

University of St Andrews



Full metadata for this thesis is available in
St Andrews Research Repository
at:

<http://research-repository.st-andrews.ac.uk/>

This thesis is protected by original copyright

A STUDY OF THE DOCTRINE
OF THE
EUCCHARISTIC SACRIFICE
FROM THE
REFORMED CHURCH STANDPOINT



MS 1486

ms
1486

I hereby declare that the following
dissertation has been composed by me
and that it has not been accepted in
any previous application for a degree.

Denzil J. Brown, M.A., B.D. (N.Z.)

This dissertation embodies the results of the higher study undertaken by me on the topic approved by the Senatus Academicus of the University of St. Andrews in accordance with regulations governing the Degree of Bachelor of Philosophy.

I was admitted under Ordinance No. 50 to read for the Degree of B.Phil. as from 1st January, 1953.

My terms of study were under Part VII; Higher Degrees in Arts; Degree of B.Phil.; Sections XXVII, XXVIII and XXXIV(a).

Denzil J. Brown, M.A., B.D. (N.Z.).

I certify that Denzil James Brown, M.A., B.D. (N.Z.), has spent not less than twelve months (full time) in higher study in the field of Divinity; that he has fulfilled the conditions of Ordinance No. 50 of the University Court of the University of St. Andrews (Regulations for Degrees in Arts, Philosophy and Letters); and that he is qualified to submit the accompanying dissertation for the Degree of Bachelor of Philosophy.

Supervisor.

CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION.	Page 1.
II.	JESUS AND SACRIFICE.	12.
III.	THE LAST SUPPER AND SACRIFICE.	26.
IV.	UNSATISFACTORY VIEWS OF THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE.	41.
V.	THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE AND CALVARY.	66.
VI.	THE HEAVENLY SACRIFICE.	82.
VII.	THE SACRAMENTAL SACRIFICE.	101.
VIII.	THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE: OFFERING.	119.
IX.	THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE: COMMUNION.	133.
	BIBLIOGRAPHY.	153.

ANALYSIS OF CONTENTS.

I.	INTRODUCTION.	Page 1
	1. The Problem in its Setting.	1
	2. Two Stages in the Liturgy of the Faithful.	3
	3. Two Movements in the Eucharist.	6
	4. A Christological Approach.	6
	5. Baptism and the Eucharist.	8
	6. The Theology of Sign.	9
	7. Summary.	11
II.	JESUS AND SACRIFICE.	12
	1. Sacrifice Not the Only Interpretation Possible.	12
	2. The Sacrificial System.	13
	3. Defects and Advantages of the Sacrificial System.	19
	4. Jesus' Attitude to the Sacrificial System.	22
III.	THE UPPER ROOM AND SACRIFICE.	26
	1. The Influence of Mystery Religions.	26
	2. The Relation of the Last Supper to the Passover Meal.	27
	3. The Eucharistic Words of Jesus.	30
	(a) Luke 22:15-16.	31
	(b) Mark 14:22.	32
	(c) Mark 14:24.	34
	I Corinthians 11:25.	
	(d) I Corinthians 11:24.	36
	I Corinthians 11:25.	
	4. Conclusion.	37
IV.	UNSATISFACTORY VIEWS OF THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE.	41
	1. The Eucharistic Sacrifice and Propitiation.	42
	2. The Eucharistic Sacrifice and Merit.	48
	3. The Role of Grace and Faith in the Sacraments.	51
	4. Some Modern Views.	60
V.	THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE AND CALVARY.	66
	1. Rejection of the Idea of Physical Repetition of the Cross.	67
	2. Vonier's View: The Sign of Christ as Dead.	70
	3. Masure's View: Immolation as Self Consecration.	72
	4. Spens's View: The Eucharist as Investing the Death with its Meaning.	75
	5. 'Death' and 'Life' in the Sacraments.	78

VI.	THE HEAVENLY SACRIFICE.	Page 82
	1. After the Order of Melchisedec.	82
	2. When does Christ's Priestly Action Begin?	86
	3. The Priestly Task of Intercession.	90
	4. Calvary and the Priesthood of Christ.	92
	5. The Heavenly Offering of Christ - Past or Present?	93
	6. The Eternal Sacrifice of Christ.	97
VII.	THE SACRAMENTAL SACRIFICE.	101
	1. The Act of Memorial.	102
	2. To Whom is the Act of Sacramental Remembering Directed?	104
	3. Showing the Lord's Death.	108
	4. The Role of Eschatology.	111
	5. The Role of the Holy Spirit.	113
	6. The Heavenly Memorial and its Eucharistic Counterpart.	114
VIII.	THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE: OFFERING.	119
	1. The Sacrifice of Praise and Thanksgiving.	119
	2. Offering Ourselves.	121
	3. Offering the Fruits of the Earth and of Men's Toil.	124
	4. 'Offering Christ'?	126
	5. The Idea of Reciprocity.	129
IX.	THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE: COMMUNION.	133
	1. Sacrifice and Communion Belong Together.	133
	2. Maintaining the Balance.	139
	(a) When the Godward movement in the Eucharist is stressed to the detriment of the manward.	144
	(b) When the manward movement in the Eucharist is stressed to the detriment of the Godward.	146
	3. The Eucharistic Sacrifice and its Eschatological Goal.	149
	BIBLIOGRAPHY.	153

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

I. THE PROBLEM IN ITS SETTING.

Ecumenical discussions in our day have been responsible for bringing to light a number of problems which are obstacles to the growing sense of unity among the Churches, one such problem being the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice. In the earlier Ecumenical conversations of this century the doctrine was rarely mentioned, but now that broad agreement on the major articles of the Christian Faith has been reached, and disagreements have been narrowed down, this doctrine looms larger in importance than at any time since the 16th century. As yet, however, the sustained attention of few leading theologians has been given to it. Even the Third World Conference on Faith and Order at Lund in August, 1952, did little more than underline the problem.

Reasoned discussion of the Eucharistic sacrifice is made more difficult by the history of controversy that has been associated with it since the Reformation. To some, the very mention of this subject conjures up memories of battles fought long ago over the 'sacrifice of the Mass', and they become alarmed at what they fear is an attempt to overthrow the evangelical doctrine of the Lord's Supper. To others, the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist seems so obvious that they underestimate the quality of their opponents' conception of the sacrament.

Fortunately, however, the rebirth of theological and of liturgical interest in all communions, together with the drawing together of the Churches in the Ecumenical Movement is making possible a reconsideration of the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice, which, in time, will enrich the Christian faith and practice of the whole Church. In this respect it was encouraging to hear the late Professor D.M. Baillie, one of the leaders of the Ecumenical Movement, who had much to do with the Inter-communication commission preparing for Lund, say he believed that the best 'evangelicals' and the best 'catholics' were very much closer to each other on the question of sacrifice in the Eucharist than either realised.

The aim of this dissertation is to present a critical account of the doctrine as it appears in contemporary theology, seen from the Reformed Church standpoint. The use of the word 'Reformed' in this context requires definition. In this dissertation the expression is not used in the narrower sense of the 'Reformed communion', that is, the Presbyterian family of churches. It is here used in a broader sense to include those churches which claim to have sprung directly from the spiritual influences of the Reformation, or which, like the Church of Sweden, the Church of Scotland, and the Church of England (and their daughter churches) all claim continuity with the historic

Church, but which also acknowledge a decisive debt to the Reformation.(1)

The basic questions with which we are here concerned are:

In what sense is it legitimate for Reformed churchmen to speak of the Eucharist in terms of sacrifice? And, does a conception of the Eucharist in these terms illuminate or obscure a right approach to the Sacrament?

2. TWO STAGES IN THE LITURGY OF THE FAITHFUL.

In this enquiry reference will be made to the two main stages in 'the liturgy of the faithful'. These stages correspond to Jesus' actions when on one hand, He took bread and wine, gave thanks and blessed, and broke the bread, and on the other, He gave to His disciples.(2) These two stages are apparent in the Eucharistic orders of all major churches.

Thus, in the Church of Scotland order of communion (3) the first stage includes the Offertory, the 'taking' of the

(1) The term 'evangelical church' as understood by continental Christians, would be a suitable one. In the English-speaking world, however, this refers more commonly to a particular 'party' within a church (e.g. 'Evangelicals and Moderates', 'High Church and Evangelical' in 19th century Scotland and England respectively.)

The term 'non-Roman' is too negative in tone, and moreover would include Eastern Orthodoxy, which lay outside the influence of the Reformation and Counter-Reformation.

(2) Mark 14:22-24, Matt.26:26-28, Luke 22:17-20, I Cor.II:23-25.

(3) The Book of Common Order, (1940) pp.II6 f.

bread and wine. During the singing of a hymn the elements are brought into the church and laid on the Holy Table. After the minister has unveiled the elements, he offers the 'prayer of the Veil' and the 'offertory prayer'.

Then follows the Prayer of Consecration recalling Jesus' own giving of thanks in the Upper Room. Thanks are given for God's creation of the world, for His providence, and for His redemption of man through Jesus Christ. Then, after recalling the work and passion of Christ and the pleading of His sacrifice prayer is made for the descent of the Holy Spirit to sanctify the worshippers and the elements. This is followed by prayers of self-oblation, and brief intercessions, the whole prayer of Consecration (or the Eucharistic prayer, or the Great Prayer) culminating in the saying of the Lord's Prayer.

After the 'manual acts' the second stage begins. This involves the Delivery of the consecrated elements to the people. The bread is given accompanied by the words: 'Take ye, eat ye; this is the body of Christ which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of Him.' The giving of the cup is accompanied by the words: 'This cup is the new covenant in the blood of Christ, which is shed for many unto remission of sins: drink ye all of it.' When all have received the bread and wine the Peace is given, and the service gathered up in a prayer of thanksgiving for the benefits received, and for the faithful departed.

It will be seen that the direction of interest is different in each of the two stages. In the first stage the Church brings her gifts of bread and wine to God, together with her prayers of thanksgiving for creation and redemption and her oblation of herself. The direction, or movement, of this stage in the Eucharist is clearly Godward. It is a turning of creature to Creator, sinner to Redeemer.

In the second stage the Church is no longer the 'doer' offering her gifts and prayers: she is the receiver. God gives: man receives. Man's part is to wait quietly, but expectantly, on God's assurance in the Communion, (4) that he is accepted 'in the Lord'. The accent is on what Christ does in us and for us. The 'movement' in this second stage is manward.

The words of the late Dr. H.J. Wotherspoon sum up the characteristics of the Godward and the manward aspects of the Eucharist:

'I select two values of which to speak, which correspond to the two great stages of the rite which we call respectively the Consecration and the Communion; namely, the showing of Christ's death and the receiving of His nourishing Gifts: that in which we approach God and that in which God responds to our approach: that in which Christ our High Priest goes before us and we follow, co-operating in His action, and that in which Christ turns to us and gives to us from God: - two movements in which Christ's double mediation, for man to God and God to man, is completely expressed.' (5)

(4) The much discussed question of how we are to conceive the Real Presence is not our concern in this dissertation. There has been an immense amount of writing and discussion of the nature of the Eucharistic gift, so much so that it has overshadowed the question of the Eucharistic sacrifice.

(5) Wotherspoon, Religious Values in the Sacraments, p.225.

3. TWO MOVEMENTS IN THE EUCHARIST.

Is this two way movement of the Eucharist capable of a sacrificial interpretation that is consistent with the general insight of Reformed sacramental thought? We believe it is - provided that it is realised that 'sacrifice' and 'communion' are not mutually exclusive and opposed conceptions.

We will be assisted in our enquiry by a consideration of the two stages of the liturgy in relation to each other. They are not to be rigidly separated. It will be apparent in the course of this paper that it is an unsound view of the sacrament which suggests that the Eucharistic sacrifice is confined to the Godward movement - an error often made both by antagonists and protagonists of the sacrificial interpretation of the Eucharist. When this happens, as it does frequently, not only is the Godward movement wrongly understood, but the understanding of the act of communion itself becomes defective. Thus, ⁱⁿ Roman Catholicism the communion tends to become an optional addition to the sacrifice of the Mass, and not an essential part of it. In Protestantism, on the other hand, the minimizing of the Godward movement into the mere preliminary of communion deprives the communion of its significance as the great climax of the two way movement.

4. A CHRISTOLOGICAL APPROACH.

Where shall we start? It has frequently been the experience in Ecumenical discussions when agreement seemed in

sight, that the parties to the discussion have drifted apart again. Often the reason for this has been failure to begin from a common starting point, so that fundamental agreement was doomed before ever the discussions began. Deep in their personal experience, and in the history of their denominations, lie the reasons why Christians tend to choose one starting point instead of another: Bible or Church, the community or the individual, the historic facts of the faith or inner experience, the 4th, 11th, or 16th centuries.

The one point from which all can agree to start is the person and work of Jesus Christ. The Third World Conference on Faith and Order at Lund, 1952, demonstrated the value of 'the Christological approach'. It is to the credit of Edwyn Bevan to have pointed out twenty years earlier that the common ground in the piety of German Protestantism, English Methodist and Roman Catholic hymnology is Christological. Of the hymns of German Protestantism he said:

'Like the most central Catholic devotion, it is devotion directed to the vividly apprehended Person of Jesus, apprehended not as a mere human figure..... but as one who is God come down in the infinite condescension of love, and love for whom is fused with the awe and worship belonging to God. Very great theological differences divide (St. Bernard of Clairvaux, Tersteegen and Wesley), but how enormously more important than the things which divide them is the astounding belief in which, as against everything outside Christianity, they are one.' (6)

Oscar Cullmann has shown (7) in regard to the significance of time, what fruitful results are yielded when a

historian interprets history from the central event of Jesus

(6) Christianity, pp.201-202. (7) Cullmann, Christ and Time.

Christ. In sacramental theology this same Christological approach enables students to discuss the question of the Eucharistic sacrifice from a common ground, rather than from inflexible 'positions'. It is in line with this insight that the emphasis in this dissertation is upon the work and person of Christ in relation to the Eucharistic sacrifice.

5. BAPTISM AND THE EUCHARIST.

The Christological approach serves to remind students of the common ground, the contemporary ministry of Jesus Christ, that exists in the two gospel sacraments.

The two sacraments represent Christ's dealings with men in different situations. Through one, Holy Baptism, men are incorporated once-and-for-all into the Body of Christ. In the other, Holy Communion, the members of the Body of Christ are fed by Christ's giving them of His Body and Blood. Yet both these sacraments are of a common stock. Both are sacraments of the Word made flesh. Both owe their efficacy to the benefits of Christ's sacrifice, (8) which are mediated by the power of the Holy Spirit. Moreover, both are only truly understood when seen in their eschatological setting.(9) The administration of both sacraments are occasions of the inbreaking of the 'Age that is to come', occasions when, through grace, Christians are what they shall become - new men in Christ.

(8) L.S. Thornton, The Common Life in the Body of Christ, p.336.

(9) T.F. Torrance, Eschatology and the Eucharist, in Intercommunion pp.314ff; Liturgy and Apocalypse, Scottish Church Service Society Annual, 1954, pp.3ff.

6. THE THEOLOGY OF SIGN.

Another factor making the present time opportune for a consideration of problems like the Eucharistic sacrifice is renewed interest in the theology of 'sign'.

This approach to the interpretation of the sacraments was given classic expression in the 16th century by John Calvin, taking his stand, as he so frequently did, on the theology of St. Augustine. In our own day it is encouraging to see this line of thought coming to the forefront in the Roman Church through the work of people like Canon Eugène Masure, Director of the Lille Seminary. We do well to ask ourselves what is the source of the enormous power that lies behind the understanding of the sacraments as 'sign', as this can have a bearing upon our understanding of the Eucharistic sacrifice.

There is of course, the power of the symbols to represent the thing symbolized - the broken bread representing the broken Body, and the poured wine representing the shed Blood. Such symbols appeal strongly to the imagination, and were not chosen arbitrarily. A chair and a violet, for example, could not have symbolized the Body and Blood of Christ as well as bread and wine. The great power of apt symbolism to evoke sympathetic thought and feeling is recognized wherever the Eucharist is spoken of as a Drama.

The power of the Christian sacraments, however, goes far beyond their artistic capacity to stir the heart and mind,

great though the natural appeal of the symbol may be. What gives this particular symbolism a unique significance and potency is that it was instituted by Christ. As Masure aptly remarks: 'It is a sign, possessing in virtue of its author, the value it signifies.' (IO)

Its Author is He who is risen and ascended, and whose heavenly ministry is the present source of power in the lives of Christians. It is because of this fact that Calvin can teach so emphatically that sacrament is more than symbol: 'Nor does (the sacrament) merely feed our eyes with a bare prospect of the symbols, but conducts us at the same time to the thing signified, and efficaciously accomplishes that which it represents.' (II)

The service which the theology of sign can render the Church is clear enough when Masure, in urging the rejection of the crude notions of immolation common in popular Roman Catholic manuals on the Eucharistic sacrifice since the time of de Lugo,

(IO) Masure, The Christian Sacrifice, p.225.

Karl Barth in The Knowledge of God and the Service of God, pp.206-208, rightly warns Reformed churchmen against regarding the Eucharist as a means of satisfying human psychological and artistic needs, rather than as a vehicle of obedience to the Divine command. Not all Roman churchmen are so unaware of this principle as Barth suggests. Masure, for one, is emphatic that the Eucharist is an efficacious sign, not primarily because of its resemblance to the thing symbolised, but because Jesus Christ instituted it. op.cit., pp.224-225. Also c.f. Vincent Taylor on the Eucharist as an 'acted sermon' a 'drama of redemption' in St.Paul's thought. Jesus and His Sacrifice, p.212.

(II) Calvin, The Institutes, 4/15/14.

Also c.f. The Westminster Confession, Chapters 27 and 29.

II.

pleads instead for a renewed appreciation of the concept of efficacious sign in understanding the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist.

7. SUMMARY.

As a result of constant Ecumenical encounter, the Faith and Order Movement has reached the stage when sustained study of the Eucharistic sacrifice is called for, if ever the unity of the Church is to be fully manifested. The rise of the Liturgical Movement in all Churches, the great interest on all sides in Biblical and Dogmatic Theology, and the recognition that the person and work of Jesus Christ are central in all discussions of the Christian Faith are factors of great assistance to those who would re-examine the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice in our day.

CHAPTER II

JESUS AND SACRIFICE

The sacraments are inseparably connected with the work of Christ. If it is possible to speak of the Eucharist in sacrificial terms, it is because it is possible to interpret the work of Christ as a sacrifice. It will be the object of Chapters II and III of this dissertation to discuss the extent to which the sacrificial principle underlay the thought of Jesus about His death. First, however, it is necessary to be clear as to the meaning that the sacrificial system had for the Jewish people, and to evaluate Jesus' own attitude towards sacrifice. This task will be undertaken in the present chapter.

I. SACRIFICE NOT THE ONLY INTERPRETATION POSSIBLE.

Although our concern in this dissertation is with sacrifice, this is not to suggest that sacrifice is the only figure under which the work of Christ may be understood. Even in the Old Testament, it is a mistake to suppose that sacrifice was the only way to the forgiveness of sins.(1) No sacrifice was provided to atone for 'sins with a high hand'. The sinner simply had to throw himself upon the mercy of God.(2)

(1) H.H. Rowley, The Meaning of Sacrifice in the Old Testament, pp. 98, 101.

(2) A.B. Davidson, The Theology of the Old Testament, pp.315-318

In the New Testament there are various ways of speaking of Jesus' work, for example, as reconciliation(3), a new creation(4), regeneration(5), redemption from hostile powers(6), conferring of sonship(7), and inaugurating the Kingdom of God(8). The sacrificial interpretation does not exhaust the riches of Christ's work, yet it is probably the most characteristic manner of interpreting His work.

2. THE SACRIFICIAL SYSTEM.

The difficulties that many Reformed churchmen have in admitting any sacrificial significance in the Eucharist are often ^{due to} based on the assumption that the Jewish sacrificial system was such that there could have been no connection between it and the simple religion of Jesus. This is a question that calls for an examination of the meaning of sacrifice in the Old Testament, and to that task we now turn.

It is not a matter that can be settled simply by a discussion of the origins of sacrifice - whether in gifts presented to a god(9), or in a communion feast that sought to bind

(3) Colossians 1:20; Romans 5:10f; II Corinthians 5:19.

(4) II Corinthians 5:17; Galatians 6:15.

(5) I Peter 1:3, 2:2; John 3:3; James 1:18.

(6) I Corinthians 15:25; Romans 8:38. c.f. Gustaf Aulén, Christus Victor.

(7) Ephesians 1:3-14; Gal. 4:7.

(8) Mark 1:15; Luke 11:20.

(9) A.B. Davidson, The Theology of the Old Testament, p.315.

the worshipper and the god together(I0), or in the power that was released for use by the death of the slain animal.(II) On one hand, scholars are not agreed upon an answer to the question of the primary meaning of sacrifice, and on the other hand, the determinative factor in interpreting sacrifice must be the usage of the particular people concerned. This is especially important in the case of the Hebrew people, in view of their genius for taking over the ideas of neighbouring peoples, and transforming them into vehicles for the expression of their own austere, desert religion.(I2)

In the Old Testament there is no systematic theological exposition of sacrifice, though there are many rules laid down for its performance, and records given of its observance. Two things that can be said with certainty about the theory of sacrifice among the Hebrews are that it was believed that sacrifice was something sanctioned by God(I3), and that the life of the animal was seen as associated with its blood.(I4)

Not all sacrifices involved the offering of animals. The minhah, or 'gift offering' came, in post-exilic times, to be confined to non-animal offerings (Genesis 4:3-5). These sacrifices were tributes of man to God and were sometimes

(I0) W. Robertson Smith, The Religion of the Semites.

(II) E.O. James, Sacrifice, Article in E.R.E., vol.11, and also Report of the Anglo-Catholic Congress, 1927, pp.57f.

(I2) H.H. Rowley, op.cit. pp.75-78, 81-83.

(I3) Exodus 29, 30, 40; Leviticus 1-17, 23.

(I4) Genesis 9:4; Leviticus 17:11.

associated with the azkarah, or 'memorial offering'.(15)

Of the animal sacrifices the most common was the 'burnt offering', ôlah, literally 'that which ascends', referring to the smoke rising from the altar. Such offerings were regularly offered on behalf of the community as a whole, with the intention of paying homage to the Deity. (Leviticus I; Exodus 29: 38-42; Numbers 28 f.) Sometimes this offering was called the kalil, 'the whole burnt offering', (c.f. Psalm 51:19) as no part of the flesh was eaten, the whole of the flesh being burnt upon the altar. This offering could also be offered by a private individual in recognition of God's goodness to him, or in fulfilment of a vow. (Leviticus 22:18; Numbers 15:3).

The most common of the sacrifices for the individual worshipper was the zabah, sacrifice, or as it was called in later times, the shelem 'peace offering'. (Leviticus 3; 7:11-16; 22:21). This was an offering in a spirit of thankfulness, and one which culminated in a sacrificial feast.(16)

The history of the Hebrew people after they came to the land of Canaan is a story of constant lapses from the true worship of Yahweh into the degrading paganism of the fertility cults about them. The experience of the Exile in Babylon, driving home the stern message of the prophets, taught them the

(15) C.R. North, Sacrifice. Article in T.W.B. pp.206, 208.

(16) North, op.cit., p.207; Hicks, The Fullness of Sacrifice, pp. 19f; 84; 234f.

importance of preserving the purity of their national faith(I7). After the Exile had deepened the Hebrew consciousness of sin, the pisacular offerings came to assume a greater importance than ever they had done before.

The 'sin offering', hattath, had a closer relation to sin and its expiation than did the burnt offering or peace offering. (Leviticus 4). It could not atone for sins committed with a 'high hand', or on purpose. For such presumptuous sin there was no sacrifice that could atone. (Numbers 15:30 f., Psalm 19:12f.) The 'sin offering' served only for those sins committed unwittingly. This offering could be made for the community or an individual, especially upon occasions of national religious importance (e.g. Leviticus 8: the consecration of the High Priest). It was also required upon the conclusion of a period of ceremonial uncleanness, as when cured of leprosy. (Leviticus 14:19. c.f. Mark 1:44).

The 'guilt offering', asham (Leviticus 5:14-6:7; 7:1-7 Numbers 5:5-8), had features in common with the sin offering. It served to atone in cases where dues had been withheld from God (Leviticus 5:14-19) or from man (Leviticus 6:1-7). The offender was obliged to make good the due which he had withheld from the sanctuary or from a creditor, together with one-fifth its value. He was also required to offer a ram as a sacrifice.

(I7) c.f. A.G. Hebert, The Authority of the Old Testament, pp.138-140, 174-179.

The Day of Atonement (Leviticus 16; Exodus 30:10; Numbers 29:7-11) which loomed so large in the national life of the Hebrews in post-Exilic times, consisted of a sin offering and a burnt offering, together with the ritual of the scapegoat. The purpose of the sin offering was to make expiation for unwitting sins of the community during the preceding year. The guilt that was transferred to the scapegoat were real sins, not just those committed unwittingly. (18)

The Passover festival (Exodus 12; 13:11-15; Deuteronomy 16:1-8) was probably of ancient origin. But from the time of the Exodus on, it was celebrated in remembrance of the redemption of the Hebrew people from slavery in Egypt. It was a sacrifice in the nature of a 'peace-offering', which, after the centralisation of worship could only take place in Jerusalem. As far as the Passover meal was concerned, it was eaten in private houses, and remained essentially a family festival. (19)

Is there any pattern underlying these sacrifices of the Old Testament, which, if grasped could assist in apprehending the meaning of the whole system? F.C.N. Hicks has shown that there is such a plan with regard to the sin-offering, the burnt-offering and the peace-offering. (20)

(18) North, op.cit., pp.212-213.

