

GARRETT-EVANGELICAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Anamnesis or Memorial?
An Exploration of the Shifting Eucharistic Theology
of
The Book of Common Prayer 1549-1979

A
THESIS

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements

for the degree

MASTER OF THEOLOGICAL STUDIES

Field of Liturgical Studies

By

Sophia H. Twaddell

Evanston, Illinois

April 2017

Contents

Chapter 1: Historical Background	1
Chapter 2: Thomas Cranmer's Eucharistic Theology: Real Presence, Oblation, Sacrifice and Memorial in the First <i>Book of Common Prayer</i> (1549)	16
Chapter 3: The Second Edwardian Prayer Book (1552) and The Elizabethan Prayer Book (1559)	34
Chapter 4: The 1662 <i>Book of Common Prayer</i> : Theological Ambiguity but Liturgical Stability	44
Chapter 5: <i>The Scottish Book of Common Prayer</i> (1637); The Nonjuror's Liturgy of 1718, the <i>Scottish Communion Office</i> (1764), and <i>The First American Prayer Book</i> (1790)	56
Chapter 6: <i>The 1979 Episcopal Book of Common Prayer</i> : Full Circle	73
Chapter 7: Conclusion	86
Appendices	97
Bibliography	118

Chapter One: Historical Background

The dominical command “Do this for the remembrance of me” forms the basis of the Church’s most constitutive liturgical celebration, the Holy Eucharist. Nonetheless, what Jesus meant by “do this” and “for the remembrance of me” has been the subject of debate for centuries by biblical and liturgical scholars alike. This thesis will explore the evolving eucharistic theology of the *Book of Common Prayer* 1549-1979, with reference to the concept of “remembrance,” in particular, the related linguistic and theological constructs of *anamnesis* and memorial.

Background

The institution of the Eucharist by Jesus at the Last Supper¹ is attested to in 1 Corinthians 11: 23-25 and three of the four Synoptic Gospels, each with slightly different emphasis and wording (Mark 14:22-23; Matthew 26:26-28; Luke 22:14-20). The Gospel of John does not mention the blessing of the bread and wine but the “Last Discourse” pericope exudes eucharistic imagery. Paul’s account is the earliest known mention and will serve as the proof text here.

For I received from the Lord what I also handed on to you, that the Lord Jesus on the night when he was betrayed took a loaf of bread, and when he had given thanks, he broke it and said, “This is my body that is for you. Do this in remembrance of me.” In the same way he took the cup also, 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.²

¹ Recent scholarship casts significant doubt on this attribution. A not exhaustive list would include: Andrew McGowan, “‘Is There a Liturgical Text in this Gospel?’: The Institution Narratives and Their Early Interpretative Communities,” *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 118, No. 1 (Spring, 1999): 73-87; “The Myth of the ‘Lord’s Supper’ Paul’s Eucharistic Meal Terminology and Its Ancient Reception,” *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly*, Vol. 77, no. 3 (July 2015): 501-510; Paul F. Bradshaw, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2012), 61-72; Paul F. Bradshaw, *Reconstructing Early Christian Worship* Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2010), 3-19; Robert J. Daly, “Eucharistic Origins From the New Testament to the Liturgies of the Golden Age,” *Theological Studies* 66 (2005): 3-22; John Dominick Crossan, *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant* (San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1991), 360-67, John Meier, “The Eucharist and the Last Supper: Did it Happen?” *Theology Digest* 42 (Winter, 1995): 335-51; Enrico Mazza, *The Origins of the Eucharistic Prayer* (Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 1995), 30-34, 76-90; Bryan D. Spinks, *Do This in Remembrance of Me: The Eucharist from the Early Church to the Present Day* (London: SCM Press, 2013), 1-29.

² All biblical citations derive from NRSV.

The cumulative witness of the New Testament associates the Last Supper within the context of the Passover meal.³ Jones argues that

The context of the Passover reveals the depth and the breadth of *anamnesis* in connection with the Lord's Supper. *anamnesis* means that we are drawn into the history of salvation: "In every generation let each man look on himself as if he came out of Egypt." This is the Passover's eternal present, an eternal present which is true for the Christian Eucharist. *anamnesis* means that the entire history of salvation is remembered and re-experienced—from the creation to the return of Christ. The bread in the Passover meal points back in time to creation and liberation; the wine points forward in time to the Day of the Lord and the coming of the Messiah. This is the eschatological aspect of the Passover—an aspect which is also true for the Lord's Supper.⁴

The blessing of the bread and cup may therefore derive from the Jewish *berakot* prayer, particularly the *birkat ha mazon*, or grace after meals, although there is no scholarly consensus on this point.⁵ The *birkat ha mazon* consists of three blessings: for the food, for the land, and for Jerusalem. What is important is the character of remembering that is constitutive of these prayer forms. Similarly, scholars have debated the importance of the order of blessing, which is not important to this discussion, and the significance of the word "remembrance," which is. It is to that notion that we will now turn.

The semantic range of the term *anamnesis*, in Greek and in modern languages is wide, and the meaning of the term has evolved over time from its classical Greek usage. For the purposes of this discussion, the focus will be on the use of the term in Christian use. Dennis Smolarski has argued that "the Christian concept of *anamnesis*" has Jewish roots and was tied to the covenant

³ Jonathan Klawans argues in his article "Was Jesus' Last Supper a Seder?" *Bible Review*, Vol. 77, no. 5 (October 2001): 24-33, 47 that it was not. <http://www.biblicalarchaeology.org/daily/people-cultures-in-the-bible/jesus-historical-jesus/was-jesus-last-supper-a-seder/> (accessed on June 30, 2016); nor does Andrew McGowan, "Rethinking Eucharistic Origins," *Pacifica* Vol. 23, no. 2 (June 2010): 173-191, or Paul F. Bradshaw; see *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship: Sources and Methods for the Study of Early Liturgy* (London: SPCK, 2002), and also Paul F. Bradshaw, *Eucharistic Origins* (London: SPCK, 2004). Max Thurian, on the other hand, argues that it was. Max Thurian, *The Eucharistic Memorial*, trans. J. G. Davies (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1959), 16-19, as does Joachim Jeremias, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus* (New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1966), 238-43.

⁴ Ray Carlton Jones, "The Lord's Supper and The Concept of Anamnesis," *Word & World*, Vol. 6, no. 4 (1986): 434-446. https://wordandworld.luthersem.edu/content/pdfs/6-4_Romans/6-4_Jones.pdf (accessed on July 3, 2016).

⁵ Bryan D. Spinks covers this subject in *Do This is Remembrance of Me: The Eucharist From the Early Church to the Present Day* (London: SCM Press, 2013), 5-11; as does Frank C. Senn, in *Christian Liturgy: Catholic and Evangelical* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1997), 55-58.

theology and worship practice of ancient Israel.⁶ Both the Old and New Testaments are replete with the notion of *anamnesis*, as the remembrance of God's past action that leads to newness of life in the present. However, the Greek word *anamnesis* and its cognates, and the Hebrew word *zikkaron* are not common words in Scripture. According to Warren Schmidt, the former appears only nine times in the Hebrew Bible, (for example: Exod 28: 12; Num 17: 40; Josh 4: 7; Zech 6: 14⁷), and in the New Testament, *anamnesis* and similar words are even rarer, with only seven appearances. The particular form in 1 Corinthians 11: 24-25 occurs in only one instance in the New Testament outside of these two verses, in Luke's account of the Last Supper (22: 19). Derivatives of *zikkaron* appear fifty-nine times in the Hebrew Scriptures, most often connected to temple sacrifice.⁸ The Christian concept of *anamnesis* supports the sacramentality of the Eucharist when the entire sacramental celebration, as an encounter with the transcendent God, in signs accessible to the senses, is understood as *anamnetic*. It is not limited to the moment of consecration as some have argued.⁹ Most contemporary scholars argue that the entire eucharistic prayer is consecratory.

Max Thurian argues that the Eucharist can only be understood in view of the liturgical tradition of the Old Testament. "The expression employed by Christ to enjoin the *repetition* of the Eucharist ("Do this in remembrance of me") was part of the current liturgical language of Judaism and was particularly used in the celebration of the Passover" and thus must be

⁶ Dennis C. Smolarski, *Liturgical Literacy: From Anamnesis to Worship* (New York, NY/Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1990), 11.

⁷ Julie Duncan, *Ecclesiastes* (Nashville: Abingdon Press (forthcoming 2017).

⁸ Warren Schmidt, *A Theological, Historical, and Social Study of Anamnesis in Christian Liturgy*, A Canadian Catholic Perspective, April 23, 2012 <https://catholiccanada.wordpress.com/2012/04/23/a-theological-historical-and-social-study-of-anamnesis-in-christian-liturgy/> (accessed on July 5, 2016).

⁹ Aelred Arnesen, "The Myth of Anamnesis," *Theology* 105, no. 6 (November 2002): 436-437.

considered a rubric, not part of the liturgical text itself.¹⁰ The crux of the question depends upon the meaning of the Greek “ἀνάμνησιν,” or *anamnesis*, which is used by Paul and Luke (“τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν”).¹¹ Thurian argues *anamnesis* is the equivalent of the Hebrew *zikkaron*, which he translates as *memorial* “in order to give this word the particular liturgical meaning implied by the Hebrew expression...In any case we must not give to the word the spiritualizing meaning of ‘remember.’”¹² He further distinguishes between the words “*memorial* and *memory*, [as well as] *reminiscence*, *commemoration*, *remembrance*, and *anniversary*” which refer to mental recollection of a person or thing, absent or passed.”¹³ Smolarski concurs: “*anamnesis*” in Christianity “coincides with the Jewish understanding of *zikkaron*,” which he explains as remembrance “that makes the effects of [a] historical event present and effective for the believer.”¹⁴

David Gregg has undertaken a detailed analysis of the possible Hebrew roots for the Septuagint Greek *anamnesis*, including *azkarah*, *hazkir*, *zeker*, and *zikkaron*, concluding, with Thurian, that *zikkaron* is the most likely original. He notes that the noun’s

[S]ubstantive import...seems to be that it designates ‘*something*’ which directs the attention of those who perceive it (i.e. constitutes a *COMMEMORATION*) to a prior reality from which the *zikkaron* itself derives. This ‘something’ may be a cultic *object*, the *material* substance of which forms the essential link with the prior reality which it commemorates. Or it may be a cultic *act*, done to commemorate an event. Or it may be a *written record*, preserving, (and therefore commemorating) words spoken, lists of names, or facts of history.¹⁵

¹⁰ Max Thurian, *The Eucharistic Memorial*, trans. J. G. Davies (Richmond: John Knox Press, 1959), 17. Italics mine. David Gregg concurs with the characterization as a rubric.

¹¹ 1 Cor. 11:24, 25, cf. Luke 22:19.

¹² Ibid., 18.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Smolarski, *ibid.*

¹⁵ David Gregg, *Anamnesis in the Eucharist*, Grove Liturgical Study No. 5 (Bramcote: Grove Books, 1976), 20. His capitalization.

Thurian settles on *zikkaron* in the sense of a commemorative cultic *act* as the most likely Hebrew original for *anamnesis*¹⁶ but Gregg questions whether, given that *zikkaron* is translated *mnemosunon* more frequently in the Septuagint, the two are interchangeable, as Thurian claims. *Mnemosunon*, according to Gregg, implies an element of continuity, “while *anamnesis*, on the other hand, characteristically designates something that is momentary and discontinuous—something that has no abiding existence of its own...there is a distinct sense of *renewal*, of remembering *again*, about *eis anamnesin*, which made it far more appropriate to use to render *l’zikkaron*.”¹⁷

Gregg defines *anamnesis* as

[T]hat element within the Eucharist which corresponds to the ‘remembering’ aspect in the original. We must then further distinguish between the ‘*anamnesis* rubric’ by which we mean the formula recorded in the New Testament as ‘*touto poeiite eis ten emen anamnesis*’ (‘do this in remembrance of me’) (1 Cor. 11: 24, 25, cf. Luke 22: 19) with its qualifying clause ‘*hosakis ean pinete*’ “as often as you [pl] drink it’) inserted in connection with the cup (1 Cor. 11: 25) and the *anamnesis* in the liturgy, which is the technical term for the verbal formula by which is articulated the mode and content of the worshippers’ response to the dominical command, and which may sometimes include a further element known as the ‘Oblation,” an articulation of an act of ‘offering.’¹⁸

He goes on to state that the rubric means: “*Take, give thanks, break the bread and say the interpretive words, at each weekly festive communal meal, as the commemorative act in which you initiate a genuine encounter in the present by means of a moment of redemptive time from the past, namely the moment of my atoning, New Covenant-establishing death.*”¹⁹ Not all scholars would agree with Gregg’s contention that the death of Christ is the singular referent. Current scholars²⁰ argue that it is the whole economy of Christ’s life that is to be celebrated, not

¹⁶ Ibid., 20.

¹⁷ Ibid., 23.

¹⁸ Ibid., 3.

¹⁹ Ibid., 27. Gregg’s italics and punctuation.

²⁰ James Farwell, “Salvation, the Life of Jesus, and the Eucharistic Prayer: An Anglican Reflection and Proposal,” *Liturgy*, Vol. 31 no. 3 (2016): 19-27.

simply his passion, death, resurrection, and ascension, which is what Archbishop Cranmer held and put forth in his Books of Common Prayer, a tradition that has largely persisted to the present day.

The Eucharistic Sacrifice and anamnesis

The early church fathers in the West, including Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambrose, Augustine and Jerome, among others, struggled to articulate their understanding of the significance of the sacrifice of Christ on the cross and how to relate it to the eucharistic sacrifice. Nonetheless, each articulated theologies of the Eucharist affirming the real presence of Christ in the eucharistic elements, primarily in response to heresies (e.g., Docetism and Gnosticism). While the language used by each was different (signs, figures, symbols), in the early church, the assumption that Christ is truly present in the Eucharist was never in question. There was no metaphorical interpretation of the words of institution, “This is my body...this is my blood,” or the dominical command to “do this in remembrance of me.” Macy observes that “the early Christian community shared the belief that the ritual re-enactment of the Lord’s Supper was a participation in the Mystery of Christ, and a sharing in the glorious salvation won for humans through the death and resurrection of the Lord.”²¹ Only a brief summary of the theology will be undertaken, simply in order to make the issues that Cranmer faced clear.

According to Kilmartin, the Western patristic tradition of eucharistic sacrifice consists of two characteristics which had their origin in the doctrine and practice of the North African church:

[T]he celebration is viewed above all as a sacrificial act of the Church made in union with Christ the High Priest who draws his disciples into his own worship of the Father. He does this by faith and within the context of the ritual memorial of the ‘death of the Lord.’ Eventually the emphasis is reversed so that the attention becomes focused on the role of

²¹ Gary Macy, *The Theologies of the Eucharist in the Early Scholastic Period* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984), 20.

Christ as both the offerer and offered, the source of the possibility of the acceptable worship of the Church.²²

Kilmartin further notes that “concretely, this Latin theology of eucharistic sacrifice was based on a sharp distinction between the efficacy of the historical sacrifice of the cross with respect to the victory over original sin, and the efficacy of the sacramental repetition of the sacrifice of Christ in the Mass with respect to the victory over daily sins—with the emphasis on the propitiatory effect for the souls in purgatory.”²³ This perspective is in contrast to that of the Greek patristic theology “which was inclined to view the eucharistic celebration as a means of sacramental representation of the mystery of the historical redemptive work of Jesus Christ,”²⁴ which explains rather neatly why the East has never been overly concerned with explaining what “happens” to the elements at the consecration, while the West focused almost exclusively on that very effort.

Julie Gittoes points out that “*anamnesis* is a somewhat enigmatic concept, which resists easy definition despite its scriptural basis and liturgical usage...it has been regarded as a matter of subjective mental recollection. It has also been used to underpin doctrines of Christ’s real presence in the sacrament and associated to a repetition of Christ’s sacrifice.”²⁵ It is the latter which is relevant to the current argument. Cranmer was eventually to reject both the real presence and its association with the repeated sacrifice of Christ, choosing to characterize the Eucharist as a memorial.

²² Edward J. Kilmartin, *The Eucharist in the West: History and Theology*, ed. Robert J. Daly (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1998), 3.

²³ *Ibid.*, 7.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, 4.

²⁵ Julie Gittoes, *Anamnesis and the Eucharist: Contemporary Anglican Approaches* (Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Ltd, 2008), 9.

Gregg is helpful in that he enumerates various theories of *anamnesis*: sacrificial, appropriation, and memorial, which Gittoes also reviews in much the same manner and defines the terms similarly.²⁶

Gregg points to Thomas Aquinas (1225-1274), the great scholastic philosopher theologian, as a proponent of the sacrificial theory of the Eucharist: the idea that Jesus commanded a sacrificial offering to be made in each celebration; he also originated the concept of transubstantiation as the explanation for what happens to the bread and the wine. He argued that Christ is present in the Eucharist sacramentally. This is the position asserted by the Council of Trent (see next chapter).

Gregg defines the “appropriation theory” as “those who view the eucharistic action mainly as a visual aid to stimulate their mental recollection of Christ’s sacrifice, or who believe it is chiefly the faithful reception of the bread and wine as tokens of their receiving the benefits of Christ’s death, which constitutes obedience to the anamnestic imperative,”²⁷ e.g., Zwingli and Cranmer, each in his own way. Finally, he defines the ‘memorial’ theory, “characterized by a belief in the intrinsic efficacy of performing a commemorative act.”²⁸ This view is consistent with interpreting the Passover as a commemoration of the Exodus. Gregg (and Thurian) find support for this view in the following passage in the Haggadah, which occurs when the cup is being blessed:

Our God and God of our fathers, may there rise, and come, and come unto, be seen accepted, heard, recollected and remembers, the remembrance of us and the recollection of us, and the *remembrance* of our fathers, and the *remembrance* of the Messiah, son of David, thy servant, and the *remembrance* of Jerusalem, they holy city, and the *remembrance* of all thy people, the house of Israel. May their *remembrance* come before

²⁶ Gregg., *ibid.*, 4. Dix, Kilpatrick, and Thurian have also covered this material at length.

²⁷ *Ibid.*

²⁸ Gregg, *ibid.*

thee, for rescue, goodness, grace, mercy, and compassion, for life and for peace, on this Festive of Unleavened Bread.²⁹

The memorial theory views obedience to the *anamnesis* rubric in terms of re-presenting the symbolic actions of the Last Supper in order to bring something about.”³⁰ Gregg claims that this is the position of most Protestant denominations and is appealing as it represents a middle way between the first two theories. Julie Gittoes also calls this “appropriation,” which “describes a process in which the performers recognise the world proposed by the rite, and make claims upon it within and beyond the terms of the performance.”³¹

Real Presence and the Sacrifice of the Mass

The debate over the nature of Christ’s presence in the Eucharist had been going on in the Church for centuries. A tradition of diversity of theologies of the Eucharist was characteristic of the early scholastic period.³² In fact, the issue of the real presence of Christ in the sacrament was the dominant theme of Western sacramental theology during the Middle Ages.³³ To some extent, this may have been because the Church had not settled upon a definition of sacrament. The focus here will be the ninth century Benedictine monks, Radbertus (d. 865) and Ratramnus (d. 870), who took opposing positions, and whose articulations influenced Cranmer’s thinking. Radbertus taught that the bread and wine were physically changed into the body and blood of Christ. Ratramnus denied this interpretation in no uncertain terms—arguing Christ’s presence was spiritual. Radbertus’ viewpoint was eventually endorsed by the Church at the Fourth Lateran Council (1215) convened by Pope Innocent III, which adopted, in Canon 1, transubstantiation as the explanation for that which occurs during the consecration of the elements on the altar. The

²⁹ *The Passover Haggadah*, with English translation, introduction, and commentary based on the commentaries of E. D. Goldschmidt, ed. Nahum N. Glatzer, rev. ed. (New York, Schocken Books, 1969), 69.

³⁰ Gregg, *ibid.*, 5.

³¹ Gittoes, *op. cit.*, 49.

³² *Ibid.*

³³ Frank C. Senn, *Christian Liturgy: Catholic and Evangelical* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1997), 248.

doctrine of transubstantiation holds that when the bread and wine offered in the Eucharist are consecrated, they cease to be bread and wine, although without a change of appearance, and become the body and blood of Christ by the agency of the Holy Spirit. Christ is truly and wholly present—body and blood, soul and divinity—under the “appearances” of bread and wine. Canon 1 states:

There is one Universal Church of the faithful, outside of which there is absolutely no salvation. In which there is the same priest and sacrifice, Jesus Christ, whose body and blood are truly contained in the sacrament of the altar under the forms of bread and wine; the bread being changed (*transubstantiation*) by divine power into the body, and the wine into the blood, so that to realize the mystery of unity we may receive of Him what He has received of us. And this sacrament no one can effect except the priest who has been duly ordained in accordance with the keys of the Church, which Jesus Christ Himself gave to the Apostles and their successors.³⁴

This change occurs when the words of institution are uttered by the priest, who acts *in persona Christi*. Thus, at the same time that transubstantiation became doctrine, the role of the priest was no longer understood to be that of the leader of the prayers of the assembly, but rather one who had “power to offer sacrifice to God for the living and the dead.”³⁵ Wandel notes that in Canon 1 of Lateran IV, the eucharist is called “the sacrament of the altar” – an “understanding of the Mass itself as a reenactment of the sacrificial act of the Crucifixion—a reenactment, moreover, that, each and every time it was performed, did not simply affirm that original sacrifice but represented it, make it present again and in so doing, reenacted its efficacy.”³⁶

Following Lateran IV, a second understanding of sacrifice within the mass developed, that of a “sacrificial oblation offered by the priests to God.”³⁷ This understanding, according to Wandel, was reinforced by the artwork that filled the churches: altarpieces, crucifixes, and other

³⁴ Lee Palmer Wandel, *The Eucharist in the Reformation: Incarnation and Liturgy* (New York: Cambridge, 2006), 20.

³⁵ Senn, op. cit., 255.

³⁶ Wandel, op.cit., 27.

³⁷ Ibid., 28.

visual representations of the Passion, giving “material and visual form to the identification of Christ and the priest, to the understanding of the Mass as a sacrifice, both reenactment of the Crucifixion and oblation.”³⁸ Churches by this time had already come to house multiple altars, where multiple masses could be and were conducted, for individual families or groups, or even privately, by the priest alone. This proliferation of altars seems to have arisen as a result of the perception that the celebration of the Mass was essential to the priestly office. The mass was apparently no longer seen as necessarily a communal celebration, but simply a ritual consisting of “a sequence of gestures and readings that could be performed in utter solitude and not lose their essential meaning”³⁹ although still grounded in the understanding that the Mass was a commemorative act. Along with this privatization of the Mass came the commercialization of the Mass: priests earned a stipend for saying Mass on behalf of their benefactors, the dead, or a patron saint.⁴⁰ This practice, too, was to be roundly criticized by the Reformers. In addition, because the people were so often warned not to receive communion unless they had done sufficient penance, a popular custom arose: “spiritual reception” or “ocular communion” in which it was enough to simply gaze upon the consecrated host or perform some other act of devotion in order to receive the benefits of communion (e.g., salvation) as long as they were leading a life of faith and charity. This practice had gained popularity to the point where the laity rarely received the sacrament, and when they did, it was only in one kind, primarily out of an abundance of caution about spilling the contents of the cup. Because the Mass was celebrated in Latin, with the priest facing East and his back to the people, the largely uneducated populace could not follow even those words which were said aloud, so they engaged in private devotions,

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ Ibid., 31.

⁴⁰ Gary Macy, *The Banquet's Wisdom*, 2nd ed. (Ashland City, TN: OSL Publications, 1992), 147-148. Macy notes that Lateran IV forbade charging for such services, but the people were encouraged to make a donation to the church so that the church would remember those commemorated.

saying the rosary or other prayers, until the Sanctus bell was rung to alert them to the elevation of the host, the climax of the Eucharist. Cranmer's communion liturgy was developed in reaction to these practices.

In the 16th century, Ratramnus' interpretation of the presence of Christ in the eucharist as spiritual gained new life when the Protestant Reformers, including Nicholas Ridley, seized on it as an argument against transubstantiation. Ratramnus held that the bread and the wine of the Eucharist represent Christ's body and blood figuratively and serve as a remembrance of him, but are not truly (perceptible by the senses) Christ's body and blood because they did not change in appearance, nor were the consecrated elements literally Christ's historical incarnate body. This view was especially influential in England, where Cranmer claimed to have been finally convinced against transubstantiation by Ratramnus via Ridley. According to Willemein Otten, "Protestants came to emphasize the figurative interpretation of the eucharist in Ratramnus, which put him in line with their largely commemorative reading of this sacrament, while the Catholics were at pains to show that Ratramnus was nevertheless a faithful son of the church, that is: their Roman Catholic church."⁴¹

Similarly, Berengar of Tours' (d. 1088) formulation that "if Christ had truly died and was by the right hand of the father, then his 'presence' at the altar could not be his body or blood,"⁴² (a formulation which he was forced to recant under threat of excommunication) was to resonate with Cranmer, and subsequently found its way into the *Book of Common Prayer*.

Therefore, it is clear that controversy over the medieval understanding of the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist was a flash point among the Reformers. Cranmer's eventual

⁴¹ Willemien Otten, "Between Augustinian sign and Carolingian reality: the presence of Ambrose and Augustine in the Eucharistic debate between Paschasius Radbertus and Ratramnus of Corbie," *Nederlands archief voor kerkgeschiedenis* 80, no. 2 (2000): 138.

⁴² Wandel, op.cit., 21.

rejection of this received doctrine reshaped both the theology and the liturgical celebration of the Eucharist in England and the rest of what is now known as the Anglican Communion. However, the Anglican understanding of the Eucharist as a memorial (the Protestant view) or as *anamnesis* (the Catholic view) has shifted in subsequent Prayer Books over the past 464 years. It is this shift that this thesis explores.

Cranmer's theology evolved over a period of years and with it his articulation of the nature of the Eucharist. The first *Book of Common Prayer* (1549) rejected the Catholic concept of transubstantiation and with it the doctrine of the eucharistic sacrifice (every celebration of the Eucharist Christ is offered again by the priest as a propitiatory sacrifice on the altar). Cranmer's position on the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist at this point was somewhat ambiguous; the text of the liturgy and the rubrics for its celebration are inconsistent. It was not that which he would articulate in his *Defense* of 1550, although he seems to have been moving in the direction of his mature understanding: Christ is present spiritually in the sacrament and in the faith of the receiver, not substantially, corporally or really, because His body is in heaven; a nominalist, not realist, view. In his writings, Cranmer used the terms memorial, commemoration, and remembrance more or less interchangeably, but always in the sense of individual mentation.

Therefore, for Cranmer, the eucharistic sacrifice is seen as strictly a conceptual or intellectual activity of remembering. The traditional understanding of the eucharistic sacrifice – in which the bread and wine are identified with the body and blood of Christ, and the self-giving of Christ at the Last Supper with His self-giving on the cross—depended on a theology of the presence of Christ which Cranmer rejected. The bread and the wine were “signs” or “creatures,” not the actual body and blood of the Lord. Because it is impossible to duplicate the self-giving of Christ, all that can be done is to remember it. Cranmer's mature eucharistic theology is enshrined

in the *Book of Common Prayer* of 1552, newly titled *An Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion*. Cranmer fashioned the entire liturgy around the notion of the Eucharist as memorial.

