so clear and important in BCP, between the sign and the thing signified, i.e. between receiving the bread and wine, on the one hand, and partaking of the spiritual benefits of Christ’s death by faith, on the other.  
See §§25(d); 38; 64; 75-78; 92; 99 below. Cf. §74.
- (f) There are various indications that can be taken as signals of a “real and substantial presence” of Christ in the sacrament which, if so understood, depart from BCP.  
See §§20-26; 59-63 (also §§68; 73; 83); 90 below.
- (g) Some of the expressions in the Second Order Holy Communion appear to be designed to express the concept of *anamnesis* (“memorial”) as a process of bringing the past into the present in the sacrament. The simplicity of the important and essential human activity of “remembering” is confused by this unbiblical understanding.  
See §§31-37; 65-66; 70 (also §§68; 73; 74; 79; 80; 83; 86) below.

8. The Doctrine Commission considers these to be matters of significance which involve departures from BCP. This is not to say that of necessity APBA explicitly teaches false doctrines. APBA inadequately expresses the doctrine found in BCP at certain points and is capable of being interpreted at other points in ways that are contrary to the doctrine of BCP.

## THE DETAILED EVALUATION ON WHICH THIS REPORT IS BASED

9. An examination of the doctrine expressed in church liturgies involves -

- (a) Exegesis of the explicit statements of the liturgical text, in their immediate context in the particular service.
- (b) Interpretation of the shape of the liturgy, drawing conclusions, where appropriate, about the significance of the placement and arrangement of various parts of the service.
- (c) All this must be done in the context of the history of Christian liturgy, recognising that the doctrines and principles of BCP and APBA must be understood in the historical context of each, and with appropriate regard to historical precedents.

10. Furthermore the theological evaluation of liturgies must recognise that language is always capable of variation in interpretation. Sometimes this variation is insignificant, but sometimes it bears on the central

affirmation of a text, so that there can be two virtually contradictory interpretations. It would be impossible to insist that a liturgy should contain no ambiguity at all, but the Commission endorses the view of the Synod that no liturgy of the Anglican Church of Australia should “clearly allow for interpretations or practices contrary to the doctrines and principles of *The Book of Common Prayer* and *The Thirty Nine Articles*” or “reflect doctrines and principles that are [not] in accordance with God’s written word” (§2 above). Liturgies should strive for clarity of expression, freedom from serious ambiguity, and the avoidance of unacceptable interpretations.

### Historical Background

11. The death of Jesus Christ is central to the Christian gospel. Differences in understanding that gospel have therefore often been expressed in controversies about the Lord’s Supper: the sacrament of Christ’s death. This was certainly the case in 16th and 17th century England with the process that resulted in BCP of 1662. It has also been the case in the process that has produced APBA.

12. A central issue in these controversies has been the place and character of any “sacrifice” that takes place in the service. On the eve of the Reformation the Holy Communion (or the Eucharist, or the Mass) was generally believed to be a re-immolation (re-sacrificing) of Christ for the sins of the living and the dead.

### Early notions of Eucharistic Sacrifice

13. The seeds of the doctrine of the re-immolation of Christ in the Lord’s Supper can be found in Christian writings as early as the 3rd or 4th centuries. This became the doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church in the Middle Ages, and it remains so today.

14. The Council of Trent (1545-63) and Vatican II (1962-5) endorsed this doctrine.

15. The Council of Trent anathematised those who deny that the Eucharist is a real re-immolation of Christ – “in the mass is contained and immolated in an unbloody manner the same Christ who once offered Himself in a bloody manner on the altar of the cross, ... the victim is one and the same.”<sup>4</sup>

“If anyone says that in the mass a true and real sacrifice is not offered to God; or that to be offered is nothing else than that Christ is given to us to eat; let him be anathema.”<sup>5</sup>

16. The *Catechism of Vatican II* asks -

“What is the significance and purpose of the Sacrifice of the Eucharist?”;

and answers:

“At the Last Supper, on the night he was betrayed, our Saviour instituted the eucharistic sacrifice of his Body and Blood. This he did in order to perpetuate the sacrifice of the Cross throughout the ages until he should come again, and so to entrust to his beloved spouse, the Church, a memorial of his death and resurrection: a sacrament of love...”<sup>6</sup>

17. This understanding of the “eucharistic sacrifice” as “real and objective”, has nonetheless consistently been described as “spiritual”. Historically “spiritual” in this context has had two meanings -

(a) “not material” (as opposed to the “bloody” sacrifices of the Old Testament) even though “real”, “true” and “substantial”.

(b) “properly acceptable to God” (as opposed to “sinful”, “carnal”, “unspiritual”).

### The Reformation work of Thomas Cranmer

*The sacrament is not a sacrifice*

18. In his *Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament* (1551) Thomas Cranmer insisted that, according to the New Testament, there are only two proper sacrifices: the one literal sacrifice of Christ on the cross, and the sacrifices of “laud, praise, and thanksgiving”. He maintained that the only properly spiritual sacrifices which a Christian can make are the latter. He expressed this understanding in the *Book of Common Prayer* of 1552 (which is also preserved in the *Book of Common Prayer* 1662) by using language of sacrifice in the prayer of consecration *only* to describe Christ’s “one oblation of himself once offered”. Sacrificial language referring to *our* actions was kept well removed from this prayer, occurring only at the beginning of the Prayer for the Church Militant (with reference to “alms and oblations”), in the citation from Hebrews 13:16 in the Sentences at the beginning of the Offertory (referring to doing good) and the responsive prayer of the communicants after they had received the communion (the nature of this sacrifice is one of “praise and thanksgiving”; consisting in “ourselves, our souls and bodies”).

19. Certain of *The Thirty Nine Articles* make clear statements about this doctrine and practice. Article 25 says that “The Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about, but that we should duly use them.” Articles 26 and 28 indicate that the “due use” is worthily receiving the sacraments with faith in God’s promises and so partaking in the blessings they set forth. Article 31 emphasises that “the one

Oblation of Christ [was] finished upon the Cross” and that “the sacrifices of Masses... were blasphemous fables, and dangerous deceits.”

