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Introduction

Whether or not Christ is sacramentally offered to the Father in the Eucharistic celebration, as the Roman Catholic Church teaches,1 is one of the major points of controversy between Lutheran and Roman Catholic theology.2 In this essay I intend to show that a sacrificial view of the Eucharist is compatible with Lutheran theology. The Roman Catholic doctrine can be broken down into five different pieces, of which I will analyse and discuss the second, third and fourth in more detail: (1) the glorified Christ is truly present in the Eucharistic elements; (2) Christ offers himself eternally in the heavenly sanctuary; (3) the Eucharistic celebration is a participation in this ‘heavenly liturgy’; (4) the Church participates in Christ through her offering of thanks and praise and gives herself to the Father, through the Son, in the Holy Spirit; and (5) the priest is the main Eucharistic celebrant and operates in persona Christi as he offers the Eucharistic prayer. I will not discuss the first and fifth points beyond mentioning that in both Lutheran and Roman Catholic theology, there is an insistence on the real and personal presence of Christ in the Eucharistic elements,3 and a belief that the priest liturgically (as well as pastorally) operates in persona Christi,4 which is sufficient for my treatment here. Martin Luther opposed this notion of sacrifice, and in 1523, he revised the Mass and introduced his Formula missae.5 According to Frank C. Senn, it was a conservative revision, using Latin, allowing the “use of lights, incense, and vestments,” largely following “the traditional Western structure, sequence, and content of the Mass,” and was “characterized not by what Luther added to the traditional Mass, but by what he deleted.”6 Luther removed the Offertory and radically revised the Eucharistic prayer or Canon. In his removal of the Offertory, Luther, “urged the replacement of the material offerings with “spiritual sacrifices”.” We should, Luther said, offer “ourselves, and all that we have, with constant prayer,” so that God “may make of us what he will, according to his own pleasure,” and we ought to “offer him praise and thanksgiving with our whole heart.”7 Senn makes the point that the offering of material things gained traction with Ireneus and his fight against the Gnostics. Defending the goodness of creation, Ireneus makes the point that the Lord taught his disciples “to offer God the firstfruits of creation – not as if He Himself had need of
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5 Pelikan & Lehmann, Luther’s Works (LW), 53:15-40.51-90, including the later Deutsche Messe. Also see LW 35.62-65.94-102; 36.137-198. For later volumes (56-75), see the Prospectus from Concordia Publishing House, 2007, accessed via the blog The Rebel God (http://goo.gl/i0BA1I).
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7 Senn, “Martin Luther’s Revision of the Eucharistic Canon,” 110, see. 110-111.
them, but in order that they be not ungrateful and unfruitful.” And, with reference to the institution narrative, he wrote that the Church “offers Him [Christ] to God, Him who is nourishing us; these are the first-fruits of His gift in the New Covenant.” This is “a marked change in the understanding of the Eucharist as a result of the threat of Gnosticism,” and the following (third) century saw the introduction of the Offertory, and a change in terminology from eucharistia, the ‘preferred term’ in the first two centuries of the Church, to oblatio and sacrificium. Senn goes on to make the point that Luther, with his limited knowledge of the Early Church and his polemic against the notion of the Mass as a propitiatory sacrifice, removed the Offertory, but that we ought to restore the Offertory in Lutheran churches, maintaining that it is the ‘spiritual sacrifice’ of the people, in part to “combat the “gnosticism” or “spiritualism” which is latent in much Protestant piety.”