However, we are left with the problem of interpreting what Cranmer actually meant by “memorial.” His construal was limited to the medieval misunderstanding of the nature of sacrifice which had led to multiple masses being offered at the same time. He may not have had an adequate understanding of the nature of sacrifice in the Hebrew Bible, and thus the context in which Jesus exhorted the disciples to remember an event they could doubtless not forget, one that is a communal, ongoing remembrance (e.g., the covenant with Israel) rather than a recollection of a moment in time. Although he was a fine scholar and liturgist, Cranmer was not a first rate theologian. It appears that in rejecting transubstantiation and the Catholic doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice, Cranmer fell back on the concept of memorial, as in commemoration, instead, in order to leave no question about the Eucharist as a re-enactment of the sacrifice on the cross. This may account for some of the ambiguity in his theology—or perhaps his desire to accommodate both Catholics and Reformers left no choice but to espouse a position that he hoped would be acceptable to both, but ultimately pleased neither.

A second problem is semantic. Cranmer's notion of the eucharistic memorial is that of an abstract mental recollection, a calling to mind, of Christ's sacrifice, combined with the dominical command to “do this.” He considers it “the sacrifice of all Christian people to remember Christ's death, to laud and thank him for it, and to publish it abroad unto other, to his honor and glory.” It is also consistent with Cranmer's notion of spiritual presence and receptionism, both of which have at the heart the Reformation idea of justifying faith.

Each succeeding *Book of Common Prayer* has wrestled with articulating an understanding of *anamnesis* and memorial in relation to the eucharistic liturgy. In this thesis I will examine and analyze the eucharistic prayers and their associated rubrics to unpack and tease out the nuances of meaning.

Chapter Two

Thomas Cranmer's Eucharistic Theology:

Real Presence, Oblation, Sacrifice and Memorial in the First *Book of Common Prayer* 1549¹

As noted, the controversy over the medieval understanding of the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist was a flash point among the Reformers, including Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, the chief architect of the Reformation in England. His rejection of this received doctrine reshaped both the theology and the liturgical celebration of the Eucharist in England from his time to the present day rites of the worldwide Anglican Communion. Over time, Cranmer developed and articulated his reformed understanding of real presence, sacrifice, oblation, and the Eucharist as a memorial of Christ's "full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world."

Background

Prior to being named Archbishop of Canterbury by Henry VIII in 1533, Thomas Cranmer had been deeply enmeshed in "The King's Matter" – Henry's efforts to rid himself of his first wife, Catherine of Aragon, who proved unable to provide Henry with the much-longed for son and heir who would cement the Tudor dynasty. Catholic Catherine was the aunt of the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V, who put increasing pressure on Pope Clement VII to not grant Henry the dispensation he needed to divorce her. Shortly after being named to the See of Canterbury, Cranmer pronounced the marriage null and void, freeing Henry to marry Protestant Anne Boleyn, to whom Henry was already secretly married and who was already pregnant. This resulted in Henry's excommunication. In November of 1534, Parliament passed the Act of

¹ Portions of this chapter appeared in a paper written for Dr. Frank Senn's course on the Eucharist in the Spring of 2016. It has been revised for this thesis to account for the focus on anamnesis.

Supremacy, categorically declaring Henry (and subsequent monarchs) supreme head of the Church of England. The break with Rome was thus complete. Although the Reformation had been stirring in England prior to the Act, with its passage, the official reformation was poised to begin. Because Henry sought to preserve some semblance of unity within his kingdom, Cranmer, therefore, proceeded carefully and incrementally in his quest to reform the church's practice and theology.

In 1537, Cranmer was a member of the commission that produced both the *VI Articles* and *The King's Book*, whose purpose was to affirm traditional teaching and practice, including transubstantiation. Although the term is never used, these documents declared that 'the creatures which be taken to the use thereof, as bread and wine, do not remain still in their own substance, but by the virtue of Christ's word in the consecration be changed and turned to the very substance of the body and blood of our Savior Jesus Christ.'" At this point, it appears as if Cranmer was comfortable with the received doctrine of the Western Church, as expressed in a letter to the Swiss Reformer Joachim Vadianus:

Wherefore, since this catholic faith which we hold respecting the real presence has been declared to the church from the beginning by such evident and manifest passages of scripture, and the same has also been subsequently commended to the ears of the faithful with so much clearness and diligence by the first ecclesiastical writers, do not, I pray, persist any longer to carp at or subvert a doctrine so well grounded and supported.²

Patricia Wilson-Kastner notes that "it seems generally agreed that until at least 1537 Cranmer adhered to the orthodox medieval Roman Catholic theology of transubstantiation, with its concomitant theology of sacramental corporeal presence of Christ."³

Nonetheless, Cranmer's own thinking had begun to evolve through contacts with the Continental Reformers, including Bucer, Peter Martyr, Bullinger, Zwingli, Luther, Calvin, and

² Ibid., 4.

³ Patricia Wilson-Kastner, "Andreas Osiander's Probable Influence on Thomas Cranmer's Eucharistic Theology," *The Sixteenth Century Journal* Vol. 14, No. 4 (Winter 1983): 417.

Osiander, whom he had met through his earlier participation in The King's Matter. Peter Brooks states "It is certainly true to state that few sixteenth century divines underwent such a gradual doctrinal development."⁴ The proof-text for this assertion is the oft-repeated incident at his trial for heresy in 1555, when Cranmer was accused by one of his examiners thus: "For you, master Cranmer, have taught in this high sacrament of the altar three contrary doctrines, and yet you pretended in every one *verbum Domini*," to which Cranmer replied, "Nay, I taught but two contrary doctrines in the same."⁵ Certainly by 1548 Cranmer's theology had moved to that position which he summarized in his "preface to the reader" of the 1551 *Answer*:

Moreover, when I say and repeat many times in my book, that the body of Christ is present in them that worthily receive the sacrament; lest any man should mistake my words, and think that I mean, that although Christ is not corporally in the outward visible signs, yet he is corporally in the persons that duly receive them, this is to advertise the reader, that I mean no such thing; but my meaning is, that the force, the grace, the virtue and benefit of Christ's body that was crucified for us, and his blood that was shed for us, be really and effectually present with all them that duly receive that sacrament: but all this I understand of his spiritual presence."⁶

In other words, Cranmer affirms that worthy reception is the means that the body of Christ is present in the Eucharist—not corporeally or “truly” present.

The debate over which Reformer had the most influence over Cranmer's eucharistic theology is ongoing and has been covered at length in multiple volumes.⁷ What is clear is that

⁴ Peter Newman Brooks, *Thomas Cranmer's Doctrine of the Eucharist* (London: MacMillan, 1992), 1.

⁵ *Ibid.*, 2.

⁶ Patricia Wilson-Kastner, *op. cit.*, 417.

⁷ Among them Patricia Wilson-Kastner, *op. cit.*; Cyril Richardson, "Zwingli and Cranmer on the Eucharist," Dwight M. Johnson Memorial Lectureship in Church History, Evanston, IL: Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, 1949; Peter Newman Brooks, *Thomas Cranmer's Doctrine of the Eucharist*, 2nd edition (London: MacMillan Academic and Professional Ltd, 1992); Colin Buchanan, *What did Cranmer think he was doing?* Grove Liturgical Study No. 7 (Bramcote, Nott.: Grove Books, 1976); G.J. Cuming, *A History of Anglican Liturgy* (London: MacMillan and Co Ltd, 1969); Basil Hall, "Cranmer, The Eucharist and the Foreign Divines in the Reign of Edward VI," in *Thomas Cranmer: Churchman and Scholar*, ed. Paul Ayris and David Selwyn (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1993); Gordon P. Jeanes, *Signs of God's Presence: Thomas Cranmer's Sacramental Theology and the Book of Common Prayer* (London: T&T Clark, 2008); Frank C. Senn, *Christian Liturgy: Catholic and Evangelical* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1997); Dom Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*, 1945, reprint, with additional notes by Paul V. Marshall (New York: The Seabury Press, 1982); Aidan Kavanagh, *The Concept of Eucharistic Memorial in the Canon Revisions of Thomas Cranmer Archbishop of Canterbury 1533-1556* (St. Meinrad: Abbey Press, 1964);

Cranmer had access to the best theological minds of the time and was actively engaged with virtually all of them. With Brooks, I would argue that Cranmer “by no means imbibed the ideas of any one school of thought to the exclusion of the others.”⁸ Wilson-Kastner rightly contends that

Scholars are increasingly cautious about assigning labels such as Zwinglian or Lutheran. It is recognized that such categories may be anachronistic, inaccurate, or may be so colored by later controversy as to be virtually meaningless. One of the results of consideration of the influence of Osiander on Cranmer may be to further cast doubt on the use of some of those general categories on Cranmer, who may have drawn on more people than once had been imagined, in order to formulate his own particular theories.⁹

Given that it is clear that Cranmer’s own eucharistic theology evolved over time, and given that he was engaged in some fashion with Reformers all over the world, it is fruitless to attempt to link specific influences to his thinking. That Cranmer was familiar with multiple sources and liturgical materials is undisputed. However, this does not lead to the conclusion that he necessarily accepted the theological basis for those materials. He had a reputation as a careful scholar before he became archbishop and appears to have developed his own unique approach to liturgical composition rather than appropriating that of others.

Cranmer’s Eucharistic Theology

Cranmer’s eucharistic theology began to come into its own upon the accession of nine-year-old Edward VI. His first effort, *The Order of the Communion*, was published in 1548--in English, and was inserted into the Latin Mass after the priest received communion. This *Order* restored the cup to the laity, included devotions and two exhortations, a general confession and absolution, the Comfortable Words, the Prayer of Humble Access, and communion with words

Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer: A Life* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998); Cyril C. Richardson, “Cranmer and the Analysis of Eucharistic Doctrine,” *The Journal of Theological Studies*, New Series, Vol. 16, No. 2 (October 1965); 421-437; Richard F. Buxton, *Eucharist and the Institution Narrative* (Great Wakering: Mayhew-McCrimmon, 1976).

⁸ Brooks, op. cit., 55.

⁹ Ibid.

of administration and blessing.¹⁰ *The Order* was strongly influenced by the Consultation of Hermann von Wied, the reforming bishop of Cologne, and was subsequently incorporated into the 1549 *Book of Common Prayer* with few changes, which MacCulloch claims is an indication that “Cranmer’s work on the communion section of the liturgy was already well advanced, indeed...he may have prepared these texts for Henry VIII in summer 1546.”¹¹ Further, MacCulloch points out that two final rubrics provide an indication of where Cranmer was heading: one specified that every consecrated wafer was to be broken into at least two pieces:

There were good reasons for insisting on the breaking of all the bread: it was a reflection of the Gospel narratives in which Christ broke the bread which he distributed, and probably it was also an attempt to undermine the symbolism of the Fraction of the priest’s wafer which was an integral part of the Roman canon of the mass. It was important to emphasize there was no difference in kind between the priest’s and the people’s communion....¹²

The other rubric provided for the additional consecration of wine, should there not be enough for all communicants, the text for which both MacCulloch and Jeanes note is based on a provision in the *Sarum Missal*; but Cranmer forbids the elevation;¹³ that is, a repeated elevation during subsequent consecration.

Note, that if it doth so chance that the Wine hallowed and consecrate doth not suffice or be enough for them that do take the Communion, the Priest, after the first Cup or Chalice be emptied, may go again to the Altar, and reverently and devoutly prepare and consecrate another, and so the third, or more likewise, beginning at these words, *Simili modo postquam conatum est*, and ending at these words, *Qui pro vobis et pro multis effundetur in remissionem peccatorum*, and without any levation or lifting up.¹⁴

¹⁰ Gordon P. Jeanes, *Signs of God’s Promise* (London: T&T Clark, 2008), 110.

¹¹ Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer: A Life* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), 385.

¹² *Ibid.*, 386.

¹³ Jeanes, *op. cit.*, 111.

¹⁴ Thomas Cranmer, *The Order of the Communion*, 1548

http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bcp/Communion_1548.htm (accessed on June 30, 2016).

MacCulloch argues that the “clear purpose of *The Order of the Communion* in text and rubric was to attack the notion of real presence....”¹⁵

Also published in 1548 was the *Catechism*, which Cranmer apparently adapted from Osiander’s 1533 work, which itself was based on Luther’s *Small Catechism* of 1529, with disastrous results, because of the Lutheran real presence language that he had not sufficiently stripped out.¹⁶ By the third edition, no fewer than six changes were made to the eucharistic passages, which resulted in numerous inconsistencies in the text which later came back to haunt Cranmer at his trial for heresy.

Cranmer’s Prayer Book of 1549, *The Booke of Common Prayer and the Administracion of the Sacramentes, and other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church after the Use of the Church of England* was a prayer book for a people, not a priesthood. It combined the five principal medieval service books: Breviary (Morning and Evening Prayer, Litany and Psalter); Missal (Holy Communion, Collects, Epistles and Gospels); Manual (Occasional services); Pontifical (Confirmation and Ordinal); and Pie (Calendar and Tables, directions for Priest). Largely based on the Sarum rite in structure, but in English rather than Latin, it maintained the familiar vestments, altars, and other trappings of the medieval church. The First Prayer Book was a mixture of tradition and innovation, allowing the church to move in the direction of a more reformed liturgy without scandalizing conservatives too much. Cranmer’s genius as a liturgist is imprinted on every page.

The focus here will be the Communion service, which Cranmer called *The Supper of the*

¹⁵ MacCulloch, *ibid.*

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 391.

Lord and the Holy Communion, Commonly Called the Mass. As Jeanes notes, “this [title] serves as a clue that Reformation theology is to be found disguised, as it were, in medieval dress.”¹⁷ The Collect for Purity and Lord’s Prayer are prayed aloud. The introit psalm, *Kyrie* and *Gloria* are followed by two Collects, one of which is for the King, then the Epistle and Gospel, but the Gradual, Alleluia and Sequence are eliminated. Next is the Creed and the sermon (earlier than in the Sarum), followed by an exhortation to worthily receive communion, as well as an additional exhortation about private confession and absolution, which Cranmer made optional but commended. The service includes an Offertory at which point the people were to deposit alms for the poor but there is no Offertory prayer commending the oblation of bread and the wine to God. Instead, the Offertory sentences consist of a selection of Biblical texts referring to the offering of alms.

Colin Buchanan argues that Cranmer therefore accepts much language of offering, but “all the medieval understanding and use of it is on his view is in great need of remodeling.”¹⁸ All references to offering the consecrated elements as a sacrifice or oblation were eliminated. Per Buchanan, “there is in his understanding no such presence of Christ in the Eucharist as would enable us to offer him to the Father, and no instituted action to be fulfilled with the elements except the eating and drinking of them.”¹⁹ Further, Buchanan argues that

Moderns might also care to notice that both Cranmer and Gardiner agree that the Greek *anamnesis* means ‘remembering’ – the frequent use of ‘remembrance’ and its cognates never seems to include the idea popularized in the twentieth century that a ‘memorial’ is either a recalling objectively into the present of the sacrifice of Christ, or a pleading of that sacrifice before the Father....it will be recalled that ‘memorialism’ was a hostile description of Swiss sacramental theology-characterized by its opponents as being a

¹⁷ Jeanes, op. cit., 195.

¹⁸ Colin Buchanan, *What did Cranmer think he was doing?* Grove Liturgical Study No. 7 (Bramcote, Nott.: Grove Books, 1976), 6-7.

¹⁹ Ibid., 6.

‘nuda commemoratio.’ The term ‘memorial’ is not only...in the disputations but in the text of the 1549 rite.²⁰

It seems clear that the nuance of the word “memorial” in Cranmer’s day was quite different from that mental recall activity which the term brings to mind in our day. That Cranmer had in mind *anamnesis* is also evident in the priest’s call of the people to Communion: *The Priest*. Christ our Paschal Lamb is offered up for us once for all, when he bare our sins on his Body upon the cross; for he is the very Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world: *wherefore let us keep a joyful and holy feast with the Lord*.²¹ Cranmer himself in the Preface to the Reader in *A Defense* makes clear his own understanding of the sacrifice of the cross and the dominical command to “do this” – to eat the bread and drink the cup.

Our Savior Christ Jesus...came into this world from the high throne of the Father, to declare unto miserable sinners good news...to preach and give pardon and full remission of sin to all his elected. And to perform the same, he made a *sacrifice and oblation of his own body* upon the cross, which was a *full redemption, satisfaction, and propitiation, for the sins of the whole world*. And to commend this his sacrifice unto all his faithful people, and confirm their faith and hope of eternal salvation in the same, he hath ordained a *perpetual memory* of his said sacrifice, daily to be used in the Church to his perpetual laud and praise...that is to say, the celebration of his holy supper....²²

Therefore there are no gifts offered—the only sacrifice is that of praise and thanksgiving.

Stephen Platten notes that:

All mention of sacrifice is moved back so that it comes after both the preface and the narrative of institution...all the offertory prayers with their strong sacrificial language are removed. Sacrifice remains but it has already become a post-communion thanksgiving. No longer do believers offer themselves to God in the perfect offering of Christ made present in the Eucharist. Now, it is the reception of the sacrament, *the memorial enacted*, that strengthens these to offer themselves to God in Christ and thus to make themselves available for his service.”²³

²⁰ Ibid., 7.

²¹ Italics mine. Keeping the feast with the Lord implies a “commemorative cultic act” to use Gregg’s terminology.

²² Thomas Cranmer, *A Defense of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Savior Christ* (Stoke-on-Trent: Berith Publications, 2004 edition), xxii. All quotes will derive from this edition.

²³ Stephen Platten, “Reanimating sacrifice?” *Theology* Vol.115 no.1 (2012): 28. Italics mine.

It may be argued that, in Platten's terms, "the memorial enacted," is, in fact the *anamnesis* as understood by both the Old and New Testament writers: the remembrance of God's past action that leads to newness of life in the present.

Cranmer's Canon consisted of the *Sursum Corda*, preface, *Sanctus* and *Benedictus*, prayers of intercession (but not for the dead), the setting apart of the bread and wine, and an *anamnesis* prayer celebrating the memorial and requesting the benefits of communion and a self-oblation. Cranmer avoids any sense that Christ's sacrifice is repeatable by adapting the Sarum oblation prayer; he makes clear that the oblation is not that of Christ to the Father but ourselves as the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, consistent with his reading of Romans 12: 1:

O God heavenly father, which 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 oblation 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 celebrate a perpetual memory of that his precious death, until his coming again:

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.

Who in the same night that he was betrayed, (*Here the Priest must take the Bread into his hands*) took bread, and when he had blessed, and given thanks, he brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying: Take, eat, this is my body which is given for you, do this in remembrance of me.

Likewise after supper, he took (*Here the Priest shall take the Cup into his hands*) the cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, saying: drink ye all of this, for this is my blood of the new Testament, which is shed for you and for many, for the remission of sins: do this, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of me.

These words before rehearsed are to be said, turning still to the Altar, without any elevation, or shewing the Sacrament to the people.

There is an (almost) consecratory epiclesis inserted before the words of institution (bless and sanctify), but the petition is for the Holy Spirit and Word (that is, the institution narrative) "that they may be unto us the body and blood." Buchanan notes that this is a radical departure from

the words of the Latin canon, “we...offer to thy most excellent majesty...the pure victim, the holy victim’ ...the medieval doctrine of consecration meant that it was now Christ himself whom the priest, with and on behalf of the church, offered to the Father. And this...Cranmer did not believe.”²⁴ Cranmer’s concept of consecration had clearly shifted. Moreover, as Buchanan further notes, neither the word consecration nor its cognates is used and the prayer for supplementary consecration from the *Communion Service* is not included.²⁵ MacCulloch argues that for Cranmer at this point in his thinking, “the presence of Christ in the Eucharist was to be associated with the gift of the Holy Spirit. It is therefore much safer to describe Cranmer as holding a ‘spiritual presence’ view of the Eucharist from at least 1549....”²⁶ Kavanagh sums up Cranmer’s understanding of Christ’s presence in the Eucharist thus: “Christ was really present in time past in the incarnation; he is present now really in heaven; he is now present by his power, through the sacraments, on the basis of the receiver’s contemplation of faith.”²⁷ The Eucharist, then, is understood to be a commemoration of the Last Supper. Cranmer makes this clear in the offertory prayer:

O Lord and heavenly father, according to the Institution of thy dearly beloved son, our saviour Jesu Christ, 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, mighty resurrection, and glorious ascension, rendering unto thee most hearty thanks, for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same, 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.

And here we offer and present unto thee (O Lord) ourselves, our souls, and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto thee: humbly beseeching thee, that whosoever shall be partakers of this holy Communion, may worthily receive the most precious body and blood of thy son Jesus Christ: and be fulfilled with thy grace and

²⁴ Buchanan, op. cit., 17.

²⁵ Buchanan, op. cit., 16. See also Jeanes, op. cit., 197-201.

²⁶ MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer: A Life*, 392.

²⁷ Kavanagh, op. cit., 132.

heavenly benediction, and *made one body with thy son Jesu Christ*, that he may dwell in them, and they in him.

Jeanes rather gleefully notes that “Cranmer’s use of Sarum as a source by no means demonstrates his allegiance to its theology!”²⁸

The words of administration at communion may be read, however, to maintain the Catholic sense of real presence: “*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.*” Jeanes argues, however, the words “must be understood as a prayer for spiritual communion, asking that the communicant receiving the sacrament may also receive by faith the body and blood of Christ.”²⁹ However, the rubric providing for the reserved sacrament lends credence to the notion that the real presence in the consecrated bread and wine was assumed. Cranmer’s intent is therefore not clear.

Overall, Cranmer’s *Communion Service* emphasized the act of communion and the consequent change in the faithful believers who receive, rather than the change effected in the elements. Brooks has argued that “Cranmer’s Canon thus cleverly concealed revolution behind the conservative forms of hallowed usage. Indeed, the *Communion Service* of 1549 is “a monument to the kind of cautious approach to Reformation that the Archbishop almost certainly hoped would both satisfy the ardent spirits, and carry the country with him.”³⁰

Unfortunately for Archbishop Cranmer, this first effort at an English Prayer Book satisfied no one: Protestants found it too Catholic, Catholics too Protestant. Some have argued that the 1549 Eucharist was intentionally transitional and that a more complete revision would

²⁸ Jeanes, op. cit., 197.

²⁹ Ibid.

³⁰ Brooks, op. cit., 75.

follow,³¹ as evidenced by the fact that Cranmer began work on a new Prayer Book as soon as this one was published. In addition, Cranmer himself asked others, including Bucer, to review the *Prayer Book*, which Bucer did in “an extended criticism...entitled *Censura super libro sacrorum sue ordinationis Ecclesiae atque ministerii in regno Angliae* (1550).³² Peter Martyr also provided comments, of which no manuscript is extant. MacCulloch notes that “the opinions of both Bucer and Martyr significantly influenced the revision of the Prayer Book, although Cranmer did not slavishly follow their recommendations in all things.”³³

Cranmer’s seemingly ambiguous eucharistic theology resulted in the writing of his primary theological articulations on the Eucharist, *A Defense of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Savior Christ* (1550),³⁴ which was attacked by Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester. In reply, Cranmer wrote his *Answer unto a Crafty and Sophistical Cavillation*, published in 1558, which contains substantially the same arguments.

In *A Defense*, Cranmer expresses more fully and radically his theology of the Eucharist, particularly his position on Christ’s presence (Book 3) and sacrifice (Book 5), while providing an overall commentary on the Communion service in the 1549 Prayer Book.³⁵ In the Preface, Cranmer dedicates the book to King Edward, stating that “I have considered that the Supper of the Lord...should be renovated and restored according to the institutions of our Saviour Christ, and I have considered that all should be performed according to the authority of the Divine Word and of the Ancient and Holy Church....”³⁶ Cranmer goes on to identify the “popish doctrine of transubstantiation, of the real presence of Christ’s flesh and blood in the sacrament of the altar,

³¹ G.J. Cuming, *A History of Anglican Liturgy* (London: MacMillan and Co Ltd, 1969), 80.

³² Senn, op. cit., 376.

³³ MacCulloch, op. cit., 505.

³⁴ Cranmer, *A Defense*.

³⁵ Brooks, op. cit., 77.

³⁶ Cranmer, *A Defense*, xix.

(as they call it) and of the sacrifice and oblation of Christ made by the priest for the quick and the dead” as the “chief root of all errors.”³⁷

In Book 1, he argues from Scripture what Christ meant the Eucharist to be: a *memorial*. He rails against the notion that “the very natural flesh and blood of Christ, which suffered for us on the cross, and sitteth at the right hand of the Father in heaven, is also really, substantially, corporally and naturally, in or under the accidents of the sacramental bread and wine.”³⁸ Instead, he states, “Christ in his human nature substantially, really, corporally, naturally and sensibly be present with his Father in heaven, yet sacramentally and spiritually he is here present. For in water, bread, wine, he is present as in signs and sacraments, but he is indeed *spiritually in* the faithful Christian people.”³⁹ Therefore Cranmer affirms the importance of the Eucharist, at the same time refuting any carnal eating and drinking. Sacramental presence is not related to real or corporal presence in any way.

Book 2 consists of Cranmer’s argument against transubstantiation, appealing to the fathers of the church (Justin, Irenaeus, Origen, Cyprian, Eusebius, Chrysostom, Augustine and more). He refutes any carnal eating and real presence by referring to the way the bread and the wine *signify* sacramental and spiritual eating. “Outwardly nothing is changed but remaineth the same that was before, but all the alteration in inward and spiritually”⁴⁰

Book 3 consists of Cranmer’s articulation of how Christ is present in the Eucharist: “in them that worthily eat and drink the bread and wine...that he is received in the heart, and

³⁷ Ibid, xxiv.

³⁸ Ibid., 30.

³⁹ Ibid., 32.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 59.

entereth in them by faith.”⁴¹ This focus on worthy reception and the transformation of the receiver rather than the elements is to be a theme with Cranmer.

Book 4 is a further exposition of the eating and drinking of the body and blood as spiritual food and drink by faith. He again cites the Fathers of the Church to support his position.

In Book 5, Cranmer discusses the sacrifice of Christ and its relationship to the Eucharist in some of his harshest language:

The greatest blasphemy and injury that can be against Christ, and yet universally used through the popish kingdom, is this, that the priests make their mass a sacrifice propitiatory, to remit the sins as well of themselves as of other, both quick and the dead, to whom they list to apply the same. Thus, under pretense of holiness, the papistical priests have taken upon them to be Christ’s successors, and to make such an oblation and sacrifices as never creature made but Christ alone, neither he made the same any more times than once, and that was by his death upon the cross.⁴²

Cranmer then goes on to distinguish two types of sacrifice: “propitiatory or merciful,” and sacrifices of “laud, praise and thanksgiving.” Propitiatory sacrifice

[P]acifieth God’s wrath and indignation, and obtaineth mercy and forgiveness for all our sins, and is the ransom for our redemption from everlasting damnation....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 shall ever be...for by his one oblation he satisfied his Father for all men’s sins, and reconciled mankind unto his grace and favour.⁴³

In contrast, says Cranmer, “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 thereby they be called sacrifices of laud, praise, and thanksgiving.”⁴⁴ There can be no doubt about what Cranmer meant to communicate in the Eucharistic Prayer in the 1549 Prayer Book—the language is nearly identical: “*mercifully to accept this our Sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.*” He goes on to say “The first kind of

⁴¹ Ibid., 98.

⁴² Ibid., 232.

⁴³ Ibid., 235.

⁴⁴ Ibid.

