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ABSTRACT

DANIEL BREVINT AND THE EUCHARISTIC CALVINISM OF THE CAROLINE CHURCH OF ENGLAND 1603-1674

A dissertation submitted in conformity with the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Theology, Faculty of Theology, Wycliffe College, Toronto School of Theology, University of Toronto by Eric Richard Griffin, March 2000.

The book The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice written by Daniel Brevint and published in 1673 strongly influenced the eucharistic theology of John and Charles Wesley. Although there has been much attention paid to the Wesleys, Brevint remains largely neglected among the seventeenth-century English divines, and there has been very little study of him. There have been three brief biographical notices, (Wood's Athenae Oxoniensig, Dictionary of National Biography, and the Dictionary of Jersey Biography), two studies of John Wesley's abridgement of the Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice, (Rattenbury 1948, McAdoo 1994) and a recent but very brief one on Brevint's book itself (Stevenson 1994).

This essay presents a revised biography of Brevint from primary sources, and orients his writings within those of the so-called Caroline Divines. A survey of the eucharistic theology of the seventeenth century will conclude that despite serious divisions in the Church of England between "Puritans" and "Laudians" over issues such as episcopal polity, eternal election, sabbatarianism, and set liturgies, inter alia, there was remarkable unanimity between them regarding the eucharist, both groups drawing very much on the tradition of Calvin; most of the differences which did exist are attributable to
the later divergence in the doctrine of election between "humanist Calvinism" and "scholastic Reformed Orthodoxy."

Analysis of the structure and theology of The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice shall demonstrate that Brevint's theology of the eucharist is consistent with the Calvinist sacramental consensus of the Caroline church, and expressed it in a form taken from Theodore Beza. Brevint thus stands as a tangible theological connection between Calvin and Wesley. Brevint's other two books were vehemently anti-Papal, and although such polemics were not uncommon, they were rarely as nasty.
His words in his Institutions and elsewhere are such, so comfortable to the style and mind of the ancient fathers, that no Catholic Protestant would wish to use any other.

John Cosin, on John Calvin

The whole (doctrine of Eucharist) was crowned by Peter Martyr, who left nothing more to be done.

John Calvin

The ancient church held the doctrine of a real presence without transubstantiation; and it is to antiquity that the Church of England makes her appeal.

Charles Gore
The Altar

A broken A L T A R, Lord, thy servant rears,
Made of a heart, and cemented with tears:
Whose parts are as thy hand did frame;
No workman's tool hath touched the same.

A H E A R T alone
Is such a stone,
As nothing but
Thy power doth cut.
Wherefore each part
Of my hard heart
Meets in this frame,
To praise thy Name:

That, if I chance to hold my peace,
These stones to praise thee may not cease.
Oh let thy blessed S A C R I F I C E be mine
And sanctify this A L T A R to be thine.

George Herbert (1633)
INTRODUCTION

The study of the theology of the seventeenth-century Church of England has customarily divided it into two opposed parties, the Calvinist "Puritans" and the Arminian "Laudians" or "Caroline Divines." Historical and theological scholarship of the past several decades has demonstrated the inadequacy and misleading character of these, now apparently unavoidable, labels.

The term "Caroline divines" has been in general use in Anglican theology and history for nearly 150 years. Older studies have generally excluded Calvinism as exerting any theological force among them, for example Cross' The Oxford Movement and the Seventeenth Century,¹ or Dugmore's Eucharistic Doctrine in England from Hooker to Waterland.² Haddan claimed in 1870 that among their best achievements was the purging of Calvinism from the Church of England.³ The Laudians have been generally categorized as "antiCalvinist" and therefore "Arminian" even in very modern discussions, particularly those by


Tyacke, Lake, Fincham and Hughes. It will be shown, however, that the eucharistic theology of the Caroline Divines conformed much more to Calvin's own position than has been generally recognized.

Puritan theology has been commonly understood to be Calvinistic, and opposed to that of the "Caroline divines." Recent studies such as those by Kendall, Holifield and White, amongst others, particularly concerning the Westminster Assembly, reveal instead that the work of Beza became the Puritan standard; Puritan thought developed away from Calvin's own, although it came to be understood as "orthodox" or "high" Calvinism. In following this shift away from Calvin's humanism towards Beza's application of scholastic method in Reformed theology, they had ceased to be truly in sympathy with the spirit of Calvin, regarding election and grace at the least, and this turn may well account for much of the conflict between the Puritans and the Laudians. Moreover, certain unresolved tensions within the thought of Calvin himself have contributed to the differing theological opinions within the seventeenth-century Church of England.

Daniel Brevint, Dean of Lincoln and Prebendary of Durham (1616-1695), was, like most Jerseymen, both a Royalist as well as a convinced Calvinist Presbyterian member of the Church of England. He was, however, hostile to


the Puritans. The fact that he is not easily categorized shows that the
categories themselves, which at times may seem to be indispensable, often
create more problems than they solve.

My first interest in Brevint arose when researching on the high
sacramentalism of John Wesley: Brevint's devotional manual *The Christian
Sacrament and Sacrifice* was published in 1673, and became very popular, going
into three editions during Brevint's own lifetime, reprinted three more times
during the eighteenth century, and again in 1847. It strongly influenced the
eucharistic theology of Charles and John Wesley, who used an abridgement of it
as the preface to their enormously popular *Hymns on the Lord's Supper*, which
was itself inspired, both in form and content, by Brevint's book. Despite the
huge corpus of Wesley studies, Brevint remains largely neglected among the
seventeenth century divines.

This is not to say that he has had no other admirers: Bishops George
Hickes and Daniel Waterland admired and recommended his work, this book in
particular, and quoted him in their own; and some passages from *The Christian
Sacrament and Sacrifice* were reproduced by Pusey in *Tract 81*. There has also
been some small recent notice of him, but none of his work has been reprinted
since 1847, and no dedicated study of him has come to press.

This dissertation is a study of the English eucharistic theology of the
first half of the seventeenth century and the place of Brevint's thought in
relation to it. I assert that despite serious divisions in the Church of England
between "Puritans" and "Laudians" over issues such as episcopal polity, eternal
election, sabbatarianism, set liturgies, the surplice, wedding rings, and
kneeling for communion, *inter alia*, there was remarkable theological unanimity
between them regarding the doctrine of the eucharist. This unanimity was to a
very large degree the same as that shared by Calvin, Bucer, Martyr, Jewel, and others of the sixteenth-century "Rhineland consensus."

I shall demonstrate that his *Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice* is entirely within the mainstream of Caroline theology of the eucharist, in which I include the thought of those called the Puritans. Many, if not most, of the arguments and illustrative examples used by Brevint are also to be found in Andrewes, Cosin, Taylor, and other "high church" writers, as well as in the works of Puritans such as Perkins, Baxter, Hildersam, Sibbes, and other conforming, or "moderate Puritans." It is the thesis of this essay that the work of Daniel Brevint, therefore, typifies the eucharistic theology of the English divines of the Caroline period, and his devotional manual became so popular and influential precisely because it represented, and shared much in common with, the best eucharistic writing of the time.

The first chapter is a new biography of Daniel Brevint drawn from primary sources, supplementing and correcting those which at present are available, including a survey of his publishing history and an examination of the use made of his work by later writers.

The second chapter is a survey of historical and theological work published on the Caroline Divines, beginning with John Henry Newman's "invention" of the category. Particular attention will be paid to those studies of the sacramental theology of both them and the Puritans, concluding with a discussion of how "Calvinism" had evolved into two separate traditions based on the prominence attributed to the doctrine of election. Chapter Three describes in general terms the theology of the Eucharist first of Calvin and Jewel, second of the "Caroline Divines," and third of the English Puritans, concluding that
their teaching has much more in common than has generally been assumed, although each group has its own characteristic emphases.

Chapter Four examines Brevint's eucharistic thought as it is found in The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice, and orients his writing within the dominant themes of eucharistic teaching of the Caroline Church of England. A close analysis of the theology of The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice will demonstrate that Brevint's Huguenot Calvinism is consistent with the uniformly Calvinist sacramental thought of the theologians of the Caroline Church, both "Laudian" and "Puritan." The form in which this theology is presented is taken from Theodore Beza, which seems to be Brevint's unique contribution to Caroline divinity.

In point of fact little explicit work has been done on the theology of the Caroline Divines, even less on their doctrine of the Holy Eucharist; and only one small work, now rare and neglected, has ever recognized their Calvinist unanimity. Furthermore, that which has been done has generally adopted the Tractarian perspective, omitting the Puritans as an aberration from the true path of Anglican identity as though they were not members of the Caroline Church of England; Stone, Dugmore, More and Cross, and others, simply ignored them in their studies.  

Brevint does have a small modern following. William Crockett has included brief references to Brevint in a couple of his works; 7 Kenneth


Stevenson believes that Brevint's "...Huguenot roots and the tradition he helped to inspire in the Wesley brothers mark him off as a figure of considerable ecumenical significance." Moreover H.R. McAdoo has observed that Brevint's language surrounding the theology of the eucharistic elements and the concept of "value" have much in common with modern ecumenical conversations concerning the Holy Communion, concluding that "his theology of the eucharist has anticipatory individuality worthy of note." It is now more than fifty years since Rattenbury's study of the Wesleys' Hymns on the Lord's Supper, which examined only the abridgement of Brevint's book. Since Brevint was so influential, though indirectly, on both Methodist devotion through Wesley and Anglican teaching via Waterland; since his work is representative of both the "Caroline" and "Puritan" traditions; and since The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice represents a tangible and important theological link between John Calvin, Theodore Beza, and John Wesley, a specific study of Brevint addresses an important lacuna in Anglican historical theology.

---


CHAPTER ONE

DANIEL BREVINT: A NEW BIOGRAPHY

"His Majesty to-day called me, your proxy, in while the Deanery of Lincoln was in dispute. I did you all the right I was able, but his Majesty in a very few words expressed a great value for your merits."

Sir Leoline Jenkins to Daniel Brevint, Oct. 13, 1681

The name of Daniel Brevint, D.D. (1617-1695), prebendary of Durham and Dean of Lincoln, has not been prominent within the usual canon of the "Caroline Divines." In 1797 when George Whitfield sold John Wesley's abridgement of Brevint's most famous book, The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice, Wesley was duly accredited with the abridgement, but Brevint himself was reduced to simply "...a late author."¹ Nevertheless, Brevint greatly influenced later writers, John and Charles Wesley in particular. As Rattenbury has demonstrated, the outline and structure of their Hymns on the Lord's Supper intentionally matches that of Brevint's The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice, and the Methodist hymns themselves represent much of its content.²


² Rattenbury, Eucharistic Hymns, 1948.
"No adequate understanding of the Eucharistic teaching of the Wesleys is possible without it." 3

Bishop Daniel Waterland ("a cautious and cold theologian of the eighteenth century" 4) was a great admirer of Brevint, and Waterland's A Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist 5 was a standard textbook in Anglican theological schools until the late nineteenth century. Thus Brevint's subsequent influence on generations of Christians has been significant, if indirect.

There has been over the years comparatively little study of Brevint himself, although his name crops up from time to time. The standard sources are the notice in the Dictionary of National Biography, 4 which largely depends on Wood's Athenae Oxonienses, 7 both of which contain some degree of error; and his notice in Balleine's Biographical Dictionary of Jersey, which is not everywhere available, and draws heavily on the DNB. All three of these notices are only a few paragraphs long.

---

3 Ibid., vii.


5 Daniel Waterland, A Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist, as laid down in Scripture and Antiquity (Cambridge: for Corn. Crownfield and W. Innys, 1737); it was reprinted as A Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist with Four Charges to the Clergy of Middlesex connected with the same subject, ed. Bishop van Mildert (Oxford: Clarendon, 1880, repr. 1896).


7 Anthony a Wood, Athenae Oxonienses: an exact history of all the writers and Bishops who have had their education in the University of Oxford, 3d ed. (London: Rivington, 1813-1820).

8 This draws both on the DNB and J.A. Messervy, "Notice sur la Famille Brevint," VIIème Bulletin de la Société Jersiaise, 39-46. This latter source is occasionally anecdotal, and needs to be used with some reserve.
Examinations of Brevint's theology include Rattenbury's study of the Wesleys' abridgement of *The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice* and their adaptation of it in their eucharistic hymns, a brief examination in Crockett's *Eucharist: Symbol of Transformation*, an essay by McAdoo comparing the Wesleys, Brevint and Jeremy Taylor, and Stevenson's short survey of *The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice*.

It would be an error to romanticize Brevint as a pious, dutiful, long-suffering scholar/pastor, loyal to the church in persecution. It is not possible to identify such character virtues, should he have had them. There is, however, some evidence to show that he might well have been a social-climbing, tight-fisted, ecclesial opportunist, who had little compunction in shirking his clerical responsibilities for the jollities of Society. Although it was said of Richard Montagu "very sharp the nib of his pen, and much gall in his ink," it may fairly be said that Brevint had a talent for a jeering, nasty turn of phrase. Nevertheless, despite these suspected personal vices, *The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice* is a splendid book, and the course and events of Brevint's life deserve a fresh recounting.

---

9 Crockett also includes a paragraph on Brevint in his essay on "Holy Communion" in *The Study of Anglicanism*, 278.

10 McAdoo, "Brevint and the Wesleys," 245–256.


Daniel Brevint was born in 1617\(^{13}\) on the Channel Island of Jersey, and was baptised on May 11 in St. John's parish. He was from a clerical family: his grandfather, father, and a paternal uncle were all protestant ministers. His parents were the Rev. Daniel Brevint Sr., the Presbyterian minister of St. John's for 46 years (1604-1651), and his wife Elisabeth Le Sebirel, widow of Guillaume Le Goupil. They also had an elder daughter, Rachel, born 1614. Daniel Sr.'s father was the Rev. Cosme Brevint, a Huguenot refugee and the first Protestant Rector of Sark (1570-1605), which had then been newly-recolonized.

The Channel Islands, the largest being Jersey, Guernsey and Sark, have been French-speaking\(^{14}\) English dependencies since the Norman Invasion, and between 1482 and 1486 were granted neutrality during the hostilities between France and England. Since 1586 they have been annexed to (but not technically part of) the Diocese of Winchester. There is a firmly established French Calvinist Huguenot tradition: in 1565 Queen Elizabeth granted the Islanders the right to worship as Calvinists.\(^{15}\) Toward the end of the sixteenth century they were encouraged by the Huguenots to adopt presbyteral leadership; James I then attempted to impose Anglican episcopal uniformity\(^{16}\) in Jersey with the

\(^{13}\) As per the parish registers of Jersey; the DNB states 1616. His memorial stone in Lincoln is ambiguous; it is not clear whether he was in his 79th year, or 79 years old when he died in 1695. It was not customary in Jersey to record the date of birth. As was common in the seventeenth century, there are several variant spellings of his name, among them Breven, Brevin and Brevant.

\(^{14}\) The official language is French, the local dialect being "Walloon," also used in Belgium.


installation of a Dean and a translation of the Prayer Book.\textsuperscript{17} Conformity was difficult to enforce, however, because the Islanders have always been particularly independently-minded in matters of religion. The senior Daniel Brevint was described as "the last of the Presbyterian stalwarts" and "the firmest adherent of the Religion of Geneva, having accepted the Prayer Book greatly against his will."\textsuperscript{18}

The period of Daniel Jr.'s life was a time of continuous political and religious conflict in France. The Colloquy of Poissy in 1561 (at which the chief Huguenot spokesman was Theodore Beza) was followed by the Wars of Religion which began in 1562 and continued for 35 years. The height of violence occurred with the Massacre of St. Bartholomew's day, 24 August 1572, when somewhere between 4,000 and 70,000\textsuperscript{19} protestants were killed over three days. Even following the Edict of Nantes in 1598 hostilities continued to break out from time to time, the most notorious being the siege and reduction of the Huguenot citadel of La Rochelle in 1627-28. Though guaranteed protection under Nantes, the city was attacked at the specific direction of Cardinal Richelieu. This campaign also involved a disastrous, "bizarre and pointless"\textsuperscript{20} naval attempt by the Duke of Buckingham to relieve the besieged defenders; he was assassinated just before a second attempt was to be made.

\textsuperscript{17} Trevor-Roper, \textit{Laud}, 349.


\textsuperscript{19} The various authorities for this event vary wildly in their estimates of numbers killed; the Huguenot Duke de Sully, a survivor, claimed that 70,000 died; modern estimates are much lower.

The reduction of La Rochelle must have just preceded Brevint's enrollment in the Reformed Academy at Saumur. It was the premier Reformed Academy in France, one of five Huguenot academies, the others being at Montauban, Nunez, Montpellier, and Sedan. Saumur was established in 1596 by Philippe duPlessis-Mornay, the Huguenot patriarch. He spent the decade following the St. Bartholomew's Day Massacre in England and was instrumental in framing the Edict of Nantes. The city of Saumur is located on the Loire in northwestern France, between Tours and the west coast city of Nantes, and over time became a Huguenot stronghold; the Assembly of Saumur in 1611 proved to be the high point of Huguenot history and organization.

Saumur's most famous teacher was Moïse Amyraut, whose tenure was from 1626 to 1664, and Armstrong states that he was "without contest" the most influential Reformed theologian of the seventeenth century; by mid-century the majority of French pastors and theologians were Amyralâians.

Daniel Brevint graduated from Saumur M.A., 12 September 1634, having excelled in logic and philosophy, went as a tutor to Poitou. In 1636


22 Armstrong, Amyraut.

23 A typographical error in Brevint's notice in the DNB gives his graduation as 1624, but Brevint would have been only 8 years old in that year. It is interesting to note that although Daniel Jr. no doubt studied with Amyraut, Daniel Sr. almost certainly studied with Beza (immediately after, or perhaps even along with Arminius; Arminius was born 1560, studied 1576-82 at Geneva with Beza, and ordained 1588; Brevint Sr. was born 1573 and apparently ordained by 1592).

Charles I, at the request of Archbishop Laud, established three fellowships at Oxford for French-speaking students from the Channel Islands, one each at Jesus, Pembroke, and Exeter colleges. Laud's aim, states Trevor-Roper, was to provide orthodox, Oxford-trained preachers for the Islands, whose preachers were drawn largely from Universities of Saumur and Geneva. On the strong recommendation of his community, Brevint, now 20 or 21 years old, was the first to benefit from the Jesus College fellowship, and was appointed in 1637.

As chancellor, Laud was opposed to the incorporation of Brevint's Saumur M.A. too quickly, saying that Brevint (referred to as "the Guernsey man") should be made to understand "...the difference of a master of art at Oxford and Saumur...." Nevertheless, despite Laud's repeated urging to delay, the committee found no legal impediment, and Brevint was incorporated M.A. at Oxford on 12 October 1638.

During the first Civil War Oxford was a Royalist Garrison from 1642. Sometime after the Solemn League and Covenant was adopted by Parliament in 1643 Brevint was ejected from his fellowship, as were, according to Wood,

—

25 "These fellowships were founded from a portion of the property of Sir Miles Hubbard, alderman of London, which, in default of an heir, escheated to the crown. See Heylin's Life of Laud, p. 336." William Laud, History of his Chancellorship, in Works, LACT (Oxford: Parker, 1847-60), vol. V, Part I, 140n.

26 Trevor-Roper, Laud, 349.


28 Coincidentally, Jeremy Taylor was then fellow at University College, having also been appointed by Laud.


30 Ibid., 209-10.
something like 400 others at Oxford.\textsuperscript{31} It took some time before the actual ejections occurred: the Head of Jesus College, Dr. Mansell, was not actually expelled until 21 May 1648. Brevint was imprisoned by the Parliamentarians for a long period following his ejection which affected his health badly for some time afterwards.\textsuperscript{32} He returned to Jersey, and was appointed Rector of Grouville in 1647.

He faced a lawsuit for defamation in February 1649 brought by a Mr. Joshua Carteret, who, it seems, had publicly threatened revenge against his father-in-law Jean le Febre, Brevint's godfather. Brevint consequently admonished Carteret to refrain from holy communion.\textsuperscript{33} A serious quarrel ensued, but Brevint was exonerated entirely in the matter. The local officers deferred the matter, but Carteret subsequently left for France and nothing more came of it.\textsuperscript{34}

Brevint visited France from 14 April 1649 and returned 7 September that year. Charles II and his court retreated to Jersey from 17 September 1649 to 13 February 1650, and was received as King; Brevint preached before him and his


\textsuperscript{32} W.D. Macray, ed. \textit{Calendar of Clarendon State Papers} (Oxford: Clarendon, 1866.), vol. 2., 20, item 113. Also John Durel, \textit{A View of the Government and Publick worship of God in the Reformed Churches across the seas} (London: n.p. 1662). Nevertheless there is something not quite right about this claim; why Brevint would have been ejected and imprisoned before the Parliamentary Visitation to Oxford is not explained; the charges made against him are not named. Furthermore, had he been such an offender against the Commonwealth, it would seem unlikely that he would later remain unmolested in Jersey for more than half a year following the reduction of the Channel Islands.


brother the Duke of York (the future James II) in French, 25 November in the town church of St. Helier.

On Sunday 1 June 1651 Daniel Brevint and Jean Durel were episcopally ordained both deacons and priests "in regard of the necessitie of the times" by Dr. Thomas Sydserff, Bishop of Galloway. The ordinations took place in the chapel of Sir Richard Browne in Paris, the main church for the Anglicans who had taken refuge in France. The ordinands were presented by John Cosin, then Dean of Peterborough and chaplain from 1645 to 1660 to the Anglicans in Paris of Henrietta Maria's court.

Brevint returned to Jersey to continue as Rector of Grouville. After the Channel Islands were reduced by the Parliamentarian forces October 1651, the record of tithes show that Brevint did not leave immediately, but remained

35 There is some conflict regarding the recorded dates, see Appendix 4.


37 John Cosin preached; Evelyn, Diary. The extract from Evelyn found in Correspondence of John Cosin Part II, Publications of the Surtees Society vol. 55 (London: 1872), is more detailed; see Appendix 3 below. One might speculate that Brevint's contact with Charles II led him to seek episcopal orders, which, at the time, were unavailable from English bishops; Paris, in any case, was nearer to Jersey. It is to be assumed that Brevint had earlier received presbyterial ordination (as had his father and grandfather) upon his appointment to Grouville, but there are no records of the event. In seeking re-ordination he was not unique at the time; Stevenson relates the events of Simon Patrick's decision to seek episcopal reordination following his reading of the works of Henry Hammond and especially Thorndike's Primitive Government of the Church. Patrick had been ordained as a presbyterian, "there being no public alternative" some years before 1652; he was reordained by Joseph Hall, 5 April 1654. Stevenson, Covenant of Grace, 150. See below, Appendix 4, for details and difficulties in dating Brevint's ordination in Paris.

38 Henrietta Maria's personal chaplain was Christopher Davenport, an English convert to Roman Catholicism who became a Franciscan, taking the name Franciscus a Sancta Clara, and with whom Cosin was friendly. One charge laid against Laud at his trial was his contact with Davenport.
undisturbed in Jersey for several months afterwards, and left for France in the second half of 1652 in "voluntary exile."

Brevint and Durel attended the Synod of the French Reformed church at Caen, Normandy, in company with another Anglican priest from Jersey, Phillipe le Couteur. After presenting their letters of ordination and the reasons for their exile they were accepted by the synod for congregational appointments. Durel recorded that there was only one dissenting voice, "...by one onely who was a little possessed with Cromwellism." Le Couteur was appointed to Caen and at the Restoration was made Dean of Jersey.

Brevint's connections with Durel continued to be close. Durel was born in 1625 and entered Merton College Oxford in 1640, but left for France when Oxford was garrisoned by Charles I. He graduated M.A. at Caen in 1644 and continued to Saumur for theological studies. He returned to Jersey in 1647 as chaplain to the Lieutenant-Governor Sir George Carteret.

The presentation of the Anglicans at the Normandy Synod seems somewhat odd: Durel praised the good judgment of the Normandy Synod for accepting the three Anglicans as valid ministers based on their recent Anglican ordination in Paris, but Brevint had already served as Rector of a congregation, based, presumably, on having received Presbyterian ordination, the norm in Jersey. Nevertheless, following the Synod Brevint was appointed to the Huguenot

---

39 Durel confirms Wood's statement that the exile to France from Jersey was "voluntary."

40 Durel, A View, 95.

41 After the Restoration Carteret was appointed Treasurer to the Royal Navy, and for his service to Charles II during the civil war, was granted the American colony of "New Jersey." Charles II was godfather to his son.

42 Durel, A View, 94.
Temple at Compiegne, about 70 km north of Paris, but very shortly afterwards was made chaplain to the Princess of Turenne and tutor to her children.

The Princess of Turenne, Charlotte de Caumont, was deeply devoted to protestantism and apparently loved religious disputation. It was for her, Brevint wrote, that he originally composed The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice. She was the daughter of the Duc de la Force, to whom Durel, following brief pastorates in St. Malo and Caen, had become chaplain in 1652.

The Marshall of Turenne, Vicomte Henri de la Tour D'Auvergne, was born into a protestant family in the Huguenot city of Sedan in 1611. He was the younger son of Henri, Duc de Bouillon, and both he and his elder brother entered the army of Louis XIII at a young age, apparently for the sake of his family who had been under pressure from Richelieu. The Vicomte was made Marshall of France in 1643. He read and admired duPlessis-Mornay, and was especially attracted to his ideas regarding the reunion of protestant and catholic churches. The Princess of Turenne died childless in 1662, and six years later, in October 1668, the Vicomte converted to Catholicism, retaining,

---

43 Wood recorded that Brevint had ministered in a French protestant congregation in Normandy; Venables in the DNB incorrectly placed this ministry prior to his episcopal ordination. Durel's A View confirms that the ordinations took place first. Wood, however, incorrectly set Brevint's ordination during his time in Oxford.


46 Ibid., 169.

47 Ibid., 181-2. Speck states that his conversion "astounded contemporary Europe." W.A. Speck, Reluctant Revolutionaries: Englishmen and the Revolution of 1688 (Oxford: University Press, 1988), 123; and indeed John Henry Newman mentioned it in Tract 71 as though it were an event of some
however, his interest in reconciliation of churches. He was close friends with Henrietta Maria and died 27 July 1675.

Bosher has noted that the lack of eucharistic hospitality between the Anglicans and the Huguenots during the Commonwealth period proved to be a difficulty for the Jersey Anglicans Durel and Brevint, because they had sympathies with both the Anglicans and the French Calvinists. Cosin was notable in that he encouraged intercommunion, one of the few leading churchmen to do so.

According to Bosher the Jersey Anglicans, Brevint, Durel, and le Couteur, sought to alienate the Calvinists in France from the Puritans in England, hoping that the Huguenots would see themselves as the French version of the Church of England rather than as counterparts to the Puritans. Durel noted in his *A View of the Government and Publick Worship of the Reformed Churches beyond the Seas* that the French Reformed churches did not tolerate non-conformist religion. At the Restoration prominent Huguenot clergy in France wrote to Brevint and Durel, the latter preserving some of that correspondence in this same book, including one letter addressed to himself and several to Brevint, all dated post 1660. Bosher states that the French leaders wrote, "strongly advocating the re-establishment of episcopacy [in England],

---

infamy. Turenne's decision may well have influenced James II's own conversion ca. 1669-72.

48 Ibid., 146.


and deploring their own want of bishops." Bosher's conclusion that the Jersey Anglicans worked to re-establish episcopacy in the French Reformed church has been generally accepted. 52

I must, however disagree with Bosher's reading: these particular letters do indeed show Huguenot support for the re-establishing of a non-prelatical episcopacy in the English church, but nowhere do they hint that the French Reformed churches were eager to adopt it themselves. The letters congratulate the English for re-establishing the bishops, assuring them that the French Reformed leaders had no aversion to episcopacy. Their own lack of it, the French asserted, had been for pragmatic, rather than theological or political reasons; nevertheless they perceived no defect in not having bishops, and did not (in this correspondence at least) express the desire to re-establish episcopacy in France. 53

Brevint cultivated relationships with prominent English exiles in Paris, among them Charles II. During this time Brevint wrote much, and, he claims, worked towards a settlement between the Catholic and Protestant churches in

51 Bosher, Restoration Settlement, 131, 133.

52 For example, McAdoo, "Brevint and the Wesleys," 245.

53 For example a letter from M. du Bose, from the Reformed Church of Caen, to Brevint, 14 June 1660: "...Well ordered Episcopacy hath most important and considerable utilities which cannot be found in the Presbyterian Discipline. If we have followed the last in our Churches, it is not for any aversion that we have against the former: It is not because we hold Episcopacy to be contrary to the nature of the Gospel, or because we think it less convenient for the good of the Church, or less worthy of the condition of the true flocks of the Lord; but it is because necessity hath obliged us to it..." Durel, A View, 122ff. See also I.M. Green, The Re-establishment of the Church of England 1660–1663, Oxford Historical Monographs (Oxford: University Press, 1978) for other correctives to Bosher's analysis; also C.E. Whiting, Studies in English Puritanism from the Restoration to the Revolution, 1660–1688 (London: SPCK, 1931) reprint, (New York: Augustus M. Kelly, 1968), 328 ff.
France, though apparently in vain. He was recommended by Charles II himself and was mandated on 17 December 1660 as the Tenth Prebendary of Durham, and installed (by proxy) 15 March 1661; in May Brevint was made Rector of Brancepeth, although he was still apparently in Paris until at least September. He succeeded Cosin in both of these preferments, apparently by Cosin's direct influence, who had by now been made bishop of Durham. It seems that Brevint had been originally intended for Westminster, but Charles II decided (or perhaps had been prevailed upon to decide) otherwise. On 27 February 1662-3 Brevint was made D.D., Oxon.

Durel returned to England in 1660 and was appointed by Royal warrant chaplain to the French congregation at the Savoy chapel. The King selected Durel to translate the new Prayer Book into French for use there and in the Channel Islands; he was also much involved in the Latin translation of the

54 Preface to Daniel Brevint, Saul and Samuel at Endor (Oxford: at the Theatre, 1674). Considering the anti-Papal tone of his books, this claim frankly seems unlikely. If it is true, then one might speculate that this is an admission of acquaintance with Sancta Clara, or that such a project may have been at the initiative of the Marechal Turenne, who had an enduring interest in ecclesiual reconciliation.

55 M.A. Everett Green, ed. Calendar for State Papers Domestic, Charles II, 1661-1662 (London: Her Majesty's Stationers Office), vol. 2, 370; Cosin, Correspondence Part II, 26n.

56 Cosin, Correspondence II, 255.


58 The statement by Balleine that Brevint preached for a short while at the French chapel in the Savoy, and Messervy's claim in "Notice sur la Famille Brevint" that he was then reinstated to his Oxford fellowship and was chair of theology at Oxford, do not seem to be accurate.

59 According to Gwynn this translation was in reality merely a revision of the 1616 French translation of the BCP made by Pierre de Laine; Durel's revision was criticised for being too protestant. Robin D. Gwynn, Huguenot Heritage: the history and contribution of the Huguenots in Britain (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1985), 99. The Prières Publiques was adopted only slowly, though
Prayer Book." He published several books, among them his A View of the Government and Publick Worship of the Reformed Churches beyond the Seas noted above, and "his great work" Sanctae Ecclesiae Anglicanae...vindiciae, a vindication of the Church of England against schismatics. He was made D.D. 1669/70. Durel held several benefices in England by 1679, amongst them joining Brevint at Durham 1668 as prebendary, and in 1677 he was made Dean of Windsor where he was buried in 1683.

Brevint is mentioned in Pepys Diary, 1661-2, May 18, Whitsun, when Pepys attended worship at the chapel at Whitehall with the King and others; then to dinner with Sir G. Carteret and his wife, along with "...one Mr. Brevin, a French Divine, we were very merry...." Ten years later Brevint had earned a reputation for preferring to make merry in London to the neglect of his duties in Durham.

Brevint was married to Ann De Carteret, though the date is not yet known. Her sister was married to Sir George Carteret. They were the daughters of Sir Philippe De Carteret, Lord of St. Ouen, Bailiff and Lieutenant Governor of Jersey, and his wife Anne, daughter of Sir Francis Dowse. Daniel and Ann Brevint had one child, a daughter Charlotte (no doubt named after the

by the nineteenth century it was in use in all the parish churches in Jersey.


63 Correspondence of John Cosin II, 279.
Princess of Turenne). She was baptized in the Huguenot Temple at Charenton, outside of Paris, 23 September 1663. Charlotte married Sir Edward Hussey, Baronet de Welbourne, Lincoln, and died at age 30, August 30 1695, having borne 11 children, only two of whom survived to adulthood, daughters Sara and Charlotte.

The Surtees Society publications contain several anecdotal events regarding Brevint's life in Durham: for example, in September 1670 he was threatened with a lawsuit by Bishop Cosin to recover arrears for the pension for the Bishopric, apparently owed for several years, which he subsequently paid by October; in 1674 during a violent storm Brevint's rectory partially collapsed, and the only reason he and his family were not all killed was that they happened not to be at home.

The Durham Cathedral Registers record that Daniel Brevint was a godfather to Elias Turvill, a Greek Jew by birth presented for baptism November 1666; and that Ann Brevint was a baptismal sponsor for Charles Cartwright, son of Thomas Cartwright, July 1675. The Brevints seem to

---

"Dennis Granville seems to have been most fond of her and his terms of endearment seem today to be almost immoderately affectionate. Ibid., 148-9.

"Balleine, Biographical Dictionary, 50. This date is just a few months before Amyraut's death, whose theology was supported warmly by the Reformed church at Charenton. Charenton was a church of some diplomatic importance, and was the site of two Reformed Synods at which Amyraut's theology was disputed.

"This was a grievous year for Ann: Daniel died 5 May 1695, Charlotte August 30 1695, and two grandchildren: Ann, died April 1696 aged 5, and Daniel, aged 3, died November 1696.


have been particularly close with two other Cathedral clergy, Isaac Basire and Dean Dennis Granville; Basire's son and Granville himself had married daughters of John Cosin.69

Brevint was made Dean of Lincoln Cathedral in the fall of 1681, but not without considerable distress. He seems to have been most importunate for the preferment, and made matters worse by refusing to relinquish his Durham livings.70 He had originally been passed over, the Lords for Ecclesiastic Affairs71 deciding that he was well enough off where he was, and electing to offer the Deanship to Dr. Gardiner who already held a prebend at Lincoln.

Much of the negotiating was managed by Sir Leoline Jenkins, at the time Secretary of State, who obviously admired Brevint,72 and who was able to secure Brevint's appointment even after Gardiner had been elected. The King, apparently fulfilling a promise made before the Earl of Bath, Bernard Grenville


70 CSPD 1681, 468, 470, 509, 550; Sept 14, 448.; Sept 15, 452-3; 455; Nov. 30, 595. CSPD 1682, 57. From his pension arrears from Brancepeth for the Bishopric of Durham, his refusal to relinquish his Durham livings, and a continuing correspondence over a particular £100, it might easily be concluded that Brevint was mighty close with his money; cf. Correspondence of John Cosin part II, 254-5. Sept 29 1670, inter alia.

71 A short-lived commission which appointed 8 bishops and 10 deans, and other minor preferments, from 1681 to 1684, all in firm support of the crown.

72 Sir Leoline Jenkins (1623-1685) entered Jesus College Oxford 1641 where he undoubtedly knew Brevint, and they seem to have become close friends; for examples of his affection and efforts, see CSPD Vol. 22, Charles II, 1681, Sept. 14., Sept. 17, Oct. 13, pp. 448, 455, 509. At the restoration he was elected Fellow of the College, took LL.D. Feb. 1660/61 and became Head of Jesus College the following month. He was a major benefactor of the College, and is buried in the chapel (DNB).
and Jenkins, 73 eventually appointed Brevint to the post following Brevint's repeated assurance that all his Durham livings would be given up, a promise he never kept. 74 He was installed 7 January 1681-2 as Dean and as Prebendary of Welton Paynshall, but held all four of his livings until his death. 75 Gardiner, who eventually became bishop of Lincoln while Brevint was still Dean, regarded him as "non-resident in mind if not in body."

74 Probably at the encouragement of Secretary Jenkins; Archbishop Sancroft insisted that recipients of crown appointments under the Commission for Ecclesiastical Promotions (1681-84) relinquish their former incomes, partly to effect "widening the opportunities of promotion, as well as aiding his attack on the excesses of pluralism." Beddard, "Commission," 21. Jenkins, apparently, was opposed to the policy; Jenkins to Brevint, 13 Oct, 1681. P.R.O., SP, 44/62, pp 338-9.

75 Brevint was one of only three deans appointed against the approval of Archbishop Sancroft. After Brevint's death the Tenth Stall at Durham was granted to Fitzherbert Adams, who had held the Sixth Stall since 1685; John Tonge succeeded Brevint at Brancepeth, both in 1695.


77 Ibid., ref. Bodl.Libr. MS Tanner 130, f.121. Brevint's successor was little better, Samuel Fuller (1695-99) was often drunk.
was the anti-Christ. Brevint supported him in his efforts to re-establish weekly eucharist at Lincoln, as he had similarly supported Dean Granville in Durham. They in all probability had known each other at Oxford; Barlow had remained librarian at the Bodleian throughout the civil wars and managed to avoid the troubles of the interregnum.

In 1688 Brevint was also likely well-pleased with the prospect of a new (and protestant) King William. Brevint's loathing of Roman Catholicism would well have outweighed any scruples, had he any, toward his former oath to James II. But even had it not, there was nowhere for him to go. Many thousands of Huguenots were fleeing to England. The revocation of the Edict of Nantes in 1685 had resulted in the deprivation of French protestants of their civil liberties, and led to the massive emigration of between 200,000 and 300,000 people. Furthermore, the Academy at Saumur closed that same year. In 1689 William withdrew the neutrality of the Channel Islands. Brevint was by now 73 years old, married and in fashionable society, a D.D., popular in print, and a comfortable pluralist. Had he lived but six months longer he would have undoubtedly led the procession of clergy "in full canonicals" which solemnly

78 Despite his hostility to Roman Catholicism, Barlow was a close and intimate friend of Sancta Clara.

79 Cocksworth incorrectly identifies Brevint as a non-Juror, Christopher J. Cocksworth, Evangelical Eucharistic Thought in the Church of England (Cambridge: University Press, 1993), 67. Similarly Jeremy Taylor was incorrectly called a non-Juror in Howard A. Snyder, The Radical Wesley and Patterns for Church Renewal (Downers Grove: Intervarsity Press, 1980); Taylor died 24 years before the schism.

80 Among them Moise Amyraut (Jr.), son of the principal of Saumur; and became a professor of divinity at Oxford. Armstrong, Amyraut, 77.
welcomed William when he attended divine service in Lincoln Cathedral, October 1695.81

Brevint died 5 May 1695 and was buried in the choir of the Cathedral. His will is unremarkable: £30 to the poor; £100 to his daughter Charlotte; one year's wages to any servant not remaining in the family's employ following his death; his library, excepting his French and English books, to his son-in-law the Baronet Sir Edward Hussey; the remainder of his estate (not itemized) to his wife; his tomb to bear the inscription "I have waited for thy Salvation O Lord."82 His wife Anne died 13 years later, 8 November 1708, also 78 years of age, and was buried with him.

II) PUBLICATIONS

Brevint has aptly been called a "devotional theologian,"83 his most famous book being The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice. His other two books are vehement, even scurrilous, anti-papal polemics,84 which appeared at the


84 By this time such a tone was rather more than simply old-fashioned; after the Restoration such explicit anti-papal denunciations were frowned upon. See Anthony Milton, Catholic and Reformed: The Roman and Protestant Churches in English Protestant Thought 1600-1640 (Cambridge: University Press, 1995), chapter 2.
time of the "greatest outburst of anti-popery since the early 1640's" and seem to have been considered by Brevint to be his most important works.

Brevint's books were all published between 1672 and 1674. The fact that Leoline Jenkins had been appointed to the University Press in 1671 and was likely seeking out potential authors may have been the most significant factor in Brevint's timing. The first of Brevint's books to be published was Missale Romanum, or The Depth and Mystery of the Roman Mass, an attack on the Roman teachings on sacrifice, transubstantiation, mass-offerings, and the Roman concept of priesthood. Brevint knew, even hoped, that it would be provocative and inflammatory. In a 1672 letter to Jenkins, apparently in response to an invitation to publish at the Sheldonian Theatre in Oxford, Brevint wrote:

I have under my hand something, that cannot but make much noise and start against me whole swarms of wasps, about Mass sacrifice. I think therein to show both Papists and Protestants many things they never thought of, neither, it may be, would be believed unless I demonstrated, both out of authentic Roman authors and good logic, that they are proper and essential to Mass."

In reply to Brevint's Missale Romanum, "R.F." (Robert Fuller) published in 1674 Missale Romanum Vindicatum; or, the Mass vindicated from D. Dan. Brevints calumnious and Scandalous Tract. In his flattering epistle to "The right worshipful, grave and reverend Doctours of the Famous University of Oxford" he accused both Brevint and the Sheldonian Theatre of wrongdoing,


"Jenkins was a close friend of Gilbert Sheldon, and helped with the founding of the Theatre; in 1672, the year Brevint began to publish, Jenkins became one of the managers of the university press, and the next year resigned as Head of Jesus. He became a Secretary of State in 1680; "the most faithful drudge of a secretary that ever the court had." wrote Roger North. DNB, 740-41.

"CSPD, 29 Jan. 1672, 108."
calling Brevint's book "an unseemly Imp...hatched under its roof..." and issued by no authority.

Although Fuller's book is shorter than Brevint's, it is equally biblical. He assembled long catenae of patristic texts to support his arguments, perhaps in the hope that Brevint would seem to be out-gunned by the sheer weight of patristic authority. But Brevint was a dab hand with the Fathers too, and the Missale Romanum is heavily shot through with patristic references, though he preferred to weave his authorities and their substance into his own text and argument rather than simply make extensive lists of quotations.

Fuller even quoted Calvin against Brevint and stated that Brevint's position was condemned with Wycliffe at Constance, hinting at the Lollard tarbrush. He accused Brevint of keeping company with Arians, and his epigram certainly accused Brevint of being no better than the Pelagians:

The Catholick Fathers and Doctors have held what they found in the Church, have taught what they learned, and delivered to their Sons what they received from their Fathers: as yet we did not deal with you before these Judges; and our cause is judged by them: neither we, nor you, were known to them, yet we recite their sentences, or Judgments, made against you. (S. Augustine lib.2. contra Julianum Pelagium cap.10.)

The crux of Fuller's argument is that all the miracles of the mass which Brevint scorns stem from the one miracle of the Real Presence.

" Robert Fuller (R.F.), Missale Romanum Vindicatum (n.p. 1674), 78.

" Ibid., 87. John Cosin himself may have provided some oblique support for Brevint; Cosin's The History of Popish Transubstantiation, though written 19 years earlier, was published in 1675 (translated and with an introduction by Durel) in which Cosin declared that the Council of Constance was wrong to have condemned Wycliffe. Cosin, Works, LACT (Oxford: Parker, 1849) vol. iv, VII, 28.

" "This terrible word Transubstantiation, is much baited at by this learned Doctor, even as the word homoousion, declared and determined by three General Councils, was impugned by the Arians, because it was new, and not found in the Scriptures;" Fuller, Vindicatum, 119.
Brevint replied to R.F. in an appendix to his next anti-Roman book, Saul
and Samuel at Endor, or The New Ways of Salvation and Service, which usually
tempt Men to Rome, also of 1674.¹¹ This book, arguably a companion volume to
the first, attacks Roman practices and beliefs such as, and in particular, the
rosary and other subjects concerning the Blessed Virgin Mary; the Roman
Church's claims to catholicity; indulgences; popular devotions; confraternities;
scapulars; the invocation of saints; the immense wealth of the church;
consecrated images, and so on.¹² Brevint claims in the preface that he had
spent 17 years abroad among the papists, 9 of those exiled; during which time
he debated with the Jansenists (who, he says, were able to dress up false
teaching in Christian language) at the Sorbonne and the French Court. Thus,
he claims, he knows the Roman religion as well as anyone, and in fact worked
towards reconciling Protestants and Papists.¹³

There was an interesting change to the frontispiece of Saul and Samuel at
Endor:¹⁴ one volume from this edition depicts the antiChrist wearing a papal

---

¹¹ The reference of the title is to I Samuel 28:7-25. The prophet Samuel is
dead; King Saul has put away all persons who practice augury and divination,
that "have a familiar spirit." In preparation for battle with the Philistines, of
which he is not at all certain, Saul seeks advice from God, but is not answered,
either by prophets, dreams, or of the lots known as urim and thummim.
Disguised, he seeks out an old woman who has a familiar spirit, who brings up the
spirit of Samuel for consultation. Samuel, angered, tells Saul that he shall be
defeated, because the Lord is now against him.

¹² These subjects are very much in keeping with duPlessis-Mornay's work; one
is led to speculate whether Brevint's dissuasive was occasioned by Turenne's
conversion. The genre of "dissuasive from popery" has existed even into our
own century: in 1948 R.P.C. Hanson published The Church of Rome: A
Dissuasive (London: SCM, 1948) aimed at University students who may have
been considering joining the Roman Catholic church.

¹³ Frankly, this is hard to believe, unless it is a tacit admission of
acquaintance with Sancta Clara.

¹⁴ See Appendix 6.
tiara and carrying a staff crossed at the top with horned crosslets, the papal staff. " But other volumes, evidently from the same edition, have an obviously altered engraving; the picture is in all other ways identical, but the antiChrist is now bareheaded with a plain walking staff. " One might speculate that the obviously inflammatory statement made by the original drawing did not sit well with certain authorities, and the printer was required to change it partway through the book's print-run. This hypothesis is supported by the fact that the copy with the altered engraving retains the irregular pagination of the other, which, were this a second edition, one would assume would have been corrected. " Both copies bear the imprimatur of the vice chancellor of Oxford, 19 October 1674.

By 1600 the assertion of the Pope as the antiChrist was Anglican orthodoxy, James I himself writing on the subject. But under Laud and Charles the expression of this opinion was sharply discouraged. " Contrarily duPlessis-Mornay had gone to great lengths to prove that the Pope was the antiChrist in two chapters of his A Notable Treatise on the Church and later in a 600 page folio entirely dedicated to the subject, English translations of which

---

95 Trinity College Toronto; General Theological Seminary, New York.

96 Thomas Fisher Rare Book Library, Toronto; General Theological Seminary, New York; English Short Title Catalogue (Wing Collection), mfm. reel 376.

97 Despite the irregular pagination the actual text of the book continues correctly. Wood recorded that there was a second edition in 1688 but no supporting evidence of this can be found.

98 Spurr, Restoration Church of England, 122; Milton, Catholic and Reformed, 110-27, &c. Sheldon was the first bishop to deny that the Pope was the anti-Christ; at his trial Laud, when accused of denying it, replied that the matter had not yet been resolved, "even among learned protestants." W. Prynne, Canterbury's Doom (1644) quoted in Christopher Hill, AntiChrist in Seventeenth Century England (London: Oxford University Press, 1971), 37.
appeared in 1579 and 1612 respectively." Brevint's book must have already been composed and perhaps had even gone to press when Fuller's *Vindicatum* appeared, because the reply to R.F. is restricted to an appendix, though it is noted on the title page. This short reply does not engage Fuller's arguments in any full manner, but tends to be arrogantly and provocatively dismissive. In this tone Brevint begins his rebuttal:

In the whole course of this his Vindication, the good Man favors me so far, as not to answer one wise Word, to any thing that seems to be somewhat material in my Book; only leaving his dear Jewel under all the dirt imaginable, he shews by what he pleased to write, how he is well resolved to make much of it, such as it is; and like a tender-hearted Parent, to kiss the Child, tho it be deformed.  

Brevint often asserts simply that Fuller's arguments fail to address Brevint's conclusions, or that he had misunderstood Brevint's plain meaning:

Whereon I will say nothing to him, but that he should have read what he carps at, with some kind of attention, rather then expose himself to the hazard of censuring me, like one who had neither common sense nor Conscience.

---

**The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice**

*The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice* was first composed, Brevint wrote, in Paris for the private devotional use of "those two Incomparable Princes" of Turenne and Bouillon. During the time he was finishing his *Missale Romanum*, Brevint sent the English manuscript of *The Christian*


101 Ibid., 409.

Sacrament and Sacrifice to his sister-in-law, the Lady Elizabeth Carteret, and a Dr. Stradling to decide whether it ought to be published at all\textsuperscript{103} (although he writes in the epistle dedicatory that he has "made bold" to dedicate the book to her "without so much as asking leave"). From the epistle it is apparent that the families Carteret and Turenne, like their former chaplains Brevint and Durel, were well-acquainted.