According to Confessio Augustana, the early Lutherans claimed to be apostolic and catholic: “[T]here is nothing [in art. I-XXI] that varies from the Scriptures, or from the Church Catholic, or from the Church of Rome as known from its writers” (the Church Fathers). The Fathers had a a relatively strong ‘consensus’ on the ‘Eucharistic sacrifice.’ Before Ireneus, in the second century, we find Justin Martyr, talking of “all the sacrifices in this name which Jesus appointed to be performed, viz. in the eucharist of the bread and the cup, and which are celebrated in every place by Christians,” and who identifies the Eucharist with the ‘pure offering’ of the prophet Malachi. Then, in the fourth century, more than a century after Ireneus, we find Cyril of Jerusalem, describing the Eucharist as ‘the spiritual sacrifice,’ ‘the unbloody service,’ ‘the holy and most awful sacrifice’ and ‘the sacrifice of propitiation.’ He even goes on to say that “intercession may be offered for the dead as well as the living while the dread victim lies before us, for what we offer is ‘Christ slain on behalf of our sins, propitiating the merciful God on behalf both of them and of ourselves’.” This is clearly a development, and in this essay I intend to explore this, from a Lutheran perspective. One of the key characteristics of Lutheran theology is its rootedness in the Incarnation, where, in the terminology of the Chalcedonian Definition, there is both a definite separation (“inconfusedly, unchangeably”) and a close union (“indivisibly, inseparably”) between God and creation, characterised by God as giver and creation as receiver, but which does no rule out that creation (humans) can, in any way, be involved as a cooperater. I do not intend here to analyse this in and of itself, to analyse Luther’s revisions, or to primarily work with historical theology, but to discuss the sacrificial nature of the Eucharist with these points in mind. This essay is a development of some of the themes in my master’s thesis, with the intent to systematically and critically analyse and discuss this theme from the perspective of (contemporary) Lutheran theology, with its emphasis on God as giver and human beings as receivers, focusing on Wolfhart Pannenberg, in critical dialogue with Roman Catholic theology, represented by Joseph Ratzinger. Pannenberg notes that “ecumenical discussion has even reached understanding on [the topic of the sacrificial nature of the Eucharist],” which “is to be celebrated as a remembrance of the unique sacrifice of Christ on the cross, and, through that remembering, the celebrants allow themselves to be drawn into Christ’s giving of his life.” And Ratzinger notes that Luther’s concern was that we
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10 CI XXI
13 Kelly, Early Christian Doctrines, 196.
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ought to say that Christ’s saving deed is “the once for all sufficient sacrifice in which God gives us, instead of the futility of our worship, the true, propitiatory sacrifice,” and that Christian worship can therefore “no longer consist in the offering of one’s own gifts,” but is rather “the reception of [this saving deed],” characterized by thanksgiving, Eucharistia.17 Lutheran theologian John T. Pless disagrees, noting that “Christ crucified is not a work we offer to God,” that modern talk of representation “still leaves the traffic moving in the wrong direction, from earth to heaven,” and that “[t]he mingling of the once-and-for-all sacrifice of Christ and the ongoing sacrifices of the Christian individually and corporately is to confuse law and gospel, sanctification and justification.”18 In this essay I intend to show that Pless is mistaken, primarily by discussing the Church’s sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving and the Sacrifice of Christ. It is my thesis that, focusing on the Church’s sacrifice of thanks and praise, understood as participation in Christ, there is a clear connection, in both Lutheran and Roman Catholic theology, between eucharistia, oblation, and sacrificium, and that this can be defended while respecting the integrity of the Lutheran faith (and the Church Catholic as a whole). With this in mind, let’s return to the main point, starting with the Church’s sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.

The Church’s sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving

According to Benedictine theologian Cyprian Vagaggini, the main pattern of worship within Christianity is from the Father, through Christ, in the Holy Spirit, to the Father.19 The divine persons have, or are given, specific tasks:20 “[Every] good thing comes to us from the Father, through the mediation of Jesus Christ His incarnate Son, by means of the presence in us of the Holy Spirit; and likewise, it is by means of the presence of the Holy Spirit, through the mediation of the incarnate Son, Jesus Christ, that everything returns to the Father,” expressed in Latin by Vagaggini: A Patre, per Filium eius, Jesum Christum, in Spiritu Sancto, ad Patrem. This gives us four prepositions: a, per, in, ad (from, by, in, to). Vagaggini points out that this scheme is found in different places throughout the New Testament, but his focus is on the liturgy and, specifically, the Eucharist.21 Writing within Roman Catholic tradition, Vagaggini points out that the Sacrifice of the Mass “is structured essentially on the Christological-Trinitarian perspective according to the scheme a, per, in, ad, and primarily in the extratrinitarian sense.” This “can be seen from the essential form of its central part, called the anaphora, canon, or Eucharistic prayer.”22 Here the Father is shown “as the principium a quo and the terminus ad quem of the Eucharistic action.”23 He is thus the one from whom the action originates and the one to whom the action aims. Christ is “the High Priest through whom we perform the same priestly action,” and the Holy Spirit “appears there as in quod [‘in whom’].”24 The point of Vagaggini is that the Church’s offering of anamnesis, of thanks and praise