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.”⁴⁵ Since this is the case, Cranmer continues, “So that now we may look for none other priest, nor sacrifice, to take away our sins, but only him and his sacrifice...Thus the Scriptures teacheth, that if Christ had made any oblation for sin more than once; he should have died more than once; forasmuch as there is none oblation and sacrifice for sin, but only his death.”⁴⁶ Recall the words of Cranmer’s Eucharistic Prayer: “O God heavenly father, which 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 oblation once offered*) *a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world...*” which leave no doubt about what Cranmer believed. Contrast that with the Sarum language at the elevation of the host: “Which oblation do thou, O Almighty God, we beseech thee, vouchsafe in all respects to make hallowed, approved, ratified, reasonable, and acceptable, that it may be made unto us the body and blood of thy most dear Son our Lord Jesus Christ.”⁴⁷

Jeanes notes that in traditional scholarly understanding of eucharistic sacrifice depends on “the identity of the bread and wine with the body and blood of Christ, and the self-giving of Christ at the Last Supper with his self-giving on the cross...so this understanding of the Eucharist as a sacrifice depended on a theology of the presence of Christ that Cranmer had rejected.”⁴⁸ Having clearly set out his own theology of sacrifice and oblation, Cranmer goes on to vitiate the “papists cavillation.” Speaking of the priests he says

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 237.

⁴⁷ *The Mass According to the Use of Sarum* <http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bcp/Sarum/English.htm> (accessed on April 4, 2016).

⁴⁸ Jeanes, op. cit., 217.

For if they make every day the same oblation and sacrifice for sin that Christ himself made, and the oblation that he made was his death and the effusion of his most precious blood upon the cross for our redemption and price of our sin; then followeth it of necessity, that they every day slay Christ and shed his blood: and so they be worse than the wicked Jews and Pharisees, which slew him and shed his blood but once.⁴⁹

Cranmer goes on to argue that there is no difference between the priest and the lay person, other than the fact that the priest administers the sacrament: “But the very Supper itself was by Christ instituted and given to the whole church, not to be offered and eaten of the priest for other men, by him to be delivered to all that would duly ask it.”⁵⁰ This is a not-so-subtle criticism of the practice of private votive masses (especially for the dead) and with no communicants, which Cranmer anathemizes as idolatrous.

Although others have argued that Cranmer planned a revised Prayer Book all along, Hall claims there is no evidence from contemporaries, and points to Cranmer’s statement in the final book of the *Defense*⁵¹:

But thanks be to the eternal God, the manner of the holy communion, which is now set forth within this realm, is agreeable with the institution of Christ, with St. Paul and the old primitive and apostolic Church, with the right faith of the sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross for our redemption, and with the true doctrine of our salvation, justification, and remission of our sins by that only sacrifice.⁵²

Nonetheless, as we shall see in the next chapter, Cranmer revised the 1549 Prayer Book in 1552.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 241.

⁵⁰ Cranmer, *A Defense*, 246.

⁵¹ Basil Hall, “Cranmer, The Eucharist and the Foreign Divines in the Reign of Edward VI,” in *Thomas Cranmer: Churchman and Scholar*, ed. Paul Ayris and David Selwyn (Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1993), 237.

⁵² Cranmer, *A Defense*, 257.

Chapter Three:

The Second Edwardian Prayer Book (1552) and The Elizabethan Prayer Book (1559)

Whether a revised Prayer Book was Cranmer's intention or not, The Second Prayer Book of 1552 attempted to address issues and misunderstandings that had arisen as a result of the language of the 1549, and reflects a much more Protestant and Reformed theology. This major shift was signified by the change in the title of the rite. Whereas the 1549 Prayer Book was called *The Supper of the Lord, and the Holy Communion, Commonly Called The Mass*, the second was given the title *The Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion*. (See Appendix A for a comparison of the order of service 1549 and 1552.) Remembrance and worthy reception take center stage, in the language of the prayers, in the order of service, and in the rubrical instructions.

The Mass is no more. The rite still begins with the Lord's Prayer and Collect for Purity, but the order of service is much changed: the Introits are omitted; the Decalogue is added with *Kyrie*, the *Gloria* is moved to the end; the *Benedictus* and *Agnus Dei* are omitted; the Prayer for the Whole State of Christ's Church is separated from the Canon and moved earlier. The Prayer of Humble Access is moved to an earlier position after the *Sanctus*. The Eucharistic Prayer is transformed into an instruction in preparation for reception of the bread and wine:

Priest: Almighty God, our heavenly father, which 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, and did institute, and in his holy Gospel command us to *continue, a perpetual memory* of that his precious death, until his coming again: Hear us O merciful father we 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: who, in the same night that he was betrayed, took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and gave it to his Disciples, saying:*

Take, eat, this is my body which is given for you. Do this in remembrance of me. Likewise after supper he took the cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, saying: Drink ye all of this, for this is my blood of the new Testament, which is shed for you and for many, for the remission of sins: do this as oft as ye shall drink it in remembrance of me.

Cranmer here clearly positions the Eucharist as an act of remembrance ('perpetual memory') of Christ's sacrificial death. The proponents of this 'appropriation theory' of *anamnesis*, as Gregg has argued, "view the eucharistic action mainly as a visual aid to stimulate their mental recollection of Christ's sacrifice, or who believe it is chiefly the faithful reception of the bread and wine as tokens of their receiving the benefits of Christ's death, which constitutes obedience to the anamnestic imperative."¹ In Cranmer's case, both definitions are relevant.

The prayer of Thanksgiving follows the distribution, followed by the Gloria—moved from its earlier position to the end of the liturgy, just before the dismissal. There is no offertory, no consecration, no fraction. Eliminating these actions makes clear that the Eucharist is not a representation of Christ's sacrifice, one of Cranmer's key concerns. At the words of institution, the priest is not directed to take bread and cup in hand. The epiclesis is removed entirely. The only thanksgiving is for Christ's completed work on Calvary. The prayer of oblation and doxology are moved to a position after communion. "And here we offer and present unto thee, O lord, ourselves, our souls, and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto thee...."

The focal point of the Eucharist is reception since there is no consecration of or change in the elements, emphasizing Cranmer's belief that only when received by faith does the recipient receive the body and blood of Christ--through the heart. This emphasis permeates the exhortation to communion:

Dearly beloved in the Lord: ye that mind to come to the holy Communion of the body and blood of our saviour Christ, must consider what St. Paul writeth to the Corinthians,

¹ David Gregg, *Anamnesis in the Eucharist*, Grove Liturgical Study No. 5 (Bramcote: Grove Books, 1976), 4.

how he exhorteth all persons diligently to try and examine themselves, before they presume to eat of that bread, and drink of that cup: for as the benefit is great, if with a truly 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 be one with Christ, and Christ with us;)* so is the danger great, if we receive the same unworthily.

Corresponding to this theology, Cranmer changed the words of administration to “Take and eat this, in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on Him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving.” According to McCulloch, “all Gardiner’s points were met by revision [of the communion rite], in order to clarify the spiritual presence view of the Eucharist which Cranmer had advanced in the *Defence and Answer*,” particularly the words of administration.² The Peace is omitted, and the Lord’s Prayer delayed until after communion.

As Platten points out: “The key, then, was to retain the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, the reasonable, holy and lively sacrifice and the offering of ourselves, our souls and bodies, but to make it crystal clear that this was not a crude repetition of the perfect sacrifice of our Lord. This was the key to the Reformers’ concerns. It must be a theology of representation and not re-presentation.”³

The rubrics also provide insights into Cranmer’s intentions. He instructs that “bread such as usual to be eaten at the table” (not wafers) should be placed in the communicants’ hands, not in the mouth. Further he insists, “If any of the bread or wine remain, the curate shall have it to his own use” – clearly indicating that no consecration has taken place. Finally, 1552 includes the “Declaration on Kneeling,” commonly called “The Black Rubric,” the insertion of which, according to McCulloch Cranmer himself vehemently opposed⁴. This declaration, printed in black instead of the usual red, was inserted by the Privy Council, as the 1552 Prayer Book was

² MacCulloch, op.cit., 506.

³ Platten, op. cit., 29.

⁴ MacCulloch, op. cit., argues this point in detail, 525-530.

going to print, and was an attempt, without the authority of Parliament, to deny any connection between kneeling and the corporal presence of Christ in the sacramental elements of bread and wine. “For concerning the Sacramental bread and wine, they remain still in their very natural national substances, and therefore may not adored, for that were idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians, as concerning the nature body and blood of our savior Christ, they are in heaven and not here.”⁵ The rubric makes explicit that kneeling to receive communion was an expression of "humble and grateful acknowledging of the benefits of Christ, given unto the worthy receiver" and was “not meant thereby that any adoration is done or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread and wine there bodily received or unto any real or essential presence of Christ’s natural flesh and blood.”⁶

A new Act of Uniformity authorizing the use of the Second Prayer Book was passed in October 1552. This Prayer Book too, proved controversial; it was only in use for a few months. Edward died in 1553, at which point his half-sister Mary Tudor (daughter of Henry VIII and Catherine of Aragon) ascended the throne and restored Catholicism to England. Mary was still bitter about Cranmer’s part in the divorce of her mother and father. Revenge may well have been the motive behind her persecution of Cranmer, who died a martyr to the cause of a reformed Church of England. It was left to Elizabeth I, daughter of Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn to revive and revise the 1552 *Book of Common Prayer* with its reformed eucharistic theology, into the 1559 BCP, which essentially looked back to the traditional understanding of *anamnesis* rather than the Protestant notion of memorialism.

Cranmer’s Eucharistic Theology Undone: The Elizabethan Prayer Book (1559)

⁵ *Second Prayer Book of Edward VI (1552) The Order for the Administration of the Lord’s Supper or Holy Communion*, http://archive.churchsociety.org/publications/liturgy/Lit_1552_Holy_Communion.pdf (accessed on February 22, 2016).

⁶ Ibid.

When Mary Tudor died in 1558, she was succeeded by her half-sister Elizabeth, daughter of Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn. A Protestant, Elizabeth early in her reign worked to swiftly bring back the Prayer Book in English, replacing Mary's Latin liturgy and restoring Royal Supremacy. However, the Edwardian Prayer Book (1552) was not restored in its entirety. Elizabeth herself was apparently involved in the revisions, which were aimed at appeasing those with more catholic leanings—a political as well as a theological move. In fact, Elizabeth herself may have been more traditionally “catholic” in her own faith, as evidence from the Chapel Royal demonstrates,⁷ including the fact that her Chapel had both a crucifix and candles, which were forbidden in parish churches. The 1559 BCP had a much longer life than either of its predecessors, nearly 100 years, until it was outlawed by the Puritan Parliament in 1645. The Elizabethan Prayer Book was also the first Prayer Book used in America, brought by settlers in the early 1600s.

Changes made to the Communion service have been interpreted variously; however, it may be argued that they had the effect of the Book being less Protestant. The most obvious changes to the Communion Service of 1559 were three. The first was the inclusion, in a prominent location before Morning Prayer, of the so-called “ornaments rubric”: “And here is to be noted, that such Ornaments of the Church, and of the Ministers thereof, at all Times of their Ministration, shall be retained, and be in use, as were in this Church of England, by the Authority of Parliament, in the Second Year of the Reign of King Edward the Sixth.” In other words, the chalice and paten, bells, and all the other usual objects, linens and furnishings, and vestments of the earlier rite were to be used. The eucharistic vestments were a particular source of contention among the clergy: those who held continental views refused to wear any garment which to them

⁷ Roger Bowers, “The Chapel Royal, the First Edwardian Prayer Book, and Elizabeth's Settlement of Religion, 1559,” *The Historical Journal*, Vol. 43, No. 2 (June, 2000): 317.

implied Real Presence.⁸ There was some confusion about exactly to which Prayer Book customs the “ornaments rubric” referred, because the “Second Year” began on January 28 1548 and the Act approving the introduction of the first *Book of Common Prayer* was approved by Parliament on January 21 1549.

The second change was the elimination of the “Black Rubric,” which had been inserted to deny any connection between kneeling and the corporal presence of Christ in the sacramental elements of bread and wine. In addition, the words of administration at Communion in 1559 combine those of 1549 and 1552, nominally allowing for the real presence of Christ in the bread and wine, but received by faith. The doctrines of real presence and receptionism may be therefore seen as combined:

And when he delivereth the bread, he shall say,

The body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul into everlasting life: and take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thine heart by faith, with thanksgiving.

And the Minister that delivereth the cup, shall say,

The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ which was shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul into everlasting life: and drink this in remembrance that Christ's blood was shed for thee, and be thankful.

However, it is ambiguous that the Communion service of 1559 affirmed a doctrine of the real presence of Christ in the consecrated bread and wine. The text is largely the same as that of 1552. The exhortation to communion remains the same:

DEARLY beloved, 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 declare unto us, as well by God's word as by the holy Sacraments of his blessed body and blood, the which being so comfortable a thing to them which receive it worthily, and so dangerous to them

⁸ Louis E. Daniels, “The Ornaments Rubric: Its History and Force,” *The Anglican Society*, n.d., http://anglicanhistory.org/liturgy/daniels_ornaments.html (accessed on January 10, 2017).

that will presume to received it unworthily: My duty is to exhort you to consider the dignity of the holy mystery...

As in 1552, there is no offertory prayer and no mention of oblation or sacrifice, other than praise and thanksgiving. The emphasis in 1559 remains on the memorial aspect of the Eucharist: “to continue a perpetual memory of that his precious death until his coming again,” which text appears in the prayer for worthy reception before the institution narrative. There is no “Amen” at the end of the instruction, further refuting the sense that the prayer itself is one of consecration; rather, it serves as an instruction. The recollection of the institution of the Lord’s Supper is followed immediately by reception of the bread and wine. It is all one action – the minister recalling Christ’s institution of the Eucharist and the communicants receiving the bread and wine. In addition, there is no rubric requiring the priest to “consecrate” additional bread and wine if the amount used in the service is not sufficient to communicate all present. The rubric at the end of the service repeats what was allowed in the 1552 rite, that “if any of the bread or wine remains, the Curate shall have it to his own use.” In other words, there is no reserved sacrament – the bread and wine in the communion service revert back to ordinary usage, because they have not been consecrated.

Still, McCulloch argues that

One of the most striking features of Elizabeth’s 1559 Settlement was that it began the Church of England’s long march away from Cranmer’s eucharistic theology, if only in small details. The clarity of Cranmer’s sacramental intentions was undermined by restoring to the communion service the 1549 formula of administering bread and wine to communicants which he had replaced in 1552, simply shackled to the later formula: was the communicant receiving the body and blood of Christ, or taking the elements in remembrance that Christ died for human salvation?⁹

Elizabeth accepted the 1552 BCP as a condition of the Settlement, even as her own practice remained less reformed. Although no additional changes were made to text of the Prayer

⁹ Diarmaid MacCulloch, *Thomas Cranmer: A Life* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998), 621.

Book itself, Cuming notes that large quantities of supplementary material appeared during her reign which had the effect of bringing back some “catholic” practices, including Church furnishings and vestments.¹⁰ Not unlike its predecessors, according to Cuming, “no-one really wanted the Prayer Book that they had been given. Those of the exiles who were prepared to use the 1552 Book opposed the retention of even the few ceremonies that remained in it, and many wished to abandon the book altogether.”¹¹

Nonetheless, the 1559 *Book of Common Prayer*, with few revisions (1604), none to the Communion service, remained in use in England through the reign of James IV of Scotland (1556-1625), also known as James I of England. James was the son of Catholic Mary, Queen of Scots and her second husband Lord Darnley. He ascended the throne of England in 1603, on the death of his cousin and godmother Elizabeth I (who, after much angst had his mother beheaded for plotting against her). Like Elizabeth, James was raised Protestant. He moved to England upon his accession and rarely visited Scotland thereafter. The Puritan clergy in England immediately made demands for a more reformed church, primarily with regard to ceremonial. For example, they called for the abolition of the “sign of the cross in baptism, the marriage ring, and the surplice.”¹² Most of these were rejected by James but the Millenary Petition (1603) led to the Hampton Court Conference, which in turn led to the BCP of 1604 as well as the King James translation of the Bible.

Under James (and his successor and son Charles I), “a High Church party developed under the leadership of the Archbishop of Canterbury, William Laud. The High Churchmen could be as critical of the Prayer Book as the Puritans, although for opposite reasons; they

¹⁰ G.J. Cuming, *A History of Anglican Liturgy* (London: MacMillan and Company, 1969), 124 ff.

¹¹ Ibid., 131.

¹² Frank C. Senn, *Christian Liturgy: Catholic and Evangelical* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1997), 505.

wished to restore the old Catholic order (which eventually led to Laud's execution).¹³ Senn notes that "while the Church warded off Catholic plots, keeping at bay Puritan criticism, a definite style of church life developed."¹⁴ This church life was informed by the work of Richard Hooker, widely credited as the originator of the Anglican notion of a *via media* between Catholicism and Protestantism, but MacCulloch notes that "nowhere in any of his writings does Hooker use either the word Anglicanism or the phrase *via media*."¹⁵ Hooker's *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* describes a theology that draws on scripture, reason and tradition (known today as Anglicanism's three-legged stool); he also located the church's place in society and why the individual should participate in it. Whether or not Hooker should be situated in the mainstream of Protestant Reformed theology, or that he merely sought to oppose Puritan extremism rather than striving to move the Church of England away from Protestantism, as has been the traditional view, is not settled.¹⁶ Nonetheless, if we take him at face value, his Preface states that it was written to counteract the dangers posed by Presbyterians and Puritans within the English Church.¹⁷ Other important figures included churchmen Lancelot Andrewes, Bishop of Ely, and, John Donne, Dean of St. Paul's¹⁸, who developed a cathedral style of preaching. George Herbert, priest and poet, was the exemplar of Anglican spirituality. Throughout these currents of change, the eucharistic theology of the 1559 Prayer Book remained intact in 1604.

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁵ Diarmaid MacCulloch, "Richard Hooker's Reputation," in *A Companion to Richard Hooker*, ed. Torrance Kirby (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 564.

¹⁶ Michael Brydon, in *The Evolving Reputation of Richard Hooker: An Examination of Responses, 1660–1714* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), argues the former. MacCulloch argues the latter.

¹⁷ Richard Hooker, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity, 1597*, Edited by Arthur Stephen McGrade (New York: Oxford University Press, 2013).

¹⁸ North Carolina State University has created an amazing virtual reality simulation of Donne's sermon for Gunpowder Day in St. Paul's Cross pulpit in the courtyard of St Paul's Cathedral. You can see and hear it here: <https://vpcp.chass.ncsu.edu/> (accessed on July 21, 2016).

James attempted to bring the Scottish Kirk closer to the Anglican ritual, but his plans were largely thwarted other than restoring the episcopacy. The liturgy and sacramental theology of the Kirk differed from that of England, following that drawn up by John Knox et al. in Geneva in 1556, although in some places the *Book of Common Prayer* seems to have been used. The Kirk's eucharistic theology was fully Reformed. While Christ's body and blood are present in the sacrament, his presence is communicated in a spiritual or mystical manner rather than by his body being physically present in the instruments of the bread and the wine—symbolic instrumentalism. The Kirk's reformed liturgy, derived from the *Genevan Service Book*, which became the *Service Book of the Church of Scotland*, was focused on the Word and spurned accretions not seen to be Biblical, for example, gestures such as kneeling. It was in fact the first Puritan prayer book. The Kirk's polity was congregational rather than episcopal. The church in Scotland would remain Presbyterian despite attempts to impose an English liturgy upon it.

Chapter Four: The 1662 *Book of Common Prayer*: Theological Ambiguity but Liturgical Stability

After a bitter civil war and the restoration of the monarchy 1660, the Church of England was re-established as the nation's church, bishops were re-appointed, and parish clergy were required to have been ordained by the bishop of their diocese. In order to consolidate the Church's authority while at the same time making it possible for persons of differing theological points of view to worship together, a new Prayer Book was introduced in 1662. The Preface states

Our general aim therefore in this undertaking was, *not to gratify this or that party in any of their unreasonable demands*; but to do that, which to our best understandings we conceived might most tend to the preservation of Peace and Unity in the Church; the procuring of Reverence, and exciting of Piety and Devotion in the publick Worship of God; and the cutting off occasion from them that seek occasion of cavil or quarrel against the Liturgy of the Church.

And as to the several variations from the former Book, whether by Alteration, Addition, or otherwise, it shall suffice to give this general account. That most of the Alterations were made, either first, for the *better direction of them that are to officiate* in any part of Divine Service; which is chiefly done in the Calendars and Rubricks: Or secondly, for the *more proper expressing* of some words or phrases of ancient usage in terms more suitable to the language of the present times, and the *clearer explanation* of some other words and phrases, that were either of doubtful signification, or otherwise liable to misconstruction....¹

Thus the intent of the restoring revisers was clear: The *Book of Common Prayer* is a “publick Liturgy” that reflects a *via media* between extremes, based upon historical materials: “the Body and Essentials of it (as well in the chiefest materials, as in the frame and order thereof) have still continued the same unto this day, and do yet stand firm and unshaken, notwithstanding all the vain attempts and impetuous assaults made against it...” The revived Prayer Book included the

¹ *The Book of Common Prayer 1662*, <http://www.eskimo.com/~lhowell/bcp1662>, accessed on June 24, 2016. All citations will derive from this version. Italics mine.

Articles of Religion, which strive to further clarify the theology of the Church, although these, too, are subject to interpretation.

The text of 1662 varied very little from that of 1552, although some 600 changes were made, most extremely subtle; it was still recognizably Cranmer's text. However, as indicated in the Preface, important changes were made to the rubrics, most having to do with the celebration of the Eucharist—a nod to the Laudian High Church—which resulted in an inherently more Catholic Communion service experience for worshipers—closer to that of the 1549 BCP. Much of the ceremonial that had been stripped out of the Communion Service of 1549 in 1552 was restored in 1662, including, for example, moving the altar back into the body of the church or chancel, covered with a “fair linen cloth,” the vesting of the priest and his position behind the altar rather than on the north side, and the reinstatement of manual acts indicated at the consecration. Consequently, it can be argued that a theology of the Eucharist closer to that of 1549 was revived as well, although the juxtaposition of the text with the rubrics leads to ambiguity about the intent of the revisers. Some have argued that the ambiguity is intentional, a compromise between realist and nominal views of the Eucharist; it may also reflect a compromise between the High Church contingent and the Presbyterians, who lost the battle for an alternative service book. This will be explored further below.

The reordering of the parts of the Communion service, even as the texts remained the largely the same, changes the theological thrust of the liturgy. Restoring the Offertory by the insertion of the words “and oblations” into the Prayer for the Church Militant, along with the revision of the rubric to require the alms to be brought to the table (instead of being put in the poor box) and for the bread and wine to be placed upon the table, implies that they function as a sacrifice to God. The Prayer for the Church Militant restores the reference to both oblations: “We

humbly beseech thee most mercifully [to accept our alms and oblations, and²] to receive these our prayers..." and a thanksgiving for those "departed this life in thy faith and fear" was inserted, introducing the petition that the congregation be "given grace so to follow their good examples that with them we may be partakers of thy heavenly kingdom." While not restoring the prayer for the departed which had been removed in 1552, the wording leans in that (Catholic) direction. Whether the bread and wine are to be considered "oblations" has been the subject of scholarly debate;³ however, their placement on the Table at this point invites the conclusion that they are an offering to God. The Prayer of Humble Access is found in Cranmer's 1552 position after the Preface and *Sanctus* and before the institution narrative, functioning as second confession of unworthiness even to receive the Holy Communion. Immediately following is the institution narrative, which Cranmer and the Reformers considered to be the complete Eucharistic prayer, but it is re-titled "The Prayer of Consecration." Consecration characterizes the bread and wine as the body and blood of Christ (even if no physical change is implied or assumed or intended). In addition, the rubric clearly anticipates the Fraction: "When the Priest, standing before the Table, hath so ordered the Bread and Wine, that he may with the more readiness and decency *break the Bread before the people*, and take the Cup into his hands, he shall say the Prayer of Consecration, as followeth." At the Words of Institution, the manual acts are specified in the rubric: "(a) Here the Priest is to take the Paten unto his hands: (b) And here to break the Bread: (c) And here to lay his hand upon all the Bread. (d) Here he is to take the Cup into his hand: (e) And here to lay his hand upon every vessel (be it Chalice or Flagon) in which there is any Wine to be consecrated." There can be no doubt that consecration is intended. The word "Amen" is added here to signify the end of the consecration and to separate it from

² If there were no alms, this phrase was to be left out.

³ Brian Douglas, "The 1662 Book of Common Prayer: Assessing its Eucharistic Theology 350 Years On," *Pacifica* Vol. 25, no. 3 (October 2012): 277.

reception. The *amen* also signifies the assent of the congregation and gives the congregation a role in the liturgy that had been eliminated in 1552 but existed in 1549. The people are to receive Communion in their hands “meekly kneeling” as in 1552. The words of administration from 1549 are restored along with the words from 1552, as in 1559—the original *via media*, originally agreed to—or suggested by -- Elizabeth I.

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.

While there was doubtless enough time for the Queen or King to hear each in its entirety, it is likely that the priest would say the above while communicating a line of persons at the altar rail as is the case today when the entire formula is used in Anglo-Catholic parishes. The rubric that follows provides for the consecration of additional bread and wine if not enough has been consecrated to commune all those who present themselves:

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, &c.] for the blessing of the Bread; and at [Likewise after Supper, &c.] for the blessing of the Cup.

When all have communicated, the Minister shall return to the Lord's Table, and reverently place upon it what remaineth of the consecrated Elements, covering the same with a fair linen cloth.

If any of the elements remain, only those unconsecrated are to revert to the Curate's use as in 1552; the consecrated elements are to be consumed within the Church.

Finally, in a concession to the Puritans, the Black Rubric on kneeling was included, but with slightly altered wording, denying Christ's “corporal presence” instead of 1552's “real and essential presence”:

Whereas it is ordained in this Office for the Administration of the Lord's Supper, that the Communicants should receive the same kneeling.... 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.

The question of whether this change was purely semantic or deliberately ambiguous eucharistic theology has, as in the case of the word oblation, been extensively debated.⁴ Certainly no fleshly presence is implied. Douglas argues persuasively that “there is no specific rejection of the “real presence” of Christ in the Eucharist in the 1662 BCP; that is, where such real presence involves no change in the substance of the bread and wine.”⁵ Further, with regard to transubstantiation, the *Articles of Religion* are unambiguous in rejecting it: “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. The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner.”⁶

Brian Douglas contends that the Anglican eucharistic tradition enshrined in the 1662 Prayer Book reflects multiple understandings concerning what transpires at the Eucharist—both realist and nominalist. According to Douglas,

In the 1662 BCP Eucharist, for example, an Anglican realist would argue that when the words: “Grant us therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the flesh of thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink his blood” are spoken, that Christ is really present and received in the Eucharist and the Eucharistic elements of bread and wine, although this is of course distinguished from any fleshy notions of Christ's presence...Realists would also argue that Christ's sacrifice is dynamically remembered in the Eucharist, such that the effects of

⁴ Douglas, op. cit., 280.

⁵ Ibid., 279.