*The rejection of a doctrine of the real and substantial presence*

20. It is important to observe that the doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice definitively rejected by BCP does not require a notion of transubstantiation<sup>7</sup> as its basis. Historically the doctrine has existed with and without transubstantiation. However the doctrine of a real and substantial *presence* of Christ in the elements, that is that Christ is actually present in his essence in the bread and wine, is often associated with notions of eucharistic sacrifice.

21. In BCP the elements of bread and wine (or the bread and the cup) do not represent the *presence* of Christ either before or after consecration. That the risen Christ is present by his Spirit with his body the Church when it meets in his name, is not to be doubted, and we have biblical assurances of this (e.g. Matthew 18:20). But the sacramental elements are not symbols of that spiritual presence. Rather, they are symbols or signs of “his meritorious cross and passion, whereby alone we obtain remission of our sins, and are made partakers of the kingdom of heaven” (Exhortation in BCP), and they have that significance when we partake of them by faith, and not otherwise.

22. Consecration in BCP means no more than the setting apart of the elements for their sacramental purpose. There is no change of substance, and no additional “presence”. They are still bread and wine, but now “bread and wine, which the Lord hath commanded to be received” (BCP Catechism). BCP makes it clear that it is only in the *receiving* of the elements — in the eating and drinking — that we partake sacramentally of the benefits of union with Christ, and feed on him in our heart, and *that* feeding is spiritual, not physical, by faith and not by sight or sense. Moreover the sacramental feeding is a sign of our *continual* feeding on Christ, without which we would have no life. There is no ground for thinking that we have in our midst, either on the Table or in our hands, any substances or objects which we can or should offer to God, or which he might find acceptable worship or sacrifice.

23. The locus of our worship of God is heaven itself: “Lift up your hearts! We lift them up unto the Lord”. The elements are “pledges of his love, and for a continual remembrance of his death, to our great and endless comfort”, but not signs of an objective presence of the Saviour. The body of which the bread is a sign is the crucified body, no longer here because he is risen. But it is the ground of our salvation, and is “verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord’s Supper”.

“... 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...” (from the Declaration on Kneeling in BCP)

24. Historically, liturgies which, unlike BCP, have signalled a doctrine of the real and substantial presence, have done so in a number of ways, including -

- (a) The singing of the ancient hymn *Agnus Dei* “Lamb of God, you take away the sins of the world” after the consecration and before the administration.<sup>8</sup>
- (b) A petition (called an “epiclesis” by some) that the Holy Spirit will come and make the bread and wine become — in some sense — the body and blood of Christ in the prayer of consecration.
- (c) The words “Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord” when associated by their position in the liturgy with the equivalent of the prayer of consecration.
- (d) By explicitly referring to the bread and wine as the body and blood of Christ without qualification and by bowing and praying to the bread and wine as to Christ himself.
- (e) Unqualified realistic words of administration such as “The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve your soul for everlasting life. Amen.” (medieval rite);<sup>9</sup> and “The body of Christ” (modern rite).<sup>10</sup>

25. Cranmer (and BCP) modified or removed each of these elements in ways that sought to avoid their being interpreted as indicators of a real and substantial presence.

- (a) From 1552 the hymn *Agnus Dei* was deliberately rejected from the place before or during the Communion.<sup>11</sup>
- (b) Words that were taken by some as an “epiclesis” (in the sense described in §24(b) above) in the prayer of consecration of 1549 were completely removed in 1552 and 1662.
- (c) Although the words “Blessed is he who comes...” appeared in the Prayer Book of 1549, they were omitted altogether in 1552 and 1662. See §§60-63 below.
- (d) The prayer of consecration in BCP makes a clear *distinction* between receiving the bread and wine which remain created things, namely bread and wine, and the communicants’ partaking of Christ’s body and blood: “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."

- (e) The realistic language of administration was qualified by "Take and eat this in *remembrance* that Christ died for thee, and feed on him *in thy heart by faith* with thanksgiving" and "Drink this in *remembrance* that Christ's Blood was shed for thee, and *be thankful*." [emphasis added]

26. Cranmer's writings make clear that his rejection of the doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice — which is the most important effect of his rejection of the doctrine of a real and substantial presence — was entailed in the New Testament's doctrine of justification by faith.

### Recent developments

27. An important development in recent times for our understanding of the historical background to APBA was the Lambeth Conference of 1958. A subcommittee of the conference recommended a phrase to express eucharistic sacrifice. The phrase was -

"we offer our praise and thanksgiving for Christ's sacrifice for us *and so present it again*, and ourselves in him, before the Father." [emphasis added]<sup>12</sup>

The Lambeth Conference Report repudiates the interpretation of this as a "re-immolation of Christ, [or] a sacrifice additional to his one sacrifice."<sup>13</sup>

28. However some have seen an ambiguity in the Report which suggests a purposive move toward an objective eucharistic re-presentation of Christ. For example, J.I. Packer says that the Report has a studied and intended ambiguity, an "episcopal experiment in double-talk", and then goes on to show from its contents three principles the Report operates on:<sup>14</sup>

- (a) The atoning sacrifice of Jesus Christ is more than His death on the Cross. It is in some sense an eternal event, continuing in heaven.
- (b) The relation of Christians to the atoning sacrifice of Christ is more than one of thankful recollection and trust. It is part of their calling to present Christ's sacrifice to God repeatedly, in and through their own repeated self-oblation in Christ to God for his service.
- (c) The Eucharist is more than a means for "the continual remembrance of the sacrifice of the death of Christ, and of the benefits which we receive thereby." It is primarily a means of offering Christ, and ourselves in and with Christ, to God. Communion with Christ and reception of His benefits comes second to this in eucharistic worship in order both of being and of importance.

Later Anglican liturgies appear to have taken up this understanding.<sup>15</sup>

29. Anglican liturgies since 1958 have widely reflected a strong movement towards notions of eucharistic sacrifice - in a real and objective sense. The precise nature of the oblation (offering) varies. It may be the bread and wine, or ourselves, or the Church that is being offered to God, in and with Christ's original and continued offering to the Father, and in the re-presentation of Christ's sacrifice or participation in Christ's sacrifice in the Eucharist.