(19) See Articles in Richardson's T.W.B.: C.E.B. Cranfield, Thanksgiving, pp.254-257; C.R. North, Sacrifice, p.211; F.J. Taylor, Passover, pp.163-164.

(20) Hicks, op.cit., pp.11-14.

1. First, the offerer, accompanied by his victim, 'drew near'.

2. The offerer laid his hands upon the head of the victim. This action was the means of dedication of the animal to God on behalf of the offerer. It is not to be regarded as the means of transferring the guilt of the offerer to the animal as his substitute, though it signified the animal life as the offerer's representative.

3. The slaying of the victim then took place. This was carried out by the sinner himself, the offerer, not the priest. The only exception to this was on the day of Atonement, but then the high priest slew the animal by virtue of being one of the sinners for whom the sacrifice was being offered. It should be noted that it was not the death of the victim that was regarded as the atoning factor; it was the offering of the blood.

4. The specifically priestly part of the sacrifice began at this point. In accordance with the principle that the blood was the life, (21), the blood was now carried into the presence of God, and dashed against the altar. This task was the function of the priest.

5. The victim's flesh, or a portion of it, depending upon the kind of sacrifice being carried out, was then placed upon the altar and 'devoted' to God by means of the altar fire. The object

(21) Genesis 9:4; Leviticus 17:11.

of this was not to obliterate or destroy the animal's body, but to transform it, so that, thus etherealized, it could rise in smoke to the Heaven above.(22)

6. Finally, in those sacrifices in which a certain portion of the victim was eaten (in peace offerings by the offerer and his friends; in sin offerings only by the priests) there followed the communion feast.

3. DEFECTS AND ADVANTAGES OF THE SACRIFICIAL SYSTEM.

We are now in a position to note some of the disadvantages and advantages of this Jewish system of sacrifice.(23)

In the first place there is the passive character of the victim (or of the vegetable offering). While the victim was required to be a perfect specimen of its kind, its perfection was in the physical realm, not in the moral and spiritual. The victim might be a useful symbol, but the self-identification of the sinner with the victim was qualified by the limited communication possible between a man and an animal.

Further, sacrifices could make atonement only for ritual offences, and not for major offences against the commandments of God. The only rite that dealt with breaches other than those of religious duty was the ritual of the scapegoat on the day of Atonement.

(22) Also c.f. I Kings 18:38 : Elijah's sacrifice.

(23) These evaluations based on Vincent Taylor, op.cit.,pp.55-60; A.B. Davidson, op.cit.,pp.306 ff; Rowley, op.cit.,pp.87-102 109-110; C.R. North, op.cit., p.213; Hicks, op.cit., pp.61-91.

There was, also, a liability to abuse. Wherever there is an external form, it is possible to perform it without a true spiritual response. It was to the credit of the prophets that they saw this so clearly, and strove to awaken the conscience of the nation. It is sometimes supposed that this form of hypocrisy was especially associated with the sacrificial system, and that the priests were the villains of the piece. It must be remembered that the prophets denounced 'false prophets' with equal, if not greater vehemence (24) than 'false priests', and that even a bleak form of worship still involves 'forms', and still has its impure adherents. Nevertheless, this does not get away from the fact that the Hebrew sacrificial system, or rather, its participants, often fell down at this point.

On the other hand, there were many fine aspects of the cultus. It set before men the possibility of fellowship with God. It recognised the sinfulness of man, and the holiness of God, and aimed at overcoming the obstacles in the way of the Divine - human encounter. The Hebrews did not look upon the sacrificial system as merely symbolizing the fellowship of God and man, but as effecting that fellowship. (25) No doubt sacrifice 'required the spirit (of the worshippers) to validate it, but once validated it was thought to be charged with power.' (26)

(24) Isaiah 9:15; Jer. 2:8; 5:31; 23:9ff; 28:15; Lam.4:13; Ezek.13:2ff; and c.f. Luke 6:26.

(25) Rowley, op.cit., p.87.

(26) Rowley, op.cit., pp.87-88.

While the scope of the sacrificial system was limited, nevertheless, within its bounds, it created a lively conscience in the worshipper. It created an awareness of the serious nature of sin, the need for penitence, and an urgency in seeking to eliminate the barrier that sin had placed between the worshipper and God.

The worshipper was left in no doubt that the reconciliation was a costly matter. It was not sufficient that any animal at all be used in the sacrifice. The animal had to be a domestic animal, one whose closeness to the family and whose worth to the family was beyond question.

One of the best aspects of the sacrificial system was its witness to the fact that, for the attaining of fellowship with God, there was need of a life surrendered and devoted to Him. It is true that in the ritual itself the life blood on the altar was that of an animal, and not of the offerer himself, yet that blood was regarded as the expression of the offerer's devotion and submission to God, and not a substitute for his own obedience. It accorded as much with the teaching of the Law, as with that of the prophets who attacked the abuse of the sacrificial system, that the only sacrifices that were acceptable to God were those offered with a humble and consecrated spirit.(27) The surrender of the offerer's life demanded in the sacrificial system is most characteristically represented by the words: "Lo, I come to do thy will".(28)

(27) Rowley, op.cit.,pp.91-95; Hicks, op.cit.,p.13, and c.f. pp.139-152.

(28) Hebrews 10:7.

Even when allowance has been made for the defects that were associated with the sacrificial system, the insights which the cultus made possible into the nature of worship and fellowship with God were such that we should expect that Jesus Himself, valued the cultus for these good qualities. This conclusion, however, would remain a hypothesis were it not for the fact that it is open to us to measure it against the attitude that Jesus displayed to the sacrificial system as it is shown in the Gospels. It is to an examination of that matter that we now turn.

4. JESUS' ATTITUDE TO THE SACRIFICIAL SYSTEM.

There is no evidence that Jesus ever took part in the Temple sacrifices. In St. John's gospel especially, there is mention of religious feasts in Jerusalem, but no direct suggestion that Jesus himself was a participant. There is, however, no evidence that Jesus ever condemned the sacrificial system as such. Certainly on two occasions he cites Hosea 6:6, 'I desire mercy, and not sacrifice' with approval. However, the context, His justification of His eating with sinners (Matthew 9:13a), indicates that on this occasion He was concerned to emphasize the primacy of moral responsibility over that of ceremonial nicety, rather than to urge the abolition of the whole system. On the other occasion, the incident in the wheatfields on the Sabbath day, (Matthew 12:7) He uses the quotation from Hosea to vindicate the ancient traditions of the Sabbath, against the

later multiplication of rules regarding Sabbath observance.(29)

The passage in Mark 12:33 f, where Jesus approves the affirmation of the scribe that ethical dealing has supremacy over the ritual of worship, cannot be regarded as an attack by Jesus upon the whole rationale of sacrifice. A right understanding of the purpose of sacrifice is in agreement with the scribe's observation. It is evidence, rather, that there were among the Temple worshippers those who, like Jesus, saw the relation of conduct and worship in its proper light.

So far from leading an attack upon the sacrificial system there were occasions when Jesus urged men to sacrificial observance, as in the cases of the leper (Mark 1:44) and the ten lepers (Luke 17:14). Even more striking is His reminder of the moral responsibility of those who offer 'gifts' to the altar, coupled with His injunction 'then come and offer thy gift'. (Matthew 5:23f)

In His use of scripture Jesus makes little use of notable anti-sacrificial passages. He makes frequent use of the Book of Isaiah (30) with its underlying sympathy for the Temple worship, and comparatively little use of the book of Jeremiah, which appears to be anti-sacrificial(31). It is often

-
- (29) Both these quotations are Matthaean insertions in the stories as related by Mark and may not in any case belong to the original saying of Jesus, c.f. Mark 2:16f, 2:23-28.
- (30) V. Taylor cites Jesus' use of Isaiah on twelve occasions, compared with His use of Jeremiah on only three, op.cit.p.70.
- (31) e.g. Skinner, Prophecy and Religion, pp.177-184. Whether or not Jeremiah advocated a root and branch eradication of sacrifice is at least open to question, c.f. Hicks, op.cit. pp.70-82.

maintained that when Jesus spoke in the Upper Room of a new Covenant, this was an obvious reference to Jeremiah 31:31 f. This may well be part of what was in Jesus' mind, but in that case Jesus gives a sacrificial turn to the teaching of Jeremiah by adding 'in my blood' to the mention of the Covenant, thus making the incident redolent of the sacrificial background of the Covenant of Exodus 24.

It is interesting to note that it was in the synagogues rather than in the Temple that the clash between Jesus and His opponents developed and came to a head, (32) and it was the synagogues that He recognised would be the centre of the persecution of his followers. (33)

This is not to say that Jesus desired the abolition of synagogue worship. Similarly it should be a warning against interpreting Jesus' recognition of the limitations of sacrificial worship, as a fundamental objection to it. As it was, He taught frequently in the Temple precincts, (34) paid the tax for the upkeep of the Temple, (35) assumed that a penitent would go to the Temple to seek forgiveness, (36) saw the Temple as the dwelling place of God, (37) vindicated its sanctity as 'my Father's house' against its desecration by materialistic custom. (38)

(32) Luke 4:28; Mark 3:5.

(33) Matthew 11:20-24; Luke 10:12-15.

(34) Mark 11:27; 12:35; Luke 19:47; 21:37f.

(35) Matthew 17:24ff.

(36) Luke 18:9-14.

(37) Matthew 23:21.

(38) John 2:13ff; Mark 11:15ff.

In view of these considerations it may be concluded that Jesus, while aware of the defects of contemporary sacrificial practice was yet appreciative of the spirit of sacrificial worship at its best, and conscious of its lasting religious content. This being so then, as Dr. Vincent Taylor says, it 'raises a presumption in favour of the view that Jesus thought of His death in terms of sacrifice.' (39) Any finality, however, is dependent upon the meaning that Jesus set upon His own death, and to arrive at a conclusion necessitates an enquiry into the nature of the Last Supper, and the meaning of Jesus' words in the Upper Room. This enquiry will be the main theme of the following Chapter. If Jesus' words bear a sacrificial stamp, then they not only confirm our inference as to how Jesus thought of His death, but will suggest the sense in which it is permissible for the Church to think of the Eucharist as a sacrifice.

(39) Taylor, *op.cit.*, p.74.

CHAPTER III

THE LAST SUPPER AND SACRIFICE

I. THE INFLUENCE OF MYSTERY RELIGIONS.

Before going on to discuss the meaning of the events in the Upper Room, mention should be made of the suggestion that St. Paul was influenced in his account of the institution by the meals celebrated in conjunction with the mystery religion of the day. There may be a superficial resemblance, but such comparisons could be drawn between other aspects of the Christian faith and non-Christian religions. No credible explanation has been offered how or when St. Paul, a Hebrew of the Hebrews, (1) should have come to be under the influence of pagan mystery cults. The fact that the antecedents of the Supper are thoroughly Jewish, that there is a strong ethical demand, (2) and that the object of the rite is not the deification of the believer, but his participation in the redeeming activity of Jesus Christ should be sufficient to show the improbability of Paul's having borrowed from pagan sources. (3)

If the stories of the Supper are not adoptions from pagan religions, are they 'cult narratives'? Could they be

(1) Phil. 3:5-7.

(2) Thornton, op.cit., p.350.

(3) Taylor, op.cit., pp.216-217, 124.

inventions of the early church for the purpose of explaining existing sacramental practice? They are too terse to be explanations of ritual origins. That is not to say that they are uninfluenced by the experience of some decades of Eucharistic worship in the Apostolic church.(4) The accounts of the Upper Room are certainly written by those who found in sacramental worship that the presence of the Lord, through His Holy Spirit, was with them as He had promised. Nevertheless we may be reasonably certain that the record of the words spoken on that occasion have their origin substantially with Christ Himself.

2. THE RELATION OF THE LAST SUPPER TO THE PASSOVER MEAL.

In seeking a sound basis for interpretation of the Last Supper, it is important to try to understand the relation of the Last Supper, to the Passover Meal which Jesus desired so strongly to eat with His friends. This is a matter about which there has been considerable discussion, and no final settlement is yet possible. The difficulty is due to an apparent divergence on this point, between the Synoptic Gospels and the 4th Gospel.

The Passover fell upon the 15th Nisan. Both the 4th Gospel and the Synoptics regard the Last Supper as having taken

(4) Moffatt, The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, pp.169,164-170; Taylor, op.cit.,pp.116-117; A.J.B. Higgins, The Lord's Supper in the New Testament, p.9; On the critical interpretation of John 6:52-59 c.f. E.C. Hoskyns, The Fourth Gospel, pp.323-324, 345-346.

(5) For summaries of the evidence see A.E.J.Rawlinson, The Gospel According to St.Mark, pp.262-267; and A.M.Hunter, The Work and Words of Jesus, p.121.

place on the evening of Maundy Thursday, and the Passion culminating on the afternoon of Good Friday. According to Jewish reckoning a day began at sundown, so that the Last Supper and the Crucifixion would have taken place during the same day.

In the 4th Gospel that day is the 14th Nisan, the 'day of Preparation' for the Sabbath (John 19:31), and also 'the day of Preparation for the Passover'. (John 19:14). That the Passover was associated that year with the Sabbath is suggested by the words 'that Sabbath was an high day' (John 19:31). This means that in the Johannine account, the Last Supper was not a celebration of the Passover, but was a meal eaten 24 hours before the Passover.

The Synoptic Gospels seem to identify the Last Supper with the Passover, (6) so suggesting that the day beginning upon the evening of Maundy Thursday with the Supper must have been the 15th Nisan.

Traditionally the Last Supper had been regarded as the Passover. With the advent of modern Biblical criticism this view has been vigorously assailed, so that today most scholars adhere to the Johannine dating. (7) In our own time, however, the Synoptic dating has been strongly defended, notably by

(6) Mark 14:12; Luke 22:7.

(7) c.f. McArthur, The Evolution of the Christian Year, pp.80-81. Scholars who have upheld the Johannine dating include G.H. Box, W.O.E. Oesterley, G.H.C. McGregor, F.C.N. Hicks, and W.D. Maxwell.

J. Jeremias.(8) If the Last Supper was the Passover, then Jesus' words are to be interpreted in that light.

However, even if the Johannine dating is preferred, the Paschal associations are still considerable. The account in the 4th Gospel suggests that Jesus was being crucified at the same time as the Passover lambs were being sacrificially slain in the Temple.(9) Further, the 4th Gospel dates the anointing of Jesus at Bethany (John 12:1ff) as 10th Nisan. A.A. McArthur (10) points out that the 10th Nisan was the day each Hebrew family in Egypt was to set aside the Paschal lamb (Exodus 12:2-3) so that it appears that the Fourth Evangelist sees the Anointing as Jesus being set apart as the Paschal victim. Further, the 4th Gospel view of Jesus' death records that none of Jesus' limbs were broken at the Crucifixion, (John 19:33,36), this being explicitly connected with the institution of the Passover in Egypt (Exodus 12:46). Thus, while the 4th Gospel does not regard the Last Supper/^{as}itself the Passover, the Paschal significance of the events of those days is stressed.

If the Johannine dating is accepted, it is necessary to put forward an alternative to the Synoptic idea of the Supper.

(8) Jeremias, J.T.S. Vol. L, p.1f, 1949.
c.f. C.F.D. Moule's review of The Eucharistic Words of Jesus
in The Expository Times, November, 1954.

(9) John 18:28; 19:14. c.f. Exodus 12:6; 34:25.

(10) McArthur, op.cit., pp.84-86.

Some scholars maintain it to have been a kiddûsh, a form of thanksgiving at a meal held in preparation for the Sabbath, for the Passover, or for some other religious festival.(11) Others believe that it was a gathering of a chabûrah, an informal association for religious fellowship, frequently consisting of a teacher and his followers, and meeting regularly for a weekly supper, generally on the eve of Sabbaths and holy days.(12)

If, at the present time, it is not possible to settle the question as to the date of the Supper in relation to the Passover, it is possible to say that the meal was of Paschal significance.(13) The Synoptics suggest the meal itself was the Passover; the Johannine Gospel underlines the Paschal significance of Jesus' death, so that the Supper is to be understood against the background of that event. Again it must be remembered that it was no coincidence that the Supper and the Passion took place in the season of the Passover. It is clear from the Gospel narratives that the place and the time were carefully chosen by Jesus, and that it was with the conviction that His hour had come that He made His way to the Holy City.

3. THE EUCHARISTIC WORDS OF JESUS.

There are three narratives incorporating independent accounts of the institution of the Lord's Supper: Mark 14:22-25,

(11) Hicks, *op.cit.*, pp.215 f; Moffatt, *op.cit.*, p.165; Maxwell, An Outline of Christian Worship, pp.5-7; Otto, Religious Essays, pp.45-46, 59.

(12) Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy, pp.59ff; R. Otto, The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man, pp.278-284. For criticisms of this view, c.f. A.J.B.Higgins, *op.cit.*, pp.14ff; Jeremias, (13) Wm. Manson, Jesus the Messiah, p.170. (*op.cit.*)

(substantially the same as this is Matthew 26:26-29), I Corinthians 11:23-26 (with which may be associated Luke 22:19f-20), and Luke 22:15-25 (sometimes called 'the longer text' to distinguish it from the other form for which there is manuscript evidence, Luke 22:15-19a, 'the shorter text'). William Manson(14) indicates that as a result of comparison of the various accounts (if we regard Luke 19b-20 as a Pauline development), we seem to be left with two different traditions as to the original form of the institution narrative, Mark 14:22-25 and Luke 22:17-19a. Criticism of the texts provides useful material in trying to interpret the saying, though whether or not it will ever be possible to determine finally the form of the original sayings is doubtful. In any case the Church is concerned with textual criticism not as an object in itself, but as an aid to the understanding of the intention of Jesus, and the meaning of His words in the Upper Room.

(a) Luke 22:15-16: 'With desire have I desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer; for I say unto you, I will not eat it until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God.'

The relation of the Last Supper to the Passover as it appears in the Synoptics and in the Johannine Gospels has already been discussed (above). It is probable that St. Luke himself thought the Last Supper to have been the Passover, in view of

(14) Wm. Manson, Jesus the Messiah, pp.134-146.

his statement that on the day of unleavened bread 'the passover must be killed'. (Luke 22:7, c.f. Mark 14:12).(15) On the other hand it may well be that Jesus' own words as here recorded, mean that, in spite of His great desire to share with them in the festival, He will be unable to do so, because of the treachery of one of His disciples. This is supported by the strong negative in verse 16, οὐ μὴ φάγω In either case, however, the Paschal setting of the Supper remains intact, and in view of the sacrificial nature of the Passover,(16) this is of importance in determining the way in which we are to understand the nature of the Eucharist.

(b) Mark 14:22: 'Take, eat; this is my body.'

The saying 'This is my body' is common to all the institution narratives. These words are to be interpreted in the light of Jesus' prior action of taking bread, blessing, breaking and giving it to His disciples. It seems that the breaking of the bread was designed to demonstrate by action what would happen to His body,(17) in the same way in which some of the Old Testament prophets dramatized their words. Such prophetic actions were not regarded as 'merely symbolic', but as initiating the events foretold.(18) Jeremiah had smashed the earthen jar (Jeremiah 19), and worn the yoke

(15) Taylor, op.cit., pp.180-181.

(16) c.f. Chapter II above.

(17) c.f. R. Otto's interesting suggestion that the breaking of the bread indicated that Jesus expected to be a victim of death by stoning, Religious Essays, p.49.

(18) Taylor, op.cit., pp.118-119, w.Manson, op.cit.,pp.141-142.

(Jeremiah 27 and 28) in token of the fate God was even at that moment bringing upon His rebellious people.

By commanding His followers to eat the bread, defined by Him as His body, Jesus was inviting them to share proleptically in the experience of His redeeming sacrifice. It is evident that Jesus intended the bread to be the vehicle by which His disciples participated in the power of His life surrendered in sacrifice.

The fact that Jesus deliberately chose the season of the Passover for His Passion indicates a sacrificial content to the words about His body. The Passover meal which the Last Supper anticipated (or which was identical with the Last Supper if the Synoptic chronology be preferred) was the concluding stage in a sacrificial action that began with the slaying of the lambs in the Temple.(19) The direction 'take ye' indicates that Jesus desired His disciples to appropriate, in the most intimate fashion, the benefits of Christ, their Paschal lamb.(20)

(19) Hicks, op.cit., p.234.

(20) Taylor, op.cit. p.121; Higgins, op.cit., pp.49-54.

The question of the meaning of the copula $\xi\sigma\tau\iota\nu$ in this saying is of great importance in a consideration of the doctrine of the Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, but raises problems that are not within the scope of this dissertation. For discussions of this question see Taylor, op.cit., pp.121-122; Rawlinson, The Gospel According to St. Mark, p.205; Moffatt, op.cit. p.168; Higgins, op.cit., p.51 f; H.J. Wotherspoon, op.cit., pp.281 f; N. Pittenger, The Christian Sacrifice, Chapter 7.

It is sufficient to note that most Reformed theologians uphold the idea of the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, while rejecting the attempt of Roman Catholic theologians to explain this in Aristotlean terms of a change of 'substance'. Frère Max Thurian expresses the view of many Reformed churchmen when he says: 'Le pain

(c) Mark 14:24: 'This is my blood of the covenant, which is shed for many.'

I Corinthians 11:25: 'This cup is the new covenant in my blood'

After the word 'many' in Mark 14:24, St. Matthew adds, 'unto remission of sins', Matthew 26:28. This is probably an addition due to St. Matthew himself. Its purpose is apparently to focus attention upon the reason for the command to drink.(21)

It has been argued against the authenticity of the above sayings in Mark and Paul that they are plainly sacrificial in meaning.(22) This will be a cogent argument only if we are convinced on other grounds that Jesus had no sympathy with the meaning and purpose of sacrifice. As it is, however, there is good reason to believe Jesus to have been in sympathy with the principles underlying sacrifice, so that this saying now becomes

(Footnote continued from Page 33)

reste pain, mais devient le véhicule du Christ s'incarnant en nous. Le dogme de l'incarnation implique l'union et la distinction des deux natures; Jésus-Christ, c'est le vrai Dieu s'incarnant dans un homme vraiment homme (le péché en moins); le sacrement de l'eucharistie, c'est Jésus-Christ s'incarnant dans le fidèle par les espèces, qui restent du vrai pain et du vrai vin.' pp.69-70, Joie du Ciel sur la Terre.

While affirming the reality of the Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, most Reformed theology, and certainly Calvinist theology, does not rigidly separate it from the Presence of Christ in the Word conjoined with the Sacrament. As Frère Max again expresses it: 'Il est certain que la réalité substantielle et objective de la Parole comme du Sacrement, c'est Jésus-Christ, également présent dans l'une comme dans l'autre.' op.cit., p.128. Also see two interesting letters of Dr. Cairns to Miss Talbot, David Cairns, An Autobiography, p.190.

(21) Higgins, op.cit., pp.24ff; Taylor, op.cit., p.127.

(22) To the objection that drinking even the symbol of blood would have been objectionable to a Jew, see Dr. Taylor's reply, op.cit., pp.133-136.

an important fact in support of that conclusion.(23)

A.J.B. Higgins concludes that the words 'my blood of the covenant' do not belong to the original saying, on the grounds that they make an awkward expression in the Greek, and still more so when translated into the Aramaic, and further that the reference to a new Covenant is an addition due to Pauline influence.(24) However, even if the precise wording were not that of Jesus Himself, the idea of a new Covenant is so expressive of Jesus' attitude to His mission, that it may be taken to be representative of the mind of Jesus on that occasion

A.E.J. Rawlinson considers that Jesus had in mind, not only the thought of the Passover, with its celebration of the deliverance from Egypt, or the covenant sacrifice at Sinai (of which he believes the phrase 'blood of the covenant' to be an echo), but also the figure of the Suffering Servant who was called to give his life a ransom for many.'(25)

Moffatt connects the Pauline saying with Jeremiah 31:31 and also Zechariah 9:11, remarking that, thanks to the sacrifice of Christ their Paschal lamb, the followers of Christ are initiated into a new Covenant in a deeper sense than any prophet had anticipated.(26)

Likewise Vincent Taylor considers the Markan saying to be based on Exodus 24:8, and Isaiah 53:12, and the Pauline saying

(23) See Chapter II above.

(24) Higgins, op.cit., pp.33-34.

(25) Rawlinson, op.cit., pp.205-206; Mark 10:45.

(26) Moffatt, op.cit., p.168.

on a combination of Jeremiah 31:31 and the ideas illustrated in Exodus 24:1-13. On the critical question, he acknowledges that both sayings may be variants of a lost original, but that on the practical question of which gives the better ground for interpretation, he agrees with Jeremias that the Markan saying is to be preferred. (27)

The story, which we may therefore assume to be the major element in the background of these sayings tells how, after Moses had returned with the words of Yahweh, the people agreed to obey. The following day an altar was built, and burnt offerings and peace offerings were sacrificed to Yahweh. When the book of the covenant had been read, some of the blood was sprinkled on the altar, and some of it on the people. The saying in the Upper Room would appear ^{then} to mean that, as of old Yahweh blessed the people through the dedicated life-blood, so now His Son was surrendering His own life that all might participate in an infinitely greater blessing. (28) As L.S. Thornton remarks: 'A new dispensation is being inaugurated. As the covenant of Moses was the prelude to the promised land, still more the covenant of Jesus.' (29)

(d) I Corinthians 11:24: 'This do in remembrance of me.'
I Corinthians 11:25: 'This do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.'