⁶ *Articles of Religion*, <http://www.eskimo.com/~lhowell/bcp1662/articles/articles.html> (accessed on June 24, 2016). All references derive from this edition.

that sacrifice are re-newed and re-presented.... Realists interpret the words of the 1662 BCP Prayer of Consecration in this way when it states that Christ “did institute, and in his holy Gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory of that his precious death, until his coming again.”⁷

Anglican realists, then, would view the 1662 Eucharist as anamnetic—not simply a remembrance or memorial of Christ’s sacrifice, because the worshipers participate in the perpetual memory *by receiving communion*. Douglas goes on to say that nominalists, on the other hand, deny this “analysis of sacramental instrumentality and argue that all we have are particular signs, which function in a metalinguistic manner to remind us to give thanks for past and completed transactions, without any real participation in, or instantiation of, what they signify.”⁸ Further, he argues “[t]he Eucharist therefore functions principally as a reminder only, acting as the moment of remembering a past and completed action and the giving of thanks for the benefits of that action in people's lives without any realist linking between the signs and what they signify.”⁹ A realist perspective, then, sees the Eucharist as *anamnesis*, while a nominalist would describe the Eucharist strictly as a memorial. Both realist and nominalist interpretations are possible in interpreting the text of the 1662 Prayer Book, which may account for its relative longevity and influence.

The 1662 *Book of Common Prayer* includes the *Thirty Nine Articles* (1563, revised 1571). In the Sacraments section, XXVIII. Of the Lord's Supper, the text reads:

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. *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.

⁷Douglas, op. cit., 274-275.

⁸ Ibid.

⁹ Ibid., 276.

There is still no ambiguity about the sacrifice of Christ on the Cross or the validity of the “sacrifice of the Mass”:

XXXI. 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.

In summary, the majority of the changes to the 1662 Prayer Book were rubrical, not textual, and the changes to the text were slight. However, as Colin Buchanan notes, “in wording (and thus in explicit doctrine), the service stands where it stood in 1552, and yet the ‘feel’ of it is subtly changed. The priest functions ‘up there.’ The consecration is a priestly event. The consecrated elements have a special character independently of reception. The rite has now moved to a 1549-type diagram--it has two ‘moments’ (consecration and reception)”¹⁰ The changes made largely pertained to the ceremonial aspects of the eucharistic liturgy, but in such a way as to create theological ambiguity and allow the various factions to interpret the meaning to suit their point of view. On the other hand, the Offertory, Consecration, and Fraction were restored, with manual acts to accompany these inserted via rubric, with the effect of rendering this Communion service closer to that of 1549 and its predecessor Sarum rite theologically—restoring the concept of eucharistic sacrifice and real presence which Cranmer had rejected. The “Black Rubric” on kneeling was included in 1662 as a concession to the Presbyterians, but with a change in the wording: the denial of Christ’s “corporal presence” (which Cranmer and the reformers affirmed) but not 1552’s “real and essential presence” (the meaning of which is ambiguous and has been interpreted in a multitude of ways). At the same time, transubstantiation continues to be rejected, but what is meant by Christ’s “presence” --other than not bodily--in the

¹⁰ Buchanan, *op. cit.*, 31.

Eucharist is left open to interpretation. The words of administration at Communion are a somewhat muddled combination of 1549 (real presence) and 1552 (reception), again leaving considerable ambiguity about the presence of Christ in the Eucharist. While the text is traceable to Cranmer, it is debatable that the liturgy reflects his mature eucharistic theology. (A table comparing the 1549, 1552, and 1649 Communion services appears in Appendix B.) Julie Nichols' observation is incisive:

[T]he 1549 and 1552/1662 eucharistic models are quite differently weighted. Thus, at the outset, assumptions can be made about the significance attached in each case to the various actions that constitute the whole eucharistic celebration. These assumptions begin to point beyond the structural markers in the action...to the place of the worshippers in relation to acts of consecration and reception.¹¹

She goes on to point out that

[t]he communion service proposes different aspects of God, and different ways for the liturgical community to perceive itself. In the transition from 1549 to 1552 this occurs through observable variations in the sequence of ritual events. For the second stage (1552-1662) the structural evidence must be amplified with reference to those performative aspects of liturgy which are not readily tabulated.¹²

Cranmer intended *The Book of Common Prayer* to be a prayer book for a people, not a priesthood, which is one reason why he developed a service book in the vernacular – eliminating the need for the people to have specialized knowledge of an archaic language in order to participate in the prayers. The effect of beginning the service with the Ten Commandments interwoven with the response “Lord have mercy” informs a penitential rite, not one of celebration. This was reinforced by the position of the Prayer of Humble Access. When Cranmer restored the cup to the laity in 1549, the intent was to encourage their full inclusion in the sacred mysteries. Unfortunately, by adding strongly worded exhortations to worthy reception, it soon became clear that the effect was the opposite of his intention. The people were cowed to the

¹¹ Nichols, op. cit., 59.

¹² Ibid., 60.

point that they ceased to present themselves for Communion, which itself resulted in the subsequent need to delineate the number of times the people were to receive annually.

Further, in wrestling with the concept of sacrifice, Cranmer recognized that the Eucharist both commemorates the sacrifice of Christ and elicits a corresponding sacrifice of “ourselves, our souls and bodies,” in thanksgiving for that sacrifice. In order to reinforce the point that the sacrifice of Christ was a past event that was unrepeatable, in the 1552 BCP he repudiated transubstantiation and did away with the priestly action of consecrating the bread and the wine. The offering was thus a joint action by the priest and people, one of remembrance, and the reception of Communion was spiritual nourishment. By restoring the offertory, fraction and consecration to the 1662 BCP, the role of the people is changed once again.

The 1662 Prayer Book has been enormously influential. It remains the official Prayer Book of the Church of England. It has been reprinted hundreds of times, and multiple languages (among them Latin, French, German, Spanish, Hebrew, Dutch, Arabic, Chinese)¹³ and has been in use continuously throughout the Anglican Communion to the present day. Many other denominations have borrowed from or based their liturgies upon the BCP.

¹³ <http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bcp/languages.html> (accessed on June 24, 2016).

Chapter Five:

The Scottish Book of Common Prayer (1637); The Nonjuror's Liturgy of 1718, The Scottish Communion Office (1764), and The First American Prayer Book (1790)

Background

When James I died in 1625, his second son Charles ascended the thrones of England and Scotland. His attempts, influenced and aided by the Archbishop of Canterbury William Laud, to cause the Church of Scotland to adopt high church Anglican practices helped precipitate his own downfall and execution. Charles and Laud favored the idea of a worship book for Scotland that more closely resembled the *Book of Common Prayer* even though the Kirk was largely Presbyterian in sentiment, despite its Anglican bishops. The Scottish Book was introduced in 1637 but never put to use because of the resistance of the Scottish people. Nonetheless, the Book has been influential.

The Scottish Book

Although the Scottish Book is often referred to as “Laud’s liturgy,” Senn points out “This book was the work of two Scottish bishops and not the work of Laud...[I]t was a book closer in order and content to the 1549 than to the 1552 Prayer Book”¹ on which it was nominally based (with some 1604 changes). Nonetheless, Laud’s eucharistic fingerprints are all over it, and he was forced to defend the Book, particularly the Communion service, at his trial, and lost his head as a result, even while proclaiming himself to be a good Protestant. For example, Laud supported the inclusion of the Offertory and Prayer of Consecration, as well as the reordering of the liturgy such that the Lord’s Prayer and the Prayer of Humble Access followed the Prayer of Consecration. The placement of these prayers, before communion and in the presence of the

¹ Senn, op. cit., 506.

consecrated elements, suggests a real presence of Christ in the bread and wine; however, Laud argued at trial that only spiritual, not corporal, presence was intended. Similarly, Laud was in favor of the 1549 words of administration rather than those of 1552, et al., which were argued to imply fleshly presence, which again, he denied vociferously. In fact, he denied that the elimination of the 1552 words was his idea—he pointed to the Scottish bishops as the revisers of that particular portion of the liturgy. The order of service for 1637 alongside 1549 and 1552 is shown in Appendix C.

The changes to the Communion Service were significant, including a change in the order of service restoring the structure of the ancient canon as one continuous prayer, as it was in the 1549 BCP, with the *anamnesis* and *epiclesis* included. The language of offering, therefore, is used in the presence of the consecrated bread and wine. The rubrics stipulate that “*The Holy Table having at the Communion-time a Carpet, and a fair white linen cloth upon it, with other decent furniture, meet for the high mysteries there to be celebrated, shall stand at the uppermost part of the Chancel or Church, where the Presbyter standing at the North-side or end thereof....*”²

Various rubrics provide further insight into the eucharistic theology of this Book. For example, the offertory of unconsecrated bread and wine was restored:

*While the Presbyter distinctly pronounceth some or all of these sentences for the offertory, the Deacon, or (if no such be present) one of the Church-wardens shall receive the devotions of the people there present in a bason provided for that purpose. And when all have offered, hee shall reverently bring the said bason with the oblations therein, and deliver it to the Presbyter, who shall humbly present it before the Lord, and set it upon the holy Table. And the Presbyter shall then **offer up** and place the bread and wine prepared for the Sacrament upon the Lords Table, that it may be ready for that service.*³

And we also bless thy holy name for all those thy servants, who having finished their course in faith, do now rest from their labours. And we yield unto thee most high praise and hearty thanks for the wonderful grace and virtue declared in all thy saints, who have

² *The Book of Common Prayer for Scotland* (1637) <http://www.commonprayer.org/pb/pb1637.cfm> (accessed on June 17, 2016). All quotes from this service derive from this source.

³ Ibid.

been the choice vessels of thy grace, and the lights of the world in their several generations; most humbly beseeching thee, that we may have grace to follow the example of their steadfastness in thy faith. . . .

The Prayer of Humble Access was reinserted before the consecration and the distribution; the Prayer of Oblation and the Lord's Prayer were united with the consecration. An epiclesis was added to the eucharistic prayer along with rubrics specifying the manual acts of the "presbyter"

Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee and of thy almighty goodness vouchsafe so to bless and sanctify with thy word and Holy Spirit these thy creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son: so that we receiving them according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of the same his most precious body and blood.

The eucharistic theology is strikingly similar to that of the 1549 BCP, including the view that Christ is present in the consecrated elements: the bread and wine are blessed and sanctified by the power of the word and Holy Spirit so that they 'may be unto us' the body and blood of Christ. Clearly the implication is that Christ's body and blood is present in the bread and wine and that the receiving of the elements is the means by which they are given to those who receive communion.

The notion of a eucharistic sacrifice is also present in the 1637 book, taken from 1549, as is clear from these phrases from the Prayer of Consecration: perpetual memory of that his precious death and *sacrifice*, bless and *sanctify* with thy word and Holy Spirit, that they may be unto us the *body and blood*,

ALMIGHTY GOD, our heavenly Father, which of thy tender mercy didst give thy 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, and did institute, and in his holy gospel command us to continue a perpetual memory of that his precious death and **sacrifice**, until his coming again; Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee; and of thy almighty goodness vouchsafe so to **bless and sanctify** with thy word and holy Spirit 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; so that we receiving them according to thy Son

our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of the same his most blessed body and blood.

The gifts of bread and wine are offered in connection with the memory of Jesus' death and sacrifice, as well as with the mention of "his coming again." In addition, the gifts are clearly identified with the body and blood of Christ. Brian Douglas notes that

The memorial of the death of Christ and his resurrection is made in close connection with the gifts of bread and wine. In fact the celebration of the memory is said to be made with the gifts of bread and wine. There is...a clear statement of moderate realism using the notion of *anamnesis*, whereby the effects of the historic sacrifice are operative in the present through the celebration of the Eucharist and with the gifts of bread and wine.⁴

Douglas' contention, that the association of the gifts of bread and wine with the celebration of the "memorial" leads to the conclusion that *anamnesis* is signified is cogent. The bread and wine are signs which point to a deeper reality—the presence of Christ in the eucharistic celebration—which confers grace on those who receive Communion.

The words of administration are those of the 1549 Prayer Book without the 1552 additions, clearly associating the real and spiritual presence of Christ with the bread and the wine:

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

Here the party receiving shall say, Amen.

And the Presbyter or Minister that receiveth the cup himself, or delivereth it to others, shall say this benediction.

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

Here the party receiving shall say, Amen.

Additional rubrics provide direction for the disposition of the consecrated elements:

⁴ Brian Douglas, *The Scottish Prayer Book of 1637: Case Study 1.34*, http://anglicaneucharistictheology.com/Anglican_Eucharistic_Theology/Case_Studies/Entries/2006/4/28_The_Scottish_Prayer_Book_of_1637.html (accessed on June 17, 2016).

And to take away the superstition, which any person hath or might have in the Bread and Wine (though it be lawfull to have wafer bread) it shall suffice that the Bread be such as is usuall: yet the best and purest Wheat Bread that conveniently may be gotten. And if any of the Bread and Wine remaine, which is consecrated, it shall be reverently eaten and drunk by such of the communicants only as the Presbyter which celebrates shall take unto him, but it shall not be carried out of the Church. And to the end that there be little left, he that officiates is required to consecrate with the least, and then if there be want, the words of consecration may be repeated again, over more, either bread or wine: the Presbyter beginning at the words in the prayer of consecration (our Saviour in the night that he was betrayed, took, &c.)

The Scottish Prayer Book dramatically modified Cranmer's mature eucharistic theology into a more "Catholic" doctrine and practice, by re-ordering the order of service, restoring the prayer of consecration invoking the Holy Spirit upon the bread and wine, by changing the words of administration to signify real presence, by specifying the disposition of the consecrated elements not consumed, as well as restoring the *Agnus Dei*—but once again, as was the case with the 1549 Prayer Book--the attempt went "too far, too fast."⁵ Spinks argues that "we...see in Laud...the need to understand the Eucharist as a sacrifice in some sense or other."⁶ To this point, Fisher reports that at his trial, Laud declared that "all sides agree in the faith of the Church of England. That in the most Blessed Sacrament, the worthy receiver is, by his faith, made spiritually partaker of the 'true and real Body and Blood of Christ, truly and really' and of all the benefits of His passion."⁷ On the eucharistic sacrifice, Laud argued

For at and in the Eucharist, we offer up to God three sacrifices: **One by the priest only**; that is the commemorative sacrifice of Christ's death, represented in bread broken and wine poured out. **Another by the priest and people jointly**: and that is, the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving for all the benefits and graces we receive by the precious death of Christ. **The third, by every particular man for himself only**: and that is, the sacrifice of every man's body and soul, to serve Him in both all the rest of his life, for this blessing thus bestowed on him. Therefore...it is safest for a man to believe the commemorative, the praising, and the performing sacrifice, and to offer them duly to God...⁸

⁵ Senn., op. cit., 506.

⁶ Spinks, op. cit., 97.

⁷ William Laud, John Fisher, and Charles Hare Simpkinson Dewesselow, *A Relation of the Conference between William Laud ... and Mr. Fisher ...* (London: New York: Macmillan, 1901), 358-359.

⁸ Ibid. Emphasis mine.

Laud's understanding of the eucharistic sacrifice was threefold: the medieval doctrine of priest's sacrifice on the altar (which Cranmer repudiated), the priest's and people's praise and thanksgiving, and the people's own offering of body and soul; this understanding found its way into the Prayer Book. This expanded notion of sacrifice is consistent with the meaning of *anamnesis* as proposed by Smolarski: remembrance "that makes the effects of [a] historical event present and effective for the believer"⁹ who participates in that remembrance by participating in Communion and serving Christ in his/her life.

Laud did not assert the corporeal presence of Christ in the Eucharist as he was accused at his trial. Davies correctly argues that Laud's "moderate form of eucharistic sacrifice is that which is meant by the term *anamnesis*, that is, where the effects of Christ's once only sacrifice are made known and proclaimed in the present in the Eucharist. Such an interpretation seems quite defensible within the framework which Laud, and by implication the 1637 Scottish Eucharist, sets out."¹⁰

Like its predecessors, the introduction of the Scottish *Book of Common Prayer* met with strenuous resistance. Spinks notes that "although the bishops attempted to persuade ministers to use the new liturgy, there was widespread rejection of it."¹¹ Senn claims that "a riot broke out when this book was used in Saint Giles Cathedral in Edinburgh, and a National Covenant was drawn up to repudiate the king's Prayer Book and to call for the abolishment of the episcopacy."¹² Although not directly the cause, a civil war broke out, both Laud and Charles I were executed, and Oliver Cromwell established the Protectorate. The Church of England was outlawed, its bishops sent into exile, and the Church of Scotland would forever be Presbyterian.

⁹ Smolarski, *ibid.* Emphasis mine.

¹⁰ Douglas, *ibid.*

¹¹ Spinks., *op. cit.*, 98.

¹² Senn, *ibid.*

The Nonjuror's Liturgy of 1718

As noted, the Scottish Book of 1637 was never implemented. High church Anglican clergy in Scotland (known as “Non-jurors” because they would not swear allegiance to William and Mary after the “Glorious Revolution” of 1688), thereafter deprived of their livings and offices in the Church of England, formed an independent Scottish Episcopal Church. They originally used the 1662 Prayer Book, changing the royal names. According to The Society of Archbishop Justus “many Scottish Episcopalians wished to use the 1637 Communion service, but, since copies weren't easily available, pamphlets (called “wee bookies”) were produced, giving the Communion service starting either at the Exhortation or at the Offertory, thus conveniently omitting prayers for the English king. As there was no central control over these “wee bookies”, they gradually diverged from the 1637 text....¹³ However, as Jasper and Cuming note, some wished to reform the Prayer Book further: In 1716 a number of Nonjuring priests and laymen petitioned their bishops, not only for a greater degree of uniformity in their forms of worship, but also for the inclusion of four elements in the eucharist—the mixed chalice, prayer for the departed, and a prayer of oblation and an epiclesis in the eucharistic prayer.¹⁴

Unfortunately, the meeting called to discuss these issues resulted in two factions: Non-usagers, who wanted no changes and the Usagers, who devised new liturgies. A new rite was published in 1718 which retained elements of the 1662 Prayer Book, elements of the 1549 rite, and appropriated portions of the early liturgies of the Clementine liturgy in Apostolic Constitutions, St. Basil, and St. James.¹⁵ This is the service that Bishop Samuel Seabury brought back to Connecticut, upon which his own Communion-Office was based, and which found its

¹³ *The Scottish Communion Service of 1764*,

http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bcp/Scotland/Scot1764_Communion.htm (accessed on July 8, 2016).

¹⁴ R.C.D. Jasper and G.J. Cuming, *Prayers of the Eucharist: Early and Reformed*, 3rd edition (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1990), 290.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 291.

way to the First American Prayer Book of 1789. The order of service was changed in a number of instances. Introits were restored to the beginning of the service. Immediately after the *Sanctus* is the Prayer of Consecration, which bears more similarity to those of the early church than that of Cranmer, and interestingly refers to the whole economy of Christ's life, not just His death, and makes explicit the doctrine of atonement:

HOLINESS is thy nature and thy gift, O Eternal King; Holy is thine only begotten Son our Lord Jesus Christ, by whom thou hast made the worlds; Holy is thine Ever-blessed Spirit, who searcheth all things, even the depths of thine infinite perfection. Holy art thou, almighty and merciful God; thou createdst Man in thine own image, broughtest him into Paradise, and didst place him in a state of dignity and pleasure: And when he had lost his happiness by transgressing thy command, thou of thy goodness didst not abandon and despise him. Thy Providence was still continued, thy Law was given to revive the sense of his duty, thy Prophets were commissioned to reclaim and instruct him. And when the fulness of time was come, thou didst send thine only begotten Son to satisfy thy Justice, to strengthen our Nature, and renew thine Image within us: For these glorious ends thine Eternal Word came down from heaven, was incarnate by the Holy Ghost, born of the Blessed Virgin, conversed with mankind, **and directed his life and miracles to our salvation: And when his hour was come to offer the Propitiatory Sacrifice upon the Cross; when he, who had no sin himself, mercifully undertook to suffer death for our sins,** in the same night that he was betrayed (a) took bread; and when he had given thanks, (b) he brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, Take, eat, (c) **THIS IS MY BODY**, which is given for you, Do this in remembrance of me. **LIKEWISE** after Supper, (d) he took the Cup; and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, saying Drink ye all of this, for (e) **THIS IS MY BLOOD** of the New Testament, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins; Do this, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of me.¹⁶

The accompanying rubrics specify the manual acts of the Priest, laying hands on the paten and chalice. The Offertory is also very different from Cranmer's, especially its explicit Christological focus, and acknowledgement of the offering of the bread and wine to be a sacrifice as indicated in bold:

Wherefore...**we Offer to thee**, our King and our God, according to his holy Institution, **this Bread and this Cup**; giving thanks to thee through him, that thou hast vouchsafed us the honour to stand before thee, and to **Sacrifice unto thee**. And we beseech thee to

¹⁶ *A Communion Office, Taken partly from Primitive Liturgies, And partly from the First English Reformed Common-Prayer-Book*, http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bcp/Communion_Nonjurors.htm (accessed on July 29, 2016). Letters indicate the manual acts of the priest.

look favourably on these thy Gifts, which are here set before thee, O thou self-sufficient God: And do thou Accept them to the **honour of thy Christ**; and send down thine Holy Spirit, the witness of the passion of our Lord Jesus, upon this Sacrifice, that he may make this **Bread the Body of thy Christ**, and this **Cup the Blood of thy Christ**; that they who are partakers thereof, may be confirmed in godliness, may obtain remission of their sins, may be delivered from the Devil and his snares, may be replenished with the Holy Ghost, may be made worthy of **thy Christ**, and may obtain everlasting life, Thou, O Lord Almighty, being reconciled unto them through the merits and mediation of **thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ**; who, with Thee and the Holy Ghost, liveth and reigneth ever one God, world without end. *Amen.*

The First American Prayer Book 1789

The first permanent English settlement in America was founded in 1607 by the Virginia Company of London, and called Jamestown, for James I. Hatchett reports that the “first Prayer Book service of Holy Communion on American soil was conducted by Robert Hunt, an Anglican clergyman. . . on 14 May 1607” and that soon the leaders of the settlement “were conducting daily worship within their fort, using the English *Book of Common Prayer* with its obligatory prayers for the King, the royal family, and Parliament.”¹⁷ The Church of England was designated the established church in Virginia in 1609, in New York in 1693, in Maryland in 1702, in South Carolina in 1706, in North Carolina in 1730, and in Georgia in 1758.¹⁸ The American churches were under the authority of the Bishop of London. The War of Independence changed this dramatically. Those clergy who had been ordained in England or by English bishops returned to England or fled to Canada; those who remained omitted the prayers for the King or adapted them to suit the political reality.¹⁹

In 1785, representatives of seven states met in Philadelphia to consider establishing an independent church and to consider drafting a *Book of Common Prayer* that would be acceptable

¹⁷ Marion J. Hatchett, “The Colonies and States of America,” in *The Oxford Guide to the Book of Common Prayer: A Worldwide Survey*, ed. Charles Hefling and Cynthia Shattuck (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 176.

¹⁸ Douglas, Ian T., “Anglican Mission in Changing Times: A Brief Institutional History of the Episcopal Church, USA,” in David A. Roozen and James R. Nieman, *Church, Identity, and Change: Theology and Denominational Structures in Unsettled Times* (Grand Rapids, Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2005), 188–197.

¹⁹ Hatchett, *ibid.*

to the groups that came together to form what was called the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States. Neither was to prove an easy task. Proposals for a common worship book were submitted by various states based on their own adaptations of the Prayer Books of England and Scotland; there was much material upon which to draw. King's Chapel Boston, in particular, had adopted a revised Book, a copy of which apparently circulated throughout New England. John Wesley also adapted the 1662 Prayer Book for use by Methodists.²⁰

A Prayer Book for the Episcopal Church in the United States

The key players in the 1786 Prayer Book were William White of Philadelphia (consecrated bishop of New York in 1787), William Smith of Maryland, and Samuel Seabury of Connecticut. Seabury had been consecrated Bishop in 1784 in Scotland after English bishops refused to consecrate him because he would not swear the Oath of Supremacy. At the time of his consecration, Seabury agreed to “endeavor” to make the Scottish form of the Communion liturgy the norm in the United States.²¹

Hatchett notes that “the book that actually emerged from the Philadelphia convention, however, introduced a number of changes that not only caused Seabury to turn against it, and with him other clergy from Connecticut, New Jersey, and New York, but also raised concerns on the part of Bishops in England,”²² primarily by eliminating the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds and other changes favored by the Evangelical wing, including eliminating the word “regeneration” from the baptismal rite, eliminating the requirement for the sign of the cross, and not referring to the clergy as “priests.”²³

²⁰ Hatchett, op. cit., 177.

²¹ The text of the Concordat between Seabury and the Scottish bishops appears in W.S. Perry, *The History of the American Episcopal Church 1587-1883*, II (Boston: Osgood and Company, 1885), 56-57, quoted by Marion J. Hatchett in *The Making of the First American Book of Common Prayer* (New York: The Seabury Press, 1982), 172.

²² Hatchett, op. cit., 177.

²³ Ibid.

Also in 1786, Bishop Seabury published, for use in his Diocese, his own Communion Office, largely based on the Scottish model. It begins with the Exhortation. He substituted “priest” for “presbyter,” eliminated prayers for the King, added some private “ejaculations” for the priest to say during the Comfortable Words, (for example, “Refresh, O Lord, thy servant wearied with the burden of sin”) as well as adding “Private Devotions for the Altar” of his own devising after the Peace. This Office, as well as the Scottish office upon which it was based, is closer to the 1549 Prayer Book than 1662 which was in use in both England and the Colonies. (A detailed comparison of the books is found in the Appendix D.) That this service was eventually to form the basis of the Communion Service in the First American Prayer Book should not be a surprise given Bishop Seabury’s prominence.

General Convention met again in 1789 and adopted a modified version of the Proposed Book, eliminating its more controversial features, for example, the Athanasian Creed was omitted but the Nicene Creed was restored as an option to the Apostle’s Creed. There were a number of changes to the order of service compared to the 1662 BCP, including: The sections labelled Oblation and Invocation are expanded and moved; the Prayer for the Whole State of Christ’s Church, the Confession and Absolution, and the Comfortable Words also appear in the same positions as they held in 1637 and 1662. As Hatchett notes, “[I]t was in the Holy Communion service, however, that one of the most noteworthy innovations appeared. Here the Prayer of Consecration...is much longer. The tradition it belongs to is not that of English Prayer Books since 1552, but the one that begins with the Scottish Prayer Book of 1637, which had drawn on the original 1549 Prayer Book.²⁴

The Prayer of Consecration includes rubrics specifying the priest’s manual acts:

(a) Here the Priest is to take the Paten into his hands.

²⁴ Hatchett, op.cit., 178.

- (b) And here to break the Bread.*
- (c) And here to lay his hand on all the Bread.*
- (d) Here he is to take the Cup into his hands.*
- (e) And here he is to lay his hand upon every vessel, in which there is any Wine to be consecrated.*

The text is that of the Scottish Communion Office of 1764:

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 thy 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 thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same.

The Invocation is marked by an epiclesis—the wording is that of 1549, 1637, and 1764:

And we most humbly beseech thee, O merciful Father, to hear us; and, of thy almighty goodness, vouchsafe to bless and sanctify, with thy Word and Holy Spirit, these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine; that we, receiving them 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 administration at Communion are the combination of those in 1549 and 1552.

Cranmer's mature eucharistic theology has once again been superseded by that of the transitional 1549 BCP. Real presence, sacrifice, consecration, oblation, invocation and epiclesis (after the institution narrative) are all restored. The rubrics specify manual acts that the priest must make although no elevation is specified. The Eucharist is referred to as a "precious memory" and "memorial" of Christ's death and passion "until His coming again," and those who come to the Eucharist as "partakers." Jasper and Cuming state that

This book was a brave attempt to be more contemporary than 1662, with fewer archaisms, greater flexibility and abbreviation, a broader range of services, and drawing material from a wide variety of sources...the eucharistic rite was generally faithful in following the lines of the Scottish 1764 rite but there was also evidence of a study independence in showing a preference for 1662 or the Scottish rite of 1637 at significant points, or even in adopting a quite new line.²⁵

²⁵ Jasper and Cuming, op. cit., 309.