30. *An Australian Prayer Book* (1978) [AAPB] Second Order did not follow the re-presentation doctrine advocated in 1958. As in BCP (1662), the worshippers' offering of the "sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving" and of the sacrifice of themselves comes *after* the communion. It is true that the Prayer of Consecration is called the Prayer of Thanksgiving and Consecration, but this was under the influence of the biblical reference to the thanksgiving Jesus offered for the bread and cup at the Last Supper, and no sacrificial terminology was used.

### "Anamnesis" and "celebration"

31. The concept of re-presenting Christ's sacrifice has developed in particular ways in the modern liturgies. There has been a new emphasis on what is commonly called *anamnesis* ("memorial"). Modern writers have argued that "to remember" in the context of the Eucharist involves more than recalling the past event. The "remembering", they say, makes the past event or person actually present. The combination of the concepts of "remembering" and "offering" in this context contribute much to establish the idea that in the Eucharist the death of Christ at Golgotha is being re-offered or re-presented.

32. This concept was expressed recently by three Australian Anglican bishops as follows -

"Within the Jewish tradition the word 'remembrance' means something quite different from what it means to us. 'Memorial' or 'remembrance' are tied up in our minds with a look into the past. But for the Jew, and therefore for Jesus, 'remembrance' means exactly the opposite. It means the bringing of the past into the present (cf 1 Kings 17.18). 'Commemorate' and 'celebrate' come near to this meaning. The sense is something like this: We may perhaps think of God as a novelist whose plot is but a brief flash in his mind, but must be actually written over weeks in another time

scale, and may be lived out in the novel over generations. There are three time-scales involved. In the time-scale of God, our past, the present and the future are all one. To make remembrance is to carry us into a world where time as we know it does not exist. To use our time-scale, we should say that we bring the past, the present and the future into the present moment.... Remembrance for us suggests that the person remembered is past and absent, but anamnesis signifies that the person is in the here and now."<sup>16</sup>

33. The Commission does not accept that this understanding of "remembrance" is either Biblical or in accordance with the doctrine of BCP. In the Bible the great acts of God are "remembered" in order to recognise our participation in the past event (see, e.g. Deut 4:9-20). But the event remains a past event. Our participation in it consists in the fact that it was "for us and for our salvation". Likewise the "perpetual memory of that his precious death" retains the normal distinctions between past, present and future (cf. 2Cor 5:14-15). The idea of moving into "a world where time as we know it does not exist" threatens to empty "remembering" of its proper meaning.

34. The Commission thinks the bishops may also misunderstand the sense of "celebrate" as used in liturgy.

35. In BCP, as in other 16th and 17th century formularies, "celebrate/celebration" normally has its formal sense of the performance of a religious ceremony, such as to officiate at a service of holy communion (see, e.g. BCP Exhortations). In *The Book of Common Prayer* of 1549 Cranmer three times used "celebrate" more precisely for the performance by the congregation of what Jesus commanded his disciples to do at the Last Supper, namely, "do this *in remembrance* of me":

"... this congregation which is here assembled in thy name to celebrate the *commemoration* of the most glorious death of thy Son";

"... thy Son did institute, and in his holy gospel command us to celebrate, a perpetual *memory* of that his precious death until his coming again";

"we thy humble servants do celebrate and make here before thy divine majesty, with these thy holy gifts, the *memorial* which thy Son hath willed us to make, having in *remembrance* his blessed passion...".

It is the commemoration/memory/memorial which Jesus commanded ("do this *in remembrance* of me") which is ritually performed by the congregation when it takes and eats according to Christ's ordinance. The *celebration* is the *communion*.

36. AAPB introduced a different sense of "celebrate" when it said "we celebrate the redemption he has won for us" instead of "we celebrate the *memorial* of the redemption he has won for us." Perhaps "celebrate" here could be taken in the sense (allowed by the dictionaries) of "praise" or "extol" — perhaps even "proclaim" as indicated by St. Paul in 1 Cor 11:26. However we certainly have no mandate to perform ritually the redemption Christ won for us.

37. As we will see later in this Report, APBA moves further away from both the 1549 Prayer Book and BCP 1662 with its "we celebrate, with this bread and this cup, his one perfect and sufficient sacrifice."

#### *Re-presenting Christ's unique sacrifice*

38. It is important to understand that in the history of Christian liturgy, the concept of re-presenting Christ's sacrifice is not always seen to be inconsistent with words that affirm that Christ's sacrifice was once and for all, sufficient and unrepeatable. The notion of eucharistic sacrifice, at least since Chrysostom, has been that we participate in that unique event by re-presenting it in the sacrament. The Reformers (and BCP) repudiated this understanding, insisting that in the sacrament we participate in that unique event by receiving its benefits by faith alone.

"to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the [sacrament], the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ. ... And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith." (Article 28)

"... the benefit is great, if with a true penitent heart and lively faith we receive that holy Sacrament; (for then we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ, and drink his blood; then we dwell in Christ and Christ in us; we are one with Christ, and Christ with us;) ..." (from the Exhortation at the time of the Celebration of the Communion in BCP)

39. The Doctrine Commission has sought to examine the liturgies for the Lord's Supper in APBA with this historical background in mind.

#### **The Holy Communion: First Order**

[APBA pages 101 to 117]

40. This order is the closest in APBA to BCP's Holy Communion. While BCP, rather than AAPB, is the

standard against which APBA is to be evaluated, the Doctrine Commission has noted three significant changes from the corresponding service in AAPB.

### The Commandments

41. First, only an abbreviated form of the Ten Commandments is printed. The full text of the Ten Commandments appears nowhere in APBA. The words which have been omitted in APBA are:

“For I the Lord your God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children to the third and fourth generation of those who hate me, but showing steadfast love to thousands of those who love me and keep my commandments.”

“For the Lord will not hold him guiltless who takes his name in vain.”

“... in it you shall not do any work, you, or your son, or your daughter, your man-servant, your maid-servant, or your cattle, or the sojourner who is within your gates. For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that is in them, and rested the seventh day; therefore the Lord blessed the seventh day, and hallowed it.”

“... that your days may be long in the land which the Lord your God gives you.”

The tenth commandment has been given in a brief paraphrased form.