As the meaning of the word *ἀνάμνησις* is discussed in

(27) Taylor, op.cit., pp.130-133, 203-206.

(28) Taylor, op.cit., pp.137-138.

(29) Thornton, op.cit., p.349.

Chapter VII below, we are here concerned with the question of authenticity. It has often been contended that the command to continue the Supper (not mentioned in Mark, and in Luke apparently borrowed from Paul) is St. Paul's own addition. However, Mark may have taken the command for granted. Further it is by no means certain that without a specific command from Jesus, the Supper would ever have been continued, while there is every reason to suppose that if Jesus wished His followers to share in His work, He would have commanded its continuance until He should come again.(30)

Even if, like A.J.B. Higgins, we could not be certain that Jesus enjoined the repetition 'in so many words', we could agree with Higgins that 'the tradition that He did is certainly in harmony with His intention on that occasion.'(31)

4. CONCLUSION.

In view of the meaning of the Old Testament sacrificial system at its best, and the attitude of Jesus to the sacrifices of His day (c.f. Chapter II above), and of the nature of the Eucharistic sayings of Jesus discussed in this present chapter, it is reasonable to conclude that Jesus thought of His death in terms of sacrifice. We may also conclude that He desired men to share in the fellowship with God which His sacrifice was to make possible, and that the Eucharist derives its significance

(30) C.E.B. Cranfield, *op.cit.*, p.256; P.T. Forsyth, The Church and the Sacraments, pp.245f; Taylor, *op.cit.*, pp.206-208.

(31) Higgins, *op.cit.*, p.36.

from Jesus' teaching along these lines at the Last Supper. Dr. Taylor observes in this connection: 'Every important aspect of the sacrificial principle can be found in the thoughts of Jesus concerning His Passion. The aim of sacrifice is a restored fellowship; its medium is a representative offering; the spiritual condition is the attitude of the worshipper; its rationale is the offering of life; its culmination is sharing in the life offered by means of the sacred meal. These ideas form a natural background against which the Passion-sayings can be readily understood.' (32)

When it is remembered who Jesus was, God's Son and chosen instrument for the redemption of mankind, then it is right to speak of His sacrifice as that which both fulfilled and transcended the sacrifices of the Old Testament. (33) The Old Testament sacrifices were fulfilled in that Jesus' redeeming work accords with the finest insights made available by the sacrificial system. They were transcended in that there is a finality about that ~~one~~-and-for-all sacrifice in which offerer, victim, and priest were One who was 'Very God of Very God', who now 'sitteth on the right hand of the Father'. (34) While it is permissible to speak of Jesus' redemptive work as the 'perfect sacrifice', it would be doing it less than justice to regard it merely as the natural climax of the sacrifices that had gone

(32) Taylor, *op.cit.*, p.295.

(33) C.R. North, Sacrifice, article in Richardson's T.W.B., p.213 f.

(34) Nicene Creed

before. As E.G. Selwyn observes(35): 'The sacrifices of the Jewish law were only "types and shadows", and it is they which are to be interpreted by the realities of the Christian covenant and not vice versa.'

It is unlikely that Jesus consciously strove to model His teaching about His death upon the ritual of the Temple, even though, as we have seen, His thought was in harmony with the underlying principles of sacrifice. It is more likely that the clue to His conception of His work lies rather in the Isaianic description of the Suffering Servant of God.(36) While Jesus did not apply the title to Himself directly, it seems clear that frequently it is the Servant passages that He has^d in mind.(37)

The figure of the Suffering Servant in Deutero-Isaiah is portrayed in four passages: Isaiah 42:1-4; 49:1-6; 50:4-9, and 52:13-53:12. The Servant's work is connected with bringing in the age of universal obedience to, and worship of, the God of Israel. This work is elsewhere regarded as the task of the Messiah.(38) Thus the object of the work of the Servant and of the Messiah is largely the same, but in the Servant's case this work will involve him in grievous suffering, which will be the very organ of his mission. His death will not be the consequence

(35) Selwyn, The Christian Sacrifice in the Eucharist, Article in Report of Anglo-Catholic Congress, 1927, p.94.

(36) Taylor, op.cit., p.296.

(37) Mark 8:31, 9:12-13; 10:45; 1:11; Luke 22:37; Matthew 8:17.

(38) c.f. Rawlinson, The New Testament Doctrine of the Christ, pp. 44f, 49, 238f.

of his own sin. His death is to be regarded rather as that of a sacrificed lamb, namely as the means of releasing a spirit both to bear man's spirit to God, and God's blessing to man. Isaiah 53:10 speaks of the Servant's soul as a 'sin-offering' or asham. (39)

H.H. Rowley sums up the character of the sacrificial work that this Servant of the Lord will achieve for men, thus:

'The Servant is therefore said to be a sacrifice that is effective for those whose hearts are so moved by his sufferings that they humbly confess their own sin, and recognize that his death may be at once the organ of their approach in humble submission to God and of God's approach in cleansing power unto them.' (40)

It is clear that on one hand the profound insight here displayed in the description of the Servant's task is fully in accord with the meaning of the sacrificial system, and probably arises out of it, and on the other, that the work here envisaged is of a kind far outreaching the range of the Old Testament Temple sacrifices. (41) As this conception was a determinative factor in Jesus' own Messianic consciousness, His death can justifiably be described as fulfilling and transcending what the Old Testament sacrifices were striving to attain. Further it points to the Eucharist as a means whereby men appropriate the benefits of that perfect sacrifice.

(39) c.f. Chapter II above. (40) Rowley, op.cit., pp.104-105.
 (41) H.L. Goudge, Sacrifice in the Old Testament. Article in Report of Anglo-Catholic Congress, 1927, p.70.

CHAPTER IV

UNSATISFACTORY VIEWS OF THE EUCCHARISTIC SACRIFICE

It is not easy to discuss a question like that of the Eucharist understood in terms of sacrifice, around which there has been so much debate, and be able to examine the matter dispassionately.

In the minds of many the very expression 'Eucharistic sacrifice' suggests that what is involved is a 'propitiatory sacrifice', and in consequence they throw the whole idea of the Eucharistic sacrifice out of court.

Others associate the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice with the view that the celebration of the Eucharist is a meritorious act by which the participants are able to justify themselves in the eyes of God.

Some fear that the performance of the Eucharistic rite may come to be regarded as valuable in itself and not requiring the offering up to God of the faithful and obedient spirit of men. No doubt these objections are largely suggested by the recollection of the abuses in sacramental faith and practice of the late Medieval period, and will, in many cases, be historically 'out of date'. Nevertheless we must not lightly dismiss such objections as inapplicable today lest many good Christian people jump

to the conclusion that false views are being taught, when such views are equally unacceptable to the student of the sacraments. Moreover, behind many objections to what is popularly imagined to be the doctrine of the Eucharist^{ic} sacrifice there often lies a deeper protest against unbalanced or unworthy views of the Atonement. It is not always realised, however, that the removal of objections to a doctrine may well necessitate 'theological second thoughts' not only by the protagonist of the particular doctrine, but also by the objector as well.

We shall now proceed to discuss the objections we have mentioned.

I. THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE AND PROPITIATION.

There is little doubt but that the late Medieval Church came to regard the sacrifice of the mass as serving to appease God. It is significant that even after the Counter-Reformation was under way, ~~that~~ this idea persisted. Furthermore it is explicitly taught in the Catechism of the Council of Trent. This is well brought out by Darwell Stone's quotations from that Catechism, in which the reasons for the instituting of the Eucharist^{are} declared to be the nourishment of the soul, and 'that the Church may have a continual sacrifice, whereby our sins might be expiated, and the Heavenly Father, often grievously offended by our wickedness, may be brought from anger to mercy, from the severity of just punishment.'

'The most holy sacrifice of the Mass.... is also really a propitiatory sacrifice, by which God is appeased and rendered propitious.... This is the power of this sacrifice that it is of benefit not only to him who offers and him who receives, but also to all the faithful, whether still living with us on earth or being dead in the Lord and not yet fully expiated.' (1)

This idea of the Church offering a propitiatory sacrifice gained such a hold that by the 17th century Cardinal de Lugo, S.J., was able to speak in terms of the independence of this sacrifice from any present action of Christ. De Lugo taught that Christ has commissioned priests to offer the sacrifice so that if, by hypothesis, He did not know, or were asleep, while it were being done, it would still take place. (2)

It was this kind of teaching, as it was represented in the Church of the West prior to the Reformation, that was so sharply rejected by the Reformers. Thus Calvin after saying that he is setting out to combat the opinion taught by the theologians of Rome that the mass 'is an expiatory victim by which they reconcile God to them', (3) concludes this argument:

'Wherefore, I conclude, that it is a most criminal insult and intolerable blasphemy, both against Christ himself,

(1) Stone op.cit., Vol.II c.f. section on Trent, 99f.

(2) Stone op.cit., Vol.II, p.374.

(3) Calvin, op.cit., 4/18/1.

and against the sacrifice which he completed on our behalf by his death upon the cross, for any man to repeat any oblation with a view to procure the pardon of sins, propitiate God, and obtain righteousness'. And after protesting against the practice of saying masses on behalf of 'everyone who was willing to purchase such a commodity with ready money,' he goes on to make clear that these were the grounds of his repudiation of the sacrifice of the mass: 'In this sense, we deny that they are priests; that they can intercede with God on behalf of the people by such an oblation; that they can appease the wrath of God, or obtain the remission of sins.' (Institutes 4/18/14).(4)

Yet, for all the integrity of the Reformers' counterblast to the abuses of their time, it is not possible for us simply to accept the position as they saw it. Our day is benefiting from the fruits of theological rediscovery, in which the Reformers, if they were living, would certainly rejoice.

One of these rediscoveries we have already dealt with: the realisation that the essence of sacrifice is after all not in the destruction of a living being, but in the release of a life.(5)

Another rediscovery concerns the use of the word 'propitiation'. Both Reformed (as well as ^{and} Roman theologians of the 16th century were children of their time(6) in their

(4) Also see Westminster Confession, Chapter 19, Section 2.

(5) See Chapter II above.

(6) Hicks, op.cit., pp.330-331.

understanding of the word 'propitiation' as appeasing an angry God. The Reformers rightly repudiated a view of the Eucharistic sacrifice that suggested the celebration of the Eucharist was a means by which man could appease the wrath of God; and yet they retained the notion that in ^{the} saving acts of our redemption Christ was making a sacrifice that turned an angry God to mercy. This is a grave misunderstanding of what the Cross meant, both to Jesus and to God, not to mention we who partake of the fruits of that Cross, for so far as New Testament thought goes 'in whatever way the process of salvation through the Cross is conceived, God's merciful attitude towards sinners is never regarded as the result of the process, but as its cause and source. It all took place because God so loved the world.' (7)

When the full implication of the fact that the cost of the Cross is born by God Himself is realized, it does not surprise us to find that this purpose of love is expressed even in the Old Testament dispensation. This fact has been obscured by our misunderstanding of many Old Testament terms. A notable example is the case of the verb כָּפַר , 'to cover' or 'to wipe away'. Its common Piel form כִּפֵּר , has been usually translated 'to atone', 'to make atonement', in the sense of propitiating the Deity. However, Vincent Taylor points out that where this verb is used in the sense of 'appeasing' or 'pacifying' the reference is to man. (8) Further, 'in other passages it is used of expiation for

(7) D.M. Baillie, God Was in Christ, p.188, c.f. pp.184-189.

(8) Gen. 32:20, and Prov. 16:14.

sin apart from sacrifice,(9) and where God is the subject the meaning is "to forgive" or "to purge away." (10) This is in line with the deepened consciousness of sin after the Exile, and with the Old Testament conviction that the sacrificial system was the means of grace provided for Israel out of God's loving concern for them.(11)

This is borne out by C.H. Dodd's study of the usage in the LXX of the word ἰλάσκεσθαι, or ἔξιλάσκεσθαι, the stock rendering of 𐤀𐤒𐤁 (12). The common usage in classical Greek does suggest 'placating' someone. Dodd finds, however, that the only places where the LXX retains this sense is in LXX Zech.7:2; 8:22, and Mal.1:9. In the first and third cases the word is used contemptuously as if to say: 'it is useless to think of "placating" Jehovah.' The second case is not so clear, but it is significant that it is pagan peoples who are pictured approaching Jehovah in order to 'propitiate' Him.(13)

After a study of all the cases of LXX usage Dodd reaches this conclusion:

'Thus Hellenistic Judaism, as represented by the LXX, does not regard the cult as a means of pacifying the displeasure of the Deity, but as a means of delivering man from sin, and it looks in the last resort to God himself to perform that

(9) Ex. 32:30; Num. 16:46f; II Sam. 21:3.

(10) Deut. 21:8; 32:43; Ps.65:3; Jer.18:23; V. Taylor, op.cit., p.52.

(11) A.B. Davidson, Theology of the Old Testament, pp.310,316-317

(12) Dodd, Chapt.5 on Atonement in The Bible and the Greeks.

(13) Dodd, op.cit., pp.86-87.

deliverance, thus evolving a meaning of ἰλάσκεσθαι strange to non-biblical Greek.' (I4)

5/ The consequence_α of all this for the way we are to understand Christ's death on Calvary are far reaching. It means that what is involved is not a turning of God's anger to pity, His justice to mercy, but a means whereby our sins are 'covered' and 'wiped away'. Further, it means that this happens not, as it were, in defiance of God, but from His own intention and design. God in Christ is Himself the Author of this salvation.

'In accordance with biblical usage, therefore, the substantive (hilasterion) would mean, not propitiation, but "a means by which guilt is annulled": if a man is the agent, the meaning would be a "means of expiation"; if God, "a means by which sin is forgiven". Biblical usage is determinative for Paul. The rendering 'propitiation' is therefore misleading, for it suggests the placating of an angry God, and although this would be in accordance with pagan usage, it is foreign to biblical usage. In the present passage it is God who puts forward the means whereby the guilt of sin is removed, by sending Christ. The sending of Christ, therefore, is the divine method of forgiveness'. (I5)

If this is so it means that both the Church of Rome and her Protestant critics must re-think their theological

(I4) Dodd, op.cit., p.93.

(I5) C.H. Dodd, Romans, (Moffatt Commentaries) p.55, where he comments on Romans 3/25. Also c.f. pp.54-55, 58.

positions. On one hand it would indicate that her critics are right in their rejection of a doctrine of the 'sacrifice of the mass' as taught in the Council of Trent Catechism. The Roman doctrine in this respect certainly calls for 'reformation'. On the other hand, it would seem that Rome's critics are right for the wrong reason when they reject the doctrine on the grounds that the death of Christ on the Cross was able to render God propitious. As we have seen, however, from the results of the work of scholars like Dodd and Taylor, this view of propitiation is itself misleading, and stands in need of being 'reformed' along more soundly biblical lines. There are thus very fundamental reasons why the Eucharistic sacrifice may never be thought to be 'propitiatory sacrifice' in the sense of appeasement of God, and they lie in the gracious nature of God's concern for sinful man.

2. THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE AND MERIT.

Closely associated with the erroneous view that the 'sacrifice of the mass' was propitiatory, was the notion that it was also a meritorious performance before God. That this view is still prevalent in the Roman Church may be seen from the fact that a modern exponent of the sacraments can still teach, most emphatically, that two masses are twice the worth of one mass, each one being of a single definite value, and that this principle is the essential basis of the Church's 'sacramental jurisprudence

(16)

(16) Dom A. Vonier O.S.B., A Key to the Doctrine of the Eucharist, p.235.

Fear of this view gaining ground outside the Roman obedience is one of the reasons why some Protestants tend to react against the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice, no matter in what sense it is understood.

Happily there are those who are earnestly opposed to the notion that the performance of the Eucharistic motions is a meritorious action in the sight of God, yet who are also clear-sighted enough to appreciate the great religious value of a sound doctrine of the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist. Thus Bishop Aulén speaks for those who are of this persuasion, when he writes:

'The defect of the Roman theory of the Mass was not that it emphasized the sacrifice, but that it separated the act of sacrifice from divine love, and understood it as a human achievement.' (I7)

In the same vein his colleague, the Archbishop of Uppsala, points out that, as the idea of sacrifice is common to all religions, it is easy for ideas which belong to other religions to creep into ^{the} Christian conception of the sacrificial idea in the Eucharist. Furthermore, when in the Middle Ages, the Eucharistic sacrifice came to lose its great climax of the communion of the people, 'it could come to be regarded, not as the

(I7) Gustaf Aulén, The Faith of the Christian Church, p.391.
 'The perverted use (of the idea of sacrifice) should not be allowed to discourage the rightful use of this idea.'

representation and appropriation of God's own sacrifice, but as a sacrifice offered by man, having an independent value of its own, and intended to influence God as it were from outside.' (18)

This notion of meritorious performance in the Eucharist founders on the same rock that eliminates any propitiatory aspect to the Eucharist: the fact that the saving events of our redemption are initiated by God Himself. (19) Everything that we do by way of returning to God, is done after the cost of our return has already been born by God's love. 'Man himself approaches God by a way the stones of which he has not cut; he finds access to the Father through the self-offering of Jesus.' (20) The Eucharist serves as a vehicle for man's return and approach to God, but always and only within the economy of grace. (21) We oversimplify the issues, however, if we imagine that the idea of merit is a danger that is peculiarly connected with the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice. It is just as likely to arise, and does arise, in systems of thought that have little regard for sacramental worship.

(18) Yngve Brilioth, Eucharistic Faith and Practice Evangelical and Catholic, p.284.

(19) D.M. Baillie, *op.cit.*, pp.171-202.

(20) V. Taylor, *op.cit.*, p.298.

(21) This is the same idea that lay behind the O.T. sacrifices: 'The sacrifices were thus offered to a God already in relations of grace with His people. They were not offered in order to attain His grace, but to retain it.' A.B. Davidson, *op.cit.*, pp.316-317. What the prophets denounced was not this conception of sacrifice, but one that did see the Temple sacrifices as a device for meriting God's favour, just as what the Reformers denounced was a false view of the Eucharistic sacrifice that did not take account of the priority of Grace.

On the one hand there is the good pagan's notion that he can merit his salvation by being decent: the idea that I can 'try to compensate for having done less than my duty in the past by doing more than my duty in the future. But alas! there exists nothing that is more than my duty..... We are dealing not with law but with love.' (22)

On the other hand there is the most subtle error of all: that of trying to combat an imagined danger from sacramentalism by ~~em~~ emphasizing faith, in a way that implies faith is 'meritorious' in the eyes of God.

It is never true to say that we merit the favour of God either by our works, or by the offering of the Eucharistic sacrifice, or by our faith in Him. It is He who enables us to do good works, it is He who ^{us} moves to draw near to Him in the Eucharistic sacrifice, it is He who gives us faith as a gift.

3. THE ROLE OF GRACE AND FAITH IN THE SACRAMENTS.

There are those who fear that to accept any doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice might lead to faith coming to be regarded as unessential. To put this objection in another way: Granted that a sound doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice does not involve the idea of its being a meritorious work, yet is there not a possibility that its efficacy will come to be thought of as working ex opere operato?

(22) J. Baillie, Invitation to Pilgrimage, p.62.

Our first comment is that this problem is not confined to the Godward movement in the Eucharist, but is quite as much connected with the manward movement. Moreover, as the Eucharistic sacrifice, properly conceived, also includes the act of communion, it is not really legitimate to speak as if this is a problem that is peculiarly attached to the first stage in the rite. Still less is there reason for rejecting the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice, because some have thought it to be efficacious ex opere operato, any more than we reject the doctrine of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist because Roman Catholics teach transubstantiation.

Nevertheless, there is still a need to go further into the question, as there is underlying it a matter of the greatest importance for our understanding of the whole of Christianity - the relationship between the objective fact of the salvation of the world wrought by God in Christ, and our appropriation of it. It is a question of the relationship between 'grace' and 'faith', as for example, expressed by I John 4:19, 'We love him, because he first loved us.' God's love of us is the cause of our love of Him. God's saving Act on our behalf makes possible our response of faith. God's grace is always prior to our faith, and if it were not so the gospel would not be 'good news' (εὐαγγέλιον) for Mankind. At the same time, as the end of God's grace is the salvation of men, we fail to understand 'grace' if we ever imagine that the question of men's response, and the manner of it,

is of small concern. Many errors in the theology and practice of the sacraments have their roots in faulty understanding of the nature of grace and of faith and of their relationship. Reformed churchmen may properly object that Roman Catholics are so impressed by the grace of God in the sacraments that they give scant consideration to the question of its reception. Nevertheless, there is a tendency, at least in some Reformed circles, to fall into the opposite sacramental error of forgetting that grace is after all prior to faith, and that faith is only able to be called forth because grace is already there.

We may well take as a starting point for our consideration the interesting interchange of views published in the Hibber Journal between Dr. H.H. Rowley and Fr. Lattey S.J. Speaking of the Work of Christ, Rowley observes that the New Testament never thinks of the effects of the Cross as achieved ex opere operato. He continues that Christ died for all men, but they are saved only when they believe in Him; that men are not saved by their faith, but faith is the pre-requisite.

To this Lattey replies that he is in general agreement with the fact that the effects of the Cross are not achieved merely ex opere operato. He also agrees that we are not saved by our faith, but by the power of Christ crucified, though faith is the condition of salvation being effective in us. He then asks if there is not, however, an element of opus operantum in 'the power of Christ crucified'?, and he adds:

'It is to this power to which Catholic doctrine refers the power of the sacraments to work ex opere operato, though without limiting them to "the power of Christ crucified".' (23)

What both Lattey and Rowley point to is an objective element in the Christian faith, which in itself is the rock upon which any agreement in the theology of the sacraments must rest. It is this that P.T. Forsyth refers to as 'the sense of the givenness, of the simple, silent massiveness of God's grace, and its independence of human energy.' (24)

That there is a concrete element in our religion not determined by our subjective state is well brought out by C.H. Dodd's comment on Romans 3:21-26 where St. Paul teaches what God has done for man under three metaphors:

'In the first, God takes the part of the judge who acquits the prisoner; in the second, that of the benefactor who secures freedom for the slave; in the third, that of the priest who makes expiation..... But the metaphors serve in each case to emphasize the pure objectivity of that which God has done for men.' (25)

The fact that above and beyond the sacraments stands the solid, objective initiative of God, is the reason why the sacraments are potent, for they derive their potency from outside themselves.

(23) Hibbert Journal, Jan. 1942, p.187, also c.f. p.183.

(24) Forsyth, op.cit., p.231.

(25) Dodd, Romans, pp.56-57.

It is on this ground that a Roman Catholic, Masure, contends that the Mass is true sacrifice because it is the efficacious sign of the Cross, and not that the Mass makes the sacrifice, which exists without it. By way of analogy he points out that miracles, which are the sign of the presence of the supernatural in the world, only exist because the supernatural does so already. (26)

Again it is because of this objective aspect to our faith that an Evangelical, Forsyth, writes:

'This grace (of God's objective work) fills the sacraments always with the same power that gave them being. And they are useless without the reverberation of that foregone and incessant Act of Christ..... So there is a certain place for the idea of an opus operatum in the sacraments.' (27)

Moreover, just as the Act of God is prior to the sacraments, which derive from it, our faith is also derived from God; it is a response to the Divine initiative. (28) Furthermore, not only does the efficacy of the sacraments ~~not~~ depend on God's Action, not our faith, but faith itself is sustained and strengthened by participation in the sacraments. In this connection Oliv Wyon, a member of the Church of Scotland, points out: 'Thus the fundamental value of the sacrament lies in the Act of God: in

(26) Masure, *op.cit.*, p.75.

(27) F.T. Forsyth, *op.cit.*, p.251.

(28) H.R. Mackintosh, The Divine Initiative, p.43.

the fact that God has done all, before we knew anything about it it does not depend on our faith; indeed it is this Act of God which creates and evokes faith.'

She deplores the widespread idea that equates Christian experience with an intensified emotional awareness. She continues

'This heresy (if I may so describe it) works havoc in the spiritual life, both of the individual, and of the community. If it is unchecked it leads to a habit of morbid introspection, breeds unhealthy scruples, and may in extreme cases lead to the loss of all real faith in God and interest in other people. There is no finer corrective for such an attitude than this objective view of the sacrament as God's Act - quite apart from anything we can do or feel. In the Eucharist God acts - we receive and adore.' (29) This aspect of the 'givenness' of grace in the sacraments is well understood by P.T. Forsyth, who holds that 'there is a sense in which the Roman phrase (ex opere operato) is true. The fundamental value of the Sacrament lies in a supreme and final Act..... The reservoir, always full in heavenly hills, is laid on to our door. The value lies in something done to our hand, in a finished work of Christ before and outside of our faith, before our faith was there - indeed, it puts our faith there, it creates it.' (30)

(29) Wyon, The Altar Fire, p.17.

(30) Forsyth, op.cit., p.230.

This is not to say that there is no danger of the role of faith in the sacrament ever being underestimated. This has been the case in the past in the Roman Catholic Church, and even today it seems that the Mass as a spectacle largely displaces the element of personal commitment of the worshippers, through the sacrament, to Jesus Christ. When this happens it is easy to drift into thinking of the Eucharist superstitiously.

As a commentary on the relationship between grace and faith in the sacraments, we might well take Revelation 3:20 : 'Behold I stand at the door and knock: if any man hear my voice, and open the door, I will come into him, and will sup with him and he with me.' (31) By analogy we may say that our Lord's presence at the door is like the objective element in the Sacrament. This Presence is there irrespective of our personal belief. Faith is represented by ^{the} action of the man inside opening the door, and welcoming the Lord. The opening of the door in no sense 'creates' the presence, but it is necessary if Christ is to 'enter his house' and 'sup with him'.