Just as Cranmer drew on a number of sources for his Communion services, so too did compilers of the First American Prayer Book. Aspects of the 1662 book are present, but the influence of the various Scottish rites that harken back to 1549 are primary. It seems fitting that after winning political independence from England that the American Episcopal Church would exhibit the same spirit of independence in its liturgical practice. (A comparison of the Order of Services of the Scottish and American Prayer Books is found in Appendix D.) The 1790 Prayer Book was slightly revised in 1892, and to a significant degree in 1928.

The movement away from Cranmer's mature eucharistic theology of 1552 continued throughout the 17th and 18th centuries, and continued in the 19th. His concept of the Eucharist as an act of remembrance ('perpetual memory') of Christ's sacrificial death – a visual aid to stimulate recollection on the part of the congregation, was replaced with a more traditionally Catholic notion of *anamnesis*, wherein the gifts of bread and wine are clearly associated with Christ's body and blood prevailed.

Chapter Six: The 1979 Episcopal *Book of Common Prayer*: Full Circle

Background

The same General Convention that authorized the 1928 *Book of Common Prayer* established a Standing Liturgical Commission (SLC) to prepare for its future revision.¹ This was to prove prescient as the next revision was to require nearly 50 years of effort to come to fruition. In 1950, influenced by the liturgical movement, the ecumenical movement, and the revival of biblical theology, the SLC published the first of a series of 29 *Prayer Book Studies*, and in 1967, the first of a series of trial use services, which would eventually lead to the next revision, that of the 1979, current Prayer Book, which itself has been proposed for revision within the next triennium. At the same time, the bishops of the Anglican Communion gathered at Lambeth Palace to discuss liturgical revision, recommending a “recovery of the worship of the Primitive Church which was the aim of the first Prayer Books of the Church of England.”²

Prayer Book Studies IV, The Eucharistic Liturgy, “a detailed and comprehensive review of the Eucharistic rite”³ was published in 1953 and “submitted for free discussion” by the Standing Commission.⁴ It was the result of nine years of “intensive consideration” based on “very numerous suggestions made to use from every side in the Church.”⁵ *PBS IV* consists of

¹ Hatchett, *ibid.*

² *The Lambeth Conference 1958: The Encyclical Letter from the Bishops Together with the Resolutions and Reports*, (London: SPCK: 1958) quoted in Thaddaeus A. Schnitker, *The Church's Worship* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 1989), 123.

³ W. Chilton Powell, *Prayer Book Studies XVII, The Liturgy of the Lord's Supper* (New York: The Church Pension Fund, 1966), iii.

⁴ Bayard H. Jones, *Prayer Book Studies IV, The Eucharistic Liturgy* (New York: The Church Pension Fund, 1953), iv.

⁵ *Ibid.*, v.

two parts: a history of the eucharistic liturgy, and proposals for its revision.⁶ The revision was not well-received.

Thirteen years later, in 1966, the Standing Commission published *Prayer Book Studies XVII*, a report to the Church of the analysis of the reaction to *PBS IV*. SCLM had received extensive comments and criticisms on *PBS IV* from both clergy and laity; which, having been reviewed, led SCLM to conclude that “there was not sufficient consensus, except for a few details of formulary and ceremony, to suggest that the proposed draft of Study IV would receive a widespread and enthusiastic acceptance.”⁷ Rather than tinker with the rite proposed, SCLM determined that it was prudent to start over from scratch. A revised eucharistic rite was presented by the Standing Liturgical Commission to the 1967 General Convention. This proposed revision was approved for trial use. In 1970, a series of rites was published as *Services for Trial Use* and authorized for use by the 1970 General Convention. Additional rites were authorized at the 1973 General Convention, and revised eucharistic rites, rites of initiation, orders for the Daily Office, and a complete revision of the Psalter were subsequently published as *Authorized Services* (known as the zebra book because of the cover graphic) in 1973. The 1976 General Convention approved the full report of the Standing Liturgical Commission, known as the *Draft Proposed Book of Common Prayer*. This became the *Proposed Book of Common Prayer*. It was approved as the *Standard Prayer Book* by the 1979 General Convention.

The process of trial use of newly developed liturgical resources has continued since the adoption of the 1979 BCP, including expanded language and gender neutral language liturgies,

⁶ The Commission at that time was made up of Goodrich R. Fenner, Arthur C. Lichtenberger (both Bishops), Bayard H. Jones (professor of ecclesiastical history in the School of Theology of the University of the South, Sewanee, Tennessee), Morton C. Stone (Chaplain, University of Wisconsin), John W. Sutter, Churchill J. Gibson (priest), Massey H. Shepherd, Jr. (priest/liturgical scholar), Walter Williams (priest), Spencer Ervin (layman, historian specializing in the polity of the Anglican Church) and John W. Ashton (priest). I note for the record that only one layperson and no women were appointed to SCLM.

⁷ Powell, *ibid*.

as well as liturgies for special services and occasions. The series was originally known as *Supplemental Liturgical Materials* but now are called *Enriching Our Worship* (EOW). Examples include *Enriching Our Worship 1: Morning and Evening Prayer, The Great Litany, and The Holy Eucharist*; *Enriching Our Worship 2: Ministry with the Sick or Dying: Burial of a Child; A Great Cloud of Witnesses* (which replaced *Holy Men, Holy Women*); and the rite originally developed for the blessing of same sex marriages, called *Liturgical Resources 1: I Will Bless You and You Will Be a Blessing*, but which today may be used for marriage of any couple. There are also musical resources under the same series.

The 1979 *Book of Common Prayer* in many ways represents a radical departure from previous BCPs. Doctrinally it emphasizes the pascal mystery as the “unitive principal” in Christian worship which finds expression in the sacraments. Accordingly, significant attention is paid to the primary rites of Baptism and Eucharist (although other rites also received attention). It “substantially and intentionally reduces the deeply penitential tone of its 1928 predecessor.”⁸ The first clue to the revisers’ intentions appears on the very first page of the section entitled *Concerning the Service of the Church*: “The Holy Eucharist, the principal act of Christian worship on the Lord’s Day and other major Feasts, and Daily Morning and Evening Prayer, as set forth in the Book, are the regular services appointed for public worship in this Church.”⁹ The title *Holy Eucharist* is completely new: previous BCPs referred to the Eucharist as *The Order for The Administration of the Lord’s Supper or Holy Communion* or some variation thereof. Up to this point in time, the regular Sunday service in Episcopal parishes was Morning Prayer; the

⁸ Lesley A. Northrup, “The Episcopal Church in the U.S.A.,” in the *Oxford Guide to the Book of Common Prayer*, ed. Charles Hefling and Cynthia Shattuck (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 366.

⁹ *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 (New York: The Church Hymnal Corporation, 1979), 13. All quotes derive from this document.

Eucharist was a once-per-month service, if that. The shift to the Eucharist as the primary service was a major one, as was the assumption that every major Feast and celebration of the Church would include a Eucharist (e.g., baptisms, marriages, funerals). The Eucharistic theology of the 1979 Prayer Book looks back to that of 1549 and to early Christian rites rather than that of the reformed 1552 BCP. In fact, Price explicitly states that “from an overall Anglican perspective [Proposed BCP] is still recognizably an Anglican *Book of Common Prayer*. It belongs to a familiar genus, whose archetypal member, the Book of 1549, set a style of worship which this new Book is intended to maintain and enhance.”¹⁰

The Eucharist is presented as the active recollection, or *anamnesis*, of the community, not a mental recollection or remembrance of past events. Smolarski’s definition is cogent: *anamnesis* “coincides with the Jewish understanding of *zikkaron*,” remembrance “that makes the effects of [a] historical event *present and effective* for the believer.”¹¹ The offering by the community of the bread and wine as sacramental signs and the prayers of praise and thanksgiving in response to the whole economy of the life of Jesus, leads the community to “new and unending life in Him.” As the post-communion prayers plead: “Send us into the world in peace, and grant us strength and courage to love and serve you, with gladness and singleness of heart, through Christ our Lord,” and alternatively, “Send us out to do the work you have given us to do, to love and serve you as faithful witnesses of Christ our Lord.”

The entire rite is proposed as consecratory in contrast with the Reformed position that the institution narrative alone serves as consecratory. Broad theological themes that the revisers sought to emphasize in the 1979 Book include creation, redemption (“asserted more overtly especially in the eucharistic prayers, which now use a rich language of sacrifice, oblation,

¹⁰ Price, *ibid.*, 13-14.

¹¹ Smolarski, *ibid.* Emphasis mine.

satisfaction, reconciliation, victory, atonement, and deliverance to describe Christ's saving action of love"¹²). For example, the Prayer of Consecration "speaks of Christ's death as a 'sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction' and of his work as 'our redemption.'"¹³ As Price notes, "[t]o think of Christ's death as a *sacrifice* and *oblation* is to confess that his death accomplished what the Old Testament sacrificial system did not accomplish--reconciliation and restoration of communion between God and his creation."¹⁴

A second major paradigm shift in 1979 is the acknowledgement of the "ministry of the all the baptized." For the first time, the laity are given the opportunity to play specific roles in the services of the church: as lectors during the Ministry of the Word, but more importantly, certainly from a symbolic perspective, as bearers of the gifts to the altar, a task in previous Prayer Books assigned to deacons and churchwardens, and even occasionally, if licensed by the local Bishop, to administer the chalice. Bringing up the gifts, of course, is consistent with the practice of the early church, wherein the people brought their own bread and wine (and in some cases olives) to be consecrated and shared. This expansion of the role of the laity paved the way for both children and adults to serve in liturgical roles, as acolytes, crucifers, and Gospel Book bearers, and lectors.

Further, the revisers sought to simplify the number and placement of the rubrics (as well as Proper Prefaces) to allow for flexibility in practice and to avoid distracting the congregation with texts which are directed only at the celebrant. Therefore the rubrics are largely gathered at the beginning of the rite (p. 354) or in a section called *Additional Directions* which appears after *Communion Under Special Circumstances* (Communion of the sick) with reserved sacrament, (p.

¹² Northrup, *ibid.*

¹³ Charles P. Price for the Standing Liturgical Commission, *Prayer Book Studies 29 Revised: Introducing the Proposed Book* (New York: The Church Hymnal Corporation, 1976), 39.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, Emphasis his.

396) and *An Order for Celebrating the Holy Eucharist* (a new feature, outlining the necessary elements of the eucharistic liturgy, without text, for use other than at the principal Sunday Eucharist (p. 400ff). Interestingly, 1979 is the first Prayer Book to allow intinction, with restrictions (p. 407-408). The people at the Eucharist are encouraged to stand following the *Sanctus*.

In addition to changes in status, nomenclature, and participation, the provision of multiple eucharistic prayers in the 1979 Prayer Book represents a major departure from previous BCPs. The intention of the revisers was to provide flexibility consistent with the diversity of Episcopal parishes, in both language and new forms of eucharistic worship. During the trial use period, it became clear that some Episcopalians were highly attached to “traditional” language, which resulted in the Rite I liturgies (the language of which was somewhat modernized, it being lost on those persons that Elizabethan English is no longer the vernacular of the modern/post-modern era) being included.¹⁵ The rubrics are similarly flexible. Perhaps an unintended consequence of this lack of rubrical authoritarianism was the proliferation of ceremonials designed to aid the celebrant in the conduct of the Eucharist—a veritable cottage industry’s worth.¹⁶ Whereas 1928 had but one eucharistic prayer, modeled for the most part on 1662 and the Scottish rites, the 1979 Book includes six options, two in Rite I, in “traditional language,” which are very similar except in length, and four, in Rite II, in “contemporary/inclusive language.” Also provided is *An Order for Celebrating the Holy Eucharist*, which outlines the

¹⁵ No hard data exists on the distribution of parishes celebrating the various rites, but in conversation on May 1, 2016 with Dr. Kirk Hadaway, PhD, Officer Congregational Research of TEC, the following estimates were provided: Rite I ~ 10% of parishes (somewhat higher in Lent); Rite II ~ 65% of parishes; Combination Rite I and II ~ 25% of parishes.

¹⁶ For example, Dennis A. Michno, *A Priest's Handbook: The Ceremonies of the Church*, 3rd ed., ed. Christopher Webber (Harrisburg, PA: Morehouse Publishing, 1998); Patrick Malloy, *Celebrating the Eucharist: A Practical Ceremonial Guide for Clergy and Other Liturgical Ministers* (New York: Church Publishing, 2007); Howard E. Galley, *Ceremonies of the Eucharist: A Guide to Celebration* (Lanham, MD: Cowley Publications, 1989); Marion J. Hatchett, *A manual of ceremonial for the new prayer book* (Sewanee, TN: The St. Luke's Journal of Theology, 1977); Byron D. Stuhlman, *Prayer Book Rubrics Expanded* (New York: The Church Hymnal Corporation, 1978).

necessary elements of the eucharistic celebration but not texts. The structure of all six prayers, under the title *The Great Thanksgiving*, is the largely the same with the exception of Prayer C, which is unique in several ways to be discussed below. Structures of the two 1979 rites with 1928 is found in Appendix E.

The general pattern is: *Sursum Corda*, Preface, *Sanctus and Benedictus*, institution narrative, memorial acclamation, *anamnesis* with oblation, epiclesis over the gifts, epiclesis over the communicants, Lord's Prayer, fraction, invitation, Communion, post-Communion prayer, optional blessing, dismissal.

Rite I eucharistic prayers will be considered only briefly. Efforts to modernize archaic language (e.g., "living" for "quick," "Spirit" for "Ghost") were rejected; thees and thous abound. "The hold of our Anglican inheritance of liturgical speech from the sixteenth century is very strong among us."¹⁷ The order of the Eucharist is different from that of 1928: the offering has been returned to the pre-Reformation position before the Prayer of Consecration (now titled The Great Thanksgiving) to clarify the connection between the offering and the consecration. The Fraction has also been moved from the Prayer of Consecration to just before Communion.

Eucharistic Prayer I is the same text as the eucharistic prayer in the 1928 Prayer Book, which itself was adapted from the 1764 Scottish rite. Eucharistic Prayer II is a revised, shortened version of I, enriched by the inclusion of references to creation and incarnation as well as Christ's second coming. Cranmer's receptionistic language has been retained in Eucharistic Prayer I of Rite I, but it is not found in any of the other Eucharistic prayers: "And we earnestly 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

¹⁷ The Standing Liturgical Commission of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, *Prayer Book Studies XII: The Liturgy of the Lord's Supper, A Revision of Prayer Book Studies IV* (New York: The Church Pension Fund, 1966), 54.

through faith in his blood, we, and all thy whole Church, may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of his passion.”

All of the prayers have a renewed emphasis on creation and on the full economy of Christ’s life and work, as opposed to the medieval and early Prayer Book preoccupation with the Passion and Death. Both these themes are re-appropriations of those found in early eucharistic prayers.

We will consider in detail the four eucharistic prayers of Rite II. Eucharistic Prayer A is that provided in the context of the main eucharistic rite—prayers B, C, and D as *Alternative Forms of the Great Thanksgiving*. Some features are common to all the prayers: the emphasis on creation and on eschatological fulfillment. The rubric notes that the people may stand or kneel, although standing is preferable (the practice of kneeling has been difficult to extinguish; it is believed by many that kneeling is “more reverent” than standing). This prayer is relatively short, which makes it suitable for regular and daily celebrations, and is a modern adaptation of Eucharistic Prayer I, which itself looks back to previous American Prayer Books.¹⁸ The elegant phrase “a perfect sacrifice for the whole world”¹⁹ recalls Cranmer’s “(one oblation once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world” without Cranmer’s anxiety about Real Presence and the Sacrifice of the Mass. The institution narrative is a conflation of Scriptural sources; the sole rubric specifies that the celebrant hold or lay a hand on the vessels containing the gifts. Consistent with Cranmer’s concern that the elements not be “adored,” there is no provision for the ringing of *Sanctus* bells nor the elevation of the paten and chalice, although in practice many presiders do so, and many congregants make the sign of the cross at this point. The institution narrative is followed by a restored memorial

¹⁸ Hatchett, *Commentary*, 374.

¹⁹ BCP 1979, 362.

acclamation by the celebrant and people, which includes an eschatological dimension, also new: “Christ has died. Christ is risen. Christ will come again.” Added to this acclamation is the phrase “Recalling his death, resurrection, and ascension, we offer you these gifts,” which Price states “constitutes the section as a formally complete *anamnesis*,” the intention of which was “to make explicit the remembering of God’s action in Christ on our behalf in connection with the offering of the bread and wine.”²⁰ According to Hatchett, the memorial acclamation “is a translation by ICEL of the most frequently used of the Eastern memorial acclamations; another translation is given in Prayer B.”²¹ “We remember his death, We proclaim his resurrection, We await his coming in glory.”²² The phrase “sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving” is Cranmer’s articulation of eucharistic sacrifice. The use of the plural “we” contributes to the sense of active participation in remembering, and the use of the present tense adds to the immediacy rather than signifying a passive recollection of a past event. Cranmer’s theology of the Eucharist as only memorial has been replaced. The gathered community actively participates in the *anamnesis* and the oblation. A double epiclesis then follows, upon the gifts and the congregation:

Sanctify them by your Holy Spirit to be for your people the Body and Blood of your Son, the holy food and drink of new and unending life in him. Sanctify us also that we may faithfully receive this holy Sacrament, and serve you in unity, constancy, and peace; and at the last day bring us with all your saints into the joy of your eternal kingdom.

The text of the epiclesis is similar to both 1549 and Scottish liturgies before 1764.²³ In keeping with the revisers’ desire to streamline the rubrics, no actions are specified at the epiclesis; the ceremonials offer a range of actions for the presider, including making the sign of the cross over

²⁰ Price, *ibid.*, 84.

²¹ *Ibid.*

²² The Syrian liturgy of St. James text reads: “Your death, our Lord, we commemorate, Your resurrection we confess and Your second coming we wait for. May Your mercy be upon us all.”

<http://sor.cua.edu/Liturgy/Anaphora/James.html> (accessed on March 21, 2017).

²³ *Ibid.*, 375.

each vessel, and extending the hands over the gifts. Likewise, no rubric specifies action by the congregation; however, many people make the sign of the cross at the words “sanctify us also.” Hatchett notes that the concluding petition, “that we may serve you in unity, constancy, and peace” “gathers into a concise statement some of the lengthier petitions of self-oblation in earlier Books.”²⁴ The invitation to Communion is unlike any found in previous BCPs: “The gifts of God, for the people of God,” an echo of the Eastern formula “Holy things for the holy people.” The rubric states that “Take them in remembrance that Christ died for you, and feed on Him in your hearts by faith, with thanksgiving” which was the formula in 1552, may also be said. Two options are provided for the words of administration; they are simplified versions of the medieval Western formula: “The Body (Blood) of our Lord Jesus Christ keep you in everlasting life. [Amen.] or The Body of Christ, the bread of heaven. [Amen.] The Blood of Christ, the cup of salvation. [Amen.]” The revisers wished to develop a formula that would be sufficiently short that it could be repeated to each communicant individually, rather than only a portion of the words while the priest passed down a line of communicants. A rubric under the heading *Additional Directions*²⁵ also provides for laypersons to administer the chalice if not enough ordained persons are present, consistent with the provision of additional roles for the laity.

Eucharistic Prayer B is an adaptation of a text found in *Apostolic Tradition*, often attributed to Hippolytus, but scholars have shown the text²⁶ is neither apostolic nor written by

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ 1979 BCP, 408.

²⁶ Bradshaw and Johnson, *The Eucharistic Liturgies: Their Evolution and Interpretation* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 2012), 41. The reconstructed text reads: “We render thanks to you, God, through your beloved servant Jesus Christ, whom in the last times you sent to us as savior and redeemer and angel of your will, who is your inseparable word, through whom you made all things and it was well pleasing to you, [whom] you sent from heaven into the virgin’s womb, and who conceived in the womb was incarnate and manifested as your Son, born from the Holy Spirit and the virgin.”

Hippolytus.²⁷ Following the *Sanctus*, the prayer begins with thanksgiving for creation and the Incarnation: “We give thanks to you, O God, for the goodness and love which you have made known to us in creation; in the calling of Israel to be your people; in your Word spoken through the prophets; and above all in the Word made flesh, Jesus, your Son. For in these last days you sent him to be incarnate from the Virgin Mary, to be the Savior and Redeemer of the world.”

The institution narrative which immediately follows is identical to that in Prayers A and D. The memorial acclamation, “We remember his death, We proclaim his resurrection, We await his coming in glory” is, according to Hatchett, “a literal translation of the Eastern memorial acclamation and, as in some Ethiopian eucharistic prayers, it constitutes an *anamnesis*.”²⁸ The oblation, “And we offer our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving,” has appeared in Anglican eucharistic prayers since the 1549 BCP. As in Prayer A, there is a double epiclesis, upon the gifts and the congregation: “We pray you, gracious God, to send your Holy Spirit upon these gifts that they may be the Sacrament of the Body of Christ and his Blood of the new Covenant. Unite us to your Son in his sacrifice, that we may be acceptable through him, being sanctified by the Holy Spirit,” followed by an optional commemoration of the saints. Again, as with Prayer A, Prayer B’s emphasis on the Incarnation makes it particularly suitable for use in Advent, Christmas, Epiphany, and on saints’ days. The remaining text is the same as that of Prayer A.

Eucharistic Prayer C is an entirely new creation, written in 1974 by Howard E. Galley, a layperson who was instrumental in the revision of the Prayer Book.²⁹ It has several distinctive

²⁷ Paul F. Bradshaw, *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2002), 82; John Baldovin, “Hippolytus and the Apostolic Tradition: Recent Research and Commentary,” *Theological Studies* 64 (2003): 525; Andrew B. McGowan, *Ancient Christian Worship* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2014), 12-13.

²⁸ Hatchett, *ibid*.

²⁹ This prayer is fondly referred to as the “Star Wars” prayer. It has recently been argued that it is dated and should be either revised or removed on the next Prayer Book revision. Galley himself, before his death, made some suggestions for changes to make the language more inclusive, but it appears he himself did not write them down;

features. The prayer is reminiscent of Eastern anaphoras in that it is structured as a litany between the celebrant and the people. It cannot be celebrated by one person alone. Cranmer would have approved. This was a major innovation as it gives the laity a central role in the celebration of the Eucharist (the Episcopal Church, after all, as its name suggests, is the Bishop's church). There is no rubric in Eucharistic Prayer C for the congregation to change its posture after the *Sanctus*. All other prayers include a rubric with the option to stand or kneel. Prayer C assumes that the congregation will remain standing, the oldest posture for prayer. It is distinctive also in that there is a fixed preface, rather than a seasonal preface as is the case with the other three prayers, which nonetheless covers much of the material in the prefaces of Prayers A and B, including creation, the incarnation, and redemption. Finally, this prayer is particularly creation-centered and arguably environmentally conscious, as the soaring language affirms: "At your command all things came to be: the vast expanse of interstellar space, galaxies, suns, the planets in their courses, and this fragile earth, our island home. By your will they were created and have their being." The powerful phrase, "this fragile earth, our island home," is particularly memorable.

The oblation and epiclesis come before the institution narrative as the Roman tradition, unlike those in the other eucharistic prayers in Rite I and II: "And so, Father, we who have been redeemed by him, and made a new people by water and the Spirit, now bring before you these gifts. Sanctify them by your Holy Spirit to be the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ our Lord." The first person plural "we" signals both immediacy and participation. The epiclesis is explicit: "*to be* the Body and Blood." The phrase "unite us to your Son in his sacrifice, that we may be acceptable through him, being sanctified by the Holy Spirit" is understood to be the epiclesis

they are enshrined only in the memories of various liturgists, including Ruth Meyers and Lee Mitchell. See footnote 32 below.

over the people; many people will cross themselves at this point. Again, there is no indication of the means by which this transformation takes place, nor any attempt to define it. The Real Presence of Christ is assumed, clearly not corporeally, but in a nominalist understanding. The reference to baptism is not incidental. The 1979 Prayer Book states unequivocally that “Holy Baptism is full initiation by water and the Holy Spirit into Christ’s Body the Church.”³⁰ The institution narrative, as is the case with the other prayers, is scriptural but a variant reading³¹ (On the night he was handed over to suffering and death, our Lord Jesus Christ took bread; and when he had given thanks to you, he broke it, and gave it to his disciples, and said, “Take, eat: This is my Body, which is given for you. Do this for the remembrance of me.” After supper he took the cup of wine; and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, and said, “Drink this, all of you: This is my Blood of the new Covenant, which is shed for you and for many (some substitute the word “all”) for the forgiveness of sins. Whenever you drink it, do this for the remembrance of me” and is not in itself considered consecratory. The *anamnesis* and oblation, “Remembering now his work of redemption, and offering to you this sacrifice of thanksgiving” is typically Anglican/Cranmerian—the only sacrifice is thanksgiving. The memorial acclamation again includes the eschatological element and is proclaimed by the people: “*We celebrate his death and resurrection, as we await the day of his coming.*” The conclusion is reminiscent of the Prayer of Humble Access but is more positive in tone:

Lord God of our Fathers; God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ: Open our eyes to see your hand at work in the world about us. Deliver us from the presumption of coming to this Table for solace only, and not for strength; for

³⁰ 1979 BCP, 298. This was one of the more controversial aspects of the 1979 BCP for reasons too complicated to review here, primarily having to do with confirmation as a separate rite, which the revisers had eliminated and the Bishops abhorred.

³¹ 1 Cor 11:24 “This is my body that is for you. Do this in remembrance of me.” In the same way he took the cup also, 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. NRSV.

pardon only, and not for renewal. Let the grace of this Holy Communion make us one body, one spirit in Christ, that we may worthily serve the world in his name.³²

Deliberate or not, the prayer seems to imply that the transformation of the people into “one body, one spirit,” is through Communion, not the operation of the Holy Spirit.³³ This would seem to be consistent with Cranmer’s concept of receptionism, the doctrine that bread and wine are not changed, but when received by faith effect a change in the heart of the communicant. The intent, however, is simply that communicants should approach the sacrament with the correct disposition, with which Cranmer would heartily agree.³⁴ Finally, the congregation’s response recalls the Emmaus road story: “*Risen Lord, be known to us in the breaking of the Bread.*” The Eucharist continues per Prayer A.

Eucharistic Prayer D is based on the Liturgy of St. Basil (c. 4th century) and was adapted by an ecumenical group of liturgical scholars, chaired by Marion Hatchett. Hatchett states

In 1974 a group of American Catholic, Anglican, and Protestant scholars gathered to draft a prayer which the major American denominations might approve. The committee studied the prayer of Saint Basil especially because of its widespread use, broad scope, ancient roots, and appeal for both Eastern and Western Christianity. Both the form in the Roman sacramentary and the earlier versions that inspired it were influential in developing an American form in a version which has also been authorized for use by the Inter-Lutheran Commission on Worship and by the Committee on Word and Table of the United Methodist Church.³⁵

It is the longest of the eucharistic prayers, largely because of the number of intercessions, and sadly is probably the least used, despite its beautiful language and the fact that it is authorized for use by more denominations than any other eucharistic prayer.