42. These omissions have the following effects:

- (a) The doctrine of God as creator and judge is muted.
- (b) The historical particularity of the text is greatly reduced by their abbreviation (despite the commandments being introduced as those “which God gave to his people Israel”— an improvement on BCP and AAPB in the opinion of most members of the Commission).
- (c) The first commandment with a promise (Eph 6:2) loses its promise!
- (d) A summary is presented as Holy Scripture (the tenth commandment).

43. The printing of only this abbreviated form of the Ten Commandments has the effect of weakening the theological grounding of the commandments in the person, works and purposes of God.

44. APBA continues the provision (not in BCP) of the two great commandments. The introduction to these: “Hear O Israel ...” [APBA page 102] gives the impression that the following words apply to people of another covenant. The introduction in AAPB was more immediate: “Our Lord Jesus Christ said ...”.

### The Nicene Creed

45. The second change is in the text of the Nicene Creed [APBA page 104] which follows the English Language Liturgical Consultation 1988, and attempts to express Biblical Christology and anthropology in modern English. The changes are:

BCP (AAPB)	APBA
“for us men and for our salvation”	“For us and for our salvation”
“and was made (became) man”	“and became truly human”

46. While the problems of modern English are real, these changes lose the allusion to the Adam/Christ typology allowed by the original version of the Nicene Creed.

47. In attempting to use modern English an unfortunate mistranslation occurs in the Nicene Creed. Without “men” or an equivalent, “For us” must refer to the “We” who are confessing the faith. The original of the Creed is, literally, “for us who are men (*anthropoi*) and for our salvation.” This is a designation of the human race as distinct from angels or the animal creation. “Men”, it is true, is sometimes ambiguous, indicating either the generality of humans, or the male members of the race. In the Creed it cannot mean males only, nor has it ever been so taken. “For us human beings” or “for us humans” would convey the original sense. The new version thus limits the scope of Christ’s work of salvation.

### The prayer of consecration

48. The third change to be noted is that in the prayer of consecration [APBA page 112], BCP words describing Christ’s death as an “oblation and satisfaction”, which were omitted from AAPB, have been reintroduced from BCP. The Commission welcomes this change which makes explicit the substitutionary and propitiatory nature of the atonement.

49. In summary, while the First Order of Holy Communion in APBA is close to BCP, some changes are problematic.

**The Holy Communion: Second Order**

[APBA pages 119 to 165]

50. The Second Order is quite different in form and language from anything in BCP. Therefore the examination of the doctrine of this liturgy in comparison with BCP needs to proceed by a method other than noting omissions and additions. Critical to the Commission's evaluation of this service will be an examination of the five prayers of Thanksgiving. Before that, however, several comments on the theological perspective of this Order will be made.

51. The Second Order in APBA is in some ways based on the Second Order in AAPB, and therefore some of the following comments may apply equally to AAPB.

***The first parts of the service*****The loss of the doctrines of wrath and substitution**

52. The Order of the Lord's Supper in BCP clearly established the doctrine of the wrath of God in the following ways:

- (a) The recitation of the full text of the Ten Commandments (cf. §41 and §42(a) above).
- (b) The solemnity of the Exhortations, and references in them to God's condemnation.
- (c) The words "Provoking most justly thy wrath and indignation against us ... the burden of them is intolerable" in the General Confession.

For believers, Christ's death has accomplished the propitiation of God's wrath (Rom 3:24) and "there is now, therefore, no condemnation for those in Christ Jesus" (Rom 8:1).

53. There is no clear expression in APBA Second Order Holy Communion of the doctrine of God's wrath. The words "our maker and our judge" in the Confession [APBA pages 120 and 126] and "He will come in glory to judge" in the Creed [APBA page 123] are the closest to suggesting this truth, but fall short.

54. In BCP the death of Christ is understood in terms of the "full satisfaction" ... "by his one oblation of himself once offered ... for the sins of the whole world". The failure of APBA Second Order Holy Communion to give clear expression to the doctrine of God's just wrath means that Christ's death is not presented, in this liturgy, in terms of these substitutionary concepts.<sup>17</sup> While other valid aspects of Christ's death are expressed, this liturgy fails to make explicit what is fundamental to BCP's (not to mention the New Testament's) understanding of the atonement.

55. While there are many references to God's mercy, these cannot have the same force when the context of God's wrath is not clearly present. It is one thing for a wealthy man to show mercy to a person who is hungry, quite another for God who is judge, and who is the aggrieved party, to show mercy to a sinner.

**The gifts of the people**

56. It is significant that "the gifts of the people are brought to the Lord's Table", and described as "offerings" immediately before "The Great Thanksgiving" (or prayer of consecration) [APBA page 127]. BCP deliberately and significantly separated the former from the remembrance of Christ's offering.<sup>18</sup>

***The Great Thanksgiving***

57. The Thanksgiving prayers (corresponding to BCP's Prayer of Consecration) are the place in the liturgy where the doctrine of Christ's death is brought into focus. Each of the alternative versions will be considered.

**Thanksgiving 1 [APBA pages 128 to 129]**

58. Thanksgiving 1 is distinguished by a special reflection on the incarnation, which expounds the New Testament's understanding of the significance of Christ's birth ("by the power of your Spirit") and life ("as one of us") in relation to his death ("the one true sacrifice for sin") and resurrection (which "obtained an eternal deliverance for his people"). The Commission welcomes these perspectives.

*"Blessed is he ..."*

59. However the words -

"Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord"

are controversially re-introduced here [APBA page 128] and in Thanksgivings 2, 3, and 4. The inclusion of these words immediately before the petition for effectual communion is unacceptable (even optionally). See §§24(c); 25(c) above.

60. *The Tutorial Prayer Book* says that the omission of this acclamation at the end of the *Sanctus* ("Holy, holy, holy ...") in the 1552 Prayer Book "was due to the more than possible mistaking the words as a reference to the effect of the forthcoming Consecration."<sup>19</sup>

61. In fact the use of the text from Matthew 21:9, based on Psalm 118:26 (where it is a greeting to the

pilgrim who comes up to Jerusalem to worship), is inappropriate in any of its traditional positions in the Communion service.<sup>20</sup>

62. Even apart from the possibility of the words referring to the effect of the ensuing consecration of the elements, the hymn does not fit with the *Sanctus*, which already concludes with its own version of “Hosanna in the highest,” namely “Glory be to thee, O Lord most High,” in BCP, or “Glory to you, O Lord most high,” in First Order APBA. Second Order reverts to the less intelligible “Hosanna in the highest.”