We may now go on to enlarge on the manner in which we are to conceive the role of faith in the sacrament:-

(a) In the first place faith is always 'faith in' something or someone. Christian faith is faith in God in Christ. We are not asked to 'have faith' in the sense of experiencing a high toned

(31) Some commentators consider that this expression has risen out of the Early Church's Eucharistic experience, e.g. Preston and Hanson, The Revelation of Saint John the Divine, p.68.

religious emotion, yet neither are we asked to have faith in the sacraments, but rather faith in Him who is the Author of the sacraments. Moreover, the God in whom we are to have faith has expressed His redeeming love of man in a series of events, which are prior to our own personal experience of them. Thus 'faith in the New Testament sense means being convinced of the fact that this entire happening takes place for me.' (32)

(b) This faith is not something that is so individual that it does not owe anything to the help of other men. It is possible, in fact, for faith to be vicarious, (33) as is shown in the healing of the centurion's servant. (34) A man could not have come to a saving faith in Christ, had it not been for the Body of Christ, the Church. The very fact that infants are baptized not upon the confession of their own faith, but upon that of their parents and the Church is a witness of this truth.

(c) If this faith is to lead to the fullest Christian experience however, it must also involve an intimate personal relationship between the individual and Jesus Christ. Such a faith must be positive and outgoing, and not the merely negative matter of not putting obstacles in the way of our own reception of the benefits of Christ's sacrifice. There must be the desire to receive Him, and an active 'opening the door' and bidding Him welcome. The Westminster Confession of Faith sums up the question of the

(32) Cullmann, op.cit., P.219.

(33) Forsyth, op.cit., p.218.

(34) Matthew 8:5-13.

relationship between grace and faith in the sacraments in an admirable fashion: 'The grace which is exhibited in or by the sacraments, rightly used, is not conferred by any power in them; neither doth the efficacy of a sacrament depend on the piety or intention of him that doth administer it, but upon the work of the Spirit, and the word of the institution; which contains, together with a precept authorising the use thereof, a promise of benefit to worthy receivers.' (35)

The Confession thus recognizes the sacraments as a means of grace, and at the same time rejects two extreme views: on one hand the strict ex opere operato view of Roman Catholicism, and on the other the making of the faith and sincerity of the celebrant the central element, as exemplified in Anabaptism. It ascribes the power of the sacraments to the work of the Holy Spirit.

In spite of all the divergencies of belief with regard to the sacraments, where there is the recognition of the objective element in salvation, and, on the other hand, of the necessity of its faithful appropriation by the individual, there should be more scope for drawing closer together in the sacraments than is commonly supposed. (36) After all the power which the Roman

(35) Westminster Confession, Chapter 27, Section 3.

(36) There is much to be said for the view that of the two errors (of overrating and underrating the power of God in the sacraments) the latter is the more grievous. 'Those who regard the sacraments superstitiously do need to have their views reformed; but at least they do not make the mistake of assuming that God never bothers about His Church..... Where there is desire to minimize the significance of the sacraments one may wonder whether the person really believes in the God of the Bible.'

Catholic asserts to work ex opere operato in the sacraments, is the power to which the evangelical ascribes his salvation when he sings:

'My hope is built on nothing less
Than Jesus' Blood and Righteousness.'

There is no need for the Roman Catholic to fear that to be concerned with faith is to plunge into 'pure subjectivism'. Nothing that is evoked and created by 'grace' can be thought of as 'merely subjective.' Again there is no need for the Evangelical to fear to admit the objective aspect of the grace of God in the sacraments, for 'faith' itself is outgoing and is faith 'in' something and Someone that is prior to his own belief.

4. SOME MODERN VIEWS.

In view of the discussion in the preceding chapters, it is of interest to apply the Reformed principles there expressed to the thought of a modern Roman Catholic exponent of the Eucharistic sacrifice.

In his book, The Christian Sacrifice, Canon Eugène Masure, Director of the Seminary at Lille, does not make his starting point the sacrifice of Christ. He is impressed by the universality of sacrifice. Christ, he maintains, accepted the 'law and logic' of all ancient sacrifice, (37) with which Christ's own sacrifice was 'one in its underlying metaphysic.' (38)

(37) Masure, The Christian Sacrifice, p. 155.
(38) Masure, op.cit., p. 160.

Masure regards sacrifice as pre-eminently a human actio. God gives 'sign', but man invents sacrifice.(39) Sacrifice, he holds, is part of the natural order.(40) The creature cannot help but adopt the sacrificial gesture in approaching the Creator. God, however, cannot be satisfied with this, and something extra is intended - grace.(41) As God is glad at man's return, He welcomes that return by sanctifying the victim,(42) which only in this way can become acceptable to Him. The Eucharistic sacrifice begins in man's own sphere, in 'his barns and cellars', but it succeeds ultimately only because it is changed into the sacrifice of Christ.(43)

Our first comment is that Masure, in approaching his subject from a consideration of the universality of sacrifice, is beginning at the wrong point. If our concern is primarily with the Christian sacrament, then it is ^{to} the work of Christ, interpreted in the light of its Old Testament background, that we ought to look for our starting point. It is interesting to note that the initial approach to the question adopted by Masure is rejected by his co-religionist, Anscar Vonier, O.S.B., who points out that Thomas Aquinas was careful not to begin from the universality of sacrifice. This is not to say that the universality of sacrifice is not a remarkable fact, for sacrifice does appear to

(39) Masure, op.cit., p. 71.

(40) Masure, op.cit., p. 167.

(41) Masure, op.cit., pp. 168f.

(42) Masure, op.cit., p. 78.

(43) Masure, op.cit., pp. 242f.

be the chief element in nearly all human worship, or that such a study may not provide valuable material for the theologian. Neither is it to suggest that the principles underlying Christ's sacrifice are so different from those behind all ancient non-Biblical sacrifices, that it is not possible to speak of His sacrifice as fulfilment of all human striving for fellowship with God. But it is to suggest that, in a matter of such importance in the Christian faith, we ought to ensure that our categories are thoroughly Biblical. The study of sacrifice in general is not without its value, but it is ^{to} the meaning that sacrifice has for the Hebrew people that the New Testament writers turn, and with which we must be primarily concerned.

A more serious objection to Masure's approach is, that by regarding sacrifice as part of the natural order it fails to take sufficient account, on one hand, of man's predicament through sin, and on the other, of the role of grace. No doubt Masure's view of the Eucharistic sacrifice as consisting of a good natural act to which God, by transubstantiating the natural gift into the body and blood of Christ, adds grace, (44) is based upon the Roman Catholic theory that the fall involved only the loss of the donum superadditum, but not the corruption of Nature itself.

(44) Masure's conception of man's role in offering the Eucharistic sacrifice seems to be rather like that of the small boy in Paul Gallico's story, The Small Miracle, who besieges the Vatican, passes the officials, labours along the corridors till he finally reaches the Pope himself, and the role of God in the Eucharistic sacrifice like the Roman Pontiff who, surprised and pleased, rewards the persevering lad with his blessing.

The view of many Reformed theologians is that nature itself is involved in the Fall, and is in need of redemption, (45) and in consequence it is not possible to regard man's sacrificial approach to God as essentially good, though lacking in grace. This is in accordance with the Pauline view of man and sin. (46) Man's return to God is not prior to the operation of God's grace; rather his return is a consequence of the grace of God at work in men's hearts. As John Keble wrote:

'Get up as early as you may,
Grace, like an angel, runs before.' (47)

Bishop J.E.L. Newbigin of the Church of South India expresses the conviction of most Reformed churchmen when he says: 'Having once sinned (man's) effort to return to his true relation with God becomes charged with the very egotism which is precisely the essence of his sin. Sinful man is not free to put away his sin and return to God, apart from the atonement which God has wrought for him. And this atonement, like the sacrificial system in which it was fore-shadowed, is both a gift from God to men, and an offering of Man to God.' (48)

The recognition of the pervasive nature of sin, and of the role of God's grace in enabling man's approach to Himself does not mean that the basic form of man's worship is not sacrificial. It does mean, however, that for any doctrine of the

(45) A.D. Galloway, The Cosmic Christ, pp. 47ff.

(46) Romans, 7:14-25.

(47) Quoted by H.R. Mackintosh, The Divine Imperative, p. 44.

(48) J.E.L. Newbigin, The Reunion of the Church, p. 88.

Eucharistic sacrifice to be satisfactory it must be in harmony with the Biblical doctrine of grace.

That it is possible to give a sacrificial interpretation of the Eucharist which is in accord with the Biblical teaching on grace may be seen from the work of the late Dr. H.J. Wotherspoon of the Church of Scotland, in his Religious Values in the Sacraments.

He regards the Eucharistic sacrifice, not as an action in which men take the initiative and return to God, but one in which men, who have already been called by Christ, obey His command and Do This.(49)

The Eucharistic sacrifice, he holds, is something that the church can offer only in union with Christ as He now acts in heaven, and which He enables the Church to do by the power of the Holy Spirit.

The setting forth of the memorial, and the receiving of the nourishing gifts are the two stages in the Eucharistic sacrifice 'in which Christ our High Priest goes before us and we follow, co-operating in his action, and that in which Christ turns to us and gives to us from God.'(50)

For Wotherspoon, the Divine role does not begin with God's welcome of man's return by sanctifying the victim.(51)

(49) Wotherspoon, op.cit., p. 243.

(50) Wotherspoon, op.cit., p. 225.

(51) Masure, op.cit., p. 78.

It is God's grace that moves man to return to God in the first place. Even when men obey through the sacrament, Christ is never deprived of His place as 'Doer.' (52)

The strong Biblical and Reformed basis of Wotherspoon's position comes to the fore when he stresses the Christological nature of the Eucharistic sacrifice: 'We can think or speak safely only if we see Christ as the Celebrant of His own Memorial, and ourselves as the instruments by which He wills that His witness to an accomplished Atonement be made on earth as witness to it is made in Heaven.' (53)

(52) Wotherspoon, op.cit., p. 243.

(53) Wotherspoon, op.cit., p. 242.

CHAPTER V

THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE AND CALVARY.

Many Reformed churchmen have been reluctant to admit a sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist for fear of encouraging views that would undermine the once-for-all nature of Christ's sacrificial death on the Cross. This is a serious matter, for it involves the sufficiency of the saving events which are the foundations of Christian Faith.

It is true that there have been times in the history of the Church when theologians tended to regard the Eucharistic sacrifice almost as sacrificial in its own right. Allied with this was the notion that the Cross was the sacrifice for original sin, and the mass the sacrifice for daily sin.(1) Again, others who imagined that sacrifice is primarily the destruction of an object,(2) rather than the offering of a life, concluded that if the Eucharist was a sacrifice (as had been the teaching of the Church from very early times)(3) it must be because Christ was slain in the mass. This was explained in various ways: the words of consecration were the oral sword with which the priest immolated the Divine victim;(4) Christ's condescension in

(1) e.g. Peter Lombard; Stone, op.cit., I, p.307; and Biel. Stone, op.cit., I, p.390.

(2) e.g. de Lugo; Stone, op.cit., II, p.374.

(3) Stone, op.cit., I, 109-124.

(4) e.g. Gregory Naziansus; Stone, I.

consenting to become incarnate in the transubstantiated Eucharistic elements was seen as a death; the separate consecration of the species was held to represent the separation of Christ's blood from His body in death.(5) While the most extreme of these views are not taught today by the best Roman Catholic scholars, there is little doubt they are prevalent in popular Romanism. The hardening of Roman Catholic thinking on these matters through controversy with Protestantism, and the fact that Post-Tridentine sacramental theology was dominated by men like de Lugo and Lessius,(6) who had lost sight of the best fruits of the Augustinian tradition, led to 'three centuries of misplaced theological ingenuity '(7) in the Roman Church. Reformed churchmen must continue to be wary of these misconceptions. In this connection Bishop Gore remarked in warning: 'We are not now, and our forefathers in the sixteenth century were not, fighting a phantom.'

(8)

I. REJECTION OF IDEA OF PHYSICAL REPETITION OF THE CROSS.

An encouraging feature of the present day theological scene is the way in which Roman Catholic thinkers such as Eugene Masure, de la Taille, Lepin and Billot insist on the absolute sufficiency of Calvary. They affirm, as do Reformed theologians,

(5) Vonier, *op.cit.*, pp. 124-125.

(6) Masure, *op.cit.*, pp. 27-31.

(7) Masure, *op.cit.*, p. 254.

(8) Gore, *op.cit.*, p. 181.

that Jesus' death on the Cross is an event in time that is unrepeatable, and that the Eucharist does not have to add something to the Cross which it would otherwise lack.(9)

Why is the death of Jesus on the Cross once-and-for-all and unrepeatable?

1. First, because as an historical event, something that happened at one point in time and at no other, its very nature precludes the idea of its being repeated. In this sense it is like the Resurrection which cannot happen again, and it is unlike the Ascended work of Christ which is concerned with what our Lord is doing for us at the present time.

2. Secondly, there is no need that it should be repeated. The Cross was something that was final religiously as well as historically. Evangelical Christians would be the first to agree with Masure when he says that Jesus' death is final because it 'has cost the Saviour too much already and, as an event in time, was too atrocious.'(10) Calvary was the absolute extremity to which human sin could go in rebellion against God, and it was God's judgment on human sin. In so far as there is a sequel to Calvary it does not lie in a repetition of the Cross but in God's raising Jesus from the dead, and in Jesus entering the Heavenly Sanctuary and abiding there forever.

(9) Masure, op.cit., p. 177; Pittenger, The Christian Sacrifice p. 59.

(10) Masure, op.cit., p. 179.

3. Furthermore, the Eucharistic sacrifice as ἀνάμνησις and the nature of the relationship of the Heavenly work of Christ to the Eucharistic sacrifice (II) rules out any conception of a physical repetition of the Cross in the Eucharist. Through the operation of the Holy Spirit the Church sacramentally remembers what Christ did once-and-for-all and what He does for us at this present moment. For this reason St. Paul speaks of the Church's action in the Eucharist, not as repeating the Lord's death 'till He come', but as proclaiming it.

4. Finally, the nature of the Eucharist as a sign, in which there is a sacramental relationship between the sign and the thing signified, is incompatible with any notion that the Eucharist involves a repetition of the Cross. It is through the 'efficacious sign' of the Body and Blood of the Lord, that we are enabled to make the fruits of the Passion our own. (I2) This is a question upon which Roman and Reformed could agree, deriving their theology of sign, (I3) as they do, from their common spiritual heritage in St. Augustine. Understanding the theology of sign is rightly characterised by Dom Vonier in the title of his book as A Key to the Doctrine of the Eucharist.

(II) See Chapter VI below.

(I2) Masure, op.cit., pp. 179, 214, 215, 289; Vonier, op.cit., p.93.

(I3) Masure, op.cit., p.225; Vonier, op.cit., p.102; Westminster Confession, Chapter 27, Section 2; Calvin, op.cit., 4/17/10, II, 21, 28; Torrance, Eschatology and the Eucharist, Inter-
communion Volume, p.310.

2. VONIER'S VIEW: THE SIGN OF CHRIST AS DEAD.

We disagree, however, with Vonier's definition of the content of the Eucharistic sign which he limits to Jesus in a state of death on the Cross. Some quotations from Vonier will make this clear:

'The Eucharistic sacrifice, then, is essentially representative: it puts on the altar the Christ of Calvary, the great spectacle which Mary beheld as she gazed at the Body of her dead son.' (14)

'It is truly the Christus passus of S. Thomas who is thus contained in the Eucharist. In virtue of the sacrament, the Eucharist contains not the mortal Christ, nor even the dying Christ, nor even the glorious Christ; but it contains the Christ directly after his death though without any of the gaping wounds.' (15)

While Vonier believes that Christ is now glorified, he explicitly declines to connect what is represented under a sign in the sacrament with Christ as He now is: 'Christ's Body and Blood aptly and completely represent that phase of Christ when he ~~was~~ dead on the cross; they do not represent in any way that other phase of Christ's existence, his glorious life in heaven.' (16)

(14) Vonier, op.cit., p.123. This appears to be similar to the view of the Anglican divine, Bishop Andrewes: c.f. Stone, op.cit., II, p.261; Gore, op.cit., p. 183.

(15) Vonier, op.cit., p. 131.

(16) Vonier, op.cit., p. 122.

This view of the content of the sign is unsatisfactory to Reformed churchmen for the following reasons.

I. While, certainly, it does not revert to the idea that appears to be held in popular Roman thinking that there is a bloodless recrucifying, it does not seem to have escaped from an obsession with the crude notion that what we are concerned with in the Eucharist is the corpse of Jesus Christ. This is far removed from the way that the New Testament speaks of Jesus' death as Christians are sacramentally to remember it and to preach it. The significant thing about the death of Jesus in the New Testament is the costliness of Jesus' self-giving for us. It was a life 'given' in service of God and man - even to the point of death. It is the perfect obedience of Jesus to God leading to His death on the Cross, not the mutilated condition of His body after life is extinct, that has saving quality for man. It is true that the New Testament never minimizes the suffering and the reality of the death He underwent, but it always sees it in the light of the victory of the Resurrection. By refusing to allow the work of the Ascended Christ a place in the content of the Eucharistic sign, Vonier eliminates the very element which transforms the tragedy of the Cross into the 'Good News' which it is the Church's task to announce.

2. Vonier's emphasis does not do justice to the fact that the person who is to be remembered is one who not only 'was', but 'is' and is 'to come'. By teaching that the Christ we

remember in the sacrament is Jesus dead on the cross, he fails to make it clear that it is the power of the Ascended Christ at work in the Church which gives the Church's sacramental remembering its potency.

3. In order to understand what phase of Jesus' life He is in when we experience Him in the Eucharist, it is important to remember the meeting of Jesus with His disciples on the first Easter evening. The Jesus who made Himself known to them in Breaking of Bread (17) was not one stiff in the rigor of death, but one who was alive. Certainly this living presence was not divorced from the death through which it had passed. Jesus carried the marks of His death, so that He was able to say to St. Thomas: 'Reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side: and be not faithless, but believing.' (18) Only with a living person was St. Thomas able to have such communication. It is not possible to communicate with one who is dead on^a gallows.

3. MASURE'S VIEW: IMMOLATION AS SELF CONSECRATION.

While Vonier's representation of the Christ of the Eucharist as Jesus 'directly after his death' is unsatisfactory, the grimness of Vonier's view is mitigated a good deal when it is remembered that he is speaking in terms of the theology of sign. Still more unsatisfactory are the viewpoints in which the theology of sign recedes and the idea of re-immolation of Christ comes into the foreground. Many Roman Catholic writers today

(17) Luke 24:35.

(18) John 20:27b.

feel this difficulty, and seek to give a more adequate interpretation of what is actually done in the Eucharist. The view put forward by Eugène Masure in this connection is interesting. It has some similarities to the account of the Eucharist given by Père de la Taille in Mysterium Fidei.

Masure rightly rejects that theological tradition in his Church which teaches a physical re-immolation in the Eucharist. His own theory turns upon the interpretation of the word immolation itself. This word, he holds, does not primarily mean to destroy some object, but it means to repent 'visibly and invisibly'. (19) As such it refers primarily to the will of the person making the offering and so depriving himself of some of his possessions, rather than to what happens to the victim. (20) What Christ did at the Last Supper was to offer Calvary to God, i.e. to immolate Himself. In giving the Church the authority to repeat the words and actions of the Last Supper which inaugurated Calvary itself, He gave it power to perpetuate and renew Calvary. 'As Jesus was immolated in His offering of Himself at the Last Supper, so the Church immolates Christ by offering Him upon the altar.' (21)

While Masure's attempt to avoid the pitfalls of Roman sacramental theology is to be welcomed, it is by no means certain

(19) Masure, op.cit., p. 267.

(20) Masure, op.cit., p. 36.

(21) Masure, op.cit., p. 242, c.f. 241-2, 254, 261.

that his theory is the solution to the problem. In the first place: Is it really the case that the word 'immolation' means the offering of the will, and not the slaying of the victim?

The Shorter Oxford Dictionary may be taken as typical in its definition of immolation as the 'sacrificial slaughter of a victim'. This definition is essentially the same as that given by the Council of Trent, when it says that immolation involves destruction or change in the outward thing offered in sacrifice. It taught that, while there was not an actual death of Christ in the Eucharist, there must be some real immolation of Christ, in order that its nature as a sacrifice be guaranteed.

(22) Vonier cites Thomas Aquinas on immolation: 'The Cross is Christ's true immolation. Mass is its perfect image; therefore it is an immolation.' (23)

None of these references to immolation seem to support the specialised meaning that Masure attaches to it. Masure would be on surer ground if he dropped the word 'immolation' and used expressions like 'self-giving', 'self-consecration', 'self-offering'.

Moreover, to Masure's assertion that in the Supper Jesus offered Calvary to God and this offering was the immolation of Himself, it must be replied that it is just as impossible for

(22) Quick, The Christian Sacraments, p. 200; Stone, *op.cit.*, II, p. 99f; Gore, *op.cit.*, p.175. Gore holds that Roman thought here is a departure from that of the Fathers who saw 'immolation' as referring to the symbolism of the sacrament, and not to its inward reality.

(23) Vonier, *op.cit.*, p.149.

us to repeat that as it is for us to repeat the Crucifixion itself. His decision was historical, and unique as the Cross itself. If that is the meaning of 'immolation' then Masure's theory is inadequate in that, it is not possible for one human being to offer another's will. One human being can act in harmony with another's self-offering, but he can never make, or repeat, another man's self-dedication.(24)

4. SPENS'S VIEW: EUCHARIST AS INVESTING THE DEATH WITH ITS MEANING:

We now turn to examine a kindred theory that has been attractively worked out by Mr. Will Spens in an essay entitled The Eucharist(25) in the composite volume Essays Catholic and Critical. He maintains that it is possible to teach that the Eucharist is a sacrifice without any suggestion (as the Roman Catholic doctrine appears to suggest) that there is a further immolation of Christ in the sacrament. He holds that we must distinguish two necessary elements in sacrifice: the death of the victim and certain ritual acts, often connected with the blood which invest the death with a supernatural significance. This ritual act is as much a part of the sacrifice, as the death

(24) Wotherspoon, op.cit., p.244 note. 'It is not of the Institution that we make memorial, but of Christ, and of Him crucified and risen. In any case.... institution cannot be reproduced.... I should prefer to say we obey the Institution'

(25) Spens's theory is similar to that advanced about the same time by de la Taille, but was actually worked out independently of it. c.f. Quick, op.cit., p.245. Also see discussion on de la Taille and Spens in Pittenger, op.cit., Chapter 5.

itself.(26) Thus Abraham in seeking to obey the command to sacrifice his son did not immediately kill his son out of hand, but acted in accordance with convention in preparing an altar and the victim in order to indicate the meaning of the death.(27) The aim of the ritual acts is to make clear what is the purpose of the sacrifice. If it is a propitiatory sacrifice then the ritual acts are the means by which acknowledgement is made before God and man that there is need for propitiation. The ritual acts and the death of the victim together make up the one act of sacrifice.

In applying this to the sacrifice of Christ, Spens holds that the Last Supper corresponded to the ritual acts by which the meaning of the sacrifice of the Divine Victim on the cross on the following day is set forth. The events in the Upper Room and the crucifixion on Calvary together make up the one sacrifice.

Spens's next step is to identify the function of the Eucharist with that of the Last Supper, namely, to invest the sacrificial death of Jesus with its meaning. As such the Eucharist, like the Last Supper which it succeeds, is an essential part of the one sacrifice. It is now possible for Spens to maintain on one hand that the crucifixion and death of Jesus are unrepeatable, and on the other that the investing or proclamation of the sacrificial death can, and ought to be repeated. A

(26) Spens, *op.cit.*, p.434.

(27) Genesis, 22:1-14.

Scottish Presbyterian churchman, (28) who acknowledges his debt to Spens, puts it thus: 'The Sacrifice of Calvary is an act to which nothing can be added, but our recognition of it is required. The Eucharist is this recognition.'

This theory has the merit of avoiding the suggestion of a repetition in any historical sense of Christ's sacrifice on the Cross. It also does justice to the idea of proclaiming the Lord's Death in the Eucharist. However, the same criticism that can be levelled at Masure can be made here, namely, that Jesus' own dedication of Himself in the Last Supper cannot be repeated any more than can the Cross.

Another difficulty is that Spens makes such a rigid link between the Upper Room and the Cross and the continuing Eucharist, that it is hard to avoid the conclusion that the Cross is lacking in some element that the Eucharist supplies. (29) As Vonier points out (30) it is a reversal of the Christian tradition and experience to regard the Eucharist as supplying something that the sacrifice of Christ lacks, rather than as being the memorial of an accomplished sacrifice. In this connection it is significant that there is little said in Spens's theory of ἀνάμνησις as the means through which the Holy Spirit makes the death on the Cross a present reality, and by which the earthly liturgy echoes the work of Christ above

(28) D.H. Hislop, Our Heritage in Public Worship, Kerr Lectures,

(29) Quick, *op.cit.*, p.247. (p.233.)

(30) Vonier, *op.cit.*, pp.137-8. He is actually referring to de la Taille, but Spens's position is similar.

The significance of *ἀνάμνησις* emphasises the derivative nature of the Eucharistic sacrifice, whereas Spens's theory makes it a part of the one sacrifice itself.