The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice was first printed in 1673, between the Missale Romanum (1672) and Saul and Samuel at Endor (1674). This period of publishing followed immediately on John Cosin's death, while Brevint was still in Durham. This was a time of some political turmoil, particularly around religious matters. Charles II's second "Declaration of Indulgence" gave limited official tolerance to the gathering of Non-conformists and Roman Catholics for worship. It was withdrawn after a few months and the "Test Act" followed in March 1673 which required that all clergy and holders of public office denounce transubstantiation and communicate in the Church of England. It is therefore probably no coincidence that John Durel was also at this time translating Cosin's History of Popish Transubstantiation, which, though written in Latin in 1656, first went to press in 1674.

Brevint's book was reprinted in 1673 and 1679, twice in 1739, once in 1757 and finally in 1847. It differs from Brevint's other books in important ways. First, apart from one barb in the preface, it contains little anti-Papal polemic or invective, and it lacks what is frankly the nasty tone of his other two works.

\textsuperscript{103} CSPD, 29 Jan. 1672, 108. Presumably Brevint meant George Stradling (1621-1688). Stradling, Welsh, entered Jesus College 1636-43, coinciding with Brevint, though he managed to retain a fellowship at All Souls during the Commonwealth, apparently due to his skill as a lutenist. He was made D.D. in 1661, prebendary of Westminster in 1663, and Dean of Chichester (1672-88). Wood, Ath. Oxon.
Second, it is devotional, concluding its chapters with long carefully composed prayers. Third, it is significantly shorter than his other books; and fourth, although there are a few scattered footnotes, it is not a scholarly dissertation which systematically examines the teaching of the Fathers. Perhaps it is for these reasons that generations of Christians have found it so appealing. This might also explain why Saul and Samuel at Endor was never reprinted, and Missale Romanum, though it met with more success, was never as popular as The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice.

The two reprint editions of The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice of 1739 were probably made in response to a recommendation by Bishop Daniel Waterland. Five years later in 1744 an "extract" or abridgement appeared anonymously and independently. The book was reduced to about 20% of its original length, and paraphrased passages instead of simple deletions are common. Rattenbury states that the abridgement is without doubt the work of John Wesley; in his journal Wesley recorded that he was reading Brevint on board ship 23 December 1735. H.R. McAdoo has written recently on the

---

104 Moreover, the sole known reference to it is in an editor's footnote to James Calfhill's An Answer to John Martell's Treatise of the Cross, ed. Richard Gibbings (Cambridge: Parker Society, 1846), 19n.


theology of the Abridgement and its correlation with the thought of the Wesley's. \textsuperscript{107} It was used by John as the preface to his and Charles' \textit{Hymns on the Lord's Supper} 1745, and is included in all subsequent editions of the \textit{Hymns}. Thus it seems that Wesley published the abridgement as a tract in 1744, then prefaced the \textit{Hymns} with it the next year. This conclusion is also asserted by Curnock in his edition of Wesley's \textit{Journal}.\textsuperscript{108} Rattenbury has well demonstrated that not only does the structure and organization of the \textit{Hymns} follow Brevint's outline closely, his theology of the Eucharist is central to the study of Wesleyan Eucharistic thought.

Between Brevint's prose and [Charles] Wesley's verse there is no theological clash whatever....Charles Wesley gives Brevint wings, and adds very significantly the confirmation of Methodist experience to Brevint's doctrine. In some of his verses he turns the devotional theology of a High-Church Caroline divine into the flaming Methodist Evangel without losing Anglican values.\textsuperscript{109}

It would be of some interest to examine the Abridgement to determine whether Brevint's thought may have been altered in subtle ways to better suit Wesley's own ideas. For example, Brevint wrote in Ch.V.7:

Here then Christ our blessed savior being desirous before his death, as by a deed of his last will, to settle upon his true disciples both such a measure of his grace in this life, \textit{as might in part make them holy}, and after this life such a fullness of all blessings, \textit{as might make them eternally happy}...\textsuperscript{110}

This is found in the Abridgement as:

Our blessed Lord being desirous before his death, as by a deed of his last will, to settle on his disciples both such a measure of grace

\textsuperscript{107} McAdoo, "Brevint and the Wesleys."

\textsuperscript{108} Curnock, \textit{Wesley's Journal}. But Brevint would have winced at Curnock's comment that he is thought to have been a Roman Catholic author.


\textsuperscript{110} Daniel Brevint, \textit{The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice} 1st ed., 63, emphasis mine.
in this life, as might now make them holy; and after this life, such a fulness of blessings as might make them eternally happy...\textsuperscript{111}

This is a significant alteration, and one which demonstrates Wesley's, rather than Brevint's, understanding of "Christian perfection."

In 1871 another abridgement was included in a devotional handbook titled \textit{Eucharistica: Meditations and prayers on the Most Holy Sacrament}. This version is somewhat different, and seems to have been inspired by Wesley's extract, but it includes passages from Brevint's full work which Wesley omitted; it is shorter as well.\textsuperscript{112}

\textbf{Other Works}

Brevint published a few minor incidental works: a French translation of the judgement of Oxford on the Solemn League and Covenant (now lost), and three broadsheet epitaphs, among them one for Charles II.

There were apparently four Latin works "now forgotten"\textsuperscript{113} written by Brevint whose titles are preserved in Wood's \textit{Athenae}:

The time when these four books were published, or in what volumes, Sir Lith. Jenkyns, who had received them from the author...

\textsuperscript{111} John and Charles Wesley, \textit{Hymns on the Lord's Supper, with a Preface concerning The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice, Extracted from Dr. Brevint.} 2d ed. (Bristol: Felix Farley, 1752), 19, emphasis mine. It is to be noticed that Wesley does not here claim to have abridged the book himself. This differs from, for example, his abridgement of Thomas a Kempis' \textit{Companion for the Altar}; on the title page Wesley specifically takes credit for the abridgement.


in a letter sent to him, which was communicated to me, did not at all mention.\(^{114}\)

\[\text{Ecclesiae primitiae Sacramentum et Sacrificium a Pontificis corruptelis, et}
\text{exinde natis Controversiis liberum.}\(^{115}\)

\[\text{Eucharistiae Christianae Praesentia realis, et Pontificia ficta, luculentissimis}
\text{non Testimonis modo, sed etiam Fundamentis, quibus fere tota S.S. Patrum}
\text{Theologia nititur, haec explosa, illa suffulta et asserta.}
\]

\[\text{Pro Serenissima Principe Weimariensi ad Theses Jenenses accurata Responsio.}
\]

\[\text{Ducentae plus minus Praelectiones in S. Matthaei xxv. capita, et aliorum Evangel}
\text{istarum locos hisce passim parallelos.}\(^{116}\)

Very little of Brevint's correspondence and papers survives. Apart from the
sources already mentioned there are apparently two French sermons and several
unedited writings preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, in the
"Collection des Manuscrits Conrart," Tome XIV.\(^{117}\)

\(^{114}\) Wood, \textit{Ath. Oxon.}, 3d. ed. (1813-20), quoted in the \textit{British Biographical}
\textit{Archive}, 165-67. Even though Brevint admitted that his penmanship was poor,
these four titles were presumably in ms. form. Jenkins' personal ms. collection
was bequeathed to Jesus College, and his maritime collection to the Oxford college
of marine engineering. A search in November 1998 of both the Bodleian (in which
the manuscript collection of Jesus was deposited) and the Jesus College libraries
failed to find any trace of them.

\(^{115}\) "Written at the desire of the illustrious princesses of Turenne and
Bouillon." (Wood). Perhaps this was the earlier version of what would become
\textit{The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice}. See Stevenson, \textit{Covenant of Grace}
Renewed, 100.

\(^{116}\) The parable of the Wise and Foolish Virgins; the parable of the Talents;
the Matthean apocalypse; helping others is in fact helping Jesus, neglecting
others is to neglect Jesus. The clear message to be vigilant, prudent, profitable
and full of works of charity would be most appropriate, perhaps even flattering,
meditations for rich philanthropic gentlewomen.

\(^{117}\) Messervy, "\textit{la Famille Brevint}," 44.
Brevint had admirers in Bishops George Hickes and Daniel Waterland. The Non-Juring Hickes, in his *Christian Priesthood* (1707), called *The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice* an "excellent little book," from which he took a few short quotations, and added, "I wish it were reprinted, for the honour of God and the benefit of the Church." \(^{118}\)

Waterland in 1738 agreed with Hickes, quoted his judgement, and included Brevint amongst the "best-learned Protestants." He made much use of the *Depth and Mystery* (i.e. *Missale Romanum*) in his "The Christian Sacrifice Explained in a Charge delivered in part to the Middlesex Clergy, 1738," \(^{119}\) footnoting him no fewer than eight times, and twice more in other works, placing Brevint in the first rank of theologians, in the company of Cranmer, Andrewes, Buckridge, Taylor, Field, Laud, Payne, Patrick, duPlessis, Montagu and Mason. \(^{120}\) Regarding expiatory sacrifice, Waterland stated that no one explained the matter better than Brevint, and that no one understood the eucharistic sacrifice better. His praise of Brevint's first two books is effusive:

He stood upon the ancient ground, looked upon evangelical duties as the true oblations and sacrifices, resolved the sacrifice of the Eucharist, actively considered, solely into them; and he explained the practical uses of that doctrine in so clear, so lively, and so affecting a way, that one shall scarce meet with any thing on the

---


\(^{120}\) *Ibid.*, 293n.
subject that can be justly thought to exceed it, or even come up to it.\textsuperscript{121}

The Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology listed him in the prospectus of authors to have been published, but such an edition was not produced.\textsuperscript{122} He was quoted rather extensively, however, in Pusey's Tract \textit{81}, "Catena Patrum No. IV: Testimony of writers of the later English Church to the Doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice."\textsuperscript{123}

There were other, but scattered, references to Brevint during the nineteenth century. Most were by Nathaniel Dimock in his books against Tractarian opinions, and he quoted Brevint against Pusey's views on the Real Presence.\textsuperscript{124} William Goode in 1856 argued that there is nothing contained in

\textsuperscript{121} Ibid., 139-40.

\textsuperscript{122} The date of the Vincent edition of \textit{The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice} and \textit{Missale Romanum}, however, is just right; perhaps this edition was intended to be the one for the Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology, but for now unknown reasons, was printed privately.

\textsuperscript{123} Pages 192-200 consist of passages from \textit{The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice}; 201-2 notes a brief passage from \textit{Depth and Mystery}. Apparently this Catena was not compiled by Pusey himself but by his friends; W.H. Mackean, \textit{The Eucharistic Doctrine of the Oxford Movement: A Critical Survey} (London: Putnam, 1933), 45, 155.

\textsuperscript{124} Nathaniel Dimock, \textit{On Eucharistic Worship in the English Church} (London: Haughton & Co., 1876); \textit{idem.}, \textit{MISSARUM SACRIFICIA: Testimonies of English Divines in respect of the claim of the "Massing Priests" to offer Christ for the quick and the dead to have remission of pain or guilt} (London: Elliot Stock, 1896); \textit{idem.}, \textit{Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church concerning the Eucharistic Presence} 1 vol. (London: Church of England Book Society), Memorial ed. 2 vols. (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1911); \textit{idem.}, \textit{Some Notes on the Conference held at Fulham Palace in October 1900 on the Doctrine of the Holy Communion and its expression in Ritual} (London: Elliot & Stock, 1901). "Mr. Dimock's books...are among the greatest treasures a clergyman can possess." declared W.H Griffith Thomas in his B.D. dissertation: \textit{A Sacrament of our Redemption: An Enquiry into the meaning of the Lord's Supper in the New Testament and the Church of England} (London: Bemrose, 1905), vi. Griffith Thomas also concluded that the doctrine of the BCP was "Reformed," neither Lutheran nor Zwinglian. But evangelical appeal to Brevint was not above suspicion either: in a footnote in which he claims that Brevint was opposed to the doctrine of the "Real and Objective Presence" Dimock's three citations of \textit{Depth
the passages Pusey quoted from Brevint that could be used in support of the Tractarian position, and that Pusey had deliberately misrepresented Brevint's own intentions, selectively using *The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice* to argue opinions contrary to Brevint's own.\(^\text{125}\) Goode wrote to refute Pusey, Denison and Wilberforce's\(^\text{126}\) use of patristic and seventeenth-century English sources, and particularly accused Denison of simply being insufficiently familiar with the subject at all. Goode simply cited supplementary, but contradictory, passages from the same works they had used, and argued that the intent of the English divines in their use of the phrase "real presence" was contradictory to the meaning the Tractarians were attributing to it, and thus, by extension, to them.

In the continuing controversy regarding *Tract 81*, Alfred Mortimer included Brevint among forty-two Anglican writers "whose treatment of the Eucharistic Sacrifice is unmistakably Catholic" as opposed to F.E. Brightman's understanding of the nature of the eucharistic sacrifice.\(^\text{127}\)

On the other hand, the ignoring of Brevint by certain other writers is rather more intriguing: Darwell Stone's study of the Eucharist omits Brevint altogether, and although he quotes from no fewer than nine of the Wesleys' and Mystery are fabricated. *Papers on the Doctrine of the English Church*, vol. 1, 192n.


\(^\text{126}\) Denison was unsuccessfully prosecuted 1854-58 in the civil courts for his teaching on the real presence but remained vicar of East Brent until his death; in 1854 Wilberforce was received into Rome, as were his brother Henry in 1850 and Henry Manning (with whom he had been close) in 1851; joining Newman and Ward who were received in 1845.

hymns on the Lord's Supper, he makes no reference at all the original writer of the Preface.¹²⁸ Dugmore's study of eucharistic doctrine from Hooker to Waterland likewise is silent about Brevint, although he discusses R.F.'s fulminations against him.¹²⁹ More and Cross's famous volume of extracts from the Caroline divines, Anglicanism, fails to mention Brevint even once, as though he never existed.¹³⁰ In 1914 J. Wickham Legg made two glancing references to Brevint, stating only that Brevint was noted for his "protestant attitude."¹³¹

With such approbation as Brevint received from the likes of Hickes, Waterland, Wesley and Pusey, one cannot help but think that these omissions were deliberate. Those Tractarians who appealed to the orthodoxy of the Caroline Divines might well have been initially attracted to Brevint's sacrificial views, but then have been disappointed with his decidedly Calvinist and anti-Roman opinions. It is really no surprise that the LACT never got around to him.

Perhaps the reason for his neglect is that Brevint in some senses is neither fish nor fowl; he does not neatly fit into the pre-conceived classifications of some historians. For example, he was used to support opposing sides: Anglo-Catholics appealed to Brevint to support their idea of eucharistic sacrifice, but "protestant" Anglicans used him to combat Tractarian


¹³⁰ More and Cross, Anglicanism.

¹³¹ J. Wickham Legg, English Church Life from the Restoration to the Tractarian Movement (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1914), 69.
teaching on Real Presence. As a French Anglican, anti-Catholic, Calvinist Royalist graduate from both Saumur and Oxford, Brevint may have been seen as an anomaly, not an example of the true stream of Anglican Carolinism of other seventeenth-century divines. Yet it is my conclusion that Brevint is in fact entirely typical of the Early Stuart Church, and it is the categories such as "Puritan" and "Caroline Divine" which are artificial; the fact that he cannot easily be categorized serves merely to demonstrate the inadequacy of the categories themselves.
CHAPTER TWO

THE STUDY OF THE CAROLINES

I. WHO WERE THE CAROLINE DIVINES?

Ah blessed Hammond, thou didst write rationally; excellent
Gauden, thou persuade powerfully; devout Taylor, thou didst urge
pathetically; honest Nicholson thou didst answer satisfactorily;
solid Sanderson thou didst state clearly; holy Usher and Hall you
did offer moderately, heartily and learnedly--------But who, o ye
worthies! believed your report? who would hear you? who was
convinced by you?

Examination of the "Caroline Divines" must begin with John Henry
Newman, for it is almost entirely due to him that we have the category in the
first place. "The Oxford Movement," says John Spurr, "has long dictated
modern perceptions of the seventeenth-century Church of England."¹ A
central Tractarian claim was that they were recapturing the authentic spirit of
Anglicanism definitively achieved during the seventeenth century. The high-
church writers of that period came to be known as "Caroline divines" and


² Spurr, Restoration Church of England, 394.
"Anglo-catholics" and the Oxford Movement was but an Anglo-catholic "revival," but this self-evaluation has recently been subjected to critical scrutiny, as has the idea that there existed a coherent group of non-Puritan seventeenth-century writers that represents "classical" Anglicanism.

Newman often claimed that his teaching was guided by the authority of Andrewes, Bull, Beveridge, Laud, Cosin, Bramhall, Chillingworth, and other seventeenth-century theologians. He wrote in Tract 71 that the sources of knowledge of the truth in the English Church are the writings of the Fathers and "our Divines of the seventeenth century, though little comparatively at present is known concerning those great authors." The works in which he makes the claim of Caroline revival and continuity are Tracts for the Times 38, 41 and 71; his Lectures on the Prophetic Office of the Church; and his Apologia pro vita sua. Tract 71 claims:

[T]he tie of that invisible communion with the dead as well as the living, into which the Sacraments introduce us; the memory of our great teachers, champions, and confessors, now in Paradise, especially of those of the seventeenth century,—Hammond's name alone, were there no other, or Hooker's, or Ken's,—bind us to the English Church, by cords of love, except something very serious can be proved against it. But this surely is impossible.

Weidner has documented Newman's ambition to systematize the writings of the seventeenth-century Anglican divines into a "corpus theologicum et

---


* e.g. R.W. Church, The Oxford Movement: Twelve Years 1833-1845 (London: Macmillan, 1891), 44. "What [they] fought for was not Rome, not even a restoration of unity, but a Church of England such as it was conceived of by the Caroline divines and the Non-jurors."

5 Tracts for the Times: by members of the University of Oxford (Oxford: Parker, 1833-41); Tract 71, On the Controversy with the Romanists, 35.

6 Tract 71, 4.
ecclesiasticum." Newman had received sound advice that such an "Anglican consensus built on Anglican sources was impossible," and yet his project remained, as he later wrote in the Lectures on the Prophetic Office to make just this synthesis, and he ended Tract 71 with this appeal:

Nor could a more acceptable or important service be done to our church at this present moment, than the publication of some systematic introduction to theology, embodying and illustrating the great and concordant principles and doctrines set forth by Hammond, Taylor, and their brethren before and after them.6

The idea of an authoritative "consensus doctorum" of seventeenth-century theologians seems to have appealed to Newman's romanticism, but he actually knew little of them. Mackean wrote that the Tractarians "had but a limited acquaintance with them,"9 and Thomas Parker expressed the opinion that there is no evidence to show that Newman had read any of them before 1834.10

Weidner and Kenneth Parker have demonstrated otherwise,11 and Kenneth Parker concluded that Newman may have read the Carolines casually, but never seriously studied them. Weidner demonstrates that Newman knew the works of Butler and Beveridge, but that his early introduction to the rest of the Carolines was Richard Mant's annotated Book of Common Prayer, the

---


8 Tract 71, 35.

9 Mackean, Eucharistic Theology, 44.


commentary to which was selectively drawn from many seventeenth and
eighteenth-century "high church" authors.\textsuperscript{12}

Newman was opportunistic in his use of the Caroline divines, and simply
omitted inconvenient passages over which he would in private express dismay
and disappointment.\textsuperscript{13} Nockles notes Ann Mozley's statements that

\begin{quote}
\textquote{[I]n the heyday of the \textit{via media}, Newman selected \textquote{here a teacher, there an authority} but accepted \textquote{them no further than they fell in with his views.} She felt that he snatched at \textquote{every chance saying of any of our Divines}, even though \textquote{the whole tenor of the work has no weight with him.}}\textsuperscript{14}
\end{quote}

The \textit{Tracts for the Times} give the impression that the Tractarians were
indeed labouring to revive an older, forgotten theological strand of
Anglicanism. In the Advertisement from the first volume of the collected \textit{Tracts}
Newman wrote that they were working for the \"...practical revival of doctrines,
which, although held by the great divines of our Church, at present have
become obsolete with the majority of her members." He wrote in \textit{Tract 38}:

\begin{quote}
\textquote{In the seventeenth century the theology of the divines of the
English Church was substantially the same as ours is; and it
experienced the full hostility of the Papacy. It was the true \textit{Via}
Media; Rome sought to block up that way as fiercely as the
Puritans.}\textsuperscript{15}
\end{quote}

Several of the \textit{Tracts} are extracts from Caroline works: 25 and 26 are from
Beveridge's sermons \"The Great Necessity and Advantage of Public Prayer\" and

\begin{footnotes}
\item[12] The \textit{Book of Common Prayer, with Notes Selected and Arranged by The
Reverend Richard Mant, D.D.} (Oxford: 1820); Weidner, \"Introduction,\" xxi(n).
Weidner calls Mant an \"evangelical baiter,\" and refers to the account by Storr of a
lecture by Mant resulting in a very real evangelical/high church split; xviii, xx.
Vernon Storr, \textit{The Development of English Theology in the Nineteenth Century}


\item[14] Ibid., 133; Ann Mozley, \"Dr. Newman's Apology,\" \textit{Christian Remembrancer}
48 (July 1864), 178.

\item[15] Tract 38, \textit{Via Media #1}, 11.
\end{footnotes}
"The Necessity and Advantage of Frequent Communion"; 27 and 28 are from Cosin's *History of Popish Transubstantiation*; 64 from Bull's sermon, "On the Ancient Liturgies"; 72 From Ussher on Prayers for the Dead; 86 a translation of Andrewes' Greek devotions. Furthermore, Tracts 74, 76, 78 and 81 are extensive *Catenae Patrum*, extracts from writings from Caroline theologians on baptismal regeneration, the apostolic succession, the "Rule of Vincent" ("quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est")\(^{17}\), and the eucharistic sacrifice.

In the Advertisement to his *Lectures on the Prophetic Office of the Church* Newman wrote that he "...has endeavoured in all important points of doctrine to guide himself by our standard divines."\(^{18}\) In the *Apologia pro vita sua* Newman said of the *Lectures*:

> It was an attempt at commencing a system of theology on the Anglican idea, and based upon Anglican authorities....I wished to build up an Anglican theology out of the stores which already lay cut and hewn upon the ground, the past toil of great divines.\(^{19}\)

Yet apart from name-dropping, Newman made very little actual use of seventeenth-century writers in the *Prophetic Office*.\(^{20}\) Kenneth Parker has demonstrated that Newman in fact knew little about these authors, Hammond excepted, until August 1836, when he looted the Bodleian library in a flurry of

---

\(^{16}\) Which apparently gave Froude the fantods.

\(^{17}\) St. Vincent of Lérins, "Commonitorium" II.3; often misquoted in the nineteenth century as "quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus."

\(^{18}\) Newman, *Via Media*, 7.


reading just prior to the Lectures.21 The Lectures on Justification also reveal Newman's unfamiliarity with seventeenth-century theology, and did not here claim as before to be reviving the theology of the "Standard Divines"; he simply used them to bolster his own arguments. Given that Newman was familiar with Hammond, Butler and Bull, the only Caroline he made any consistent appeal to was Davenant.22 The very few other references to any Caroline divines are all en passant, mostly scattered in footnotes, to names such as Jackson, Hammond, Wilson, Field, Taylor, Tillotson, Wake, Waterland, and even Perkins, Smith and Baxter, none of whom he actually cites. The closest Newman comes here to making any claim for Caroline unanimity is in Lecture VIII.2 regarding the non-Juring English theologians:

By the latter divines I mean the Arminians who rose in Charles the First's time, and have exercised an extensive influence in our Church since 1688.23

This reads remarkably like Froude's comment some years earlier:

...I should like much to get together materials for the lives of Bishops Andrews, Cosin and Overall. They might be made into a nice first volume, for a series of "Lives of Apostolic Divines of the Church of England:" a genus which seems to me to have come into existence about the beginning of James I., and to have become extinct with the non-Jurors.24

Mackean has said that Newman found his work on the Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology tedious and ungratifying,25 and Nockles shows how little Newman

21 Ibid., 40.
22 Generally considered to have been a Puritan bishop.
25 Mackean, Eucharistic Theology, 44-45.
cared for the project. It was soon apparent that the seventeenth-century divines were not quite so uniformly "Catholic" (as opposed to Protestant) as the Tractarians might have wished. Newman wrote that by the end:

I began to have misgivings....in some things which I had said, I had taken the statements of the Anglican divines for granted without weighing them for myself....I was sore about the great Anglican divines, as if they had taken me in, and made me say strong things, which facts did not justify.

Later 19th and 20th-century Anglo-Catholics uncritically accepted Newman's claims of revival of the high-church seventeenth-century Anglo-Catholic divines. On the other hand, some 19th-century "evangelical" writers would demonstrate that the Caroline divines could not be used in support of the ideas which Newman and the Tractarians were promoting, and although their objections were seldom heard, they were in fact mostly correct.

Daniel Brevint was a clergyman of rank, an Oxford D.D., and an author of repute by the latter decades of the seventeenth century. He sought episcopal re-ordination, and was closely associated with Cosin both in France during the Interregnum and after the Restoration in Durham. By his actions

---

26 Nockles, Oxford Movement in Context, 128.

27 See Spurr, Restoration Church, 395 for a critical discussion of the editorial policies of the editors of the LACT. Newman regretted that Copeland, one of the editors, resigned "because our divines do not go far enough for him." J.H. Newman to F. Rogers, Letters and Correspondence of John Henry Newman during his life in the English Church, ed. Anne Mozely (London: Longmans, Green, 1891), vol. ii, 323.

28 Newman, Apologia, 190. Nevertheless, Darwell Stone in a letter to Viscount Halifax, president of the English Church Union, praised the Tractarians' "providential" notion that "they had support for their position in a post-Reformation tradition, because without this belief, they very likely would not have had the heart to go on." Letter to Lord Halifax, Jan. 27, 1914; F.L. Cross, Darwell Stone: Churchman and Counsellor (Westminster: Dacre Press, 1943), 245; Gregory Dix, Dixit Cranmer et non Timuit: A Supplement to Mr. Timme (London: Dacre Press, 1948); reprinted from The Church Quarterly Review, 145 and 146 (1948), 1.
and writings it is evident that he does not match any conventional Puritan
definition. Almost by default, then, he might appropriately be numbered among
the "Caroline Divines," as indeed he has been by Rattenbury. 29 But an
important issue is that of definition: who exactly were the "Caroline Divines"
and what distinguished them from the other non-Roman Catholic writers in
seventeenth-century England? The term, though convenient, betrays the
assumption, such as found for example in Haddan and Cross, that these
seventeenth-century high churchmen were a distinct school or a party, but this
assumption has proved to be unwarranted.

"Caroline" denotes a time period, but also, because it is named after the
Kings, hints at an erastian concern for de jure divino authority and
consequently a disciplined national conformity in the church. Puritans and
Dissenting writings are excluded from the usual canon, though this is not
strict: Richard Baxter is occasionally included amongst the Carolines. Hooker,
though Elizabethan, is often included; Andrews, though Jacobean, is usually
considered the patriarch; and others who published during James II and William
III might well be included. 30 However the terminus ad quem (as scholars of the


30 The following is a tentative list which are all arguably Caroline Divines, and
there are undoubtedly more: Richard Allestree, Lancelot Andrews, Richard
Bancroft, Thomas Barlow, Isaac Barrow, Richard Baxter, William Beveridge,
Thomas Bilson, John Bramhall, Thomas Bray, Thomas Brett, Daniel Brevint,
John Buckeridge, George Bull, Joseph Butler, Isaac Casaubon, William
Chillingworth, John Cosin, Ralph Cudworth, John Davenant, John Donne,
George Downman, Bryan Duppa, John Durel, Henry Ferne, Nicholas Ferrar,
Richard Field, William Forbes, John Gauden, Peter Gunning, Joseph Hall, Henry
Hammond, George Herbert, Peter Heylyn, George Hickes, Richard Hooker,
Thomas Jackson, John Johnson, Thomas Ken, Peter King, William Laud, Hamon
L'Estrange, Joseph Mede, Richard Montagu, George Morley, Thomas Morton,
William Nicholson, John Overall, Simon Patrick, John Pearson, Thomas Pierce,
John Pocklington, Edward Reynolds, Robert Sanderson, Gilbert Sheldon, William
Sherlock, John Smith, Anthony Sparrow, Edward Stillingfleet, Christopher
Sutton; Thomas Sydserff, William Sancroft, Jeremy Taylor, Herbert Thorndike,
Caroline period are in the habit of saying) is generally taken to be the rise of the Non-Jurors. It is common to read that after 1690 the Church of England became dominated by Latitudinarian and rationalist thought (culminating, in eucharistic matters, in the dreaded Hoadly) whilst the "Laudian Spirit" of the Caroline Divines remained alive and well among those, who along with Archbishop Ken, refused to take the new oaths to William and Mary. These clergy formed a schismatical party within England for the greater part of the eighteenth century, and among their most notable writers were George Hickes and William Law. The eucharistic thought of John Johnson, though not himself a non-Juror, was closely associated with them through his influential book The Unbloody Sacrifice (1714-18).

Various terms of varying propriety have been used to denote the Bishop-scholars of the seventeenth century whom Newman claimed are the English "Standard Divines." The term "Anglo-catholic," especially since the adding of

John Tillotson, Thomas Traherne, James Ussher, Izaac Walton, Brian Walton, John Williams, Thomas Wilson, Matthew Wren.

There have been three lines of argument regarding the survival of the "Caroline spirit." The first is that it was sustained by the Non-Jurors, then forgotten, finally to be recovered by the Tractarians, and by their noble efforts it has survived into our own time. The second is that, ending more or less with Ken, the Caroline spirit lay dormant for nearly 200 years, arising again with Gore and the liberal catholic movement; Henry McAdoo, The Spirit of Anglicanism: A Survey of Anglican Theological Method in the Seventeenth Century (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965); he asserts that the Tractarians were a side development, and P.E. More agreed. See also Newman, Via Media, xv, that the liberal catholic succeeded where Pusey's anti-modernist rigidity had led tractarianism into a dead end; H.C.G. Matthew, "Edward Bouvarie Pusey: Liberal Scholar to Tractarian," Journal of Theological Studies 32 (1981): 123. The third is that, like other excellences in Western Christianity, it survived in Ireland, in the tradition begun with Bramhall and Taylor; F.R. Bolton, The Caroline Tradition of the Church of Ireland, with particular reference to Bishop Jeremy Taylor (London: SPCK, 1958); this is evident in Mant's Book of Common Prayer; Mant was bishop of Down and Connor 1776-1848.
the "ism" is an anachronism if applied to the seventeenth century. "Laudian" is often used, most notably by Bosher, Higham and Milton, and is defended admirably by Trevor-Roper. It is seen to apply following the interregnum because of the ascendancy of Cosin and the harshly enforced conformity following 1662. But Laud's personal contributions to the Church were largely political rather than theological. The Laudians were High Churchmen who shared the religious viewpoint of Laud and who were in whole-hearted agreement in their method of defending the Church's interests both before and after the Restoration.

Tyacke has written that the least misleading term is "Arminian," which denotes the anti-Calvinist nature of English high-church theology of the period. His book Anti-Calvinists led to a debate with White and Lake, amongst others, as to the extent to which the early Stuart church was in conflict between predestinarian Puritans and the high-church Laudians. Lake and White prefer "Laudian" as the least misleading, "vastly better than 'Arminian' or even 'anti-Calvinist.'" Arminian" was, however, the favoured term of abuse at the


35 Bosher, Restoration Settlement, xv; see especially Packer, Transformation of Anglicanism, 1, who supports Bosher's use, adding also that the word "Canterburian" is also apt, and was used in the seventeenth century, but would now only lead to confusion; and 126, regarding complaints about the rigidity and narrowness of some Restoration bishops.

time, and its wielders accused non-predestinarians of leaning to popery, although there were few direct contacts with Arminius.\textsuperscript{37}

Davies has written of the "Caroline captivity" of the Church of England in the seventeenth century, and has described the theological tenor as that of being dominated not by Laud but by King Charles himself and his personal understanding of sacramental kingship. Davies concluded that the Caroline church was "not the apogee of Anglicanism, but a very weird aberration from the first hundred years of the early reformed Church of England."\textsuperscript{38} For Davies, the term "Arminian" will not do because apart from their anti-Calvinism the Caroline Divines were not promoting the theology of Arminius. Tyacke, on the other hand, thinks it an accurate term, but rejects "Anglican" as anachronistic.\textsuperscript{39}

Trevor-Roper had attributed the Arminian flavour to the influence of Erasmus in England during the late sixteenth century,\textsuperscript{40} but Davies dismisses this conclusion. A very convincing argument is that of Wallace who attributes it

\textsuperscript{37} Jeremy Taylor wrote: "every man that is angry in this question calls his enemy Pelagian." Henry McAdoo, \textit{The Eucharistic Theology of Jeremy Taylor Today}, (Norwich: Canterbury Press, 1988), 31; and Arminius was condemned at Dort as such. The late Professor Elliot Rose is remembered as saying that the whole issue of Arminianism in England is "an interesting but inconsequential red herring."


\textsuperscript{39} Tyacke, \textit{Anti-Calvinists}, vii.

\textsuperscript{40} Trevor-Roper, "Laudianism and Political Power," 42-3.
to the rise of Melanchthon's popularity in England in the early seventeenth century. Oddly enough, Newman was of the same opinion. The question of what, exactly, constitutes the "Caroline Church" itself is one which is not easily answered. For the present, largely theological purposes the term shall indicate the established Church of England, approximately from 1603 to 1685; from the accession of James I during the time of Lancelot Andrewes, until the end of the reign of Charles II, that is, largely coextensive with the "seventeenth-century Stuart Church of England." The reason I do not therefore refer to it, as historians generally do, simply as the "Stuart Church," or distinguish between the Jacobean and Caroline periods, is because of the established character of the term "Caroline" in Anglican historical theology. Newman may have been wrong, but his influence has been immeasurable. The topic at hand will be that of the conforming Church of England, even during the interregnum, hence independents and non-conformists will be excluded.

---


12 Newman stated that his interpretation of the Thirty nine Articles in Tract 90 was in accordance with Melanchthon's own general leaning, and from whom the articles were principally drawn. John Henry Newman, Tract Ninety, or Remarks on certain passages in the Thirty-nine Articles, ed. A.W. Evans, (London: Constable, 1933), 99. Melanchthon too was in his own time reproached for "popish tendencies." Newman, Apologia, 150.

13 I am aware that historians distinguish the "Jacobean Church," from the "Caroline Church"; and both are within the "Early Stuart Church," that is, from 1604 to the end of the century. Although there may be important issues here to be distinguished, it has also been asserted that there was a significant degree of theological stability, in some matters at least, during the period. Since Andrewes, and even Hooker occasionally, have been called "Caroline divines," I shall use "Caroline Church" and "Stuart Church" synonymously, rather than in their technical, historiographical sense.
It has become apparent that conventional labels such as Puritan, Arminian, Laudian, Calvinist, Caroline Divine, Anglican, *inter alia*, may often do more to cloud than to clarify discussions of the seventeenth-century Church of England, and most are either inadequate or incorrect in some way. By way of a now-famous example of rivalry, Peter Smart was without doubt a Puritan and John Cosin a Laudian, and there were significant and visible differences in teaching and practice between them. Nevertheless they were both episcopally-ordained clergy of the same church, prebendaries of the same cathedral, and held to a large degree the same Protestant theology. The difference between them seems to be mostly an ecclesiological question of where, exactly, loyal English Protestants might draw the line between acceptable adiaphora and "popish innovation."

"Caroline" may be used to denote the party of high-churchmen, distinguished from, but yet often overlapping, the Cambridge Platonists, the Great Tew Circle, the Latitude Men, and the Puritans. But it must be clearly asserted that although there existed a good deal of consensus among these writers, they did not dominate the English Church during the Caroline period. Those whom we call the "Caroline Divines" were indeed constituents of the Caroline church, but they did not alone constitute the norm, or even a "dominant party" any more than did the "Puritans."

It is in this context that Dugmore quoted Alec Vidler, stating that theological labels may be helpful, and may even be indispensable, but labels may lead to errors of generalization. "Catholic" and "Protestant" were not used antithetically in the seventeenth century as they are often used now.

---

Dugmore nevertheless cautiously divided the Carolines into "High Churchmen," "Central Churchmen," "Latitudinarians" and "Puritans." He seems to have meant that the difference between the first two is that "High" tends to be less hostile to Rome than is "Central." This distinction is however subject to debate. Buxton and Nockles are critical of both Dugmore and Stone, saying that there is less difference in eucharistic theology between the High and Central churchmen than Dugmore maintained. Even so, Dugmore admitted a high degree of agreement among the Carolines on common points of eucharistic doctrine:

Nevertheless, these central churchmen all believed in the spiritual reception by faith of Christ's body and blood; they maintained that there is no change in the bread and wine except in the sacred use to which they are appointed; that the sacrifice in the Eucharist is a "sacramental representation, commemoration and application" of "the real sacrifice on the cross"; that it is the crucified body of Christ now in heaven which is spiritually partaken, and that the wicked do not eat the body of Christ in the sacrament.

What must be avoided as simply being romantic myth is any conclusion which resembles Thornton's regarding Richard Hooker:

"Central" churchmanship was a concept larger than just Dugmore's use of it in Eucharistic Doctrine; J. Denton Thompson identified members of this category as Evangelicals committed to Prayer Book observance. Not all Central Churchmen are necessarily Evangelicals, he wrote, but all Evangelicals are essentially Central Churchmen. He carefully distinguished Low, High, and Broad-Churchmanship from Central, claiming that they are not truly Evangelical. J. Denton Thompson, Central Churchmanship (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1911), viii, 12-13. His discussion would be much in sympathy with that of Mackean.

Dugmore, Eucharistic Doctrine, 53-58.


Ibid., 57.
[T]here is a real sense in which he is the father of Anglo-Catholic theology, for he laid foundations upon which the school of Caroline divines built in the following century. To these in turn the Tractarians appealed when they began their work of recovery. These are obvious links in a definite tradition.

Or as is reported in the Catholic Encyclopedia:

When the Armada was scattered and broken, many adherents of the old faith appear to have conformed; and their impetus accounts for the rise of the High Anglican party, whose chief representative was Launcelot Andrewes, Bishop of Winchester (1555–1626). The Anglo-Catholic school was continued by Laud, and triumphed after the Restoration. In 1662 it expelled from the Church, Baxter and the Presbyterians. But from the Revolution in 1688 it steadily declined. The non-juring bishops were wholly in its tradition, which, through obscure by-ways, was handed on from his father to John Keble and so to Hurrell Froude and Newman.

II. "ANGLICANISM"

Studies of the Caroline Divines have often been made from the Tractarian position, particularly in the application of Newman's via media as the single, unifying theme. For example, P.E. More insisted in his influential essay "The Spirit of Anglicanism" that the "true line of development" of Anglican theology itself began with Hooker, the "father of Anglo-Catholic theology" and was exemplified by the Caroline Divines, and continued, though imperfectly, through the Non-Jurors. This direction was towards a definite goal, viz. the via media, the "watchword," even charter, of the Church of England from then


51 Hickes, though a Non-Juror, "was in the true line of development from Laud and Cosin and Thorndike." P.E. More, "The Spirit of Anglicanism," in More and Cross, eds, Anglicanism, xix, xxxv.
until now, the pursuit of which was the "manifest intention" of the Carolines.

The eighteenth century failed to maintain this direction, and, says More, historians have pretty well agreed in holding the significance of the Oxford Movement to be exactly this, that it brought theology back to the path from which it had deviated in the arid intervening years.52

Nevertheless it seems to More that the Lux Mundi school of Gore et al., now bears the Caroline torch, and that the Oxford Movement was at risk of "leading the Church away from the line of its normal development."53

This post hoc reasoning assumes that the idealized church is the inexorable result of all that is good which has gone before, and towards which all correct theology and history tend. The assertion of a "straight line of descent" begs its own question: everything not fitting the theory is simply dismissed a priori as an aberration, such as puritanism, the evangelical revival, Hoadly's rationalism, nineteenth-century evangelicalism, Elizabethan Calvinism, the "pseudo-antiquity of the Reformation,"54 and so on. To More's statement, "What we have to look for in the ecclesiastical literature of England is not so much finality as direction,"55 one may simply ask: "Why?" More insists that without this line of continuity, Anglicanism itself is left without an identity.

One particularly hagiographical review of the theology of the period was the essay by Arthur West Haddan in The Church and the Age, in which the Carolines were depicted as the only true Anglican school of thought, which endowed the Church with "the only theology we have worthy of the name,

learned, thorough, and systematic." They finally got rid of Calvin, affirmed the real Catholicity of the Church, and because of them, we are not a sect, but a true church based upon the conscious principle of moderation and the via media.

Frankly, the repeated insistence on the existence of an authentic "stream" of thought which is pur laine Anglican from which any departure is a deviation, becomes wearisome. Since 1962 historians have questioned the existence of an ideologically coherent, unitary and stable 'Anglicanism', distinctive of the English Church and dedicated to a self-consciously achieved golden mean between Rome and Geneva, which could be read back into the Tudor and early Stuart Church.  

Nockles has clearly described the Tractarian divergence spiritually and theologically from the Old High-churchmanship. Tractarian historiography is mistaken, he writes, in suggesting that the Oxford Movement rediscovered Anglicanism, and that what has become known as Anglo-Catholicism is its natural line of evolution. Spurr likewise disputes the idea of the development of an enduring principle of "Anglicanism," and asserts that the seventeenth century saw the development of one Anglicanism "which then formed a heritage to be reappropriated, cannibalized, or transformed into other 'Anglicanisms.'" He

---

54 "The 'Anglican tradition' had come to be conceived as a tradition which did not include Calvinism. That tradition ran through Hooker, and Laud, and Thorndike, and Bull, and Jeremy Taylor; not through Whitaker, and Davenant, and Hall, and Baxter. When the men of the Oxford Movement claimed to be representing the 'authentic' Anglican position in theology, they meant this. To them, Calvinism seemed by its history to have sacrificed any right which it might once have possessed, to be counted an authentic portion of the tradition." Owen Chadwick, The Mind of the Oxford Movement (London: Adam & Charles Black, 1960), 20.

57 Milton, Catholic and Reformed, 1.

58 Nockles, Oxford Movement in Context, 309.
also points out that one of the main difficulties with the Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology, despite its value, is the very "assumption of the notion of the 'Caroline Divines.'" 59 Nockles agrees: "Historical context was ignored, and a spurious assumption of theological coherence was made in the very title 'Caroline Divines.'"

Breward has summed up this discussion admirably, and his comments are worth citing at length:

The combined effects of 1662 and the Oxford movement have frequently resulted in the search for an anglicanism recognizably like the ideas of Pusey and his followers. Anglicanism is portrayed as a search for a via media between the twin perils of Genevan and Roman extremism, as if these offered the only viable theological alternatives in the sixteenth century. Many quotations could be adduced which rest on the following syllogism: Anglicans are not Calvinist. Puritans are Calvinists. Therefore Puritans are not Anglicans. 60 The result is a tendency to see Hooker as the theologian of the Elizabethan church, despite the fact that his Ecclesiastical Polity was a worst seller and appears scarcely to have been noticed until later in the seventeenth century...Perkins himself showed no sign that he thought of himself as anything other than a normal and loyal member to the Church of England. 61

III. WHO WERE THE PURITANS?

It has recently become a commonplace to assert that the term "Puritan" is useless, or nearly so. Christopher Hill in 1964 wrote that the word "Puritan"

59 Spurr, Restoration Church, 395, 396.

60 L.S. Thornton is here cited by Breward as an example: "as Puritanism degenerated, genuine theology was beginning to lift up its head." McAdoo's insistence in The Spirit of Anglicanism that Anglicanism has no writer of a Summa or a distinctive body of teaching "is essentially a condition of the existence of theological method" ignores even moderate puritan members of the Church of England. Allison makes the same error. Ian Breward, "Introduction" to William Perkins, The Works of William Perkins Courtenay Reformation Classics III, ed. Ian Breward (Appleford: Sutton Courtenay Press, 1970), 116–7, n.5.

61 Breward, "Introduction" to William Perkins, 15.
has become "an admirable refuge from clarity of thought." Even as early as 1626 John Yates wanted the word banned because "Satan gains much by the free use of it." Nevertheless Webster, citing Yates, has commented:

It may be true that Satan (or at least a considerable historiographical sub-discipline) has benefitted from an over-enthusiastic employment of the term, but, as Ian Breward has pointed out, if contemporaries like Baxter had not used the term, historians would have had to invent it. "

This dissertation asserts that the distinction between "Laudian" and "Puritan" on theological grounds is misleading. Finlayson writes

"The basic problems surrounding the term "Puritanism" are somewhat magnified by the fact that not all scholars agree that there was a clear-cut theological or ecclesiastical distinction between the "Puritans" and their opponents."

Therefore, rather than try to solve the problem of defining either, I shall here note some of the prominent literature regarding the debate, and then conclude this chapter with a discussion of "Calvinism," the theological orientation usually used to distinguish the unique perspective of the Puritans.

---


63 John Yates Ibid ad Caesarem, (1626) 'that this offensive name of a Puritan, wandering at large, might have some Statute passe upon it, both to define it, & punish it: for certainly Satan gains much by the free use of it.' I. Breward, "The Abolition of Puritanism," Journal of Religious History 7 (1972), 32; quoted in Tom Webster, Godly Clergy in Early Stuart England: The Caroline Puritan Movement c.1620-1643 (Cambridge: University Press, 1997), 3.

64 Although he agrees with Tyacke, J. Sears McGee states that the identifying element to Puritanism was not doctrine or practice, but rather, using Peter Lakes's words, "it lay in the capacity, which the godly claimed, of being able to recognize one another in the midst of a corrupt and unregenerate world." Lake, Moderate Puritans, 282; cited in J. Sears McGee, "On Misidentifying Puritans: The Case of Thomas Adams," Albion 30 (1998), 402. Adams, he says, was a non-Puritan Calvinist Episcopalian, which did not necessarily make him a Laudian.

There has been much concern in the past forty years by historians to
determine, what, if anything, made Puritans distinct as a group within the
seventeenth-century Church of England. As Todd has written, "The
historiographical problem of puritanism has now reached epic proportions." 66
From Basil Hall in 1965 writing on "Puritanism: the Problem of Definition," and
Peter Lake's 1993 essay "Defining Puritanism: Again?" no one has satisfactorily
arrived at a conclusive definition. J.F.H. New, admitting the difficulty, simply
wrote "we know who we mean"; Tyacke has abandoned the term, asserting that
the Calvinists were the norm in the early Stuart Church, and it was Laud and
his crony "Arminians" who introduced a foreign, destabilising element.

Dewey Wallace Jr.'s Puritans and Predestination: Grace in English
Protestant Theology, 1525-1695 worked to identify those theological points in
which "Anglican" and "Puritan" actually differed. Similarly John F.H. New's
Anglican and Puritan: The Basis of Their Opposition pointed out that in many
respects the differences were in fact minimal. He criticized Dugmore as

positively misleading when it distinguishes Puritan opinion from
Anglican by describing the former as 'Receptionist' or neo-
Zwinglian. The distinction is unreal." 67

New is himself criticized, however, by Breward who asserts that New's
definition of Calvinism is too narrow, and therefore New easily shows that it was
not the dominant theology of the Church of England 1558-1640. 68

Nevertheless, the Georges, denying that there was a distinctive Puritan
movement, agreed that there was substantial unity of outlook in the Church of


England until 1640." Margo Todd agrees with Breward as well on this point, stating that the Puritans were not revolutionaries, or a disaffected sub-group within the Church, but were in fact part of the mainstream Elizabethan and Jacobean Church. She argues, however, against those who would deny that there was a distinct Puritan identity: "They certainly recognized each other in the midst of the 'mere Prayer Booke protestants' who comprised the bulk of the church."

Webster prefers to use the term "godly" for those who refer to themselves as such; this is difficult because it suggests that all who differ must therefore be "not godly." But if "Puritan" is rejected in modern scholarship because it was rejected by those who were labelled with it, surely by the same argument, "Arminian" is equally objectionable, because it too was rejected by its victims; Montagu, for instance.

---

69 Charles H. & Katherine George, The Protestant Mind of the English Reformation 1570–1640 (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961), 405; see E. Brooks Hollfield, The Covenant Sealed: The development of Puritan sacramental theology in Old and New England (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1974), 234. J. Sears McGee compares the work of J.F.H. New and the Georges, and discusses, and defends, the usefulness of the words "Anglican" and "Puritan": "There are difficulties in the use of both terms. 'Anglicanism' is an anachronism and 'Puritanism' has been so stretched as to lose most of its shape. But they are the best we have, and they do correspond, in a rough way, to the political divisions present in the early stages of the Civil War. Although there are many objections to these terms, all the other possibilities entail even more problems." J. Sears McGee, The Godly Man in Stuart England: Anglicans, Puritans and the Two Tables, 1620–1670 (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1976), 10.

70 Todd, Christian Humanism, 2, 15n. She agrees with Tyacke et al. that Laudianism was the departure from the mainstream Church of England.