63. “Blessed is he ...” is at best a distraction, and at worst open to error, in the position allowed in APBA.

*The petition for an effectual communion*

64. The words:

“we thank you for these gifts of your creation,  
this bread and wine,  
and we pray that by your Word and Holy Spirit,  
we who eat and drink them  
may be partakers of Christ’s body and blood” [APBA page 128]

correspond to the following words in BCP -

“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.”

The words of APBA are readily understood in terms compatible with BCP. However they are less clear and more ambiguous. For example

- (a) The introduction of the words “by your Word and Holy Spirit” which appear to be instrumental in some sense, replace the clear and unambiguous “according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ’s holy institution” of BCP.
- (b) BCP words make a very clear distinction between “receiving ... bread and wine” and being “partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood”. The distinction is not as emphatically expressed in the APBA words.
- (c) In the APBA wording partaking in Christ’s body and blood is not linked to *remembrance* of his death, as in BCP.

*The memorial acclamation*

65. “The memorial acclamation” [APBA page 129] has its origin in certain Eastern liturgies where it was intended to give expression to St Paul’s words “... you proclaim the Lord’s death,” which occur at the end of his account of the Last Supper in 1 Cor 11:23-26. But St Paul’s “you proclaim” was linked to the eating and drinking; he was not suggesting a liturgical *anamnesis* (“memorial”) of the kind exemplified in APBA (as against BCP Order). The words of the acclamation are in themselves unexceptionable, but calling them a “memorial” acclamation, and introducing them with the obscure words “Let us proclaim the mystery of faith” (Thanksgiving 3, APBA page 134), makes them a part of the new emphasis on *anamnesis*. See §31-33 above.

*“Celebration”*

66. The notion that with the bread and cup we “celebrate” Christ’s one sacrifice is introduced [APBA page 129, close to AAPB page 147 in wording, but significantly different in punctuation]. Our Saviour has commanded us to “remember”. It is not true that he has commanded us to “celebrate” his sacrifice as a religious ceremony. For one understanding of the difference between these terms see §31-37 above.

**Thanksgiving 2** [APBA pages 130 to 132]

67. Thanksgiving 2 is distinguished by its recital of biblical theology from creation through redemption in Christ to his coming again.

*“Blessed is he ...”, The memorial acclamation, and “Celebration”*

68. The comments in §§59-63, 65, 66 above apply equally to Thanksgiving 2.

69. The phrase “teaching justice by the prophets” [APBA page 130] in the modern world probably suggests an idea alien to the prophets. Perhaps “teaching righteousness ...” would have been better.

*The petition for an effectual communion*

70. In Thanksgiving 2 the prayer for an effectual communion is as follows:

“send your Holy Spirit upon us and our celebration  
that all who eat and drink at this table  
may be strengthened by Christ’s body and blood to serve you in the world.” [APBA page 132]

The idea that the Holy Spirit is sent on “our celebration” makes the prayer less amenable to an acceptable interpretation than the corresponding words in Thanksgiving 1. “Our celebration” in this context is defined by the preceding sentence: it is what we are doing “with this bread and this cup”. See §§34-37.

71. The question is: What are we doing “with this bread and this cup”? The problem is that while “our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving” which we ask God to “accept” easily means our sacrifice *consisting of* praise and thanksgiving, other interpretations have become possible. For example could we not be offering the consecrated bread and wine in an attitude “of praise and thanksgiving”? These words were removed from the prayer of consecration in 1552 because “*This our sacrifice on the lips of the Priest turned towards the Altar, immediately after consecration, might be, and was, misinterpreted. The same words, after reception, when there ought to be nothing remaining, ... cannot refer to the elements.*”<sup>21</sup>

### **Thanksgiving 3** [APBA pages 133 to 135]

72. In Thanksgiving 3 the movement towards a notion of eucharistic sacrifice is most definite of all forms of the prayer of consecration in APBA.

*“Blessed is he ...”, “Celebration”*

73. The comments in §§59-63 and 66 above apply here again.

*“Our salvation”*

74. A straightforward reading of the prayer suggests that the prayer of “thanksgiving” confers saving benefits:

“It is ... our salvation, that we ... give thanks to you ...” [APBA page 133]

This would be a return to the idea of pre-Reformation liturgies in which the Eucharist (“Thanksgiving”) was believed to be itself saving.

*The petition for an effectual communion*

75. The following words are more problematic than the corresponding words in Thanksgivings 1 and 2:

“by the power of your Word and Holy Spirit,  
sanctify this bread and wine,  
that we who share in this holy sacrament  
may be partakers of Christ’s body and blood.” [APBA page 134]

These words are similar to the 1549 Prayer Book:

“with thy holy Spirite and worde,  
vouchsafe to bl+esse<sup>22</sup> and sanc+tifie these thy gyftes, and  
creatures of bread and wyne,  
that they maie be unto us the bodye and bloude of thy moste  
derely beloued sonne Jesus Christe”

which were changed in 1552 and 1662 to:

“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.”

The words were changed because they had been taken by some to admit the doctrine of transubstantiation. The new words focused on “receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine”, and expressly relate partaking in Christ’s body and blood to remembering his death and passion.

76. APBA avoids the 1549 petition that God would “bless” inanimate objects, but loses the clear and unambiguous understanding of the sacrament achieved in the 1552/1662 form. The “sanctification” of bread and wine by God’s Word and Spirit is not the ground on which Jesus bade his disciples to “do this in remembrance of me”.