³² Lee Mitchell recalls this reworking of the opening phrase by Galley: “God of our holy and righteous forbears, Redeemer and mother of Israel, God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.” Personal communication via Milner Seifert. There was also a movement in 2009 to include the names Sarah, Rebekah, Leah and Rachel but I am not aware that this got very far. Josh Thomas, “No to CO77, Rewriting Howard Galley,” Gay Spirit Diary (blog), July 12, 2009, <https://joshtom.wordpress.com/2009/07/12/no-to-c077-rewriting-howard-galley/> (accessed on July 12, 2016).

³³ Schnitker, op. cit., 177.

³⁴ Hatchett, op. cit., 376.

³⁵ Hatchett, op. cit., 377.

Like Prayer C, this prayer has a fixed, rather than seasonal preface:

It is truly right to glorify you, Father, and to give you thanks; for you alone are God, living and true, dwelling in light inaccessible from before time and for ever.

Fountain of life and source of all goodness, you made all things and fill them with your blessing; you created them to rejoice in the splendor of your radiance. Countless throngs of angels stand before you to serve you night and day; and, beholding the glory of your presence, they offer you unceasing praise.

The prayer continues after the *Sanctus* with a powerful recitation of creation and the incarnation before moving into the institution narrative, the beginning of which reads: “When the hour had come for him to be glorified by you, his heavenly Father, having loved his own who were in the world, he loved them to the end,” followed by the narrative itself which is the same as that of Prayers A and B. The *anamnesis*, oblation, and epiclesis follow:

Father, we now celebrate this memorial of our redemption.

Recalling Christ’s death and his descent among the dead, proclaiming his resurrection and ascension to your right hand, awaiting his coming in glory; and offering to you, from the gifts you have given us, this bread and this cup, we praise you and we bless you.

The phrase “the memorial of our redemption” is, in my view, somewhat problematic because it reduces the Eucharist to a commemoration. When asked what this phrase refers to, many Episcopalians say they have no idea. A double epiclesis, upon the gifts and the congregation comes next:

Lord, 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.

Grant that all who share this bread and cup may become one body and one spirit, a living sacrifice in Christ, to the praise of your Name.

The phrase “showing them to be holy gifts” is an unusual one in Anglican prayers. Anglican eucharistic theology has tended to balance an objective change of an undetermined nature in the

eucharistic elements to become the body and blood of Christ, and the subjective faith of the believer who receives the sacrament. And eucharistic adoration is forbidden by the *Articles of Religion XXVIII*: The Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was not by Christ's ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped. Hatchett points out that “like Prayer B it allows the insertion of a saint’s name if there is a commemoration. And like Eastern and Roman eucharistic prayers since the fourth century it provides for intercessions,”³⁶ including those for the departed, which Cranmer removed from 1552.

Remember, Lord, your one holy catholic and apostolic Church, redeemed by the blood of your Christ. Reveal its unity, guard its faith, and preserve it in peace.
[Remember (NN. and) all who minister in your Church.]
[Remember all your people, and those who seek your truth.]
[Remember _____.]
[Remember all who have died in the peace of Christ, and those whose faith is known to you alone; bring them into the place of eternal joy and light.]
And grant that we may find our inheritance with [the Blessed Virgin Mary, with patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and martyrs,
(with _____) and] all the saints who have found favor with you in ages past. We praise you in union with them and give you glory through your Son Jesus Christ our Lord.

In summary, the four Rite II eucharistic prayers share the following characteristics:

- (1) Emphasis on creation;
- (2) Emphasis on eschatological fulfillment;
- (3) Oblation (*anamnesis*) in which the saving acts of Christ are commemorated as the basis for the eucharistic offering;
- (4) Epiclesis or double invocation, upon the gifts and the congregation;
- (5) Rejection of a “moment of consecration;” instead, the whole service consecrates.³⁷

Prayer A will serve here as an example of the traditional understanding of the Eucharist as a sacrifice which underpins all four Rite II Eucharistic prayers. It is the shortest of the four; it tends to be the most often used for both daily and Sunday Eucharists, especially in Ordinary Time. Immediately following the *Sursum Corda* and *Sanctus*, the presider prays: “He stretched

³⁶ Hatchett, 378.

³⁷ Charles P. Price, *Introducing the Proposed Book, Prayer Book Studies 29 Revised* (New York: The Church Hymnal Corporation, 1976), 83-85.

out his arms upon the cross, and offered himself, in obedience to your will, a perfect sacrifice for the whole world.” The *anamnesis* is proclaimed by the presider and the people together: “Christ has died. Christ is risen. Christ will come again.” The oblation is rendered “We celebrate the *memorial* of our redemption, O Father, in this sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving. Recalling his death, resurrection, and ascension, we offer you these gifts.” The epiclesis upon the gifts and the people follows: “Sanctify them by your Holy Spirit to be for your people the Body and Blood of your Son, the holy food and drink of new and unending life in him. Sanctify us also that we may faithfully receive this holy Sacrament...” The Fraction is restored as a primary action of the Eucharist, again recalling Christ’s sacrifice: “Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us. Therefore let us keep the feast.” The post-communion prayers leave no question that the consecrated bread and wine are the “body and blood” of Christ, and “spiritual food” – the Real Presence is affirmed, but not defined: “Eternal God, heavenly Father, you have graciously accepted us as living members of your Son our Savior Jesus Christ, and you have fed us with spiritual food, in the Sacrament of his Body and Blood” and “Almighty and everliving God, we thank you for feeding us with the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood of your Son our Savior Jesus Christ; and for assuring us in these holy mysteries that we are living members of the Body of your Son, and heirs of your eternal kingdom.”

An additional innovation in the 1979 Prayer Book is “An Order for Celebrating the Holy Eucharist.” The rubric specifically states this order “requires careful preparation by the priest and other participants. It is not intended for use at the principal Sunday or weekly celebration of the Holy Eucharist.” Rites I and II are the principal eucharistic celebrations; improvised services are not permitted. Nonetheless, the intention is to provide “freedom for those situations [in which Rites I and II]...are too formal, too verbose, or too demanding...when the congregation is

principally composed of children or other particular age groups, or of special ethnic or cultural groups. It allows for appropriate adaptations when members of the congregation have limited sight, hearing, or other physical [dis]abilities, or have minimal reading ability or attention span.”³⁸ Interestingly, Hatchett also states

The order also provides the freedom, within certain limitations, to use some of the great historic liturgies of the church, to celebrate according to different traditions, or use texts from previous editions of the *Book of Common Prayer* or the Prayer Books of other provinces of Anglicanism (so long as the peace is included and the preparation of the table is reunited with the eucharistic prayer rather than preceding the prayer for the world and for the church).³⁹

The order (which is exactly the same as Rite I and II) provides a list of essential elements for making Eucharist: the people and priest

Gather in the Lord’s Name
Proclaim and Respond to the Word of God
Pray for the World and the Church
Exchange the Peace
Prepare the Table
Make Eucharist
Break the Bread
Share the Gifts of God

Two very simple forms of The Great Thanksgiving are provided. Form 1 consists of (in this order), the *Sursum Corda*, optional *Sanctus*, “giving thanks for the salvation of the world through Jesus Christ (extempore if the priest is able and wishes to do so), an epiclesis, the institution narrative (identical to Prayer C), the *anamnesis* (abbreviated version of Roman Prayer IV) and oblation (Prayer III in the Roman sacramentary of Paul VI)⁴⁰:

Father, we now celebrate the memorial of your Son. By means of this holy bread and cup, we show forth the sacrifice of his death, and proclaim his resurrection, until he comes again.

³⁸ Hatchett, 411.

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Hatchett, 415.

Gather us by this Holy Communion into one body in your
Son Jesus Christ. Make us a living sacrifice of praise.

Despite their sources, the theology of these texts is ambiguous, perhaps because they are so abbreviated as to have lost essential meaning. “The memorial of your Son,” could refer to either the Last Supper or the Cross—which is it? There is no mention of redemption. “Showing forth the sacrifice of his death” is not a robust *anamnesis*; it sounds like a stage direction and has no sense of participation. What does “a living sacrifice of praise” signify? The eucharistic theology of Form 2 is somewhat less ambiguous. Following the institution narrative (identical to Prayer A), there is a clear *anamnesis* (similar to the memorial acclamation of Prayer B), oblation (similar to Prayer A), and epiclesis (a combination of phrases from Prayers A and B)⁴¹:

Recalling now his suffering and death, and celebrating his
resurrection and ascension, we await his coming in glory.

Accept, O Lord, our sacrifice of praise, this memorial of our
redemption.

Send your Holy Spirit upon these gifts. Let them be for us
the Body and Blood of your Son. And grant that we who eat
this bread and drink this cup may be filled with your life and
goodness.

The rubric then directs the Celebrant to pray extemporaneously “that all may receive the benefits of Christ’s work, and the renewal of the Holy Spirit.” This is consistent with the practice of the early Church when prayer texts were not written down and the presider prayed extempore.⁴²

In keeping with previous BCPs, the 1979 Prayer Book provides for the additional consecration of the elements in the circumstance when not enough bread and wine have been consecrated for all communicants, by saying the following:

Hear us, O heavenly Father, and with thy (your) Word and

⁴¹ Hatchett, 416.

⁴² I am not personally acquainted with any congregations that have used this order, I suspect because it requires significant knowledge and preparation on the part of both the presider and the people.

Holy Spirit bless and sanctify this bread (wine) that it, also, may be the Sacrament of the precious Body (Blood) of thy (your) Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who took bread (the cup) and said, “This is my Body (Blood).” Amen.

The rubric also provides “or else the celebrant may consecrate more of both kinds, saying again the words of the Eucharistic Prayer, beginning with the words which follow the *Sanctus*, and ending with the Invocation (in the case of Eucharistic Prayer C, ending with the narrative of the Institution). The BCP, as noted previously, is the only eucharistic rite which makes this provision.

In conclusion, the eucharistic prayers in the 1979 *Book of Common Prayer* are based on multiple sources, taking into consideration advances in biblical and liturgical scholarship, as well as the insights of the ecumenical liturgical renewal movement. Rite I preserves traditional language while Rite II uses contemporary language, consistent with the Anglican tradition of celebrating the holy mysteries in the vernacular. Some material jettisoned in the Reformation out of an abundance of concern about medieval excesses has been reclaimed. The concept of the Eucharist as a memorial has been replaced with active *anamnesis* by the gathered community. Honoring the ministry of all the baptized by specifying additional roles for the laity contributes to the sense of the community celebration. Presider and people proclaim the mystery of faith which is celebrated at every Eucharist. In that the 1979 BCP claims 1549 as its ancestor, its eucharistic theology is not that of Cranmer’s mature articulation: it is more Catholic than Reformed.

Chapter 7: Conclusion

Cranmer's early position on the "real presence" of Christ in the Eucharist was somewhat ambiguous; the text of the 1549 liturgy and the rubrics for its celebration are inconsistent. It was not that which he would articulate in his *Defense* of 1550, although he seems to have been moving in the direction of his mature understanding: Christ is present spiritually in the sacrament and in the faith of the receiver, not substantially, corporally or really, because His body is in heaven; a nominalist, not realist, view. Interestingly, in the prayer after the institution narrative, Cranmer uses the words "celebrate and make" to describe "the memorial which thy Son hath willed us to make" which Kavanagh interprets to be as close to *anamnesis* as Cranmer would go;¹ but the word celebrate would be eliminated from the 1552 rite. More often Cranmer would use memorial, commemoration, and remembrance more or less interchangeably, but always in the sense of individual mentation.

For Cranmer, therefore, the eucharistic sacrifice was strictly a conceptual or intellectual activity of remembering. In *A Defense*, he argues from Scripture that what Christ intended is that the Eucharist would be a "memorial." This position seems to have been his answer to the major controversy of the Reformation: the connection between Christ's sacrifice on Calvary and the *anamnesis* of His sacrifice in the Eucharist. The traditional view maintains that nature of sacrifice in which the bread and wine are identified with the body and blood of Christ, and the self-giving of Christ at the Last Supper is identified with His self-giving on the cross. But Cranmer had rejected this view. For Cranmer, the bread and wine were "signs" or "creatures,"

¹ Aidan Kavanagh, *The Concept of Eucharistic Memorial in the Canon Revisions of Thomas Cranmer Archbishop of Canterbury 1533-1556* (St. Meinrad: Abbey Press, 1964), 167-168.

not the actual body and blood of the Lord. Because it is impossible to duplicate the self-giving of Christ, all that can be done is to remember it mentally.

The *Book of Common Prayer* of 1552 was irenic -- an attempt to pacify both Catholics and Reformers by providing a liturgy that was acceptable to both. Cranmer's mature eucharistic theology is enshrined in 1552's newly titled *Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion*. The mood is strongly penitential; the unworthiness of the people to so much as "gather the crumbs under thy table" is far from the notion that the Eucharist is a foretaste of the heavenly banquet to which all are invited. Any aspect of the liturgy that might be misconstrued as upholding the sacrifice(s) of the Mass has been eliminated². There is no offertory, no consecration, no epiclesis, no fraction. The bread and the wine are those for ordinary table use but of the purest quality. The Eucharistic prayer, much like that of Calvin, is an exhortation to worthy reception followed by the institution narrative, which for the Reformers, was all that was necessary to confect the sacrament. Further, the focal point of the Cranmer's Eucharist is reception, consistent with his contention that only when received by faith does the recipient receive the body and blood of Christ, underlining his notion of the spiritual presence of Christ. The sacrifice offered is one of praise and thanksgiving, the offering of "ourselves, our souls and bodies," which can in no way be confused with a repetition of the sacrifice of Christ. Kneeling is allowed but the rubric specifically states that kneeling is not to be a sign of adoration of the elements or any "real or essential presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood." The words of administration have been changed to "Take and eat this, in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on Him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving." What *this* refers to is left open, but arguably Cranmer is emphasizing reception and leaving no room for an

² C.f., Article 31 of the *XXIV Articles*, as Colin Dunlop points out in *Anglican Public Worship* (Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 1961), 88. This was a major concern of the Reformers.

interpretation of the real presence. Cranmer fashioned the entire liturgy around the notion of the Eucharist as memorial.

Cranmer's theology of the Eucharist was largely undone in the Elizabethan Prayer Book of 1559, although considerable ambiguity is evident. This Prayer Book is less Protestant than that of 1552, largely because of Elizabeth's own influence. The Black Rubric on kneeling was removed, which may be interpreted to signify that when the priest gives the elements to the faithful he is giving them not bread and wine but the body and blood of Christ. Elizabeth herself seems to have wanted to preserve the sense of real presence, which was accomplished by combining the words of administration from both 1549 (nominally affirming real presence even as the rubric for additional consecration does not) and those of 1552 (receptionism-with the word "remembrance" signifying communion as a memorial). Doubtless the revisers thought they had reached an acceptable compromise by including both formulas—pointing to that *via media* which would eventually become characteristic of the Anglican eucharistic tradition, although the term did not enter the vocabulary of the Church until much later. Certainly Elizabeth I would have affirmed this position, if her famous statement "There is only one Christ, Jesus, one faith. All else is a dispute over trifles," is any indication. However, Cranmer's *Forty-Two Articles* (1552), later revised to the better known *Thirty-Nine Articles*, were still in effect in 1559 as a doctrinal formulary. Article 28 states that '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.' In other words, the real presence is in the administration of the sacrament, so that those who with faith receive the sacrament receive Christ's body and blood. Article 31 states that any celebration of Christ's sacrifice on the cross is only a thankful commemoration of that saving event. There is no sense that the Eucharist is a

liturgical proclamation of a current reality that communicants participate in. Therefore the understanding of the Eucharist as a memorial in the psychological sense perdures in the 1559 BCP. The word memorable, a cognate of memorial, was defined as “worthie to be remembred” in Cawdrey’s 1604 dictionary of English words.³ Overall, the 1559 BCP represents a compromise that both Reformed and Catholic partisans could accept: this Prayer Book was as much a political solution as a religious one.

Therefore we are left with the problem of interpreting what Cranmer actually meant by “memorial.” His construal was limited to the medieval misunderstanding of the nature of sacrifice which had led to multiple masses being offered at the same time. It is questionable whether he had an adequate understanding of the nature of sacrifice in the Hebrew Bible, and thus the context in which Jesus exhorted the disciples to remember an event they could doubtless not forget, one that is a communal, ongoing remembrance (e.g., the covenant with Israel) rather than a recollection of a moment in time. This may account for some of the ambiguity in his theology--or perhaps his desire to accommodate both Catholics and Reformers left no choice but to espouse a position that he hoped would be acceptable to both, but ultimately pleased neither.

A second problem is semantic. Cranmer’s notion of the Eucharistic memorial is that of an abstract mental recollection, a calling to mind, of Christ’s sacrifice, combined with the dominical command to “do this.” He considers it “the sacrifice of all Christian people to remember Christ’s death, to laud and thank him for it, and to publish it abroad unto other, to his honor and glory.” This explains why he removed any reference to the bread and wine being an oblation and why

³ Robert Cawdrey, *A Table Alphabeticall of Hard Usual English Words* (1604), reprint ed. Raymond G. Siemens (Toronto: University of Toronto Library, 1997), <http://www.library.utoronto.ca/utel/ret/cawdrey/cawdrey0.html#m> (accessed on March 21, 2017).

there is no consecration of the elements. It is also consistent with Cranmer's notion of spiritual presence and receptionism, both of which have at the heart the Reformation idea of justifying faith.

Anamnesis, on the other hand, is a term of art. Textual studies have demonstrated that the words memorial (*mnemosunon*) and *anamnesis* are often used interchangeably and are related to the Hebrew term *zikkaron*, which itself has a specialized meaning—that of the commemoration of a ritual act. While Thurian is comfortable with the interchange, Gregg makes a distinction, claiming that *mnemosunon* implies a sense of the participants in engaging with the past event enables a “genuine encounter” in the present. Finally, Morrill argues that “what [our] study of the liturgical tradition of *anamnesis* has uncovered, however, is the way in which the definite content of both the Old and New Testaments is communally shared in the eucharistic action, in the combined and irreducible roles played by both narrative and symbolic gesture as the Church encounters Christ in his commemoration.”⁴ Our understanding of the semantic differences between the terms may be a case of attributing a meaning to the word memorial that Cranmer himself would not recognize. Certainly *anamnesis* in no way implies the Eucharist as repeating the sacrifice of Christ on the cross. Instead, it points both back to the Cross and forward to the Parousia.

The text of the Prayer Book of 1662 is largely that of 1559. It is expressly a “publick liturgy,” designed to accommodate and unite various church factions, namely, the High Churchmen and the Puritans. The revisers of this Book, like their predecessors, tried to steer a middle course between two extremes. It can be argued that a high church spirituality and a Puritan sensibility combine in 1662.

⁴ Bruce T. Morrill, *Anamnesis as Dangerous Memory* (Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 2000), 199.

The eucharistic theology of the 1662 Book may be said to be Cranmer's because it follows that of 1559, which itself follows 1552; however, the rubrics are contradictory. Whether this was intentional or an oversight is not clear. For example, one rubric directs the priest to "begin the Offertory" and states that the bread and wine are to be placed on the altar, which seemingly indicates the bread and wine are oblations, which Cranmer did not recognize. In the Prayer for the Church Militant there is another reference to oblations—"we humbly beseech thee most mercifully to accept our alms and oblations, and to receive these our prayers." Yet there is no consecration of the elements. The words of institution are followed immediately by communion. There is no rubric providing for additional consecration. The final rubric, on the other hand, specifies that if any of the elements remain, only those "unconsecrated" are to revert to the Curate's use; the consecrated elements are to be consumed within the Church so lest they be taken away and adored. This would indicate that consecration is assumed to have taken place, presumably by invoking the words of institution. Cranmer was a nominalist: he would argue that the bread and the wine are only signs that remind us to give thanks for the work of Christ on the cross, not that we participate in any way in that work. The exhortation to communion declares, "it is your duty to receive the Communion in remembrance of the sacrifice of his death, as he himself hath commanded." Thus the Cranmerian notion of the Eucharist as memorial is intact in 1662. The words of administration are those of 1559, joining those of 1549 with those of 1552: "The Body (Blood) 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." Again, the combination is a perfect example of the *via media* sacramentalism that came to define Anglicanism. The Declaration on Kneeling, or the

Black Rubric, was altered once again in 1662 to remove any sense of the corporal presence of Christ in the Eucharist (as 1552 was altered to deny any “real and essential presence”):

Whereas it is ordained in this Office for the Administration of the Lord's Supper, that the Communicants should receive the same kneeling....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.⁵

Whether this change was semantic or intended to deny transubstantiation is unclear; it seems to adopt a nominalist viewpoint, which is consistent with Cranmer's understanding of the sacrament. The *Book of Common Prayer* of 1662 is often invoked, along with The Thirty-Nine Articles of 1571, to define the core beliefs of Anglicanism. The Book has served as a model for Books throughout the Anglican Communion and remains the official Prayer Book of England.

The First American Prayer Book of 1789 incorporated some aspects of 1662, but the greater proportion of the liturgy derives from the Scottish Prayer Book, which is closer to 1549 in both structure and theology. The consecration, oblation, invocation and epiclesis are all in their original 1549 positions. Real presence and sacrifice are once again assumed. The prayer of consecration begins with the acknowledgement that “Thine only Son Jesus Christ did institute, and in His holy Gospel *command us to continue, a perpetual memory* of that His precious death and sacrifice, until His coming again” and continues after the institution narrative to “celebrate and make here before thy Divine Majesty, with these thy holy gifts, which we now offer unto thee, *the memorial thy Son hath commanded us to make*; having in remembrance his blessed

⁵ *The Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion (1662)*, <http://www.eskimo.com/~lhowell/bcp1662/communion/index.html> (accessed on June 24, 2016).

passion and precious death, his mighty resurrection and glorious ascension; rendering unto thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same.” The Eucharist is therefore described in the same terms as *zikkaron* in the Hebrew Bible. The memory is perpetual and living.

The 1979 BCP is much more closely aligned with 1549 than any other Prayer Book, even as its revisers included contemporary language liturgies along with the traditional language of the 1662/1928 Prayer Book in Rite I. The whole celebration of the Eucharist is presented as *anamnesis*: the active participation of the congregation in following the dominical command to “Do this” – to give thanks and remember the sacrifice of Christ and the benefits accrued by that sacrifice. Price notes that the fundamental thrust is “maximum congregational participation in the services expressing the corporate character of the People of God.”⁶ Even the title “The Great Thanksgiving” emphasizes the significance of this prayer to God for all that has been done in creation and redemption. All four prayers emphasize creation and the whole economy of Christ’s life, death, and resurrection, rather than the exclusive focus on the Passion and death that are found in previous BCPs. Accordingly, the structure of the Great Thanksgiving is: *Sursum Corda*, Preface, *Sanctus* and *Benedictus*, institution narrative, memorial acclamation, *anamnesis* with oblation, epiclesis over the gifts, epiclesis over the communicants, Lord’s Prayer, fraction, invitation, Communion, post-Communion prayer, optional blessing, dismissal. That Christ is understood to be present in the communion elements is clear from the prayers of invocation and the invitation. Price notes in the introduction to the new Prayer Book that “Christ is present in the Eucharist as sacrificed, as well as risen, that his self-giving is present as a liturgical and spiritual reality.”⁷ Laypersons bring forward the gifts to be consecrated, representative of offering both

⁶ Price, op. cit, 82.

⁷ Price, ibid., 79.

the congregation and the world. Consistent with Anglican tradition, there is no moment of consecration: the whole service consecrates. Memorial acclamations derived from ancient liturgies are included in all four prayers, connecting the assembly with the promise of the heavenly banquet. “The oblation or *anamnesis* is the part of the Great Thanksgiving in which the saving acts of Christ are commemorated as the basis for the eucharistic offering...the acclamation “Christ has died, Christ is risen, Christ will come again” [alone in the trial version]...did not make explicit the connection with the offering of the bread and wine. Consequently the sentence has been inserted “Recalling his death, resurrection, and ascension, we offer you these gifts.” This addition constitutes the section as a formally complete *anamnesis*.”⁸ Thus the 1979 *Book of Common Prayer* of the Episcopal Church represents a watershed moment in Prayer Book revisions, looking as it does both to the past and the future. The theology of the Eucharist as active *anamnesis* -- the ongoing participation of the people -- is fully inscribed in the entire eucharistic celebration.

Supplemental liturgical materials continue to be developed and made available for use. At its last General Convention in 2015, Resolution A169 directs SCLM “to prepare a plan for the comprehensive revision” of the 1979 *Book of Common Prayer* and to present it to the next General Convention in 2018. It says the plan must “utilize the riches of our church’s liturgical, cultural, racial, generational, linguistic, gender and ethnic diversity in order to share common worship” and “take into consideration the use of current technologies which provide access to a broad range of liturgical resources.”⁹ In December 2016 The Standing Commission on Liturgy and Music issued a press release indicating its intention to send to General Convention 2018 four

⁸ Price, *ibid.*, 84.

⁹ “Plans to be created for prayer book, hymnal revision,” [Press Release] July 3, 2015, <http://episcopaldigitalnetwork.com/ens/2015/07/03/plans-to-be-created-for-prayer-book-hymnal-revision/> (accessed on July 15, 2016).

different paths forward with regard to the *Book of Common Prayer* and liturgical renewal. The four paths enunciated are:

“1) Full and comprehensive revision of the 1979 *Book of Common Prayer* beginning after the 2018 General Convention;

2) Creation of comprehensive Book(s) of *Alternative Services* and no revision of the 1979 *Book of Common Prayer*, with work beginning after the 2018 General Convention;

3) Intensive church-wide conversation between the 2018 and 2021 General Convention about whether a revision of the *Book of Common Prayer* is needed or desirable; to what extent; and whether, if revision is not desirable, the Episcopal Church should instead develop significant supplemental liturgical resources, such as a *Book of Alternative Services*;

4) A step back from efforts toward comprehensive liturgical revision or creation of new liturgies, and an accompanying commitment to deepening the collective understanding of – and engagement with – the theology of our current liturgies.”¹⁰ Predictably, the sides for and against have already lined up, long before the work has even begun. It appears, however, that so far, with few exceptions¹¹, no loud cry has arisen for a complete reimagining of the liturgical resources of the Episcopal Church, although issues of inclusive/expansive language, theological feminism, multiculturalism, and inclusion of the voices of the LGBTQ community continue to be raised by some liturgists.

Of all the Books of Common Prayer reviewed, the 1979 Prayer Book most closely resembles the first *Book of Common Prayer* of 1549, which was the intention of the revisers. The

¹⁰ Standing Commission on Liturgy and Music, “Four Possible Paths for the Book of Common Prayer,” [Press Release] December 6, 2016, <https://standingcommissiononliturgyandmusic.org/2016/12/02/four-possible-paths-for-the-book-of-common-prayer/> (accessed on December 12, 2016).

¹¹ Bryan Cones, “The 78th General Convention of the Episcopal Church and the Liturgy: New Wine in Old Wineskins?” *Anglican Theological Review*, Vol. 98, no. 4 (Spring 2016), 681-701. Ruth Meyers has also argued for comprehensive liturgical renewal. See “Imagining a New Prayer Book,” CDSP Convocation, October 8, 2015, personal communication.

serial undoing of Cranmer's mature eucharistic theology in Prayer Books subsequent to 1552 culminated in this Book. Each revision moved away from receptionism and the understanding of the celebration of the Eucharist as a mental recollection or commemoration of a one-time event in history and closer to the understanding of the gathered community's perpetual recognition of the sacrifice of Christ on the cross and its redemptive effect, accompanied by the community's response of praise and thanksgiving. There is no sense present of that sacrifice being repeated in the eucharistic celebration as was and is the case in traditional Catholic doctrine, and from which Cranmer shifted away. What is present is the clear sense of the Eucharist as *anamnesis*: through the spoken words, the manual acts of the presider, the active participation of the laity in the prayers, and the distinct awareness of the real presence of Christ in the consecrated elements.