What Spens says about a sacrifice consisting of a death together with certain ritual acts, moreover, needs some qualification. The ritual acts were not confined to those before the death of the victim as is implied in Spens's essay. Thus in the case of the sacrifice of the day of atonement the immensely important and priestly action of the blood being poured out on the altar takes place after the death of the victim. Spens does not take sufficient account of this aspect of Christ's priestly work represented in the Epistle to the Hebrews as the offering of His blood in the Heavenly Sanctuary. In consequence Spens fails to emphasize sufficiently that the continuity of the sacramental life of the Church is dependent on the continuity of the Ascended life of Christ. (31)

5. 'DEATH' AND 'LIFE' IN THE SACRAMENTS.

In seeking to avoid speaking of the Eucharist as if it involved the repetition of the death of Christ, it is necessary to take care not to overlook the sense in which the death of Jesus is a present reality in the life and worship of the Church.

It is true that He is now glorified, but it is also true that 'until He come' the sinful actions of men which once led to the killing of the Son of God will be repeated. Whenever

(31) Pittenger, op.cit., Ch. 5.

there is treachery, mob blood lust, lack of courage of convictions, envy, malice and fear, men still 'crucify to themselves the Son of God afresh.'(32) It is well to remember that this expression is found in the Epistle that makes most of the heavenly session of Christ. The reverse side is that we ourselves must be crucified with Christ. 'They that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts.'(33)

'I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live; yet not I, but Christ liveth in me.'(34)

'Knowing this, that our old man is crucified with him.'(35)

Both 'death' and 'life' are presented to us in each of the two dominical sacraments. If we seek to understand the role of death as it is in the Eucharist we do well to link it with death in Holy Baptism.

The going down into the waters of Baptism is spoken of as going down to death with Christ; and the rising from the waters as rising to life with Him.(36) There are few theologians who would fear the Church's doctrine of Baptism suggests that Christ dies historically and rises again every time that this sacrament is administered. The manner in which the death of Christ may be said to be present in Baptism provides the clue

(32) Hebrews 6:6.

(33) Galatians 5:24.

(34) Galatians 2:20.

(35) Romans 6:6.

(36) Romans 6:4; Colossians 2:12.

for the way we are to think of its presence in the Eucharist. The bread which is consecrated to be His sacramental body is broken and the cup consecrated to be His sacramental blood is poured out. In receiving the bread, we may speak appropriately with William Temple(37) of taking to ourselves the dying of the Lord and in receiving the wine of taking to ourselves the rising of the Lord. That which we receive through different media in Baptism and the Eucharist is a 'Life-through-Death'. In both cases we are dealing with, and are dealt with by, the Christ in whose person is the evidence of the Passion.(38) It is not just the glory of the victory of Christ that changes men, but the sharp realisation of the cost to Him of man's salvation.

It is only through our dying with Christ that we are able to receive life with Christ. If the sacrifice of Christ is to avail for us, then, as the Council of Trent(39) rightly insists, the fruits of that self-offering of Jesus Christ must become ours. But if that sacrifice is to avail for us, then the Cross of Jesus must in the first place become the organ of our submission and obedience to God. In the gospel sacraments there is involved both a death to self, and a reception of the fruits of the Passion. As H.M. Rowley expresses it: 'The old man, instead of crucifying Him, is now crucified with Him, that the new man may be born of Him.'(40)

(37) Wm. Temple, Readings in St. John's Gospel, pp.94-95.

(38) John 20:27; Revelation 5:6.

(39) Stone, op.cit., II, pp.99f.

(40) Rowley, Sacrament and Sacrifice, Hibbert Journal, January, 1942, p.184.

In this sense it is fitting that, as in the sacrament of Baptism, so in the Eucharist, part of the rite should be seen as representing and expressing the dying of the Lord.(41) The breaking of the bread and the taking of the cup immediately spring to mind as filling this role. As symbolic actions they are strongly suggestive of Calvary. If we recognise this, then we do justice to the Roman Catholic concern that the Sacrament should represent the dying of the Lord, and yet we avoid any suggestion of the re-immolation of Christ. The aim of such expressive actions is not to repeat Calvary, but through the exhibition of the signs of His Body and Blood, 'to renew in us now, by means of His life, the spirit and power in which he died.'(42) In this sense we may say with Archbishop Laud that in the Eucharist there are three sacrifices. The first is that performed by the Minister only, and is a commemorative sacrifice of Christ's death, represented in broken bread and in poured wine. Then there is that in which minister and people are together joined in offering a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving for all the benefits of Christ's death, and finally there is that sacrifice which every man makes individually - the 'devoting' of himself to serve God.(43)

(41) Quick, op.cit., p.202.

(42) Quick, op.cit., p.200.

(43) Stone, op.cit., II, p.267.

CHAPTER VI

THE HEAVENLY SACRIFICE

I. AFTER THE ORDER OF MELCHISEDEC.

In this chapter we are to consider the relationship between the sacrifice of Christ on Calvary and the work in which our Lord is now engaged in heaven, as this will be seen to have an important bearing on our understanding of the nature of the Eucharistic sacrifice. Immediately the question is raised: What is the nature of this heavenly work?

It must be recognised that here we are dealing with matters which can only be understood figuratively. Our knowledge of our Lord's heavenly work cannot be of the same literal kind that we have of the events of His earthly ministry. Our experience of the power of His heavenly work is in the life of the Church, in the 'life in the Spirit'. While we have no 'historical information' as to the heavenly session of Christ, we are given some help towards understanding the nature of His work for us in the Biblical figure of a heavenly high priesthood exercised on our behalf, and enabling us to draw near to God in Him.(1) It is to the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews that we are indebted for the fullest treatment of this matter in the New Testament.

(1) Hebrews 4:14-16.

What are the main characteristics of the work of a priest? To this A.B. Davidson replies that 'the functions or ministry of all priests whatever "order" are virtually the same, consisting of an approach unto God with an offering within a sanctuary.' (2) The differences which the Epistle to the Hebrews sees between the old Aaronic priests and Christ lie not so much in the functions that are performed, as in the nature, character, quality of the person who performs them. (3) There is a vast gulf separating the priesthood of Christ from that of the Aaronic priests. The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews tries to express this by saying that while Christ is a priest, yet He is so after the order of Melchisedec. (4) The remarkable thing about Melchisedec was the unique significance of his person. He was not only a priestly, but a royal being, as his name suggests: 'King of righteousness' and after that 'King of Salem', 'King of Peace'. (5) In him the priest and the king are one, so that kingship is sanctified, and priesthood made effective. (6) Melchisedec is also said to be 'without father, without mother.' (7) This quality stands in sharp contrast to the conditions

(2) Davidson, The Epistle to the Hebrews, p.104.

(3) Hebrews 5:1-10.

(4) Hebrews 5:6,10; Hebrews 1:13 quotes Psalm 110 which also contains a reference to the Melchisedec priesthood.

(5) Hebrews 7:2.

(6) William Milligan, The Ascension and Heavenly Highpriesthood of our Lord, p.87.

(7) Hebrews 7:3.

that made for a valid Levitical ministry - the ability to trace one's descent accurately to demonstrate that one belonged to a whole family of priests.(8) In the case of Melchisedec, his authority does not rest on his proving himself to be one of many, but in his being alone, unique.(9) The stress is on the person, not the family, of this priest. In this, Melchisedec is a suitable figure to suggest the person of the Son of God who Himself is seen as living forever.

The real crux of the comparison is, however, in the next words concerning Melchisedec, that he 'abideth a priest continually.'(10) This priesthood is of abiding validity because it springs out of the nature or person of the priest as one having 'neither beginning of days, nor end of life.'(11) The functioning of other priests is intermittent as they are forever being taken away by death and replaced by others. Melchisedec's priesthood, however, is constant and unchanging because the life of its only priest has the stamp of eternity upon it.(12) It has therefore a tremendous dignity and accomplishment about it. 'Like a portrait he (Melchisedec) is always the same; he follows us about with his eyes, a king and a priest, always alone, with no ancestry of priesthood before him, and none succeeding to his priesthood after him, always living.'(13) What the writer

(8) Hebrews 7:5.

(9) Hebrews 7:6-21.

(10) Hebrews 7:3.

(11) Hebrews 7:3.

(12) Hebrews 5:6, 7:16-17.

(13) Davidson, op.cit., p.132.

endeavours to teach, using the analogy of Melchisedec, is that Christ, the Son of God, is a priest 'forever', and in this permanence lies the guarantee that He is the abiding confirmation of the New Covenant and able always to bring us to the Father.

To illustrate further the true nature of Christ's work for us the writer of Hebrews compares it with that of the Aaronic high priest. The Aaronic high priest was simply one among many whose work, being of transient usefulness, had constantly to be repeated.(I4) Christ, by contrast, was the true high priest. The Aaronic high priest had to keep going each year into the earthly holy place, and, after a moment in the Presence of God, emerge again.(I5) When Christ entered the heavenly sanctuary, He went in once-for-all, there to abide in the Presence forever.(I6) What the earthly high priest took into the Presence of God was not his own blood, but that of bulls and goats, which could never be truly representative of the lives of men. What Christ offers is not a life that has been wrested from a creature but His own life: What He offers is not the blood of domestic animals, but Himself.(I7)

The whole point of the comparison suffers if we try to interpret Hebrews simply as an attack on the O.T. sacrificial

(I4) Hebrews 7:27.

(I5) Hebrews 9:6-7.

(I6) Hebrews 9:11, 10:11-13.

(I7) Hebrews 9:12-14.

worship, as if it were bad in itself. On the contrary, the writer is so conscious of the profound significance of the Levitical system that, when he wishes to commend the excellence of the heavenly work of Christ, he begins from the only religious system that approaches the profundity of Christian insight into the relation of God and man. If he argues that the Christian insight exceeds the Jewish, it is because the latter is now supplanted by that consummation pointed to by the very existence of the Jewish sacrificial system.

2. WHEN DOES CHRIST'S PRIESTLY ACTION BEGIN?

If Christ may be described as a priest, when did His priestly work begin? It is His entry into the sanctuary on high that is regarded as the commencement of Christ's high priestly ministry, and not, as is so often supposed, His Passion on the Cross. This is not surprising when it is remembered that the Jews regarded the task in the sanctuary as specifically priestly work.(18) The victim was brought to the sacrifice by the offerer (or, the sacrificer) not the priest, and it was the offerer who slew the victim with his own hand. It was only then that the priestly action began with the taking of the blood and pouring of it on the altar.(19) Until this action was carried out the sacrifice was regarded as incomplete, as it was not the slaying, as such, of the animal that was efficacious for atonement, but

(18) c.f. Hebrews, Chapters 8 and 9.

(19) Hicks, op.cit., p.12.

the presentation of a life to God.(20) The slaying was necessary for only in this way could the blood (the life) be released in order to be utterly 'devoted' to God.

Thus it is the bearing into the Presence of God by Jesus of His 'blood' (i.e. of His life passed through death) that is His priestly and atoning work. The Bible does not speak of the death of Christ, as such, as His priestly work. This is not to say that the Death of Christ is merely incidental or unimportant. On the Cross Jesus submitted Himself in perfect and willing obedience to death. That death may be regarded as part of the 'sacrifice of Christ', but a sacrifice the priestly part of which follows upon Christ's entry into heaven. The slaying of Christ on Calvary is once-and-for-all. By its very nature as a concrete historical event, it is unrepeatable and cannot be continuous. What does continue is that Life which passed through death, and still, in heaven, is given in obedience to the Father; and in this sense it is possible to speak of that death being present, without any affront being done to our conception of the nature of historical events. A man who passes through a certain 'crucial' experience generally bears the marks of it all his days.(21) Certainly, in one sense, that experience becomes remoter in time, and yet, in so far as the man's

(20) Lev. 17:11.

(21) e.g. Dostoevsky's terrible experience of being led to an execution that did not eventuate. Introduction to the Everyman's Crime and Punishment, pp.vi-ix.

personality is moulded and directed by it, that experience may be said to be 'present' in his life. William Milligan puts the point well when he says: 'Death is an act accomplished in a moment. If any claim is to be founded upon it, it must be recalled as a past act in order that the claim may be allowed. Life is a condition or a state. At every instant of its course it may bear the stamp imprinted upon it at its beginning, and it will be judged by what it is, not by what it was.' (22) The Priest does not need to offer that life again and again, for it is an unceasing life, a life that is always efficacious and powerful to save. The offering cannot be 'repeated' because the life is a continuous one and the presentation of it to God never ceases.

The conception of the heavenly work of Christ as represented under the figure of the heavenly high priest of Hebrews, may be compared with that disclosed in the vision of St. John the Divine in the 4th to 6th chapters of Revelation.

In the latter, the vision reveals a door opening in heaven, and a throne set in heaven, 'and one sat on the throne'. Around the throne four and twenty elders clothed in white were sitting, and four living creatures representing creation. These all worshipped Him on the throne. In his right hand was a book.

(22) Milligan, op.cit., p.134.

None could be found who was worthy to open the book, till the seer beheld, standing in the midst of the thrones, 'a Lamb as it had been slain.' This Lamb came and took the book. At this the living creatures and the elders burst forth into the song of praise: 'Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive..... glory and blessing.'

There are similarities in the religious content of this vision and that of Hebrews. Both represent the heavenly work of Christ as the consummation of a spiritual cultus in which the action is set forth in a heavenly court of worship. In both cases the central figure is that of the person of Jesus, and the crucial action His appearing before God. While both representations of Christ's work are sacrificial in content, the function of Jesus is portrayed under different, but complementary, modes. In Hebrews, He is pictured as the Priest bearing His own Blood; (23) in Revelation as the sacrificial Lamb, the victorious victim. (24) Both of these figures suggest a continued presentation of Himself before the Father, while neither suggest any idea of repetition of the historical death of Jesus. The efficacy of what is achieved is guaranteed in Hebrews by the abiding presence before the Father of the priest who by his own blood.... 'entered in once into the holy place, having obtained

(23) Hebrews 9:12.

(24) Revelation 5:6-10. The symbol of the Lamb (Jesus is so described 28 times) has strong Paschal associations. c.f. John 1:29; I Cor. 5:7-8.

eternal redemption for us.' (25); and in Revelation by the presence of the Lamb 'as it had been slain.' (26)

3. THE PRIESTLY TASK OF INTERCESSION.

Finally we must consider our Lord's high priestly task of intercession for those members of His Body who are still in the world.

This language is, of course, symbolic, and it is not therefore necessary to think literally of Christ uttering words that constitute prayers. It is the presence of Christ's person before the Father that the Epistle to the Hebrews regards as being the memorial before God of His people. Hebrews 9:24 says that Christ has entered heaven 'now to appear in the presence of God for us.' (27) The same idea, but under the symbol of the Lamb of God rather than the priest, is contained in Revelation 5. While this intercession is not to be understood narrowly in terms of spoken prayers, it certainly is to be thought of as a work which Christ does on behalf of men. Indeed Hebrews 7:25 links His ability to save with the fact of His intercession: 'Wherefore He is able to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them.' In this verse the verb 'to intercede' is rendered by ἐντυγχάνειν . After examining the six occasions on which the

(25) Hebrews 9:12b.

(26) Revelation 5:6.

(27) c.f. ἐμάνισθῆναι 'to make clearly visible.'

verb is used in the New Testament, William Milligan concludes that it implies a much wider idea than petition only, although its interpretation in any one case must be determined ultimately by the context. In general Milligan shows that the idea is of dealing or transacting with one person in reference to another. Westcott remarks that it often has the meaning of one person meeting with another. In so far as this interaction between Father and Son may be expressed in words, John 17 is the most luminous example that we have. In this 'high priestly prayer', as it is commonly called, the intercession for the disciples is not so much a series of formal requests, as the uttering of thoughts that belong to the common life of the Father and Son, (28) and the disciples are, as it were, gathered into this sharing of the life of the Godhead. Such intercession is a powerful work, for in this way the Redeemer 'knows' (29) each church, their sufferings, trials, failures and temptations, and in 'knowing' these things He is able to supply what they need to continue the struggle to the end.

In summarising the work of intercession and offering that Christ carries out for us in His glorified humanity in heaven the Epistle to the Hebrews says that He appears in heaven as our present representative (Hebrews 9:24), that through Him the prayers and praises of the redeemed community

(28) Wm. Milligan, op.cit., p.153. Also c.f. G.A.F. Knight, A Biblical Approach to the Doctrine of the Trinity, pp.65, 67, 76.

(29) Revelation 2:1, 9, 13.

are brought to God (13:5), and that in Him and through Him we gain access to the Holy Place itself where His life that has passed through death avails for us. (10:19-22). It is a similar conviction that leads St. Paul to pose so confidently his rhetorical question: 'When God acquits, who shall condemn? Will Christ? - the Christ who died, yes and rose from the dead! the Christ who is at God's right hand, who actually pleads for us!'

(30)

4. CALVARY AND THE PRIESTHOOD OF CHRIST.

Two alternative ideas to that of a continued offering in heaven by Christ our high priest (as it is outlined above) have been suggested, and these must be considered before proceeding.

The first view is that the priestly work of Christ is essentially that which He performed on Calvary. According to this view, the slaying of Jesus on the Cross was the sacrifice over which Jesus himself, as Victim and Priest, presided. The Resurrection and the Ascension are then regarded as signs that the sacrifice of the Cross is over. Thereafter Christ in Heaven may intercede for His own, but this is not a priestly action. The Eucharist is regarded as being connected primarily with the celebration of Christ's death on the Cross rather than being the earthly counterpart of His heavenly work. This view is held by some schools of conservative Protestantism and of Roman

Catholicism. It appears to be based on a failure to recognize that the New Testament does not speak of Jesus on the Cross as a priest offering a sacrifice. This, in turn, appears to be due to the common misconception that sacrifice consisted primarily in the destruction of a victim, rather than in the offering of the blood (life). Because Fr. Vonier sees sacrifice as primarily the immolation of a victim, he logically enough, denies Christ's sacrifice in heaven.(31) Moreover, because he regards the mass as involving the immolation of Christ's body, he is led to propound the strange idea that in the mass Christ is no longer a priest, but that the ministers of the Church on earth are: 'Christ's resurrection and Christ's glory are not the continuation of the priesthood, but the sacramental offering and the sacramental priesthood are that continuation on which the Council (of Trent) lays such stress.'(32)

5. THE HEAVENLY OFFERING OF CHRIST - PAST OR PRESENT?

A more serious alternative is that of A.B. Davidson, (33) who clearly recognizes that the priest's role in sacrifice is the taking of the blood into the sanctuary and offering it there. His contention is that the offering in the heavenly sanctuary was made at the moment of the Ascension, so that, like the death of Jesus on the Cross, it is now a thing of the past. His case is based mainly on an interpretation of Hebrews 10:12 : 'But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins for ever, sat down on the right hand of God.' Davidson interprets

(31) Vonier, op.cit., p.233, line 15.

(32) Vonier, op.cit., p.238.

(33) c.f. his Epistle to the Hebrews.

the verse in a strict time sequence so that the 'offering' is seen as one completed act, followed by an entirely new act of 'sitting' at God's right hand.

It must be acknowledged that Hebrews does not teach a continuous offering of Christ before a heavenly altar in so many words. Nevertheless this is by no means all that is to be said on the matter, for, as Dr. Davidson himself concedes: 'The feeling indeed, is difficult to get rid of, that whatever high priestly acts Christ performs in heaven must be acts which He performs continuously there.' (34)

However, is not the reason why this feeling is 'difficult to get rid of', that the idea of a continuous offering is an implication of the Epistle as a whole? It is significant that the author of the Epistle speaks of heaven as 'the sanctuary on high', 'a greater and more perfect tabernacle', 'the holy place'. Necessarily, therefore, there are here strong overtones of the worship of the Temple. The author makes great play of the fact that the Levitical high priests went once each year into the Holy of Holies, but Christ has gone in to abide in the Presence of God forever. It is Christ's presence in the 'Sanctuary on high' that opens up the fellowship of man with God. If by the reference to the 'sitting down' of Christ, the author of the Epistle meant that the heavenly presentation of His life was over, he would surely have indicated this in some specific way. He

(34) Davidson, op.cit., p.153.

might have changed the imagery of heaven as a sanctuary to that, for example, of a king's residence, thus showing that Christ's function as a priest was past. There is, however, no indication that the author of Hebrews intends to teach that the heavenly offering is over. Dr. Davidson appears to be thinking too literally of the moment of 'sitting down' - as if it really were a part of an historical sequence of events in heaven. In this connection it is significant that the writer to the Hebrews seems to be so little concerned to suggest any such precise succession of moments in the heavenly sanctuary, that in Hebrews 8:1-2 he actually reverses the order of Hebrews 10:12, mentioning the sitting down before and not after, the priestly work of His ministry: '..... a high priest, one who is seated at the right hand of the throne of Majesty in the heavens, and who officiates in the sanctuary or true tabernacle set up by the Lord and not by man.' (Moffatt) The real contrast that the Epistle intends is clearly between the transient work of the earthly high priest and the royal, (35) enduring and final nature of the work of our heavenly high priest.

Moreover it must always be remembered that the scene in a heavenly sanctuary is, after all, an attempt to put into words and pictures mysteries that are too high for men fully to understand. What the Epistle is trying to convey by these

(35) Only princes were permitted to be seated in the Temple at Jerusalem. Milligan, op.cit., p.140.

figurative expressions is not a 'history' of heaven, but illustrations of the qualities that mark the eternal person and work of the Redeemer of men. What holds all these ideas together is not a sequence of events in heaven, but the person of Jesus, 'the author and finisher of our faith.' (36) What represents humanity before the Father, and intercedes for it, is the 'Life' of our high priest, bearing in itself the marks of His suffering, and abiding with God forever. Our high priest has 'somewhat also to offer'. (37) What He offers is Himself, His Life; the same life that in obedience He 'devoted' to God on the Cross, and a life through which He still wills obedience to the Father. He cannot cease to devote Himself to the Father for His will is one with the Father. No doubt this has been represented by some writers too literally, so leading B.F. Westcott to protest that : 'The modern conception of Christ pleading in heaven His Passion, "offering His blood" on behalf of men, has no foundation in the Epistle.' (38)

The force of this objection is abated when it is remembered 'His blood' means 'His life', 'His presence', 'Himself' and that the presence in heaven of Christ's living, glorified humanity is the embodiment of His self-giving. It is only through that presence, that 'Life', that we can make our own offering to

(36) Hebrews 12:2.

(37) Hebrews 8:3.

(38) Westcott, Epistle to the Hebrews, p.230.

the Father, and it is by that presence that Christ intercedes for His own.

Again it is a mistake to distinguish rigidly between Christ's heavenly offering and His intercession. His offering of Himself is a continuous intercession for us, and the blessings of His intercession flow from His continuous giving of His life, (i.e. Himself), to the Father for us. From the moment of His entering into heaven, His life is unchanging not only in its direction towards us, but in its representation of us to the Father.(39)

6. THE ETERNAL SACRIFICE OF CHRIST.

The conception of a continual offering of Christ in heaven appears to be pre-supposed in the consecration prayer of the Church of Scotland Book of Common Order. Commenting on the phrase contained in that prayer: 'pleading His eternal sacrifice, we Thy servants do set forth this memorial', Dr. W.D. Maxwell says that the emphasis of the Scottish rite is upon 'the eternal quality of our Lord's sacrifice: it happened once and for all in time, but it belongs to eternity where He continually presents Himself before the Father.'(40)

Some have been reluctant to make much of the idea of the eternal sacrifice of Christ, fearing that it may savour of the Platonic disparagement of time and the familiar world in

(39) Milligan, op.cit., pp.160f.

(40) W.D. Maxwell, in Ways of Worship, p.115.

favour of the real, eternal world of Forms. That it is possible however, to do justice to the eternal nature of Christ's heavenly work, without drifting away from the general Biblical standpoint as to time (41) is shown by the work of the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews. No doubt the writer to the Hebrews has been influenced to some extent by Alexandrian thinking, but it is unlikely that this influence goes much deeper than the outward form of the ideas expressed. It seems that the author has found the Alexandrian forms of thought well suited to expressing his own Christian convictions. (42)

In the first place the eternal nature of Christ's work in Hebrews does not imply that time is not real, or that interest in the historical is lacking. On the contrary there is in Hebrews an emphasis both on the reality of the 'once-and-for-allness' of Christ's Cross, (43) and on the historical details of His humanity. (44)

Secondly, while there is some resemblance to Platonism in the conception in Hebrews of 'the two worlds', the resemblance does not extend to the key idea of Platonism - that this earthly world is but a pale and inferior copy of the real, 'ideal' world (45) Hebrews sees this world as real, and solid; and human

(41) O. Cullmann, *op.cit.*, pp.37-80.

(42) W. Manson, The Epistle to the Hebrews, pp.123-125, 141-142.

(43) Hebrews 7:27; 9:27-28; 10:10.

(44) Hebrews 2:9; 2:17-18; 4:15; 5:8-9; 12:2-3.

(45) W. Manson, The Epistle to the Hebrews, pp.124-126, 184-186.

existence, not as sordid and limiting, but as a race in which Christians must ever be looking unto Jesus.

At the same time the Epistle does not see 'the two worlds' as equal in status. The earthly tabernacle is 'made with hands' and will pass away: the heavenly tabernacle is not made with hands and will remain forever. The priesthood of the earthly temple is intermittent, and thus transient: the heavenly high priesthood is a ministry that is eternally valid. This world is not mere appearance. It does point, however, to the heavenly world which is far better, and which itself provides the key to the understanding of the present world.(46)

What is the principle that joins these two worlds? Greek philosophy would seek an answer in terms of $\nu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$. But the Epistle finds it in a Person, Jesus Christ. Time and eternity receive their meaning for the Christian from Jesus Christ. It is the presence of that person which joins time and eternity in the Eucharist.(47)

This is brought out well in the 35th Scottish paraphrase:

'And oft the sacred rite renew
That brings my wondrous love to view.....
In this the Covenant is sealed
And Heaven's eternal grace revealed.'