*“Our sacrifice of praise”*

77. The words “through Christ accept our sacrifice of praise” (APBA page 134) could refer to what precedes and to what follows as “a sacrifice consisting of praise”. There can be no objection to such language if it is understood in terms of Hebrews 13:15 (“the fruit of lips that confess his name”). However the words occur in the same sentence as “sanctify this bread and wine”, and “of praise” can describe the manner rather than the content of the sacrifice. APBA does not, in fact, provide for the elevation of the elements to God during the eucharistic prayer and Article 28 makes it clear that the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper should not be “lifted up or worshipped”. But if the bread and the wine are in some sense being offered to God in association with this “sacrifice of praise”, or as an expression of such praise, serious confusion is introduced into the liturgy.

78. Some modern Anglican thinking seeks to distinguish between Christ's atoning work and the "eucharistic sacrifice" by which its benefits are appropriated.<sup>23</sup> But offering to God the symbols of his redemptive work for us obscures the fundamental truth of the gospel that we are to receive with faith and thanksgiving what God has provided for us in Jesus Christ. We have nothing to offer or contribute to our salvation — not even Christ himself.

*The memorial acclamation*

79. What is elsewhere called "the memorial acclamation" is here introduced with the optional words "Let us proclaim the mystery of faith". The comment in §65 applies. See also §§31-33.

*"Celebration"*

80. On the expression "we commemorate and celebrate" [APBA page 135] see §66 and §§31-37 above.

*"Here we offer you a spiritual sacrifice"*

81. The words

"here we offer you a spiritual sacrifice". [APBA page 135]

are problematic. The Commission's objections to this phrase are:

- (a) The re-introduction of the language of *our* sacrifice into the prayer of consecration is contrary to the practice of BCP in this regard. Furthermore BCP's removal of such language from the prayer of consecration was theologically significant: its purpose was to guard against serious theological error. See §18 above.
- (b) The difficulty is: What is this "sacrifice"? Even the words "of praise and thanksgiving" found in Thanksgiving 2 have now been dropped. It has been shown already that the word "spiritual" in this context has historically simply meant "unbloody", and therefore does nothing to guard against a pre-Reformation understanding (see §17).
- (c) While the petition is made up of words from Rom 12:1 and 1Pet 2:5, combining the ideas that we offer ourselves and our praises to God, in response to his grace towards us in Christ, the problem is the position of these words in the Thanksgiving. This may suggest that our "spiritual sacrifice" is somehow associated with the presentation of the consecrated bread and wine to God.
- (d) The phrase "and here we offer to you a spiritual sacrifice", in its context here, can be understood as referring to the bread and the wine. Alternatively, the phrase can be understood in terms of "this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving" as used in BCP after the communion. However, the context is different from BCP, and qualifying words to indicate this understanding (such as the "of praise and thanksgiving" in BCP) are lacking here. On the other hand, the words "We thank you that by your grace alone you have accepted us in Christ" guard against thinking that it is *this* sacrifice which secures our acceptance (as though it had not been secured before). However, these words do not hinder the thought that the offering of ourselves and our praise is linked to some kind of re-presentation of the one sacrifice of Jesus Christ. Understood in this way the phrase is contrary to the doctrine of BCP and the teaching of the New Testament.

**Thanksgiving 4** [APBA pages 136 to 138]

82. Thanksgiving 4 is distinguished by its reflection on creation.

*"Blessed is he ...", The memorial acclamation, "Celebration"*

83. The comments in §§59-63; 65; 66 apply again.

*The petition for an effectual communion*

84. The petition for the Spirit to "renew us ... as we eat and drink" is different from BCP Holy Communion where the work of the Spirit is not focused on a moment in the service, but he is sought at the very beginning (in the collect for purity) in terms that anticipate his continuous work in the believers' lives.

**Thanksgiving 5** [APBA pages 139 to 140]

85. Thanksgiving 5 moves from a reflection on creation ("this world of wonder and delight") to the entrance of sin ("we turned away from you"), the sending of Jesus ("to live and work as one of us, and bring us back to you") and his death ("on the cross Jesus took away our sin"). The prayer lacks any indication of God's judgment and a substantial doctrine of the atonement.

*The memorial acclamation*

86. The comments in §65 apply to Thanksgiving 5.

87. "Working for justice and bringing your peace" [APBA page 140] too narrowly defines what it means to "follow Jesus".

**The Lord's Prayer** [APBA page 141]

88. The Lord's Prayer may now be used in the position it had prior to 1552 when Cranmer reordered the Prayer of Consecration, and put the Lord's Prayer after the reception of the Communion.

**The Breaking of the Bread and the Communion** [APBA pages 141-142]

89. The symbolic significance of the bread is extended without Biblical warrant in the words [APBA page 141]:

"As this broken bread was once many grains,  
which have been gathered together and made one bread:  
**so may your Church be gathered  
from the ends of the earth into your kingdom.**"

*Additional Prayers and Anthems*

90. Two versions of the hymn *Agnus Dei* have been introduced among "Anthems" [APBA page 146] which may be sung or said during communion [APBA page 142], the position from which it was removed in 1552. See §24(a) and §25(a).

91. The application of Luke 24:35 to the Lord's Supper [APBA page 146] is questionable. The resurrected Jesus was known to the disciples in Luke 24 in a *visible* form! The allusion to Luke 24:35 recurs in the Prayer after Communion for Easter on page 155.

**Seasonal Variations**

*Receiving the sacrament and partaking in Christ*

92. In various ways BCP indicates a distinction between partaking of the bread and wine and the spiritual benefit of the sacrament received by faith. For example:

"... thou dost vouchsafe to feed us, who have duly received  
these holy mysteries<sup>24</sup>, with the spiritual food of the most  
precious body and blood of thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ."

This distinction is unhelpfully blurred, for example, in the "Prayer after Communion" in APBA page 148 where, without qualification, it is said:

"... we thank you that you have fed us with the bread of life and the cup of salvation."

Here the important distinction is further confused by the tense of "have fed us". In BCP God vouchsafes "to feed us" (continually).

The blurring of this distinction is also seen on page 149:

"we thank you for feeding us with this holy food";

and on page 155:

"we thank you that you nourish us in these Easter mysteries";

and on page 157:

"... in this heavenly banquet you invigorate and renew us";

and on page 163:

"... we thank you for feeding us with the body and blood of your Son".