71 "The dangers of the term are never more apparent than when it is assumed to have a single, static and essential referent." Webster, Godly Clergy, 3-7.
Cocksworth has suggested a workable definition.\textsuperscript{72} For the sake of this present study, "Puritan" will mean those whose ecclesiology was concerned more with the elect and personal conversion than with birth and baptism into an institution; whose concern was more with preaching and teaching rather than corporate worship and sacraments;\textsuperscript{73} an emphasis on biblical authority in all things, not just in doctrine; a zealous piety centred on the family; and, I add, a general opposition to set forms of prayer rather than an emphasis on liturgy and passive obedience. Whether or not there was ever such a thing as "puritanism" is hotly debated among historians,\textsuperscript{74} but what cannot be denied is that there were Puritans.

\textsuperscript{72} Cocksworth, \textit{Evangelical Eucharistic Thought}, 46.

\textsuperscript{73} This is not to say that the Carolines did not emphasize preaching and teaching; both Laud and Charles I insisted on a literate, preaching clergy. Some Royalist Military Orders referred to a Chaplain simply as "the Preacher of the Regiment," and all sets of Orders commanded soldiers to attend regular sermons in addition to daily prayers. The emphasis among the Carolines was that preaching should be well-ordered, and that preachers should be duly licensed. "It was the disruptive and divisive potential of unregulated sermons by unlicensed preachers preaching unsound doctrine that worried Charles." Margaret Griffin, "Regulating Religion and Morality in the King's Armies 1639–46." (Ph.D. diss. University of Toronto, 1997), 81–2; also 121; 264–5; 320–22, 332 and infra. It has become a popular impression that those Caroline Divines customarily called the "Arminians" valued sacramental worship much more than they did preaching, but this is inaccurate. The Homilies were produced primarily not to inhibit freedom of the pulpit, but to improve the level of parochial preaching. Charles I and his bishops, amongst others at court, were enthusiastic sermon-listeners, and Davies has shown that Charles only engaged chaplains who were good preachers; Davies, \textit{Caroline Captivity}, 41.

\textsuperscript{74} "What Stone has done...is similar to the approach of many other historians. He has inferred from the activities of many 'Puritans' over a number of years the existence of the abstraction 'Puritanism.' Having created the concept, he has proceeded to analyze it as if it possessed the properties of a phenomenon in the natural world....As a rhetorical device, the reification of the abstraction 'Puritanism' and the subsequent treatment of the concept as though it were a real thing... represent part of the conventional historians' stock-in-trade." "Puritanism," says Finlayson, is a metaphor, a persuasive literary device; but as such is deceptive, because metaphors can lead us to think that the thing itself exists as an organism. Finlayson, \textit{Historians}, 5–6.
Another working definition, though it borders on oversimplification, is offered by Collinson, and similar to those by Finlayson and Conrad Russell, who suggests simply that the Puritans were those who thought that the Church needed further reforming following the model of the "best reformed churches" of the continent; contra popery and more conformable to Scripture. Breward suggests that the Puritans may be understood as those who, until 1640, were dissatisfied with the government and worship of the Church of England, yet refused to separate, those whom Lake labelled "moderate Puritans." Thus it can be argued that the word "Puritan" may legitimately be applied only to those who remained in the Church of England; those "Puritans" who left may be adequately, and with greater specificity, identified as Separatists: Independents, Presbyterians, Quakers, Brownists, etc. It may therefore be argued that it is unfair to exclude the Puritans from the canon of the Caroline Divines as though an aberration from the authentic Anglican tradition. "Puritan" and "dissenting" are not necessarily the same thing.

IV. "CAROLINE" EUCHARISTIC THEOLOGY

The eucharistic theology of the Carolines has received a certain amount of scholarly attention during the past hundred years. Darwell Stone's two-volume compendium *A History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, specifically volume

---

75 Patrick Collinson, *The Elizabethan Puritan Movement* (London: 1967), 27; cited in Michael G. Finlayson, *Historians*, 85. See particularly 180-81, n15: "As soon as one proposes a definition of "Puritanism" that moves from the genus to the species—that includes both the disposition to reform the church as well as specifying more precisely which particular reforms were intended—-one becomes open to Collinson's strictures that such "laboratory-bench" taxonomy" risks over-simplifying an "unstable and dynamic situation."

II, chapters 13 and 15 are very useful, having short selective extracts from 
Caroline works connected by commentary and very brief biographical remarks. 
His comments, however, lack analysis and synthesis, and bear a distinctive 
Tractarian bias.

Stone's attention to the Carolines was not without precedent, however: 
Thomas Vogan's rather immodestly titled book *The True Doctrine of the 
Eucharist* also paid a good deal of attention to those whose works had been 
republished by the LACT, as well as to others of the seventeenth century. One 
chapter of Vogan's large and intentionally pedantic opus briefly examines some 
forty Church of England writers from Ridley to Phillpotts and Palmer on the 
meaning of the doctrine of "the real Presence," one of Stone's visible 
preoccupations; perhaps this is a *catena patrum* in answer to Pusey's on 
sacrifice.

Stone in fact briefly mentions Vogan's work, including a brief extract, 
and summarizes Vogan's position as follows:

Dr. Vogan contended that the consecrated bread is the body of 
Christ, and the consecrated wine is His blood, by representation 
and in spiritual power and effect, but not in literal fact; that the 
body denoted is the dead, not glorified, body of Christ; that there 
is no real presence either of the dead or of the glorified body; that 
the body and blood are not received by the wicked; that Christ is 
not to be adored as present in the elements; and that the Eucharist 
is not a sacrifice but a feast on a sacrifice."

The number of negative statements here employed may fairly indicate Stone's 
own inclination, and yet Vogan's conclusions, which Stone has indeed correctly 
(if brutally) summarized would be happily accepted by the Caroline Divines in

---

77 Thomas S.L. Vogan, *The True Doctrine of the Eucharist* (London: 
Longmans, Green & Co., 1871).

78 Stone, *History* ii, 562. W.H. Griffith Thomas admired Vogan. The idea of 
the eucharist as a feast upon a sacrifice is also to be found in Simon Patrick's 
general (and Brevint in particular). But what Stone omits is Vogan's correct conclusion that what in the seventeenth century had been commonly been understood as "Real Presence," and what the Tractarians wished to assert about it, were very different indeed.

W.H. Mackean's 1930 essay "Anti-Roman Apologetics (The Carolines)" is relatively brief, but he concluded that there was by and large a theological consensus amongst Anglicans in the seventeenth century, and this consensus was very much like Calvin's view of the eucharist. He took pains to show how this Receptionism, carefully distinguished from Transubstantiation, Memorialism and Virtualism, still asserts the Real Presence of Christ in the eucharist; not in the consecrated elements themselves but by faith in the hearts of worthy communicants. He contributed a similar essay on the Non-Jurors in the same volume. Mackean's book The Eucharistic Doctrine of the Oxford Movement continued his earlier examination, and he concluded that the eucharistic theology of the Tractarians was very different from that of the Carolines. Hardelin has disagreed with some of Mackean's conclusions in this latter work, but neither he nor Brilioth discuss the Carolines to any significant degree. Of particular note is the popular compendium of seventeenth-century theological writing titled Anglicanism compiled by More and Cross (1935). This is an assemblage of extracts from many seventeenth-century authors on a vast number of "catholic" subjects. Its introductory essays, though idealistic, are


nevertheless helpful, but the work as a whole is compiled according to the
dogmatic principle of Tractarian continuity with the "Laudians."

Dugmore's survey, *Eucharistic Doctrine in England from Hooker to
Waterland* makes much the same presumptions as More and Cross, that there is
an identifiable thread of theological continuity running through "classical"
Anglicanism, and this church of the *via media* is catholic in the fullest sense,
and is found most perfectly in the Caroline Divines. It owes much to Stone, and
McAdoo has written that, in the case of Jeremy Taylor at least, Dugmore's
assessment is to be treated with respect." Dugmore's later work *The Mass
and the English Reformers* explicitly downplays any idea of continental
theological influences on the English reformers."

There have been three recent books of particular importance to the study
of seventeenth-century eucharistic theology. The first is Crockett's *Eucharist:
Symbol of Transformation* which includes an excellent summary of Calvin and a
brief examination of Brevint in the context of the Wesleys. Kenneth Stevenson's
*Covenant of Grace Renewed* is a survey, part historical and part theological, of
ten Caroline Divines on the eucharist. It is much in the spirit of More, Mackean
and Dugmore, though updated and much less ideological. Stevenson calls
Dugmore's book useful, though now long out of print. Thirdly, Cocksworthy's
dissertation *Evangelical Eucharistic Thought in the Church of England* contains
material on both the Puritans and the Carolines essential to the present study.

Henry McAdoo has been the central figure this century for the study of
Caroline theology, particularly in his book *The Spirit of Anglicanism*, and those

---


McAdoo has also collaborated with Kenneth Stevenson on the subject of Anglican eucharistic theology in their survey *The Mystery of the Eucharist in the Anglican Tradition*. He has always been concerned with Anglican casuistry, discussed in his first book *The Structure of Caroline Moral Theology*,¹⁴ in response to which Thomas Wood wrote *English Casuistical Divinity During the Seventeenth Century*¹⁵ as a continuation of McAdoo's study.

Although not about the eucharist *per se*, mention must be made of C. FitzSimons Allison's *The Rise of Moralism*. For many years it was the only specifically "Caroline" theological study of any kind. This targets the "holy living" school of Anglican moral theology, concluding that its pelagian "destructive doctrine" of the worthy communicant was no less than "pastoral cruelty" to the faithful. Spurr has taken a fresh and rather more dispassionate view of Restoration moral theology, and though he agrees that there was a change in the doctrine of grace among writers from the early to later seventeenth century, he disagrees that it was necessarily bad or a degradation of orthodoxy.¹⁶

---


¹⁶ Spurr, *Restoration Church*, 297ff. For a more detailed response to Allison, see Henry McAdoo, "CarolineS under criticism," *Theology* 72 (1969): 400–408. "Orthodoxy is my doxy; heterodoxy is another man's doxy," said Bishop Warburton to Lord Sandwich.
V. PURITAN EUCHARISTIC THEOLOGY

Stone, Dugmore, More and Cross all claimed to set forth the doctrine of the seventeenth-century Church of England, yet none of them made any reference whatever to the writings of those whom we have come to know as the Puritans, e.g. Preston, Perkins, Hildersam, Owen, Prynne, Sibbes, Greenham, Ames, Cartwright, Travers, Dent, etc. Even McAdoo completely omitted any discussion whatever of the Puritans in his Spirit of Anglicanism, although Stevenson's Covenant of Grace Renewed dedicated a half-chapter to Baxter. Frank's dissertation on the doctrine of the Eucharistic Presence among the Caroline Divines omitted any discussion of the Puritans, but did note, referring to Perkins, that the Carolines and the Puritans were not to be contrasted as being different doctrinally.**


The standard introduction to Puritan sacramental thought is Holifield's *The Covenant Sealed*. His definition of "Puritan" is broad, including Baptists, Quakers, Independents, and Presbyterians, and half of the book is given to colonial thought; nevertheless his is one of the few explicit studies of Puritan sacramental theology. His discussion of the eucharist revolves around two major points, viz. the demand by some Puritans for sequestration from the sacrament, and the concomitant debate regarding whether the Lord's Supper was not just a sealing, but also a converting ordinance. His work is especially interesting in his tracing of the development of the anti-sacramental propensity towards "spiritualizing" faith to the point of denying all material forms of worship.

Mayor's *The Lord's Supper in Early English Dissent*" is not about conforming Puritans, but it further demonstrates the lack of theological dispute during the period. Spinks' *From the Lord and the Best Reformed Churches*" is a study of some of the Puritans' liturgical concerns, especially concerning Prayer Book revisions.

Wakefield in 1957 included a ten-page survey of Puritan eucharistic doctrine in his *Puritan Devotion*, placing it in the context of the doctrine of the Church. A similar survey was included by Cocksworth's *Evangelical Eucharistic Thought* which briefly surveys the major points of Puritan eucharistic theology. In so doing, both address popular misconceptions regarding the supposed anti-

---


sacramental spirit of Puritan worship.\textsuperscript{91} Horton Davies' \textit{Worship and Theology in England} similarly includes a 15-page survey which focuses largely on Calvin, Ames and Baxter. His earlier \textit{The Worship of the English Puritans} examined the manner of Puritan sacramental worship, but did not address eucharistic theology to any significant degree.\textsuperscript{92}

Webster's \textit{Godly Clergy in Early Stuart England}\textsuperscript{93} is primarily an examination of Puritan clergy and the Puritan "mode" of devotion and spiritual fellowship, but he includes a brief discussion of their theology of the ordinance, particularly as it affected Puritan sacramental piety.

As odd as it may seem, these few titles constitute the sum of scholarly work done on Puritan sacramental theology. There are other Puritan studies of course, such as Wallace's \textit{Puritans and Predestination: Grace in English Protestant Theology} or Pettit's \textit{The Heart Prepared: Grace and Conversion in Puritan Spiritual Life},\textsuperscript{94} yet the emphasis in Puritan studies seems to be on non-sacramental piety, as though that was all that was expected to be found.


VI. THE EVOLUTION OF "CALVINISM"

Any discussion of the Puritans necessarily involves a discussion of what, exactly, constitutes "Calvinism," particularly since many modern works tend to see predestination as its defining characteristic and label those who do not as "Anti-Calvinists." But "Calvinism" can mean many things to many people, including apparent opposites, from Arminius' liberal protestantism to the rigid High Orthodoxy of Gomar and the Synod of Dort. Since it is here asserted that there was in England a general Calvinist consensus on the doctrine of the eucharist during the seventeenth century, a clear understanding of what is meant by "Calvinism" is necessary.

The decade from the mid 1960's until the mid 1970's saw the publication of several theological studies of Calvinistic thought in England with reference to the Puritans, and there was expressed a broad consensus that the "high" Calvinism in evidence at the Westminster Assembly was in fact an aberration away from Calvin's own thought, and in a manner was retrograde in its appeal to medieval scholastic method.

Some minor studies attributed this shift to several different influences. Trevor-Roper's analysis of the events leads him to believe that it was the very significant influence of Erasmus and Erasmian humanism which came to be called "Arminianism avant la lettre." Wallace makes an interesting case for the appeal of Melanchthon in England, but he admits that the Swiss and Calvinists were more influential. Yet Wallace quotes Thomas Pierce who claimed that Arminius was no more than a follower of Melanchthon; Montagu quoted him regarding predestination, and Taylor cited him in his eucharistic theology. Wallace's note is of interest, that the degree of Lutheranism in the Church of England during
the mid-sixteenth century indicated protestant influences in the Church; but by
the turn of the century, it shows the degree to which the Church was turning
away from reformed protestant orthodoxy.”

An important point is not just the study of Calvin's own thought, or how
it was adapted by Beza who succeeded him in Geneva, but rather how Calvin
and Beza were read and used in England. Cremeans' The Reception of
Calvinistic Thought in England began with the assertion that there was a
"vast difference between seventeenth century English Calvinism and the system
of thought adhered to by John Calvin himself." English Calvinism had
evolved into something distinctive which Calvin himself would have had trouble
recognizing.

This is the theme picked up by Basil Hall, who included a brief but telling
study of how Calvin was used in the Church of England. He made it very plain
that the "Anglican" opponents of the Puritans were much in sympathy with
Calvin, and cited him often; whereas the Puritans seldom did, and were much
more likely to refer to Beza. Hall concluded that Beza's return to scholastic
method and the resulting "Calvinism" of Dort and Westminster must be
distinguished from the "carefully prepared balance of complementary doctrines"
of Calvin himself. Beza, he said, hardened Calvin's lines of doctrine,
specifically with the ideas of limited atonement and supralapsarianism, and it
was Beza's changes which so influenced Perkins' development of the doctrine of

---

96 Charles Davis Cremeans, The Reception of Calvinistic Thought in England
97 Ibid., v.
98 Basil Hall, "Calvin against the Calvinists," in John Calvin, ed. G.E.
Duffield (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1966), 20.
Predestination, against which Arminius reacted, thus culminating in the five articles of Dort."

Holmes Rolston III was of the opinion that Calvin would have found Westminster's doctrine of man scandalous, and were he there he would have voted against the Confession. The language of the two covenants of Federal Theology reverses much of Calvin's own conclusions regarding the human relationship to God, and the dualism between law and grace which Reformed confessional theology affirmed was alien to Calvin.100

Peter Toon produced a couple of small volumes of some immediate interest. In *The Emergence of Hyper-Calvinism in English Non-Conformity*101 he states clearly that English Puritans departed from Calvin's own theology, and he distinguishes between "Calvinism," meaning Calvin's own theology, and the "High Calvinism" of those more in the line of Beza. Although Toon often tends to over-simplification,102 the opening chapter from this book is a good summary of the issues. Toon's *Puritans and Calvinism* continues that this new "Calvinism" evolved from Calvin's own humanist form into the rigid scholasticism favoured as reformed orthodoxy at the Synod of Dort and the Westminster Assembly.

---


102 He claims that the rise of "Federal" or Covenant Theology was a reaction to the rigidity of the scholastic determinism, or "high Calvinism" of Dort, as a way to reintroduce human moral responsibility; and that federal theology combined with this "high Calvinism" resulted in the Puritan orthodoxy of the Westminster Assembly. Although he notes the roles of Arminius, John Calvin and Amyraut in the evolution of Calvinism, his argument and conclusions make hasty generalizations and are not entirely convincing.
Beza, Toon notes, agreed with Calvin that it was not knowable who was elect and not, yet Beza also vigorously asserted limited atonement and supralapsarianism. Toon says that Calvin in his commentary on John 2.2 stated that Christ died sufficiently for all humanity, but effectively only for the elect; and also that Calvin insisted that predestination was not a topic for idle speculation. The extent of the atonement was not for Calvin the major issue it became for Beza and Perkins. The difference, essentially, between Calvin and Beza was that Beza changed the place of election and predestination from Calvin's Book III on the work of the Holy Spirit and grace, and located it in the doctrine of God's providence and sovereignty, where Aquinas had.

There are grounds, however, for a less harsh interpretation of Beza. Jill Raitt's dissertation on Beza's eucharistic theology admits that Beza became more reliant on scholastic method than was Calvin, but she questions whether it was his "fault" that orthodox Calvinism became scholastic. Beza's work was rather indicative of a development that was already in progress, and she calls Beza "one link between Calvin and Reformed orthodoxy." Raitt makes it very clear that though there may have been differences between Calvin and Beza on matters of election, Beza did not deviate from Calvin's teaching on the sacrament, although in the defence of this doctrine his method became increasingly scholastic. Kirk Summer, too, defends Beza's humanism,

---


104 Calvin, says Toon, placed it where St. Paul had put it. Toon, *Puritans and Calvinism*, (Swengel, Penn.: Reiner, 1973), 61. Calvin himself had in his first edition of the *Institutes*, originally put predestination and election under the doctrine of God, but most commentators insist that the 1559 edition must be taken as Calvin's final word.

105 Jill Raitt, *The Eucharistic Theology of Theodore Beza* (Atlanta: Scholars' Press, 1972), 69-70, 73. This extract from her dissertation is very important for the study of Daniel Brevint's theology, for reasons given in Chapter Four below. 
stating that Calvinism properly contains the thought of Beza. Even though
Beza's method indeed shifted over time in reaction to Roman Catholicism, the
Calvinist content of his theology did not. "Too much, however, is made of the
tension between what is viewed as the teaching of Calvin and the teaching of the
Calvinists." 106

One of the best studies has been very recently reprinted, Kendall's
Calvin and English Calvinism to 1649. Although the question of whether or not
Calvin himself taught a limited atonement is still controverted, 107 Kendall
asserts that Calvin taught that Christ died for all, and Beza introduced the
doctrine of limited atonement. Kendall demonstrates that the doctrine of the
Westminster Assembly was derived from Beza rather than Calvin, and that the
experimental predestinarian view has a propensity to lead believers into morbid
introspection. In support of Kendall's conclusions, Alan Clifford points out
that Arminius' teaching was not pure Calvin either:

"[T]he main cause of Calvinist-Arminian controversy was the re-
emergence of Aristotelian scholasticism with Reformed theological
thought. Once Beza's exaggerated orthodoxy gained ground, it
was inevitable that the equally exaggerated Arminian reaction
should set in." 108

The divergence in the Reform tradition can be seen within two decades of
Calvin's death. Armstrong's book Calvinism and the Amyraut Heresy delineates
the shift in the Continental Reform movement away from Calvin's own humanism,

106 Kirk M. Summer, translator's introduction to Theodore Beza, A Little Book

107 See G. Michael Thomas, "Calvin and English Calvinism: A Review Article,"
Scottish Bulletin of Evangelical Theology 16 (1998), 111-127; Thomas states that
Kendall overstates his case, and there is still disagreement over whether Calvin
held limited atonement or not.

108 Alan C. Clifford, Atonement and Justification: English Evangelical
identifying Peter Martyr, Beza and Zanchi as the roots of protestant scholasticism. Amyraut defended Calvin’s own work against the "Calvinists," and used Calvin extensively, whereas Calvin was cited almost not at all by the orthodox Calvinists.¹⁰⁹ Amyraut was a student and disciple of the Scot John Cameron who had taught at Saumur before him. Cameron was called "Beza's scourge" by Pierre du Moulin¹¹⁰ because he attacked Beza at every opportunity for having shifted attention away from justification by faith to election. Beza changed Calvin's "non-scholastic theology" particularly by shifting predestination into the doctrine of God.¹¹¹ Du Moulin (who was close to Lancelot Andrewes) was the leading French exponent of this new Reformed Orthodoxy, and a great opponent of Moise Amyraut, just as Gomar was vigorously opposed to Arminius in Holland.

Amyraut stood foursquare against Reformed Orthodoxy because it was a corruption of Calvin's thought, and his version of Calvinism met with much resistance as the Continental Reform movement progressed in the direction of the Synod of Dort; but Amyraut was resolute that he taught only authentic Calvin. He was tried for heresy because his understanding of the order of the Divine Decrees was suspect, and Armstrong notes the irony that "...less than one hundred years after Calvin's death, the communion which generally bore his name considered his teaching heresy."¹¹² Armstrong states:


¹¹⁰ Ibid., 264.

¹¹¹ Ibid., 129, 136-7. Armstrong also asserts that Calvin did not teach limited atonement, but he recognizes that others disagree with him.

¹¹² Ibid., xviii. Amyraut’s doctrine of the eucharist can be found, says Armstrong in his De l'elevation de la foi et de l'abaisement de la raison in la creance des mysteres de la religion (Saumur: 1640). Ibid., 9.
I believe that Calvin's religious thought is still commonly judged in the light of what eventuated in Calvinism and that a careful comparison of his writings with those of representative Calvinists of the seventeenth century reveals a radical change of emphasis. In fact, this change of emphasis is so pronounced that at many points the structure of Calvin's thought is seriously compromised.\textsuperscript{113}

Armstrong believes that French Calvinists can be classed in either of two intellectual categories of "Protestant scholasticism" and "French humanism."\textsuperscript{114} The Calvinists of the late sixteenth and seventeenth centuries rarely refer to Calvin himself,\textsuperscript{115} and the Synod of Dort and the Westminster Assembly are not faithful representations of Calvin, but are substantial modifications of his thought. Armstrong also points to the influence of Beza on this scholastic shift in Reform theology; Amyraut, conciliatory, humanist and ecumenical, was anxious to maintain a rapport with both the Lutherans and the Roman Catholics, which again fuelled ire against him by du Moulin, who was anxious to have the conclusions of Dort binding on the French protestant churches, as were Prynne and Perkins in England. Armstrong states that supralapsarianism, limited atonement and the immediate imputation of Adam's sin are all innovations by Beza, to which the Dutch reaction was Arminianism; the French reaction was from John Cameron.\textsuperscript{116} Von Rohr continues that Amyraut

\textsuperscript{113} Ibid., xvii.

\textsuperscript{114} Ibid., xvi.

\textsuperscript{115} Ibid., xvii. Breward agrees that after 1590 or so Calvin himself influenced less and less puritan thought; "Introduction," 105.

\textsuperscript{116} By way of a modern note, Jurgen Moltmann's Ph.D. dissertation was on Amyraut and his covenant theology at Saumur.
and Arminius both rejected limited atonement, but Amyraut was not "Arminian" in that he did not accept that grace was resistible.\textsuperscript{117}

Brian Gerrish has taken the same tack as both Kendall and Armstrong, and has recently published \textit{Grace and Gratitude},\textsuperscript{118} a sympathetic and extraordinary book on Calvin's own eucharistic doctrine. Gerrish has quite rightly observed that once you hear Calvin say "predestination" you cannot hear him say anything else, and modern historical discussions of the early Stuart church have borne him out. An excellent complement to Gerrish is McLelland's study of Peter Martyr Vermigli, \textit{The Visible Words of God}. He states that any examination of Martyr's theology is of his sacramental theology; and the degree of agreement between the positions outlined by Gerrish and McLelland is remarkable.

\ldots[B]etween the cleavage of Lutheran and Zwinglian emerged a positive theology which was in a profound sense the true gravitational centre of the Reformation: not Wittenberg or Zurich, but the Strassburg of Bucer, from which both Calvin and Martyr went forward to a massive and powerful theology...the more comprehensive and influential theology of John Calvin was representative of the Reformation as a whole as no other could be.\textsuperscript{119}

Another book of particular relevance is James' \textit{Peter Martyr Vermigli and Predestination}.

\textsuperscript{117} John von Rohr, \textit{The Covenant of Grace in Puritan Thought} (Atlanta: Scholar's Press, 1986), 127-9 for an examination of the common ground shared by Amyraut and the Puritans.

\textsuperscript{118} Brian A. Gerrish, \textit{Grace And Gratitude: The Eucharistic Theology of John Calvin} (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1993).


rather than Calvin's views which most influenced Beza, derived not directly from Augustine, as was Calvin's, but from the "Hyper-Augustianism" of Gregory of Rimini. James has convincingly argued that the connection between Calvin's doctrine of the eucharist and Beza's shift of the theological role of predestination is Peter Martyr. This view, James demonstrates, was not inherited from Calvin's reading of Augustine, and concludes that Calvin was not an influence on Martyr's doctrine of predestination.

Breward's introduction to his edition of Perkins works is again notable. He too states that Calvinistic thought evolved away from Calvin's own, and that there was by and large a theological consensus in the Church of England during the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries.

Ann Hughes concludes that "English Protestants in the early seventeenth century were both largely Calvinist and seriously divided." She cautions that "we should not take the notion of a broad spectrum to imply that there was simply a broad, cosy 'Calvinist' consensus..." She distinguishes between "credal Calvinists" and "experimental Calvinists"; Puritans, being "experimental" attempted, in theory, to distinguish between the elect and the reprobate.

A final evolution in scholastic Calvinism which affected the doctrine of the eucharist was that of Federal, or Covenant Theology which so dominated the Westminster Assembly. A full survey of the nature, strengths and weakness of Federal Theology is outside the present work, but it must be acknowledged to some degree because of the role that the eucharist as the seal of the Covenant of Grace plays in Puritan sacramental thought. The sacraments are signs and seals of the Covenant of Grace; baptism is its appropriation, eucharist is its

---

121 Hughes, Causes of the English Civil War, 103.
renewal. In this assertion the Puritans were not unique, but federal theology has unique sacramental consequences which will be described in the next chapter.\footnote{122}

Von Rohr's \textit{The Covenant of Grace in Puritan Thought} agrees with this, and provides a close examination of the changes in "Calvinism," the rise of federal theology and its consequences for English Puritanism.\footnote{123} David Weir's dissertation traces the sixteenth-century origins of federal theology, although he does not explore its sacramental ramifications. Weir's very concise summary of Federal Theology is as follows:

According to the federal theology, the prelapsarian covenant was made with Adam and is still binding on all men, even after the Fall of Adam into sin. The postlapsarian covenant of grace is made with Jesus Christ, the second Adam, who keeps the original prelapsarian covenant of works, takes upon himself the penalty for breaking it, and then applies this work of redemption to his elect people only.\footnote{124}

Calvin, and most others of the time, spoke freely of the "covenant of Grace," but this alone does not imply federal theology as such. Weir concludes that the marker for the presence of federal theology is the notion of the "covenant of works," the natural or universal covenant that God makes with all persons, not merely the elect. According to Weir and von Rohr, the

\footnote{122}{For example, see James B. Torrance, "Strengths and Weaknesses of the Westminster Theology," in Alasdair I.C. Heron, ed., \textit{The Westminster Confession in the Church Today} (Edinburgh: Saint Andrew Press, 1982); Torrance points out that federal theology led to the eventual division among Puritans regarding the intention of the eucharist, whether it was for all, or only the elect. Such division led to fencing the altar and morbid introspection rather than joy. He agrees with von Rohr that Puritan federal theology departed much from Calvin's doctrine of grace.}

\footnote{123}{"Hence Calvin himself was not a good 'Calvinist,' if the term be used to refer to that subsequent development in Reformed scholasticism that came also to bear his name." von Rohr, \textit{Covenant of Grace}, 3.}

Westminster Confession enshrined Federal Theology as the definitive Puritan statement of faith.

What becomes of great importance to Federal Theology is precision in understanding the order of the Divine Decrees, that is, the decrees, a) to create humanity, b) to permit the Fall, c) to elect some to salvation, d) to send Christ to redeem, and e) to send the Holy Spirit to effect this redemption. In the Infralapsarian (or sublapsarian) view, the decree of election follows creation and the Fall; Supralapsarianism (or prelapsarianism) requires that God's decree of election must logically precede all else. The question is one of the preservation of God's utter sovereignty:

does God look at man as an uncreated being whom he will then purpose to create and then redeem or send to hell, or does he look at man...as a sinner having fallen because of Adam's sin, heading towards hell and therefore in need of redemption?\[125\]

The doctrinal background of predestination and election, then, must be considered because the divergence in opinion within the Church of England regarding the doctrine of election, the scholastic and humanist developments of Calvinist thought, the rise of Covenant theology, and disagreement over whether the conclusions of the Synod of Dort ought to be made authoritative for England all had serious consequences for seventeenth century teaching on the eucharist. For the Puritans at least they determined very much the purpose of the eucharist and for whom it was intended.

"Calvinism" is often defined in terms of predestination alone,\[126\] and anyone opposed to this one doctrine, especially as it was defined at Dort, is understood to be an anti-Calvinist or an Arminian; at best a dirty little

---

\[125\] Weir, Federal Theology, 19.

\[126\] See particularly Tyacke, Anti-Calvinists.
Pelagian. As White has urged, this is entirely incorrect and needs to be changed. To use "Calvinist" in this sense, as Tyacke, Fincham, and others do,\(^\text{127}\) excludes all those other Calvinists who had grave misgivings over the place and role of the doctrine of double predestination. But this is to be regretted. T.M. Parker wrote concerning the issues of predestination and election that such discussions were constant and cross-denominational: "It would indeed be difficult to find a time, from the days of St Augustine onwards, when grace, freewill and predestination were not matters of dispute in Western Christendom."\(^\text{128}\) He referred to Whitaker, Bara, Francis Junius, Arminius, and others, stating that "These controversialists are well aware that they are taking part in perennial arguments."\(^\text{129}\) Parker also notes how differing parties cited the young, middle, and mature Augustine, depending which view they were trying to defend.

---

\(^{127}\) It is easy to agree with Tyacke's assessment that "by the end of the sixteenth century the Church of England was largely Calvinist in doctrine," but not with his definition of "Calvinism": "centring on a belief in divine predestination, both double and absolute, whereby man's destiny, either election to Heaven or reprobation to Hell, is not conditioned by faith but depends instead on the will of God." Anti-Calvinists, 3, 1. Tyacke would have done well to heed Basil Hall: "'Calvinism' means the careful balance of complementary doctrines which can be seen in his Institutio, especially in the final Latin edition of 1559, and it must not be used to mean the choosing of one or more of these doctrines, without reference to the whole, as sufficient in itself to justify, or indeed as the key to understanding, the term 'Calvinism.'" Calvin against the Calvinists, 21. See also Milton, Catholic and Reformed, 426-47, who accepts the anti-Calvinist idea, but also notes that Samuel Harsnett in 1585 identified predestination as a specifically Genevan error; Harsnett's implication that it is in fact Beza, not Calvin himself, who is under attack, is not explored by Milton.


\(^{129}\) Parker, "Arminianism," 29.
The doctrines of original sin, unmerited election, predestination and "effectual calling" were not invented by Calvin: they were innovations of St. Augustine which stirred up much grief and controversy. Their genesis is Augustine's 397/8 De Diversis Quaestionibus ad Simplicianum. Pelagius himself, many have argued, was gravely misunderstood, and Augustine's attacks were in any case largely against the teachings of Caelestius and Julian of Eclanum, whom he called "Pelagians." Arminius was condemned for Pelagianism because he accepted the idea that election was based on foreseen faith; what is not noticed is that this was also an idea explored and espoused briefly by Augustine, although he corrected himself in Ad Simplicianum. What also passes unnoticed is that the notion of the "congruent vocation," which became important for Beza and others afterwards, and particularly for both the

---

Westminster and Savoy Confessions, although also derived from Augustine, is an idea he never appealed to again following Ad Simplicianum. This issue of the "effectual calling" becomes an important theme in Puritan thought; but accusations of heterodoxy are not aimed at those who espoused it, as they were at Arminius who had accepted a different, though equally transitional teaching of Augustine.

The issues of the Synod of Dort were resolved in England twenty years earlier, said T.M Parker, and he suggested that this "Arminianism by anticipation" may not have been condemned as wholly heterodox in Elizabeth's time. However, to continue to call this phenomenon Arminianism "avant la lettre" is as unhelpful as the word "Puritan" because of the enduring stigma of heterodoxy. White asserts that Arminius' doctrine was developed in opposition to the rising scholasticism of Beza. The "remorseless" predestinarianism of the Lambeth Articles of 1595 was suspected of being unCalvinistic by Porter, and the fact that they were not adopted may have been simply another, independent, example of humanist-Calvinist reaction

131 Westminster Confession, XII; Savoy X; "Of Effectual Calling."

132 In ad Simp. Augustine states that God calls all, but only those who are "effectively called" i.e. are called in such a manner in which they will respond positively, are the elect. Interpreting Romans 9, Augustine states that Esau was a vessel made unto dishonour, an image made famous by both Beza and subsequent Puritan appeal.

133 Parker, "Arminianism and Laudianism," 26, 28.

134 The term was coined, I believe, by H.C. Porter, Reformation and Reaction in Tudor Cambridge (Cambridge: University Press, 1958), 281, with respect to Peter Barrow's concern for universal, resistible grace, and universal atonement. Both Fincham and Tyacke still use it.

135 White, Predestination, Policy and Polemic, 13.

136 Porter, Reformation and Reaction, 364-375. See also Tyacke, Anti-Calvinists, 31, n8.
against the rising scholastic Reformed Orthodoxy. The accusation against Montagu, and by extension to Laud and Cosin, of "Arminian" came first from Prynne,\(^{137}\) not because they read and supported Arminius, or that Arminius was a heretic, but because they were opposed to making Dort normative for England; the same issue vexed Amyraut in France. Wakefield in *Puritan Devotion* made particular note that the doctrine of election is the Reformed alternative to the doctrine of Apostolic Succession. Here is the Church's continuity and divinity— in God's election. She is created and kept in being by God's sovereign mercy.\(^{138}\)

Calvin was deep in his heart a renaissance humanist, not a rigidly doctrinaire metaphysician. The doctrine of predestination does not appear in his *Institutes* until the latter half of Book III, introduced for practical reasons, to comfort and reassure the Christian believer that one need not be obsessed with piling up good works to earn enough merit so as to be acceptable to God, because our salvation does not depend on our own efforts.

Calvin the humanist was not alone; Melanchthon, Grotius, Arminius and Amyraut all exhibited the humanism and liberal spirit of the Renaissance. But the intellectual lure of well-ordered Aristotelianism as expressed by Aquinas drew others in the direction of Martyr, Beza, du Moulin, Ames, Dort, and eventually, Westminster and Savoy. To dismiss Protestant humanism as "anti-Calvinist" is both incorrect and unfair. To call it Pelagian is a moot point, depending on how sympathetically one wishes to understand Pelagius himself.

---

\(^{137}\) Prynne argued that the denial of the doctrine of strict election was Arminianism, and that it was a resurrection of Pelagian heresy. It was Prynne also who "first advanced the view, often repeated but seldom argued, that there was a connection between 'Arminian' error in doctrine and 'Popish' ceremony in worship." White, *Predestination, Policy and Polemic*, 2-3.

\(^{138}\) Wakefield, *Puritan Devotion*, 32.
The purpose of this chapter has been to survey the dominant studies of seventeenth-century English theology, and to identify some theological problems regarding the Calvinism of the Church of England. This has been necessary to set the context for the next chapter, which examines English eucharistic theology from its origins in Calvin and its Elizabethan expression, to the teaching of both those who are called the Caroline Divines and those called the Puritans, both of whom were unanimously Calvinist in their eucharistic theology, diverging precisely at the point where "Calvinism" itself splits on the matter of predestination and election. The work of Daniel Brevint has had such a broad appeal primarily because it demonstrates that the eucharistic doctrine of the English Church was not controverted in the Caroline period; and what differences we may observe can be largely attributed to the two conflicting versions of what "Calvinism" had become by the turn of the century.
CHAPTER THREE

CAROLINE EUCHARISTIC THOUGHT

'You must sit down', says Love, 'and taste my meat.'
So I did sit and eat.

George Herbert

I. CAROLINE ANTECEDENTS: CALVIN AND JEWEL

Before the discussion of the eucharistic theology of the Caroline Church can begin, it is important first to examine its Reformation foundations in sixteenth-century Anglican thought. This section will first briefly survey the eucharistic thought of Calvin, in order that the teaching of the Anglican divines that follow may be compared with his. Next, to set the specifically Anglican stage, the thought of Jewel will be summarized to provide not only an immediate comparison with that of Calvin, but also to establish the common Anglican context out of which both the Laudians and Puritans were writing. Jewel's Apology of the Church of England is one of the definitive texts of Anglican identity from the final quarter of the sixteenth century. Because both Puritan and Laudian agreed with him, Jewel is indispensable for the study at hand. These surveys of Calvin and Jewel will as it were set the benchmarks against which those to follow will be measured.

This dissertation asserts that the Church of England was thoroughly Calvinist in its theology of the sacrament. It is necessary, therefore, to define
what is meant by "Calvinism." As the seventeenth century progressed, explicit reference to Calvin diminished to the point of being negligible. For the present purposes, "Calvinist" and "Calvinism" shall be taken in their literal senses, that is, indicating the express theology of John Calvin. For instance, Laud and Montagu were Calvinists: Laud cited Calvin against Fisher, and appealed to Perkins in his own defence at his trial; Montagu cited both Calvin and Beza against the Puritan attack on his book. Laud's biographer, Peter Heylyn, wrote:

Nor am I of opinion that Puritan and Calvinian are terms convertible; for though all Puritans are Calvinians, both in doctrine and in practice, yet all Calvinians are not to be counted as Puritans also; whose practices many of them abhor and whose inconformities they detest. ¹

Calvin's thought, rather than being entirely unique, is representative of a consensus of Reformed theologians including Bucer and Martyr which became the theological standard for England. The eucharistic doctrines of Peter Martyr and John Calvin are indistinguishable, yet it is legitimate to refer to this consensus as "Calvinism." In his recent examination of Calvin and the development of the French Reformed doctrine of the Eucharist, Christopher Elwood has asserted that Calvin was pivotal in the development of sacramental understanding because of his radical semiotic reorientation of the discourse surrounding the sign and the signified. ² Calvin had been a key figure in

¹ "Lastly, Mr. Perkins, in 'Reformed Catholic,' sets down divers opinions in which they of Rome and we agree: shall he be a Papist for this? Or shall not that which is lawful for him, be as lawful for me?" Laud, Works, iv, 317.


³ Christopher Elwood, The Body Broken: The Calvinist Doctrine of the Eucharist and the Symbolization of Power in Sixteenth-Century France (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 4-5. Gore, however, pointed out the danger of identifying any particular doctrine with an individual; regarding Luther and
working towards a doctrinal consensus among Bullinger, Zwingli, the Lutherans, and others, although it has been pointed out that texts such as the Consensus Tigurinus do not represent the fullness of Calvin's thought, but rather how far he was willing to go for the sake of peace and consensus.

JOHN CALVIN

Milton has written that by the late sixteenth century the Church of England was considered by the Continentals to be Calvinist "by default," "...principally because of her doctrine of the eucharist" which was both Protestant and anti-Lutheran. By 1600, he notes, 90 editions of Calvin's works had been published in English, and a further 56 editions of those of Beza. In 1949 Cremeans wrote that the influence of the writings of Calvin and Beza on the English church "is incalculable." Citing Pollard and Redgrave's Short Title Catalogue Cremeans determined that between 1548 and 1600 no other writer had nearly so many publications in English as John Calvin had. Only in the early seventeenth century was his record surpassed, and then it was by William Perkins and Henry Smith, both Calvinists.

John Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's supper was, to use an anachronism, much "higher" than many people have supposed. His ambiguity regarding the instrumentality of the elements has been observed by others, and sometimes

"consubstantiation" Gore wrote, "If he held such a view...it was no more his view than the doctrine of the incarnation can be called his doctrine because he held it." Body of Christ, 235.

4 Holifield, The Covenant Sealed, 24; James, Vermigli and Predestination.

5 Milton, Catholic and Reformed, 385; Milton is apparently citing Cremeans.

6 Cremeans, Calvinistic Thought in England, 65.
simply dismissed as a dangerous aberration within Reformed theology. Yet it is not too much to assert that Calvinism began as "a distinct variety of sacramental theology, more particularly as a distinct interpretation of the central Christian mystery of the eucharist."*

His writings on the subject range from the various editions of the Institutes, his 1540 Petit Tracté de la Sante Cène (made available in English in 1549), his commentary on Hebrews, and includes several sets of articles of agreement such as the Consensus Tigurinus made between Calvin and other reformed churches.

There have been a very few secondary studies made of Calvin's eucharistic doctrine; of special note is the recent Grace and Gratitude: The Eucharistic Theology of John Calvin by Brian Gerrish. Gerrish's thesis is that at the centre of Calvin's entire theology is the eucharist; not that his doctrine of the holy communion is of primary importance, but rather that the whole of Calvin's work is centred in the concept of God's feeding his children on Christ. In an earlier essay Gerrish referred to Calvin's doctrine as "symbolic instrumentalism,"10 a term which might aptly be applied to the general consensus of the Church of England until the mid–eighteenth century.

---

7 Charles Hodge simply refused to believe it. Gerrish, Grace And Gratitude, 4–5.
8 Ibid., 2.
9 Ibid., 20.
Another recent study of note is Thomas Davis' *The Clearest Promises of God: The Development of Calvin's Eucharistic Teaching*, which traces the evolution of Calvin's teaching on the eucharist from the early editions of the *Institutes* to the last of 1559. He argues convincingly against the claim that Calvin's theology was consistent throughout his career, and that his mature work was considerably more developed than his earlier writings. This view was shared by Gore, who in 1901 asserted that Calvin moved away from Zwingli "and asserted in the strongest possible language the actual and substantial communication to us in the sacrament," which was "the substantial point of agreement...between the divided portions of the ancient church, and nearly all the Reformed bodies."\(^{12}\)

Calvin naturally rejected the Roman mass, in particular the doctrines of transubstantiation and propitiatory sacrifice. He wrote that the mass "counterfeits," "annihilates" and negates the Lord's supper.\(^{13}\) Nevertheless he believed in the real objective presence of Christ in the sacrament, not localized or "enclosed" in the species of bread and wine, neither dependent upon the faith of the recipient. We are truly given in the supper what is signified by it.

He agrees with his opponents that the flesh of Christ is given in the sacrament. "Westphal insists on the presence of the flesh in the supper. We do not deny it."\(^{14}\)

---


Calvin opposed the Zwinglian idea of a bare memorial only. To deny the real presence substantially of Christ in the sacrament is to render it useless and frivolous, he wrote. Nevertheless, the manner of this presence cannot be known: "Now, if anyone should ask me how this takes place, I shall not be ashamed to confess that it is a secret too lofty for either my mind to comprehend or my words to declare."  

The symbol and the symbolised, the bread and the Body of Christ, are not identical, yet the relation of the sacramental bread to the Body of Christ is so close that believers can "easily pass from one to the other." In the sacrament the thing itself is given and our "participation" in Christ is real. The sign can be distinguished from that which is signified, but they can never be actually divided. The sign brings about what it signifies: "What God... depicts in the sacraments, He actually brings to pass through their agency." The bread and wine take the name of the body and blood because they are instruments of their distribution to us. Calvin calls this a "metonymical," or "sacramental" form of expression, one that is regularly used in Scripture. The mystery of the sacramental union is paralleled, according to Calvin, by the mystery of the union of the human and divine in the Incarnation.

Since Christ is spiritually present, however, he can only be received spiritually, that is by the faith of the recipient. The wicked and unfaithful do

---

15 Inst. IV.17.32.


17 Wallace, Calvin's Doctrine, 159.


19 Wallace, Calvin's Doctrine, 167.
not discern the body of Christ, and therefore they are guilty of it, which, Calvin wrote, is the same thing. Though faith is requisite for reception, nevertheless the sacraments nourish, strengthen and increase that faith. The communion really effects what it represents, but only in the elect; and it is precisely here that we find the important connection between predestination and eucharistic theology. Yet, according to Calvin, Christ is objectively present, indiscriminately offered to all in the eucharist. Just as God sends rain to the earth, but rocks and stone cannot absorb it, the non-elect receive only the signs, not the reality of Christ. The eucharistic sacrifice is "indispensable" to the Lord's supper, Calvin wrote. The sacrifice of the eucharist is that of praise and thanksgiving, in memory of the one and only propitiatory sacrifice of Christ on the cross. "We deny not that in the supper the sacrifice of Christ is so vividly exhibited as almost to set the spectacle of the Cross before our eyes." The eucharist is a sign and seal in our consciences of God's promises that we are indeed partakers of Christ's body and blood; it is the mirror in which we can see reflected Christ crucified and risen for us. The sacramental seal is analogous to the seal which authenticates government documents.

Communion must be in both kinds. Calvin rejected Thomistic concomitancy as an "intolerable perversion" separating what God has joined.

---

10 Ibid., 213.
21 Inst. IV.18.17.
22 Inst. IV.18.11.
23 Calvin, Short Treatise, 167-8.
24 Holifield, The Covenant Sealed, 26; Calvin Inst. IV.14.5.
25 Ibid., 190; Inst. IV.17.18.
He urged frequent communion, at least weekly, although he moderated this later in his life allowing, he said, for the weakness of human nature, to monthly, and eventually, quarterly reception. Once-yearly reception, however, he condemned.

Central to Calvin are Christ's ascension and the sursum corda, by which our spirits are lifted up into heaven where we are nourished by the body and blood of Christ; the Holy Spirit is both the agent of Christ's presence and the means of our full participation in Christ in the eucharist. Calvin paradoxically affirmed both that Christ does not descend to earth, and yet also that he does indeed descend through the supper by his Holy Spirit.

The holy communion according to Calvin, says Gerrish, has a double movement in that it is both a gift of God's grace and an invitation to Christians to give thanks to God. God gives Christ to us; we in thanksgiving offer ourselves to God in Christ.

Probably the most significant element to Calvin's sacramentalism is his use of Augustine's statement that the sacraments are the Word made visible. The Word is itself presented to us in visible form, not just as a confirming sign or seal, but as the Word itself. The sacraments are dependent on the Word for

26 Inst., VI.17.43. Bishop Beveridge concurred: his sermon on the advantages of frequent communion, (reprinted in Tracts for the Times no. 26) states that the Church of England requires weekly celebration. See Hardelin, Tractarian Understanding, 273.

27 Wallace, Calvin's Doctrine, 253.


29 Wallace, Calvin's Doctrine, 208-9.

30 Ibid., 140; esp. 135–141.
their very existence, and again he refers to Augustine, that "the elements only become sacraments when the Word is added." Thus the preached Word and the efficacy, even existence of the sacraments, are necessarily connected.

JOHN JEWEL (1522–1571)

Hurrell Froude hated Jewel, and petulantly declared of his teaching: "I do not hesitate to say that this Doctrine ought to be denied under pain of damnation." But this condemnation arose from apparently invincible ignorance, and Froude's summary of Jewel's teaching on the eucharist is a false caricature.32

Jewel's immediate friend and patron was Peter Martyr Vermigli. McLelland has shown that by 1549 Calvin, Peter Martyr, Bullinger and Bucer shared views on the sacrament which were for all intents and purposes identical.33 Because Jewel's opinions so closely followed Martyr's, they

31 Ibid., 135.

32 Froude wrote of Jewel: "He calls the mass 'your cursed paltrie service', laughs at the apostolic succession both in principle and as a fact, and says that the only succession worth having is the succession of doctrine. He most distinctly denies the sacrament of the Lord's Supper to be a means of grace as distinguished from a pledge...He says the only keys of the kingdom of heaven are instruction and correction and the only way they open the kingdom is by touching men's consciences...Jewel justifies Calvin for saying that the sacrament of the Lord's Supper 'were superfluous' if we remembered Christ's death enough without it, ridicules the consecration of the elements and indirectly explains that the way the Body and Blood are verily received is that they are received into our remembrance." Oratory F.N., Froude to Newman, 25 January 1834. Quoted in Paul Avis, Anglicanism and the Christian Church: Theological Resources in Historical Perspective (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989), 193; Piers Brendon, Hurrell Froude and the Oxford Movement (London: Elek, 1974), 148.