Appendices

Appendix A: Order of Service BCP 1549 and 1552

BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER 1549* THE SUPPER OF THE LORD, AND THE HOLY COMMUNION, COMMONLY CALLED THE MASS	BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER 1552** THE ORDER FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER OR HOLY COMMUNION
Lord's Prayer (Priest) Collect for Purity (Priest) Introit and psalms (Clerks) <i>Kyrie</i> <i>Gloria</i> Collect of the Day Collect for the King Epistle Gospel Nicene Creed (sung or said) Sermon or Homily Exhortation to Communion Offertory sentences <i>Sursum corda</i> Proper Preface <i>Sanctus</i> Prayers for Church Militant Prayer for Consecration/institution narrative Prayer of oblation Lord's Prayer (All) Fraction Peace Invitation to confession Absolution Comfortable Words Prayer of Humble Access Communion <i>Agnus Dei</i> Post Communion sentences Post Communion Prayer/Thanksgiving Blessing	Lord's Prayer (Priest) Collect for purity (Priest) Decalogue/interspersed with <i>Kyrie</i> responses [omitted] [moved] Collect of the Day Collect for the King Epistle Gospel Nicene Creed (said) Sermon/Homily [moved] Almsgiving with sentences Prayer for the Church Militant Exhortation to communion Invitation to confession Absolution Comfortable Words <i>Sursum corda</i> Proper Preface <i>Sanctus</i> Prayer of Humble Access Words of Institution [moved] [moved] [omitted] [omitted] [moved] [moved] [moved] [moved] Communion [omitted] Lord's Prayer (All) Prayer of Oblation or Thanksgiving <i>Gloria</i> Blessing

Appendix B: Order of Service 1549, 1552, 1662

BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER 1549 The Supper of the Lord, and The Holy Communion, Commonly Called the Mass	BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER 1552 The Order of the Administration of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion	BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER 1662 The Order of the Administration of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion
Lord's Prayer (Priest) Collect for Purity (Priest) Introit and psalms (Clerks) <i>Kyrie</i> <i>Gloria</i> Collect of the Day Collect for the King Epistle Gospel Nicene Creed (sung or said) Sermon or Homily Exhortation to Communion Offertory sentences Almsgiving with sentences Prayer for the Church Militant Exhortations Invitation to confession General confession Absolution Comfortable Words <i>Sursum corda</i> Proper Preface <i>Sanctus</i> Prayers for Church Militant Prayer of Consecration Prayer of oblation Lord's Prayer (All) Fraction Peace Invitation to confession Absolution Comfortable Words Prayer of Humble Access	Lord's Prayer (Priest) Collect for purity (Priest) Decalogue/interspersed with <i>Kyrie</i> responses [moved] Collect of the Day Collect for the King Epistle Gospel Nicene Creed (said) Sermon/Homily Notices Almsgiving with sentences Prayer for the Church Militant Exhortations Invitation to confession General confession Absolution Comfortable Words <i>Sursum corda</i> Proper Preface <i>Sanctus</i> Prayer of Humble Access Words of Institution [moved] [moved] [omitted] [omitted] [moved] [moved] [moved] [moved]	Lord's Prayer (Minister) Collect for Purity (Minister) Ten Commandments/<i>Kyrie</i> (kneeling) [moved] Collect for the King Collect of the Day [reversed] Epistle Gospel (standing) Nicene Creed (sung or said, standing) Notices Sermon/Homily Offertory Scripture sentences Collection of alms Preparation of the elements Prayer for the Church Militant Exhortations Invitation to confession General confession Absolution Comfortable Words <i>Sursum corda</i> Proper Preface <i>Sanctus</i> Prayer of Humble Access Prayer of Consecration [restored] [Fraction anticipated] Communion

BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER 1549 The Supper of the Lord, and The Holy Communion, Commonly Called the Mass	BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER 1552 The Order of the Administration of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion	BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER 1662 The Order of the Administration of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion
Communion <i>Agnus Dei</i> Post Communion sentences Post Communion Prayer/ Thanksgiving Blessing	Communion Lord's Prayer (all) Prayer of Oblation or Thanksgiving <i>Gloria</i> Blessing	Lord's Prayer Prayer of Oblation or Thanksgiving <i>Gloria (said or sung)</i> Blessing

Appendix C: Order of Service 1549, 1552, Scottish 1637

BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER 1549* THE SUPPER OF THE LORD, AND THE HOLY COMMUNION, COMMONLY CALLED THE MASS	BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER 1552** THE ORDER FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER OR HOLY COMMUNION	<i>BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER FOR SCOTLAND 1637</i> THE ORDER OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE LORDS SUPPER, OR HOLY COMMUNION
Lord's Prayer (Priest) Collect for Purity (Priest) Introit and psalms (Clerks) <i>Kyrie</i> <i>Gloria</i> Collect of the Day Collect for the King Epistle Gospel Nicene Creed (sung or said) Sermon or Homily Exhortation to Communion Offertory sentences <i>Sursum corda</i> Proper Preface <i>Sanctus</i> Prayers for Church Militant Prayer for Consecration/institution narrative Prayer of oblation Lord's Prayer (All) Fraction Peace Invitation to confession Absolution Comfortable Words Prayer of Humble Access Communion <i>Agnus Dei</i> Post Communion sentences Post Communion Prayer/Thanksgiving Blessing	Lord's Prayer (Priest) Collect for purity (Priest) Decalogue/interspersed with <i>Kyrie</i> responses [omitted] Collect of the Day Collect for the King Epistle Gospel Nicene Creed (said) Sermon/Homily [moved] Almsgiving with sentences Prayer for the Church Militant Exhortation to communion Invitation to confession Absolution Comfortable Words <i>Sursum corda</i> Proper Preface <i>Sanctus</i> Prayer of Humble Access Words of Institution [moved] [moved] [omitted] [omitted] [moved] [moved] [moved] [moved] Communion [omitted] Lord's Prayer (All) Prayer of Oblation or	Lord's Prayer Collect for Purity Ten Commandments Collect for the King Collect for the Day Epistle Gospel Nicene Creed Sermon/Homily Offertory Scripture sentences Collection of alms Preparation of the elements Intercessions, with commemoration of the departed Preparation for Eucharist Exhortations Invitation Confession of Sins Absolution Comfortable Words Sursum Corda Proper Preface Doxology Prayer of Consecration Prayer of Oblation with Invocation Lord's Prayer Prayer of Humble Access

BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER 1549* THE SUPPER OF THE LORD, AND THE HOLY COMMUNION, COMMONLY CALLED THE MASS	BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER 1552** THE ORDER FOR THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER OR HOLY COMMUNION	<i>BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER FOR SCOTLAND 1637</i> THE ORDER OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE LORDS SUPPER, OR HOLY COMMUNION
	Thanksgiving <i>Gloria</i> Blessing	Communion Thanksgiving Prayer <i>Gloria</i> Blessing

Appendix D: Orders of Service*

Scottish BCP 1637	<i>Book of Common Prayer</i> 1662	Non-jurors' Liturgy 1718	Scottish Communion Office 1764	First American Prayer Book 1790
Lord's Prayer Collect for Purity Ten Commandments Collect for the King Collect for the Day Epistle Gospel Nicene Creed Sermon/Homily Offertory Scripture sentences Collection of alms Preparation of the elements Intercessions, with commemoration of the departed Preparation for Eucharist Exhortations Invitation Confession of Sins Absolution Comfortable Words Sursum Corda Proper Preface Doxology Prayer of Consecration Prayer of Oblation	Lord's Prayer (Priest) Collect for Purity (Priest) Ten Commandments /Kyrie Collect for the King Collect for the Day Epistle Gospel Nicene Creed Notices Sermon/Homily Offertory Scripture sentences Collection of alms Preparation of the elements Intercessions with commemoration of the departed Preparation for Eucharist Exhortations *Invitation *Confession of Sins *Absolution Comfortable Words Sursum Corda Proper Preface Doxology *Prayer of Humble Access Prayer of Consecration	Introit Psalm Salutation and Litany Lord's Prayer (Priest) Collect for Purity Summary of the Law/Kyrie Collect for the King Collect for the Day Epistle Gospel Nicene Creed Notices Sermon/Homily Exhortations (3) Offertory Sursum Corda Proper Preface Doxology Prayer of Consecration Prayer of Oblation	Lord's Prayer Collect for Purity Ten Commandments or Summary of Law Prayer for Divine Help or the King Collect for the Day Epistle Gospel Nicene Creed Sermon/Homily Exhortation Offertory Sursum Corda Proper Preface Doxology Prayer of Consecration Prayer of Oblation	Lord's Prayer (Priest) Collect for Purity (Priest) Ten Commandments or Summary of Law Prayer for Divine Help Collect for the Day Epistle Gospel Nicene or Apostle's Creed Notices Sermon/Homily Offertory Intercession for the Church Preparation for Eucharist Exhortations *Invitation *Confession of Sins *Absolution *Comfortable Words Sursum Corda Proper Preface Doxology Short Intro-Address *Prayer of Humble Access Prayer of Consecration Prayer of Oblation

with Invocation		Invocation Intercession for the Church Lord's Prayer Peace	Invocation Intercession for the Church Lord's Prayer	Invocation
Lord's Prayer		*Invitation	*Invitation	
Prayer of Humble Access		*Confession of sins	*Confession of Sins	
		*Absolution	*Absolution	
		Comfortable Words	Comfortable Words	
		*Prayer of Humble Access	*Prayer of Humble Access	
Communion	Communion	Communion	Communion	Communion
Thanksgiving Prayer	Oblation or Thanksgiving Prayer		Short Address	Lord's Prayer
<i>Gloria</i>	<i>Gloria</i>	Thanksgiving Prayer	Thanksgiving Prayer	Thanksgiving Prayer
Blessing	Blessing	<i>Gloria</i>	<i>Gloria</i>	<i>Gloria</i> or hymn
		Blessing	Blessing	Blessing
			*Texts from Scot 1637	*Texts from Scot 1637

Appendix E: Order of Service 1928, 1979 Rites I and II

1928	Rite I	Rite II
Lord's Prayer Collect for Purity Ten Commandments or Summary of the Law Lord, have mercy Collect of the Day Epistle Gospel Nicene or Apostle's Creed Announcements Prayer for the Whole State of Christ's Church Sermon Offertory Sentences General Confession Absolution Comfortable Words Proper Preface <i>Sanctus</i> Prayer of Consecration Lord's Prayer Prayer of Humble Access	The Holy Eucharist <i>The Word of God</i> Opening Acclamation Collect for Purity Ten Commandments or the Summary Lord, have mercy or Kyrie or Trisagion Gloria Collect of the Day <i>The Lessons</i> 1-2 lessons Psalm (optional) Gospel Sermon Nicene Creed (options for we/I) Prayers of the People Confession of Sin (may also be located after Collect for Purity-2 options) Absolution Comfortable Words Peace <i>The Holy Communion</i> Offertory sentence Eucharistic Prayer I <i>Sursum Corda</i> Proper Preface <i>Sanctus/Benedictus</i> Institution narrative Memorial acclamation Oblation <i>anamnesis</i> Epiclesis/invocation Lord's Prayer Fraction <i>Agnus Dei</i> Prayer of Humble Access Invitation	The Holy Eucharist The Word of God Opening Acclamation Collect for Purity Lord, have mercy or Kyrie or Trisagion Gloria Collect of the Day <i>The Lessons</i> 1-2 lessons Psalm (optional) Gospel Sermon Nicene Creed Prayers of the People Confession of Sin (may also be located after Collect for Purity) Absolution Peace <i>The Holy Communion</i> Offertory sentence Eucharistic Prayer A <i>Sursum Corda</i> Proper Preface <i>Sanctus/Benedictus</i> Institution narrative Memorial acclamation <i>anamnesis</i> Oblation Epiclesis/invocation Lord's Prayer Fraction <i>Agnus Dei (optional)</i> Invitation

Communion Post Communion prayer Glory be to God on high Blessing Dismissal	Communion Post Communion prayer Blessing Dismissal <i>Alternative Form of the Great Thanksgiving</i> Eucharistic Prayer II	Communion Post Communion prayer Blessing Dismissal <i>Alternative Forms of the Great Thanksgiving</i> Eucharistic Prayer B Eucharistic Prayer C Eucharistic Prayer D
--	--	--

Appendix G
Comparison of Eucharistic Prayers ABCD:
The Great Thanksgiving
1979 BCP

Prayer A	The Holy Communion	Comments*
	<i>The Celebrant may begin the Offertory with one of the sentences on page 376, or with some other sentence of Scripture.</i> <i>During the Offertory, a hymn, psalm, or anthem may be sung.</i> <i>Representatives of the congregation bring the people's offerings of bread and wine, and money or other gifts, to the deacon or celebrant. The people stand while the offerings are presented and placed on the Altar.</i> The Great Thanksgiving <i>Alternative forms will be found on page 367 and following</i> <i>The people remain standing. The Celebrant, whether bishop or priest, faces them and sings or says</i> The Lord be with you. People And also with you. Celebrant Lift up your hearts. People We lift them to the Lord. Celebrant Let us give thanks to the Lord our God. People It is right to give him thanks and praise. <i>Then, facing the Holy Table, the Celebrant proceeds</i> It is right, and a good and joyful thing, always and everywhere to give thanks to you, Father Almighty, Creator of heaven and earth. <i>Here a Proper Preface is sung or said on all Sundays, and on other occasions as appointed.</i> Therefore we praise you, joining our voices with Angels and Archangels and with all the company of heaven, who for ever sing this hymn to proclaim the glory of your Name: <i>Celebrant and People</i> Holy, holy, holy Lord, God of power and might, heaven and earth are full of your glory. Hosanna in the highest.	Optional. Music may be used instead. Required in 1549, 1552, 1662 and 1928. New emphasis on the inclusion of laypersons. Previously, Deacons, churchwardens were specified. Restored ancient title. Similar to Eucharistic Prayer I (itself based on Scot 1764). Standing for the Eucharist is new. It is an acknowledgement of the joyous celebration. <i>Sursum Corda</i> <i>Sanctus and Benedictus</i>

	Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord. Hosanna in the highest. <i>The people stand or kneel. Then the Celebrant continues</i> Holy and gracious Father: In your infinite love you made us for yourself; and, when we had fallen into sin and become subject to evil and death, you, in your mercy, sent Jesus Christ, your only and eternal Son, to share our human nature, to live and die as one of us, to reconcile us to you, the God and Father of all. He stretched out his arms upon the cross, and offered himself, in obedience to your will, a perfect sacrifice for the whole world. <i>At the following words concerning the bread, the Celebrant is to hold it, or lay a hand upon it; and at the words concerning the cup, to hold or place a hand upon the cup and any other vessel containing wine to be consecrated.</i> On the night he was handed over to suffering and death, our Lord Jesus Christ took bread; and when he had given thanks to you, he broke it, and gave it to his disciples, and said, "Take, eat: This is my Body, which is given for you. Do this for the remembrance of me. " After supper he took the cup of wine; and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, and said, "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. Whenever you drink it, do this for the remembrance of me." Therefore we proclaim the mystery of faith: <i>Celebrant and People</i> Christ has died. Christ is risen. Christ will come again. <i>The Celebrant continues</i> We celebrate the memorial of our redemption, O Father, in this sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving. Recalling his death, resurrection, and ascension,	More flexibility in posture. Emphasis on the Incarnation. Particularly suitable for use in Advent. The shortest of the prayers; suitable for daily celebrations as well as the main Sunday Eucharist. Sacrifice and redemption through the cross. This rubric appears in 1549, was removed in 1552, restored in 1662 but with the instruction to break the bread at this point. <i>The Institution Narrative:</i> wording varies slightly among the four Eucharistic prayers, but all are a conflation of scriptural sources. <i>The memorial acclamation:</i> derives from Eastern liturgies; the wording is slightly different in each. <i>The anamnesis:</i> Christ's death and resurrection plus the eschatological element of the second coming. 1549 did not reference the second coming; 1552 moved <i>anamnesis</i> to the prayer for worthy reception; 1789 restored 1549. <i>The oblation:</i> Omitted in 1549, moved in
--	---	---

	<i>we offer you these gifts.</i> Sanctify them by your Holy Spirit to be for your people the Body and Blood of your Son, the holy food and drink of new and unending life in him. Sanctify us also that we may faithfully receive this holy Sacrament, and serve you in unity, constancy, and peace; and at the last day bring us with all your saints into the joy of your eternal kingdom. All this we ask through your Son Jesus Christ. By him, and with him, and in him, in the unity of the Holy Spirit all honor and glory is yours, Almighty Father, now and for ever. AMEN. Lord's Prayer The Breaking of the Bread <i>The Celebrant breaks the consecrated Bread.</i> <i>A period of silence is kept.</i> <i>Then may be sung or said</i> [Alleluia.] Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us; <i>Therefore let us keep the feast. [Alleluia.]</i> <i>In Lent, Alleluia is omitted, and may be omitted at other times except during Easter Season.</i> <i>In place of, or in addition to, the preceding, some other suitable anthem may be used.</i> <i>Facing the people, the Celebrant says the following</i> <i>Invitation</i> The Gifts of God for the People of God. <i>and may add</i> Take them in remembrance that Christ died for you, and feed on him in your hearts by faith, with thanksgiving. <i>The ministers receive the Sacrament in both kinds, and then immediately deliver it to the people.</i>	1552. Scottish 1637 restored <i>anamnesis</i> and included self-oblation prior to the administration. 1781 used the oblation from Apostolic Constitutions, American 1790 retained this. <i>The epiclesis/invocation:</i> 1549: Bless and sanctify by thy Word and Holy Spirit; 1552: None. 1662: None; 1637. 1979 Epiclesis over the congregation as well. ICET translation. <i>The Fraction</i> is restored as a primary action of the Eucharist. 1549: wafers; 1552: bread. Derived from anthem in 1549; omitted in 1552. <i>The invitation to Communion</i> 1549: Prayer of Humble Access 1552: Take and eat this, in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith, with thanksgiving. <i>Words of administration:</i> Simplified Medieval Western formula. 1549: 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. 1552: Take and
--	---	--

<i>The Bread and the Cup are given to the communicants with these words</i> The Body (Blood) of our Lord Jesus Christ keep you in everlasting life. [Amen.] <i>or with these words</i> The Body of Christ, the bread of heaven. [Amen.] The Blood of Christ, the cup of salvation. [Amen.] <i>After Communion, the Celebrant says</i> Let us pray. <i>Celebrant and People</i> Eternal God, heavenly Father, you have graciously accepted us as living members of your Son our Savior Jesus Christ, and you have fed us with spiritual food in the Sacrament of his Body and Blood. Send us now into the world in peace, and grant us strength and courage to love and serve you with gladness and singleness of heart; through Christ our Lord. Amen. <i>or the following</i> Almighty and everliving God, we thank you for feeding us with the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood of your Son our Savior Jesus Christ; and for assuring us in these holy mysteries that we are living members of the Body of your Son, and heirs of your eternal kingdom. And now, Father, send us out to do the work you have given us to do, to love and serve you as faithful witnesses of Christ our Lord. To him, to you, and to the Holy Spirit, be honor and glory, now and for ever. Amen. <i>The Bishop when present, or the Priest, may bless the people.</i> <i>The Deacon, or the Celebrant, dismisses them with these words</i> Let us go forth in the name of Christ. People Thanks be to God. <i>or this</i> Deacon Go in peace to love and serve the Lord. People Thanks be to God.	eat this, in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith, with thanksgiving. say. Drink this in remembrance that Christ's blood was shed for thee, and be thankful. 1559: combination of 1549 and 1552 texts 1662-all American revisions: 1559 texts Postcommunion prayer; two options. Blessing (optional) Dismissal
--	--

	or this Deacon Let us go forth into the world, rejoicing in rejoicing in the power of the Spirit. People Thanks be to God. <i>or this</i> Deacon Let us bless the Lord. People Thanks be to God. <i>From the Easter Vigil through the Day of Pentecost</i> <i>“Alleluia, alleluia”</i> <i>may be added to any of the dismissals.</i> The People respond Thanks be to God. Alleluia, alleluia.	
Prayer B* (alternative forms of the Great Thanksgiving)	We give thanks to you, O God, for the goodness and love which you have made known to us in creation; in the calling of Israel to be your people; in your Word spoken through the prophets; and above all in the Word made flesh, Jesus, your Son. For in these last days you sent him to be incarnate from the Virgin Mary, to be the Savior and Redeemer of the world. In him, you have delivered us from evil, and made us worthy to stand before you. In him, you have brought us out of error into truth, out of sin into righteousness, out of death into life. <i>At the following words concerning the bread, the Celebrant is to hold it, or lay a hand upon it; and at the words concerning the cup, to hold or place a hand upon the cup and any other vessel containing wine to be consecrated.</i> On the night before he died for us, our Lord Jesus Christ took bread; and when he had given thanks to you, he broke it, and gave it to his disciples, and said, “Take, eat: This is my Body, which is given for you. Do this for the remembrance of me.” After supper he took the cup of wine; and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, and said, “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. Whenever you drink it, do this for the remembrance of me.” Therefore, according to his command, O Father, <i>Celebrant and People</i> We remember his death, We proclaim his resurrection, We await his coming in glory;	Adaptation of prayer in <i>Apostolic Tradition</i>. Incarnation is a prominent theme. <i>Institution narrative.</i> <i>Memorial acclamation; different wording.</i>

	<i>The Celebrant continues</i> And we offer our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving to you, O Lord of all; presenting to you, from your creation, this bread and this wine. We pray you, gracious God, to send your Holy Spirit upon these gifts that they may be the Sacrament of the Body of Christ and his Blood of the new Covenant. Unite us to your Son in his sacrifice, that we may be acceptable through him, being sanctified by the Holy Spirit. In the fullness of time, put all things in subjection under your Christ, and bring us to that heavenly country where, with [] and] all your saints, we may enter the everlasting heritage of your sons and daughters; through Jesus Christ our Lord, the firstborn of all creation, the head of the Church, and the author of our salvation. By him, and with him, and in him, in the unity of the Holy Spirit all honor and glory is yours, Almighty Father, now and for ever. <i>AMEN.</i>	<i>Oblation.</i> <i>Epiclesis on the gifts.</i> <i>Epiclesis over the congregation.</i>
--	---	--

Prayer C	God of all power, Ruler of the Universe, you are worthy of glory and praise. <i>Glory to you for ever and ever.</i> At your command all things came to be: the vast expanse of interstellar space, galaxies, suns, the planets in their courses, and this fragile earth, our island home. <i>By your will they were created and have their being.</i> From the primal elements you brought forth the human race, and blessed us with memory, reason, and skill. You made us the rulers of creation. But we turned against you, and betrayed your trust; and we turned against one another. <i>Have mercy, Lord, for we are sinners in your sight.</i> Again and again, you called us to return. Through prophets and sages you revealed your righteous Law. And in the fullness of time you sent your only Son, born of a woman, to fulfill your Law, to open for us the way of freedom and peace. <i>By his blood, he reconciled us.</i> <i>By his wounds, we are healed.</i> And therefore we praise you, joining with the heavenly chorus, with prophets, apostles, and martyrs, and with all those in every generation who have looked to you in hope, to proclaim with them your glory, in their unending hymn: Holy, holy, holy Lord, God of power and might, heaven and earth are full of your glory. Hosanna in the highest. Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord. Hosanna in the highest. <i>The Celebrant continues</i> And so, Father, we who have been redeemed by him, and made a new people by water and the Spirit, now bring before you these gifts. Sanctify them by your Holy Spirit to be the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ our Lord. At the following words concerning the bread, the Celebrant is to hold it, or lay a hand upon it; and at the words concerning the cup, to hold or place a hand upon the cup and any other vessel containing wine to be <i>consecrated.</i> On the night he was betrayed he took bread, said the	Fixed Preface. Litany form. Focus on creation <i>Sanctus.</i> <i>Benedictus.</i> Reference to baptism. The entire prayer is modeled on the Baptismal Covenant. <i>Epiclesis</i> over the gifts-<i>before</i> the institution narrative. <i>Institution narrative.</i>
------------------------	---	--

	blessing, broke the bread, and gave it to his friends, and said, “Take, eat: This is my Body, which is given for you. Do this for the remembrance of me.” After supper, he took the cup of wine, gave thanks, and said, “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. Whenever you drink it, do this for the remembrance of me.” Remembering now his work of redemption, and offering to you this sacrifice of thanksgiving, <i>We celebrate his death and resurrection, as we await the day of his coming.</i> Lord God of our Fathers; God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob; God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ: Open our eyes to see your hand at work in the world about us. Deliver us from the presumption of coming to this Table for solace only, and not for strength; for pardon only, and not for renewal. Let the grace of this Holy Communion make us one body, one spirit in Christ, that we may worthily serve the world in his name. <i>Risen Lord, be known to us in the breaking of the Bread.</i> Accept these prayers and praises, Father, through Jesus Christ our great High Priest, to whom, with you and the Holy Spirit, your Church gives honor, glory, and worship, from generation to generation. AMEN.	<i>anamnesis.</i> Eschatological element.
--	--	---

Prayer D	It is truly right to glorify you, Father, and to give you thanks; for you alone are God, living and true, dwelling in light inaccessible from before time and for ever. Fountain of life and source of all goodness, you made all things and fill them with your blessing; you created them to rejoice in the splendor of your radiance. Countless throngs of angels stand before you to serve you night and day; and, beholding the glory of your presence, they offer you unceasing praise. Joining with them, and giving voice to every creature under heaven, we acclaim you, and glorify your Name, as we sing (say), <i>Celebrant and People</i> Holy, holy, holy Lord, God of power and might, heaven and earth are full of your glory. Hosanna in the highest. Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord. Hosanna in the highest. <i>The people stand or kneel.</i> <i>Then the Celebrant continues</i> We acclaim you, holy Lord, glorious in power. Your mighty works reveal your wisdom and love. You formed us in your own image, giving the whole world into our care, so that, in obedience to you, our Creator, we might rule and serve all your creatures. When our disobedience took us far from you, you did not abandon us to the power of death. In your mercy you came to our help, so that in seeking you we might find you. Again and again you called us into covenant with you, and through the prophets you taught us to hope for salvation. Father, you loved the world so much that in the fullness of time you sent your only Son to be our Savior. Incarnate by the Holy Spirit, born of the Virgin Mary, he lived as one of us, yet without sin. To the poor he proclaimed the good news of salvation; to prisoners, freedom; to the sorrowful, joy. To fulfill your purpose he gave himself up to death; and, rising from the grave, destroyed death, and made the whole creation new. And, that we might live no longer for ourselves, but for him who died and rose for us, he sent the Holy	Based on the Liturgy of St. Basil. No Proper Preface per Eastern tradition. Text was developed by ecumenical group of liturgical scholars. <i>Sanctus</i> <i>Benedictus</i> It was the intention of the revisers that the people would stand throughout the Eucharistic prayers in recognition of the joyous nature of the Eucharist. Kneeling has persisted in many parishes.
------------------------	--	--

	Spirit, his own first gift for those who believe, to complete his work in the world, and to bring to fulfillment the sanctification of all. <i>At the following words concerning the bread, the Celebrant is to hold it, or lay a hand upon it; and at the words concerning the cup, to hold or place a hand upon the cup and any other vessel containing wine to be consecrated.</i> When the hour had come for him to be glorified by you, his heavenly Father, having loved his own who were in the world, he loved them to the end; at supper with them he took bread, and when he had given thanks to you, he broke it, and gave it to his disciples, and said, “Take, eat: This is my Body, which is given for you. Do this for the remembrance of me.” After supper he took the cup of wine; and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, and said, “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. Whenever you drink it, do this for the remembrance of me.” Father, we now celebrate this memorial of our redemption. Recalling Christ’s death and his descent among the dead, proclaiming his resurrection and ascension to your right hand, awaiting his coming in glory; and offering to you, from the gifts you have given us, this bread and this cup, we praise you and we bless you. <i>Celebrant and People</i> <i>We praise you, we bless you, we give thanks to you, and we pray to you, Lord our God.</i> <i>The Celebrant continues</i> Lord, 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. Grant that all who share this bread and cup may become one body and one spirit, a living sacrifice in Christ, to the praise of your Name.	<i>Institution narrative.</i> <i>anamnesis.</i> <i>Oblation.</i> <i>Epiclesis: upon the people and the gifts.</i> Items in brackets may be omitted.
--	---	--

	Remember, Lord, your one holy catholic and apostolic Church, redeemed by the blood of your Christ. Reveal its unity, guard its faith, and preserve it in peace. [Remember (NN. and) all who minister in your Church.] [Remember all your people, and those who seek your truth.] [Remember _____.] [Remember all who have died in the peace of Christ, and those whose faith is known to you alone; bring them into the place of eternal joy and light.] And grant that we may find our inheritance with [the Blessed Virgin Mary, with patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and martyrs, (with _____) and] all the saints who have found favor with you in ages past. We praise you in union with them and give you glory through your Son Jesus Christ our Lord. Through Christ, and with Christ, and in Christ, all honor and glory are yours, Almighty God and Father, in the unity of the Holy Spirit, for ever and ever. AMEN.	
--	---	--

*In part based on Hatchett, *Commentary on the American Prayer Book*, as well as Schnitker, *The Church's Worship*.