*Prayers for Australia*

93. In the prayers for Australia [APBA pages 161-162] there is an attempt to express concern for the reconciliation of indigenous and non-indigenous Australians in Christian terms. This matter is of great importance for the Church as well as the nation. It is therefore unfortunate that there are difficulties in some expressions here.

(a) The citation of 2 Chron 7:14 in this context is open to the misleading conclusion that God has promised to "heal" Australia if the Christians repent.

(b) The following paragraph ("Though Christ has called us ..."), though true of the Church, is open to the confusion of Christ's body with the nation of Australia.

(c) The claim that God has revealed  
"your purpose in [the land's] cycles of death and renewed life"

reflects a natural theology foreign to the Bible.

**Notes**

94. It is commendable that Note 8 [APBA page 164] says that "The sermon is integral to the Ministry of the

Word". It is regrettable therefore that the same note indicates that a sermon is only "normally" required, even on Sundays and Holy Days.

95. Silence is commended as "important" in note 10 [APBA page 164]. While pauses for reflection and/or personal prayer are no doubt valuable, rubrics should indicate the purpose of such silences.

### **The Holy Communion: Third Order**

[APBA pages 168 to 180]

96. The Third Order has a simple theological clarity which distinguishes it from the Second Order.

#### *God's wrath and substitutionary atonement*

97. The doctrine of God's wrath finds no clear expression in this liturgy (except in the statement that "God is slow to anger and full of compassion" [APBA page 175]). However the optional quotation of 1 Pet 2:24 [APBA page 175] contributes to a concept of substitutionary atonement.

98. Although the comment in §84 applies to the Prayer of Thanksgiving and Consecration [APBA pages 176-7], it does not exhibit any of the other ambiguities and difficulties noted above in Thanksgivings 1 to 5.

#### *Receiving the sacrament and partaking in Christ*

99. The comments in §92 above apply to the prayer on page 179:

"thank you for feeding us with the spiritual food of the body and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ."

### **The Holy Communion (with Baptism)**

[APBA pages 63-71]

100. This service follows the Second Order fairly closely, giving the impression (along with the other occurrences of the Second Order in the book (see below)) that the Second Order is the "standard" form of Holy Communion in this book.

101. The Great Thanksgiving [APBA pages 64-66] is the same as Thanksgiving 1 in the Second Order Communion service, with an additional paragraph, in realistic language, about baptism.

102. The service lacks clear reference to God as our Judge or any requirement for a careful self-examination before a just and holy God. On pages 52-53 there is a weak confession of sins.

### **The Holy Communion: following A Service for Marriage**

[APBA pages 669 to 676]

103. The service generally follows The Second Order Holy Communion, with a number of allusions to marriage added.

104. The Great Thanksgiving [APBA pages 669-671] is in the general style of the Thanksgivings in The Second Order Holy Communion, closest to Thanksgiving 1.

105. In this prayer the significance of the bread and the cup is extended beyond the death of Christ:

"With this bread and this cup, ...  
we proclaim his passion and death,  
his resurrection and ascension,  
the outpouring of his Spirit,  
and his presence with his people." [APBA page 671]

While a reminder of these gospel realities is welcome, the shift of focus from the death of Jesus is unwarranted and different from BCP.

106. The use of a "Confession and Absolution" to be said if the Holy Communion is to be celebrated is optional [APBA page 669]. This is a significant departure from the previous Prayer Book requirement. Such a provision allows a participation in the Holy Communion without challenge to repentance of sin.

### **The Holy Communion: following Ministry with the Sick**

[APBA pages 685 to 693]

107. This service is a brief version of The Second Order.

108. The Prayer of Thanksgiving follows Thanksgiving 1 in part. The significance of the bread and cup is again broadened to Christ's death, resurrection, ascension and promise to be with us. See §105 above.

### **The Holy Communion: on the Day of a Funeral**

[APBA pages 725 to 729]

109. This Holy Communion order is provided not merely for use on the day of a funeral but (optionally) as part of the funeral service. This has not been allowed before in the history of our English Prayer Book.

110. This service is a brief version of The Second Order, with a Prayer of Thanksgiving that focuses on Christ's victory over death.

111. While there is a provision for confession of sins at page 720, there is no Absolution.

### **The Holy Communion: Outline Order**

[APBA page 813]

112. This consists of a list of the sections of The Second Order, with liberty to use any suitable words in most places. The only specific requirements are the Collect of the day, two or three Bible readings (one from a Gospel), and an authorised Prayer of Thanksgiving (said by a Priest), and that each communicant replies **Amen** to the words of distribution.

113. There is insufficient theological guidance for users of this form to ensure maintenance of sound doctrine.

114. This Order raises the question of whether the "main Body and Essentials of it" (Preface to BCP) are maintained in this form.

### **Minority Report: from the Rev E.A. Mathieson**

115. APBA, in the Orders for Holy Communion, uses rich metaphorical and symbolic language which is helpful in conveying to contemporary congregations the character of God and the meaning of the gospel.

116. In relation to paragraph 8 of this report, I consider that, while APBA expresses certain aspects of the doctrine of BCP differently, APBA does not constitute a departure from BCP.

117. I agree with the general findings of the majority report that APBA fails to state aspects of the doctrine of BCP explicitly and that there are a number of areas in APBA where it would be possible to interpret material in a way that would be a departure from BCP, but it is not necessary to do so.