(46) W. Manson, The Epistle to the Hebrews, p.126.

(47) 'In Jesus Christ eternity is manifested in time.'
W. Manson, The Epistle to the Hebrews, p.187.

That which is eternal is 'renewed' in time, (not 'repeated' or 're-enacted'), and that which is 'revealed' through the celebration is 'Heaven's eternal grace'.(48)

In the following chapter we shall be concerned to discuss in greater detail the conception that what Christ does eternally in heaven, the Church, through the power of the Holy Spirit, 'echoes' in the Eucharistic sacrifice on earth.

(48) W.D. Maxwell, in Ways of Worship, p.116.

CHAPTER VII

THE SACRAMENTAL SACRIFICE

If Jesus' sacrifice is not to remain a thing apart from men, there must be an appropriation of its benefits by men.

(1)

Our examination of the sayings of Jesus in the Upper Room(2) leads us to believe that it was His desire and intention that men should participate in the life that He surrendered, and should take to themselves its sacrificial power, as the vehicle of their approach to God.

Of this work of Christ, H.R. Mackintosh observes:

'.... this is not a sacrifice that makes our sacrifice needless; it is one, rather, that makes it possible.'(3)

In so far as the Eucharist effects this, it may legitimately be termed a sacramental, or a Eucharistic sacrifice.

(4)

In order to understand how it is that the Church appropriates the benefits of Christ's sacrifice through the Eucharist, it is necessary to enquire into the meaning of the

(1) V. Taylor, *op.cit.*, p.282.

(2) Chapter III above.

(3) Mackintosh, The Christian Experience of Forgiveness, p.225.
Also p.222.

(4) Pittenger, The Christian Sacrifice, Chapter 5.

Old Testament rite by which Israel, remembering the Exodus from Egypt,(5) appropriated the benefits of her redemption.

The Passover, the celebration of which formed the background of the Eucharistic sayings of Jesus in the Upper Room, is believed to have had a long history, going back far beyond the time of Moses.(6) From the time of the deliverance of the Hebrews from Egypt the celebration of the Passover was associated with the remembrance of that event.(7) By the time of Jesus the feast was held in Jerusalem, owing to the post-Exilic centralisation of sacrificial worship in the capital. After the lambs had been slain by the worshippers in the Temple, and the life blood poured on the altar by the priests, the remaining portions of the lambs were taken to private homes for the sacrificial feast.

I.. THE ACT OF MEMORIAL.

To Jews performing the memorial of the Exodus from Egypt, the significance of what was done was much greater than our custom of laying a wreath upon the stone 'memorial' of a great person, or of an event. By this modern 'act of memorial' we keep green the memory of the past.(8) The Hebrew memorial was

(5) Regarding the centrality of this event in the Hebrew religious consciousness, see J. Macmurray, The Clue to History, p.38.

(6) c.f. Article on Passover in Richardson's T.W.B., pp.163-164, by F.J. Taylor; The Temple Dictionary of the Bible, pp.561-564 and Encyclopaedia Biblica, Vol.III, cols.3589-3600.

(7) Exodus 12; 13:11-15.

(8) See the discussion on the subjective use of the word 'memorial' in Aulén, op.cit., p.389.

not of this purely subjective nature. It was, rather, an act through which the past was regarded as becoming the present. Something was done, or performed, by which the events of the past were represented and re-called, the participants experiencing the benefits of the events by their present effects. The Passover memorial was a means by which the worshippers were caught up into 'salvation - history'?(9)

This was the rite which Jesus was so desirous of sharing with His followers, and which was so patently in His mind at the Last Supper (whether that was the actual Passover meal or not).

It is in the light of this sacrificial remembering, that we must seek to understand the meaning of the words: ΤΟΥΤΟ ΠΟΙΕΙΤΕ

ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ἑμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. (10) The verb ΠΟΙΕΙΝ very often, though not necessarily, carries the meaning 'to celebrate', 'perform', 'offer'. The precise meaning can, however, only be determined from the context. In this case we believe that the context suggests that ΠΟΙΕΙΝ should be understood in a sense analogous to that of celebrating or performing the Passover memorial.(11)

The words suggest that, just as the disciples had in the past kept the Passover as the memorial of the redemption of

(9) Dix, op.cit., p.245; Pittenger, op.cit., pp.77f; A.G. Hebert, article on Memorial in Richardson's T.W.B., pp.142-143.

(10) Luke 22:19.

(11) Wotherspoon, op.cit., pp.230-231; Gore, op.cit., pp.315-318, says the verb is used sixty to eighty times in the LXX in the sacrificial sense of 'offer' but that there is not sufficient evidence to say that this is the sense it is used in in the New Testament.

their nation from slavery, they were now to 'do this' (i.e. what Jesus had just done with the bread and the wine) as the memorial of the even greater redemption from the enslaving power of sin and death, that Jesus was about to accomplish.(12) There is also a strong eschatological note here: a forward look to the day when Jesus and His own will meet together in the rendezvous of the Parousia.(13) The memorial consists in the four actions of Jesus at the Last Supper (the taking, giving thanks, breaking and giving of the elements.) It is in the faithful carrying out and understanding of these four actions that the Eucharistic sacrifice may be said to consist. In the Upper Room the sacrifice was offered proleptically; in the sacrament today it is offered memorially. It is a 'sacrifice of Commemoration', as the Caroline divines were fond of putting it, not in the sense of the children's hymn 'I should like to have been with Him then', but by a re-calling ⁱⁿ to the present of the mighty acts of God-in-Christ for our salvation.(14)

2. TO WHOM IS THE ACT OF SACRAMENTAL REMEMBERING DIRECTED?

It is directed to the Church. Unless the Jewish people had thus 'remembered' that they had been bondsmen in the land of Egypt, and unless the Church 'remembers' that she has

(12) Wotherspoon, op.cit., pp.231f; Pittenger, op.cit., p.37; Dix, op.cit., p.161.

(13) Higgins, op.cit., p.55.

(14) c.f. Chapter 4 of Pittenger, op.cit., on the Eucharist as Action.

been captive in an Egypt of sin and death, then the benefits of her redemption will not be brought home to her. At the same time the potency of the act of memorial does not lie merely in the fact that men remember, but that God remembers. There can be no question of any crude notion of 'reminding God' - as if He were forgetful of His Son's passion. That would be to overlook the fact that the three persons of the Holy Trinity are not strangers to each other in the salvation of men. They are one. If the act of memorial is directed to God as well as to the Church, it is because, in this way, it is possible to give liturgical expression to the evangelical basis of the Christian religion; that it is in Christ we approach God. It is not that God needs a reminder of His own work in Christ: but that we need God's aid in the celebration of the sacraments.

Jeremias points to the sense in which it is permissible to speak of a Godward aspect of ἀνάμνησις, when he says: 'God's remembrance has always a special meaning in the Bible; it is never a matter of mere bringing to mind, but always, when God remembers, he acts, he does something, he shows his grace, he fulfills his promises: "He hath ~~holden~~ Israel his servant, that he might remember mercy, as he spake to our fathers." Luke I:54.' (15)

Not all writers agree that ἀνάμνησις has a Godward reference. Thus W.M.F. Scott writing in Theology (16) criticises

(15) Jeremias, J.T.S. Vol.L, 1949, p.9.

(16) Theology, February, 1953.

the theology of the Eucharistic hymns of the Wesleys in which it is taught that Christ, having once been slain, entered heaven, and there makes his priestly offering, and that through $\alpha\nu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\upsilon\tau\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$ in the Eucharist, the Church joins in what Christ does above. Scott holds that $\alpha\nu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\upsilon\tau\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$ is not used of sacrifice in the LXX, and that it does not have a Godward reference, but only a manward reference.

It will be useful to consider here the usage of the word in the LXX. (I7)

The word $\alpha\nu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\upsilon\tau\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$ is used five times in the LXX. Of these Wisdom 10:6 probably has a manward reference. The use in Psalms 38 (LXX 37) and 50 (LXX 59) are so obscure that commentators cannot speak with certainty about them. The two remaining occasions in which the word is used both appear to suggest a memorial before God, as much as before men. In one of these, Lev. 24:7, frankincense is put on the shew bread to be a memorial before God: 'And thou shalt put pure frankincense upon each row, that it may be on the bread for a memorial ($\epsilon\iota\varsigma \alpha\nu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\upsilon\tau\eta\sigma\iota\upsilon\upsilon$. $\eta\gamma\alpha\theta\acute{\alpha}\nu\epsilon\iota$) even an offering made by fire unto the Lord.'

The associations of the word in this context are, moreover, sacrificial.

In the final case, Numbers 10:9-10, the blowing of

(I7) For this section see Darwell Stone, op.cit., I, pp.9-II.

the trumpets is a memorial before God, and in this connection the manward reference is slight: 'If ye go to war in your land... then ye shall blow an alarm with the trumpets; and ye shall be remembered (ἀνάμνησθήσεσθε, אָנָהֶם) before the Lord your God, and ye shall be saved from your enemies. Also in the day of your gladness and in your solemn days, and in the beginning of your months, ye shall blow with the trumpet over your burnt offerings, and over the sacrifices of your peace offerings: that they may be to you for a memorial (ἀνάμνησις, זִכָּרוֹן) before your God: I am the Lord your God.'

There is also the reference in Hebrews 10:3 to be taken into account: 'But in those sacrifices there is a remembrance (ἀνάμνησις) again made of sins every year.'

This refers to the yearly Day of Atonement sacrifice. W.M.F. Scott believes this re-calling of sins is limited to bringing sins to the notice of men. The difficulty with Scott's view is that the Atonement, the blotting out of sin, is scarcely possible if man's sins are brought only before man. It is God who expiates sin.

Jeremias links ἀνάμνησις with the cognate word μνημόσυνον. Thus in Acts 10:4b the angel says to Cornelius: 'Thy prayers and thine alms are come up for a memorial (εἰς μνημόσυνον) before God.' Further in Mark 14:9b Jesus is represented as using the word in connection with the woman who anointed Him, and probably in the same sense as Acts 10:4b:

'This also that she hath done shall be spoken of for a memorial of her.' (εἰς μνημόσυνον αὐτῆς)

It is unlikely, however, that a discussion of these passages alone can ever establish a final conclusion as to the meaning of the Greek word, even though we believe that the evidence leans in favour of the two-fold reference. Moreover, any conclusion based on a philological study alone, is always liable to be modified in the light of fresh archeological evidence. Certainly the idea of a 'memorial before God' was a familiar one in ancient sacrificial thought. Whether or not we adopt that interpretation here will be determined by the extent to which we are able to believe that Jesus had the sacrificial principle in mind at the Last Supper. (18)

3. SHOWING THE LORD'S DEATH.

Closely related to ἀνάμνησις is the idea of showing the Lord's death. In I Cor. 11:26 are these words: ὁσάκις γὰρ ἔαν ἔσθίητε τὸν ἄρτον τοῦτον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον πίνητε, τὸν θάνατον τοῦ Κυρίου καταγγέλλετε, ἄχρι οὗ ἔλθῃ.

Has this proclamation the same sacrificial overtones that it seems ἀνάμνησις has? Clearly the 'remembering' and the 'proclaiming' in the sacrament have the same object, namely, the one sacrifice of Christ. Neither are ^{vs} historically identical to that one sacrifice, but both are derived from it.

Supposing that there is sufficient reason for believing

(18) Hicks, op.cit., pp.212f. Also see Chapters II and III above of this dissertation.

that the idea of sacramental remembering does involve a Godward as well as a manward reference, can the same be said of sacramental proclamation?

Dr. Pittenger holds that to show the Lord's death meant for St. Paul 'to plead and to placard before God and men that which had been accomplished on Calvary.' (19)

All commentators agree that the death is shown forth before men, but many are hesitant about saying that the proclamation is directed towards God also. It is pointed out that the word used to describe the Paschal ritual, haggadah, means 'showing forth' to men (c.f. Ex.13:8) and that this is the term used by St. Paul in I. Cor. 11:26. (20) W.M.F. Scott believes that the use of the prefix κατά, 'down', rules out the idea of a Godward reference. (21) Gayford points out that the term is used elsewhere in the New Testament with reference to the Church's preaching to the world, and concludes that the Godward reference in I Cor. 11:26 is not primarily suggested, although it is not necessarily excluded. (22) It seems, however, that the early Church must have interpreted sacramental proclamation as being directed towards the Church rather than the pagan world, as it excluded the outsider from its Eucharistic worship. (23) Darwell Stone considers that,

(19) Pittenger, op.cit., p.42. Torrance, Eschatology and the Eucharist, Intercommunion, Vol. p.324f.

(20) Edersheim, quoted by Gore, op.cit., p.262, n.3.

(21) Scott, Theology, February, 1953.

(22) Gayford, op.cit., pp.161f. Also c.f. Balmford, Theology, May, 1953.

(23) Moffatt, op.cit., p.169.

while the Eucharist is a reminder to Christians of Christ's death, in view of the sacrificial context of the Last Supper and its sayings, it is difficult to exclude some idea of a proclamation and a pleading of Christ's death before God.(24)

In order to arrive at a satisfactory solution, it is necessary to consider what is understood by the 'death' of Christ that is to be shown forth. The death of Christ that the Church is to proclaim is much more than Jesus' death upon the gallows. It includes the proclamation of the results of that death for the relationship of man and God.(25) What is to be recalled is not the mere fact of Christ's death, but the work of reconciliation, of which that death was a vital part. Vincent Taylor holds that St. Paul means that the Last Supper is a kind of acted sermon, a 'drama of redemption', in which eating and drinking provide an opportunity for the spiritual appropriation of that which was made possible by the death of Christ.(26) The Church proclaims the truths concerning Christ's death by meeting for worship at the Lord's Table, where 'Christians were not simply to remember him as he had been and to look for his return, but to live on him.... to be sustained in their communion with God through his presence.'(27)

(24) Stone, op.cit., I, p.14.

(25) Dix, op.cit., p.242.

(26) V. Taylor, op.cit., p.212.

(27) Moffatt, op.cit., p.170.

III.

Even though our study of the word *καταγγέλλειν* may not fully establish the sense of proclamation before God, there are two factors which suggest that the Godward aspect has its place.

First, there is the presence of Christ in the sacrament. It is hard to conceive how the proclamation of His death could be made in the presence of Christ who is 'of one substance with the Father' and this proclamation not be made before the Father.

Second, if the proclamation be made through the worship of the Church, and worship is necessarily directed to God, then it would seem that only by an artificial and unnatural separation could 'proclamation' be stripped of all Godward reference.

4. THE ROLE OF ESCHATOLOGY.

For a right understanding of sacramental remembering and sacramental proclamation in and through the Eucharist, it is necessary to give due regard to the eschatological nature of the Lord's Supper. The neglect of this has led many 'Evangelicals' to be chary about thinking sympathetically of the Eucharistic sacrifice, just as it led many 'Catholics' to speak of these things in an unguarded and illegitimate manner. Thus, a recognition of the eschatological nature of the Eucharist makes it possible to speak of the Real Presence without resort to any unbiblical notion of degrees of presence. Christ's presence in the sacrament is both 'now' and 'not yet', both 'come' and 'yet to come'. (28) It is legitimate to speak of the Real Presence in

(28) Cullmann, op.cit., pp.74, 146.

the sacrament provided that Presence is never confused with the Second Advent when Christ will judge even the use we have made of His sacramental mysteries. In the same way the sacramental proclamation of the sacrifice of Christ is not part of the eternal nature of things, as may be seen from the command to show the Lord's death $\alpha\chi\rho\iota\ \delta\epsilon\ \xi\lambda\theta\eta$ (29). Jeremias holds that there is a strong eschatological quality in $\alpha\nu\acute{\alpha}\mu\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$ before God. To the question 'How does God remember?', Jeremias replies: 'There is only one answer - by eschatological fulfilment, by the Parousia. It is this remembrance of which the Didache speaks: "Remember, O Lord, thy Church.... and gather it from the four winds." IO.5.' (30)

The sacraments belong in Christian apocalyptic thought to 'the time of the Church': the intervening time between Christ's coming and His Second Advent. In the fullness of time there will be no temple and no sacraments for the Lamb will stand in the midst of His people. (31) In the meantime it is in the Eucharist that the gulf between Christ's life on earth and His Second Coming is spanned. Through the $\alpha\nu\acute{\alpha}\mu\eta\sigma\iota\varsigma$ in the Eucharist, not only is the past, the historical sacrifice of Christ made present, but the New Age, the Parousia, is also made sacramentally present, both being mediated by the fruits of Christ's heavenly work.

(29) I Cor. 11:26.

(30) Jeremias, op.cit., p.9.

(31) Rev. 21:22.

5. THE ROLE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

The means by which we partake of the powers of the New Age is through the operation of the Holy Spirit. It is through 'the Spirit' that our *ἀνάμνησις* effectually recalls Christ's work for us, and through 'the Spirit' that the coming Kingdom of God breaks through here and now, and becomes effective in the life of the Body of Christ. Sacramental remembering is both an act of the Church and an act of the Holy Spirit. It is by the operation of the Holy Spirit that the sacrament is an efficacious sign, having the power to convey that which it symbolises. (32) It is through the work of the Holy Spirit 'which proceedeth from the Father and the Son' that the heavenly worship of the Sanctuary on high becomes effective in our worship. 'What he hears, the Holy Spirit echoes in the anamnesis of the Church.' (33) Not only this, but through the Holy Spirit our Eucharistic worship is caught up into that of the heavenly Liturgy. It is the Eternal Spirit ^{who} raises the sacramental *ἀνάμνησις* of the Church to the throne of God, and makes her members kings and priests who join with the host of heaven in their adoration of the Lamb. If we are able to share in Christ's intercession for mankind, it is only insofar as we are members of the spirit-filled community, the Church, and are enabled by the Spirit to offer our prayers in union with the Divine intention.

(32) Calvin, op.cit., 4/17/10, 12.

(33) T.F. Torrance, op.cit., p.324.

The Scriptures express this truth in the teaching concerning the two Advocates, on one hand: 'We have an advocate (Παράκλητον) with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous,' (34) and on the other we have with us here Christ's Advocate, the Holy Spirit: 'The Comforter (Παράκλητος) which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall.... bring all things to your remembrance.' (35) Both ideas are gathered together by the idea of representation. Jesus represents us before the throne of God, and the Holy Spirit dwelling with us represents to us Jesus who has gone to the Father. It is through this operation of the Spirit of Christ that the intercourse between heaven and earth in the Eucharist is so sustained that 'we see and judge and feel with Him; that His requests for us become our requests for ourselves, and the unity of Father, Son, and redeemed humanity is in Him completely resolved.' (36)

6. THE HEAVENLY MEMORIAL AND ITS EUCHARISTIC COUNTERPART.

The nature of the consummation of Christ's redemptive work for us finds expression under a variety of forms. It is depicted in the Epistle to the Hebrews (Chapters 4-10) under the figure of a Heavenly high priest entering into the Tabernacle on high to appear before God for men. (37) In Revelation (Chapters 4,5) it is represented by the Lamb, which bears the marks of

(34) I John 2:1b.

(35) John 14:26.

(36) Wm. Milligan, The Ascension of Christ, p.159.

(37) 'What the vision (in Revelation) discloses in Heaven the Eucharist sets forth here.' H.J. Wotherspoon, op.cit., p.240

having been slain, and which is the centre of adoration as He presents Himself to God.

The truth that lies behind these figurative expressions is that which the Church sets forth on earth in its celebration of the Eucharist.(38) The various conceptions of Christ's heavenly work, especially as related to Eucharistic worship, are perhaps best set forth in hymnology.

The conception of the heavenly priesthood of Christ, and of the power of His glorified humanity to present our humanity to God is expressed in the 58th Scottish Paraphrase, the second version of Hebrews 4:14f.

Where high the heavenly temple stands,
The house of God not made with hands,
A great High Priest our nature wears,
The guardian of mankind appears.
He who for men their surety stood
And poured on earth his precious blood,
Pursues in heaven his mighty plan,
The Saviour and the friend of man.
With boldness, therefore, at the throne,
Let us make all our sorrows known;
And ask the aids of heavenly power
To help us in the evil hour.

The priestly work of Christ in the heavenly sanctuary is given vivid expression in E.W. Eddis's hymn:

Thou standest at the altar,
Thou offerest every prayer;
In faith's unclouded vision
We see Thee ever there.

Out of Thy hand the incense
Ascends before the throne,
Where Thou art interceding,
Lord Jesus, for Thine own.

(38) T.F. Torrance, Liturgy and Apocalypse, pp.13-14.

And, through Thy blood accepted,
 With Thee we keep the feast:
 Thou art alone the Victim;
 Thou only art the Priest.

We come, O only Saviour;
 On Thee, the Lamb, we feed:
 Thy flesh is bread from heaven;
 Thy blood is drink indeed.

(39)

Three aspects of the Church's sacramental *ἀνάμνησις*
 (the re-calling of the historical once-for-all death of Christ,
 the power of Christ's continued heavenly work for the world,
 (together with) the sacramental proclamation of His sacrifice)
 are brought out well in William Bright's great hymn:

And now, O Father, mindful of the love
 That bought us, once for all, on Calvary's Tree,
 And having with us Him that pleads above,
 We here present, we here spread forth to Thee
 That only offering perfect in Thine eyes,
 The one true, pure, immortal sacrifice.

(40)

What an Anglican put into verse, a Scottish churchman
 of last century John Macleod, parish minister of St. Constantine's
 Govan, declared in a sermon in 1889. After reminding his hearers
 that the real memorial of our salvation is the presence in heaven
 of Christ, before the Father, (41) he continued: 'And do you not
 see it in some measure here on earth? We are His Body. We are
 His Church. He has united us with Himself. And when the Bread

(39) No. 515 Revised Church Hymnary.

(40) No. 320 Revised Church Hymnary.

(41) Also c.f. Wotherspoon, *op.cit.*, pp.239f.

is blessed we know Jesus Christ is here sacramentally present. And, when that Bread is broken and that Cup lifted up, there is a sacramental exhibition - here in the Church of God, here on earth, here in this Church of Govan - of the reality of the Mediation of the Lord in the Upper Sanctuary. And it is on the ground of that sacramental exhibition of Jesus with us, Jesus at our Head, Jesus the Mediator, that faith is quickened to draw near into the Holiest of All, having a High Priest over the House of God, presenting our intercessions.'(42)

This Eucharistic action may be described as 'the sacramental shadow'(43) of Christ's heavenly work. Through participation in this Eucharistic action we are given to appropriate the benefits of that once-and-for-all death and the heavenly work that follows from it. In so far as in the Eucharist the Church lays hold of the benefits of Christ's sacrifice, it may legitimately be described as a 'Eucharistic' sacrifice. It must be clearly understood that the Eucharist is not sacrifice in its own right. We participate in the Eucharistic sacrifice just as we eat and drink the body and blood of our Lord after the manner of a sacramental 'sign'. A sign is not identical with the thing itself, the thing signified, yet at the same time it is not

(42) J. Macleod, The Gospel in the Institution of the Lord's Supper, p.74. A similar idea is expressed in Calvin's Institutes 4/17/11. 'I say, therefore, that in the mystery of the supper, under the symbols of bread and wine, Christ is truly exhibited to us, even his body and blood, in which he has fulfilled all obedience to procure our justification.'

(43) J. Macleod, *op. cit.*, p.65.

separate from it. Thus the Eucharistic sacrifice is not identical with the sacrifice of Christ; it is the Church's re-actio to the sacrificial actio of Christ Himself(44): 'it is counterpoint, not the canto firmo.'(45) Through being a proclamation of the Lord's death 'the Eucharist becomes the sacramental counterpart to the unique sacrifice of Christ, and therefore in its own way, in as much as it echoes that, and is derivative from it, a sacramental sacrifice.'(46)

(44) Torrance, Eschatology and the Eucharist, Intercommunion, p.327.

(45) Torrance, Liturgy and Apocalypse, Church Service Society Annual, 1954, p.14.

(46) Torrance, Eschatology and the Eucharist, Intercommunion, p.328.

CHAPTER VIII

THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE: OFFERING

I. THE SACRIFICE OF PRAISE AND THANKSGIVING.

If the Eucharist is the sacramental counterpart of the heavenly work of Christ, and in that sense may be called a Eucharistic sacrifice, then it is necessary to enquire into the nature of the offering that is made in that sacrifice. Such an enquiry is important as much of the opposition to the idea of a Eucharistic sacrifice in Reformed circles arises because protagonists of the sacrificial interpretation of the Eucharist sometime speak in an illegitimate way about what is offered in the Eucharist and how it is offered.

We may confidently rule out any idea that the offering is aimed at appeasing an angry God. As we have seen in Chapters II and IV above, such a conception is a misunderstanding of the purpose of the Old Testament sacrificial system.

John Calvin distinguished between two types of offering under the old Law.(1) On one hand there were those sacrifices by which guilt was expiated before God, and which Calvin held were fulfilled once-and-for-all in the Cross. On the other hand there

(1) Calvin, Institutes, 4/18/13-17.

were the sacrifices of homage: some offered by way of supplication to improve the favour of God; some expressing the thanks of the people for the mercies and gifts of God; and others to confirm the covenant. It was this type of sacrifice that Calvin saw fulfilled in the Eucharist.