33 McLelland, Visible Words of God. See also B.A. Gerrish, "The Lord's Supper in the Reformed Confessions" for a discussion of Zwingli, Bullinger and Calvin. See also John Booty, John Jewel as Apologist of the Church of England (London: SPCK, 1963), 172–3, that Martyr and Jewel were basically agreed, as
reflected this Rhineland consensus. The theologies of the eucharist of both the Puritans and the Caroline divines are entirely consistent with that of Jewel. He may, therefore, be taken as a common starting point, an expression of the undivided witness of the sixteenth-century Church of England (and Continental Reform) on the subject.

Jewel turned the tables on standard Roman apologetics in his "Challenge Sermon" at St. Paul's Cross by claiming the high ground of catholic continuity, and accusing the Roman church of innovation. His appeal to the Scriptures and to Christian antiquity as the authoritative arbitrers of all doctrine, particularly eucharistic, has never faded from Anglican apologetics. Jewel remained firm in his argument that Rome was the schismatic innovator and that the Protestants were the real church catholic.

Jewel's doctrine of the eucharist may easily be summarized from the Apology and from his Treatise on the Sacraments, which was compiled from several of his sermons at Salisbury. In this latter he discussed controversially the dominical sacraments of baptism and eucharist, as well as the other five ceremonies which had been called sacraments. Jewel distilled his teaching down to a manageable six topics, the first being that the body and blood of Jesus are actually and truly eaten and drunk, "and this shall be the foundation and key of entrance into all the rest." Being culled from sermons, his arguments are happily brief and practical, though nonetheless full of patristic support. The eucharistic passages from the Apology are short, blunt, and unambiguous, and are found in the latter pages of Part II.

[w]ere Bucer and Martyr.

Overall, Jewel's teaching on the eucharist can be conveniently categorized as follows:

1) Christ is really and truly present in the sacrament, objectively "set before us" and offered wholly and effectually. Jewel emphatically asserted the real presence of Christ in the Sacrament.

2) Transubstantiation is superstitious, heretical and evil, yet Jewel also denied that the elements are "bare signs" only and as such inefficacious. Christ is really present in the Sacrament, nevertheless locally absent, for his body resides in Heaven. The bread and wine retain their own nature and substance.

3) The change in the elements of bread and wine consists in their having a "new dignity and pre-eminence which they had not before." They are no longer common bread and wine, but are the sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, just as the water of baptism remains in all ways water, but not mere water, for it is the sacrament of our redemption and those washed with it are truly washed with Christ's sanctifying blood.

4) Christ is truly received in the sacrament by the faithful recipient. As the physical elements of bread and wine are eaten by the physical body and nourish it, the truly present Body of Christ is eaten by "the mouth of faith" and nourishes the soul. 35 The presence of the Body of Christ in the sacrament

35 The "mouth of faith" image is repeated later in 1612 by Lewis Bayly in the devotional manual The Practice of Piety: directing a Christian how to walk that he may please God. 36 ed. [S.L.] Sa. Lee. [16367]; Cockswong, Evangelical Eucharistic Thought, 49n; also C. J. Stranks, Anglican Devotion: Studies in the Spiritual life of the Church of England between the Reformation and the Oxford Movement (London: SCM, 1961), 54. It is also repeated by Ussher, who calls faith the "spiritual mouth" by which we receive the body and blood of Christ. Works, vol II., 434. Ussher, who was "learned unto a miracle," attributed the term to Basil's commentary on Ps. 33: "Εστι μεν τι και νοητόν στόμα τού ἐνδον ἀνθρώπου,..." Ussher, "An Answer to a Challenge Made by a Jesuit in Ireland," Works vol. iii, 53n.
is not dependent on the subjective condition of the recipient; it is objectively offered to all communicants, but since it is spiritual, it can only be received spiritually, that is, by faith. Jewel asserted that the faithless and wicked, though they may receive the sacrament, do not receive Christ. Thus the benefits of Christ's death cannot be obtained by virtue of a massing priest, because the individual's faith is the critical factor. Moreover Jewel asserted to Harding that "without faith sacraments be not only unprofitable to us, but also hurtful."  

Regarding how it is that Christ is really presented to all, but only received by the faithful, Jewel used the idea of a book being examined by an illiterate: the person can only hold it, look at it, turn the pages, but sees nothing of what the book truly is. The reader, however, receives all its content and the meaning of the author. A similar analogy is to be found in Thomas Jackson: Christ is really present to all persons, as is the sun, which simultaneously softens faithful hearts, as the sun does wax, and hardens faithless hearts, as the sun does clay.  

5) According to Jewel, there is a double movement in the sacrament; that of the heavenly Body of Christ being offered to all faithful recipients, but also

---

36 "For the unbelievers and faithless cannot feed upon that precious body." The use of the word "cannot" instead of "do not" is indicative of the idea that the presence of the body at the sacrament is not dependent upon the faith, or lack thereof, of the recipient; rather the faith of the individual enables reception of Christ, who is present regardless of the faith of the individual. Jewel, *Homily of the...Sacrament*, 400.


of our lifting up our hearts beyond the sacrament to heaven itself to take hold of the Glorified Christ. Jewel often made use of a figure from Chrysostom of eagles flocking to the corpse; we are to be eagles ascending on high to feed on the real body of Christ.69 Christ is in heaven; the sacrament, because it is his body, lifts us there, and its purpose is to cause this flight.71

6) The sacrament is a real eucharistic sacrifice in that the faithful offer the unbloody sacrifice of prayer, praise and thanksgiving; and the sacrifice of Christ once offered is revived and represented to us in the holy mysteries.72 He denies as blasphemy the sacrifice of Christ on the altar.

Like Calvin, Jewel asserted the figurative use of language in the Bible and stated that the literal use of the scriptures to defend transubstantiation leads to error: even though Jesus said "hoc est corpus meum," the bread is not literally Jesus, any more than Jesus is literally a door, a vine,73 a lamb, a lion, a way, light, water, a bride-groom, etc. However Christ is in truth all of these things spiritually. "These speeches, and infinite others the like, are plain, open and evident; yet they are not true, as the words sound them, and

---

60 Matthew 24: 28, "Wherever the body is, there the eagles [or vultures] will be gathered together." This saying from Matthew's apocalypse of ch. 25 is not itself directly eucharistic, as Jewel and Chrysostom use it, but it is certainly meant to be eschatological; that is, the coming of the Son of Man will be obvious even to those who do not witness it directly, because of the self-evident effects it will produce. Jewel also used this figure in the Homily of the Worthy receiving and reverent esteeming of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, 397.

61 Booty, Apologist, 169.


63 Images used originally by Hooper against Gardiner, 1547; Booty, Apologist, 151.
literally." But they are emphatically really true, spiritually. He quoted Jerome in support: "Non in verbum scripturarum est evangelium, sed in sensu."  

Jewel urged frequent, even daily reception," that all present in the church should receive, that no one should receive the communion alone while others looked on, and that it must be administered in both kinds. Private masses are the "mangling of the sacraments" against Christ's express command, and against all antiquity." He vehemently opposed massing priests, any propitiatory efficacy of the sacraments for the dead, adoration and processions of the sacrament, purgatory, Latin, and the intercession of saints. 

Dugmore classifies Jewel's thought as "the non-papist Catholic doctrine...with an admixture of moderate Calvinism of the Tigurine type," and that he "clearly expresses the realist-symbolist teaching of Augustine." That is to say, the signified is distinguished from, but offered together with, the sign. He continues that Jewel comes "dangerously close" to the doctrine of the Real Absence," but Booty takes issue with this judgement. Jewel's

---

"Jewel, Treatise, 1112.


" Ibid., 32-33.

" Dugmore, The Mass and the English Reformers, 228. The reference is to the Consensus Tigurinus, 26 articles on the Holy Communion agreed to by Calvin, Farel and Bullinger in Zurich, May 1549.

" Ibid., 229.

doctrine of the ascension, though asserting bodily absence, says Booty, did not mean that Christ is absent from the eucharist; Christ is present, but that presence is a mystery.\(^5\) Like Dugmore, Stone too seemed to want to make Jewel more "memorialist" than was the case, stating that Jewel denied that the consecrated sacrament is the body of Christ. \textit{Prima facie} this may be so, but Stone failed to continue that Jewel affirmed vigorously the real presence of Christ.

\section*{II. THE CAROLINE DIVINES}

This survey will first delineate the most common elements among the seventeenth-century "high church" writers commonly called the Caroline Divines. Specific reference shall be made only to seven individuals and their works. A few others will be mentioned in passing, and the greater portion simply omitted from the present discussion. Major figures such as Hammond, Ussher, Hall, Bramhall, Field, Patrick, Thorndike, and Forbes cannot be easily ignored, and their contributions are of much significance; but they have been examined by other writers, and their contributions add to the general English consensus here asserted and described.\(^1\)

But first, a caveat: as McAdoo has pointed out in his examination of Jeremy Taylor,\(^2\) to extract an individual's theology of the eucharist out of the

---

\(^5\) Booty, \textit{Apologist}, 167ff.


context of the rest of his theology is to do violence to the theology as a whole—
examining only a few thoughts on a specific topic out of the whole corpus of a
writer is to lose many nuances and integrity of thought.

...[U]nlike the specialization with which we are familiar today, no
branch of theology can claim Jeremy Taylor exclusively. Further,
there are throughout his varied work an interlocking of themes and
an underlying unity of thought, so that one must first see his
eucharistic theology in the context of his general theology. 3

This may be true for Jeremy Taylor in particular, but it is an appropriate
cautions prefatory to the present study: we must avoid the temptations of over-
generalization and facile simplification.

I shall argue that in their teaching on the eucharist, the Caroline divines
differed little, if at all, from Calvin, and a concluding discussion of an internal
tension within Calvin's works themselves regarding the instrumentality of the
sacraments will demonstrate that this tension accounts for much of the division
between Puritan and high-church Caroline, without needing to attribute its
origin to Arminius, Erasmus, Grotius or Melanchthon.

That Anglican eucharistic theology has been largely Calvinist is not a new
assertion. In 1857 Freeman wrote:

But the Calvinistic view, according to which the consecrated
Elements are in virtue, and on reception, the Body and Blood of
Christ, so that they who receive them aright receive That Body and
Blood; but which refuses to identify them therewith previous to
reception:—this view (setting aside any the question of particular
election) has all along found favour in the eyes of members of the
English Church, and makes some show of being compatible with her
formularies, or is even proclaimed as the designed and exclusive
sense of them.'

3 Ibid., 14.
4 Phillip Freeman, The Principles of Divine Service vol II., "Holy Communion"
Freeman does not approve of this fact, however, declaring that Calvinistic doctrine of the communion, despite Hooker's approval of it, was simply invented by Calvin in the sixteenth century, just as transubstantiation was an innovation of the fourteenth, and that neither can be reconciled with Scripture and the ancient liturgies.  

Henry Groves, an Irish curate who knew his Carolines well, compiled The Teaching of the Anglican Divines of the time of King James I and King Charles I on the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, consisting of extracts, some quite brief, from the same seventeenth-century authors the Tractarians were appealing to. This book deserves much more careful attention than it has received. Groves took dead aim at Pusey, although Keble comes in for a thrashing as well. The actual extracts from the nineteen Caroline Divines cited are very brief, and of little present consequence, but his prefatory essay is extremely fine: well-argued, learned, frank, precise, and calm. His conclusions are, more or less, those of this present study. He demonstrated that the "Old Divines" had been selectively quoted, misquoted, and otherwise abused by Pusey in order to support doctrines quite opposed to their own, specifically concerning the

5 Ibid., 201-3.

6 Henry Charles Groves, The Teaching of the Anglican Divines of the Time of King James I and King Charles I on the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist... (London: Henry & Parker, 1858), 131 pp. Pages 2-41 are the preface; the extracts, some quite short are organized under the themes of presence, sacrifice, and adoration, with the express purpose of refuting Pusey's use of them.

7 "Our old English divines, in fact, are not fortunate in passing through Mr. Keble's hands." Ibid., 37. Groves shows how Keble distorts his quotation of e.g. Jeremy Taylor, Ridley, Andrewes and Nicholson, amongst others.

8 William Goode in 1856 had also argued that Pusey misrepresented Caroline authors. William Goode, The Nature of Christ's Presence in the Eucharist: or, the True Doctrine of the Real Presence Vindicated in opposition to the fictitious real presence asserted by Archdeacon Denison, Mr. Wilberforce, & Dr. Pusey (London: T. Hatchard, 1856).
"Real Objective Presence"; and that the eucharistic doctrine of the Church of England from Cranmer to the eighteenth century was almost unanimously that of Calvin, Puritans included, whose doctrine was if anything higher than that of the Laudians.

However, when I exclude those who sympathized with Geneva, I do not wish it to be thought that they came behind their High-Church brethren in their views of the Eucharist. On the contrary, for expressive statements of the mysterious nature of this Sacrament, and for profound and most truly spiritual views of the nature of it, and the benefits connected with it, the Calvinistic writers of this period are surpassed by none....I was thus obliged to leave out writers like Ussher and Edward Reynolds, whose language is as high as that of any of Laud's school, and higher than that of some of them."

Regarding Pusey's error in his evaluation of Calvin, Groves wrote:

And most certainly Dr. Pusey did not learn this manner of speaking of Calvin from the great divines of our Church....Indeed, considering Laud's aversion to Calvin's theory of predestination and his Genevan discipline, it would have been wonderful to find him appealing so unhesitatingly to that Reformer as maintaining the same doctrine with the English Church on the Eucharist, did we not know that this was not peculiar to Laud, but that all English divines thus regarded and spoke of Calvin. For my part, I have never met a single Anglican divine, from the time of the settlement of the Reformation to the commencement of Charles the Second's reign, who expressed himself differently."

Oddly enough, Groves asserts that the "Arminians" were the Latitudinarians, who were responsible for the eighteenth-century rationalism which produced a eucharistic theology similar to Zwingli's, which "deadens the teaching of modern Calvinism." Although this is a small book, and now exceedingly rare, it speaks to the fact that it is no new conclusion, just a neglected or unfashionable one, that the Church of England was Calvinist in its sacramental theology.

9 Ibid., 7.
10 Ibid., 15.
Although Laudians and Puritans disagreed on issues such as predestination, free will, good works, means of grace, liturgical conformity, and episcopal polity, there was little or no disagreement among them regarding the Lord's supper. Even Dugmore admitted that "the eucharistic doctrine favoured by the more learned of the Puritans had much in common with that of the Central Churchmen." It is my assertion that the doctrine of the eucharist of those who have become known as the Caroline divines is not in itself distinctive or unique. Their liturgical expressions, of course, often demonstrated marked diversity of opinion between them and the Puritans on issues of grace and ecclesiastical polity, which might fairly justify such a distinction. Yet both Puritans and Laudians were agreed that they accepted the same eucharistic doctrine. Cragg, though he disagrees with their self-assessment, has written:

Indeed, one of the remarkable features of the controversies of the early Restoration period is the explicit assumption that in doctrine both Puritans and Royalists were at one. Baxter affirmed this on behalf of the Presbyterians, and his claim was not disputed. On occasion, the same plea proved useful to the other side, and as late as 1680 Stillingfleet could reinforce his attack on Nonconformist schism by asserting that in doctrine churchmen and separatists were not divided. When John Owen answered Stillingfleet, he agreed that as regards belief, "the sober Protestant people of England were of one mind."

Although Cragg remains unconvinced by their claims, the point is here made that those of the period admitted that they were more-or-less agreed doctrinally. Charles Gore accepts Hooker's opinion that there was a general


12 Dugmore, Eucharistic Doctrine, 58.

agreement, and that the only controverted question was that of a presence in the elements independently of reception.\(^{14}\)

I disagree entirely with Gregory Dix’s statement in *The Shape of the Liturgy*:

> Ever since the sixteenth century we Anglicans have been so divided over eucharistic doctrine, and are to-day so conscious of our divisions, that there is scarcely any statement that could be made about either the eucharist or one’s own rite which would not seem to some of one’s fellow churchmen to call for immediate contradiction on conscientious grounds. It is quite understandable. These things go deep behind us. Two archbishops of Canterbury have lost their lives and a third his see, in these quarrels. One king has been beheaded and another dethroned; many lesser men have suffered all manner of penalties from martyrdom downwards on one side or another.\(^{15}\)

Such division may have been the case since the latter half of the nineteenth century, but this assertion does not accurately represent the state of controversy in the English Church in its first two centuries. All these things indeed happened, but not over the doctrine of the eucharist alone.

There are, however, two issues which require a brief preliminary examination. The first is the terminology used to denote differing theologies of the nature of Christ’s presence in (or at) the Sacrament of the Lord’s supper. Various terms have been used, beginning with the familiar ones of Roman/Lateran Transubstantiation; the Lutheran Consubstantiation (with the perceived heresy of "ubiquitism"); and Zwingli and Bullinger’s "memorialism" indicating that the elements in and of themselves are merely an inefficacious aide memoire.\(^{16}\)

\(^{14}\) Gore, *Body of Christ*, 49.


\(^{16}\) Although to be fair, even Zwingli’s teaching is beginning to be read more sympathetically in our time.
The three terms which have been most often used to describe the various shades of Anglican interpretation are "memorialism," "receptionism," and "virtualism," the latter generally applied to the Non-Jurors' "higher" understanding of the eucharist. "Receptionism" has been further qualified when describing the theology of the Caroline divines to become "dynamic receptionism." By this is meant that although the corporeal, bodily presence of Christ in the elements of the sacrament is denied, there is however something "more" attached to them, more than simply the belief that Christ is present in the hearts of the faithful receivers. Horton Davies touches upon this, but prefers the term "instrumental symbolism," which is the same concept Gerrish calls Calvin's "symbolic instrumentalism." Hooker wrote:

...this bread hath in it more than the substance which our eyes behold...what these elements are in themselves it skilleth not, it is enough that to me which take them they are the body and blood of Christ."

Or Jeremy Taylor: [The bread and wine] "...are what they were, but they are more than what they were before." That is, according to "dynamic receptionism," the bread and wine themselves have something objective about them as instruments of grace, as opposed to "mere" receptionism which asserts Christ's sacramental presence in, but only in, the hearts of those who receive

---

17 See Parris, "Hooker's Doctrine," 165; Anglicans generally desire "something more" than mere receptionism, even if they are not sure what that is.


19 Hooker, EP V.LXII.12.

the sacrament in faith.21 Jewel's analogy of the book and the illiterate person is here very helpful.

John Overall (1560-1619), whom Milton counts among the "avant-garde conformists,"22 set the tone for the rest of the century in his Praelectiones:

In the Sacrament of the Eucharist or the Lord's Supper the body and blood of Christ, and therefore the whole Christ, are indeed, really present, and are really received by us, and are really united to the sacramental signs, as signs which not only signify but also convey, so that in the right use of the Sacrament, and to those who receive worthily, when the bread is given and received, the body of Christ is given and received; and when the wine is given and received, the blood of Christ is given and received; and therefore the whole Christ is communicated in the Communion of the Sacrament. Yet this is not in a carnal, gross, earthly way by Transubstantiation or Consubstantiation, or any like fictions of human reason, but in a way mystical, heavenly, and spiritual, as is rightly laid down in our Articles.23

In this he is simply reiterating the Reformed consensus, as is evident by comparing the above with the following statement made by Beza some forty years earlier:

We affirm that no local distance can impede the communion of the body and blood of the Lord, since the Lord's Supper is a heavenly action: and while on earth we eat bread and wine, symbols of the true body and blood of the Lord, nevertheless by faith and the power of the holy Spirit our minds, for which principally this is food, are lifted even to heaven to obtain the body and the blood present there. And therefore, in this sense and in this respect we say that the body is truly joined with the bread and the blood with the wine, sacramentally and not otherwise, that is not in a place or location but because they efficaciously signify24 what is given by

21 "[T]he receptionist view [is] that the presence is conditional upon the faith of the believer and is to be sought only in the heart of the worthy communicant...." McAdoo, Jeremy Taylor Today, 141.

22 Milton, Catholic and Reformed, 57.

23 John Overall, Praelectiones (commentary on the Church Catechism, 1604?); quoted in McAdoo, Jeremy Taylor Today, 142.

24 Efficaciter significant "expresses a notion of instrumental causality which is close to the scholastic causant significando..." Raitt, The Eucharistic Theology of Theodore Beza, 39. Raitt continues with Beza's observation against his Roman
the Lord to all participating with faith, and truly received by believers through faith.25

The Carolines consistently refuse to speculate on the exact manner of this presence. They simply assert that it is so, that it is too deep a mystery for comprehension. This quotation from Forbes is typical:

The body and Blood of Christ are really and actually and substantially present and taken in the Eucharist, but in a way which the human mind cannot understand and much more beyond the power of man to express, which is known to God alone and is not revealed to us in the Scriptures, --a way indeed not by bodily or oral reception, but not only by the understanding and merely by faith, but in another way known, as has been said, to God alone, and to be left to his omnipotence.26

The second issue, closely related to where Christ is present, is that of exactly what is present. The Carolines were practically unanimous in affirming that it is Christ present in the eucharist as sacrificed, ad cadaver as Andrewes rather graphically reminds us. One presumption of Lutheran ubiquity, which was unanimously rejected by Anglicans, is that the Presence in the sacrament is that of the glorified body of Christ. To the Church of England writers, Christ's crucified body and shed blood, not his glorified body, are communicated to the faithful recipient. According to Barnes this is why for them the idea of communion in one kind is a mangled, mutilated "half-communion."27

opponents that "really" and "spiritually" are not opposed, but complementary.


26 William Forbes, in More and Cross, Anglicanism, 471.

27 Barnes does not consider Cranmer's Prayer of Humble Access, in which Cranmer revives an odd dualistic medieval teaching that "our bodies may be made clean by his body, and our souls washed through his most precious blood." It may well be possible that Cranmer appealed to this unorthodox doctrine in order to emphasize the necessity of receiving the wine. See Charles Neil and J.M. Willoughby, The Tutorial Prayer Book (London: Harrison Trust, 1913), 323-33.
Barnes continues that for all their appealing to the Fathers, this concept of presence *ex cadaver* is an innovation peculiar to the Caroline divines, not to be found in the Fathers, the Schoolmen or any of the Reformers. Their conclusion is, however, understandable in the light of the Caroline emphasis on the memorial and representative aspects of the eucharist, and on the assertion of the sacrificial nature of the eucharist, particularly with reference to I Cor. 5: 7-8. This was encouraged by a "too-literal understanding of the passover analogy." The medieval belief that Christ is newly sacrificed in every celebration of the eucharist might account for the cadaver idea, but it was explicitly and repeatedly rejected by the Carolines, often with specific reference to the Letter to the Hebrews. Nevertheless, it was not a "Laudian" peculiarity. The Independent John Owen, despite teaching that the elements "exhibit that which they do not contain" and that the sacrament conveys what it symbolizes while nevertheless not containing it, taught that the grace of the sacrament was the human nature of Christ, it is the body broken and the blood shed which minister grace.

The Caroline divines were agreed with Calvin and with one another on the following points concerning the eucharist: 1) the explicit and carefully-argued

---

28 John E. Barnes "The Popish half-Communion: A study in Caroline Eucharistic theology," *Downside Review* 89 (1971): 291. According to Barnes, Aquinas specifically asserted that the crucified Body and Blood would be present separately in the species of bread and wine only if the Last Supper were celebrated between Good Friday and Easter Monday, *Summa* III. Q.76.2 and Q.81.4; and that it is Christ's glorified Body that is present, on which assertion alone the doctrine of concomitance relies.

29 Ibid., 294.


31 Mayor, "John Owen on the Lord's Supper" *Scottish Journal of Theology* 18 (1965), 176-78.
rejection of both transubstantiation and consubstantiation; 2) the rejection of the memorialism of Zwingli and Oecolampadius, very often by name; 3) the assertion of the real and objective presence of Christ as sacrificed; 4) the refusal to speculate on the manner of Christ's presence; 5) the insistence on communion under both species of bread and wine; 6) the assertion that consecration is the setting apart of the elements for sacred use, and that the consecrated elements have no virtue in and of themselves apart from consumption; 7) the rejection of adoration of the sacrament; 8) the rejection of any sense that the eucharist may be a propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead; 9) the insistence on the real sacrificial nature of the eucharist; 10) the insistence on the vernacular; 11) an emphasis on frequent reception, not mere attendance; 12) a real and spiritual, that is neither imaginary nor corporeal, communication of Christ in the sacrament. As it shall be seen, those whom we call the "Puritans" also accepted these same points of doctrine. The following surveys will expand on these basic points, and although each writer has his own unique contribution to make to the discussion there is a remarkable degree of unanimity among them.

It may be noticed that the "Laudians" did not usually make explicit the dependence of the Sacrament on the preached Word, and this omission may be thought to be a serious departure from Calvin, who clearly stated that "The Lord's Supper cannot exist apart from the Word." \(^{32}\) This can be adequately accounted for, however, by the "Laudian" suspicion of free preaching and "prophesying" which typified Puritan worship. That the Word of God needed to be duly proclaimed would not have been in question, and preaching was not an

\(^{32}\) Inst. IV.17.39; also "You see how the sacrament requires preaching to beget faith." Inst. IV.14.4.
option. The matter was one of authority and church order. No English protestant would have accepted the idea that the sacraments had any validity in and of themselves apart from the Word of God. Moreover the Puritans also had idiosyncratic departures from Calvin's own teaching, as shall be seen.

RICHARD HOOKER (1554-1600)

"It would be a rash person who dared to say anything original about Hooker's theology in general, and his views on the eucharist in particular." Mindful of this caveat, then, a few passing remarks will be made concerning Hooker, but detailed survey of his eucharistic thought is unnecessary for the present purposes of this work.

It was said that in Hooker's pulpit in the Temple Church, pure Canterbury was preached in the morning, but in the afternoon, pure Geneva, from Hooker's Lecturer and Puritan bête noir, Walter Travers. This famous comment is meant to imply of course that two very different theologies were being promulgated, and the actual controversy between Hooker and Travers apparently affirms it. But Canterbury was never a source of doctrinal teaching: it was the source of ecclesiastical discipline, and the Archbishops thereof had impeccable Calvinist pedigrees. Furthermore, Geneva in Hooker's time was no longer dominated by the voice of Calvin himself, but that of Beza, with whom Travers was a close friend. Hooker has been for many decades promoted as the most significant architect of Anglicanism, as though all subsequent English theology, if not actually derived from, was unavoidably influenced by, his thought. Yet Stevenson asserts that of all the Reformation

33 Stevenson, Covenant of Grace Renewed, 32.
theologians, Calvin exerted the most influence on Hooker. It is from Calvin, says Stevenson, that Hooker "skilfully adapted" the scriptural image of "participation."34 Hooker's main thrust in his Ecclesiastical Polity Book V, is that through the eucharist, in which Christ is fully present both in his divinity and his humanity through the instrumental means of the elements, faithful persons "participate" in Christ. This participation means a real and therefore a personal presence of Christ; it brings about a change, a transmutation, or as Hooker says, a "kind of transubstantiation" in us.35

The bread and cup are his body and blood because they are causes instrumental upon the receipt whereof the participation of His body and blood ensueth. V.LXII.5.

Parris agrees that Hooker's account of the eucharistic presence and the instrumentality of the elements bears many "striking parallels" with that of Calvin, even though Hooker failed to distinguish the teachings of Calvin from those of Zwingli,36 which he specifically rejected. Keble too noted Hooker's respect for Calvin's doctrine of holy communion.37 Frank refers to studies which have demonstrated "marked similarities between Hooker's doctrine of eucharistic presence and that of Calvin's Institutes," and that "...the

34 Stevenson, Covenant of Grace, 33,4. See Wilhelm Niesel, The Theology of Calvin (London: Lutterworth, 1956), 218 for a brief discussion of Calvin's understanding of the sacraments as effectual means of our participation in Christ which sounds very much like Hooker.

35 The theological concept of the "divinization" of humanity is also to be found in Hooker, as well as several of the Carolines; it is of Patristic descent. Although related to discussions of the eucharist, a full discussion would be prohibitively large in this context. See A.M. Allchin, Participation in God: A forgotten strand in Anglican tradition (London: Darton Longman & Todd, 1988).


Elizabethan Church found herself solidly within the stream of Reformed 'true' presence doctrine...." [38]

In his essay on Perkins, Breward stated that by the end of the sixteenth century Perkins' books were outselling even Calvin and Beza in England, and by any standard Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity* was a worst-seller, scarcely even noticed until the latter half of the seventeenth." It is common to read that Hooker "defended the Church against Puritans," yet Calvin and Jewel are most amenable with Hooker (who called Jewel "The worthiest divine that Christendom hath bred for the space of some hundreds of years." [40]) and there is substantial doctrinal agreement between Hooker and Puritans like Perkins and even Travers, particularly concerning the Eucharist.

**LANCELOT ANDREWES (1555–1626)**

"Lancelot Andrewes set the tune to which all the later divines sang in harmony," gushed Arnott in 1935, [41] and Mackean called him "the founder of the Laudian school of thought." [42] These are of course exaggerations because there was no "school" to found, and Andrewes' ideas were by no means

---


[39] Breward, xi. 15. In fairness it must also be noted that although it is true that Hooker's works were never intended to appeal to the popular press, they have been in more-or-less constant print ever since, whereas Perkins' have not.


innovative or unique. Nevertheless his learning was highly respected, evoking from Montagu the compliment "our Gamaliel."  

Jewel had defended the Elizabethan Settlement against Rome, Hooker defended it against the Puritans, and Andrewes defended the Church of England's claim to the title "Catholic," which had been the subject of James I's Apology for the Oath of Allegiance. Cardinal Bellarmine disputed this book using the name Matthew Tortus, to which Andrewes responded with Tortura Torti. 

Tortura Torti is chiefly concerned with regal and papal supremacy and authority, but there are a few short passages of relevance to Andrewes' concept of the eucharist: a page-and-a-half digression on the eucharistic sacrifice and another of two pages on communion in one kind, private masses, and use of the vulgar tongue. 

Bellarmine responded to Andrewes with an Apology, to which Andrewes replied with his Responsio ad Apologiam Cardinalis Bellarmini (1610), devoting a portion of chapter VIII on the eucharist: "Non esse dogmata antiquissima, Intercessionem Sanctorum, Missam privatam, Transubstantiationem, et alia, guae Rex novitia et nupera vocat." Andrewes stated that communion in one kind is defective, and that "Eucharistia est simul sacrificium et

______________________________

"3 Montagu to Cosin, Correspondence of John Cosin, Surtees Society, vol. 52, 70.

"4 Andrewes, Tortura Torti LACT, (1851), 305-7.

"5 Ibid., 435-6.

sacramentum,""7 asserting that the Protestants were not innovating, but renovating.

The passage from Andrewes which is probably the most quoted by others, including Newman, is from his dispute with Bellarmine: "Do you take away from the Mass your transubstantiation; and there will not long be any strife with us about the sacrifice." Here Newman ended, but the remainder of the quotation is revealing: "Willingly we allow that a memory of the sacrifice is made there. That your Christ made of bread is sacrificed there we will never allow."

The first few pages of Andrewes' first Replie to Cardinal Perron44 provide further insight; they concern the presence of Christ, reservation and adoration. Andrewes again argues against communion in one kind, and from here is taken the other of his most often quoted statements, on the subject of the real nature of eucharistic sacrifice, and the definition of a sacrament:

If we agree about the matter of Sacrifice, there will be no difference about the Altar. The holy Eucharist being considered as a Sacrifice, in the representation of the breaking the bread and pouring forth the cup, the same is fitly called an Altar; which is as fitly called a Table, the Eucharist being considered as a Sacrament, which is nothing else but a distribution and an application of the Sacrifice to the several receivers.48

It is in these two answers to Cardinal Perron that Lossky notes Andrewes' use of the Orthodox "anamnesis" to indicate a bypassing of time and space in the eucharist,50 making the communion an eternal event celebrated in the present.

---

47 Ibid., 250-52.

48 Formerly Jacques Davy, a Huguenot convert; Trevor-Roper, "Laudianism and Political Power," 110.

49 Andrewes, Works, vol. XI LACT, Altars Strictures: or, A Briefe Answer to the XVIII. Chapter of the first Booke of Cardinall Perron's Replie...to King James, 20. Emphasis mine.

Andrewes also asserted in these disputations the reality of the presence of Christ in the sacrament, but that belief in the manner of that presence is not required de fide: "Christ said, 'This is My body.' He did not say, 'This is My body in this way.'" In this same passage he expressed his own version of the Anglican refusal to define how it is that Christ is present to us in the sacrament:

We believe no less than you that the presence is real. Concerning the method of the presence, we define nothing rashly, and, I add, we do not anxiously enquire, any more than how the blood of Christ washes us in our Baptism, any more than how the human and divine nature are united in one Person in the Incarnation of Christ.  

As he does here, he often refers to the two natures of the eucharistic elements in terms of the Chalcedonian "hypostatical union" of the two natures of Christ. In this he echoes Calvin.

Andrewes' most sustained teaching on the eucharist is to be found in his preaching. Of particular note are three sermons: one on the second commandment, called "of the Worshipping of Imaginations" preached 9 January 1592 at St. Giles Cripplegate (of which he was vicar at the time); the one for Easter 1612, which Stevenson says is Andrewes' fullest statement of eucharistic theology; and the Christmas sermon 1623, which Lossky claims contains the essence of Andrewes' eucharistic theology. The collected Easter and Christmas sermons were preached before the King and the Royal Court. All but two of his Christmas sermons include a eucharistic passage, and it is from

---


52 Ibid., 342.

53 Stevenson, Covenant of Grace, 48, 53. Not everyone admired the artifice of his style. 125 years ago, John Hunt, in his Religious Thought in England, iii, 376, called Andrewes' pious conceits on the Holy communion in his Christmas sermons "pernicious nonsense." One Scottish Laird said to James I that "No doubt your Majestie's bishop is a learned man, but he cannot preach. He rather
one of these, Christmas Day 1618, that the following illustration is taken which typifies his approach:

For Christ in the Sacrament is not altogether unlike Christ in the cratch.\textsuperscript{54} To the cratch we may well liken the husk or outward symbols of it. Outwardly it seems little worth but it is rich of contents, as was the crib this day with Christ in it. For what are they but...'weak and poor elements' of themselves? yet in them we find Christ. Even as they did this day...'in the beasts' crib the food of Angels;' which very food our signs both represent, and present to us.

In these Christmas sermons it is clear that for Andrewes Incarnation leads to sacraments, which, through our participation in them, leads to our union with God in Christ. Thus they are objective means of grace. In a sermon for Whitsun 1616 he echoes Hooker,\textsuperscript{55} using the image that the sacraments are "conduit pipes" for grace; they themselves are common lead or wood, but by them grace, like water, is conveyed.\textsuperscript{56}

"Imaginations" (1592)

The eucharist is the application of Christ's atoning sacrifice, says Andrewes, and since that which is so sacrificed is eaten, then what is eaten must be in reality the sacrificed Christ:

It is the nature of an Eucharist or peace-offering; which was never offered but it was eaten, that both there might be a representation

plays with his text than preaches on it."

\textsuperscript{54} "crèche," i.e. "crib."


\textsuperscript{56} Sermon for Pentecost, 1616; Stevenson, \textit{Covenant of Grace}, 50. Bramhall would use the same image of the conduit pipe and sacramental grace in 1661; Bolton, \textit{Caroline Tradition}, 109.
of the memory of that sacrifice, and together an application to each
person by partaking it." 57

In the Holy Communion there is a true partaking of Christ's true body. It is not
a mere sign or figure or remembrance of it. The Eucharist is spiritual
nourishment, and by virtue of that sacrifice the eucharist is the means by which
we renew our covenant with God. It is necessarily linked with duty to the poor,
as part of both the offertory sacrifice and of the koinonia. 58

He argues with considerable derision and almost ad absurdum that the
Papists do not truly break bread together: in the mass, since the fraction
follows the consecration, there can no longer be any bread remaining to break.
Furthermore, since Christ is glorified in Heaven, his body is now impassable
and therefore cannot be broken.

Andrewes expresses his disappointment that the communion is often
received only once per year, and thereby "we think our duty discharged." He
hopes that, following the frequent pattern of the Primitive Church, reception
would be more frequent.

Easter 1612

This sermon is an extended comparison of Easter with the Passover.
Christ is the true passover and since Easter is the memorial of our passover, we
are commanded to keep a feast. Christ is the passover lamb, the Agnus Dei.
Andrewes again connects sacrifice with real presence by pointing out that if, in


the Old Testament sense, Christ is a propitiatory sacrifice for sin offered for us, then we must eat his flesh if we are to benefit from his death." Thus the sacrament and the sacrifice together make the perfect passover leading to eternal life.

The eucharist as a sacrament is the memorial and application of that sacrifice. The passover does not end with the sacrifice only, but with a celebration to be continued until Christ comes again. Andrewes specifically uses the word anamnesis for this "showing forth," and associates it with lepsis for "communion," or what is also called koinonia. This is not to be just an event of the mind, or merely of words, but there must be real action to show him forth. The holy symbols of eucharist must reflect that sacrifice: bread is broken, wine is poured out, just as were Christ's body and blood.

The presence of Christ in the eucharist cannot be of his glorified body for it is in heaven and not subject to death. Christ's body is truly present, not as it now is, but as it was, crucified, and Andrewes says, ad cadaver. Sounding very much like Calvin, Andrewes asserts that in the sacramental action we are carried up to heaven in the sursum corda, but there is double movement, for we are also simultaneously carried back to the very moment of Christ's sacrifice.

The theme of the worthy communicant also enters into this sermon. We are not to keep the feast casually or without regard for its dignity; we must be prepared, in a wedding garment. Retaining the Passover theme, Andrewes says we are to get rid of the old leaven, that is, we are to put on the righteousness of God and renounce our sin. We must keep the feast, as St. Paul says, not

---

59 Andrewes, "Resurrection," 301f.
with leaven of malice and wickedness, but with the leaven of sincerity and truth.

Nativity 1623

Andrewes' text for this sermon is from Ephesians 1: 10:

"That in the dispensation of the fulness of times, He might gather into one\(^6^0\) all things, both of which are in Heaven, and which are in earth, even in Christ."

Andrewes here makes much of the concept "recapitulation," an eschatological gathering together and summing up of all things in Christ. "For as there is a recapitulation of all in Heaven and earth in Christ, so there is a recapitulation of all in Christ in the holy Sacrament."\(^6^1\) One is reminded of the extensive patristic use of the "recapitulation" of all salvation history in Christ. This was especially important to Irenaeus, and recapitulation became a significant theme taken up by later Fathers.

Rather than adopting Calvin's "metonymical" use of sacramental language, Andrewes uses the language of the first councils:

And the gathering or vintage of these two [i.e. wheat and vine] in the blessed Eucharist, is as I may say a kind of hypostatical union of the sign and the thing signified, so united together as are the two natures of Christ.

Yet, as noted above in Hooker, this too may be found in Calvin.

Andrewes appeals to another word from the early Church, "synaxis," which he says means "a gathering," and which was used to denote the eucharist: wheat and grapes are gathered to make bread and wine; we are

\(^6^0\) anakephalaiosasthai = recapitulate.

\(^6^1\) Andrewes, Ninety Six Sermons, LACT, Sermon XVI, 281.
gathered in a common faith, and are gathered to Christ in the Eucharist, in whom all things are gathered together, and so we are gathered together in Christ into God's Kingdom. In this context Andrewes specifically adopts Jewel's figure taken from Chrysostom of the eagles gathering to the body, "and so one Synaxis begets another."

Lossky has well summed up Andrewes' mystical approach to the eucharist as he expressed it in his preaching:

It is essentially in the sacrament of the Eucharist that the Church lives the whole economy of salvation in the present. The Eucharist is, in fact, 'memorial' or 'anamnesis' par excellence in the sense that it makes the Person of Christ really present and participable. This 'remembrance' of the Church, ...is not a simple remembering of events that have taken place, but... actualizes and makes simultaneous, in a recapitulation of time, what is past and what is to come....

---

JOHN DONNE (1571-1631)

Another preacher whose exposition of the Sacrament may be found in his sermons, particularly those of Christmas, is John Donne. His Christmas sermon of 1621, at St. Paul's, contains a paragraph condemning papist errors regarding the eucharist, what he calls their "non-communions" (the logical result of the doctrine of transubstantiation), "semi-communions" (from communion in one kind only), and "sesqui-communions" (the idea that only the accidents of the bread and wine remain).

---

62 Lossky, Lancelot Andrewes, 340.

In another, from Christmas Day 1626, the eucharist is asserted to be an epiphany: to receive communion is to have a manifestation of Christ's birth in the soul as well as a Good Friday, a resurrection and an ascension. Every communicant becomes a priest and prophet as was Simeon, and to receive the eucharist is to take Orders, which therefore requires sanctity of life. This sermon is notable for its understanding of consecration, as much as of the elements as of the communicants.

Although he never explicitly equates the two, Donne obliquely implies that the Communion Table is the altar of Matthew 5: 23. He mentions the danger of unworthy reception, again without elaboration, but the implication is clear that Matthew 5: 23 applies here as well. He also asserts that consecration is real, and that it involves a change in use of the elements. "That Bread which you see after the consecration is not the same bread which was presented before." It is not transubstantiated, but changed by God in use. Donne uses a helpful image to explain: the consecrated bread is another Bread, in the same way that a Judge is a different man when upon the Bench than when he sits on a common bench in his own house.

Two weeks prior to this 1626 Christmas sermon, preaching at the funeral of Sir William Cokayne, Donne exhibited the typically Calvinist respectful agnosticism regarding the manner of Christ's presence in the sacrament, indeed claiming that to define the manner of such presence is in fact to exclude Christ from it:

---


65 Ibid., 82.

66 Ibid., 86.
So it is an error, and a weaknesse to attribute too much, or too little to Christs presence in his Sacraments, or other Ordinances....As long as we are present at thine Ordinance, thou are present with us. But to banish Christ from those holy actions, and to say, That he is no otherwise present, or works no otherwise in those actions, then in other times, and places, this is to say with Peter, in his astonishment, Exi a me Domine, O lord depart from me; It is enough that thy Sacrament be a signe; I do not look that it should be a Seal, or a Conduit of Grace; This is the danger, this is the distemper, to ascribe too much, or too little to Gods visible Ordinances, and Institutions,...If we have a Sacrament, if we have a Sermon all is well, we have enough."

Attacking the Zwinglians, the Papists and the Lutherans, Donne preached:

As they that deny the body of Christ to be in the Sacrament, lose their footing in departing from their ground, the expresse Scriptures; so they that will assign a particular manner, how that body is there, have no footing, no ground at all, no Scripture to Anchor upon....and so the Roman Church hath catched a Trans, and others a Con, and a Sub, and an In, and varied their poetry into a Transubstantiation, and a Consubstantiation, and the rest, and rhymed themselves beyond reason, into absurdities, and heresies, and fallen alike into error...."

There is evidence in these passages that, for all he has been proclaimed the mystical poet" of the Caroline Divines, Donne might well be better classified as a Puritan. Paul Sellin has demonstrated Donne's sympathies with the conclusions of the Synod of Dort. Donne's intellectual association with the Netherlands was extensive and he preached in the Hague vehemently against the

---


" Donne, Sermons ed. Potter and Simpson, 296.

" Very little of Donne's poetry actually concerns the Holy Communion itself; rather, argues McNees, the "real presence" of eucharist is for Donne the paradigm for the sacramental reality of the coexistence of matter and spirit which his poetry is at pains to express. Eleanor Jane McNees, "The Eschatology of Real Presence: Donne's Struggle toward Conformity with Christ," in Eucharistic Poetry: the search for presence in the writings of John Donne, Gerald Manley Hopkins, Dylan Thomas and Geoffrey Hill (Lewisburg Bucknell University Press, 1992), 33-38.
Arminians; his *Devotions on Emergent Occasions*, which has a section on preparation for the Sacrament, was sold on the Dutch market as a Puritan tract.  

**WILLIAM LAUD** (1573-1645)

Andrewes' funeral sermon was preached by John Buckeridge, who began with an extended discourse on the doctrine of the eucharist. Buckeridge had been tutor to William Laud at Oxford, and Laud himself a great admirer of Andrewes, and coeditor with Buckeridge of Andrewes' sermons. Wrote Brilioth, "It was Laud's work to give practical and administrative expression to the sacramentalism of Andrewes."  

The conversion to Rome of the Duke of Buckingham's mother, Mary Villiers, and the vacillating of the Duke himself, was the immediate occasion of the theological dispute contained in *A Relation of the Conference Between William Laud and Mr. Fisher the Jesuit by the Command of King James* (1639). They had first disputed privately, and it is in the account of their public dispute that Laud's own theological opinions regarding the eucharist are found. Stevenson says:

> The key to Laud's theological method lies in his assertion that 'the Church of England is nearest any Church now in being to the Primitive Church.' In other words, antiquity is to be the judge of whether a Church is authentic. This was a bold claim, but it was

---

70 "...the idea is questionable that Donne was hostile to the basic institutions and tenets of Calvinist orthodoxy as expressed in the formulations of the Synod of Dort....Donne may have differed from 'Puritans' in England, but not necessarily for doctrinal or even artistic reasons too often given." Paul Sellin, *John Donne and 'Calvinist' Views of Grace* (Amsterdam: VU Boekandel, 1983), 49; 17-23.

one which others made for their Churches at the time. However, it became a peculiarly Anglican ground for belief in the years and centuries to come, not without a touch of romanticism.

Laud was not afraid to use one Jesuit against another: regarding Bellarmine he said,

'That the conversion of bread and wine into the body and the blood of Christ is substantial, but after a secret and ineffable manner, and not like in all things to any natural conversion whatsoever.' Now, if he had left out 'conversion' and affirmed only Christ's 'real presence' there, after a mysterious, and indeed an ineffable, manner, no man could have spoken better.

And in this context he specifically quotes Calvin in support.

Laud made an ecumenical attempt during the Conference, stating that it was safest to communicate in the English Church because all parties agree on Christ's presence; many people deny transubstantiation, and even more deny consubstantiation. As Crockett remarked above of Hooker, Laud implies that such matters are issues of opinion only, and not in themselves matters for division.

Laud called transubstantiation a scandal to the Church of God. Since it is neither in, nor can be proved by Scripture, nor found in the Fathers, the doctrine simply is not Christian. The doctrine of concomitance he called a "fiction of Thomas Aquin." Laud approved of Calvin's understanding of the

---

72 Stevenson, Covenant of Grace, 75.

73 Laud, Conference with Fisher the Jesuit, in Works, LACT, ii, 322-3.

74 Ibid., 331.

75 Ibid., 365.

76 Ibid., 338. Also William Nicholson, "The chimaera of Thomas's brain." A Plain but Full Exposition of the Catechism of the Church of England, LACT (Oxford: Parker, 1842), 180; and Ussher calls it "a toy that was once dreamed of in those days." James Ussher, A Discourse of the Religion Anciently Professed by the Irish and British, in Works iv, 280.
real presence in the eucharist, despite Bellarmine's apparent ignorance of it; all Protestants, asserted Laud, accept the real presence and real partaking of Christ in the sacrament.

The eucharist has the nature of a sacrifice in three ways according to Laud: 1) the one offered only by the priest, which is the commemorative sacrifice of Christ's death, not a repetition of it, represented by the bread and wine; 2) the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving offered by the priest and the people together; and 3) the personal and individual sacrifice of each person's body and soul to God's service.

The idea of multiple sacrifices within the eucharist was not unique to Laud: in support of Laud, Bramhall held that there were four, viz. that of prayer and thanksgiving; a commemoration of the sacrifice on the cross, or a representation of that sacrifice to the Father; an "impetrative" (i.e. "obtained by request") sacrifice, the "impetations of the fruit and benefit of His Passion by way of real prayer"; and the "applicative," of applying Christ's merits to our souls. Bramhall also asserted that no true member of the Church of England denied the Real Presence, but that Christ nowhere said in what

---

77 Ibid., 328.
79 Laud, Works, vol. II, 88, 276; also quoted in More and Cross, Anglicanism, 496; see Dugmore, Eucharistic Doctrine, 81; Mackean, "Anti-Roman Apologetics I," 208-210; Stone, History, vol II, 337-342; Bolton, The Caroline Tradition of the Church of Ireland, 95. Hamon L'Estrange also held to four sacrificial points in the eucharist in his Alliance of Divine Offices 4th ed. "Annotations upon Chapter IV," LACT, (Oxford: Parker, 1846); see Buxton, Eucharist and Institution Narrative, 111-112. Thorndike also held four, though his are different: the placing of the elements on the altar, the intercessions, the consecration, and the people's self-offering after communion, see Stevenson, Covenant of Grace Renewed, 145-7. For an examination of other Laudian and Puritan understandings of the multiple sacrificial aspects and their remarkable similarity, particularly with respect to the liturgies between 1552-1637, see Reynolds, "Sacrifices by Resemblance."
manner: "neque con neque sub neque trans," in an apparent stab at the Lutherans. He quoted Andrewes' statement of having no dispute with Rome regarding sacrifice so long as transubstantiation was not required de fide.  