18 Pless, “Can We Participate Liturgically in the Atonement?,” 45, 47.
19 Vagaggini, Theological Dimensions of the Liturgy, 191-246. Also see Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy, 243-255; Holter, Kom, tilhe med fryd, 90-91.
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22 Vagaggini, Theological Dimensions of the Liturgy, 223-230 focuses on the Roman Canon. It should be noted that Luther’ removal of the Offertory from (and his alteration of the Canon in) his masses is in tension with the ecumenical approach of CA, and its claim to follow the Church Fathers (art. XXI, see Pannenberg, “The Confessio Augustana as a Catholic Confession and a Basis for the Unity of the Church,” 27-45; Alfsvåg, “Luthersk spiritualitet,” 42-56). The fact remains that the various Offertory settings and the Roman Canon aren’t only explicitly sacrificial, they also predate the High Middle Ages by centuries, and are thus part of the age of the Church Fathers to whom CA appeal. See Vagaggini, Theological Dimensions of the Liturgy, 169-171; Jungmann, The Mass of the Roman Rite, vol. 1, 144-167 (esp. 60-66); Aquilina, The Mass of the Early Christians, 20-24.43-45.
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for what God has done, originates in the Father and is aimed back to him, through the Son, in the Holy Spirit.  

This largely reflects the position of both Pannenberg and Ratzinger, and especially the position made by (fairly) contemporary Lutheran theology, with emphasis on our liturgical actions as God’s (received) actions.  

Pannenberg emphasises our participation in Christ, where the Church’s offering back of praise and thanks is “a letting oneself be taken up into the actual sacrifice of Jesus Christ, not an additional offering to God,” since that would constitute “an additional work.”  

The Church’s thank offering is a participation in Christ, as he offers himself to the Father. It is not our offering “to God on the altar, by the hands of the human priest, of a holy gift different from ourselves,” but a participation in “the self-giving of Christ.” For, writes Pannenberg, “nothing effects participation in the body and blood of Christ but entering into that which we receive.”  

The major focus is thus on reception and participation. Pannenberg represents a middle ground between Trent and the reformers, noting that Trent “rightly opposed restricting the eucharistic gift to forgiveness of sins (DS, 1655),” and that Luther and the Lutheran reformation “was inclined one-sidedly to focus the gift and power of the Lord’s Supper on forgiveness of sins,” although Luther also wrote of “the nourishing and strenghtening of the new man as the power and usefulness of this sacrament.”  

Pannenberg’s notion of sacrifice focuses primarily on Christ’s giving of himself to us, and only secondarily and derivately to God. The sacrifice was his obedience to his mission, his performance of the Father’s will, and he focuses on the meal, while Ratzinger makes the point that the form of the Eucharistic celebration is the eucharistia, “the prayer of anamnesis in the shape of a thanksgiving,” and that this is “more prominent than the meal aspect.”  

Both Pannenberg and Ratzinger maintains the importance of both the meal and the thanksgiving, while Ratzinger stresses the latter more, an approach I agree with, although there need not be any contradiction.  

Citing German Lutheran theologian Hartmut Gese, Ratzinger focuses on Christ’s heavenly priesthood (to which I will return), and has made the point that the Last Supper is actually a thanksgiving sacrifice in the Old Testament tradition (a todah or tooda), in which Christ offers praise and thanks to God in the context of a meal. Our sacrifice is a participation in this, “the tōda of the risen One,” where we give ourselves to God.  

This approach, writes Ratzinger presents us with “new possibilities” for ecumenical dialogue, since it “gives us a genuinely New Testament concept of sacrifice that both preserves the complete Catholic inheritance (and imparts to it a new profundity) and, on the other hand, is receptive to Luther’s central intentions.”  

Ratzinger has since moved somewhat away from this approach, without abandoning it, combining the Passover and the thanksgiving sacrifice and still holding onto the eucharistia as the decisive form which ‘in-forms’ the Eucharist.