Bibliography of Works Consulted

Arnesen, Aelred. "The Myth of Anamnesis." *Theology* 105, no. 6 (November 2002): 436–443.

Baldovin, John. "Hippolytus and the Apostolic Tradition: Recent Research and Commentary." *Theological Studies* Vol. 64, no. 3 (2003): 520-542 (accessed on April 26, 2016).

Burson, Malcolm C. ed., *Worship Points the Way: Celebrating the Life and Work of Massey H. Shepherd, Jr.* New York: The Seabury Press, 1981.

Bowers, Roger. "The Chapel Royal, the First Edwardian Prayer Book, and Elizabeth's Settlement of Religion, 1559." *The Historical Journal* Vol. 43, no. 2 (June 2000): 317-344.

Bowles, C.W.J. *The Prayer Book of 1549. The Churchman*, Vol. 63, no. 2, (1949): 76-82.
http://biblicalstudies.org.uk/pdf/churchman/063-02_076.pdf (accessed on July 5, 2016).

Bradshaw, Paul F. and Maxwell E. Johnson. *The Eucharistic Liturgies: Their Evolution and Interpretation*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2012.

Bradshaw, Paul F. *Eucharistic Origins*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.

—. *The Search for the Origins of Christian Worship*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2012.

—. *Reconstructing Early Christian Worship*. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 2010.

Brook, Stella. *The Language of the Book of Common Prayer*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.

Brooks, Peter Newman. *Thomas Cranmer's Doctrine of the Eucharist*. 2nd ed. London: MacMillan Academic and Professional Ltd, 1992.

Brydon, Michael. *The Evolving Reputation of Richard Hooker: An Examination of Responses, 1660–1714*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

Buchanan, Colin. *What did Cranmer think he was doing?* Grove Liturgical Study No. 7
Bramcote, Nott.: Grove Books, 1976.

Colin Buchanan, ed. *Essays on Eucharistic Sacrifice in the Early Church*. Grove Liturgical Study 40 Bramcote, Nott.: Grove Books, 1984.

Buxton, Richard F. *Eucharist and Institution Narrative: A Study in the Roman and Anglican Traditions of the Consecration of the Eucharist from the Eighth to the Twelfth Centuries*. London: SPCK, 1976.

Cawdrey, Robert. *A Table Alphabeticall of Hard Usual English Words*. (1604). Reprint edited by Raymond G. Siemens. Toronto: University of Toronto Library, 1997.

<http://www.library.utoronto.ca/utel/ret/cawdrey/cawdrey0.html#m> (accessed on March 21, 2017).

Chapman, Mark. *Anglican Theology*. London: T&T Clark, 2012.

Chenderlin, Fritz. “*Do This As My Memorial*.” Rome: Biblical Institute Press, 1982.

Cleugh, Hannah. “The Prayer Book in Early Stuart Society.” In *Comfortable Words: Polity, Piety and the Book of Common Prayer*. Edited by Stephen Platten and Christopher Woods. London: SCM Press, 2012.

Cocksworth, Christopher J. “The presence of Christ in the Eucharist and in the Formularies of the Church of England.” *Journal of Ecumenical Studies* Vol. 35 no.2 (Spring 1998): 197-209.

Cones, Bryan. “The 78th General Convention of the Episcopal Church and the Liturgy: New Wine in Old Wineskins?” *Anglican Theological Review* Vol. 98, no. 4 (Spring 2016): 681-701.

Cooper, James. *The Book of Common Prayer and Administration of the Sacraments and Other Parts of Divine Service for the Use of the Church of Scotland*. Edinburgh and London: William Blackwood and Sons, 1904.

Cranmer, Thomas. *The Order of the Communion*. 1548.

http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bcp/Communion_1548.htm (accessed on June 16, 2016).

—. *A Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Our Savior Christ*. Stoke-on-Trent: Berith Publications, 2004.

Crossan, John Dominick. *The Historical Jesus: The Life of a Mediterranean Jewish Peasant*. San Francisco: HarperSanFrancisco, 1991.

Cuming, G.J. *A History of Anglican Liturgy*. London: MacMillan and Co Ltd, 1969.

Cummings, Brian, ed. *The Book of Common Prayer: The Texts of 1549, 1559, and 1662*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.

Daniels, Louis E. “The Ornaments Rubric: Its History and Force.” The Anglican Society, n.d. http://anglicanhistory.org/liturgy/daniels_ornaments.html (accessed on January 10, 2017).

Daly, Robert J. “Eucharistic Origins: From the New Testament to the Liturgies of the Golden Age.” *Theological Studies* 66 (2005): 3-22.

Dailey, Prudence. ed. *The Book of Common Prayer: Past, Present & Future*. London: Continuum International Publishing Group, 2011.

Dix, Dom Gregory. *The Shape of the Liturgy*. 1945. Reprint, with additional notes by Paul V. Marshall. New York: The Seabury Press, 1982.

- Douglas, Brian. "Anglican Eucharistic Theology."
http://anglicaneucharistictheology.com/Anglican_Eucharistic_Theology/Welcome.html
 (accessed on March 21, 2017).
- . *The Scottish Prayer Book of 1637: Case Study 1.34*.
http://anglicaneucharistictheology.com/Anglican_Eucharistic_Theology/Case_Studies/Entries/2006/4/28_The_Scottish_Prayer_Book_of_1637.html (accessed on March 21, 2017).
- . *A Companion to Anglican Eucharistic Theology Volume 2: The 20th Century to the Present*.
 Leiden: Brill, 2012.
- . "The 1662 Book of Common Prayer: Assessing its Eucharistic Theology 350 Years On."
Pacifica Vol. 25, no.3 (October 2012): 273-287.
- Douglas, Ian T. "Anglican Mission in Changing Times: A Brief Institutional History of the
 Episcopal Church, USA." In *Church, Identity, and Change: Theology and Denominational
 Structures in Unsettled Times*, edited by David A. Roozen, and James R. Nieman. Grand Rapids:
 Wm. B. Eerdmans, 2005.
- Duffy, Eamon. *The Stripping of the Altars*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1992.
- Duncan, Julie. *Ecclesiastes*. Nashville: Abingdon Press, forthcoming 2017 (personal
 communication).
- Dunlop, Colin. *Anglican Public Worship*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock, 1961.
- Echlin, Edward P. *The Anglican Eucharist in Ecumenical Perspective: Doctrine and Rite from
 Cranmer to Seabury*. New York: The Seabury Press, 1968.
- Farwell, James. "Salvation, the Life of Jesus, and the Eucharistic Prayer: An Anglican Reflection
 and Proposal." *Liturgy* Vol. 31 no 3 (2016): 19-27.
- Finkelstein, Louis. "The *Birkat Ha-Mazon*." *The Jewish Quarterly Review* Vol. 19, no. 3
 (January, 1929): 211-262.
- Galley, Howard E. *The Ceremonies of the Eucharist: A Guide to Celebration*. Lanham, MD:
 Cowley Publications, 1989.
- Gibson, Frederick, *The Standard Editions of the American Book of Common Prayer*.
http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bcp/std_edsl.htm (accessed on June 23, 2016).
- Gittoes, Julie. *Anamnesis and the Eucharist: Contemporary Anglican Approaches*. Aldershot:
 Ashgate Publishing Ltd, 2008.
- David Gregg, *Anamnesis in the Eucharist*. Grove Liturgical Study No. 5 Bramcote: Grove
 Books, 1976.

Haigh, Christopher. "Liturgy and Liberty: The Controversy over the Book of Common Prayer, 1660-1663." *Journal of Anglican Studies* Vol. 11, no. 1 (2012): 32-64.

Hall, Basil. "Cranmer, The Eucharist and the Foreign Divines in the Reign of Edward VI." In *Thomas Cranmer: Churchman and Scholar*. Edited by Paul Ayriss and David Selwyn. Woodbridge: The Boydell Press, 1993.

Hatchett, Marion J. *Commentary on the American Prayer Book*. New York: HarperCollins, 1995.

—. "The Colonies and States of America." In *The Oxford Guide to the Book of Common Prayer: A Worldwide Survey*. Edited by Charles Hefling and Cynthia Shattuck. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

—. *The Making of the First American Book of Common Prayer*. New York: The Seabury Press, 1982.

—. *A Manual of Ceremonial for the New Prayer Book*. Sewanee, TN: The St. Luke's Journal of Theology, 1977.

Huelskamp, Benjamin Z. "Edward's Prayers, Elizabeth's Settlement: The 1549, 1552, and 1559 Books of Common Prayer." *Lethbridge Undergraduate Research Journal* Vol. 4 no 1. (2009): unpagged. <https://lurj.org/issues/volume-2-number-1/prayer> (accessed on March 28, 2016).

Hooker, Richard. *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*. 1597. Edited by Arthur Stephen McGrade. New York: Oxford University Press, 2013.

Jasper R.C.D. and G.J. Cuming. *Prayers of the Eucharist: Early and Reformed*. 3rd ed. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1990.

Jeanes, Gordon P. *Signs of God's Promise: Thomas Cranmer's Sacramental Theology and the Book of Common Prayer*. London: T&T Clark, 2008.

—. "A Reformation Treatise on the Sacraments." *The Journal of Theological Studies, NEW SERIES*, Vol. 46, no. 1 (April 1995): 149-190.

Jeremias, Joachim. *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*. New York: C. Scribner's Sons, 1966.

Jones, Bayard H. *Prayer Book Studies IV, The Eucharistic Liturgy*. New York: The Church Pension Fund, 1953.

Jones, Ray Carlton. "The Lord's Supper and The Concept of Anamnesis." *Word & World* Vol. 6, no. 4 (1986): 434-446.

Kavanagh, Aidan. *The Concept of Eucharistic Memorial in the Canon Revisions of Thomas Cranmer Archbishop of Canterbury 1533-1556*. St. Meinrad: Abbey Press, 1964.

Kilmartin, Edward J. *The Eucharist in the West: History and Theology*. Edited by Robert J. Daly. Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1998.

Klawans, Jonathan. "Was Jesus' Last Supper a Seder?" *Bible Review* Vol. 77, no. 5 (October 2001): 24-33, 47.

William Laud, John Fisher, and Charles Hare Simpkinson Dewesselow. *A Relation of the Conference between William Laud ... and Mr. Fisher ...* London. New York: Macmillan, 1901.

Lee, Jeffrey. *Opening the Prayer Book*. Lanham, MD: Cowley Publications, 1999.

Leuenberger, Samuel. *Archbishop Cranmer's Immortal Bequest: The Book of Common Prayer of the Church of England: An Evangelistic Liturgy*. Translated by Samuel Leuenberger and Lewis J. Gorin, Jr. Grand Rapids: William B. Eerdmans, 1990.

Macy, Gary. *The Banquet's Wisdom*. 2nd ed. Ashland City, TN: OSL Publications, 2005.

—. *The Theologies of the Eucharist in the Early Scholastic Period*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984.

Malloy, Patrick. *Celebrating the Eucharist: A Practical Ceremonial Guide for Clergy and Other Liturgical Ministers*. New York: Church Publishing, 2007.

Marshall, Paul V. *Anglican Liturgy in America, Volume One: Prayer Book Parallels*. New York: The Church Hymnal Corporation, 1989.

Marshall, Paul V. and Northrop, Lesley, eds. *Leaps and Boundaries: The Prayer Book in the 21st Century*. Harrisburg, PA: Morehouse Publishing, 1997.

Mazza, Enrico. *The Origins of the Eucharistic Prayer*. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1995.

—. *The Celebration of the Eucharist: The Origin of the Rite and the Development of Its Interpretation*. Matthew J. O'Connell, trans. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 1999.

McCrary, James Waring. *The Prayer Book Liturgy and the Proposed Revision*. Originally published as a Supplement to Volume XVI of the St. Luke's Journal of Theology, June 1973.

McCulloch, Diarmaid. *Thomas Cranmer: A Life*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1998.

—. *The Reformation*. New York: Penguin Books, 2003.

—. "Richard Hooker's Reputation," in *A Companion to Richard Hooker*. Torrance Kirby, ed. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

—. “The Myth of the English Reformation.” *Journal of British Studies*, Vol. 30, no. 1 (January, 1991), 1-19 (accessed on February 25, 2016).

—. “Cranmer’s Ambiguous Legacy.” *History Today*, Vol. 46 no. 6 (June 1996), 23 (accessed on February 25, 2016).

McGowan, Andrew Brian. “‘Is There a Liturgical Text in This Gospel?’ The Institution Narratives and Their Early Interpretive Communities.” *Journal of Biblical Literature* Vol. 118, no. 1 (Spring, 1999): 73-87.

—. “The Meals of Jesus and the Meals of the Church: Eucharistic Origins and Admission to Communion.” In Maxwell E. Johnson and L. Edward Phillips (eds.), *Studia Liturgica Diversa: Essays in Honor of Paul F. Bradshaw*. Portland, Oregon: Pastoral Press: 2003.

—. “The Myth of the “Lord’s Supper”: Paul’s Eucharistic Meal Terminology and Its Ancient Reception.” *The Catholic Biblical Quarterly* Vol. 77 (2015): 502-520.

— “Whose Meal is it Anyway? Jesus, the Church and Eucharistic Origins.” The Barry Marshall Memorial Lecture. Trinity College. August 2002, Trinity Papers Number 24 - June 2003. <http://www.trinity.unimelb.edu.au/Media/docs/TrinityPaper24-0022b068-a672-47dd-a8de-45a55288fcda-0.pdf> (accessed on July 1, 2016).

—. *Ancient Christian Worship*. Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2014.

—. “Rethinking Eucharistic Origins.” *Pacifica* Vol. 23, no. 2 (June 2010): 173-191.

Meier, John. “The Eucharist at the Last Supper; Did It Happen?” *Theology Digest* Vol. 42, no. 4 (Winter 1995): 335-351.

Michno, Dennis. *A Priest’s Handbook: Ceremonies of the Church*. 3rd ed. Edited by Christopher Webber. Harrisburg, PA: Morehouse Publishing, 1998.

Mitchell, Leonel L. *Praying Shapes Believing: A Theological Commentary on the Book of Common Prayer*. Rev. ed. Edited by Ruth A. Meyers. New York: Seabury Books, 2016.

Morrill, Bruce T. *Anamnesis as Dangerous Memory*. Collegeville: The Liturgical Press, 2000.

Nichols, Bridget. *Liturgical Hermeneutics: Interpreting Liturgical Performance*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1996.

Northrup, Lesley A. “The Episcopal Church in the U.S.A.” In *The Oxford Guide to the Book of Common Prayer*. Edited by Charles Hefling and Cynthia Shattuck. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006.

O’Donoghue, Neil Xavier. “The Shape of the History of the Eucharist.” *New Blackfriars* Volume 93, Issue 1043 (January 2012): 71-83.

Otten, Willemien. "Between Augustinian sign and Carolingian reality: The presence of Ambrose and Augustine in the Eucharistic debate between Paschasius Radbertus and Ratramnus of Corbie." *Nederlands archief voor kerkgeschiedenis* 80, no. 2 (2000): 137-156.

Platten, Stephen. "Reanimating Sacrifice?" *Theology* Vol. 115, no. 1 (2012): 26-35.

Steven Platten and Christopher Woods, eds. *Comfortable Words: Polity, Piety and the Book of Common Prayer*. London: Hymns Ancient & Modern Ltd. 2012.

Powell, W. Chilton. *Prayer Book Studies XVII, The Liturgy of the Lord's Supper*. New York: The Church Pension Fund, 1966.

Power, David N. *The Eucharistic Mystery: Revitalizing the Tradition*. New York: The Crossroad Publishing Company, 1992.

Price, Charles P. "Anamnesis and Sacrifice in Episcopal Ecumenical Dialogues." *Worship* 69 (1995): 391-393.

—. *Introducing the Proposed Book, Prayer Book Studies 29 Revised*. New York: Church Hymnal Corporation, 1976.

Procter, Francis. *A New History of The Book of Common Prayer With a Rationale of Its Offices*. Revised and rewritten by Walter Howard Frere. London: MacMillan & Co Ltd, 1961.

Prusak, Bernard P. "Explaining Eucharistic 'Real Presence': Moving Beyond a Medieval Conundrum." *Theological Studies* Vol. 75 no. 2 (2014): 231-259.

Richardson, Cyril C. "Cranmer and the Analysis of Eucharistic Doctrine." *The Journal of Theological Studies*, New Series, Vol. 16, no. 2 (October 1965): 421-437.

—. "Zwingli and Cranmer on the Eucharist." Dwight M. Johnson Memorial Lectureship in Church History. Evanston, IL: Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, 1949.

Reynolds, Stephen. "Theologies of the Eucharist II: The Anglican Tradition." Lecture notes. Toronto: Trinity College, 2013.

<https://tspace.library.utoronto.ca/bitstream/1807/36286/1/Theologies%20of%20the%20Eucharist%20II%20130723.pdf> (accessed on August 5, 2016).

Rosendale, Timothy. *Liturgy and Literature in the Making of Protestant England*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007.

Schmidt, Warren. "A Theological, Historical, and Social Study of Anamnesis in Christian Liturgy. *A Canadian Catholic Perspective*, April 23, 2012, <https://catholiccanada.wordpress.com/2012/04/23/a-theological-historical-and-social-study-of-anamnesis-in-christian-liturgy/> (accessed on July 5, 2016).

Schnitker, Thaddaeus A. *The Church's Worship: The 1979 Book of Common Prayer in Historical Perspective*. Eugene, OR: Wipf & Stock Publishers, 1989.

Senn, Frank C. *Christian Liturgy: Catholic and Evangelical*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1997.

Senn, Frank C., ed. *New Eucharistic Prayers: An Ecumenical Study of their Development and Structure*. New York: Paulist Press, 1987.

Shepherd, Massey Hamilton. *The Oxford American Prayer Book: Commentary*. New York: Oxford University Press: 1950.

Smolarski, Dennis C. *Liturgical Literacy: From Anamnesis to Worship*. New York, NY/Mahwah, NJ: Paulist Press, 1990.

Spinks, Bryan D. *Do This in Remembrance of Me: The Eucharist from the Early Church to the Present Day*. London: SCM Press, 2013.

—. *Sacraments, Ceremonies and the Stuart Divines*. Aldershot: Ashgate Publishing Limited, 2002.

Stevenson, Kenneth and Bryan Spinks, eds. *The Identity of Anglican Worship*. Harrisburg: Morehouse Publishing, 1991.

Stuhlman, Byron D. *Prayer Book Rubrics Expanded*. New York: The Church Hymnal Corporation, 1978.

Josh Thomas, "No to CO77, Rewriting Howard Galley." Gay Spirit Diary (blog), July 12, 2009, <https://joshtom.wordpress.com/2009/07/12/no-to-c077-rewriting-howard-galley/> (accessed on July 12, 2016).

Thurian, Max. *The Eucharistic Memorial*. 2 vols. Translated by J. G. Davies. Richmond: John Knox Press, 1959.

Thurian, Max and Geoffrey Wainwright, eds. *Baptism and Eucharist: Ecumenical Convergence in Celebration*. Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1983.

Turrell, James F. "Anglican Theologies of the Eucharist." In Lee Palmer Wandel, ed., *A Companion to the Eucharist in the Reformation*. Boston: Brill, 2014.

—. "Anglican Liturgical Practices." In Lee Palmer Wandel, ed. *A Companion to the Eucharist in the Reformation*. Boston: Brill, 2014.

Wandel, Lee Palmer. *The Eucharist in the Reformation: Incarnation and Liturgy*. New York: Cambridge, 2006.

Wandel, Lee Palmer ed. *A Companion to the Eucharist in the Reformation*. Boston: Brill, 2014.

Wilson-Kastner, Patricia. "Andreas Osiander's Probable Influence on Thomas Cranmer's Eucharistic Theology." *The Sixteenth Century Journal* Vol. 14, no. 4 (Winter, 1983): 411-425.

Wright, J. Robert. "The First Prayer Book of 1549." *Project Canterbury*, 2002.
<http://anglicanhistory.org/essays/wright/1549.pdf> (accessed on February 22, 2016).

—. "The Sarum Use." *Project Canterbury*, 2002.
<http://anglicanhistory.org/essays/wright/sarum.pdf> (accessed on July 7, 2016).

World Council of Churches. *Baptism, Eucharist, Ministry*. Geneva: World Council of Churches, 1992.

Zwingli, Ulrich. "On the Lord's Supper." In *Zwingli and Bullinger*. Translated by G.W. Bromiley. The Library of Christian Classics, vol. 24. Philadelphia: Westminster, 1953.

Historical Liturgical Texts

The Mass According to the Use of Sarum.
<http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bcp/Sarum/English.htm> (accessed on June 26, 2016).

The Supper of the Lord, and The Holy Communion, commonly called The Mass. As Written in the First "Booke of Common Praier", being the 1549 Edition.
http://www.commonprayer.org/pb/pb_archv.cfm (accessed on June 27, 2016)

Second Prayer Book of Edward VI (1552) The Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion.
http://archive.churchsociety.org/publications/liturgy/Lit_1552_Holy_Communion.pdf (accessed on February 22, 2016).

The Book of Common Prayer - 1552 The Order for the Administration of the Lordes' Supper or Holy Communion. http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bcp/1552/Communion_1552.htm (accessed on February 23, 2016).

The 1559 Book of Common Prayer: The Elizabethan Prayer Book.
http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bcp/1559/BCP_1559.htm (accessed on June 17, 2016).

The Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion As Written in the "Book of Common Prayer," being the 1604 Edition.
<http://www.commonprayer.org/pb/pb1604.cfm> (accessed on June 17, 2016).

The 1662 Book of Common Prayer. <http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bcp/1662/baskerville.htm> (accessed on June 24, 2016).

The Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion (1662).
<http://www.eskimo.com/~lhowell/bcp1662/communion/index.html> (accessed on June 24, 2016).

Articles of Religion.

<http://www.eskimo.com/~lhowell/bcp1662/articles/articles.html> (accessed on June 27, 2016).

The Book of Common Prayer for Scotland (1637).

<http://www.commonprayer.org/pb/pb1637.cfm> (accessed on July 27, 2016).

The Scottish Communion Service of 1764.

http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bcp/Scotland/Scot1764_Communion.htm (accessed on July 29, 2017).

A Communion Office, Taken partly from Primitive Liturgies, And partly from the First English Reformed Common-Prayer-Book.

http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bcp/Communion_Nonjurors.htm (accessed on July 29, 2016)

The Communion-Office, Or Order for the Administration of the Holy Eucharist or Supper of the Lord, with Private Devotions Recommended to the Episcopal Congregations in Connecticut, (Bishop Seabury's Communion Office). <http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bcp/Seabury.htm> (accessed on June 29, 2016).

The 1789 Book of Common Prayer, The Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion. http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bcp/1789/Communion_1789.pdf (accessed on June 29, 2016).

The Book of Common Prayer (1928), The Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion. http://www.justus.anglican.org/resources/bcp/1928/HC_1928.pdf (accessed on July 29, 2016).

The Book of Common Prayer (1979) The Holy Eucharist The Liturgy for the Proclamation of the Word of God and Celebration of the Holy Communion.

<http://justus.anglican.org/resources/bcp/euchr1.pdf> (accessed on August 8, 2016).

The Standing Liturgical Commission of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America. *Prayer Book Studies IV: The Eucharistic Liturgy*. New York: The Church Pension Fund, 1953.

Standing Liturgical Commission of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America. *Prayer Book Studies XVII, The Liturgy of the Lord's Supper*. A revision of *Prayer Book Studies IV*. New York: The Church Pension Fund, 1966.

Standing Liturgical Commission of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America. *Prayer Book Studies XVII, The Liturgy of the Lord's Supper*. A revision of *Prayer Book Studies IV*. New York: The Church Pension Fund, 1966.

Gilbert, Charles Mortimer as Custodian of the Standard Book of Common Prayer. *Services for Trial Use: Authorized Alternatives to Prayer Book Services*. New York: The Church Hymnal Corporation, 1971.

—. *Authorized Services*. New York: The Church Hymnal Corporation, 1973.

—. *The Draft Proposed Book of Common Prayer and Other Rites and Ceremonies of the Church*. New York: The Church Hymnal Corporation, 1976.

—. *Prayer Book Studies 30: Supplemental Liturgical Texts*. New York: The Church Hymnal Corporation, 1987.

—. *Commentary on Prayer Book Studies 30 Containing Supplemental Liturgical Texts*. New York: The Church Hymnal Corporation, 1989.

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. New York: The Church Hymnal Corporation, 1979.

The text of the Concordat between Seabury and the Scottish bishops appears in W.S. Perry, *The History of the American Episcopal Church 1587-1883*, II. (Boston: Osgood and Company, 1885) 56-57, quoted by Marion J. Hatchett in *The Making of the First American Book of Common Prayer*. New York: The Seabury Press, 1982.

The Passover Haggadah. With English translation, introduction, and commentary based on the commentaries of E. D. Goldschmidt. Rev. ed. Edited by Nahum N. Glatzer. New York, Schocken Books, 1969.

Episcopal News Service (July 3, 2015). "Plans-to-be-created-for-prayer-book-hymnal-revision." [Press release]. <http://episcopaldigitalnetwork.com/ens/2015/07/03/plans-to-be-created-for-prayer-book-hymnal-revision/> (accessed on July 3, 2015).

Standing Commission on Liturgy and Music. "Four Possible Paths for the Book of Common Prayer." [Press release] December 2, 2016. <https://standingcommissiononliturgyandmusic.org/2016/12/02/four-possible-paths-for-the-book-of-common-prayer/> (accessed on December 12, 2016).