Returning to Laud, his emphasis on the sacrificial reality of the eucharist and the real presence of Christ in the Sacrament can account for the reverence he, as well as Cosin, Andrewes, and Taylor paid to the holy table itself. Restoring it to the east end and railing it off was a matter of dignity and propriety, not of popery as he was accused. He asserted in his speech at the censure of Bastwick, Burton and Prynne that greater reverence is due the altar than to the pulpit, because at the altar is "hoc est corpus meum" whereas the pulpit is "at most but hoc est verbum meum." In the same speech, in defence of "bodily worship," he quoted Jewel's phrase of "adoring at the sacrament" which is to be distinguished from "adoring the sacrament." His indignation at "the profaneness of the times" is reflected in the 1640 Canons regarding the table. Dugmore admits, along with Trevor-Roper, that although the 1640 canons reflect a difference in doctrine regarding priestly power and political authority from the Puritans, no difference between them and Laud is exhibited in the Canons regarding the holy communion.

The attack on Laud over the imposition of the 1637 Book of Common Prayer in Scotland and his replies to the allegations provide some helpful insight

---

80 John Bramhall, Works, LACT v, 217. William Forbes used the statement too, Considerationes Modestae et Pacificae, Book III; quoted in Stevenson, Covenant of Grace, 82.

81 Ibid., 58; Jewel, Reply to Harding's Answer, art. 3, div. 29 (London: 1609), 151.


83 Dugmore, Eucharistic Doctrine, 48; Trevor-Roper, Laud, 45.
into his understanding of the eucharist. Laud's Puritan opponents attributed the new book to him and condemned him for it. The 1637 book represented a return to the theology and practices of the 1549 book, and Laud almost wistfully admitted that he admired it, but he also knew that for political reasons it was incautious. "Nevertheless, he said, approving of it could not make him responsible for it." On the issue of consecration, Laud defended the *epiklesis* as improving the liturgy, making it more solemn and full, although the consecration might be effected without the words. His accusers also objected to the words in the consecration prayer: "ut fiant nobis." Laud, incredulous, asked how they could squeeze corporal presence out of these words, for they flatly contradicted transubstantiation and clearly indicated receptionism. Laud's Puritan accusers also objected to the omission of the words of administration which indicated the memorial nature of communion, claiming that this was an attempt to assert the corporal presence in sacrament, although Laud insisted their omission did not alter the liturgy in any "popish" direction.

Laud's private devotions provide insight into his personal opinions. The sacrament makes the faithful recipient "an engrafted member" of the Body of Christ; it nourishes the believer's faith hope charity and obedience; yet the manner of Christ's presence is a mystery beyond our attempts to define:

> I quarrel not the words of Thy Son my Saviour's blessed Institution. I know His words are no gross unnatural conceit, but they are spirit and life, and supernatural. While the world disputes, I believe. He hath promised me, if I come worthily, that I shall receive His most precious Body and Blood, with all the benefits of His passion. If I can receive it and retain it, (Lord

---


make me able, make me worthy,) I know I can no more die eternally, than that Body and Blood can die, and be shed again."

The "worthy receiver" has no personal merits to offer, but is made worthy by the sheer grace of God.

The accusations that Laud was chief among English Arminians, then, clearly do not apply to his thoroughly orthodox and Calvinist understanding of the Lord's Supper. Furthermore, the label "Arminian" ascribed to Laud's application of decoration and ceremonial as regal honours to Christ at the eucharist is a misapplication of the word.

**RICHARD MONTAGU (1577-1641)**

Montagu is largely noted for the controversy evoked by his books. He was indicted before parliament, and a conference was held at the home of the Duke of Buckingham to enquire into his orthodoxy. The result was an appeal to the King, which was granted, "that his Majesty...prohibit all parties...any further controverting of these questions [of predestination and free will] by public preaching or writing...."

Montagu's *A New Gagg for an Old Goose* (1624) was written in response to a Roman polemical work against the Church of England, titled *A Gagg for the New Gospel* (1623) written by "Matthew Kelisson," whose real name was John Heighham. Although attacking Roman assaults on the Church of England, *A New Gagg* was in turn attacked by Puritans for supposedly promoting Arminianism and Popery. Montagu rejected "Kelisson's" description of

---

"Laud, Private Devotions, in *Works*, vol. iii, 72-3.

Protestant doctrine as simply untrue caricatures, and in his defence of Protestantism from this attack he rejected much of what the hotter sort of Calvinists held dear. They vehemently disagreed with Montagu's statement that the issue of predestination, particularly regarding the perseverance of the saints, was a matter of personal liberty, and that even learned scholars disagreed. As already noted, he asserted that although Rome was not the Catholic Church, nor even a sound member, it was, nevertheless, part of the true Church. The continental Reformed churches however, lacking episcopacy, were not. Puritan ire was thus raised, and the matter went to Parliament."

Montagu responded with a second book, Appello Caesarem, which he had earlier sent to his friend John Cosin for corrections and a title suggestion. According to Milton both of Montagu's books were heavily dependant, both in form and content, on earlier works by Bishop Overall. Montagu was charged before Parliament and a hearing had to be struck to examine the charges. He was supported by Cosin, Buckeridge and White. Only one of the Puritan charges specified the Lord's Supper, saying that Montagu was "verie popish" in his writing, particularly around the word "altar," which he defended, as did Laud, Andrewes and Hooker, inter alia, as a legitimate word. He was attacked, first for not declaring that the Pope was personally the antiChrist; secondly because he did not reject all Tridentine opinion simply for being Tridentine; and finally for saying that the Church of England was not bound by the Synod of

---

" See White, Predestination, Policy and Polemic, 219-223 for a detailed discussion of the dispute between Montagu and his Puritan accusers.

" For an extended examination of the York House Conference with regard to predestination and English politics, see White, Predestination, policy and polemic, chapter 11.

Milton, Catholic and Reformed, 114.
In all these things he replied that these were matters of opinion and did not affect the peace of the Church. He was criticized also for his apparent reverence for the Fathers because of his reliance on them.

Montagu's understanding of the eucharist is virtually identical to that which has been discussed: a vehement rejection of transubstantiation (which he called that "monster of monsters") and consubstantiation; a sustained attack on the memorialism of Zwingli and Oecolampadius with the affirmation of the real presence of Christ to the faithful communicant; denial of the propitiatory efficacy of the mass, while yet affirming the real memorial sacrifice; a learned appeal to antiquity.

Montagu was a defender of the Church as established. He defended his doctrine by appealing not only to the Scriptures and the Fathers, but also to the catechism, rubrics and Articles. He repeated the challenge of Jewel, that if anyone, Papist or Puritan could prove him wrong from the writings of the first six centuries, he would subscribe to them. He also alluded to Hooker with admiration regarding the Christian's real participation:

Sir, we acknowledge right willingly, and professe, that in the blessed Sacrament (as you call it, of the Altar) the Body and Blood of our Savior Christ is really participated & communicated; and by

---

91 John Hales, a good friend of Laud's, had been a Calvinist until the Synod of Dort, and after listening to Episcopius on John 3:16, he said "There I bid John Calvin goodnight." More, "Anglicanism," lix; Henry McAdoo, Jeremy Taylor Today, 17. Perhaps this oft-quoted comment is not an indication that Hales has rejected Calvin, but rather that Dort has left Calvin behind.

92 An example of his sarcasm: Montagu says that he can live with differences of opinion, but apparently the Puritans could not: "But your opinions must be the LORDS HOLY TRUTH."


94 Ibid., 258.
means of that real participation, life from him and in him conveyed into our soules."

He is often remembered for the words of his refusal to define the manner of Christ's presence: "Becontented with that it is and do not seek nor define How it is so; and we shall not contest nor contend with you." He preferred not "to pry into the secret counsels of the most High." Oddly enough, however, for all his ill-tempered language, Montagu also appealed for confessional peace among the churches.

Were the peace of the Church, and unity of faith (which is more mystically insinuated in this Sacrament, than else-where; in the Materials therof, both Bread and Wine) so deare and precious as it ought to bee, unto such common Barretters of Christendome, as Priests and Jesuites are for private ends; this, and many other Controversies on foot, might cease. For, it is confessed on either side, that Sacraments, which have their Being from institution, are signes of Gods love and promise, seals of his covenant and grace, and instruments and conveiances of his mercy. What they intimate, signifie, and represent, they convey unto the soule."

In Appello Caesarem he repeated this to his Puritan accusers."

When he was accused by "Kellison" of holding that the elements in the eucharist are bare signs and figures only, and devoid of Christ, Montagu replied: "Protestants say it not: they never said it." When his Puritan

95 Ibid., 251.
96 Ibid., 255.
97 Ibid., 252.
98 Ibid., 251.
99 Montagu, Appello Caesarem: A just appeale from two vniust informers (Amsterdam: Theatrum Orbis Terrarum, 1972), 289.
100 Montagu, Gagg, 253.
critics complained that this assertion implied change in the elements, Montagu simply got nasty.\textsuperscript{101}

Like many others, Montagu saw no reason why the articles of Dort should apply to the Church of England. He was genuinely puzzled at the attack on him from within his own church that he had Arminian, and for some reason, therefore Popish tendencies. He denied both, and from his own writings it is plain that his doctrine of the sacrament lies entirely within Anglican orthodoxy.

\textbf{JOHN COSIN (1594–1672)}

Using the "school" conceit momentarily, if Andrewes was the metaphysical preacher of the Laudians, Laud the administrator, Montagu the controversialist, then Cosin was the ecumenist and liturgist. He was attacked early on in his career for "popish innovations" in ceremony at Durham, that is, chanting, the lighting of candles, reverencing the altar, and standing for the Gospel.\textsuperscript{102} He introduced Andrewes' censer to Peterhouse.\textsuperscript{103} As with Laud he considered his actions to be neither innovative nor to have any taint of popery about them.

Among the main sources for Cosin's eucharistic theology are three series of notes on the liturgy; one of these, the famous "Durham Book" was the basis for the 1662 revision of the Prayer Book. There has been some controversy

\textsuperscript{101} "No man denieth: you doe. But pardon me, I meant it of discreet, moderate, understanding Divines. I should have exempted you (I perceive my error) and such as you out of the number. Pardon mee this fault, I will commit it no more. If I have any occasion hereafter to speak of learned and moderate men, I will ever except and exempt you and yours." \textit{Appello Caesarem}, 293.

\textsuperscript{102} His perpetual antagonist, Peter Smart, remained in the Church throughout the wars and Restoration.

\textsuperscript{103} Cosin however rejected the blessing and use of ashes on Ash Wednesday and palms on Palm Sunday as popish innovations.
regarding whether the first series of notes as included in the LACT edition of his works, are in fact Cosin's. Stone believes the attribution to be in question, although Dugmore provides evidence to accept them. Other sources are his *History of Popish Transubstantiation* written in 1656 but not published until 1674, two years after his death; his book to the Europeans regarding the faith of the Church of England *Regni Angliae Religio Catholica*, written at the request of Hyde; his letter to the Countess of Peterborough summarizing 14 points of similarity and 14 of difference between Rome and the Church of England; and his book of private devotions, written to provide the Protestant ladies of Henrietta's court with a "book of hours" for their protection against the fashionable use of Roman ones. In this latter book Cosin quoted the conclusion of Hooker's discussion of the eucharist: "Oh my God, thou art true and holy! Oh my soul, thou art blessed and happy."\(^{104}\)

Cosin was not afraid of quotation. He quoted Andrewes' "One canon, two testaments, three creeds, four councils, five centuries."\(^{105}\) He followed Laud in quoting Bellarmine with qualified approval:

> Indeed Bellarmine confesseth with S. Bernard, that "Christ in the sacrament is not given to us carnally, but spiritually": and would to God he had rested there and not outgone the Holy Scriptures and the doctrine of the fathers.\(^{106}\)

Cosin admired Calvin's teaching regarding the sacraments, and quoted him extensively:

---


\(^{105}\) "Unus Canon, a Deo in duo Testamenta relatus...Tria Symbole, Quatuor priora Concilia, Quinque saecula, et Catholicorum Patrum per ea series ac consensus." Cosin, *Works*, vol. IV, LACT, *Regni Angliae Religio Catholica*, 342.

His words in his Institutions and elsewhere are such, so comfortable to the style and mind of the ancient fathers, that no Catholic Protestant would wish to use any other.\(^\text{107}\)

He was not alone; Andrewes, Bilson, Laud and Jeremy Taylor all affirmed their agreement with Calvin's doctrine while nevertheless opposing the Puritans.\(^\text{108}\) McLelland has noted that Cosin in the *History of Popish Transubstantiation* is also indebted to Peter Martyr in his use of Gelasius and Theodoret.\(^\text{109}\)

Cosin, like Calvin, asserted that since Christ's bodily presence was taken away at the ascension, it cannot still be with us. Yet his spiritual presence is everywhere with us until he comes bodily again. Therefore Christ's flesh is eaten spiritually, not carnally.\(^\text{110}\) Cosin's personal epithet for Roman teaching was that "the gangrene of transubstantiation"\(^\text{111}\) was "so strange and monstrous that it exceeds the nature of all miracles."\(^\text{112}\) Although the eating of Christ's flesh is spiritual, it is no less true than were it corporal.\(^\text{113}\) The concept of consecration was important for Cosin in describing the setting apart

\(^{107}\) Cosin, *Popish Transubstantiation*, 167-8. The reference is to Calvin, *Inst.* IV.17.32 cited above: "Now, if anyone should ask me how this takes place [i.e. the presence], I shall not be ashamed to confess that it is a secret too lofty for either my mind to comprehend or my words to declare. And, to speak more plainly, I rather experience than understand it." Thorndike also uses the phrase "catholic protestant" to describe himself; Mackean, "Anti-Roman Apologetics," 221.


\(^{111}\) Ibid. 113. "...usque ad annum millesimum, gangraenam transubstantiationis Ecclesias Christi nondum depavisse." Durel translates "leprosy"; Dugmore translates "cancer," *Eucharistic Doctrine*, 106.

\(^{112}\) Cosin, *Popish Transubstantiation*, 178.

\(^{113}\) Ibid., 155-7.
of the elements. The word appears in the English Book of Common Prayer for the first time in 1662, in which he had a decisive editorial hand. But it was a limited idea for Cosin. In the second series of notes on the BCP (1638), he included in the margin:

Yet if for lack of care they consecrate more than they distribute, why may not the curates have it to their own use, as well as be given to children,...or be burnt in the fire... for though the bread and wine remain, yet the consecration, the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, do not remain longer than the holy action itself remains for which the bread and wine were hallowed; and which, being ended, return to their former use again?

By virtue of the words and blessing of Christ, the bread and wine are wholly converted into the Body and Blood of Christ, in condition, use and office; they are raised to a higher dignity. The change is not in matter and form; it is a sacramental, and therefore mysterious change. The change in the elements consists only in their sacred use, and without their intended use, that is, reception, they have no character of sacrament. Cosin here expresses the general consensus among English protestants. Nicholson, for instance, wrote in his Exposition on the Creed:

That which is more material to know is the change of these, which is wholly sacramental, not in substance, but in use. For they remain bread and wine, such as before in nature: but consecrate and set apart to represent our Saviour's passion....

---

114 Stevenson, Covenant of Grace, 95-6; the first Anglican use of the word was in the troublesome 1637 Scottish Book.


116 Cosin, Popish Transubstantiation, 172-3. In this Ecchlin states that Cosin was "strikingly similar" to Bucer. Edward P. Ecchlin, The Anglican Eucharist in Ecumenical Perspective: Doctrine and Rite from Cranmer to Seabury (New York: Seabury, 1968), 142.

117 Nicholson, Exposition, 179; also quoted in Davies, Worship and Theology, 296.
Christ is truly present in the sacrament, and this presence is objective insofar as our faith does not cause the presence, but presupposes it and apprehends it; therefore to those without faith, though they take the sacrament, the spiritual reality is unavailable. Regarding the manner of Christ's presence, Cosin says that Protestants dare not be so curious; "we that are Protestant and Reformed according to the ancient Catholic Church do not search into the manner of it with perplexing inquiries."

Although he rejected the propitiatory sacrifice of the mass for the living and the dead, Cosin asserted its eschatological significance in that the virtue of the eucharist is not just for the living, but unites the living, the dead, and those yet to come.118 The eucharist is a sacrifice of praise in commemoration of the propitiatory sacrifice once offered.

Cosin developed the image used by Hooker regarding the presence of Christ which would become important to later writers: the sacrament is like the deed of a testator. If a person receives the document with the words "Here is the land" then by accepting the deed, the land is truly his although the land may physically be elsewhere. The gift is real and concrete, although given by means of the symbol of the document.119 Calvin himself used the image of a princes' seal authenticating a document in Inst. IV.14.7. Furthermore, as Calvin also said, in a sacrament the sign takes on the name of the signified. According to Dugmore this "investiture" image originated with St. Bernard and was rejected by Thorndike as an evasion.120

118 Cosin, Popish Transubstantiation, 97.
119 Ibid., 58.
120 Dugmore, Eucharistic Doctrine, 86–7, 108, 178. The investiture image is also to be found in Beza's Confessio Christianae Fidei: "The principle is not unlike that which underlies the use of wax which is customarily impressed by the
Like Laud, Montagu, and Hooker before him, Cosin was interested more in confessional tolerance and ecclesial unity than he was in asserting the Church of England for its own sake. In a letter to Mr. Cordel at Blois, regarding whether one may receive the eucharist from the French Reformed Church, Cosin replied: "I seek the ways of peace with others, without prejudice to the truth and right that we have among ourselves." He stated that had it not been for the doctrine of transubstantiation there would be much more peace and unity in the Church.

For Cosin, God's grace is all we have to rely on when we present ourselves to the communion. In the Private Devotions he wrote: "...that I may be made worthy by Thy grace to obtain the virtue and fruits of the same...even the remission of all my sins, and the fulness of all thy graces." And again on the next page: "...and that Thou, not weighing our merits, but looking upon the blessed Sacrifice of our Saviour, which was once fully and perfectly made

__________________________

seal of a prince or magistrate to confirm a public document. In this case, the nature or substance of the wax differs not at all from any other wax, but in its use, it is far and away different. Further, if someone were to deface the wax impressed by the seal, he would be guilty of the crime of lese majeste." Quoted in Raitt, The Eucharistic Theology of Theodore Beza, 24.

Ussher used a variation of the "investiture" image: a picture of the French King is a bare sign, which may make a person think of him, but does not show that there is any real interest in him. Someone with the King's seal on letters patent, however, may have only common wax in no way changed, but it is not mere wax, for this wax has been set aside for a particular use, "yet being applied to this use, is of more worth to the patentee than all the wax in the country beside." "Sermon Preached before the Commons House of Parliament" 1620; quoted in Mackean, "Anti-Roman Apologetics," 231-2; see Works, vol. II, 417-457, where he repeats Calvin's statement that the symbol takes the name of the symbolized, and he uses the figure of king, wax and seals, to explain how consecration changes the elements in use, making them far different than before; that Christ is present ad cadaver; that the sacraments are both signs and seals of the covenant of grace. Ussher's views on the "real presence" are also to be found in "An Answer to a Challenge made by a Jesuit in Ireland," ch. 3. Ussher's very learned arguments support the present discussion.
for us all, mayest pardon our offences, and replenish us with Thy grace and benediction..."\textsuperscript{121}

**JEREMY TAYLOR (1613-1667)**

Of all of the Caroline divines Jeremy Taylor is by far the most studied both by theologians and historians of English literature.\textsuperscript{122} Stevenson's caveat regarding Hooker should again be attended to; it would take much courage to say anything new or innovative about Taylor, particularly within a general survey. Taylor's treatment of the eucharist is the most developed, thorough and nuanced among the Carolines. His works most especially concerned with the eucharist are *The Worthy Communicant* and *The Real Presence and Spiritual of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament proved against the doctrine of Transubstantiation*, but also *Holy Living*, *Clerus Domini*, and *The Great Exemplar*, and both parts of his *Dissuasive from Popery*.

Stevenson places Taylor firmly in the theological tradition of Hooker and Andrewes, and McAdoo notes a strong Alexandrian patristic influence in him. Amongst Taylor's first published works was a small tract called *On the Reverence Due to the Altar*, which Dugmore claims exceeds in its high-church

\textsuperscript{121} Cosin, *Private Devotions*, 273, 4.

emphasis anything Laud had written on the subject.\textsuperscript{123} Like others before him, Taylor held that the eucharist is an extension of the Incarnation,\textsuperscript{124} adding that it continues the presence of Christ in the world.\textsuperscript{125} He affirmed that Jesus is really present in the sacrament, but this is a "non-local presence" (a term Mackean calls nonsense\textsuperscript{126}). According to Taylor, Christ is present in the temple which is the human heart where God in trinitarian fulness dwells by faith; Christ is in the sacrament as the Tree of Life was in Eden. We are not to confuse "real" with "natural" presence.\textsuperscript{127} This is the error of Rome's transubstantiation, which Taylor vigorously denies, along with "half-communion," as innovations.

Arguing against what he understands to be Bellarmine's misconception, Taylor clarified the statement that Christ is spiritually present, not meaning "present in the manner of a spirit" but rather "present to our spirits only."\textsuperscript{128} He asserted thus that Christ's presence in the eucharist is not caused by, but

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{123} Dugmore, \textit{Eucharistic Doctrine}, 92.

\textsuperscript{124} Dugmore, \textit{Eucharistic Doctrine}, 102; Bolton, \textit{Caroline Church}, 110.

\textsuperscript{125} Bolton, \textit{Caroline Church}, 109.

\textsuperscript{126} The words "non-local presence" are nonsense, that is, being in a place locally and not locally, "...but so long as it is a distinction, it is no matter, it will amuse and make way to escape, if it will do nothing else." Mackean, "Anti-Roman Apologetics," 217; from Taylor, \textit{Works}, vol. III, \textit{Real Presence}, 111.

\textsuperscript{127} Taylor, \textit{Real Presence}, in \textit{Works}, vol. i, viii; quoted in McAdoo and Stevenson, \textit{Mystery of the Eucharist}, 64.

\textsuperscript{128} Charles Gore disputes Taylor's understanding, stating that "it is not congenial to the language of the Prayer Book." \textit{Body of Christ}, 236.
\end{footnotesize}
rather is apprehended by, our faith. This is as Cosin stated, that faith does not cause, but presupposes, the presence of Christ.

Key to Taylor's understanding are the ideas of mystery and sacramentality. He emphasized that Christ is truly received in a mysterious and ineffable manner; "Christ comes to meet us, clothed with a mystery..." and because Christ's presence is a mystery, one ought not try to understand or define it. Such an attempt is by definition impossible, not to mention a contradiction in terms, and therefore would be an act of impiety. Such inquiring into God's secrets has divided Christ's church as much as the sacrament has united it. There is no need to inquire into it; "it is sufficient to thee that Christ shall be present to thy soul as an instrument of grace...." Although we may not understand how Christ is present, our faith is not therefore defective.

Another brief excursus here may be helpful regarding "presence."

During Cosin's time William Nicholson, in his Plain but Full Exposition of the Catechism of the Church of England (1654) tackled the issue of Christ's sacramental presence, and as in the discussion above regarding Laud and the concept of multiple sacrifices, Nicholson understood four manners of presence:

129 Dugmore, Eucharistic Doctrine, 99; McAdoo, Jeremy Taylor Today, 147; Bolton, Caroline Spirit, 104.

130 Cosin, Popish Transubstantiation, 169.


132 McAdoo, Jeremy Taylor Today, 175.


134 Taylor, Holy Living; quoted in Dugmore, Eucharistic Doctrine, 95.

135 Bolton, Caroline Tradition, 110.
1) Divine, that is, God's omnipresence; 2) Spiritual, that is, present by faith in the hearts of all believers; 3) Sacramental, Christ is present in the Sacrament, which was ordained "to represent and communicate Christ's death unto us"; 4) Corporal, when Jesus was physically present in Judea.

Nicholson also examined three meanings of the term "real" in this context: real, as opposed to pretended or imaginary; real, as opposed to figurative, metaphorical or symbolic; and real meaning literal, corporal, or bodily. Nicholson concluded that Christ is present in the sacrament

divinely after a special manner, spiritually in the heart of the communicants, sacramentally or relatively in the elements, and this presence of His is real in the two former acceptions of real, but not in the last, for He is truly and effectually there present, though not corporally, bodily, casually, locally.  

Dugmore maintains that Nicholson had a deep and lasting effect on his friend Taylor; McAdoo is less sure who influenced whom. Nevertheless, both affirm that the faithful communicant truly receives Christ in the sacrament. Taylor here synthesizes the ideas that the sacrament communicates both the glorified Christ and Christ as sacrificed, because the glorified Christ is none other than the one which was crucified.

In the sacrament, that body which is reigning in heaven is exposed upon the table of blessing; and His body which was broken for us, is now broken again, and yet remains impassible. Every consecrated portion of bread and wine does exhibit Christ entirely to the faithful receiver; and yet Christ remains one, while He is ministered in ten thousand portions.

---


138 Ibid., 116.

The consecration effects a change in the bread and wine, while they yet remain the same in nature; they are taken into union with Christ himself, and thereby they are able to convey to the communicant Christ's life-giving body and blood: Taylor calls this a "synecdoche."\(^{140}\) He here repeats Calvin's use of the "metonymical" application of the names of the symbolized to the symbols. The bread is the Body of Christ, the Church is the Body of Christ, so by taking the bread, we are united one to another, "confederated into...the body of the Lord" by the Holy Spirit.\(^{141}\) Again like Calvin, Taylor places a high degree of emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit in the eucharist.

The words "take and eat" are as important and effect the consecration as much as the words "hoc est corpus meum." The elements are not Christ's body and blood until they are "taken and eaten."\(^{142}\) The consecration is accomplished by the Holy Spirit, not as a single accomplished instant, but in the whole eucharistic action.\(^{143}\)

Christ's body is truly there, and there is a conversion of the elements into Christ's body; for what before the consecration in all

\(^{140}\) The noun form of the Greek "to receive together"; a figure of speech meaning that the whole stands for the part or the part for the whole; the species for the genus or genus for the species. McAdoo, *Jeremy Taylor Today*, 188; Taylor, *Worthy Communicant*, 3. William Ames used the word in 1623 in *The Marrow of Theology*, trans. John D. Eusden, (Durham: Labyrinth Press, 1983); as did the American puritan Cotton Mather in his *Communicant's Companion* (Boston: n.p., 1690). Joseph Mede stated that the Christian sacrifice is improperly and metaphorically called *thysia*; but the word is correct if applied "synecdochically." Most correctly, however, the sacrament is *eucharista prophora*, that is, a sacrifice of thanksgiving. Joseph Mede, *The Christian Sacrifice*, in *The Works of the pious and profoundly-learned Joseph Mede* 3d ed., ed. John Worthington (London: Roger Norton for Richard Royston, 1672), 361.

\(^{141}\) McAdoo, *Jeremy Taylor Today*, 189.

\(^{142}\) *Ibid.*, 141.

\(^{143}\) Bolton, *Caroline Tradition*, 111.
senses was bread, is, after consecration, in some sense, Christ's body. 144

As with Calvin, Taylor emphasises the consecrating role of the Holy Spirit in the sursum corda.

Taylor is much more expansive than the other Carolines examined so far have been regarding the eucharistic sacrifice. The eucharist is not merely a re-enacting in the present of the Last supper, but, as Andrewes asserted, an anamnesis, a re-presentation of Christ as eternally sacrificed, continually interceding for us as High Priest to the Father.145 Taylor called the eucharist Christ's "passion in representation."146 The earthly and heavenly are by it united, and the communion table may thus correctly be called a proper altar because it is a copy of the celestial altar of sacrifice.147 McAdoo explains

[The eucharistic mystery at the earthly altar is merged with and actuated sacramentally (the words are Taylor's) by the unique high priest's offering of himself, as sacrificed, in perpetual intercession at the heavenly altar.]148

This is no innovation: Taylor cites the Letter to the Hebrews, St. Cyprian and Gregory Nanzianzen among his sources,149 and it seems that Forbes used the image before Taylor did.150 As shall be seen, Daniel Brevint made it a central

144 McAdoo, Jeremy Taylor Today, 174-5.

145 Ibid., 95.

146 Taylor, Worthy Communicant; quoted in Stevenson, Covenant of Grace, 120.

147 McAdoo and Stevenson, Mystery of the Eucharist, 154-55.


149 Bolton, Caroline Tradition, 96.

150 McAdoo, Jeremy Taylor Today, 82-3.
image in the *Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice*. But, says McAdoo, it is due to Taylor as much as anyone else that this image owes its place in Anglicanism.

Taylor asserts that there are three types of sacrifice in the Eucharist. The first is the all-sufficient sacrifice of Christ on the cross which Christ eternally presents to God; the second is that of God's ministers, who at the altar imitate in a sacramental manner that intercession; the celebrant actually offers, re-presents Christ to God, as already sacrificed once for all. Taylor expresses a rather exalted role for the clergy, particularly bishops, in the sacramental action. Thirdly there is that of the people, who in their "Amen" join with the presbyter's act, and in sharing the bread and wine make Christ's sacrifice their own, and thereby may also offer him to God. Theirs is the sacrifice of obedience and thanksgiving, in which they present themselves to God in Christ.  

Like Cosin and Hooker, Taylor expressed an ecumenical spirit regarding the intercommunion of persons of different churches:

> For what is it to me if the Greek church denies procession of the third Person from the second, so she will give me the right hand of fellowship though I affirm it, therefore because I profess the religion of Jesus Christ, and retain all matters of faith and necessity?  

He is also expansive regarding the nature of the worthy communicant, that is, how the individual must prepare for the receiving of the Lord in the sacrament.

From this survey of seven of the main writers well within the canon of those usually cited as the Caroline Divines, it is relatively simple to draw two main conclusions. First, they were unanimous in the main points of eucharistic doctrine, and often used the same sorts of language among themselves to

---

151 McAdoo, *Jeremy Taylor Today*, 83.

express it. Second, this doctrine is firmly within the sixteenth-century teaching of John Calvin and the Continental consensus he represented, which was promoted and defended in England by John Jewel. The next section of this chapter will survey some of the dominant points of Puritan thought, concluding with the same two points. A major difference, however, will become apparent, that the Puritans tended towards the scholastic strand of Reformed Orthodoxy, and this deterministic view of grace had consequences for the understanding and use of the sacrament.

III. PURITAN DOCTRINE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER

Although there are distinctive emphases and practices which have come to be called "Puritan," by no means can any particular extraction from Puritan thought be said to apply uniformly to them all. Nevertheless, Puritan doctrine of the Lord's Supper did not fundamentally differ from what has been so far examined. Stephen Mayor has stated that the broad agreement among Luther, Calvin, and Cranmer

formed the starting-point of eucharistic theology in English Nonconformity, and it explains why such theology is not a major issue in Puritan controversy.¹

As noted above, New has argued that "Puritan" doctrine and "Anglican" doctrine were essentially the same, except for a differing degree of emphasis on the doctrine of grace which he attributed to the Calvinist–Arminian tension.²

¹ Mayor, The Lord's Supper in Early English Dissent, xix.

² New, Anglican and Puritan, 61. Dugmore is misleading, says New, when he says that the Puritan view is receptionist.
Cocksworth has come to largely the same conclusion, but in a more thorough manner. Reynolds has written that the period from 1552 to 1637 "witnesses hardly any change at all" in the English church's attitude to the eucharistic sacrifice, and that "we must ask not who was challenging the consensus, but whether anyone publicly challenged the consensus on matters of fundamental importance." Buxton has concluded "the puritan eucharistic tradition...in all basic essentials...was fundamentally the same as the Anglican, both in terms of the presence and of consecration." It is apt to recall Andrewes' remark that Puritan doctrine, though not discipline, was sound. Apart from fundamental disagreement on the relationship between sacraments and grace, therefore, it is not possible to distinguish "Puritan-Calvinist" doctrine from the "Laudian-Caroline."

McAdoo has asserted that the distinctive characteristic of "Laudian" eucharistic theology was its emphasis on the mystery of sacramentality. I disagree: the Puritans' reverence for the sacraments and their sense of mystery was no less developed and "high"; so high in fact that it would paradoxically contribute to the impression that Puritan religion was originally anti-sacramental. Both Puritans and the Laudians were vigorously anti-Papal; nevertheless, remarks Mayor pointedly, "Calvinists would never have admitted

3 Cocksworth, Evangelical Eucharistic Thought, 33-60, particularly 48-52.


5 Buxton, Eucharist and Institution Narrative, 142. The very fact that Buxton cannot decide whether to class William Cowper's liturgy of 1619 as puritan or Anglican, Ibid., 135, supports the argument that the classifications are artificial.

6 McAdoo, Jeremy Taylor Today, 50.
that they recognized less significance in the Lord's Supper than Roman Catholics in the Mass.""}  

One preliminary comment on nomenclature: a common preference among the Puritans was the use of the word "ordinance" instead of "sacrament." Some disqualified the use of the latter word citing its origin as a Roman soldier's oath of allegiance. Others had no such qualms: Richard Sibbes (1577-1635) often referred to the Lord's Supper simply as "the sacrament," and both William Bradshaw (1571-1618) and Richard Baxter (1615-1691) commended the original meaning of the word to emphasize that Christians themselves made a solemn oath of allegiance to God in the Holy Communion. Calvin similarly commented on the word with approval, Inst. IV.14.13. The Puritans did not use the word "eucharist." Nevertheless, it was generally common for Puritans to prefer the word "ordinance," and at the same time less common, though not rare, for the "Caroline Divines" to do so.

The summary of twelve points noted above regarding the agreement among the "Caroline Divines" and Calvin regarding the eucharist is equally applicable to the "Puritan Divines." The Westminster Confession (WCF) being notoriously the Puritan confession of faith, contains two chapters of particular note, XXIX on sacraments in general, and XXXI on the eucharist in particular. These shall serve as a convenient outline for organizing the present discussion. Although it has been often said that the tradition represented by Westminster had grown away from Calvin's own teaching regarding law, grace, covenant, election and predestination, there is little in either of these particular chapters that he, or any of the "Caroline Divines" would have found objectionable.

---

7 Mayor, Dissent, 116.

Definition

Westminster Confession XXIX.1:

Sacraments are holy signs and seals of the covenant of grace, immediately instituted by God, to represent Christ and his benefits, and to confirm our interest in him: as also to put a visible difference between those that belong unto the church, and the rest of the world; and solemnly to engage them to the service of God in Christ, according to his word.

Puritan descriptions of the Lord's Supper almost always begin with the assertion that it is a sign and a seal of the covenant of grace which was instituted in baptism. Richard Baxter defined the Lord's Supper this way:

It is a sacred union in which, by bread and wine consecrated, broken, and poured out, given and taken, and eaten and drunk, the sacrifice of Christ's body and blood for our redemption is commemorated, and the covenant of Christianity mutually and solemnly renewed and sealed, in which Christ, with the benefits of his covenant, is given to the faithful, and they give themselves up to Christ, as members of his church, with which they profess communion."

William Ames (1576–1633) stated that "a sign sealing the Covenant of God is called a Sacrament," and a seal, like a royal seal or warrant, "not only represents, but presents something by sealing." For Ames, the principal end of the Sacrament was the sealing of the New Covenant of Grace. Ussher's definition is very similar:

[W]e acknowledge sacraments to be signs; but bare signs we deny them to be: seals they are, as well as signs, of the covenant of grace....[T]hey be signs, and more than signs; even pledges and

---


10 Ames, Marrow of Theology, 197.
assurances of the interest which we have in the heavenly things that are represented by them.\(^{11}\)

William Perkins (1558–1602) defined the sacrament in almost identical terms, as an external sign which exhibits and seals to the faithful Christ's saving grace. For example, in his catechism he defined a sacrament as: "A sign to represent, a seal to confirm, and instrument to convey Christ and all his benefits to them that do believe in him,"\(^{12}\) a solemn ratification of the baptismal covenant.

This language of sign and seal are, as has been noted, directly from Calvin, and these writers agree with him that God to his Word adds signs to assist our feeble faith, and that these signs are not "bare signs" but seals also, to confirm the reality of one's participation in the covenant of Grace. As Thomas Brooks (1608–1689) wrote:

The nature of a seal is to make things sure and firm among men; so the supper of the Lord is Christ's broad seal, as it is Christ's privy-seal, whereby he seals and assures his people that they are happy here, that they shall be more happy hereafter, that they are everlastingly beloved of God, that his heart is set upon them, that their names are written in the book of life.\(^{13}\)

---

**Sacramental Exchange of Names**

Westminster Confession XXIX.2:

There is in every Sacrament a spiritual relation, or sacramental union, between the sign and the thing signified; whence comes to


\(^{13}\) Thomas Brooks, *Heaven on Earth*: or a serious discourse toward a well-grounded assurance of men's everlasting happiness and blessedness (London: R.I. for John Hancock, 1654), 27; also quoted in Webster, *Godly Clergy*, 115 as *Heaven upon Earth*. 
pass that the names and effects of the one are attributed to the other.

This is the unanimous opinion, often repeated, from Calvin onwards that in a sacrament the sign takes the name of the thing signified. Calvin, as has been noted, used the term "metonymy" from the study of rhetoric, meaning a transfer of names. Ames agreed with Calvin's use, then defended the exchange, in good Ramist fashion, appealing to grammar;¹⁴ Perkins also used the word in his *A Golden Chain*¹⁵ and agreed in *Reformed Catholic* that Christ's words of institution were to be understood figuratively, as the Bible does of other sacraments.¹⁶ Baxter concurred, for example, in his *Poor Man's Family Book.*¹⁷ Lewis Bayly (d. 1631) too stated that when Christ said to his disciples that the bread was his body, he was using a "sacramental metonymy."¹⁸

The Caroline church simply agreed that the relationship between the sign and the signified was so close that the one takes the name of the other. Ussher, for example, said that the cup at the last supper is called "the covenant" and that circumcision in the Old Testament is called both "the covenant" and a "sign of the covenant."¹⁹ Baxter used the example of a shilling, asking whether it is silver, a coin, or the King's shilling. The correct answer is that it is all three.

---


¹⁸ Bayly, *The Practice of Piety*, 318. Here and on 358, Bayly also cites the passage about eagles flocking to the carcass as noted above with Jewel and Andrewes.

Thus the sacrament is bread, a sign and seal of the covenant, and the body of Christ, and most importantly the latter.  

Consecration

WCF XXXI.3:

The Lord Jesus hath, in this ordinance, appointed his minsters to declare his word of institution to the people, to pray, and bless the elements of bread and wine, and thereby to set them apart from a common to an holy use; and to take and break the bread, to take the cup, and (they communicating also themselves) to give both to the communicants;

At both the Westminster and Savoy Conferences there was great Puritan concern that there be a clear consecration of the elements, and consequently that the liturgical fraction be made to be more prominent. Amongst Puritan objections to the Book of Common Prayer was the suspicion that it was defective in this matter, and the Directory of Worship specifically instructed there to be a consecration to sanctify and bless the elements. WCF XXIX.3 asserts that consecration consists of the work of the Spirit,

and the word of institution, which contains, together with a precept authorizing the use thereof, a promise of a benefit to worthy receivers.

---

20 Baxter, Catechizing of Families, 225.

21 Cocksworth, Evangelical Eucharistic Thought, 47-52.

22 Holifield, Covenant Sealed, 132; Cocksworth, Evangelical Eucharistic Thought, 47-8.
The Puritans were unanimous that the consecration consisted of setting apart the elements for a holy use; this was generally expressed polemically against the Roman view of a substantial change in the elements themselves.  

Baxter insisted on three elements necessary for a complete consecration: the words of Institution, prayer of blessing, and the declaration of the sacramental status of the elements including the manual acts of breaking the bread and pouring the wine. His liturgy was most explicit:

Sanctify these thy creatures of bread and wine, which according to thy institution and command, we set apart to this holy use, that they may be sacramentally, the body and blood of thy Son Jesus Christ. Amen

This is immediately followed by the Words of Institution as they are found in I Cor. 11, a declaration of the sacramental status of bread and wine, and the liturgical fraction and libation "in the sight of the congregation." There are, taught Baxter, three essential parts to the eucharist: the consecration of the bread and wine, the commemoration of the sacrifice of Christ, and communion and reception by the people.

A central thesis of Cocksworth's dissertation is the emergence, in both the 'high' and 'Puritan' Anglican camps, of an objective, liturgical consecration, over which there is a large degree of agreement between them,

---

23 For example William Bradshaw and Arthur Hildesham, *A Direction for the weaker sort of Christians, shewing in what manner they ought to fit and prepare themselves to the worthy receivng of the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ* (London: W. Hall for Samuel Macham, 1609), 35, 51; Bayly, *Practice of Piety*, 317, etc.

24 Cocksworth, *Evangelical Eucharistic Thought*, 48–9. In the Poor Man's Family Book, 517, Baxter states that the consecration is effected by the declaration of the sacramental status of the bread and wine.


but which constitutes another clear English development away from Reformation teaching. He cites the famous 1573 case of Robert Johnson regarding whether the institution narrative had to be repeated for supplementary consecration as an example of the degree to which this shift occurred. Cranmer would have agreed with Johnson that the narrative is recited for the sake of the worshipper, not the bread. The commissioners disagreed. Buxton, however, has said that supplementary consecration was a non-issue for both the Carolines and Puritans, and concluded that they both agreed that the consecration is not brought about by the institution narrative alone.

Real Presence "ad cadaver"

The teaching of the exchange of names is repeated in WCF XXXI.5, which affirms as well that the presence of Christ in the sacrament is that of the crucified body:

The outward elements in this sacrament, duly set apart to the uses ordained by Christ, have such a relation to him crucified, as that truly, yet sacramentally only, they are sometimes called by the name of the things they represent, to wit, the body and blood of Christ; albeit in substance and nature, they still remain truly, and only, bread and wine, as they were before.

---


28 Buxton, Eucharist and Institution Narrative, 130-132. The changing understanding over time of what, exactly, constitutes a valid consecration of supplementary elements during the celebration of a eucharist is interesting to observe. For some, it simply was not necessary; for others, it was the words of institution alone. For still others, the whole narrative as anamnesis. In modern times it is the epiklesis which is seen to constitute "real" consecration, which has both positive and negative ecumenical consequences.
Again the Puritans are one with the rest of the Caroline church, agreeing that Christ is truly and really present, though mysteriously. Cocksworth has demonstrated that Puritans held no less than the Caroline divines to matters such as the objective presence of Christ in the sacrament available to the faithful recipient; that there was a real participation in Christ.

Transubstantiation is specifically targeted in Westminster XXXI.6 as being repugnant to Scripture, reason, and common sense; directly following Calvin, the article states that it in fact "overthroweth the nature of the sacrament"; and is repudiated as "the cause of manifold superstitions, yea, of gross idolatries." Again, this is the same language used by Calvin and all divines of the Church of England. XXXI.7 continues both with the denial of consubstantiation while yet affirming that Christ is received "really and indeed" by worthy communicants.

The Puritans regarded the gift of the Eucharist as not merely the appropriation of the saving benefits of Christ's work but as a real reception of Christ in his person. Christ is truly present, the Puritans confirm, though of course not in a physical, carnal manner. Since the reality of the ordinance is spiritual, Christ's presence is spiritual, but this does not make it imaginary. Ames, for example, affirmed that Christ's presence is neither physical nor imaginary, but spiritual: "the things signified are really communicated to those who rightly use the signs." It is a matter of description, rather than a denial of the presence, says Cocksworth. The Puritans held no less than, and in exactly

---

29 Inst. IV.18.1.
30 Cocksworth, Evangelical Eucharistic Thought, 50.
31 Ames, Marrow, 27.
32 Cocksworth, Evangelical Eucharistic Thought, 50.
the same way as, the "Caroline Divines" the real presence of Christ in the sacrament. Perkins wrote in A Reformed Catholic:

We hold and believe a presence of Christ's body and blood in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper and that no feigned but a true and real presence ... [C]onsidering there is a real union, and consequently a real communion between us and Christ...there must needs be such a kind of presence wherein Christ is truly and really present to the heart of him that receives the sacrament in faith. And thus far do we consent with the Roman Church touching the real presence. We differ not touching the presence itself, but only in the manner of presence. 33

Bayly in The Practice of Piety echoes Jewel:

In the same instant of time that the worthy receiver eateth with his mouth the Bread and Wine of the Lord he eateth also with the mouth of his Faith the very Body and Blood of Christ.

Baxter used the idea of marriage by proxy to explain the real presence, as a form of the "investiture" image: because the ambassador of the groom has official seals, then the presence of the groom is valid, real and effectual, but not necessarily literal and physical. 34 Sibbes also uses the investiture idea, drawing the distinction between a simple picture of the king, and a document confirmed with the king's seal. 35

John Owen (1616-1683) 36, whose writings are in fact seldom concerned with the eucharist, taught that Christ is truly communicated to the faithful, and he echoes Hooker:

33 Perkins, A Reformed Catholic, 556-8.
34 Baxter, Poor Man's Family Book, 517-18.
36 It should be noted that John Owen, Richard Baxter, and Daniel Brevint were close contemporaries, and Jeremy Taylor was only slightly older, though he died young.
It is a universal unimpeachable persuasion among all Christians that there is a near intimate communion and participation of him in the supper of the Lord. He is no Christian who is otherwise minded.²³

According to Owen, the participation and communication in Christ that is expressed in the eucharist is peculiar to it, and available in no other way, including prayer or preaching. He stated that there is a sacramental union between the elements and the body and blood of Christ, and Christ is really present in the sacrament in three ways: by representation, exhibition and "obsignation," that is, the confirming of the covenant.²⁴

Owen wrote that the elements "exhibit that which they do not contain" yet the eucharist is not an "empty, painted feast."²⁵ The mode of reception, he states, is a mystery. Wakefield agrees that the Puritans expressed a "reverent agnosticism" regarding the precise manner of the sacramental presence.²⁶ Baxter's answer to the question of how we communicate truly if Christ is in heaven is simply "these things are unfit for our inquiry and decision."²⁷ Sibbes wrote that God has appointed and sanctified the means of grace, and made them effective: we need not question how.²⁸ Richard Vines (d. 1656) also affirmed the real reception of Christ in the sacrament, and that the

---


²⁴ Mayor, Dissent, 118; Hollifield, Covenant Sealed, 131. "Obsignation" was also used by William Ames in The Marrow of Theology.

²⁵ Owen, "25 discourses suitable to the Lord's Supper," quoted in Mayor, Dissent, 118.

²⁶ Wakefield, Puritan Devotion, 49.


²⁸ Sibbes, "The Life of Faith," Works v., 379. One is reminded of George Hugh Bourne's (1840–1925) eucharistic hymn "Lord enthroned in heavenly splendour," the second stanza ends "Thou art here, we ask not how."
elements were not naked signs; but he ridiculed the idea of the Lord’s being present in an unknowable manner."

Wakefield has commented that Vines allowed nothing of resurrection and ascension in the eucharist, and this is typical. The Puritans universally agreed with Andrewes that Christ was present to the communicant as sacrificed, ad cadaver. Perkins stated in the Reformed Catholic, arguing against transubstantiation, "In the sacrament, the body of Christ is received as it is crucified and his blood as it was shed upon the cross." WCF XXXI.7 reads that worthy receivers "really and indeed...receive and feed upon Christ crucified, and all benefits of his death." Bayly in the Practice of Piety stated that the blood of Christ's cup is not the blood as is in his veins, but the blood as it was shed for sins.

**Commemoration**

WCF XXXI.1 asserts the purposes of the eucharist, and there is one difference between it and the Savoy Declaration of particular note:

Our Lord Jesus, in the night wherein he was betrayed, instituted the sacrament of his body and blood, called the Lord's Supper, to be observed in his church unto the end of the world; for the perpetual remembrance [Savoy: "and shewing forth"] of the sacrifice of himself in his death, the sealing of all benefits thereof unto true believers, their spiritual nourishment and growth in him, their further engagement in and to all duties which they owe unto him; and to be a bond and pledge of their communion with him, and with each other, as members of his mystical body.