My discussion doesn’t present us with an ‘additional sacrifice’ on the part of the Church, but acknowledges that we participate in the thanksgiving of Christ, in his giving up of himself to the Father, which is marked in the institution of the Eucharist, finds its peak in the passion and crucifixion, and is offered, continuously, in heaven. What we partake of is Christ himself, and we ought not overemphasise the Cross to the exclusion of the Incarnation and earthly life of Christ. The Eucharistic celebration is a sacrifice in the form of thanksgiving. It is a participation in God’s self-giving, where we give ourselves back to God not as ‘striving,’ but as a giving back of what God has already given, as Ratzinger notes: “God gives that we may give. This is the essence of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, of the sacrifice of Jesus Christ; from the earliest times, the Roman Canon has expressed it thus: “De tuis donis ac datis offerimus tibi”—from your gifts and offerings we offer you.” Even when talking of active participation, Ratzinger makes the point that this isn’t primarily external but the an action “in which everyone has a ‘part’,” i.e. the Eucharistic prayer, which is “more than speech; it is actio in the highest sense of the word. For what happens in it is that the human actio (as performed hitherto by the priests in the various religions of the world) steps back and makes way for the actio divina, the action of God.” Here we find a link to the Lutheran insistence on God as giver and human beings as receivers, communicated through Christ. Our actions, then, are really God’s, as St. Paul also notes (Phil. 2:12-13). With this we turn to Christ’s sacrifice as such.

The Sacrifice of Christ

Citing Norwegian Lutheran theologian Carl Fr. Wisløff, Frank C. Senn points out that the difference between the Roman Catholic Church and Luther, is that the former ‘defined sacrifice in an active sense as a yielding or resignation, whereas Luther defined sacrifice in a passive sense as essentially the death of the victim.” For the Catholic Church, the sacrifice of Christ was ‘compensation,’ while for Luther it was “Christ’s substitutionary suffering of the punishment for that sin for which no one could render a satisfactory compensation.” We see in the New Testament the claim that Christ bore our punishment, that he gave himself for us, as a sin offering. But Luther and Calvin, seeing themselves in the tradition of Anselm of Canterbury, saw this as a ‘transfer of penalty,’ as a ‘swap’ between Christ (who is punished in our place) and us (who are acquitted). According to Anselm, however, sin is atoned either through punishment (of the guilty party) or through reparation or satisfaction (by the guilty party or a representative), never through both. A person can thus atone for your punishment by some kind of satisfaction (e.g. paying your fine), but he cannot be punished as if he is guilty. According to Anselm, Christ satisfied God by offering something which was worth more than the punishment for our sins. He gave himself as a


36 Pannenberg, Systematic Theology, vol. 2, 297-324.416-454; Ratzinger, Behold The Pierced One, 103-128, in contrast to Pless, “Can We Participate Liturgically in the Atonement?,” 44-47.
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perfect offering, in obedience, thanks and praise. He was not talking about some ‘transfer of penalty.’ Anselm’s doctrine is characterised by its Feudal connections, but his principles state, in essence, that sin is that we do not offer that which we ought to offer to God (cf. sin as ‘missing the target’), and that Christ offered satisfaction, offered that which we do not. As N.T. Wright notes, Christ (the Messiah) is the substitute or representative of the people (Israel), but not their replacement.44 Christ is the representative of Israel, offering, in the words of Jeremy Begbie, “nonidolatrous worship … in the midst of creation, making possible the song of the church evoked in Revelation 5.”45 The point is thus not that God is a ‘bloodthirsty torturer’ out for his pound of flesh, but that he is just, and that Christ atones our sin and punishment. God “condemned sin,” not Christ himself.46 We ought to distinguish between being punished and (voluntarily) atoning for someone else’s punishment. The punishment Christ carried was the consequences of sin, carried voluntarily, and in love of God.

Furthermore, it would make little sense to say, with Paul, that “I have been crucified with Christ” if the point was that Christ were to ‘switch places’ with me. The point is not that Christ ‘replaced us,’ but that he was, and is, our representative in which we can participate and through whom we can offer ourselves to God.47 Pannenberg makes the point that if the crucifixion has an expiatory character, “there can be no cogent [Lutheran] objection to the idea that believing celebration and reception of the Supper give a share not only in the “fruit” of Christ’s offering but also in its enactment.”48 The key lies in the partly ‘deconstructed’ Anselmian view. For Pannenberg, Christ is our representative who atoned for our sins through obedience.49 He maintains the perfect nature of the sacrifice of Christ, but makes the point that this goes beyond the death of Christ and extends into eternity, into heaven:50

Hebrews … stresses not merely the once-for-allness and definitiveness of the sacrificial death of Jesus (9:26) but also the ongoing intercession of the risen Lord before God (v. 24). It thus gives us occasion to develop a view of his saving work or reconciling office that extends beyond the once-for-all event of the crucifixion.