While today we may not be satisfied with the propitiatory theory of the atonement that Calvin held in common with the men of his day in both ecclesiastical camps, we can agree with his fine characterization of the sacrificial principle underlying the offering of the Eucharist, and of all Christian living, to the Lord:

'This kind of sacrifice has no tendency to appease the wrath of God, to procure remission of sins, or to obtain righteousness: its sole object is to magnify and exalt the glory of God. For it cannot be acceptable and pleasing to God, except from the hands of those whom he has already favoured with the remission of their sins, reconciled to himself, and absolved from guilt; and it is so necessary to the Church as to be altogether indispensable. Therefore it will continue to be offered for ever, as long as the people of God shall exist.... For so far are we from wishing to abolish it, that in that sense we are pleased to understand the following prediction: "From the rising of the sun, even to the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense

shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering; for my name shall be great among the heathen, saith the Lord of Hosts." (2)

Calvin continues emphatically: 'This kind of sacrifice is indispensable in the supper of the Lord.' (3)

Because of 'this sacrificial employment', Calvin held that Christians may rightly be called 'a royal priesthood', but a priesthood that does not exist in its own right: 'For we do not appear in the presence of God with our oblations without an intercessor; Christ is the Mediator, by whom we offer ourselves and all that we have to the Father. He is our High Priest..... He is our altar, upon which we place our oblations, that whatever we venture to do, we may attempt in him. In a word, it is he that "hath made us kings and priests unto God."' (4)

2. OFFERING OURSELVES.

It will be seen that the nature of the Eucharistic offering was for Calvin a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving. (5) This was also the view of Luther, (6) and would be that of most Reformed Churchmen today.

Closely allied with the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving in Calvin's exposition is the offering of ourselves to God

(2) Calvin, op.cit., 4/18/16; and Malachi I:11.

(3) Calvin, op.cit., 4/18/17.

(4) Calvin, op.cit., 4/18/17.

(5) Also Westminster Confession, Chapter 19, Section 2.

(6) c.f. quotation from Luther, E. Underhill, Worship, p.58.

Christ is our Mediator in heaven 'by whom we offer ourselves and all that we have to the Father.' (7)

C.S. Gayford remarks in a similar vein to Calvin that the 'Sin offering' of the Cross and Resurrection makes possible our 'Burnt offering' of a dedicated life in the Eucharist, and makes our/self-dedication acceptable to God.(8) Certainly what makes our act of homage in the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving genuine is the dedication of ourselves to God. The sacrificial action and the gift(9) are the tangible expressions of a will that is devoted to God. Unless the offering of the will is real, then the sacrifice is, as Jeremiah insisted,(10) worthless. The obedient will must be embodied in a gift to God, and the Christian has but one gift which he can offer to God, namely, his own soul and body as a living sacrifice.(11) Such, Archbishop Brilioth maintains, is the only conception of the Eucharistic sacrifice which does not lay itself open to criticism (12)

The Eucharist is not the only occasion when Christians offer themselves to God. There is a sense in which the whole

(7) Calvin, *op.cit.*, 4/18/17.

(8) Gayford, *op.cit.*, p.132.

(9) Scholars differ in what is to be regarded as definitive in sacrifice - the sacrificial action or the thing offered. It is unwise to attempt to separate these two aspects too rigidly. In general, we agree with Wotherspoon's definition: 'Sacrifice is essentially an act of the will, and what it offers is the self of the offerer.' *op.cit.*, p.233.

(10) Jeremiah 7:1-14, 21-23.

(11) Brilioth, *op.cit.*, p.283; Aulén, *op.cit.*, p.392; Hislop, *op.cit.*, pp.228,238; Wm. Milligan, *op.cit.*, p.260.

(12) Brilioth, *op.cit.*, p.138.

Christian life is sacrificial.

In Romans 12:1 St. Paul urges the Christians to 'present' (παραστήσαί) their bodies to God as a 'Living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God' as their 'reasonable service'.

In Philippians 4:18b the alms of the Philippians are described as 'a sacrifice acceptable, well pleasing to God.'

In Romans St. Paul describes his own ministry in sacrificial language: 'I have written to you with a certain freedom, in virtue of my divine commission as a priest (λειτουργῶν) of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles in the service (ἱερουργεῖντα) (13) of God's gospel. My aim is to make the Gentiles an acceptable offering, (προσφορά) consecrated by the holy Spirit.' Romans 15:15-16, Moffatt.

The fact that the whole of the Christian life and work can be seen in sacrificial terms does not detract from the sacrificial aspect of the Eucharist. It gives added emphasis to the Eucharist as the place where the sacrificial self-offering of the people of God in their daily lives is gathered up in the worship of the Church. It sheds light on the way that the prayer of self-oblation in the consecration prayer of the Scottish Book of Common Order is to be understood as part of the Godward movement of the Eucharist:

(13) Stone, op.cit., I, p.15: 'doing the work of a priest'.

A.V. 'ministering'.

'And here we offer and present unto Thee ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and living sacrifice; and we beseech Thee mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.'

3. OFFERING THE FRUITS OF THE EARTH AND OF MEN'S TOIL.

A man's life is closely bound up with the things he possesses, (14) and his obedience to God must be expressed partly in terms of those things over which God has given him dominion. (15)

Thus, after saying that through Christ we offer to God ourselves, Calvin adds, 'and all that we have.' (16) The desire to make man's self-offering in the Eucharist complete has led to the conception of the Eucharist as a vehicle of the offering to God of the fruits of man's labour and of the fruits of the soil. This offering is part of the sacrifice of homage, of praise and thanksgiving.

It has found expression in the ceremonial that has developed around the offertory (17): the bringing of the gifts to the holy Table, and their being set apart for use in the liturgy. The connection between the offertory in the Eucharist and the workaday world has been developed in many quarters, notably in Scotland by the Iona Community, whose Leader, Dr. George F. MacLeod writes:

(14) c.f. the parable of the Rich Young Ruler, Matt. 19:16-26.

(15) Genesis 1:28.

(16) Calvin, Institutes, 4/18/17.

(17) Dix, op.cit., pp. 110-123.

'As we sing, the elements are being brought in. The choice by Jesus of Bread and Wine whereby we might remember Him, is one that is capable of an infinity of thoughts. But at least these elements are a reminder of the prairie in Canada; of the baker in our street; of the baker's boy; of the foreign vineyard; of the trade that brings us our bread; of our home where we eat it - the earth belongs unto the Lord and all that it contains.

..... Have we clean hands in our relations with all of these?

..... Thus once more the Cross stands between us and our sins; we are united now in penitence as we look out on the market place of the world, which is His present Calvary.' (18)

It is true, no doubt, that this train of thought was not prominent in the mind of Jesus at the Last Supper. Nevertheless, it is probable that the meal was begun with the customary Jewish grace: 'Blessed be Thou, O Lord our God, eternal King, Who bringest forth bread from the earth', and that it was concluded with the customary blessing of the cup: 'Blessed art Thou, O Lord our God, eternal King, Who createst the fruit of the vine.

(19) There is a parallel to these prayers of thanks for the fruits of the earth in the thanks for Creation which begin the prayer of Consecration in the Church of Scotland rite today: 'It is verily meet, right and our bounden duty that we should at all times and in all places give thanks unto Thee, O Holy

(18) G.F. MacLeod, We Shall Re-build, p.88.

(19) Dix, op.cit., pp.52,54-55.

Lord, Father Almighty, Everlasting God; who didst create the heavens and the earth and all that is therein; who didst make man in thine own image.'

We believe that the meaning that Dr. MacLeod reads into Jesus' choice of bread and wine is not foreign to the intention of Jesus, but is in accord with His mind. It is expressive of Christ's lordship over every department of men's lives, and, as such, may rightly be included in our worship when, through Christ our Mediator, 'we offer ourselves and all that we have to the Father.' (20)

No doubt it is possible to make too much of the offering of the fruits of the earth and of men's work in the Eucharist (21) This aspect of the Eucharist will be soundly based, however if it is regarded as part of the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving and of the offering of ourselves to God. This is an offering that we are enabled to make only in and through Christ. It is His Holy Spirit (Παράκλητος) (22), ^{who} that enables the Church to draw near to God, and it is He who is our Advocate (Παράκλητος) with the Father. (23) Only in Him is even our sacrifice of praise acceptable to God.

4. 'OFFERING CHRIST'?

The sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, and the

(20) Calvin, op.cit., 4/18/17.

(21) A warning against this is given by Dr. T.F. Torrance in the Intercommunion volume, pp.331f.

(22) John 14:16.

(23) I John 2/1.

sacrifice of persons are both aspects of the offering that we make in and through Christ. There are some, however, who go further than this and speak not only of offering ourselves in and through Christ, but of our offering Christ.

Such a conception must be examined very carefully and critically. First it is necessary to be clear as to what protagonists of the view actually maintain.

Canon Balmford writes: '..... in the Eucharistic Sacrifice, as and when we "offer ourselves" we cannot but "offer Christ". The two things are interlocked.'

And further: 'We offer ourselves..... as the redeemed, the Body of Christ. How can we offer "the Body" but not "Christ" (24)

A Church of Scotland Kerr Lecturer follows this line of thought: 'The Church offers to God the creator and redeemer the highest and noblest in human life - the life and doing of Jesus of Nazareth.' (25) 'In her oblation she offers to God the Eternal Christ, Who is alike without as the object of devotion and within as creative power.' (26)

Ivan Young writes: 'There is an offering of Christ as victim on the part of the Church; but on account of her

(24) Theology, May, 1953.

(25) D.H. Hislop, *op.cit.*, p.229.

(26) D.H. Hislop, *op.cit.*, p.230.

incorporation into Him as her head and sacrifice, in offering Him she is offering herself, she is doing His will.'(27)

Another Anglican writer, C.S. Gayford, states: 'In offering Himself to God upon that Altar He offers His Church, the redeemed human race, for He is the "Son of Man". In offering ourselves to God we, the Priestly Church, cannot but be offering Him in whom we are all gathered up.'(28)

What do these writers mean when they say that in the Eucharist we offer Christ?

Some may intend to teach in a vivid way the truth that it is the first duty of the Church to surrender her life to God, and that this she is able to do only in and through Jesus Christ our high priest. In other words: 'What the Church offers is her life in her Lord's life.'(29)

If this is the intention, then to say 'we offer Christ' is a curiously inverted way of expressing it. To avoid confusion it would seem to be advisable to drop the use of that expression, and to be content to say 'the Church offers herself in and through Christ'.

There may be some writers, however, who do intend to go further than this. Here we must draw the line, for the New

(27) I.R. Young, Article on Eucharistic Worship, The Church of God
An Anglo-Russian Symposium, pp.121-2.

(28) C.S. Gayford, op.cit., p.169.

(29) W. Milligan, op.cit., p.264.

Testament does not speak of our offering Christ. There is good reason for this as in the Scriptures it is with Christ, not with the Church, who takes the lead.(30) For the Church to speak of herself offering Christ would be to suggest that Christ was passive in her hands.(31) It is not permissible for us to speak of our role in the Eucharist as if we could take charge of Christ. No teaching concerning the Eucharistic sacrifice can be sound which does not do justice to the fact that in the Eucharist, as in other aspects of the Christian life, our faith and our worship are responses to the Divine initiative.

5. THE IDEA OF RECIPROCITY.

The view that the Church is able to offer Christ seems to stem from a conception of the relationship between Christ and His Body, the Church, seen in terms of reversibility or reciprocity.(32) Thus C.S. Gayford writes: 'Whatever He does, the Church His Body, the organ of His sacrificial work and suffering, does in and through Him. Whatever His Church does, He does in and through Her. We cannot separate, except in thought, the sacrifice of Christ and that of the Church.'(33)

(30) I John 4:19.

(31) Wotherspoon, op.cit., p.242.

(32) Dr. Forsyth: 'I cannot follow Dr. Moberly when he goes on to say in his fine book that the Church is what Christ is. That means an ecclesiastical pantheism. The Creation is not the Creator.' Different Conceptions of Priesthood and Sacrifice, p.163. A Conference at Oxford in 1899.

(33) Gayford, op.cit., pp.133-134.

We believe that an examination of the doctrine of the Body of Christ does not support such an interpretation.(34) The Epistles make it abundantly clear that Christ occupies a commanding position, and the Church a dependent one. In the earlier Epistles(35) Christ is spoken of as being Himself the whole body, of which individual Christians are 'members in particular'. In Ephesians and Colossians the figure is used somewhat differently. Christ is the Head of the Body, the Church.(36) It is the Head that gives the Body its life and meaning, while the task of the Body is to allow itself to be controlled by the sovereign Head.(37)

There could scarcely be a more emphatic description of the initiatory role of Christ, and of the dependent role of the Church, than the designation in Eph. 5:23 of Christ, the Head, as the saviour of the Body. Because of its being joined to such a Head, the Church has great dignity and significance. The Church has the high task and privilege of presenting Christ to the world, but it is Christ who presents Himself to the Father. The Church may be enabled by the Holy Spirit to unite herself, by faith and love, to that offering, but this is not

(34) Moreover it must always be remembered that such expressions as 'Body of Christ' and 'sanctuary on high' are attempts of Biblical writers to express in words truths that cannot fully be contained by such expressions. At the same time it is necessary to avoid the suggestion that they are 'merely metaphors'. c.f. J.A.T. Robinson, The Body. A Study in Pauline Theology, pp.50f.

(35) Rom. 12:4,5; I Cor. 6:15, 10:17, 12:12, 27.

(36) Eph. 1:22; 5:23; Col. 2:19.

(37) Col. 2:10; c.f. F.J. Taylor, Body, Richardson's T.W.B.,

to say that we offer Christ. It is not legitimate to speak of the Body as if it were co-terminous with the Head in authority and function.

A further reason why it is not permissible to speak of the relationship between Christ and the Church as one of reciprocity is that sin exists in the Church, but not in Christ. It is true that the Church is 'holy', but the holiness of the Church does not derive from the goodness of the members, but from the presence of Christ through the Holy Spirit, and of the holiness of God's purpose in using the Church for the salvation of the world. The members of the Church are sinful, however, and corporately the Church can sin through errors of commission and omission.

The inappropriateness of Gayford's statement that 'whatever His Church does, He does in and through Her', comes home very clearly when it is remembered that Christ 'was in all points tempted like as we are, yet without sin', (38) but to the Church at Corinth St. Paul was actually obliged to write: 'Shall I then take the members of Christ, and make them the members of an harlot? God forbid.' (39) There is no reversibility here.

Moreover, sin has as its result judgement, and the judge is Christ. The Church, in so far as she is part of sinful

(38) Hebrews 4:15b.

(39) I Cor. 6:15b.

humanity needing redemption, stands under that judgement. This being so we cannot say that 'whatever He does, the Church, His Body..... does in and through Him.'(40)

For these reasons we conclude that it is not permissible to say that in the Godward movement in ^{the} Eucharist 'we offer Christ.' We are on sound ground, however, when we say that in the Eucharist we unite ourselves in faith, love and obedience to His offering of Himself, and thus are enabled to offer ourselves and all that we have, through Him, to the Father.

(40) Gayford, op.cit., p.133.

CHAPTER IX

THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE: COMMUNION.

I. SACRIFICE AND COMMUNION BELONG TOGETHER.

In the last chapter we mentioned some of the dangers that surround the idea that in the Eucharist the Church 'offers Christ.' The fear of perversion along these lines has led many Evangelicals to dismiss the idea of 'offering Christ', and with it, the whole sacrificial theme in connection with the sacrament, and almost any suggestion of a Godward reference. Accordingly many have preferred to concentrate on the Eucharist understood in terms of a Holy Communion.(1)

It would help to reconcile both parties if each recognised that 'communion' is itself capable of a sacrificial interpretation. Our difficulties, both on the 'Catholic' ^{and} (as well as) on the 'Evangelical' side, have been due to the failure to recognise this sacrificial significance of communion. 'Catholics' have made little of the communion of the people, not regarding it as an essential part of the Eucharistic sacrifice, and have thereby opened the door to wrong ideas of sacrifice.

'Evangelicals' on the other hand, have made much of the communion

(1) e.g. P.T. Forsyth, The Church and the Sacraments, pp.271-273. Those who take this view-point are by no means thereby committed to a low view of the sacraments, and often have a high view of the Real Presence.

of the people, but, like the Roman Catholic Church, have not regarded it as part of a Eucharistic sacrifice. Both 'Evangelical' and 'Catholics' have had their share in the breakdown of a fully balanced Eucharistic faith and practice.

Both parties are agreed that the Last Supper involved the institution of a communion rite, which was closely related in its origin with the time and the thought of the death of Jesus. They also agree that in whatever other ways Jesus' death and resurrection might be interpreted, the most important is in terms of sacrifice. They have also in practice failed to understand that communion is part of sacrifice.

It may be that the widespread misunderstanding of the nature of sacrifice has had a great deal to do with this.(2) Both sides in the great controversy of the 16th Century tended to think of sacrifice as essentially the death of a victim, thus missing the more truly Biblical conception of sacrifice as 'Life surrendered', 'Life transformed', and 'Life shared'. As F.C.N. Hicks has pointed out, 'communion' or the feast, had an important part in the act of sacrifice. Six movements go to make up the composite picture of the stages of sacrifice.(3) In the final stage a certain portion of the victim was eaten. In

(2) The important bearing that certain misunderstandings of the nature of sacrifice have had, and still do have, on the discussion of the Eucharistic sacrifice, is dealt with in the earlier chapters of this dissertation.

(3) Hicks, op.cit., pp.11-14. Also see Chapter II of this dissertation.

the case of peace-offerings it provided a meal for the offerers, while in the case of sin-offerings it was set apart for the use of the priests because of the special holiness attached to it. Only in the cases of burnt-offerings when the entire animal was devoted to God by fire on the altar, and in cases of sin-offerings offered for the sins of the priests themselves, was no part of the victim consumed in a meal.

Thus while some sacrifices were celebrated without the customary communion meal, Hicks points out that 'there is no basis,in the Bible, for a communion-meal that was not itself a part of the sacrifice.'(4)

He also cites the Jewish writer Israel Abrahams as saying that the idea of the domestic table as an altar was common in the Rabbinic teaching of the time of Jesus, especially with regard to the Passover home-rites.(5)

It is against the background of the sacrificial pattern in the Old Testament, and of the ideas prevalent in Jesus' own day, that we must try to understand the meaning of the events in the Upper Room. Of that meal of Jesus with His disciples James Moffatt truly remarks: 'It was table-fellowship indeed, such as Jews understood, but table-fellowship with a

(4) Hicks, op.cit., p.325.

(5) Hicks, op.cit., p.182.

content of divine self-sacrifice, which differentiated the covenant as the new distinctive basis of the Christian Church... The eucharist was their assurance of this communion based on sacrifice.' (6)

There are two separate sacrificial themes with which the Last Supper may be associated, the Paschal theme and the New Covenant. (7)

Even if we cannot be certain if the Supper was definitely a Passover feast, there is no doubt as to the strong Paschal associations of the Supper. The accounts in the Synoptics suggest that it was the Passover feast, (8) while the Fourth Gospel regards Jesus as the Paschal victim. (9) If the Last Supper was the Passover feast, then it is illuminating to realise that the feast was itself regarded as part of the sacrifice - its culmination. The lamb that was used would have been slain in the Temple, and its blood used in the usual ceremonial manner the present feast being the concluding stage of the sacrifice. (10)

Further, in Luke 22:15-16 Jesus links the Passover feast they are eating, with the Messianic banquet.

(6) Moffatt, The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians, p.166

(7) The critical issues involved are discussed in Chap.III above.

(8) Mark 14:1,12,14; Luke 22:8-15.

(9) John 19:33,36. c.f. Exodus 12:46.

(10) Hicks, *op.cit.*, p.234. There seems to be little justification for Moffatt's categorical statement that 'the paschal family meal was never thought of as a sacrifice.' Moffatt, *op.cit.*, p.165.

Even if the Last Supper was not the Passover feast proper but was a Kiddûsh, it would still be a meal in celebration of the Passover sacrifice, and would justify, in our opinion, the description of the meal as itself sacrificial in character.

The other theme is that of the institution of the New Covenant.(II) Moffatt(I2) and Manson(I3) agree with Vincent Taylor(I4) in interpreting the sayings of Jesus at the Supper in the light of Exodus 24:4-II. That passage tells how the Old Covenant was instituted and of its sacrificial significance. When Moses had sprinkled part of the blood on the altar, he gave the people the Covenant, to which they promised fidelity, and he then sprinkled the rest of the blood on the people. To the elders of the people was granted a vision of the God of Israel which was followed by a communion meal: 'And they beheld God and did eat and drink.' In the Upper Room a New Covenant is made, and even 'the blood which is the life,'(I5) which is about to be poured out, is given to the disciples in communion. Jesus' words mean that, thanks to His own sacrifice, the disciples are participating in the blessings and powers of the New Covenant that God is making with His people, and they may continue to do so by celebrating the rite εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.

(II) Mark 14:24; I Corinthians 11:24-25.

(I2) Moffatt, op.cit., pp.168-169.

(I3) Manson, Jesus the Messiah, p.145.

(I4) Taylor, op.cit., pp.136-139.

(I5) Genesis 9:4; Deut. 12:16; Lev. 17:10-14.

Hicks links John 6:53 with the meaning of the institution of a rite of the New Covenant. Jesus teaches that His followers are to 'eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood,' and in this way His life will be theirs 'not in mere outward sprinkling, but in themselves by the act of drinking.' (I6) This will be, for them, the experience of perfect sacrifice, in that they will receive to their salvation not merely the flesh but the blood of the Lord. 'He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood hath eternal life.'

It is this Jesus and His sacrificial death that St. Paul went to Corinth to proclaim: 'So the Church had come into being,' says Dr. Moffatt, 'But the Church itself proclaims this truth by its meeting for worship at the sacred table of the Lord, which is an altar of sacrifice as well as of communion.' (I7)

This then is the background out of which the Church can maintain the connection and the right balance between these two conceptions of sacrifice and of communion. Thus Vincent Taylor comments on Mark 14:22 : 'In bidding His disciples to receive the broken bread, which He had interpreted as His "body", Jesus revealed that He did not look upon His sacrifice as a thing apart from men, to be accepted passively as one recognizes an external event. On the contrary, He thought of it as standing in the closest relation to human need, as an experience to be shared and appropriated; and, as a realist, He provided a rite whereby

(I6) Hicks, op.cit., p.245.

(I7) Moffatt, op.cit., p.169.

fellowship in His sufferings, and, participation in the hallowing power of His sacrifice, might be assured.' (18)

The judgement of Archbishop Brilioth, who is much concerned to safeguard the insights of the Reformation, is of value in this connection: 'There can be no danger of losing hold of evangelical truth so long as the sacrifice is not separated from the communion.' (19)

2. MAINTAINING THE BALANCE.

The need to maintain the balance between sacrifice and communion leads us back to the conception of the two-fold movement in the Eucharist: Godward and manward. If the manward aspect (communion) is to be allowed to convey to the worshippers the full benefits of the sacrament, then it is important that the worshippers have a ready appreciation of the Godward movement of the rite. It is the function of the Godward movement, not only to act as a vehicle for a man's returning to God, but to be the means of setting before man the Life, the benefits of which he is to receive in communion. (20) In other words, the meaning of what we receive when we fulfil Christ's command to 'take' and 'eat' is set forth when we obey His command 'This do.' The act of communion is always preceded by the act of commemoration and so bears witness to the fact that the benefits of the Atonement follow from the Atonement itself. H.J. Wotherspoon puts this

(18) Taylor, op.cit., p.125. Also c.f. Quick, The Christian Sacraments, p.198.

(19) Brilioth, op.cit., p.48.

(20) c.f. Dix, op.cit., pp.227,230.

well when he says: 'Our Lord's face is always set Godwards before it is turned manwards; until His self-offering should be accepted of the Father there could be no giving to us. First the Action, then its fruits: first we show the Lord's Death - then we wait for and receive the Divine response, that which the Lord's Passion has procured for us.'(21)

Calvin recognized the importance of this aspect of setting forth the drama of Christ's work before the act of communion, when he said that in the sacrament of the Holy Supper, Christ is first exhibited to us, and then communicated to us.(22)

It is only as we come to the act of communion by a deep understanding of what we are doing in the Godward movement in the Eucharist, that we realise why these two movements belong together for, as Olive Wyon remarks: 'We shall miss the deeper significance of this precious moment of Communion if we are not aware of the preceding moment of Consecration.'(23)

In the early centuries the Church appears to have held these two movements in a wholesome balance,(24) and as late as the 6th century communion was for St. Augustine still the great climax of the whole 'Christian Sacrifice.' Gradually, however, the full understanding of the nature of sacrifice was lost,(25)

(21) Wotherspoon, op.cit., p.250.

(22) Calvin, op.cit., 4/17/II.

(23) Wyon, op.cit., pp.81-82.

(24) Dix, op.cit., pp.135-139, 227f.

(25) For this section see Hicks, op.cit., pp.300,302,304,307f.

Also Dix, op.cit., p.616.

and it came to be thought of primarily as a propitiatory slaying, rather than the surrendering, transforming and communicating of a Life. It may be that this trend was accentuated by the adoption of the Christian religion by the Roman Empire. The sense of the community of believers gathered in a hostile world to celebrate the Christian mysteries(26) was then ^{not} (no longer) felt as strongly as it had been in the Early Church, while the admission of a host of new-comers to the fold gave rise to the problem of morality, in a way that had never before been experienced by the Church. The task of dealing with sin now tended to loom larger in the mind of the Church, than that of creating local Christian churches in which the risen life of Christ was the prime experience. No doubt this was a factor that contributed to the rise of the propitiatory theory of the Atonement, the Mass itself coming to be regarded as an objective sacrifice for sin to appease an angry Deity, and not requiring the communication of the people. By the time of Thomas Aquinas the practice had become so entrenched that he was able to make a distinction between the sacrificium and the communio. This is a far cry from St. Augustine who 'had shown that it is precisely in the communio that the sacrificium finds its

(26) For an imaginative reconstruction of an early celebration c.f. Dix, op.cit., pp.142-144.

deepest meaning.' (27) This loss of the Augustinian conception, and the change to that of Aquinas was a great loss to the Church

It meant that the laity were no longer participants in the 'liturgy of the faithful' as they had been in times past. In Augustine's thought, their communion had been the great consummation of the Eucharistic sacrifice. In Aquinas' thought the people's communion becomes an optional addition, to the real sacrifice performed by the ministers in the sanctuary, to the accompaniment of the acts of individual piety on the part of the lay spectators. (28)

The supreme defect of this situation is the failure to understand that the aim of the Eucharistic sacrifice as a whole

(27) Brilioth, op.cit., p.284.