---

43 Holifield, *Covenant Sealed*, 129.


46 Bayly, *Practice of Piety*, 358.
In his liturgy, Baxter used sacrificial language to describe the purposes of the Lord's Supper: it is a continued representation of his death until he comes again, externally administered by Ministers, internally by the Holy Spirit. By consecration the bread and wine are made sacramentally the body and blood of Christ, by breaking and pouring out they represent and commemorate his sacrifice, and are given to the Church to signify and solemnize the renewal of the holy covenant made in baptism; and are received to confirm that they are willing to receive Christ, to signify and solemnize their communion with him and each other.7

Puritans generally did affirm sacrificial language, so long as it was made clear that the Lord's Supper is a commemoration of Christ's one sacrifice; they were loud and long against Roman sacrificial language. There is no propitiatory sacrifice, and Christ is not offered to the Father. (WCF, XXXI.2) The sacrament is a commemoration of Christ's offering once finished, and "a spiritual oblation of all possible praise unto God for the same." Baxter even defended the words "sacrifice," "priest" and "altar" as acceptable, and of ancient, venerable use; he agreed that there may be a danger of popery if these words were to be retained, but we can renounce the error while keeping the words.8 Ames stated that the sacrifice of Christ removes the need for all other types of sacrifices, except those which manifest and seal Christ for our benefit, as is done sufficiently in the sacrament, according to God's ordinance.9

One explicit addition to Westminster XXXI.1 by the Savoy is the idea that the eucharist is for the "shewing forth" of the sacrifice of Christ. The

7 Baxter, Reformed Liturgy, 472-475.

8 Baxter, Catechizing of Families, 280.

9 Ames, Marrow, 282.
emphasis of the eucharistic commemoration being that of the sufferings of Christ made visible becomes very prominent, and rather distinctive, of Puritan devotion.

This is derived from I Cor 11: 26: "For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death til he come." This is repeated and affirmed in the writings of Laud, Andrewes, Cosin, Taylor and others, but it is not developed by them to any significant degree. For the Puritans, however, the eucharist quite literally exhibited, not Christ's physical body, but rather his physical sufferings. The breaking of the bread represented the breaking of Christ's body; the pouring out of the wine represented the pouring out of his blood. Wrote Sibbes: "It is the man Jesus Christ who is put before your eyes. When you come thither, there is a spectacle of Christ crucified."

For this reason the liturgical fraction became very important for Puritan devotion. Baxter, as noted above included in his liturgy a libation offering, a liturgical sacrificial "pouring out" to parallel the fraction, and he wrote that the fraction and libation are important because they effect more completely the consecration and setting apart of the bread and wine; reminiscent of Laud's

50 This is not to say that it was restricted only to Puritans; Andrewes used the image, as noted above: "The holy Eucharist being considered as a Sacrifice, in the representation of the breaking the bread and pouring forth the cup"; Laud stated that the bread and wine, as a commemorative sacrifice, represented the death of Christ.

51 Gregory Dix in The Shape of the Liturgy, 605-7 examines a medieval mass-devotion in which the worshipper is invited to let the liturgical actions of the priest lead to pious contemplation of the passion and sufferings of Christ. It lacks a one-to-one correspondence between the fraction and the breaking of Christ's body, and between the libation and the pouring out of Christ's blood; nonetheless it expresses the idea that the visible liturgy is somehow sacramentally analogous to the historical reality represented.

52 Sibbes, "Right Receiving," 66; this is almost a direct quotation from Calvin, Inst., IV.18.11.
approval of the inclusion of the epiklesis in the 1637 Scottish liturgy for the same reason.

Spinks wrote that for Calvin, "broken" and "shed" are key words in the eucharist, "but Calvin himself made no liturgical use of the fraction."53

Cranmer, moreover, had deliberately buried the fraction in the prayer of consecration because of rising superstition regarding the moment of transubstantiation.

...in the 1552 Communion service, Cranmer seems to have interpreted 'remembrance' as the actual eating and drinking of the elements...The Puritan tradition seems to have centred the 'remembrance' on the visible breaking of the bread and the pouring of the wine.4

Yet even then John Hooper (d. 1555), who was displeased with Calvin's doctrine of the eucharist and leaned much more to Zwingli,55 asserted the importance of the fraction representing the body of Christ broken. The "red hot puritan"56 William Bradshaw wrote:

The breaking of the bread signifieth, in a mystery, the breaking of Christ's body, that is, all the unspeakable tortments that he suffered in his own person for our sins.57

Some took it even farther: the production of the elements of bread and wine themselves were analogous to the sufferings of Christ. The wheat cut down,

---

53 Calvin Inst. IV.17.3; Spinks, From the Lord and "The Best Reformed Churches," 117.


55 Hall, Calvin against the Calvinists, 34.

56 Reynolds, "Sacrifices by Resemblance," 86.

57 Bradshaw, Direction, 30; also quoted in Reynolds, "Sacrifices by Resemblance," 86.
beaten, milled, and baked and the grapes crushed are seen to have figurative, representative significance of the Lord's sufferings. Richard Greenham (1535?-1594?) wrote:

Seeing there is such a nature in the creatures that the outward things have suffered many injuries before they become good food, as the corne being cutte down in its perfite age, pressed out of his husks with the flaire, losing all his inralles with the violence of the Mill, and after passing through the parching heate of the Oven is made good bread; so the flesh of Jesus Christ went under many paines, and the blood of Christ as the grape in its most flourishing estate was pressed out of the veines, and sustained hard passions, and shall nothing of us suffer with him?

It would stretch the imagination to call Richard Allestree, Regius professor of Divinity at Oxford, a Puritan; and yet The Whole Duty of Man from 1658 is indistinguishable from Baxter and others in its emphasis on the sufferings of Christ exhibited in the bread and wine:

Then meditate on those bitter sufferings of Christ, which are set out to us in the Sacrament: when thou seest the bread broken, remember how his blessed body was torn with nails upon the cross. When thou seest the wine poured out, remember how his precious blood was spilt there; and then consider it was thy sins that caused both. And here think how unworthy a wretch thou art, to have done that which occasioned such torments to him: how much worse than his very crucifiers! They crucified him once; but thou hast, as much as in thee lay, crucified him daily: they crucified him, because they knew him not; but thou hast known both what he is in himself, The Lord of Glory, and what he is to thee, a most tender and merciful Saviour; and yet thou hast still continued thus to crucify him afresh...

Mayor has written that for John Owen "the Lord's Supper is solemn rather than joyful, and carries the worshipper back to Good Friday rather than the first

---

58 Wakefield, Puritan Devotion, 47.

59 Richard Greenham, Works, 430; quoted in Wakefield, Puritan Devotion, 46-47 and Webster, Godly Clergy, 114.

60 The Whole Duty of Man, Section xxiv., 63.
day of creation or Easter Sunday." It is fair to apply this judgment to most of the Puritans as well.

**Word and Sacrament**

Calvin insisted that the sacrament is dependent upon the preached word for its effectiveness, and the two must not be separated. Perkins said that "the preaching of the word, and administration of the Sacrament, are all one in substance, For in the one the will of God is seene, in the other heard." John Rogers wrote:

> God dealeth with us as mothers who nurse their young children, they lap them up warme, and give them both breasts, and so they grow up: so it is between God and us: the Word and Sacraments bee the two breasts of the Church.

An exception seems to have been Thomas Goodwin, who stated that the sermon, in the last resort, did not have final priority over the sacraments:

> Many things in a sermon thou understandest not, and haply not many sermons; or if thou doest, yet findest not thy portion in them; but here to be sure thou mayest. Of Sermons, some are for comfort, some to inform, some to excite; but here in the Sacrament is all thou canst expect. Christ is light here, and wisdom, and

---


62 Laud, however, departed from his own Calvinism, and indeed demonstrated the lack of Caroline interest in the connection when he insisted that the altar took priority over the pulpit, because the one was "hoc est corpus meum" and the other is but "hoc est verbum meum."

63 Rogers, *Doctrine of Faith*, 215; quoted in von Rohr, *Covenant of Grace*, 56; also Webster, *Godly Clergy*, 113. Mayor points out that the logical corollary was ignored: "Of course, the principle was not applied in reverse—that preaching was incomplete without the Sacrament." Mayor, *Dissent*, 19-21.
comfort and all to thee. He is here an eye to the blind, a foot to the lame; yea everything to every one."  

Goodwin continues that the proclamation of Christ in sermons is changeable, like the moon; but the Christ's presence in the sacrament is as unchanging as the sun.

WCF XXIX.4 affirms two things, first that there are only two dominical, Gospel, sacraments; and second that they must be administered only by a "minister of God's word, lawfully ordained." The first part is entirely typical of the English, as well as Continental, Reform. But the second point of XXIX.4 was of much greater importance to the Puritans than its prominence might indicate: only a minister of the Word may administer the sacrament. All English theologians would have whole-heartedly agreed with this, but for perhaps differing reasons. The reason that Puritans refused lay-celebration was not for reasons of order, but because the connection between word and sacrament is so close that it determines the nature of ordained ministry itself. As the "Caroline Divines" held a connection between the eucharist and episcopal ministry (although mistakenly over-emphasized by the Tractarians), so the Puritans also closely and necessarily connected the validity of the sacrament to valid and properly conferred ministerial ordination. However this was most emphatically not on account of a belief in episcopal succession: rather it was a logical extension of their understanding of the necessary dependence of the sacrament upon the preached Word. In practice this meant that only the
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"" Wakefield, Puritan Devotion, 53; who says that these words "have more than a hint of Bernard of Clairvaux"; also Horton Davies, Worship of the English Puritans, 212.

"" Davies, Worship of the English Puritans, 212.

"" Baxter stated that strictly speaking there are but two sacraments; broadly speaking, however, there is no reason to restrict their number to seven.
preacher was eligible to preside. The belief led to conflict with conformists because the practices of simply reading a homily, or of a different priest presiding than the one who preached, were dismissed on principle. A "reading" minister, one who simply read the services and homilies was inadequate for the celebration of the sacrament, which, by Puritan reasoning, only had spiritual benefit by the accompanying of the proclaimed, preached Word of God. There was some controversy whether sacraments apart from preaching were even valid. Devout worshippers were not to receive from "reading" ministers who did not actually preach; such conventional clergy were referred to with nasty epithets such as "blind guides and dumb dogs."67 WCF, however, makes no explicit connection between sacraments and preaching.

An important element deriving from this was, surprisingly, the validity of the presiding minister's ordination. The neglect of the sacraments in the early American colonies was not due to an underemphasizing of the sacraments, but contrarily to the high emphasis on the nature of the presider, because a validly ordained preaching minister was not always available.68

Moreover, clergy not only had to be lawfully ordained, and preaching ministers in order to be eligible presiders at the sacrament, many insisted that the minister was to examine those who presented themselves for signs of election and adequate preparation for there to be a worthy reception.69 Thus another surprising element of Puritan sacramental theology was its high degree of clericalism, for all that they opposed the sacerdotalism of Rome. Nevertheless,

67 Mayor, Disent, 40.

68 Ibid., 57-8. Mayor finds the insistence on regular ordination "curious." Ibid., 154.

69 Owen, The True Nature of a Gospel Church, xx., 438f; quoted in Mayor, John Owen, 173.
an unworthy pastor did not invalidate the sacrament. Nearly all puritan theologians laboured to assure people that receiving the sacrament at the hands of sinful or unworthy ministers did not affect its efficacy, as the XXXIX Articles do opposing Donatism. WCF XXIX.3 denies first that the sacrament has no power in and of itself to confer grace, then reads:

neither doth the efficacy of a sacrament depend upon the piety or intention of him that doth administer it, but upon the work of the spirit....

Fencing of the Altar

It has been demonstrated that, to this point, the Church of England has been unanimous in its understanding of the eucharist. But from here on the "Laudians" and "Puritans" most apparently part company, and this divergence is attributable to differing understandings of grace and election. Perhaps the most famous of Puritan disciplines was the fencing of the altars. Puritan leaders took seriously the admonition of St. Paul that those who unworthily received the sacrament ate and drank their own condemnation. The sacrament was therefore to be received with care, and, many felt, was to be restricted, not just from those who were in some open and scandalous state of affairs, but to those who could give some adequate assurance of being of the elect. Holifield points out that the concern for fencing the altar reveals the centrality of covenant theology.⁷⁰

This is an excellent example of the consequences of the divergence between Humanist Calvinism and Reformed Orthodoxy: for the former, communion was to be received by all the baptized members of the church, and

⁷⁰ Holifield, Covenant Sealed, 110.
refused only to those who persisted in scandalous sin or were in enmity with another person. To this way of thinking, The Test Act made sense, ensuring that those who held office in either Church or State were in fact communicant members of the Church of England.

John Cotton, however, railed against the Test Act, for it "forced" people to take communion, regardless of their worthiness, and thus, according to him, destroyed the intent of the sacrament. If the church is understood to be a covenanted community of elect individuals, then communion is reserved only for those who can give adequate evidence of their election. Here the interconnections among experimental piety, the ecclesiology of the covenanted congregation, and reformed orthodoxy are most evident. Examination of the candidates prior to communion is justified by this view, although not all Puritans favoured it; Baxter, for instance, felt that sufficient examination was made at baptism, and that an examination of candidates for communion was unnecessary.

The Westminster Assembly affirmed this approach in Chapter XXIX.1, in a way that Savoy would not, that the sacraments are "to put a visible difference between those that belong to the church and the rest of the world." To the Established Church, "the world" is the "non-Christian world"; to the Puritans, the "world" consists of everyone who is not a member of the Covenant.

As soon as the Westminster Assembly was convened efforts towards fencing of the altars were begun, and it voted to restrict the eucharist to the worthy. WCF XXXI.8 defines the unworthy as the "ignorant and wicked," who do not receive the thing signified, because by their unworthy reception they "are guilty of the body and blood of the Lord, and bring judgement on themselves."
The sequestration from the sacrament produced the controversy, apparently unique among the Puritans, of whether the sacrament was only a sealing ordinance (implying thereby that it is to be restricted to the elect) or whether it was also a converting ordinance, in which case it was to be administered to all the baptized. The immediate conflict was between William Prynne (1600–1669) and two commissioners to the Assembly, Samuel Rutherford and George Gillespie. Prynne was a Puritan if ever one was, his ears "cropt close to his head, which is stuffed with plots." He was outraged as churches moved towards giving authority to the minister to restrict admission to the Lord's Supper. This practice, he said, was anti-Calvinist because it assumed that a human individual, the minister, could discern the elect from the reprobate, or at least worthy from unworthy communicants, which was expressly denied and prohibited by Calvin. According to Prynne, the eucharist was a powerful instrument of moral reform; suspension popishly both exalted the sanctity of the Lord's Supper, and put too much power in the hands of the minister. He felt that sequestration was a concrete contributing factor of the moral decay in England. If the non-elect were to be kept from communion, Prynne argued, then by the same reasoning, preaching should be equally if not more dangerous, because of the dependence of the sacrament on the Word.

Prynne in his *Vindication of Four Serious Questions* (1645) introduced the argument that the eucharist was both a sealing and a converting ordinance,


72 Courtesy William Laud; quoted in William Lamont, *Marginal Prynne 1600–1669*, (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1963), 1. According to Lamont, Prynne, both Puritan and Royalist, believed that the rise of de jure divino understanding of episcopacy was subversive of the Crown and he opposed Laud on this, rather than specifically theological grounds; *Marginal Prynne*, 17 and infra.
intended for all (excepting the unconverted heathen, the insane, and infants) rather than restricted to a few. Even Judas, he argued, was admitted to the Last Supper. 73

Whether the Lord's Supper could convert the unregenerate, or whether it was a seal intended only for those belonging to the Covenant of Grace became a question of great controversy. The idea may not have originated with Prynne, however. It may have started with John Dod, and Robert Bolton was convinced of it during the 1630's. The idea seems to have begun, not to defend open admission to the sacrament, but rather as a pastoral comfort, as a way to encourage those doubtful of their spiritual condition that they could receive the sacrament. Because it was not only a sealing, comforting and strengthening ordinance, but also a healing, converting, "reviving quickning" ordinance too, all ought to be encouraged to receive it. 74 John Preston (1587-1628) held that anyone who deemed themselves fit for communion should not have it; but those who felt unfit, who feel "a decay of grace" should come to the Lord's Supper as to a fountain to fill a cistern. 75

This raises the question of worthy reception and the fears of unworthy reception by those of "tender consciences," which was a source of real anxiety amongst the Puritans: they knew it was a sin to receive unworthily; they also knew that it was a sin to refrain from the sacrament. 76 Baxter wrote at length

73 Hollifield, Covenant Sealed, 110-117.

74 Webster, Godly Clergy, 116.

75 Wakefield, Puritan Devotion, 44.

76 The non-Juring bishop Thomas Ken also recognized this pastoral difficulty, and wrote: "Blessed Lord Jesus! I even tremble when I consider that he that eateth and drinketh unworthily is guilty of Thy Body and Blood, and eateth and drinketh damnation to his own soul; and this severe Sentence on unworthy Communicants makes one afraid to come to Thy Altar. But when I consider that
on who might and might not present themselves for communion, and under what conditions. In his Poor Man's Family Book" he stated that only faithful and sincere believers should come to the sacrament. However, if anyone had doubts regarding faith and sincerity, he should mind his own conscience, but if the doubts could not be quieted, the person should receive. Baxter in fact spends much more effort comforting and reassuring those who are afraid to come to the sacrament than on teaching about the sacrament itself. Baxter admitted that there were those who were not invited to the Lord's Table, but opposed examination of the candidates before communion. He denied that the communion is a converting ordinance; and although it may be that it may accidentally happen, this is not the purpose of the eucharist."

One of the stated aims of the eucharist was to bring faithful Christians into spiritual fellowship with one another," and as the Westminster Confession explicitly states (but the Savoy omits), to draw a clear dividing line between the church and the world, the elect and the reprobate.

Thy sentence is as severe against those, who being invited refuse to come, for Thou has said, they shall not taste of Thy Supper, --and unless we eat Thy Flesh, and drink Thy Blood, we have no life in us,--I am then afraid to keep away....I know, Lord, that if I should stay till I am worthy to come, I should never come; and therefore, though I am unworthy of so unspeakable a mercy, yet I come to beg Thy Grace to make me worthy..." Approach to the Holy Altar by Bishop Ken. From his "Manual of Prayer," and "Practice of Divine Love," ed. "I.L.A." (London: William Pickering, 1852), 72-3; 107-9.

77 Baxter, Poor Man's Family Book, 517-8.

78 Baxter, Catechizing of Families, 284. The Elizabethan Puritan Henry Barrow also denied that the sacrament was a converting ordinance, and argued in favour of strict eucharistic discipline: "And for the power of the church, it is not given them to receive and admit, but to drive away and keep out the profane and open unworthy, from the table of the Lord." Quoted in Mayor, Dissent, 38.

79 See Webster, Godly Clergy, 117 for a brief discussion.
This is a theme not generally explored by the "Caroline Divines" (even though Article XXVIII begins with it). But the Puritans explicitly emphasised koinonia, that the communion bound God's people together in mutual love. This is the root, paradoxically, of some ministers refusing to administer sacraments. For example John Cotton refused to baptize his own child on board ship because the ship's company did not constitute a covenanted congregation; some English ministers during the Commonwealth refused to celebrate communion for the same reason. Owen prohibited his congregants from communicating in the Church of England partly because communication would mean koinonia with an erring church; for example, they would have had to receive kneeling.

An extension of this emphasis on koinonia was that communion could not be given to anyone not physically present at the celebration. WCF XXXI.3 allows communion "...to none who are not then present in the congregation." There could be no celebration apart from the gathered congregation, and certainly no private communions were allowed. The result was that the sick or infirm were left out, along with children and the mentally infirm: Owen refused to allow communion to be given to the uninstructed, children, unbelievers, non-covenanted believers, or members of unsound churches.

Election and sacramental efficacy

Cosin recorded an instance in his accounts of the conferences on Montagu's books: "'What,' quoth my Lord of Lichfeld, 'will you have the grace

---

80 Mayor, Dissent, 57.
81 Ibid., 155.
82 Ibid., 119.
of God tied to Sacraments?" This precise indictment was first levelled at Calvin sixty years earlier by Bullinger, suspicious of what he thought were Calvin's popish leanings. Calvin's reply was a firm "yes," so long as faith were present. The mature Calvin did assert that the sacraments are a means of grace, and "God's instruments for conferring grace" though he had not always done so.

The sacraments were necessary, Puritans believed, but salvation was not dependent upon them. Some eventually came to believe, however, that since grace cannot be received until God gives it, the means are superfluous; or as Walter Marshall wrote complaining about the carnal Gospellers, that being puft up with a Conceit of their feigned Faith, imagine themselves to be in such a state of Perfection, that they are above all Ordinances, except singing Hallelujahs."

The question of election was the source of the ambiguity within Calvin himself regarding the efficacy and necessity of the sacrament: the sacrament is necessary and not superfluous, but neither did it contribute to salvation because of the prevenient grace of absolute election. Likewise the Puritans exhibited this ambivalence: the eucharist is not absolutely necessary for salvation; its purpose is to nourish and strengthen faith. The Word alone is the source of grace, and the sacraments attest to it. It is "a proppe and a stay for faith to leane upon," said Perkins; the second "ordinance" (the first being

---


84 Calvin, responsio ad annotationes Bullingeri (1549), Inst. IV.17.3; quoted in Gerrish, Grace and Gratitude, 161.

85 Rorem, Calvin and Bullinger, 34-5.

preaching) to assure us of God's grace, according to Arthur Hildersam (1563-1632); and "among the maine helps" of grace, said Preston.""

Again the question of grace and election divided opinion in the Caroline Church. That the sacraments were means of grace was unquestioned, and indeed much asserted, by the Laudians; it was much debated among Puritans. Some, like John Ball, held that the means are necessary to receive grace. "Faith is not given but in the use of the meanes.""

Calvin himself was ambiguous. He insisted both that even though the sacraments are not ultimately necessary for salvation, they are nevertheless indispensable and efficacious. The Lord's Supper offers to us the same grace as does the gospel in doctrine and preaching, but it is the visible sign to compensate for our weaknesses and mortal limitations."" Parker notes Calvin's analogy that a seal attached to a document adds nothing to its content, but does confirm the document as authentic.""

Owen held that the elements convey what they symbolize, and opposed those who neglected sacraments or who saw them as unnecessary."" He asserted that participation in Christ in the sacrament can be obtained in no
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87 Webster, *Godly Clergy*, 112-113.


89 von Rohr, *Covenant of Grace*, 56.

90 *Inst.* IV.17.1.

91 Parker, *Calvin*, 148.

92 Mayor, *Dissent*, 116.
other way, including preaching or any other spiritual exercise. "There is in it an eating and drinking of the body and blood of Christ, with a spiritual incorporation ensuing, which are peculiar unto this ordinance."³

Ames taught that the sacraments are not so necessary to salvation that the absence or lack of them deprives anyone of salvation. The eucharist is not a bare sign, yet it does not actually include the spiritual thing represented; it nevertheless communicates and testifies to it and presents the thing to be communicated, sealing the covenant of grace to believers. Sacraments were, for Ames, "individual appropriations of the covenant of grace within the life of the congregation."⁴

The primary end of a Sacrament is to seal the covenant, and that not on God's part onely, but consequentely also on ours, that is, not onely the grace of God, and promises sealed to us, but also our thankfulnessse and obedience to God."⁵

Perkins says that the Covenant of Grace is absolutely necessary for salvation, but the sacrament which seals it is not; the want of the sacrament will not condemn, but contempt of it will."⁶ To the reprobate, God is indeed present, but they receive only the signs, to their condemnation. The unconverted elect also receive only the signs, yet in a manner that will later do them good.

Predestinarian puritan clergy would occasionally refuse to baptize infants on weekdays, despite the nearness of death, because no grace is actually conferred by the ordinance and the child would be no sooner saved with or
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³ Owen, The Chamber of Imagery in the Church of Rome Laid Open; quoted in Cocksworth, Evangelical Eucharistic Thought, 60; and Mayor, Dissent, 107.

⁴ John D. Eusden, Introduction to The Marrow of Theology, 57.

⁵ Ames, Marrow; quoted in von Rohr, Covenant of Grace, 178-79. "Because the theology of the Puritan divines was a covenant theology, the sacraments were most basically interpreted in relation to covenant promise and response."

without it, as many grieving parents were informed." This was supported by WCF XXX.5:

Although it be a great sin to condemn or neglect this ordinance, yet grace and salvation are not so inseparably annexed unto it as that no person can be regenerated or saved without it, or that all that are baptized are undoubtedly regenerated.

Gerrish points out that others have recognized the conflict between Calvin's doctrines of election and sacramental efficacy: there was conflict with the Lutherans in Calvin's own time because they argued that sacramental grace was incompatible with election." Gerrish wonders whether it is possible to be both a sacramental Calvinist and a predestinarian Calvinist at the same time."

Assurance and Experimental Piety

The eucharist was to be received frequently and reverently, and with extensive preparation. The idea of the "Worthy Receiver" became more and more developed as the seventeenth century progressed, and again it was not limited to the Puritans, although the Puritan manner of piety certainly fostered detailed self-examination. "Worthy reception" could mean as little as simply an understanding of the sacrament, a desire for Christ and penitence for sin.

A good example of the connection between worthy reception and experimental piety is found in Richard Sibbes "The Right Receiving." Sibbes appeals to the conventional text I Cor. 11:28-9. He first asks whether anyone is worthy, and says that there are two senses of "worthy": it is true that no
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77 Judith Maltby, "'By this Book': Parishioners, the Prayer Book and the Established Church," in The Early Stuart Church, 123.

78 Gerrish, Grace and Gratitude, 169.

79 Ibid., 170.
one is worthy to be a guest in himself; but, on the other hand, it is indeed possible to be worthy in regard to affection and preparation.\textsuperscript{100} In ourselves we are not worthy that Christ should enter under our roof; but we are worthy when we do all that is in our power for the fit entertainment of him, coming not in rags and carelessness and pride, but repentance, joy, comfort, humility. He shows the "experimentalism" typical of the Puritans when he says we therefore must examine our heart, to see whether all is well in it.\textsuperscript{101}

But as the century progressed, spiritual disciplines preparatory to a worthy reception, or rather, to avoid the danger of "unworthy reception," became extensive, and if followed strictly would take several hours each day of close introspection and meditation. For example, Webster notes that the eucharistic fast became an important exercise among puritans, combined with study and solitary meditation.\textsuperscript{102} If the manuals like \textit{A Week's Preparation} had their way, there would be time for nothing else.

Peter Lake, amongst others, has noted that one distinguishing element in puritanism is not just the doctrine of predestination in general, but "experimental" predestination.\textsuperscript{103} That is to say, the elect, by disciplined spiritual self-examination, might be reasonably assured that they in fact could feel within themselves the fruits of God's redemption. Kendall distinguishes the "credal" predestinationarians, such as Andrewes, from the "experimental"

\textsuperscript{100} Sibbes, "The Right Receiving," 62.

\textsuperscript{101} Kendall says that Sibbes simply avoids the pastoral problem of "temporary faith," and that there is a weakness in his theology which prevents Sibbes from "lucidly espousing a doctrine of full assurance." Kendall, \textit{English Calvinism}, 106.

\textsuperscript{102} Webster, \textit{Godly Clergy}, 68-9.

\textsuperscript{103} Peter Lake, "Defining Puritanism—Again?," 24.
predestinarians. Many Puritans taught that one's election may, indeed must be known to avoid self-deception regarding one's salvation. Kendall concludes that Westminster theology is experimental predestinarian, and that its doctrine of faith is derived from Perkins and Beza, but not Calvin.

William Perkins wrote:

Q. What shall a true receiver feel in himself after the receiving of the sacrament?

A. The increase of his faith in Christ, the increase of sanctification, a greater measure of dying to sin, a greater care to live in newness of life.

Q. What if a man after the receiving of the sacrament never find any such thing in himself?

A. He may well suspect himself, whether he did ever repent or not: and thereupon is to use means to come to sound faith and repentance.

Hall points out that this is yet another Puritan departure from Calvin himself. The need for internal feelings of warm assurance reversed Calvin's purpose, for he pointed away from the feelings of the individual to Scripture, Christ the church and the sacraments for the assurance of salvation. This represents the essential factor in the division between Calvin's own thought and the development of English Protestantism which is miscalled Calvinism.

Calvin himself linked the gift of the eucharist with the assurance of election. Says Davis:

Thus, in his eucharistic theory, the Eucharist serves as an instrument by which the Christian not only is joined to Christ but also knows the goodness of God in a way most fully accommodated to the weaknesses of the faithful. Together, they form the gift of the Eucharist. According to Calvin, a gift given by God is to be
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104 Kendall notes Rogers; *English Calvinism*, 80, ff.


107 Hall, *Calvin against the Calvinists*, 29.
accepted with thanks, not questioned about its utility in relation to other gifts.\(^{108}\)

Sibbes wrote that we should take the sacrament as often as we can, properly prepared, "to make our election sure."\(^{109}\) He means that in the "sealing" of the covenant the sacrament is a reassurance and a comfort to us. Sibbes stated that one sure sign of hypocritical religion is overconfidence in outward things of religion, and a show of too much assurance is pharisaical. In this he agreed with Perkins, who stated that anyone who thinks themselves worthy is not; this is what Calvin called "carnal security" replacing the real assurance of faith.\(^{110}\)

This leads to the dreadful (and repugnant) teaching of "temporary faith," most associated with Perkins, and which is closely related to Augustine's concept of "effectual calling" which Beza made so much use of. The Westminster Confession stopped just short of affirming the doctrine of temporary faith, but the Savoy made it an explicit element of God's sovereignty.\(^{111}\) Kendall states that "The doctrine of temporary faith became the embarrassment, if not the scandal, of English Calvinism."\(^{112}\)
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\(^{108}\) Davis, Clearest Promises of God, 214.

\(^{109}\) Richard Sibbes, On Right Receiving, 63.

\(^{110}\) Inst. III.2.11.

\(^{111}\) Savoy Declaration XIV, "Of Saving Faith," iii: "[Saving faith], although it be different in degrees, and may be weak or strong, yet it is in the least degree of it different in the kind or nature of it (as is all other saving grace) from the faith and common grace of temporary believers; And therefore, though it may be many times assailed and weakened, yet it gets the victory..." Also Savoy XVIII "Of the Assurance of Grace and Salvation" "Although temporary believers and other unregenerate men may vainly deceive themselves with false hopes, and carnal presumptions of being in the favor of God, and state of salvation, which hope of theirs shall perish..." The Westminster Confession XX here reads "hypocrites" instead of "temporary believers."

\(^{112}\) Kendall, English Calvinism, 7.
It is, however, to be found in Calvin's *Institutes*, III.2.10-12.

"Temporary faith" is the sort of faith that the reprobate might have, and is an expression of how far an "ineffectual calling" might be allowed to progress: it is possible that some who believe and who desire salvation, and who think that they have faith, in fact lack the grace of saving faith; what faith they possess is incomplete and will not persevere. 113

But no one can know for certain whether or not one is of the elect, and that the appearance of faith alone is no warranty, lest faith become a work of human merit. The only difference Calvin allowed was that those reprobate who have temporary faith lack the full assurance of the elect. Thus the need for certainty contributed to the rise of experimental piety, 114 and anxiety regarding whether or not one was truly of the elect led to all sorts of despair, including the avoiding of the sacrament for fear of unworthy reception.

Sacramental Neglect

Baxter wrote that "ordinarily in well disciplined churches" the sacrament should be received every Lord's day. Owen too advocated frequent, preferably weekly, celebration. Even in Holland and the American Colonies the sacrament seems to have been observed weekly in some congregations. But the reality was

113 "Meanwhile, we must remember that however feeble and slender the faith of the elect may be, yet as the Spirit of God is to them a sure earnest and seal of their adoption, the impression once engraven can never be effaced from their hearts, whereas the light which glimmers in the reprobate is afterwards quenched." *Institutes* III.2.12. "Temporary faith" is not necessarily willfully feigned, but its assurance is imagined. Calvin continues "It hence appears that the faith of some, though not true faith, is not mere pretence." The faith of the reprobate believer lacks the full assurance of the elect.

114 See particularly Kendall, *English Calvinism*, 6-8; and infra.
that eucharistic worship quickly declined among Puritan, non-Conformist and Independent congregations, and the Puritans were criticized in their own time because of it. Baxter himself noted three reasons for fear of the sacrament: 1) excess of reverence leading to either popery or the fear of unworthy reception; 2) afraid of disappointment that one might not get immediate joy; and 3) sinful and willful neglect of the ordinance. Writing later in the century, Simon Patrick noted four similar causes: 1) some Christians have come to think of the sacraments as unnecessary, 2) the meaning and benefits of the sacrament are not clearly understood, 3) people do not want to have to work at preparation for worthy communion, and 4) some have found no immediate benefit, and so simply have abandoned communion.

Mayor summarizes the main reasons for the decline in sacramental observance, particularly among the separatist and dissenting Puritans. First, the Puritans attempted to protect the integrity of the sacrament to such a degree that they could be observed only under very particular circumstances. Secondly, while asserting their importance, they nevertheless relegated the sacraments to a secondary role in Christian life; and thirdly, a shift towards a non-material piety most notably advocated by the Quakers.

Cocksworth's summary is very similar. Officially, Puritans wanted to connect Gospel and Sacrament closely, but in practice their concerns actually brought about neglect and separation because of: 1) the need for a "preaching"

---


117 Mayor, *Dissent*, 96-105.

minister lawfully ordained to preside; 2) the requirement to establish the purity of the congregation; 3) the emphasis on the primacy of the preached word which alone authenticated the sacraments; and 4) the necessity for demonstrable outward signs of assurance of election. Their high view of the sacrament led to infrequent celebration, largely out of the need for personal holiness.

Eventual neglect of the sacraments among the Puritans may be in part attributed not to a lack of interest, or to a denigration of their importance, but rather as an ironical outcome of the attempt to protect it. They so emphasized the dangers of unworthy reception that the eucharist seemed impossibly sacred, and then tried to soothe the consciences, fears, and scruples of frightened communicants. It was a sin to refuse communion, and yet it was a sin to receive unworthily. Far better, it seemed (and safer) to stay away from an ordinance which could not convey grace, but could cause damnation. For example, Richard Sibbes wrote that since the covenant of grace is sealed in baptism and renewed in communion, sin after the sacrament is therefore made worse, just as adultery is worse than fornication. Because it breaks the renewed covenant, what he calls "the great aggravation of sin after the sacrament," it would be better not to have received the eucharist.

Hostility to the perceived popishness of the Book of Common Prayer also led to infrequent reception and consequently to the accusation of Puritan neglect of sacraments. Some practices acceptable to Prayer Book

119 Ironical it is that this high view of the sacrament led to three popish errors: high and powerful clericalism; the emphasis on visual signs, particularly the fraction, encouraging passive witnessing of the liturgy; and infrequent reception.


121 Mayor, Dissent, 21-23.
conformists were unacceptable to Puritans, either because they lacked sufficient scriptural warrant, or they were too closely identified with Rome. Some people were identified as Puritans because they refused to receive (or administer) the sacrament kneeling or at the chancel rail; or preside if the table were against the east wall. Some people would avoid communion until they could find a minister of whose practices they approved; or would travel long distances in search of one. This perhaps is the reason for such Puritan emphasis on the validity of the sacrament even if administered by unworthy ministers, and for the subsequent legislation which required attendance at one's parish church, in order to restrict "gadding."

Holifield discusses the anti-sacramental impulse largely in terms of the Puritan suspicion and mistrust of matter coupled with the rise of subjective internalist piety.122 Grace cannot come by material, fleshly carnal, sensual means. Election means that God's grace is a priori; therefore the matter of the eucharist cannot itself convey grace, consequently making actual communion superfluous to salvation, but nevertheless of grave importance.

Thus there may be seen six contributing factors to the neglect of the sacraments among the Puritans, despite their advocacy of its importance: 1) suspicion of the Book of Common Prayer; 2) the fear of unworthy reception; 3) the fencing of the altars; 4) the suspicion of material means of grace in favour of more purely "spiritual" worship; 5) the subordination of the eucharist to preaching; and 6) the Reformed orthodox doctrine of election left the impression that the sacraments were ultimately unnecessary.

This survey of the various issues of eucharistic teaching in the Caroline Church of England has examined certain common ideas and arguments from

\[122\] Holifield, *Covenant Sealed*, 2, 35, 38, and *infra*.
Elizabethan, "Laudian" and "Puritan" sources. And although it is true that those of differing opinions largely agreed on the doctrine of the eucharist, it is also true that they each typically emphasized characteristic ideas. The doctrine of the eucharist in England was remarkably uniform, and was based on a virtually unanimous acceptance of the teaching of Calvin. New held that "the antagonism between Puritan and Anglican cannot be explained in terms of sacramental theology as such," and continued:

By and large, the stated doctrines of Puritans and Anglicans were identical, yet their attitudes to the sacraments were radically dissimilar because their expectations of grace were remote from each other.¹²³

Daniel Brevint's book The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice, although published in 1673, was written nearly two decades earlier. It contains many of the ideas typical of both "Laudian" and "Puritan," and synthesizes them in such a way that it is in many ways representative of the best of Caroline eucharistic thought.

¹²³ New, Anglican and Puritan, 63, 68.
CHAPTER FOUR

THE CHRISTIAN SACRAMENT AND SACRIFICE

I want and seek my Savior himself: and I watch for all the opportunities of coming to his sacrament, for the same purpose, that once made S. Peter and S. John run so fast to his sepulcher; because I hope to find him there.

Daniel Brevint, The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice IV.4

Swift, as their rising Lord to find the two disciples ran
I seek the Saviour of Mankind
Nor shall I seek in vain.

Charles Wesley, Hymns on the Lord's Supper, #55.¹

The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice was originally composed sometime between 1654 and 1659 in Paris, probably in Latin, and the manuscript, along with those of other Latin tracts composed by Brevint for the Princess, is reported to have been deposited with Sir Leoline Jenkins. Eucharistic devotional manuals were highly popular during the seventeenth century in both Old and New England,² and encyclopaedic devotional manuals also had extensive

¹ Rattenbury, Eucharistic Hymns, 44-45; Rattenbury here demonstrates Wesley's adaptation of what Rattenbury says is one of the best passages in Brevint.

² Other manuals of note are: A Weeks Preparation Toward a Worthy Receiving of the Lord's Supper (Gregory Bedell?) 47 ed. (London: Sam Keble for D.M. Hunter, et. al., 1738). It was followed in 1750 by The New Week's Preparation for a Worthy Receiving of the Lord's Supper (London: 1750) which accused the former of being too popish because it included passages from books which had recently been publically burned by the hangman; John Gauden (Bishop of
eucharistic sections. The best-known of these, Lewis Bayly's *The Practice of Piety* and the anonymous *The Whole Duty of Man* went through many, many reprintings, and both placed high emphasis on both the correct understanding and the worthy reception of the Holy Communion.

An early example of the genre is from 1609, *A Direction for the Weaker sort of Christians*, written in two parts, one by William Bradshaw and the other by Arthur Hildersam, which by 1623 was in its 7th edition. Like Brevint's book, Bradshaw's was originally written for the private use of a noblewoman,


⁴ Attributed to Richard Allestree (1657).
Lady Grace Darcy, and was based on I Corinthians 11. Hildersam's contribution is written as a catechism.

Holifield describes the popularity and proliferation of puritan sacramental manuals in New England. But by 1690 Cotton Mather (1663-1728) in Boston complained that eucharistic manuals had become thin on the ground, and he published his own Companion for Communicants, the first such manual actually printed in New England and the only one by a Colonial American for the next 20 years. There were, however, others by English Presbyterians, Independents and non-conformists which also found a great audience in New England.

The actual theology of the eucharist as found in these manuals is very much like that which has been so far described, and witnesses further to the lack of theological conflict among English-speaking Christians during the seventeenth century. Brevint's work is clearly in the same tradition of these devotional manuals, not a technical, academic treatise on the theology and history of the Sacrament. It is unique, however, in that it keeps itself firmly fixed on the sacrament and not on the state of the soul of the recipient. Although there are certain penitential elements in its prayers, it has no

---

1 Bradshaw's main theme is that worthy reception, devout preparation, is the "Wedding Garment" of Matthew 22: 11-13.


3 Mather, Companion for Communicants. His opinions are, predictably, more extreme than those of the conforming English puritans: any talk of a commemorative sacrifice is "extremely nonsensical," and to call the table an altar is a dangerous metaphor, 18; the communion is not a converting ordinance, and therefore none but believers are to receive, and although self-examination is requisite, absolute assurance of election is not necessary before coming to communion, 42, 131; therefore the Test Act is a perversion of the eucharist, 148.

4 Holifield, Covenant Sealed, 197.
specifically penitential section. It attempts to make no window into the soul of
the recipient, and there is no sense of morbid introspection about it. Nor was
Brevint concerned with liturgical externals such as surplices, liturgical
conformity, or kneeling; whether the communion was valid apart from
preaching; or fencing the altar against the non-elect. It is about the
sacrament, neither the communicant nor the manner of communication.

Kenneth Stevenson has surveyed its theology, and speculates that
duPlessis Mornay's magisterial work *De l'Institution, Usage et Doctrine du
Saint Sacrement de l'Eucharistie en l'Eglise Ancienne* may well have been an
ey early influence on Brevint's eucharistic theology as it is expressed in the
Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice. There are however major differences
between these two books: Brevint's is but 133 pages long, Mornay's nearly
1000; the latter is primarily a polemical work, addressed to "Messeurs de
L'Eglise Romaine," against Roman Catholic teaching on the Eucharist, as well as
other controversial Roman practices such as the invocation of saints, celibacy of
the clergy, and the use of Latin; whereas Brevint's polemics targeting Roman
teaching and practices were restricted to his *Missale Romanum* and *Saul and
Samuel at Endor*. Mornay died in 1623, before Brevint's enrollment at
Saumur, but undoubtedly Brevint would have been influenced by his
thought, particularly concerning the Papacy. But it shall be seen that the

---

9 Philippe duPlessis-Mornay, *De L'Institution, Usage et Doctrine du Saint
Sacrent de L'Eucharistie en L'Eglise Ancienne*, 2d ed. (La Rochelle: Hierosme
Haultin, 1598).


11 pace Stevenson, who states that they must have known each other, not
noticing the DNB misprint placing Brevint's graduation in 1624, rather than 1634.
*Covenant of Grace*, 105.
single largest French influence on Brevint in this case was almost certainly Theodore Beza.

Brevint's work is synthetic, drawing together as many ideas and arguments as possible, and it typified the common theological discourse of the time. Crockett says:

There is nothing in his treatise that cannot be paralleled in other seventeenth-century Anglican writers. What is remarkable about the treatise is its scope and balance, and its recovery of eucharistic themes which had not achieved as clear expression in earlier Anglican tradition.  

It is the breadth and clarity of Brevint's presentation rather than the originality of its content that makes his contribution significant.

The earlier English reformers did not avoid the juxtaposition of the words "sacrament" and "sacrifice" in their attempts to distinguish Protestant and Roman understandings of the eucharist. Gregory Dix, for instance, argued that the Reformers tried to suppress any idea of sacrifice in the eucharist, and described Cranmer's difficulty regarding the offering of alms and the preparing of the bread and wine, so that there would be no "stink of oblation," to use Luther's term.  

Gardiner's comments that the 1549 liturgy clearly implied the propitiatory sacrifice of the mass show that the issue was troublesome, and resulted, asserts Dix, in the shift in the location of the Prayer for the Church.  

But Cranmer did not shy away from sacrificial language in his

\[\text{\textsuperscript{12}}\] Crockett, "Holy Communion," 278.

\[\text{\textsuperscript{13}}\] Dix, \textit{Shape of the Liturgy}, 660-1.

Response to Gardiner, so long as it was made clear that the eucharistic sacrifice is commemorative, not propitiatory.

Both Calvin and Jewel asserted that the eucharist does have a real sacrificial nature, and that this eucharistic sacrifice is "indispensable" to the Lord's Supper. The writers in the seventeenth century agreed with them. As noted above in Chapter Three, Lancelot Andrewes agreed both that "Eucharistia est simul sacrific. et sacrament," and that the table is also an altar. 

John Donne also used the words together, although less explicitly:

The first way that Christ came to thee, was in Blood; when hee submitted himselfe to the Lawe, in Circumcision; And the last thing that hee bequeathed to thee, was his Blood, in the Institution of the Blessed Sacrament; Refuse not to goe to him, the same way too, if his glorie require that Sacrifice."

They are also found together in Ussher:

For they did not distinguish the sacrifice from the sacrament, as the Romanists do now-a-days: but used the name of sacrifice indifferently, both of that which was offered unto God, and that which was given and received by the communicant.

Buckeridge's funeral sermon for Lancelot Andrewes begins as a lengthy oration regarding the sacrificial nature of the eucharist: there is the altar of the heart

15 Reynolds has examined the Protestant teaching on eucharistic sacrifice in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Reynolds, "Sacrifices by Resemblance."

16 Andrewes, Responsio, 250; "Sacrificium, quod ibi est, Eucharisticum esse," the sacrifice of the eucharist is commemorative only, but nevertheless a real sacrifice; idem., Striccturae: or, A Briefe Answer to the XVIII. Chapter of the first Booke of Cardinall Perron's Replie...to King James. Works XI, LACT, 20.

17 John Donne, "The First Sermon Preached to King Charles, at St. James's, April 3, 1625. Psalms 11.3 'If the Foundations be destroyed, what can the righteous doe?" in Donne's Sermons on the Psalms and Gospels, ed. Simpson, 92.

18 Ussher, Religion Anciently Professed, 278.
of every Christian, the cross of Christ was the altar of his sacrifice, and the
church offers itself at its own altar, which is the eucharist.19

Reynolds notes the "most original contribution to the English doctrine of
eucharistic sacrifice"20 was that of Joseph Mede (1586–1638), who asserted in

The Christian Sacrifice that:

[T]he rite of the Lord's Supper is indeed a sacrifice, not in a
metaphorical but a proper sense; and this, if the nature of sacrifice
be truly defined, no whit repugnant to the principles of the
Reformed religion.21

The idea, then, was by no means an innovation in the Church of England when
Brevint wrote about it, and he believed that the doctrine had universal assent
among sound protestant churches. In his reply to "R.F.," the appendix to Saul
and Samuel at Endor, Brevint criticized Fuller for his long lists of authorities in
which

he musters out as many places as he can find, that make any
mention of Liturgy, Oblation, Holy Victime, Incruental Sacrifice,
and Mass somtimes, which no Protestants disputes against:22

"Nevertheless this sacrifice which by a real oblation was not to be offered up
more than once, is by an Eucharistical and devout commemoration to be offered
up every day." In this one sentence from The Christian Sacrament and
Sacrifice VI.323 Brevint reaffirms the reformation principle of the

19 John Buckeridge, "A Sermon Preached at the Funeral of the Right Reverend
Father in God Lancelot, late Lord Bishop of Winchester," in Andrewes, Ninety-six

20 Reynolds, "Sacrifices by Resemblance," 91.


22 Brevint, Saul and Samuel, 408; emphasis mine.

23 For reasons of convenience, and because no edition of The Christian
Sacrament and Sacrifice (hereinafter XSS) is commonly available, all quotations
shall be from the 1st Oxford edition 1673, and reference will be made not to pages
but to chapter and paragraph. These however do not correspond to the divisions
unrepeatable sacrifice once offered, but also that the eucharist is a perpetual sacramental commemoration of that sacrifice; in fact daily celebration may here be implied. Again Joseph Mede's words are apt:

It is one thing to say, that the Lord's Supper is a Sacrifice, and another to say That Christ is properly sacrificed therein. These are not the same: 'For there may be a Sacrifice which is a representation of another Sacrifice, and yet a Sacrifice too.'

Quite conventionally Brevint held that the Christian Church is the "New Israel" and heir to all of the promises of the Covenants of the Hebrew Scriptures. The Old Testament rites and sacrifices were themselves sacraments which "prefigurated" the sacraments of the New Covenant, which fulfil them. As a result, the Old Testament was exegeted typologically, giving it primary authority in understanding the nature of Christ's sacrifice of himself.

An example of Brevint's typological exegesis is that of manna, to which he refers several times. Manna was a "type" of the sacramental nature of the eucharist, which is its fulfilling "antitype."

The Body of the Lord as it was offered up to God in sacrifice, is the truth represented by the Passover: and as represented to us at the Holy Communion, is the truth and accomplishment typified by the manna. ...That is to say, as bread and wine do not produce, but keep up that animal life, which another Cause hath produced: so doth our Lord Jesus by a necessary and continual supply of strength and grace, represented by bread and wine, sustain, improve, and set forward that spiritual life and new being, which He hath procured us by his cross. (III.6)

As Christ is the "truth" of the paschal lamb, Christ is the "truth" of the manna, but the figure is incomplete, says Brevint, because it showed only the giving, not the suffering and passion. In the eucharist alone is the representation of Christ made complete:

---

of Wesley's abridgement.