The sacrifice of Christ, while complete, is everlasting, perpetual, and it’s continually being presented in heaven by Christ. Since Christ is personally present in the eucharistic elements, and his sacrifice is himself, this heavenly liturgy of Christ is made present in the Eucharistic celebration when he is made present. Pannenberg can talk of “penal suffering,”51 but for him that means Christ shares our ‘plight and condition,’ that he became incarnate as a real man, and that we partake of him, that we are crucified with him. This, and the idea that we are ‘in Christ,’ makes little sense if we maintain that we ‘switch places’ with Christ. This overlaps with Ratzinger’s view, which focuses on the critique of the Temple. Through an analysis of the late Jewish (and partly Hellenised) idea of Sacrifice, Ratzinger shows that Israel was gradually
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44 Wright, “Jesus, Israel and the Cross”; Wright, “The meaning of περὶ ἁμαρτίας in Romans 8.3.” For more (and diverse) perspectives on this, and on the distinction between representation and replacement, see Modalsli, Korsets gate, 103-107; Ratzinger, Collected Works, vol. 11, 20-22.27.29.34-36; Hahn, “Covenant, Cult, and the Curse-of-Death.”
beginning to grasp that the sacrifice pleasing to God is a man pleasing to God and that prayer, the grateful praise of God, is thus the true sacrifice in which we give ourselves back to him, thereby renewing ourselves and the world. The heart of Israel’s worship had always been what we express in the Latin word *memoriale: remembrance*.  

According to Ratzinger, Israel recognised gradually that the sacrifice pleasing to God is *our (living) selves*, not *our (dead) animals*, the latter of which cannot ever be anything more than a shadow, a ‘replacement.’  

Christ gave himself, but this cannot be reduced to the Cross. His death (and resurrection) is essentially connected to the institution of the Eucharist: “[In his eucharistic words, Christ] undergoes a spiritual death, or, to put it more accurately, *in these words Jesus transforms death into the spiritual act of affirmation, into the act of self-sharing love;* into the act of adoration, which is offered to God, then from God is made available to men.” Christ gave himself, and this self-sacrifice is, gracefully, made present to us. Ratzinger points out that the *eucharistic words* of Christ connects the Cross and the Eucharist. By these words of institution, “what is irrational is transformed and made rational and articulate.” By these words we see “how Jesus himself intended his death to be understood, how he accepted it, what it means.” Ratzinger points out elsewhere that “the true *semel* (‘once’) bears within itself the *semper* (‘always’),” that “[the] *ephapax* (‘Once For All’) is bound up with the *aiōnios* (‘everlasting’),” and that we, in the Eucharist, are “caught up and made contemporary with the Paschal Mystery of Christ, in his passing from the tabernacle of the transitory to the presence and sight of God.”

A major point here is that Christ still is an expiatory or propitiatory sacrifice. He bore the consequences of our sins, but he, who is without sin, gave himself in love and obedience, and this atoned for our sins, cf. Prov. 16:6a: “By loyalty and faithfulness iniquity is atoned for.” But it is crucial here to make a distinction, as we find in the Old Testament, between the *consecration* (the offering up of the sacrifice on the altar) and the *presentation* of the consecrated gift, which can (and do) continue, something we see in Christ’s self-presentation in the heavenly sanctuary. These two concepts are represented, in the *Septuagint*, by two respective verbs; *anaphérō* and *prosphérō*. Just like the High Priest of the Old Covenant didn’t offer another sacrifice when he entered the inner sanctum to present the consecrated gift of atonement, the two concepts are part of the same eternal sacrifice. “For Christ has entered, not into a sanctuary made with hands, a copy of the true one, but into heaven itself, now to appear in the presence of God on our behalf.” When Heb. 7:27 states that Christ sacrificed himself “once for all,” the verb is *anaphérō*, indicating the *one consecration* which cannot be repeated. In Heb. 8:3, however, we find *prosphérō*, indicating Christ’s heavenly, continuous and eternal self-presentation. This is part of the one and same sacrifice, which according to Paul Ellingworth, is “continuous rather than repeated.” Christ remains our High Priest and is thus our continual mediator.
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In regards to the distinction between consecration and presentation, we can thus maintain a partly ‘deconstructed’ Anselmian view where the sacrifice of Christ is first and foremost a sacrifice of thanks and praise which ‘satisfies’ God and which, consequently, atones for our sins. This sacrifice is complete, yet it is also perpetual and presented in heaven by Christ. He is personally present, and his sacrifice is himself. This heavenly liturgy of Christ is made present in the Eucharistic celebration. It is the “tōda of the risen One,” the ongoing offering of thanks an praise, cf. Heb. 8:1-3 (emphasis added).  