July 1996

---

### **Endnotes**

- <sup>1</sup> The Doctrine Commission is appointed by the Archbishop in consultation with the Standing Committee. The major proportion of this Report was undertaken by the Commission in the first six months of 1996. During this time two members were absent on study leave (the Chairman, Bishop P.W. Barnett and the Rev Dr P.F. Jensen). The members who worked on the Report are: Deaconess M.A. Rodgers (Acting Chairman), the Rev S.S. Fifer (Secretary), the Rev E.A. Mathieson, the Rev Dr P.T. O'Brien, the Rev J.G. Mason, the Rt Rev D.W.B. Robinson, the Rev Canon R.C. Forsyth and the Rev Dr J.W. Woodhouse. The following consultants, appointed by the Archbishop, were fully involved in the production of the Report: the Rev Canon R.E. Heslehurst, the Rev Dr R.C. Doyle and the Rev Dr D.G. Peterson.
- <sup>2</sup> See "The Principles of Doctrine and Worship in The Book of Common Prayer and the Thirty Nine Articles," a paper read at the Anglican Church League conference on 2 September, 1995 by D.W.B. Robinson, available from The A.C.L. Hon. Secretary, P.O. Box R746, Royal Exchange, NSW, 2000.
- <sup>3</sup> *The Mystery of Salvation: the Story of God's Gift*, A Report by the Doctrine Commission of the General Synod of the Church of England (London: Church House Publishing, 1995), 1.
- <sup>4</sup> Twenty-Second Session, Chapter II; cited from H.J. Schroeder (trans) *The Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent* (Rockford, Illinois: Tan, 1978) 145-6.
- <sup>5</sup> Schroeder, *Canons*, 149.
- <sup>6</sup> Franco Pierini, *Catechism of Vatican II* (New York: Alba House, 1967), *Nihil obstat*, 132-3.
- <sup>7</sup> "Transubstantiation" is the doctrine that the substance of the bread and the wine is converted into the substance of the body and blood of Christ.
- <sup>8</sup> "In the Roman Use *Agnus Dei* at this point is recognised as a prayer to the Son of God, 'under the form of bread and wine'." C. Neil and J.M. Willoughby, *The Tutorial Prayer Book* (London: Church Book Room Press, 1959) 347.

- <sup>9</sup> The Sarum and York Manuals for administering the bread to the sick had this in Latin; see Neil and Willoughby, *The Tutorial Prayer Book*, 343. So also the *Missale Romanum* of the Council of Trent; see Bard Thompson, *Liturgies of the Western Church* (New York: New American Library, 1961) 85.
- <sup>10</sup> *The New Sunday Missal: texts approved for use in Australia and New Zealand* (Sydney: Geoffrey Chapman, 1982) 425.
- <sup>11</sup> "Becon, Cranmer's Chaplain, commenting on the practice, calls its users 'abominable idolaters,' and the practice 'intolerable blasphemy'. Ridley, in May 1550, when the hymn was authorised to be sung *during the Communion*, forbade, in his Visitation Articles, 'counterfeiting the Popish Mass in saying the *Agnus* before the Communion. ... In 1662 the proposal to reinstate the use was formally considered, and rejected." Neil and Willoughby, *The Tutorial Prayer Book*, 347.
- <sup>12</sup> *Lambeth Conference 1958* (London: SPCK, 1968) 2.84. See also Colin Buchanan, *Modern Anglican Liturgies, 1958- 1968* (London: Oxford University Press, 1968) 19-20, who highlights this phrase as he sets out to trace the developments in Anglican liturgy in the light of Lambeth's concerns.
- <sup>13</sup> *Lambeth Conference 1958* (London: SPCK, 1968) 2.85.
- <sup>14</sup> J.I. Packer (ed), *Eucharistic Sacrifice: the addresses given at the Oxford Conference of Evangelical Churchmen, September 1961* (London: Church Book Room Press, 1962), 1-21. The Jesuit theologian, Dr Francis Clark, calls the report, "finely balanced". "Different constructions may be placed upon the language according to different presuppositions. It is not impossible for an Anglo-Catholic to interpret it as meaning that at the consecration of the Eucharistic elements an offering of Christ's body and blood is objectively performed . . . an Evangelical, on the other hand, may content himself with interpreting it in the sense that reception of holy communion at the Lord's board associates Christians with Christ and assures them by faith of the benefits won by his past sacrifice."; cited by Packer, *Eucharistic Sacrifice*, 2.
- <sup>15</sup> See Buchanan *Modern Anglican Liturgies*, 19-20; and *Further Anglican Liturgies 1968-1975* (Bramcote: Grove Books, 1975) passim; and *Latest Anglican Liturgies, 1976-1984* (London: SPCK/Alcuin Club, 1985) passim. The latter is supplemented by his, *Anglican Eucharistic Liturgy, 1975-1985* (Bramcote: Grove, 1985).
- <sup>16</sup> "Three Bishops ask ... 'Give us a fair go'," a document circulated to members of General Synod in 1995, by Andrew Curnow, David McCall and David Silk.
- <sup>17</sup> For a study of the substitutionary understanding of the atonement in BCP see *The Mystery of Salvation: the Story of God's Gift, A Report by the Doctrine Commission of the General Synod of the Church of England* (London: Church House Publishing, 1995), 206-215.
- <sup>18</sup> "From these words will be seen the great difference between the word *Offertorium*, as used in the Missal, and 'Offertory,' as used in the B.C.P. The latter word was dropped in 1552, but restored in 1662, when it could no longer be confounded with the offering of the bread and wine. The elements, in B.C.P., are not 'offered,' but 'set' (1549) or 'placed' (1662) on the Table." Neil and Willoughby, *The Tutorial Prayer Book*, 310.
- <sup>19</sup> Neil and Willoughby, *The Tutorial Prayer Book*, 331.
- <sup>20</sup> Adrian Fortesque, a Roman Catholic authority, says: "It has been suggested that [the *Benedictus qui venit*] was originally an acclamation addressed to the celebrant (or Emperor), then added to the *Sanctus* when sung by the choir, so as to coincide with the elevation [of the elements]." Adrian Fortesque, *The Mass: A Study of the Roman Liturgy*, 322.
- <sup>21</sup> Neil and Willoughby, *The Tutorial Prayer Book*, 349.
- <sup>22</sup> + indicates the point at which the priest makes the sign of the cross.
- <sup>23</sup> E.g., D.R. Holeton (ed.), *Renewing the Anglican Eucharist. Findings of the Fifth International Anglican Liturgical Consultation, Dublin, Eire, 1995*, Grove Worship Series 135 (Cambridge: Grove, 1996), 15-16. The OT images of sacrifice other than the rituals of atonement to explain how the Eucharist can be a sacrifice is wrong-headed (*Renewing the Anglican Eucharist*, 13-14). The Jews did not consider that a sacrifice of praise was somehow a means of obtaining the benefits of an atoning sacrifice.
- <sup>24</sup> In 1552 the words "which have duly received these holy mysteries" were added here (and retained in 1662) in order to make this distinction clear.