Christ relates to these four figures as the body which fulfils them: and the Holy Communion relates to them on the other side, as an antitype, that is, as one image may relate to another, all to express the same object.... But this is the advantage of the Holy Communion above all the ancient figures. Adam with his open side, and all sacrifices with their blood did foretel only Christ's passion: and the tree of life with all its fruit, and the Angel with all his food [manna] did foretel only, his preserving grace: whereas this sacrament alone represents both his passion, and preserving, and besides these, another great mystery, by their mutual dependency. (III.11)

The Puritans commonly called circumcision a sacrament of the old covenant, parallel to, fulfilled and superseded by baptism;²⁵ similarly the passover was understood to foreshadow, and contain the same grace as the eucharist. William Ames, for example, taught that the passover and the eucharist are both "sacraments which look forward to the death of Christ in a special way."²⁶ The Westminster Confession XXIX.5 affirmed this view:

   The sacraments of the Old Testament, in regard of the spiritual things thereby signified and exhibited, were, for substance, the same with those of the New.²⁷

The idea of "Old Testament sacraments" comes straight out of Calvin, who asserted a fundamental unity between the sacraments of the New Covenant and those rites and sacrifices of the Old Testament which he also referred to as "sacraments."²⁸

²⁵ For example Sibbes, that the circumcision of Abraham was such a sacrament, not only a bare sign, or a sign of faith, but also a seal of the covenant. Sibbes, "The Right Receiving," 65.

²⁶ Ames, Marrow of Theology, I.xxi.47, 141.

²⁷ See also Missale Romanum (hereinafter MR): "Run over all, whether sacraments or signs, in the Old and New Testament. The lamb is the passover. Circumcision, the covenant. The seven kine, seven years. The rock, Christ. Sarah and [H]Agar, two covenants." The edition used for this study is Missale Romanum: or Depth and Mystery of the Roman Mass (Oxford: Vincent, 1847).

²⁸ Inst. IV.16.18-23. See von Rohr, Covenant of Grace, 49 for a discussion of the continuity between the Old and New Testaments, the application of covenant theology to history and the Puritan "periodization" of covenant history.
Brevint was not alone in his examination and exposition of the eucharist in Old Testament sacrificial terms: Mede's work referred to above was first delivered in 1635,29 and Cudworth had done so in 1642, focussing on the Passover, covenant, and feasting upon a sacrifice. Herbert Thorndike (1598–1672), and later Simon Patrick (1626–1707) discussed the Jewish antecedents to the eucharist, developing the idea of the eucharist as the offering of spiritual sacrifices to God.30

The main theme of The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice is that no one is to approach the Altar of the Lord with empty hands,31 and so we must come with our hands full of sacrifices. Brevint is most explicit in this conclusion in VIII.8–9, and states that "our Eucharistical Communions" correspond to the Old Testament feasts of the renewal of the first Covenant made with peace offerings. This renewal is no less powerful than when first made.

Brevint's typological exegesis is certainly supercessionist, and he says explicitly that the eucharist replaces the passover. His single reference to "the late Jews" is puzzling, presumably referring to the doctrine that the Christian Church is now the True Israel, and that the Jews, the "former Israel" so to

---

29 Although first published posthumously 1648.


31 This is not unlike Sibbes concerning worthy reception, that we must not presume to come to the sacrament familiarly, with unwashed hands, or Bradshaw, we must come wearing the Wedding Garment. The point is we must not come unprepared and casually.
speak, had relinquished any claim they had of being the people of God.\textsuperscript{32} In this I do not think that Brevint was any more anti-Semitic than anyone else of his age. His interest in the Hebrew sacrificial tradition, his familiarity with the seder and the fact that his real contempt and vitriol was reserved for Roman Catholics may in fact reveal that he was rather more sympathetic than hostile. Ussher, for example, was vigorously anti-Jewish, very often combining the Jews with pagan, heathen and papist idolaters.\textsuperscript{33} In XSS VIII.8 Brevint praises the "Old" Israel, stating: "So shall the new Israel tread on the pious steps of the old, who ever from time to time reiterated...that Covenant which the Lord had made with him in Sinai." In VIII.9 Brevint quotes Deut. 16:10-11, and states that in this passage Moses "with the same power" commands both Old and New Israel to keep feasts with offered sacrifices. This supercessionism lends itself well to typological interpretation of Scripture and to a dispensational

\textsuperscript{32} Brevint's comment must be theological rather than historical. The Jews were expelled from England in 1190 by Edward I; there were no Jews openly living in England until the 1630's when some officially "converted" Sephardic Jews ("Marranos") from Rouen were permitted entry so long as they took the Oaths of Supremacy and Allegiance. During the Protectorate they petitioned Cromwell for freedom of worship, which was granted in 1656 and not repealed at the Restoration, so small groups of Jews remained. In 1753 the "Jewish Nationalization Act" permitted Jews to omit the phrase "on the true faith of a Christian" from the oaths, but was repealed the next year due to public hostility. By the end of the eighteenth century there were perhaps 4000 Jews in Britain. Their rarity making them rather "exotic," there was a period when a certain degree of "philo-semitism" became fashionable in certain learned, liberal eighteenth-century circles; see the discussion of Emmanuel Mendes da Costa in Stephen Jay Gould, "The Clam Stripped Bare by her Naturalists, Even," in Leonardo's Mountain of Clams and the Diet of Worms (New York: Three Rivers Press, 1998), 84-5. (\textit{vide} also the difference between Shakespeare and Sir Walter Scott in their depictions of Jews, e.g. Shylock and Isaac of York respectively). The English treatment of Catholics following the Reformation is remarkably similar, though more violent, and politically rather than racially motivated.

\textsuperscript{33} Ussher, "Sermon," \textit{Works}, vol. ii, 440, 441, & \textit{infra}. On the other hand Wesley further softened Brevint's comments at the beginning of Ch. VI that "the Jews and the Pagans" both "slandered" the Christian Church by accusing it of lacking sacrifices; the Abridgement reads only "heathens."
view of history. In V.2 Brevint, speaking of temporary nature of pledges, uses as an example the "shadows of the Law" now that we are in the time of the Gospel.

Outline of The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice

The book falls broadly into two sections as the title implies and the chapter titles indicate: one on the eucharist as sacrament, the other on the eucharist as sacrifice. It is divided into eight chapters prefaced by the epistle dedicatory. Various outlines have been suggested. McAdoo noted an eight-part outline in Wesley's abridgement: the nature of the sacrament, the sacrament as memorial, conveying what it represents, a means of grace, a pledge of glory, a commemorative sacrifice, a sacrifice of ourselves, and of our offerings. Crockett's description is more in terms of its theological content rather than physical organization. The eucharist is: 1) a memorial of the death of Christ; 2) present grace and nourishment for worthy receivers, and 3) a pledge which assures our participation in God's Kingdom. It can be spoken of as a sacrifice in three ways: 1) as a commemorative sacrifice; 2) (in line with Augustine) as a sacrifice of the Church in union with Christ; and 3) Christ as eternal High Priest continually presents in heaven his sacrifice on the cross before God the Father, as the basis for our acceptance. Stevenson differs in that he divides Brevint's book into four broad sections: The Eucharist as

34 McAdoo, "Brevint and the Wesleys," 246.
memorial of the past; as a means of grace in the present; as a pledge of heaven in the future; and as representing the self-offering of the Christian."

Rattenbury, even though he restricted his analysis to Wesley's abridgement, best described the course of Brevint's argument, schematized here:

I The Eucharist as Sacrament:

1) Chapter 2, The Sacrament as a Memorial of Christ
2) Chapter 3, The Sacrament as a sign of present graces;
   Chapter 4, The Sacrament as a means of grace
3) Chapter 5, The Sacrament as a pledge of future glory

II The Eucharist as Sacrifice:

1) Chapter 6, The Eucharist as a Commemorative Sacrifice
2) Chapter 7, The Sacrifice of our own persons
3) Chapter 8, The Sacrifice of our goods and offerings

Brevint's own chapter divisions do not at first glance follow strictly the argument of the book itself, and the present analysis will follow Rattenbury's outline.

But in point of fact Brevint drew his outline from a sixteenth-century Genevan source. Theodore Beza, in his Quaestionum et Responsionum

---

35 Stevenson, Covenant of Grace, 108 n15. In this he detects a pattern found in Thomas Aquinas, noting a study by Bernard Capelle, "les oraisons de la messe du saint sacrament," in Travaux Liturgiques (Vol. III) (Louvain: Centre Liturgique, 1967): 242-51, which compares the collect, offertory and post-communion prayers for the feast of Corpus Christi with Aquinas' Summa Theologica, in which the pattern of memorial, food, and pledge figures strongly.

36 In the abridgement Wesley combined these two chapters into a single section.

37 This schematic was first described by Rattenbury, Eucharistic Hymns, 16.
Christianarum pars altera, quae est de Sacramentis stated that the sacramental nature of the eucharist looks to, and unites together, the three times of past present and future, the idea which Brevint uses for the basis of the first section of XSS. In this same work Beza also stated that there are three ways in which the eucharist may be understood as a sacrifice: as a peace-offering, the sacrificial aspect of our almsgiving, and thirdly the commemoration of the death of Christ, which Brevint uses as the basis of the second part of XSS.

In its first form XSS was written in France by a French pastor, who had trained in France, chaplain to a French noble family. It would have been most unnatural for him to avoid using one of the most venerable French theologians, who was not only the successor to Calvin, but who had taught Amyraut, Arminius and in all likelihood Brevint's own father in Geneva, and who had so admirably defended French protestantism against Rome at the Colloquy of Poissy.

Although it seems that Beza was the immediate source for Brevint's teaching that the sacrament unites past, present and future, the idea was by no means unique to Beza. John Buqueridge's funeral sermon for Lancelot Andrewes, written fifty years after Beza's Quaestionum et Responsionum, also stated that the sacrament had a "triple signification": a commemoration of...
Christ's death in the past, a means of grace in the present, and assurance of salvation in the future; but Buckeridge attributed the idea to Thomas Aquinas.\footnote{Buckeridge, "Funeral Sermon," 263. Though Buckeridge does not cite the place, it is \textit{Summa Theologica} Part III, quæs. 73, art. 4. Brevint's book shares many ideas with Buckeridge's sermon; for example Buckeridge likens the sacrament to the "daily offering" of the Jewish Temple, as Brevint will also do in XSS Chapter VII. Nevertheless they are very dissimilar works in style, organization, purpose and other content. It is not unlikely that Brevint might have known about the sermon; Andrewes was bishop of Winchester, to which diocese the Channel Islands were annexed, and Brevint would have been about ten years old when he died; Andrewes' \textit{Ninety-Six Sermons} was first published in 1629, edited by Buckeridge and Laud.}

\begin{flushright}
I make it my endeavor to rescue it out of the hands of such husbandmen, and to restore all back again both to the full meaning and institution of Christ, who is the Planter as well as the Master of the vineyard, and to the practice of the Holy Fathers, who for several hundreds of years, dressed it, and made it bear excellent
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\footnote{Bayly, \textit{Practice of Piety}, 334.}
\end{flushright}

\section*{The Epistle}

The epistle is addressed to Brevint's sister-in-law (though not acknowledged as such) Elizabeth Carteret, in which he briefly relates how he came to compose the book. Brevint states that the eucharist "is as the most generous plant in the vineyard of the Lord" and that it is as "the tree of Life" in Eden, an image he will repeat several times. It is found also in Jeremy Taylor, the \textit{Practice of Piety},\footnote{Bayly, \textit{Practice of Piety}, 334.} and Samuel Bolton's devotional noted above. The sacrament has suffered, Brevint says, first because it was "despitefully treated by popery," second because protestants were too busy defending it to "dress and improve it," and thirdly because the Anabaptists and Socinians "pretend that the best way of pruning luxuriant excrencencies, is to cut up by the roots." Brevint asserts that he has attempted to avoid both errors.
fruit. So here I take no more notice of either Papists or Sectaries, no nor Protestants neither....

This sounds very like Cranmer's On Ceremonies, in which he stated that some people are so addicted to the old customs that it is a matter of great conscience to change anything, and some are so new-fangled that they would change everything and despise the old; Cranmer's intention was to not to try to satisfy either party but try to please God, and thereby profit them both.

The appeal to Christian Antiquity is a stance more typically associated with the "Laudians" than the Puritans, and is a governing principle of the book. But Brevint's argument in XSS is not ponderously academic, gravid with patristic citations. His Missale Romanum demonstrates that Brevint has good facility with patristic writings, but here he makes few direct references to primitive authors: in all nine scattered references to Augustine, and single references to each of Tertullian, Ignatius, Cyprian, Gelasio of Cyzicus, Irenaeus, and Chrysostom. He cites no classical, medieval, reformation,

---

42 Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice, Epistle Dedicator, italics in original.

43 See, for example, Montagu, whose Gagg never refers to Arminius, Baro, or Hooker; the vast majority of citations are from Chrysostom, Basil, Augustine, and Gregory Nazianzan, amongst others. "The appeal to the church Fathers was not a polemical device, but a first principle of Montagu's theological method." White, Predestination, 216. There are other superficial resemblances between Brevint and Montagu as well besides this patristic methodological principle: both freely used a sharp, biting style; both were primarily polemicists; both even use some of the same idiosyncratic spellings, e.g. "bin" for "been," or "then" for "than."

44 Two are in passing, four are individual citations of single texts, three are to the "23rd Epistle to Boniface."
It is to Scripture that Brevint most often appeals. He says that anyone who reads the book will see that the sacrament is like the "ladder of Jacob." The Ladder of Jacob (Gen. 28:12) was commonly used in the seventeenth century as a type of Christ, always associated with the allusion to it in the conversation between Jesus and Nathaniel (John 1:51). The ladder, being rooted both in heaven and earth is invariably understood as messianic. Calvin says that the ladder of Jacob represents Christ's perpetual intercession for us; Andrewes refers to it in his Nativity 1619 sermon; Sibbes mentions it in "The Fountain Opened." Brevint seems to be unique, however, in applying the image directly to the eucharist.

Brevint states that the sacrament is a mystery, and mysteries cannot be comprehended by bare understanding. That is, the eucharist is not merely an intellectual problem, but also a spiritual one, and therefore the book will contain "discourse that refers to advancing the mind in knowledge" and also meditations and prayers, which "are the only probable means of dealing successfully with holy things." This method of discourse and meditation is not unique to Brevint;

---

43 Patrick's _Mensa Mystica_, for example, is replete with them. It is not that Brevint can't; in _MR_ he cites, among many others, Aquinas, Suarez, Bellarmine, Vasquez, Scotus, Cajetan, Ambrose, Clement, Eusebius, Theodoret, documents and canons from the Councils of Nicea, Ephesus, Trent, etc., various papal decretals and historical liturgies, and among contemporary authors, Stillingfleet and Calvin.

44 _Inst._ I.14.12. This perpetual intercession of Christ in heaven, in the light of Hebrews 7:22-28 and 9:12, 24-26, has distinct eucharistic implications, though Calvin does not himself draw eucharistic ideas out in his commentary on Hebrews, apart from condemning the mass.

47 Sibbes, "Fountain," 499.
it is a common approach, used also, for example, by Lewis Bayly, Richard Baxter and Jeremy Taylor."

Brevint's presentation is also perhaps a bit of a game: many of his points are subtly made, hinted at rather than made explicit. Sometimes he only drops clues towards the real subject at hand, as though he knew that he was not obliged to state the obvious. Considering his admiration for the intellect of his patroness, such an approach might not be unexpected."

A digression is appropriate here to examine an example of Brevint's method of "argument by allusion," that is his acerbic anti-Catholicism. His other two books, each much larger than The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice, were both anti-Catholic polemics. As noted earlier they are nasty business, and he was certainly not alone. Many other English writers of the period were vigorously anti-Catholic, but Brevint's is an extreme example of the general opinion. It is surprising, therefore, to find little invective against Rome in XSS. This is no doubt due the fact that it was written originally for a private audience for devotional rather than polemical reasons.

XSS does contain some attack on Rome, however, although what little exists is oblique, tending to imply the offender by naming the offence. The first is the explicit statement already mentioned that the eucharist "was most

"This method has its modern advocates as well. For example, Jon Sobrino has stated that theology as an intellectual endeavour cannot be complete without both spirituality and praxis; prayer and action are necessary complements to theory. Jon Sobrino, Spirituality of Liberation: Toward Political Holiness, trans. Robert R. Barr (Maryknoll: Orbis, 1988), 70-71.

"Ep. Ded.: "And really tho' they did understand all these scholastic points as well or better then their teachers, (especially the Princess of Turenne, whose clear and quick apprehension, and neat and unartificial eloquence were wonderful) yet they cared so little for them, that they deplored very often the unhappy necessity that had filled the Church with such weapons; and had so flanck't about (to use here their expression) Jerusalem with bastions, that one could hardly see the temple."
despitefully treated by Popery," and that the Romanists "made havock of the vineyard, and laid it wast; the fatness of the ground brought forth that poisonous wild vine of the Roman-mass...." This again is very much like Cranmer:

[B]ut the very body of the tree, or rather the roots of the weeds, is the popish doctrine of transubstantiation, of the real presence of Christ's flesh and blood in the sacrament of the altar (as they call it), and of the sacrifice and oblation of Christ made by the priest, for the salvation of the quick and the dead. Which roots if they be suffered to grow in the Lord's vineyard, they will overspread all the ground again with the old errors and superstitions.

The comparison between Cranmer and Brevint is apt; Book V of Cranmer's Answer unto a crafty and sophistical cavillation devised by Steven Gardiner Against the True and Godly Doctrine of the most holy sacrament also concerns the eucharist as a sacrifice, and its relation to the Old Testament sacrificial system.

Apart from this one instance Brevint does not accuse the Romanists by name. In I.2 he repeats his condemnation of the two opposing opinions which would make the sacramental body of Christ "either a false god or an empty ceremony," making them either superstitious idolaters or profane abusers of the sacrament. In this Brevint patently intends that the former opinion in each case be understood as Roman.

Another anti-Roman statement is an allusion in VI.2 to communion in one kind: "The blessed communion alone, when whole, and not mutilated, conceneters and brings together...." As noted above, "mutilated" is the common

---


51 Ibid., 348ff.
epithet in the Caroline period for "half-communion," or the reception of the bread alone. VIII. 4 also alludes to this, "It is the same act of an impious wretch to mangle, and to mutilate, either the holy sacrifices which Jesus hath made to his father, or the holy Sacrament which he hath ordained to his Church...."

VI. 2 asserts that the sacrifice of Christ on the cross is complete and needs no repetition. Without actually saying so, Brevint is clearly condemning the Roman understanding of the propitiatory sacrifice of the mass. He certainly wants to see the eucharist as both efficacious and a sacrifice, but here asserts that the Roman concept is erroneous because it implies that the sacrifice of the cross was defective:

It is most certain also, that this great sacrifice being both of an infinit virtue to satisfy the most severe justice, and of an infinite virtue to produce at once all the effects, that can be expected of it; it were impiety to think, it should need to be don again, as weak and infirm causes must, in order to make up by degrees and at several times their full effect.... But it were a much greater offence both against the Blood of Christ, to question its infinit worth, and against the infinitness and immensity of this worth, to charge it with som emptiness, which any reiteration should fill up. Therefore as the expiatory sacrifice, which Christ offered upon the cross, was infinitly able to do at once whatever an infinit number of other sacrifices had bin able to do, either all together at one time, or each of them severally during the succession of all ages; the offering of it must needs be one only: and the reiteration of it were not only superfluous as to its real effect, but also most injurious to Christ in the very thought and attempt. (VI. 2)\(^2\)

Brevint is careful not to confuse the correct understanding of the Eucharist as a memorial or figure with merely empty figures or signs (II. 4), and in this context he is not afraid to use the words "venerable," "devotion," "reverence," and "adoration" regarding the consecrated elements; but then he

\(^2\) This is more specifically and briefly stated in MR: "So Roman Mass is a reproach to the infinite value of Christ's oblation, being visibly grounded on this plain blasphemy, that Christ's oblation upon the cross was defective. To this Mass-priests confess, that the oblation upon the cross is all-sufficient, and so needs not to be reiterated, as far as to redeem: but they maintain withal, that this redeeming is beneficial to nobody, unless it be applied by Mass." MR, 142.
cannot resist one more allusion to popish error by adding "as soon as I see them used in the Church to that holy purpose that Christ consecrated them to," for the intended use is reception. This passage also implies that consecration consists not in a change in the physical matter, but rather is a setting apart, a change in use. Brevint makes no clear statement regarding the nature of consecration, however.

Brevint does nonetheless pay a good deal of honour to Mary, which is almost surprising when compared to the vigour with which he later argued against Marian devotion in Saul and Samuel at Endor.53 In XSS however, he does not shrink from mentioning her at least three times, calling her the Blessed Virgin, encouraging us to lift our souls up with hers at the foot of the cross, and likening Simeon's prophecy of the sword which would pierce her heart to the grief which ought to be inspired in our souls when we contemplate the Passion. He even refers, obliquely, to her as eschatologically representing the whole Church as the "woman clothed with the sun" of Rev. 12:1. (IV.10)

One final point not made in XSS but found in Missale Romanum bears noting as well: Brevint mocks the number of miracles which must necessarily accompany every celebration of the Roman mass were it true. This is not unique to him, but was evident also in, e.g. Perkins, who noted the absurdity of the "nine papist wonders" at the sacrament.54 Donne, in his sermon for Christmas

53 Barnes notes that there was much Marian devotion among the Caroline Divines, for example in Taylor's Great Exemplar part I, sect 1-3, and Hall's Contemplations on the New Testament, among others. Formal Marian devotions were, however, few, and he cites Andrewes Preces Privatae as one example. Barnes examines what may have been a Caroline litany to the Blessed Virgin composed by Thomas Traherne in 1673, which lists her titles but omits the "pray for us"; he concludes that it may not have been originally intended to be a litany. John E. Barnes, "Caroline Devotion to the Blessed Virgin Mary," Theology 73 (1970): 535-541.

54 Perkins, Reformed Catholic, 565.
day 1621, also mocked the idea of "quotidian miracles," for anything that is commonly done by miracle is no miracle." Baxter ridiculed the thirty-one miracles and twenty "aggravations" which accompany the mass."

Brevin concludes the epistle stating clearly the purpose of the sacrament, and his words smack of Hooker's idea of "participation" when he states:

"[T]he true end of this Sacrament,... [is] nothing less than a mutual communion between us and Christ, even here on earth while we seem to be absent from him.

Chapter One

Chapter One is very brief, shorter indeed than the Epistle, and serves as the introduction to the main body of the work. In the first paragraph Brevin asserts that "the Lords Supper is without controversy one of the greatest mysteries of godliness, and the most solemn festival of the Christian religion," and immediately states his theme that it is both sacrament, at which we receive, and a sacrifice, at which we offer. The twin themes of receiving and offering run through the whole work. He also used this definition in Missale Romanum:

For, what we call properly Sacrament, is a Divine Ordinance, whereby Christ offers himself and his blessing to faithful people who receive them: and Sacrifice is, as it were, an opposite kind of ordinance, whereby this faithful people are to offer and give up themselves, their praises, their prayers, and all such good works as God, in his mercy, will be pleased to accept of."

\[^{55}\text{Donne, Christmas 1621, 151.}\]

\[^{56}\text{Baxter, Catechizing of Families, 277-8. Baxter also notes twelve errors of the mass; he does not here list them, but refers readers to his other book Full and Easy Satisfaction.}\]

\[^{57}\text{MR, 125.}\]
Again Brevint reveals his use of Beza's *Quaestionum et Responsionum* in which this precise distinction is made."

The sacrament is the "meeting place" or "tabernacle" between the people and God. One needs to have a proper understanding of the sacrament as being both a sacrament and a sacrifice, he says, in order to avoid the errors of making the eucharist either "a false god or an empty ceremony," resulting in superstitious idolatry (i.e., popery) or profane abuse (i.e., memorialism). This, as has been amply demonstrated, is the conventional view of both Calvin and the subsequent Reformed consensus. Brevint notes that in such controversy over the nature of the Sacrament the devil has given more trouble to the church than the angel suffered over the body of Moses (Jude 9). This sentiment too was often expressed at the time (and still is) with regret, that the very sacrament of unity is in fact our greatest bone of contention, dividing Christians one from another, and such division is direct evidence of the devil's inroads into the Church. Cranmer expressed it too, and Brevint's words are very like his: "but the devil...hath so craftily juggled herein, that nothing riseth so much contention as of this holy sacrament.""'

---


" Cranmer, *An Answer unto a crafty and Sophistical Cavillation...*, 30. Rattenbury wrote in 1948, "May we not find once more in the Lord's Supper a Sacrament of Unity—*Sacramentum unitatis*—instead of the source of strife and division which it has so disastrously become?" Rattenbury, *Eucharistic Hymns*, viii. Cf. Calvin, *Inst.* IV.16.1: "Furthermore, Satan, to deprive the church of this inestimable treasure, has long since spread clouds, and afterward, to obscure this light, has raised quarrels and conflicts to estrange the minds of simple folk from a taste for this sacred food, and also has tried the same trick in our own day."
I.i The Sacrament as Memorial

Part I is organized in terms of salvation history. The sacrament, as it looks to the past, is a commemoration of Christ's death; to the present, it is means of grace; to the future, it is a pledge and assurance of our salvation. This temporal structure is not commonly found amongst English writers, but it is expressed in very similar terms in Beza's discussion of sacraments:

But sacraments touch all three moments in time: past, present and future. While they commemorate a past saving event, they also make present and witness to that which by signifying they offer to us. By doing so, they are pledges and seals of the promise of eternal life.

The introduction of this insight of Beza does seem to be Brevint's contribution to English eucharistic literature.

Chapter II of XSS concerns the sacrament as it is a memorial. Brevint here closely connects the idea of anamnesis with the eternal self-offering and heavenly intercession of Christ from Hebrews 7 and 9, closing with a lengthy mediation-prayer on the visible sufferings of Christ.

Using the example of the passover seder, Brevint explains that the eucharist is our participation in the present in the events of the past. The Lord's Supper as a sacrament is "a memorial, representation, and image" of the

---

60 Raitt, Beza, 43. The idea seems however to have originated with Aquinas, Summa Theologica Part III, quaes. 73, art. 4: "This sacrament has a threefold significance. One with regard to the past, inasmuch as it is commemorative of our Lord's Passion, which was a true sacrifice....With regard to the present it has another meaning, namely, that of Ecclesiastical unity, in which men are aggregated through this Sacrament; and in this respect it is called 'Communion' or synaxis....With regard to the future it has a third meaning, inasmuch as this sacrament foreshadows the Divine fruition, which shall come to pass in heaven; and according to this it is called 'Viaticum,' because it supplies the way of winning thither. And in this respect it is also called the 'Eucharist,' that is, 'good grace'....In Greek, moreover it is called metalepsis, i.e. 'Assumption,'...." (See the discussion of Andreyes above, Easter 1612).
Passion of Christ. Although the actual crucifixion lasted but a few hours, the
eucharist has been ordained to be a perpetual memorial of it. But it is not a
bare memorial: although Brevint does not actually use the word "anamnesis,"
he certainly means it when he says that the eucharist is for Christians as the
Passover is for the Jews, "as if they had bin present" at the first one. The
eucharist parallels and supersedes the solemnity of the Passover, which itself
had the character of being both sacrament and sacrifice. The idea here of
anamnesis is that the sacrifices of the past continue to be effectual, and
through sacraments we actively participate in them in the present. The
word literally means "a calling to mind," but the technical sense is that of re-
presentation and participation: the commemoration, says Brevint, makes the
thing represented as truly present and effectual as if the thing itself were itself
"newly done."

Because especially, besides the commemoration, this Sacrament
duly given, and faithfully received, makes the thing which it
represents as really present for our use, and as really powerful in
order to our salvation, as if the thing it self were newly done or in
doing. (II.3)

Lancelot Andrewes also made much use of the idea of anamnesis, using it to
affirm that the sacraments "recapitulate" time, salvation history, collapsing the
present and the salvific events of the past into a single event.62

61 Luke 22:19 puts "anamnesis" on Jesus' lips at the last supper; Paul uses it
eucharistically in I Cor. 11:24; and it is used in context of Jewish sacrifices in
Heb. 10:3.

62 In fact Brevint seems to have a great deal in common with Andrewes besides
anamnesis; the point that the sacrifice is to be eaten by the worshippers; the
eucharist is like the passover; presence ad cadaver; sacrifice and sacrament;
visible sufferings (Easter 1612). Brevint's careful use of the word
"participation" also echoes of Hooker.
Crockett writes:

In making the memorial of Christ's death in the Eucharist the Church not only commemorates a past action, but Christians on earth are united with Christ in the eternal pleading of his completed sacrifice in heaven.  

or in Brevint's own words:

So now the ministers of our Lord Jesus Christ, having in their hands the sacraments of the Gospel... may both produce and give them out as evidences; that the sacrifice of their Master is not less able to save mens souls, when it is offered to men, and sacramentally offered again to God, at the holy Communion, then when it was newly offered upon the cross. (VIII.8)

McAdoo examines the Wesleyan abridgement of Brevint for this element of anamnesis, comparing Brevint's ideas with those of Jeremy Taylor. He concludes that because of Brevint's "virtualism with a difference" and the use of the concept of "value," "his theology of the eucharist has an anticipatory individuality worthy of note," meaning that Brevint's language is very amenable to modern discussions such as the 1938 Doctrine Report, the Lima Report (B.E.M.) and ARCIC I. McAdoo then explores Brevint's view of just exactly how the bread and wine are themselves changed, and concludes that Brevint held more than simple "dynamic receptionism" and leaned much more to virtualism. But McAdoo correctly points out that Brevint does not use the language of sacramental change, and then presents a brief catena of English theologians who do: Taylor, Cosin, Thorndike, Bramhall and Andrewes. Nevertheless, he says, Brevint is clearly stating with them a "belief in a real and dynamic presence of Christ."  

63 Crockett, "Holy Communion," 278.

64 McAdoo, "Brevint and the Wesleys," 255.

65 Ibid., 253.
It is unfortunate that McAdoo restricted himself to Wesley’s Abridgement, because the word "virtue" on which he hinges his exposition of Brevint was Wesley’s interpolation:

These three make up the proper sense of those words, *Take eat: this is my body*. For the consecrated bread doth not only represent his body, and bring the virtue of it into our souls on earth; but as to our happiness in heaven bought with that price, it is the most solemn instrument to assure our title to it.\(^66\)

Compare with Brevint himself:

And these three parts put together make up the proper and true sense of these words, "Take and eat this is my Body": for the consecrated bread is not said to be the Lords Body only, because it represents the Lords Body, but because also as to our present use on Earth, it doth as good as exhibit it: and as to our happiness in Heaven bought with the price of this Body, it is the most solemn instrument to assure our title to it." \(^{(XSS \hspace{1pt} V.6)}\)

Brevint does use the word "virtue" in other places, but never in McAdoo's sense. The only statement Brevint actually makes which comes even close to the sense McAdoo attributes to it is: "The truth is, we really touch, have or enjoy the thing itself, when we are within that distance, where we may enjoy its virtue." \(^{(IV.11)}\) But it would be stretching a point to read anything like "virtualism" into this.

McAdoo believes that Brevint’s most significant contribution is the integration of the eucharistic *anamnesis* with the image from Hebrews of Christ’s perpetual intercession on our behalf, as both priest and victim, before the heavenly altar. This idea of the communion table being a copy of the heavenly altar is prominent, as noted above, in Jeremy Taylor, and McAdoo posits that it would have been highly improbable for Brevint not to have known of Taylor's work.\(^67\) McAdoo quotes Wesley’s abridgement of VI.4.


\(^{67}\) *Ibid.*, 247.
So let us ever turn our eyes and our hearts toward Jesus our eternal High Priest, who is gone up into the true sanctuary, and doth there continually present both his own body and blood before God, and (as Aaron did) all the true Israel of God in a memorial. In the meantime we, beneath in the church, present to God his body and blood in a memorial, that under the shadow of his cross, and figure of his Sacrifice, we may present ourselves in very deed before him."

It may be of interest to compare Wesley's treatment with Brevint himself:

Jesus our Eternal Priest, being from the cross, where he suffered without the gate, gone up into the true Sanctuary which is Heaven, there above doth continually present both his Body in true reality, and us as Aaron did the twelve Tribes of Israel in a memorial, (Exod. 28.29.) and on the other side we beneath in the Church present to God his Body and Blood in a memorial, that under this shadow of his cross, and image of his sacrifice, we may present our selves before him in very deed and reality.

Christ the high priest offers his completed offering, and the past, present, and future merge in the anamnesis of the eucharist, "still new" at the heavenly altar, and we, united with him, both offer and are offered "in the eternal pleading of that perfect offering."** This sacrifice is eternally active, and the eucharist is not merely a memorial, but a "making effective in the present" (ARCIC, Final Report, 14.) of that saving event. This anamnesis is both commemorative and representational.

McAdoo refers to the well-known frontispiece used in Wheatly's Rational Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer." It depicts a celebration of the eucharist as it would have appeared in the late seventeenth century, and in a cloud of glory over the Holy Table stands Christ at the Heavenly Altar. In a nimbus is the Scriptural reference Heb. 9:11,23. and 7:25.

** Abridgement, VI.3.


70 See Appendix 6; and compare with the frontispiece used for Jeremy Taylor's Worthy Communicant.
[This is the master theme in *The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice*. Heaven and earth meet in the eucharistic action, as depicted in the Wheatly frontispiece...the high priest presenting his completed offering at the heavenly altar, and the Church united with him in the eternal pleading of that perfect offering.\(^7\)

Therefore, says Brevint, "I will not fail to worship God, as soon as I perceive these sacraments....Here I worship neither sacraments nor tabernacle...."

Just as the Ark of the Covenant was more than just a chest, it was not itself worshipped, but was hallowed by God to be a sign of his presence. (II.6) To be prostrate before the Lord's Table is as though to be at the very foot of the cross and find that it is as Jacob's Ladder, joining heaven and earth. (II.10)

Brevint notes that there are different degrees of memorial, from mere reminders, such as the Christian cross, to more "venerable" ones which bear real authority, such as the King's Arms, and he is firm in pointing out that "figure" or "memorial" is not to be understood as "empty figure." He uses the phrase "signs and monuments" to explain that the eucharist is an "effectual and real presence" of Christ's "continued atonement." "Signs and monuments become more or less venerable according to the greater, or lesser worth of the objects, which they are made to represent." (II.4) The King's Arms in a public place are understood by common people to be different in degree and authority from an imaginary coat of arms painted for mere decoration in a private house. He explains this difference as a sort of transfiguration: "...these signs and monuments, besides their ordinary use, bear withal as it were on their face the glorious character of their institution from above." (II.4) The bread and wine bear the intention of God to be a memorial of Christ's passion. Therefore the eucharist makes the sufferings of Christ visible, requiring of the "pious beholder" three degrees of devotion, and again Brevint's theme is temporal:

---

\(^7\) McAdoo, "Brevint and the Wesleys," 247.
memory of the past event, worship and adoration in the present, and that which completes the other two, an "act of faith" in the effectual and real presence of continuing atonement. In this context Brevint makes one of his infrequent references to the ministry of the Holy Spirit:

by the power of the Spirit, by whom it was offered, which is the 'eternal Spirit,' (Hebr. 9.14.) all kinds of eternity thus concurring together to the sacrifice upon the cross, it must in all respects stand everlasting and eternal, and 'the same yesterday, to day, and for ever.' (Hebr.13.8.) (II.8)

The devotional postscript to Chapter II is almost entirely given over to rehearsing the sufferings of Christ made visible in the elements of the eucharist, and like Greenham Brevint takes it the step further by comparing the actual manufacture of the bread and wine with the passion.  

My Lord! and my God! I behold here in this bread made of a substance that was cut down, beaten, ground and bruised by men, all the heavy blows and plagues and pains, which my Savior did suffer from the hands of his murthers: I behold in this bread dried up, and baked and burnt at the fire, the fiery wrath also, which he suffered for me from above, and from the hand of his own Father. My God, my God, why hast thou thus forsaken him! the violence of wicked men first hath made him a martyr, then the fire of Heaven hath made him a burnt sacrifice: and under both these sufferings, lo he is become to me the Bread of Life! Let us then go, to take and eat it. For tho the instruments that bruised him be broken to pieces, and the direful flames that burned him be quite put out, yet this bread, which is the Body of the Lord, continues new. The spears and swords that slew, and the burnings that compleated the sacrifices, are many years since scattered and spent; but the strength and sweet smell of the oblation is still fragrant, the blood still warm, the wounds still fresh, and "the Lamb still standing as slain." ... Rock of Salvation, Rock struck and cleft for me, let those two streams of blood, and water which once gushed out of thy side, when the curse of the Law, and the Rod of Moses had opened it, bring down with them Salvation and Holiness into my soul, tho far distant from the mountain, where thou didst receive that deadly blow. And let not my soul less thirst after them at this distance, then if I stood upon Horeb, whence

See also MR, 240-41, where the image is also rehearsed, but in support of the idea that Melchizedek was a type of Christ, the bread and wine he offered foreshadowing the sufferings of Christ. Brevint continues that Melchizedek's bread and wine also had the character of being both sacrament and sacrifice.
sprung this water, and near the very cleft of that rock, the very
wounds of my Savior whence gushed out this sacred blood. All the
distance of times and countries, how great soever, which is
between Adam and me, doth not keep his sin or his punishment any
more from pursuing and reaching me, then if I had bin born in his
house: and notwithstanding this distance we sin and dye after his
image, as if we were immediately sprung from his loines. Second
Adam, Adam descended powerful from above, let thy blood reach as
far...

There is a brief reiteration in III.5.

The first I say to represent Christ's sufferings. This bread and
wine could neither sustain nor refresh me, had not that intrinsical
substance lost its first condition and estate: that is if the one had
never fallen under the sickle, the threshing, the millstone, the
fire: and the other under the hook, the trampling, and the press
of husbandmen: nor doth the Son of God save me, but by emptied
himself in a manner, for a while of his first glory in Heaven: and
by losing that second life which he had taken in Bethlehem.

Brevint hints in II.11 that the mingled chalice is also a part of the visible
passion, that blood and water both gushed out; and he takes some pains over
the water image, comparing Christ to the Rock of Horeb.\(^{73}\) The mingled
chalice is more explicitly referred to in VIII.2, in a reference to Cyprian's
metaphor that Christ and his people are united together in the sacrament
represented by the wine and the water united in the chalice.

But it is important to note that Brevint does not conclude that the
eucharist is simply a memorial, says Rattenbury. As has been amply
demonstrated here, simple memorialism would be unusual in the extreme for the
period. Rattenbury continues that simple memorialism is, as it were, a
"Protestant crucifix," an image, whether carved in wood, painted on canvas, or

\(^{73}\) As with the manna, Brevint is fond of repeating this image of the rock of
Horeb. The relating of manna and the rock of Horeb is also found in Bourne's
hymn "Lord enthroned in heavenly splendour"; the fifth stanza begins "Life-
impainting heavenly manna, stricken rock with streaming side." Brevint seems to
have taken the idea from Calvin: "The water gushing from the rock in the desert
[Ex. 17:6] was for the fathers a token and sign of the same thing as wine
represents for us in the Supper." \textit{Inst.} IV.17.15.
crafted in poetry and hymns which merely reminds us of Christ's sacrifice and evokes in us some feeling of repentance and thanksgiving for it. If the eucharist is only for this purpose, then it fulfills for Protestants what a crucifix can by itself do for Catholics. But, he continues, for Brevint (and as is here asserted, for all English divines) the sacrament actually effects what it literally "re-presents." Rattenbury does not continue his discussion past this, but I find the idea of a "Protestant crucifix" to be most apt and fruitful. Although the Puritans objected vehemently to crucifixes because of their association with popery (vide Jewel's report to Martyr of the controversy over "the queen's little cross" in the Chapel Royal) nevertheless the focus on actually seeing the physical sufferings of Christ in the broken bread and poured wine functions in exactly the same way.

I.i1 A Sign and Means of present graces

Chapters III and IV are combined by Wesley, and subsequently Rattenbury, into a single unit on "present graces," and because the chapters are so closely related in content they shall similarly be considered together here. Brevint affirms that the sacrament is both a sign of the presence of God, and also a "moral instrument," that is, a means, or conveyance of God's grace.

In Chapter III Brevint uses the conventional definition of a sacrament, that is "a sign of an invisible grace," and makes two broad points. The first is the reiteration of the Calvinist statement that the eucharist is a "visible sign" which God has added to his Word to help our feeble faith; the second is that the

"4 See below n.79 regarding Owen on appropriate signs.

"5 From Augustine, De catechizandis rudibus; Calvin, Inst. IV.14.1.
attributes of the signs themselves provide by analogy spiritual insight into the nature of that which is signified.

Faith is strengthened, he says, by the addition of visible signs, and Brevint lists several such signs from the Old and New Testaments, such as the Ark, the burning bush, the pillar of cloud, Christ's laying-on-of-hands, or breathing on the disciples. Many of these images are precisely those used by Calvin in Inst. IV.14.18; the rainbow, the Tree of Life in Eden, the smoking firepot, Gideon's fleece; these are used by Calvin as examples: "Since these things were done to support and confirm their feeble faith, they were also sacraments." They are repeated here by Brevint as examples of sacramental signs God used to confirm his Word and strengthen faith. In fact Brevint might well have approved of bodily worship and liturgical gesture:

All men by a naturall instinct do somewhat like this when they second their expressions with some signs and motions of their body, tho they think of no mysteries. So that you hardly can hear any man being somewhat earnest and serious upon any matter, whether of request, or complaint, submission, or excuses, but you may see him at the same time either bowing the knee, or joining his hands, or uncovering his head, which acts are, in a manner, civil and natural sacraments, to confirm his expression. III.2

By considering the natural constitution of the signs, we may be more strongly persuaded of their truth. Part of the nature of a sacrament is that the signs are peculiarly suited to reveal what they do, there is a correspondence between their own natures and what they are made to represent. For example, water was chosen for baptism, he says, because of its natural virtue of cleansing, refreshing, and making fruitful. In the eucharist, the manufacture of the bread and wine themselves represent Christ's sufferings. He uses the word kenosis from Phil. 2 to amplify the theological significance of these visible

\[76\text{Inst. IV.14.18.}\]
sufferings of Christ represented in the eucharistic elements, that the harvest of the wheat and the crushing of the grapes is a memorial in the present of Christ's "pouring out" of himself.

The eucharist is also intended to represent the blessings we receive in the present from these sufferings. Because they are also common food, they represent life-giving and sustaining nourishment. Without food bodies perish, without Christ souls perish; contrariwise Christ is certainly and really received, as certainly and really as the bread and wine are taken. Here Brevint refers to manna and the Passover as types of the sustaining and sacrificial natures of eucharist.

Perkins also agreed that the sacramental signs are chosen because they bear some appropriate resemblance to that which is symbolized:

there is a certaine agreement and proportion of the externall things with the internall, and of the actions of one with the actions of the other; whereby it cometh to passe, that the signs, as if it were certaine visible words, incurring into the external senses, do by a certain proportionable resemblance draw a Christian mind to the consideration of the things signified, and to be applied.

Owen however, stated that the sacramental signs are appropriate precisely because they are dissimilar to that which they represent, the sacramental signs

---

77 Also Calvin, Inst. IV.16.3; "These benefits are to nourish, refresh, strengthen and gladden. For if we sufficiently consider what value we have received from the giving of that most holy body and the shedding of that blood, we shall clearly perceive that those qualities of bread and wine are, according to such an analogy, excellently adapted to express those things when they are communicated to us." Also Inst. IV.17.10, "our souls are fed by the flesh and blood of Christ in the same way that bread and wine keep and sustain physical life. For the analogy of the sign applies only if souls find their nourishment in Christ...."

78 Holifield, Covenant Sealed, 53; Perkins, Golden Chaine, I, 72.
work because they do not resemble what they represent, and there is an inappropriateness about them which works to sacramental advantage."

Brevint then moves to a complicated image comparing the taking of Eve out of the side of Adam, with the Church, the second Eve, being drawn alive from the wounded side of Christ, the second Adam. (III.7) As humanity inherited sin and death from its first parents, forgiveness is imputed to us by the substitutionary atonement of Christ. Thus we have been given three new lives in the death of Christ, one each for the past, present and future. The first is life restored to us by the sacrifice of the cross, the second is the sustained life in the present. The water and the blood which flowed out of Jesus' side represent washing and sanctification, restored life and sustained life, which are the first two "effluxes" from Christ. The first life is that of justification, the second of sanctification, and the third new life is that of future redemption yet to come. (III.9)

Christ, Brevint says, sets up a Table by his Altar at which we are fed, nourished and sustained until "the very day of eternal salvation," just as really as we receive the bread and wine. Jesus was foreshown by the Tree of Life in Eden which sustained Adam and Eve; and corresponds also to the passover lamb in Egypt by which God's people were redeemed, and these figures are fulfilled

---

79 Mayor, Owen, 175. Appropriate visible signs such as crucifixes do not require faith to comprehend their relation to Christ's passion, which is why the faithless adopt them.

80 Brevint uses "efflux" several times, and means simply "flowing out"; although Stevenson states that this is an example of Brevint's innovative use of language, he comments that it means exactly that of the "conduit pipes" of grace of Andrewes, and has no special or technical connotation. Stevenson, Covenant of Grace, 102, 188. Nevertheless its use in English theology is not unique to Brevint; both Sanderson (1641) and Taylor (1651) used it before him. OED 1.b.
in him. Thus the sacramental giving and the sacrificial offering are again represented, the first in the Tree of Life, and the manna; the latter by the passover lamb and the breaking of bread and pouring of wine. Our life comes out of his death; our heavenly inheritance is, he says akeldamah, "bought with blood money." (Acts 1:19)

Brevint uses the transfiguration again to explain the twin ideas of receiving and offering. As Moses and Elijah, representing the Law and the Prophets, stood on either side of Jesus on the mountain, so at the holy table Jesus is flanked by Aaron and Melchizedek, one representing blood sacrifice, the other bread offering made to Abraham. (III.12) Chapters VI and VII develop these associations.

Chapter IV shifts the discussion from the eucharist as a sign of grace, to the eucharist as a positive means of grace, and what it means to call the bread "Christ's body." Here Brevint mentions specifically the Calvinist metonymical exchange of names between the sign and the signified, and draws again upon the "investiture" image, this time using biblical examples such as the seven ears of corn representing seven years in Pharaoh's dream, or the sower as the Son of Man in Jesus' parable. He refers to the sacramental exchange of names in IV.1, .2 and .4, and in VIII.7, and alludes to it in V.6. Brevint seems to be aware that the reader will be acquainted with not only the concept but the meaning of metonymy without having to explain it. His reference in both places is to Augustine, not to Calvin, and he does not himself use the word "metonymy."

---

81 The Tree of Life is also used by Beza in Quaestionum et Responsionum, 351: 164-5 as an example of one of four ways in which a sign is related to the signified. Raitt, Beza, 49.
Brevint is devoutly agnostic about the manner of Christ's sacramental presence, declaring that because it is a mystery, it cannot be known, and again he refers to the manna in the wilderness:

The manner of this real communication and conveyance, is the great unfathomable mystery, which the Holy Fathers have ever admired: and which therefore we neither need, nor do take upon us to explain. The shepherds think themselves happy with the message brought to them by an angel, "This day is born to you a savior," (Luke 2. 11.) tho they know nothing of the way of his most miraculous birth: and the honest Israelites ought not to receive manna less thankfully (as they do not less effectually) tho they know neither of what matter, nor by what means the heavens, the air, or the clouds can thus every morning shed about their tents this strange meat. I must not wonder if the waies of the Lord be unknown to me in his miracles, since they are so very often in his most ordinary works. (IV.6)

He then continues in IV.8:

Here then I come to Gods altar with a full perswasion that these words "This is my body," promise me more then a figure: that this holy banquet is not a representation made of outward shews without substance....But how these mysteries become in my behalf the supernatural instruments of such blessings; it is enough for me to admire.

He specifically uses the words "real presence" and qualifies that this statement does not mean "localized":

This victim having bin offered up both in the fulness of times, and in the midst of the habitable world, which properly is Christs great temple, and thence being carried up to Heaven, which is his proper sanctuary, thence he spreads all about us salvation, as the burnt offering did its smoke: as the golden altar did its perfumes: and as the burning candelastic its lights. And thus Christs Body and Blood have every where, but most especially at the Holy Communion a most true and real presence. (IV.11)

It is true that grace is not restricted to the communion, and that other forms of worship are means of grace, but the eucharist is superior to them all:

And his ordinances in the Church, as well as his stars in heaven, differ in glory one from another. Fasting, prayer, hearing of the Word, public and private services, and all like holy duties, are all very good vessels to draw water from this well of salvation: but yet they are not all equal. The blessed Communion must exceed as much in blessings, when well used, as it exceeds in danger of a
curse, when it is not. But in those places and ordinances, which he hath in an especial manner set out to record his Passion, and to renew the sacrifice of his body; he will certainly come with such a fulness of blessings, as attend this sacred body, which is the proper seat of blessings: the bread which we do break, being the communion of his body: just as the eating of the unleavened loaves were (out of Jerusalem) the communion to the passover, which was the type of Christ crucified. "Christ our passover," saies the Apostle, "is sacrificed for us: therefore let us keep the feast, &c." (IV.12)

It is a "true sign, an effectual means" of grace, of the "the richest gift, that a Saint can receive on earth, the Lord Jesus crucified." (IV.15)

I.iii Pledge of Future Glory

In Chapter V. Brevint addresses the subject of hope and assurance as the aspect of the eucharist which faces the future, and like Calvin, he understands assurance of salvation as the primary grace of the sacrament. As he earlier used the idea of "signs and monuments," Brevint now states that the sacrament is an "earnest and pledge" of our future glory, continuing the thematic emphasis on the twin aspects of sacramental receiving and sacrificial giving. The terms "earnest" and "pledge" mean very specific, but different things. An "earnest" is a "down payment," something "allowed upon account" as Brevint says; it is itself applied against the balance of the promise when fulfilled. Brevint uses as examples charity and holiness, which we receive from God in the sacraments, and which will remain ours in heaven.