Now the point in what we are saying is this: we have such a high priest, one who is seated at the right hand of the throne of the Majesty in heaven, a minister in the sanctuary and the true tent which is set up not by man but by the Lord. For every high priest is appointed to offer gifts and sacrifices; hence it is necessary for this priest also to have something to offer.

**Conclusion**

Pannenberg asks: “Are we really to understand the Last Supper, the origin of the church’s Lord’s Supper, as an act of self-offering on Jesus’s part? And if so, in what sense?” To answer that, we need to consider the question of the atonement. If one follows Luther and Calvin strictly, saying, on the one hand, that you ‘switch places’ with Christ and, on the other hand, that the sacrifice is reducible to his death on the Cross, the Roman Catholic view makes little sense. Luther’s view, which were written polemically, maintains that any kind of ‘eucharistic sacrifice’ involving Christ would constitute another work on our part. He reduced the sacrifice of Christ to his death, and only accepted a ‘eucharistic sacrifice’ if this was, as Senn points out, a “sacrifice of prayer, praise, and thanksgiving” which might apply to Christ, “our only Mediator and Advocate,” so that he “may present it to the Father.” He “intercedes for us in heaven and makes our sacrifice acceptable to the Father. In this sense, however, we do not offer Christ; He offers us.” And, as noted in the introduction, we also find a critique of the Eucharistic sacrifice in John T. Pless, who disagrees with the idea discussed in this essay, saying that “Christ crucified is not a work we offer to God,” that modern talk of *representation* “still leaves the traffic moving in the wrong direction, from earth to heaven,” and that “[t]he mingling of the once-and-for-all sacrifice of Christ and the ongoing sacrifices of the Christian individually and corporately is to confuse law and gospel, sanctification and justification.”

These points however, are based on a misunderstanding of Roman Catholic teaching, though it may have been a proper reaction to certain theological theories at the time of the Reformation, and on a problematic view of the atonement which doesn’t acknowledge that sacrifice of Christ, in its atoning character, is a “sacrifice of prayer, praise, and thanksgiving.” The sacrifice of Christ is the sacrifice of humanity (which we wouldn’t, and couldn’t, offer ourselves, hence God becoming a human being). The whole of Christ’s life is sacrificial, and Christ is a sacrifice. When we partake of Christ, we also partake of the sacrifice, for he is presently and perpetually the sacrifice, and he
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presents himself continually in the heavenly sanctuary. And when the Roman Catholic Church claims that Christ is offered in the Eucharistic celebration, they say that the celebration is a participation in this ‘heavenly liturgy.’ This is perfectly compatible with Lutheran theology if we recognise that we participate, and see ourselves as receivers. Both Lutherans and Roman Catholics correlate here, in that they see the Eucharistic anamnesis not merely as a ‘recollection’ of a past event, but as a genuine making present of Christ, i.e. of his sacrifice, in the context of a meal. This sacrifice isn’t merely a past event, but a continuous reality, made present for us. As noted above, Pannenberg writes that “ecumenical discussion has even reached understanding on [the topic of the sacrificial nature of the Eucharist],” which “is to be celebrated as a remembrance of the unique sacrifice of Christ on the cross, and, through that remembering, the celebrants allow themselves to be drawn into Christ’s giving of his life.” When the Church offers herself, she praisefully and thankfully participates in this sacrifice, and the presiding priest offers this in the name of the Church, through Christ, in the Holy Spirit, which is compatible with the Lutheran emphasis on God as giver and human beings as receivers, where, in Christ, the divinity and humanity are united “inconfusedly, unchangedly, indivisibly, inseparably.” Our own sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving, which can take the form of gifts of bread and wine, lest we fall into a kind of Gnosticism, is nothing outside of Christ (cf. John 15:5), and would constitute a work on our part it removed from this. When Christ offers himself, he offers himself as both divine and human, and in the Eucharist we are also made partakers of this. We do not merely partake in the sacrifice of the Cross, or its fruit, through a sacrificial meal, but we partake in “its enactment.” It seems that Pless forgets that Christ is the principal celebrant of the liturgy, and that and our sacrifices are taken up into, and offered through, him (cf. 1Pet. 2:5). They may be ‘heavenward’ but so is any of our works. And none of them is of our own, “for God is at work in you, both to will and to work for his own pleasure” (Phil. 2:13).