(28) c.f. A.G. Hebert, Liturgy and Society, p.82.

Non-communicating attendance is roundly condemned by Bishop Gore, op.cit., pp.202 and 203. In this respect Gore was more loyal to the Early Church tradition than some adherents of Anglo-Catholicism, who practise a service of High Mass with no communion of the people.

It is worth noting that the Church of Sweden Högmässa is not to be confused with the 'High Mass' of the Roman Catholic Church and of part of Anglo-Catholicism. Högmässa is celebrated with vestments, and has the classic structure of the Liturgy, except that the elements are not present. It is similar in nature to the service Calvin proposed when thwarted by the civil authorities from making the Eucharist the normal Sunday service. It is used in some Presbyterian churches in Scotland and in New Zealand. Both the Scottish and the Swedish service are of the nature of a missa sicca. For information regarding the Scottish service see: W.D. Maxwell, Concerning Worship, pp.23-29.

Colin F. Miller, the introduction to Prayers for Parish Worship.

The Book of Common Order, pp.43-49.

For the text of Swedish Högmässa see Brilioth, op.cit., pp.266-270. For suggestions of Rudolf Otto along similar lines see Religious Essays, pp.55-59. Regarding non-communicating attendance in special cases of pastoral care, see Wotherspoon, op.cit., pp.253-256.

is not only to enable man to approach God, but also to find a real and substantial union with Christ. If Christ's sacrifice is to bless us, what He has wrought for us He must work in us, by the power of His presence. The framers of the first Scots Confession (1560) understood this very well: 'We confess and undoubtedly believe that the faithful, in the right use of the Lord's Table, do eat the body, and drink the blood of the Lord Jesus, that He remaineth in them and they in Him; yea, they are so made flesh of His flesh, and bone of His bone, that as the eternal Godhead hath given to the flesh of Christ Jesus, life and immortality, so doth Christ Jesus by His flesh and blood, eaten and drunken by us, give unto us the same prerogative.' (29)

The important role of the act of meeting the Lord in communion has never been lost sight of in Reformed Churches, though its sacrificial significance has not been generally realized. There are also signs that in the Roman Church there is at present a re-discovery of the role of communion as the proper culmination of the Eucharistic sacrifice. Thus Masure gives moving expression to this when he says: 'The analysis of the idea of sacrifice ends then in the language of union and encounter, of a social compact, at the moment when God and man unite in the great embrace in which God's child falls into his Father's arms and finds there his true self.'

(29) Article 2I, quoted by W.D. Maxwell, Some Inner Aspects of the Action at the Lord's Supper, Church Service Society Annual, May, 1952, p.II.

The aim of the Liturgy, Masure teaches, is to facilitate 'the realisation of that encounter.' (30)

When Roman churchmen rediscover the blessings of communion (31) and Reformed churchmen come to understand its sacrificial significance (32) there is ground for hope that they will move towards each other in other respects also.

- (a) When the Godward movement in the Eucharist is stressed to the detriment of the manward.

When the activity of man in offering his gifts to God is stressed to the detriment of the act of man's reception of God's gifts, it is easy for the Eucharist to be thought of as a work, in which man has the prime role of 'doer'. Even when that work is the setting forth of the saving acts of Christ (ΤΟΥΤΟ ΠΟΙΕΙΤΕ ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ἑΜΗΝ ΔΟΞΑΝ I Cor. 11:24), it avails little for man's growth in grace, if it be a spectacle only, and external to him.

It tends to lead, moreover, to an impoverished experience of the graciousness of God. God is not only to be adored, but is to be known to Christians as the Giver of all good, above all in the Eucharist. Without the regular experience of this

(30) Masure, op.cit., p.44.

(31) The American Roman Catholic, Bishop Bellord, writes that the 'sacrifice of the mass consists essentially in the act of communion.' Quoted by Brilioth, op.cit., p.48.

(32) A Swedish Lutheran considers that: 'Union with the crucified Saviour, realised through communion, gives the faithful a share in his sacrifice, and so makes the Act of Memorial an actual sacrifice - a sacrifice which finds its fulfilment in a life lived after the pattern of the crucified Master.' Brilioth, op.cit., p.43.

graciousness of God, adoration itself will be deficient in the apprehension of God as Father and Friend. It is not beyond the bounds of possibility that, in the Roman Church, the Christian's encounter in the Eucharist with Jesus Christ has been so depersonalized that popular devotion has attempted to make good the loss to its sacramental experience by recourse to an increasingly popular cult of a kindly and gracious 'Mother of God.'

It is one thing to recognize and value the Godward movement in the Eucharist (as Protestants have not always done), but it is quite another to emphasise it to such an extent that one is led to say with Dom Anscar Vonier: 'To participate in Christ's great sacrifice on the cross in a merely utilitarian mode by receiving the benefits of such a sacrifice, is only one half of the Christian religion.' (33)

We may agree with Vonier that to participate in the act of communion is only one aspect of the Eucharistic experience, but we should have greatly misunderstood the role of Communion in the Eucharistic sacrifice if we conceived the communion in the Body and Blood of the Lord as 'merely utilitarian.' Such expressions suggest failure to appreciate the vital role that communion plays in the Eucharistic drama. To receive worthily (34) is not a passive matter, but involves a giving of oneself and one's life as an oblation to God.

(33) Vonier, op.cit., p.223.

(34) I Corinthians 11:29.

- (b) When the manward movement in the Eucharist is stressed to the detriment of the Godward.

The chief defect from which this worship suffers is a failure to recognize that 'man's chief end is to glorify God.' (35) God delights when the eyes of His children are turned to Him, when their chief concern is for His glory, and not primarily for their own needs. It is true that God supplies man's need, but man is most truly as God wishes him when he is bent on praising his Maker and Redeemer. When Eucharistic worship becomes too absorbed with the reception of the gift that God offers, the worshippers are apt to become introverted. The best way to ensure that in the reception attention will be turned away from self to the Divine Giver is to give due place to the making of the Memorial, with its proclamations of what God in Christ has done for man. Our desire for spiritual food is good, but it should never be allowed to obscure the fact that the Act of God is of prime importance. (36)

A one-sided emphasis on the manward movement can result in a kind of passivity in the presence of God, which eliminates the joy of making an approach and offering to Him. It is true that we have nothing of our own that, as such, is worthy of being offered to God, and that applies even to a man's humility and sincerity. (37) Only in so far as our gifts - the offering of our

(35) Westminster Shorter Catechism Q.I.

(36) Wotherspoon, op.cit., p.250.

(37) J. Baillie, Invitation to Pilgrimage, pp.60-61. The snare of being proud of one's humility.

spirits, minds and bodies - are transformed, and come to be 'in Christ' can they be accepted by God.(38) This thought is well summed up by H.H. Rowley: 'What then can (the Christian) bring to God but the sacrifice of Christ? By the humble surrender of his spirit to Christ he becomes identified with Christ, so that what he offers to God is not his own humility, but the obedience of Christ with whom he is now one by faith.'(39)

It is true that the idea of man's offering himself through the Eucharist would have no meaning if there were no Divine grace enabling the man to make it. On the other hand, the idea of God's giving Himself to man in the sacrament, regardless of the spirit within man, would be both mistaken and superstitious.

A useful parallel to this two-way movement in the Eucharist may be seen in the service for 'The Confirmation of Baptized Persons and their Admission to the Lord's Supper,' in the Church of Scotland Book of Common Order.(40)

(38) On the problem posed for theology of the salvation and sanctification of those before Christ, see D.M. Baillie, God was in Christ, pp.192-194.

(39) Rowley, op.cit., Hibbert Journal, Jan., 1942, p.185.

(40) Book of Common Order, (1940) pp.100-104. Also c.f. Articles in the Scottish Church Service Society Annual: T.B. Stewart Thomson, Confirmation in the Church of Scotland, (1938-39); R.S. Loudon, Confirmation, (1951); Neville Davidson, The Place of the Sacraments in the Life of the Church, (1951).

On one hand there is a definite Godward movement: the candidates offering of themselves to God in confirming, or ratifying of the Baptismal vows taken on their behalf in infancy by their parents. On the other hand there is an equally clear manward movement in which God confirms, or strengthens (βεβαίωω) the candidates by His Holy Spirit to carry out the vows they have taken. While the manward movement follows the Godward in sequence they are not to be thought of as entirely separate in content, or in any sense opposed to each other. Thus the Holy Spirit that 'strengthens' the candidates in the prayer and laying-on of hands of the presbyter in the Scottish and Greek Churches (and of the Bishop in the Anglican and Roman Churches) is the same Holy Spirit that moved the hearts of the candidates and brought them to this point. Neither is the manward movement of the Holy Spirit in Confirmation to be thought of as acting independently of the desire of the candidates to receive it. If the human act of will (in Confirmation the decision to ratify the vows; in the Eucharist the offering of ourselves) is overstressed, the rite will not do justice to the role of Divine grace. If the Divine graciousness (in Confirmation the strengthening power of the Holy Spirit; in the Eucharist the reception of communion) is stressed to such an extent that there is scant recognition of the necessity for human dedication, the rite will savour of superstition.

3. THE EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE AND ITS ESCHATOLOGICAL GOAL.

In dealing with the way sacrifice and communion in the Eucharist belong together, it is important to realize that they are held together in a proper balance above all by their respective roles in proclaiming the death of Christ to the world. Christ's death was no isolated event, but a victory of far-reaching consequence. Not only mankind, but the whole creation is affected by that victory,(41) yet it is only in the Church that Christ's victory is acknowledged. That acknowledgement, in the form of proclamation, is the very raison d'être of the Church. In this connection the Church has an important office to discharge on behalf of the whole creation.(42) But 'the voice of creation is dumb apart from man made in God's image.... Creation becomes articulated in and through man.'(43) Men, Christian men, must act, therefore, as the priests of creation, (44) and offer and present to God the Creator and the Redeemer the obedience of the members of the New Creation in token of the full obeisance of the world that will come to pass at the eschatological dénouement.(45) Nowhere is this Lordship of Christ over our common life more vividly manifested than in the Godward movement of the Eucharist. The fact that members of

(41) Cullmann, op.cit., p.185; A.D. Galloway, The Cosmic Christ, pp.47-51.

(42) Cullmann, op.cit., pp.187-188.

(43) Thornton, op.cit., p.358.

(44) Hicks, op.cit., p.338; R.S. Simpson, Ideas in Corporate Worship, p.36; c.f. Cullmann, op.cit., pp.101-103.

(45) Romans 8:19-25.

the Church bring their devotion, their hopes and fears, their souls and bodies(46) to be transformed, is a declaration to the Church and to the world of the end for which all things exist - their being gathered up into the fullness which is in Christ. While the Godward movement in the Eucharist is an action of man, 'It is God who incites us to give, to suffer, and to adore; and He blesses, accepts and uses all we offer.'(47) By the power of the Holy Spirit helping our infirmities we yield to God in our Eucharistic offering the homage that will be rendered by all creation when it comes to its consummation in Christ, 'that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven, and things in earth, and things under the earth; and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.'(48)

The eschatological significance of the manward aspect of the Eucharist is also great. It was at the supper in Emmaus on the evening of the third day after His death that Jesus appeared to His disciples bringing them the assurance of His resurrection. The disciples' recognition of Him came only through their 'joint-

(46) 'It is significant that where we today would speak of "the communicants" the members of the Primitive Church spoke of "the offerers". In those days no greater punishment could be meted out to an unfaithful Christian than to forbid him "to offer". The very fact that we no longer use this term, but speak rather of "going to Communion," suggests the great changes that have taken place in church life and practice.'

Wyon, op.cit., p.61.

(47) Wyon, op.cit., p.118.

(48) Phil. 2:10-11.

participation' with Him (49) in the four actions that were basic to the Last Supper and to the Church's Eucharist: 'And it came to pass that as he sat at meat with them, he took bread, and blessed it, and brake, and gave to them. And their eyes were opened, and they knew him.' (50)

The consciousness of the presence of Christ with His own was of tremendous significance in Primitive Christian worship. It was Christ's presence that carried them back to 'the same night in which he was betrayed' when 'he took bread....', (51) and back to the Easter supper, and it was a foretaste of the Messianic banquet to come at the Second Advent. It was also a strengthening of the Church to enable her to press on to the eschatological goal without fainting. 'From this point of view every Eucharist is a miracle of feeding in the wilderness like that wherein the Lord fed the five thousand Galileans. It is a provision of manna for those who have not yet reached the promised land.' (52) With them was Christ: before them the assurance of the full manifestation of His glory. Herein lies the significance of what is probably the most ancient liturgical prayer surviving, 'Maranatha', almost certainly having a double meaning: 'Come to us who are assembled in thy name,' and 'Come finally at the end.' (53)

(49) Moffatt's rendering of $\kappa\omicron\iota\nu\nu\acute{\alpha}$.

(50) Luke 24:30-31a.

(51) I Cor. 11:23.

(52) L.S. Thornton, op.cit., p.337.

(53) Cullmann, op.cit., pp.74,155-156; Also Higgins, op.cit., p.60; and Moffatt, op.cit., p.169.

The eschatological aspect of the Eucharist, in the offering of ourselves for the coming of the Kingdom, and in our meeting with the Lord who shall come again, unites both movements in the Eucharistic sacrifice and directs them to their goal in the consummation of all things in Christ.

 B I B L I O G R A P H Y.

- Aulén, Gustaf, The Faith of the Christian Church.
Muhlenberg Press, Philadelphia, 1948.
- Baillie, D.M., God was in Christ.
Faber and Faber, London, 1948.
- Baillie, John, Invitation to Pilgrimage.
O.U.P., London, 1942.
- Balmford, H., A Note on the Eucharist.
Theology, May, 1953.
- Barth, Karl, The Knowledge of God and the Service of God. Gifford
Lectures, 1938.
Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1938.
- Barth, Karl, Credo.
Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1936.
- Bates, J.M., A Manual of Doctrine.
Presbyterian Bookroom, Christchurch, N.Z., 1950.
- Bedale, Stephen S.S.M., The Eucharist and the Heavenly Ministry
of our Lord.
Theology, August, 1953.
- Brilioth, Yngve., Eucharistic Faith and Practice Evangelical
and Catholic.
S.P.C.K., London, 1930.
- Cairns, D., David Cairns. An Autobiography.
S.C.M. Press, London, 1950.
- Calvin, John, Institutes of the Christian Religion, Translated
by John Allen.
Westminster Press, Philadelphia, 1936.
- Chapman, C.T., The Conflict of the Kingdoms.
Hutchison's University Library, 1951.

- Cullmann, Oscar, Christ and Time.
S.C.M. Press, London, 1951.
- Cullmann, Oscar, Le Culte dans l'Eglise Primitive.
Delachaux and Niestlé, Neuchâtel.
- Cooper, James, The Ascension of our Lord in Kindness to the Dead and Other Discourses.
S.P.C.K., London, 1924.
- Cranfield, C.E.B., Thank, Thanksgiving in Richardson's T.W.B.
S.C.M. Press, London, 1950.
- Davidson, A.B., The Epistle to the Hebrews.
T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1882.
- Davidson, A.B., The Theology of the Old Testament.
T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1904.
- Davidson, Nevile, The Place of the Sacraments in the Life of the Church.
Scottish Church Service Society Annual, 1951.
- de Lubac, Henri S.J., Catholicism.
Burns, Oates and Washbourne, London, 1950.
- Dickie, J., The Organism of Christian Truth.
James Clarke, London, 1930.
- Dix, Dom Gregory, The Shape of the Liturgy.
Dacre Press, Westminster, 1945.
- Dodd, C.H., The Bible and the Greeks.
Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1935.
- Dodd, C.H., The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments.
Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1936.
- Dodd, C.H., The Epistle of Paul to the Romans.
Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1932.
- Forsyth, P.T., The Church and the Sacraments.
Independent Press, London, 1917.
- Forsyth, P.T., The Cruciality of the Cross.
Independent Press, London, 1909.
- Galloway, A.D., The Cosmic Christ.
Nisbet, London, 1951.

- Garrett, T.S., The Liturgy of the Church of South India.
- Gayford, S.C., Priesthood and Sacrifice.
Methuen, London.
- Gore, Charles, The Body of Christ.
John Murray, London, 1907.
- Goudge, H.L., Sacrifice in the Old Testament in Report of the
Anglo-Catholic Congress, 1927.
Society of St. Peter and St. Paul, London, 1927.
- Hebert, A.G., Liturgy and Society.
Faber and Faber, London, 1935.
- Hebert, A.G., The Authority of the Old Testament.
Faber and Faber, London, 1947.
- Hebert, A.G., Atonement, Memorial in Richardson's T.W.B.
S.C.M. Press, London, 1950.
- Hicks, F.C.N., The Fullness of Sacrifice.
S.P.C.K., London, 1930.
- Higgins, A.J.B., The Lord's Supper in the New Testament.
S.C.M. Press, London, 1952.
- Hislop, D.H., Our Heritage in Public Worship.
T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1935.
- Hoskyns, E.C., The Fourth Gospel.
Faber and Faber, London, 1940.
- Hunter, A.M., The Work and Words of Jesus!
S.C.M. Press, London, 1950.
- James, E.O., The Idea of Sacrifice outside Christianity in
Report of the Anglo-Catholic Congress, 1927.
Society of St. Peter and St. Paul, London, 1927.
- Jeremias, Joachim, The Last Supper.
Journal of Theological Studies, Vol. L, Jan., 1949.
- Knight, G.A.F., A Biblical Approach to the Doctrine of the
Trinity.
Scottish Journal of Theology Occ. Papers No.I, Oliver
and Boyd, Edinburgh, 1953.

- Lattay, Cuthbert S.J., Sacrament and Sacrifice : II. A Catholic View.
Hibbert Journal, Jan., 1942.
- Lowther Clarke, W.K., Divine Humanity.
S.P.C.K., London, 1936.
- McArthur, A. Allan, The Evolution of the Christian Year.
S.C.M. Press, London, 1953.
- Mackintosh, H.R., The Divine Initiative.
S.C.M. Press, London, 1921.
- Mackintosh, H.R., The Christian Experience of Forgiveness.
Nisbet, London, 1927.
- MacLeod, George, We Shall Re-build.
The Iona Community, Glasgow.
- MacLeod, John, The Gospel in the Institution of the Lord's Supper.
James MacLehose and Sons, Glasgow, 1907.
- Macmurray, J., The Clue to History.
S.C.M. Press, London, 1938.
- Manson, William, Jesus the Messiah, The Cunningham Lectures, 1940.
Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1943.
- Manson, William, The Epistle to the Hebrews.
Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1951.
- Martin, Hugh (ed.), The Holy Communion, A Symposium.
S.C.M. Press, London, 1947.
- Masure, Eugène, The Christian Sacrifice.
Burns, Oates and Washbourne, London, 1944.
- Maxwell, W.D., Concerning Worship.
O.U.P., London, 1948.
- Maxwell, W.D., An Outline of Christian Worship.
O.U.P., London, 1936.
- Maxwell, W.D., The Elements of Liturgy: Reformed in Ways of Worship.
S.C.M. Press, London, 1951.
- Maxwell, W.D., Some Inner Aspects of the Action at the Lord's Supper.
Scottish Church Service Society Annual, May, 1952.

- Miller, C.F., Prayers for Parish Worship.
O.U.P., London, 1948.
- Milligan, William, The Ascension of Christ, Baird Lectures, 189.
- Milligan, George, The Theology of the Epistle to the Hebrews.
T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1899.
- Moffatt, James, The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians.
Hodder and Stoughton, London, 1938.
- Newbigin, J.E.L., The Re-union of the Church.
S.C.M. Press, London, 1948.
- Newbigin, J.E.L., The Household of God.
S.C.M. Press, London, 1953.
- North, C.R., Sacrifice, in Richardson's T.W.B.
S.C.M. Press, London, 1950.
- Otto, Rudolf, Religious Essays.
O.U.P., London, 1931.
- Otto, Rudolf, The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man.
S.C.M. Press, London, 1943.
- Oulton, J.E.L., Holy Communion and Holy Spirit.
S.P.C.K., London.
- Pittenger, W.N., The Christian Sacrifice.
O.U.P., New York, 1951.
- Preston, R.H. and Hanson, A.T., The Revelation of Saint John
the Divine.
S.C.M. Press, London, 1949.
- Quick, O.C., The Christian Sacraments.
Nisbet, London, 1927.
- Ramsey, A.M., Ascension, in Richardson's T.W.B.
S.C.M. Press, London, 1950.
- Rawlinson, A.E.J., The Gospel According to St. Mark.
Methuen, London, 1925.
- Rawlinson, A.E.J., The New Testament Doctrine of Christ,
Bampton Lectures, 1926.
Longmans, London, 1926.

- Richardson, A. (ed.), A Theological Word Book of the Bible,
(Referred to in the footnotes as Richardson's T.W.B.)
S.C.M. Press, London, 1950.
- Riddell, J.G., What We Believe.
C. of S. Comm. on Publications, Edinburgh, 1937.
- Robinson, J.A.T., The Body. A Study in Pauline Theology.
S.C.M. Press, London, 1952.
- Rowley, H.H., The Meaning of Sacrifice in the Old Testament.
Bulletin of the John Rylands Library, Vol.33, No. 1,
Sept., 1950.
- Rowley, H.H., Sacrament and Sacrifice : I. A Protestant View
of the Lord's Supper.
Hibbert Journal, Jan., 1942.
- Sanday, W., Different Conceptions of Priesthood and Sacrifice -
Report of a Conference, Oxford, December, 1899.
Longmans, London, 1900.
- Scott, W.M.F., The Eucharist and the Heavenly Ministry of our
Lord.
Theology, Feb., 1953.
- Scott, W.M.F., The Eucharist and the Heavenly Ministry of our
Lord. A Reply.
Theology, October, 1953.
- Selwyn, E.G., The Christian Sacrifice in the Eucharist in Report
of the Anglo-Catholic Congress, 1927.
Society of St. Peter and St. Paul, London, 1927.
- Skinner, J., Prophecy and Religion.
C.U.P., Cambridge, 1948.
- Simpson, R.S., Ideas in Corporate Worship, Chalmers Lectures, 1928.
T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1927.
- Snaith, N.H., The Priesthood and the Temple in A Companion to the
Bible, ed. T.W. Manson.
T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1947.
- Spens, Will, The Eucharist in Essays Catholic and Critical,
ed. E.G. Selwyn.
S.P.C.K., London, 1929.
- Sprott, G.W., Worship and Offices of the Church of Scotland.
Wm. Blackwood, Edinburgh, 1882.

- Stone, Darwell, A History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist,
(2 vols.)
London, 1909.
- Taylor, F.J., Body, Passover, in Richardson's T.W.B.
S.C.M. Press, London, 1950.
- Taylor, Vincent, Jesus and His Sacrifice.
MacMillan, London, 1937.
- Taylor, Vincent, The Atonement in New Testament Teaching.
Epworth Press, London, 1940.
- Temple, William, Readings in St. John's Gospel.
MacMillan, London, 1947.
- Thornton, L.S., The Common Life in the Body of Christ.
Dacre Press, Westminster, 1942.
- Thurian, Max, Joie du Ciel sur la Terre.
Delachaux and Niestlé, Neuchâtel, 1946.
- Thurian, Max, La Vie Liturgique.
Verbum Caro, Vol.V (Nos.17-20), 1951.
- Torrance, T.F., Eschatology and the Eucharist in Intercommunion.
S.C.M., London, 1952.
- Torrance, T.F., Where do we go from Lund?
Scottish Journal of Theology, 6/1.
- Torrance, T.F., Liturgy and Apocalypse.
Scottish Church Service Society Annual, 1954.
- Underhill, Evelyn, Worship.
Nisbet, London, 1936.
- Vonier, Anscar O.S.B., A Key to the Doctrine of the Eucharist.
Burns, Oates and Washbourne, 1925.
- Westcott, B.F., Hebrews.
MacMillan, London, 1889.
- Wotherspoon, H.J., Religious Values in the Sacraments.
T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1928.
- Wotherspoon, H.J., The Divine Service.
London, 1929.

- Wyon, Olive, The Altar Fire.
S.C.M. Press, London, 1954.
- Young, Ivan R., Eucharistic Worship in The Church of God : an Anglo-Russian symposium.
S.P.C.K., London, 1934.
- Zernov, Nicholas, The Place of the Sacraments in the Life of the Eastern Christians.
Scottish Church Service Society Annual, May, 1938.
- ↙ The Book of Common Order of the Church of Scotland.
O.U.P., Oxford, 1940.
- Encyclopaedia Biblica, (ed. T.K. Cheyne and J.S. Black).
A. and C. Black, London, 1899.
- Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics, (ed. J. Hastings).
T. and T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1908.
- The Temple Dictionary of the Bible, (ed. W. Ewing and J.E.H. Thomson).
Dent, London, 1910.
- The Confession of Faith, (The Westminster Confession, 1647).
Blackwood, Edinburgh, 1944.