If the Eucharistic celebration is a participation in the heavenly, ongoing and perpetual self-offering of Christ (cf. Heb. 8:1-3), then it follows that the Eucharistic celebration involves an actual offering of Christ, but not “an additional offering.” The Eucharistic celebration is both a sacrifice of thanks and praise, a participation in the self-offering of Christ, and a ‘spiritual meal of nourishment,’ where we recieve communion, fellowship, with God. “Eucharistia,” writes Ratzinger, “is the gift of communio in which the Lord becomes our food; it also signifies the self-offering of Jesus Christ, perfecting his trinitarian Yes to the Father by his consent to the Cross, and reconciling us all to the Father in this “sacrifice”. There is no opposition between “meal” and “sacrifice”; they belong inseparably together in the new sacrifice of the Lord.”

To put this is an ecumenical perspective, we ought again to point out that the early Lutherans saw themselves as part of the universal Church, Ecclesia Catholica, expressing that “that faith which has

70 Pannenberg, “The Confessio Augustana as a Catholic Confession and a Basis for the Unity of the Church,” 33-35; Pannenberg, “Ecumenical Tasks in Relationship to the Roman Catholic Church,” 171.
72 See n.14 above.
73 Cf. Senn, “Martin Luther’s Revision of the Eucharistic Canon,” 111-112.
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been believed everywhere, always, by all.”\textsuperscript{79} We see, furthermore, that \textit{Confessio Augustana} utilises explicitly sacrificial language as it calls priests and pastors \textit{sacerdos} and \textit{Priester}.\textsuperscript{80} It is my claim that (certain views of) the Sacrifice of the Mass can be defended theologically and historically, within Lutheranism. If we cannot accept this, we need to argue against the Roman Catholic (or Eastern Orthodox) view \textit{adequately} and \textit{coherently}. We must not make the catholic principle of \textit{Confessio Augustana} an empty rhetorical device, and we cannot reject something just because it is ‘too Roman.’ We must also have in mind the fact that certain Lutherans, such as members of the Church of Norway, as I share communion with the Church of England, and thus with the wider Anglican communion. The 1979 \textit{Elucidation} on ministry from the Anglican-Roman Catholic dialogue (ARCIC) state that “the ordained ministry is called priestly principally because it has a particular sacramental relationship with Christ as High Priest,” and that we are united “sacramentally with himself in his self-offering.”\textsuperscript{81} And the American Anglican–Roman Catholic dialogue affirms that “only a validly ordained priest can be the minister who, in the person of Christ, brings into being the sacrament of the Eucharist and \textit{offers sacramentally the redemptive sacrifice of Christ which God offers us},”\textsuperscript{82} The documents concludes that “in the light of these five affirmations [the American Anglican-Roman Catholic dialogue] records its conclusions that the eucharist as sacrifice is not an issue that divides our two Churches.”

This might be controversial but that is not a reason to reject it. This does’t constitute a ‘re-offering’ or ‘re-consecration’ of Christ, but a participation in him, and thus \textit{consequently} in his self-offering. The High Priest of the Old Covenant was the main celebrant of Israel, the one through whom the priests and Levites derived their service and the one through whom the people offered their gifts. Christ is High Priest of the New and Everlasting Covenant, and \textit{he} is our main celebrant. He is the one who consecrated himself to God “once for all”, the one who eternally presents his perfect offering in the heavenly sanctuary, and the one from whom every Christian, including priests and bishops, derive their calling to participate in \textit{his} mission; to offer humanity back to God.
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