A "pledge" however, is rather like "collateral security," a token used as assurance that the promise will be fulfilled, but recalled or taken away when it is. An example is the eucharist itself, which will have no purpose when we are

---

with Christ face to face. The Church is another such example. Although it and Christ's Kingdom certainly go together, he writes, Brevint is not terribly concerned about the Church as such:

Let them not, whom He hath invited to eat and drink at Abraham's Table, trouble themselves about the room where our blessed Savior will feed them...it is a sufficient assurance that in time He will also make them sit in that other palace. (V.3)

Referring to I Cor. 2:26 Brevint says that Paul stated not only what the eucharist was for, but its duration, for it is a) to show forth the death of Christ, b) until he comes. Thus the eucharist, representing the crucifixion, looks to the future when Christ will come again, keeping passion and parousia connected in the present.

Brevint in V.6-8 moves to a discussion of the meaning of "is" in the statement "this is my body," as he had in MR regarding the grammatical identity of the sign and the signified. There he had said that Christ's words and action as recorded in Matt. 26 are to be taken plainly and literally:

So that the sacred Eucharistical act of receiving this holy Sacrament with faith and contrition, must not be less accounted of than the very real communion of Christ's body. All this is both aid and done literally and really, without scarce so much as one figure."

In XSS Brevint repeats the investiture image: deeds "are" lands and maps "are" countries, because they truly convey the reality they represent. Since one cannot actually give a whole estate into someone else's hands, they are substituted by "some ceremonies, forms, or tokens, which may visibly pass from

---

"3 Calvin also examines at some length the meaning of "is" with regards to the sacrament; Inst. IV.17.22. Beza, like Calvin, does use the word "metonymy" in Quaestionum et Responsionum; the grammatical-rhetorical discussion of the meaning of "this is my body" "...filled the remaining twenty pages of small print on folio-sized pages!" Raitt, Beza, 55.

"4 MR, 281.
hand to hand." (V.8). The Kingdom of God is no more moveable than an earthly estate, but it is given in "sure title" and the Body and Blood of Christ are given "in full value" in the morsels of bread and wine at communion. McAdoo again finds these terms of "full value" and "sure title" to have much modern application.

In V.9-11 Brevint explains his use of "worthy reception," but unlike his contemporaries, he does not mean adequate spiritual preparation in prayer, repentance, self examination, pious devotions, or a holy manner of life. Brevint spends surprisingly little time on the topic, particularly when his book is compared to the vast bulk of other contemporary eucharistic manuals. He simply states that the crime of unworthy reception is "not to discern the Lord's body." In this he is again faithful to Calvin himself."

Brevint had already used the term "worthy receiver" several times, however, first at the beginning of Ch. II, and again in II.10, but did not elaborate on what he meant. In III.5 the issue of the danger of unworthy reception was used as an argument for the real efficacy of the sacrament:

The real efficacy which the Holy Communion hath to convey grace and blessing on the true Christian receiver, is evidently demonstrated by the opposite efficacy it hath to convey a curse and destruction on the profane.

If the sacrament were merely an empty sign, devoid of power, it would pose no threat whatever to the unworthy receiver; but since all are agreed that it is mortally dangerous to receive unworthily, then the sacrament must be indeed efficacious. And in the very next sentence Brevint attacks those (presumably Puritans) who teach that unworthy communion leads to damnation, but even when devoutly used the sacrament has no salvific force:

---

"Inst. IV.17.40."
Now certainly this would be as much to think un worthily as to eat unworthily of this holy bread, to think it might be really pernicious when it is abused, but not really blissful and saving in its right use; and that this bread, which we eat of, should be an effectual communion to procure death, but merely sacramental only to shew, and not to procure salvation. (IV.5)

Nearer the beginning of Chapter V, Brevint, again obliquely, refers to the "wedding garment" of Mt. 22:12." The wedding garment was usually interpreted to indicate adequate spiritual preparation for the reception of the sacrament so that one will not attend the feast of the King carelessly. As noted above Brevint refers to the future glory of the Kingdom of God as the wedding feast of the King's Son, of the "sufficient assurance" that we will be brought there, then states: "whosoever are admitted to the dinner of the Lamb slain (Matt.22:4) unless they be wanting to themselves must not doubt of being admitted to the wedding supper of the same Lamb...." Thus he is able to connect the idea of the eucharist as assurance with the problem of unworthy reception by indirectly appealing to the "wedding garment" with the Mat. 22. citation, and in so doing touches a theme common to the eucharistic teaching of the time, saying, as it were, "let the reader understand."

Thus unworthy reception is the failure to discern Christ in the sacrament, and to treat it as common food. To amplify his meaning Brevint returns to two versions of "investiture." The first is the common "deeds and lands" example: to tear up a deed or will as though it were common paper is an act of filial impiety; to approach the communion as though it were bread only is similar, but much worse. He then moves to an example of those "rebels who pull

" cf. Bradshaw, A Direction, and Andrewes, Easter 1612.

V.3, emphasis mine.

Brevint also makes much use of "investiture" in MR, 283.
down their princes' statues," as an example of "profane want of discerning."
The brass or marble suffer nothing, but the outrage passes to the King himself, who alone suffers the wrongdoing. It is bad enough when dogs or apes "tear like loose paper all to fitters" titles and deeds to estates; to come to the sacrament unworthily not discerning the pledges of salvation is not just to fail to discern and honour Christ, but to despise and cast him away. (V.11)

Part II.1 The Commemorative Sacrifice

Chapter VI begins the second part of the book, as its title states "Of the Holy Eucharist, as it implies a Sacrifice. And first of the Commemorative Sacrifice." As noted above, Beza accepted three sacrificial aspects to the eucharist, as commemoration of Christ's death, as "peace offering," and the offering of our alms; and Brevint's discussion rides on these three points.

The commemoration of the death of Christ once offered is the first of the three ways in which the eucharist can be considered a sacrifice. This whole chapter seems to be a running commentary on Hebrews 6-10 without actually saying so. Brevint never actually cites Hebrews in this chapter, yet his language and arguments follow it closely; indeed the most important idea in the chapter is summed up in Heb 9:22b: "without the shedding of blood there is no forgiveness of sins."

The letter to the Hebrews was commonly cited by many, in respect to the perfect offering of Christ as both victim and High Priest, but particularly in recalling the Melchizedekian oblation of bread and wine to Abraham, Gen. 14:18. The bread and wine of the tribute between Melchizedek and Abraham were commonly understood to prefigure, or typologically represent, the elements of
the holy Eucharist; and the tithe offered by Melchizedek to Abraham was also seen to have sacrificial significance.

All true religions on earth involve some sort of sacrifices, Brevint says, and it is a great lie and slander to say that Christians lack them. Just as pagans accused Jews of "adoring nothing but clouds" because they had no sacred images, Jews and pagans both accused Christians of lacking sacrifices because they did not kill and burn animals on altars. In the same way that idols are not real gods, the slaughter of animals is not true sacrifice, says Brevint; and of the six kinds of Jewish "carnal sacrifices," none had any saving reality apart from their dependence on Christ. Sacrifices represented not only the forgiveness of sins, but also our service to God, and only the eucharist brings together both of these ends "towards which all the old sacrifices never look't, but as either simple engagements, or weak shadows." (VI.2) This argument draws together sacrament and sacrifice, interpreting Scripture, as mentioned above, in terms of typology and the prefiguring nature of Old Testament sacraments, while adding a solid dose of (again, implied) anti-papery.

Only the sacrifice of Christ is sufficient for the expiation of sins, and it is completely sufficient in and of itself. He seems to refer to Hebrews 10: 1-16 when he says "the expiatory sacrifice, which Christ offered upon the cross, was infinitly able to do at once whatever an infinit number of other sacrifices had bin able to do...." (VI.2) Nevertheless, this sacrifice which can never be reiterated is "by an Eucharistical and devout commemoration to be offered up every day." Brevint cites St. Augustine, saying that the flesh of Christ was offered up three ways: first, in prefiguring sacrifices under the law; second, in real deed on the cross, and third, by commemorative sacrament after his ascension.
Brevint sounds much like Andrewes when he asserts that what for humanity is a table at which we receive, to God it is an altar" "whereon men mystically present to him the same sacrifice as still bleeding and still sueing for expiation and mercy." Besides implying several times in this chapter that the eucharist might well be celebrated every day, he affirms the advantages of more frequent communion, asserting as many others did, that the primitive Church observed the sacrament every Lord's Day, and he verges on irreverence when he states that the sacrament was "...the most powerful means the Church had to strengthen their supplications, to open the gates of Heaven, and to force in manner God and his Christ to have compassion on them." (VI.4)

II. ii The Sacrifice of our own Persons

Chapter VII is the longest chapter in the book, and the one in which Brevint most explicitly draws the relationships among the crucifixion, the eucharist, and Old Testament sacrifices." He first takes up the familiar idea of the death of Christ as an offering for sin, likening it to the Day of Atonement. He then moves to the idea that the Church is joined with Christ in his sacrifice as the grain-offering accompanied the animal sacrifice of the daily

90 This is also to be found in Sibbes, who discusses the eucharist making visible the sufferings of Christ. He says that at the sacrament our first thoughts should be of Christ's body broken and blood shed as the bread is broken and the wine poured; then we should think of Christ in heaven appearing there for us, applying the benefit of his death for our souls. Sibbes, "Fountain," 538.

91 Calvin's discussion is shorter, but has much in common; Inst. IV.18.12-13.
"peace-offering." In most other comparisons between the eucharist and the sacrifices of the Old Testament, Christ's death was linked typologically to the sacrifice for sin upon which God makes a feast. For example, Patrick's *Mensa Mystica* and *The Christian Sacrifice* both assert that the eucharist is a feast upon a sin offering.92

To understand Christ's sacrifice instead as a "peace offering" is distinctive of XSS.93 This again reveals Brevint's indebtedness to Beza, who stated that the Lord's Supper is correctly called a "Eucharist," and such giving of thanks is the main purpose of the Old Testament Peace offering.94

Brevint begins by reassuring the reader that there can be only one sufficient sacrifice for sin to which nothing can be added, but this does not obviate the need for other sacrifices which Christians need to offer. He states (rather astonishingly95) that though only Christ's sacrifice can procure salvation, nevertheless the self-sacrifice required of each Christian is "absolutely necessary to receive it." (VII.1) He repeats this near the end, in VII.17, "And as to their several ends, the one is made to procure and work expiation, and the other only to get some capacity to receive it." To be in communion with Christ we must be conformed to Christ, follow Christ, to live


93 Patrick does mention the Peace offering in the second chapter of *Mensa Mystica*, 25, that the Peace offerings of Deut. 12 and 16 are feasts upon a sacrifice, but he does not refer to it again.

94 Raitt, *Beza*, 49.

95 It would seem to be uncharacteristic of a writer known to be a Calvinist to assert that there can be any human contribution possible in the accomplishing God's salvific will for the elect; by making God's will contingent upon the human action of making sacrificial offerings in order to receive grace seems to condition God's utter sovereignty, which would open Brevint to the accusation of Arminianism. The issue of election in Brevint will be further discussed below.
lives of holiness, and, Brevint says, "bearing part of his cross and dying with him." As Chapter V was about assurance, Chapter VII is about discipleship.

Brevint had earlier likened Christ to Melchizedek, but now he likens him to Aaron. As Aaron entered to offer sacrifice wearing the ephod, whose twelve stones represented all of Israel, so Christ and the Church are always associated together. Christ acted and died for the Church, and so the Church must imitate and follow him in any way it can, particularly in his sufferings: "we shall have communion with him in his glory, if we will keep conformity with him here in his sufferings." This conformity is not a matter of morals only, but to imitate Christ in all parts of his life. Brevint says

we must be regenerated in his birth, dye on his cross, be buried in his grave, bear his shame in his tribulations; in a word, Christ and Christians are and must be continually together, "Where I am there my servant shall be also." (Ioh. 12. 26.) But of all these duties the most fundamental and most indispensable, is that of bearing part of his cross and dying with him in sacrifice. (VII.5)

Brevint moves on to discuss Christ's sacrifice in terms of the sin offering and the scapegoat of Lev. 16 on the Day of Atonement. The victim alone died representing the sinners, the offering of the victim was accepted as the offering of themselves because they had laid hands on it. In the same way Christians are not crucified as Jesus was, yet in communion with Christ, his sacrifice and theirs are "both accounted before God for one and the same" by imputation, (VII.8), as the first fruits offering represented the offering of the whole harvest.

The renunciation of sin is a sacrifice, a crucifixion of the former, sinful self.

The first is, that they endeavor to crucify their sinful members as really as Christ himself had his sinless body crucified. So that the feet, that before did run to evil, the violent hands that did injure, the greedy eyes that did covet, and all those members of the flesh, that were weapons of wickedness, may by this cross and sacrifice
be most really bound, and in a good measure destroyed as to their corruption. "I do glory in the Cross of Jesus Christ, by which the world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world." (Galat. 6. 14.) (VII. 9)

The second element of this self-sacrifice is the "serious resolution to piety, and universal consecrating both of our persons and our actions."

The Church is joined to Christ so as to make a single offering with him; this mystery is represented, says Brevint, by the daily sacrifice of Numbers 28. This sacrifice consisted of two parts: the slaughtered animal and the grain-offering which accompanied it, what Brevint calls the "secondary oblation."

There are many sorts of sacrifices and offerings (גדר פסחן corban) listed in Numbers and Leviticus: 1) the daily sacrifice; 2) the peace-offering ("well-being" or "reconciliation", שלמים shalomim) of which the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving (תודה todah) is a sub-category; 3) the sin offering (of purification, חטא chatta'ah). Of these latter there were several types: the burnt offering or holocaust (ולהולחנן owlah, offered whole); the grain, or meal, offering, (or AV "meat" offering, which is confusing to modern ears, מנה mincha; which may also mean simply "offering" and implies bloodless);" the drink offering, or libation (וָנֵשֶׁק nesekh). Brevint's typological analysis makes understanding the distinctions among these different offerings important.

"Peace-offering" is an inadequate translation of the Hebrew word shalomim; closer is the NRSV "sacrifice of well-being," best seems to be "sacrifice of communion." The idea is that this particular offering is one of reconciliation and joyful celebration between God and the faithful, in which God

"Although Brevint never actually uses the word "unbloody" with reference to the sacrifice, Stevenson says he "all but" uses it. Covenant of Grace, 106. Simon Patrick agrees with the term, defined as a commemorative sacrifice; Mensa mystica, 16.
and the faithful share the sacred food. Possible eucharistic interpretations of this are obvious.

The daily sacrifice consisted of two parts, Brevint states: the lamb, and the accompanying "meat" offering, which was bread made of flour, oil, incense and wine, part of which was to be burned on the altar of sacrifice, along with the sacrificial lamb. The two parts constituted a single sacrifice. Brevint calls these grain offerings "supplemental" or "secondary" sacrifices, which become sacred only by imputation of the merit of the primary animal sacrifice. The cereal offering is in itself an insufficient offering, a "burthen" on the first which imparts to it its righteousness. (VII.18).

But here Brevint has not been entirely faithful to scripture. Grain offerings were indeed part of the regular sacrificial system, and did accompany the animal sacrifice of the peace offering (Num. 15: 28). When they accompanied animal sacrifice, a drink offering of wine was added. But they were in fact capable of being independent offerings. The Bible nowhere says that the meal offering is in itself a "secondary" or "supplemental" oblation, that it is in any way subordinate to, inadequate or dependent upon the slaughtered animal. To the contrary, Lev. 2 mentions the meal offering as an acceptable form of sacrifice in and of itself.

This grain offering image is used by Brevint to describe how the church's sacrifice is added onto Christ's once-for-all sacrifice. The bread and wine of the grain offering correspond typologically to the bread and wine of the

---

7 (Ex. 46:4-7; Ex. 29:40; Lev. 23:13; Num. 15:1-12.) It is clear that Brevint is referring to the description of the daily sacrifice in Numbers rather than in Leviticus. Perhaps Brevint considers only those offerings made with wine, first to make the explicit connection between the bread and wine of the eucharist, but also as an allusion to the necessity of the wine as part of the offering, a criticism of the "mangled" communion of the papists he has already alluded to earlier.
eucharist, and as they took their sanctity from the merits of the lamb offered on the altar, so too the sacrifice of the eucharist which we celebrate in the present is thrown onto the sacrifice of Christ on the cross, and thus we participate in that sacrifice, and in the eucharist offer ourselves to God in Christ. The bread of communion as a sacrament, i.e. that which is given, signifies the natural body of Christ; the bread as sacrifice represents the mystical body of Christ, the Church. (VII.10). All our works of charity, praise, alms and holiness are in themselves insufficient, and depend on the sacrifice of Christ to be consecrated to God and found acceptable. "And these are the spiritual offerings which every true Christian must join to cast upon the fundamental sacrifice of Christ Jesus." (VII.11).

Joseph Mede also connected the "meal offering" with the eucharist, working from Malachi 1:11: "For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same name shall be great among the gentiles, and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering." The incense represents prayers, thanksgiving and commemoration; the material part of the Christian sacrifice, the pure offering of the gentiles, is the mincha purim, the bread and wine of the meal offering. "[T]his title of Purity is given to the Christian Mincha in respect of Christ whom it signifies and represents, who is a Sacrifice without all spot, blemish and imperfection." Mede does not, however, refer to the mincha as "secondary" or interpret it as the church's self offering cast upon the sacrifice of Christ.

Brevint concludes the chapter with a recapitulation consisting of two sections, both including discourse and prayer, on intercession and mortification

---

of sin, which are, he says, the two aspects of offering, priesthood and sacrifice. (VII.17-18)

One sort of Levitical sacrifice which Brevint curiously does not appeal to, considering the language of the English Liturgy, was the *todah*, or sacrifice of "praise and thanksgiving." (Ex. 24; Lev 3; Lev. 7: 11-15) It likewise is a sacrifice of reconciliation and rejoicing; the fatted calf of the parable of the Prodigal Son might well be a good example, particularly because of this explicit connection with the teaching of Jesus. Ratzinger has written that the "do this" of the institution narrative of the eucharist relates to what Jesus is adding to the Passover, that is, interpreting the passover as *todah* for his followers." If Brevint was looking for Old Testament antecedents to the sacrificial nature of the eucharist, one is surprised not to find the *todah* in his exposition.

McAdoo connects the Aaronic and the Melchizedekian images, stating that for Brevint, the church is "united with Christ in the eternal pleading of the completed offering" and this uniting is in fact a single offering. Rattenbury took the image even farther, and his conclusion is I think quite correct: Brevint's clear inference is that the Church's self-offering in the eucharist is in fact offering to God the Body of Christ, for the Church is that Body. Just as the supplementary sacrifice of meal and wine is identified with the main sacrifice and accepted as an integral part of it, so too the Church's self-offering is identified with Christ's sacrifice, because the Church


100 McAdoo, "Brevint and the Wesleys," 249.

101 Rattenbury, Eucharistic Hymns, 132-33.
is the Body of Christ. Christ and his people "are accounted for one oblation." (VII.17). We are his body, hence the sacrifice of ourselves is the sacrifice of Christ's body. The offering of bread and wine, mincha and nesekh, is the offering of ourselves, because in the Offertory we are identified with the elements, and by consecration they are returned to us as the gift of the Body and Blood of Christ. Rattenbury says that Brevint does not make these statements explicitly; again, had he the benefit of the full text of XSS he would have found that he did. A paragraph from MR is worth quoting whole, particularly with its note of rejoicing:

This Sacrifice being done [the bringing up of the offertory gifts], immediately after, the primitive Church proceeded to the celebration of the Holy Sacrament: for which she constantly used some part of those offerings, which the people had presented before: thereby imitating, as near as it was possible, both the example of Jesus Christ, who, for the use of the Communion, which he instituted at his last supper, took some of that Bread and Wine which he had sanctified before at the Paschal Oblation: and the nature of those other more ordinary Sacrifices, (whereof the Christian eucharist is a most signal antitype,) which Moses called Shelomim, that is, sacrifices of peace; ere first the Israelites did lay their offerings at God's altar, and where God having graciously accepted of them, did then with part of these, as with a banquet of his own goods, treat them liberally, and bid them to eat and drink, and to rejoice before him at his table. Deuter. 16. 11. So that we have a complete emblem of a perfect communion, where christian people declare by their small oblations, that whatsoever they have is God's: and where God, infinite in mercy, accepting of small offerings, returns and improves them into great sacraments: and here both representing, and sacramentally presenting the body and blood of his Son, declares also thereby, that whatsoever he hath, and whatsoever his Son hath purchased with that body and blood,—heaven, mercy,—and immortal happiness becomes his people's. 102

102 MR, 129.
II.iii The Sacrifice of our Goods and Offerings

The concluding chapter of the book, Chapter VIII, is on the sacrifice of our goods and alms, the "Sacrifice of Justice," Brevint calls it. It explores the "social justice" responsibilities Christians have for the poor and for one another as eucharistic people, and it may well be the most important chapter of the book. The freewill offering of our goods and the peace offering of our praises are the natural consequences of the sacrificial offering of ourselves, just as our selves and bodies become attendant sacrifices, "secondary oblations," accompanying the sacrifice of Christ. Without them our self offering is defective and "mutilated" (VIII.3). Brevint here again discusses the adding of meal offerings to the whole offering of the lamb, and states:

And as the lamb, in the daily sacrifice was never offered without its meat oblation, nor this meat oblation without its incense, its wine, its oil: So the Eternal Son and Lamb of God, who was pleased to offer himself for me, must neither be offered without me; nor whenever I offer up my self, both by him and with him, must I appear as a dry and unsavory meat offering without juice, without sweet smell, without all the holy dispositions of readiness and joy to obey and please my God in all good works, whereof the incense, the wine, and the oil, were under the Law sacred emblems. In a word, whenever we offer our selves, we offer by the self same act, all that we have, all that we can: and so consequently we do engage for all, that it shall be dedicated to the Glory of God, and that it shall be surrendred into his hands, employed to such uses, upon such occasions and times, as he will be pleased to appoint.

103 Brevint here is remarkably similar to Calvin Inst. IV.18.17; the sacrifices of thanksgiving include "all the duties of love." "Also included are all our prayers, praises, thanksgivings, and whatever we do in the worship of God. All these things finally depend upon the greater sacrifice, by which we are consecrated in soul and body to be a holy temple to the Lord." Although this paragraph does not concern the eucharist as such, IV.18 concerns the errors of the mass, and the proper understanding of "eucharist," and "sacrifice."
To offer the person without the attendant goods is, he says, a defective sacrifice, the "sacrifice of fools," referring to Eccl. 5.1,104 akin to offering the bones without the flesh, or to communion in one kind. As in VI.2, he is not explicit in the reference to half-communion; rather he again uses the conventional euphemisms of "mangle" and "mutilate":

It is the same act of an impious wretch to mangle, and to mutilate, either the holy Sacrifice which Jesus hath made to his father, or the holy Sacrament which he hath ordained to his Church, or that holy Oblation, which after his Sacrifice and at his Sacrament he is pleased to require of us. (VIII.4)

All we have is God's, not only because he made it and as Lord has proprietary rights over everything, but is his also because we have given it freely along with ourselves.

The consecration, Brevint says, "becomes a Christian apotheosis," because by it we become capable of Christ's grace, and we are raised to God's immortality;105 but if our possessions, having been offered to God, are put to a profane use, "if Levi come to serve Ashtaroth," then they invoke curses. Thus we must give up all to God, and also avoid the two most odious sins and terrible mischiefs, first of withdrawing from God anything which has been consecrated to him, and secondly misspending our goods profanely, that is, apart from what God permits for our necessities.

104 "Guard your steps when you go to the house of God; to draw near to listen is better than the sacrifice offered by fools; for they do not know how to keep from doing evil. Never be rash with your mouth, nor let your heart be quick to utter a word before God, for God is in heaven, and you upon earth; therefore let your words be few. For dreams come with many cares, and a fool's voice with many words. When you make a vow to God, do not delay fulfilling it; for he has no pleasure in fools. Fulfil what you vow. It is better that you should not vow than that you should vow and not fulfil it." Eccl. 5: 1-5.

105 This "apotheosis" fits well with the concept of the "divinization" of humanity as expressed in Hooker et al. See above, p. 114, n.35.
Of all the liturgical elements Brevint might have emphasised, typically the
consecration, or the fraction and libation, it is the Offertory as oblation and
sacrifice which has for him the greatest theological significance.\textsuperscript{106} He begins
the discussion at VIII.10 that Christians have always offered and distributed
goods in common among themselves at the eucharist, and that it is unclear in the
Apostolic History\textsuperscript{107} whether "breaking of bread" refers to the sacrament
itself or to the offerings of the people. Brevint here mentions that some
Bishops in antiquity used two tables:

One of them was ἐν τοίς θυσιαστήριοι καὶ περιπτάσματος \textit{i.e.},
within that space where the ministers did officiate at the altar, and
where were curtins purposely shut to keep non-Communicants from
the sight of and access to the Holy Mysteries.

The other was for the offerings of the people, from which the elements of the
communion were taken.\textsuperscript{108} This offertory Brevint accepts as being of central
importance to the eucharist, as "representative of all their goods," which is why
the offering precedes communion. This close identification of the sacrament
with the offerings "which went constantly together," is another reason that the

\textsuperscript{106} I must disagree with Stevenson who claims that it was Simon Patrick who
was the first known writer to connect the alms as the oblations offered with the
bread and wine in the 1662 Offertory, and Stevenson notices Patrick's appeal to
early liturgies; Stevenson, \textit{Covenant of Grace}, 157. If this portion of Brevint's
book was composed during his time with the Princess of Turenne, then it
antedates Patrick. Rather than seeing either Brevint or Patrick as innovators,
however, it might be more accurate to view the coincidence as reflecting common
opinion of the time.

\textsuperscript{107} It seems that Brevint means the \textit{Ecclesiastical History} of Gelasius of
Cyzicus, to which he had referred earlier in VII.14. Gelasius' history was of the
Nicaean council. Here in VIII.10 Brevint simply refers to the "Apostolical History"
without amplification.

\textsuperscript{108} This conclusion is supported in Jungmann \textit{Missarum Sollemnia}; but neither
Brevint nor Jungmann are explicit re. their sources. Joseph A. Jungmann,
Brevint's ideas of the eschatological significance of the Offertory may have been
earlier hinted at when he spoke of God's setting up a table by his Altar (III.10).
eucharist was called by Irenaeus and others "promiscuously as Sacrament, or Sacrifice."

Brevint is more expansive in MR. He affirms again that the Offertory in ancient times was called "the oblation," out of which the eucharistic elements were taken; and then he specifically calls them shelomim, because the elements are given to God, who blesses them, and then all share in the sacred banquet with rejoicing. In XSS VIII.9 Brevint repeats this, footnoting both in Hebrew and Greek that the "peace offerings" are שלוסים, εἰρήνεια εὐχαριστία.

In his discussion of the 1552 BCP, Dix, equating the Offertory with the element of "taking" in the "four-fold shape," wrote that Cranmer reduced it almost to the point of non-existence. His evaluation of Cranmer aside, such an accusation cannot be levelled at Brevint. This whole of Chapter VIII is concerned with the offertory as a material and representative sacrifice of our goods, representing ourselves.

While on the subject of Dix, it must be noted that his identification of the "four-fold shape" of the liturgy was no news to the seventeenth century, especially among the Puritans. Several writers such as Ames, Perkins, Baxter, and particularly Owen explicitly affirmed that the presiding minister was to observe four essential "manual acts" during the celebration of the Lord's Supper, which themselves were essential to a full and complete consecration: to take the bread and wine; bless it; break the bread (and pour the wine); and


110 See Reynolds, "Sacrifices by Resemblance," 83, for further discussion of Dix on this point, as it affects the Book of Common Prayer.
then distribute communion. Brevint also notes the four-fold shape explicitly in MR.\textsuperscript{111}

The specific discussion of alms begins in VIII.12, in which Brevint states that each person must give according to his means, and the actual amount and proportion is not dictated by scripture. The Law prescribed for the Jews "as fathers do with children in an age unfit to guide it self" what their offering were to be: but now the Gospel has freed Christians from such "punctual pedagogy" and each is free to give according to his conscience; but in the last resort, because we are free and accountable, we are obliged to do as well as, in fact better than, did the Jews, whose righteousness and charity we are commanded to exceed. Brevint lists several of these Old Testament obligations: a tenth of everything annually, another tenth every third year, and whatever grew of itself every seventh year; presumably the reader is also to know about the commands to lend without interest, not to glean nor to harvest to the corners of the fields.\textsuperscript{112}

Here then a downright Christian will do well to take notice, of what all these charges may come to, and what proportion they will bear with the estate and revenue that God blesses him with, that so he may contribute towards works of piety and charity, not only so

\textsuperscript{111} MR, 284. Perkins too finds the same "four-fold shape" as Dix; Perkins, \textit{Works}, 222-23, as did Cotton who wrote that the bread and wine are to be 1) taken; 2) blessed and consecrated (that is, a thanksgiving given over them to set them apart); 3) the bread broken (there is no order for pouring the wine, and in this context he uses a word from Hooker, \textit{synecdoche}); and 4) the elements are to be a) given b) received, and c) eaten; Mather, \textit{Companion for Communicants}, 22-25. An early advocate of the "four-fold shape" was Thomas Cooper, defending Jewel's "Challenge" sermon, in his \textit{Answer in Defence of the Truth Against the Apology of the Private Mass} (1562), Parker Society v. 12, (Cambridge: University Press, 1859), 71. Gordon Maitland, "The 'Four-Action' Shape of the Liturgy Revisited: Was Dix the First to Suggest a Four-Fold Shape?" Unpublished paper read at the annual meeting of Societas Liturgica, Dublin, 1995.

\textsuperscript{112} Deut. 12:17; 14:28; 23:19,20; 24:21; 26:12; Lev. 19:9; 23:22; 25:36,37; Ex. 22: 25.
much but more; and if not in the very same, yet in as good a kind as the Jews did. So that he may go beyond them in charity, whom the Gospel commands us to exceed in all other virtues, as we exceed them in blessings.\(^{113}\)

Although this is called charity, Brevint says that the Jews called it "justice," because it was commanded by Law. Our sacrifices in this kind are best set aside daily, first to make them easier to bear, and secondly so that we may daily discipline ourselves in holiness; and especially at the time of unexpected good fortune. We have received all we have from God; and we have offered it all back to God. Some we keep for our own use and necessities; some is required of us to give up back to God.

Brevint then associates these offerings with the necessity of pious good works which need to accompany them; since Christ's own time the Church has depended upon the offering of people like Susanna and other religious women (Luke 8:3), which goods given to the church are received truly by Christ as if they had been given directly to him. Good moral works Brevint relates to the "heave offerings" which are made holy only by the Holy Spirit; without the Spirit they might be good works, of benefit to others, but are not accepted as a sacrifice by God.

Again, Brevint is not unique in his explication of alms and good works as eucharistic sacrifices. Patrick certainly does, as do Andrewes in his "Imaginations" sermon and Perkins in *Reformed Catholic*.\(^{114}\) But it is Hamon L'Estrange whose exposition is most like Brevint's, explicitly connecting the sacrifice of the eucharist with the Offertory. In the *Alliance of Divine Offices* L'Estrange says that the first of the sacrifices and oblations in the Eucharist is

---

\(^{113}\) An allusion to Matthew 5:20?

\(^{114}\) Reynolds, "Sacrifices by Resemblance," 84.
"the bringing of our gifts to the altar." L'Estrange comments that there are four species of sacrifices at the eucharist, and his comments are worth repeating at some length, for his tone is remarkably similar to Brevint's:

The whole action of the sacred Communion is elemented of nothing but sacrifices and oblations. So in our Church, so in the Apostolic, which should be the grand exemplar to all....These sacrifices and oblations we may cast into four partitions, and find them all in the primitive, and in our service....The first is the bringing of our gifts to the Altar, that is, the species and elements of the sacred symbols, and withal some overplus, according to our abilities, for relief of the poor. And this eleemosynary offering is a sacrifice, so called, Phil. iv. 18 and Heb. xii. 16, and declared to be "well pleasing to God:" pleasing to God, though extended to the poor: these have a warrant of attorney from God Himself to receive our alms. "He that hath pity on the poor, lendeth to the Lord," Prov. xix. 17. So that when we come together to break bread, in the Scripture notion, that is, to communicate, we must break it to the hungry, to God Himself in his poor members, as ever we expect a share in that last Venite, "Come ye blessed," &c." 119

L'Estrange writes of the specifically sacrificial character of this "eleemosynary" offering of alms and compassion. 116 The remaining three sacrifices are 1) the consecration of the elements, "whereby they become that Sacrament for which they are set apart and deputed." 2) the sacrifice of praises and prayers, which are called sacrifices, (Ps. 1.23, cxii.2; Heb. v.7, and xii.15); and 3) the oblation of ourselves, of our souls and bodies (Rom xii.1).

Brevint's discussion is remarkably similar, and he, like L'Estrange, cites Phil. 4:18 to explain. 117 In Chapter VIII.14 Brevint writes of "charitable assistances" which are the sacrifice of justice, or the "acceptable sacrifice."


116 eleemosyne, compassion, or alms for the poor.

117 Philippians 4:18b: "I have received from Epaphroditus the gifts you sent, a fragrant offering, a sacrifice acceptable and pleasing to God." This verse is also used by Calvin himself when discussing the spiritual sacrifices of good works; Inst. IV.18.16.
Therefore it is clear that part of the self-offering of the Church in the Eucharist is the offering of care and alms for those naked, hungry, sick or in prison, the "least of these my brethren." Part of the sacrificial element of eucharistic worship is the offering of our alms for the poor, the Sacrifice of Justice, without which our eucharistic worship is meaningless.

It is by no means clear that Brevint was borrowing from L'Estrange; but again it is seen that Brevint was entirely within the common eucharistic teaching of his time. Simon Patrick also connected alms with the eucharistic sacrifice:

We must not when we come to God appear before him empty, but we are to consecrate and offer unto him some of our temporal goods for the relief of those that are in want, which may cause many thanksgivings to be sent up by them to God.\(^\text{118}\)

John Buckeridge in his funeral sermon for Lancelot Andrewes insisted that the eucharist is defective without distribution of relief for the poor:

Now as it is not enough to feed our own souls, unless we also feed both the souls and bodies of the poor, and there is no true fast unless we distribute that to the poor which we deny to our own bellies and stomachs; and there cannot be a perfect and complete adoration to God in our devotions, unless there be also doing good and distributing to our neighbours; therefore to the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving in the Eucharist in the Church...we must also add beneficence and communication....So then offer the sacrifice of praise to God daily in the church...and distribute and communicate the sacrifice of compassion and alms to the poor out of the church.\(^\text{119}\)

This aspect of the Sacrifice of Justice has found admirable expression in our own time. During the 1923 Anglo-Catholic Congress Bishop Frank Weston preached:

I say to you, and I say it to you with all the earnestness that I have, that if you are prepared to fight for the right of adoring

\(^{118}\) Patrick, Menza Mystica, 36. See also Stevenson, Covenant of Grace, 157: "the spiritual sacrifice of ourselves, and the corporal sacrifice of our goods to him..." from Patrick, Menza Mystica, (1858), 114f.

\(^{119}\) Buckeridge, "Funeral Sermon," 267.
Jesus in the Blessed Sacrament, then you have got to come out from behind your tabernacle, and walk, with Christ mystically present in you, out into the streets of this country, and find the same Jesus in the people of your cities and your villages. You cannot claim to worship Jesus in the tabernacle if you do not pity Jesus in the slum....If you say that the Anglo-Catholic has a right to hold his peace while his fellow-citizens are living in hovels below the level of the streets, this I say to you, that you do not yet know the Lord Jesus in his sacrament....

**Election and Predestination**

Brevint does not anywhere discuss or analyze this touchy issue, much as it has determined in many ways the differences between Laudian and Puritan. Nevertheless, three comments gleaned from two books provide us with some small insight into his opinions, without actually being declarations of doctrine. He seems to have held rather more humanist views regarding election and predestination than perhaps his father might have. He agreed with the typically Calvinist assertion of the "total depravity" of human faculties:

> look upon what I have of thee, some small remnant of thine image, some small beginnings of thy grace, and some light sparks of thy spirit. But because all these are defective, supply them. O Lord, with thy mercy, and with the sacrifice of thy Son. (VI.5)

But in MR he makes statements which many Puritans might have found lacking, and certainly amenable to the thought of Amyraut and Arminius.

> Certainly God the Father hath abundantly asserted his love and respect for his Son in this behalf, when He hath accepted of one

---

120 A sermon preached at the Anglo-Catholic Congress 1923, quoted in Kenneth Leech, *Care and Conflict: Leaves from a pastoral notebook* (London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1990), 159. This is the social justice side of the eucharist, the side that takes James 2:14-17 seriously: "What good is it, my brothers and sisters, if you say you have faith but do not have works? Can faith save you? If a brother or sister is naked and lacks daily food, and one of you says to them, "Go in peace; keep warm and eat your fill," and yet you do not supply their bodily needs, what is the good of that? So faith by itself, if it has no works, is dead."
oblation of his upon the cross, for a sacrifice of an everlasting virtue, to satisfy the most implacable justice, to expiate the foulest sins, to wipe off the guilt of the whole world, and to redeem without any exception all men, who come to Him. So that if any one man perish, it is not for any want in the sacrifice, which either some other, or the same being reiterated, must supply; but it is for want of coming, that is, of faith and repentance in the sinner, to make use of the sacrifice.121

There is no hint of limited atonement, effectual calling or temporary faith here. But in XSS Brevint does however hint at extra ecclesiam nulla salus est. As the anamnesis of the eucharist collapses time into a single event, so also it collapses space. The sacrifice of Christ extends to all times and places so that all humanity is represented in his perpetual intercession. All persons are called to communion with Christ, but those who do not join themselves to Christ in his sacrifice cannot be saved by that sacrifice. (VII.12)

There is one more passage of some interest regarding grace, good works and sanctification: in V.5 Brevint writes of our growing into the stature which would be able to bear eternal glory, for we are as yet "too vile vessels." Then he says "Till we acquire by grace and pious endeavors a greater perfection."

This is repeated in the prayer at the end of the chapter: "Lord Jesu! who hast ordained this mystery for a Communion of thy Body: for a Means of advancement and proficiency in holiness...." (V.12) Such statements of the mutual contribution of grace and works, and the affirmation of progressive sanctification, may be at first glance rather surprising to find in a Calvinist who so easily uses Beza, but is by no means unique to Brevint, and might well

---

121 MR, 148-9, emphasis mine.
place him among those of the "holy living" school of English Divines of whom Allison so vigorously disapproves.  

**Vestments**

In VII.17 Brevint refers to the vestments of the Aaronic priesthood, typologically representing the "holy dispositions, and as it were, sacerdotal ornaments," the "personal and priestly endowments" of Jesus' disciples "considered as they are priests." There is, he says, a correspondence between officiating at one altar and the other "with all the proper attire of Aaron" and "without indecency." Admittedly if this is an approval of eucharistic vesture it is indirect, but it is as close as one can expect to get for those with the eyes to see, as it were. Evelyn's *Diary* records that Brevint was himself ordained wearing the surplice.

On the other hand, and perhaps more likely, Brevint may not be talking about physical garments at all, but rather about spiritual preparedness. The "holy dispositions" of the Christian disciple are analogous to the vesture of the Aaronic priesthood, representing preparedness and spiritual covering of the "secular" self before worship. This seems to be Brevint's Old Testament version of the "wedding garment" image often used by others.

---

122 Allison, *Rise of Moralism*. His argument that writers such as Taylor, Hammond and Bull are unorthodox because they shifted the formal cause of justification from grace to faith, is vulnerable to the criticism that Allison himself has failed to distinguish adequately between justification and sanctification. Progressive, as opposed to imputed, sanctification is also espoused by Wesley, and the modern Methodist theologian Stanley Hauerwas has examined Wesley's and Calvin's views of sanctification and development of moral character; *Character and the Christian Life: A Study in Theological Ethics* (San Antonio: Trinity University Press, 1975), 183-219. Brevint thus represents another important link between Calvin and Wesley.
Brevint's discussion is strikingly similar to Herbert's poem, "Aaron":

Holiness on the head,  
Light and perfections on the breast,  
Harmonious bells below, raising the dead  
To lead them unto life and rest:  
Thus are true Aarons dressed.

Profaneness in my head,  
Defects and darkness in my breast,  
A noise of passions ringing me for dead  
Unto a place where is no rest:  
Poor priest, thus am I dressed.

Only another head  
I have, another heart and breast,  
Another music, making live, not dead,  
Without whom I could have no rest:  
In him I am well dressed.

Christ is my only head,  
My alone only heart and breast,  
My only music, striking me even dead,  
That to the old man I may rest,  
And be in him new dressed.

So, holy in my head,  
Perfect and light in my dear breast,  
My doctrine tuned by Christ, who is not dead  
But lives in me while I do rest,  
Come, people; Aaron's dressed. (1633)

Richard Sibbes provides a good example of this approach. William Laud is often noted for his liturgical "innovations," which he defended by quoting "Worship the Lord in the Beauty of Holiness." Sibbes too was concerned with beauty, but in good Puritan tradition he expounded spiritual rather than external or physical beauty. In his "A Breathing After God" he mused that the Church, that is the people of God themselves, is beautiful. The means of salvation make the church beautiful; the word, sacraments and government (i.e. discipline), all make the church lovely and delight the spiritual senses.

---

123 Ps. 29.2; 96.9; I Chr. 16.29.
Sibbes included under worship "the ordinance of the Word," that is, preaching is itself sacramental. With specific reference to the eucharist he wrote:

[T]he sacrament, it is a sweet and delightful thing. There is a wondrous beauty in the sacrament; for therein we taste the love of God, and the love of Christ.

We are truly partakers of the body and blood of Christ as surely as we are partakers of the bread and wine he says. Church discipline, what Sibbes called "government," purges the scandalous, which cleanses the church and makes it beautiful. The praises of God are, he said, beautiful marvellous sweet and delightful:

It is a marvellous sweet thing, when all as one man hear together, pray together, sing together hymns, and spiritual songs, and praise God together, and receive the sacrament together, all as one man,—what a comely thing is this to a spiritual eye! Every Christian hath a beauty severed in himself; but when all meet together, this is more excellent. As we say of the via lactea, or milky way in the heavens (we call it so), it is nothing but a deal of light from a company of little stars, that makes a glorious lustre. So if there be a beauty in every poor Christian, what a beauty is there when all meet together.124

This cannot be used to defend Laud's revival of ceremonial, vestments and the decoration of churches; but it no less exhibits the concern for human delight in the service of God. Thus "beauty in holiness" was for Laud and Cosin a concern for institutional beauty and order, for Sibbes was an inward, spiritual beauty of holiness of the individual Christian. Brevint may have been pulling for both. In The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice Daniel Brevint never considers subjects such as external ceremony, liturgical form, episcopal legitimacy, or ecclesial hospitality. Furthermore there are themes common in the seventeenth century which Brevint avoids. Even though his book draws from and alludes to

Scripture at every opportunity, Brevint never explicitly examines subjects such as the dependence of the sacrament upon the word, the necessity of preaching, the worthiness of the presiding minister, the resolving of cases of tender conscience, and the minute spiritual scrutiny of the worthy communicant. Brevint uses both "communion table" and "altar"; he calls the Lord's Supper "Eucharist," "sacrament" and "ordinance." He exhibits typically Calvinist convictions such as total depravity, and yet implies universal atonement, and the contribution of good works to our sanctification. He strongly alludes to the propriety of the mingled chalice; he encourages frequent, perhaps even daily reception; he even obliquely approves of ritual gestures and bodily worship, and of liturgical vesture. For him the sacrament is a means of grace, both a sign and seal, and "the renewal of the covenant of his saving grace." (VIII.12) Finally, as the Puritans followed Beza's methodological turn to scholasticism away from Calvin's humanism, Brevint also promoted Beza's ideas, but on the eucharist rather than on divine election.

There is also a distinct lack of reference in XSS to contemporary political, historical and theological context. In Chapter I he laments the Roman and Zwinglian abuses of the sacrament, and then near the end of the book expresses regret that the communion has become less common than preaching and prayer (VIII.14). Only in two places does he allude to specific events: first to the waves of iconoclasm he must have witnessed before his ejection from Oxford, referring to those "rebels who pull down their princes' statues" noted above;

---

125 They are first mentioned together in the first paragraph of the book in I.1.

126 Although in XSS he often says "holy eucharist," and even more often "blessed communion," in MR he speaks of the "Blessed eucharist," 283.

127 The elements are seals of the covenant, VI.5; and the Gospel sacraments are "true seals and tables of the new Law," VIII.8.
and the second to serving Christ himself by helping "an afflicted church"\(^\text{128}\) as an example of pious good works (VIII.16).

The unique contribution of Brevint is that these many ideas from many sources are skilfully brought together into a coherent presentation which, to those of the conventional "Anglican-Puritan" theological divide, would have seemed to be incommensurable. To label Brevint as either a Puritan or a Laudian would be incorrect, but there is no doubt that he is in truth a Calvinist. His thoroughly christocentric and biblical sacramentalism exhibits affinities with both, and he easily draws from both the supposedly antagonistic "Anglicans" and "Puritans." Brevint's little book contributed little that is unique in itself, but he seems to have been diligent in being as comprehensive as possible, including as many topics and illustrations as he could from as many sources as were available. It is not so much that *The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice* transcends the categories as it shows that the categories are later interpretive impositions on the actual state of affairs.

\(^{128}\) Again a sentiment expressed in Evelyn's account of Brevint's ordination, *Diary*, 269.
CONCLUSION

The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice typifies the thoroughly Calvinist eucharistic theology of the English divines of the Caroline period, and Brevint's devotional manual became so popular and influential precisely because it represented, and shared much in common with, the best eucharistic writing of the time. It witnesses to the significant theological consensus regarding the holy communion in its use of images and arguments which were the common currency of writers of the period, both those who have been classed as anti-Calvinist Caroline Divines and the reformed-scholastic Puritans. The division of the Church of England into two opposed theological camps, Anglican (or Laudian or Arminian, or Caroline) and Puritan, seems then to be largely artificial, at least in terms of the theology of the eucharist.

The rejection of the sacramental conclusions of both the council of Trent and of the Protestant "sacramentarians" is not to be seen as a via media taken by Brevint or anyone else. Rather, in the rejection of both, he is adopting a third, not a middle, way, in the direction so remarkably blazed by Calvin, Bucer, Martyr and others of the Strassburg or Rhineland consensus. In its theology of the eucharist the teaching of the English Church has been predominantly Calvinist, although the Church did face internal disagreement regarding the authority of the conclusions of Dortrecht.

An example of a more modern author of similar eucharistic devotion is William Bright (d. 1901). He was an enthusiastic high churchman, Regius professor of ecclesiastical history at Oxford, and dedicated to the study of the
Fathers. We still sing his eucharistic hymns such as "And now, O Father, mindful of the love," and this one in particular from 1866 which shows a great affinity with Brevint's expression of eucharistic faith:

Once, only once, and once for all
his precious life he gave;
before the cross our spirits fall
and own it strong to save.

'One offering single and complete,'
with lips and heart we say;
but what he never can repeat
he shows forth day by day.

For, as the priest of Aaron's line
within the holiest stood,
and sprinkled all the mercy-shrine
with sacrificial blood,

so he, who once atonement wrought,
our Priest of endless power,
presents himself for those he bought
in that dark noontide hour.

His Manhood pleads where now it lives
on heaven's eternal throne,
and where in mystic rite he gives
its presence to his own.

And so we show thy death, O Lord,
till thou again appear;
and feel, when we approach thy board,
we have an altar here.

All the ideas and images used in this hymn were commonplace in the seventeenth century, and in bringing them together in this particular manner, it is difficult to imagine that its author had not himself just come from reading Brevint when he wrote it.
Appendix 1

Correspondence from Jersey recommending Brevint for the Oxford fellowship.

GUI.LAUD 4. 1637

A letter to the archbishop of Canterbury about the fellowships for Jersey men.


Most honourable and most reverend father in God. Having credibly understood that your grace hath been pleased to procure and settle three fellowships in several colleges of Oxford, for the advancement and maintenance of young students born in these remote islands; we acknowledge ourselves with all dutiful humility much bound and obliged to your grace for this your undeserved care and kindness; and we had sooner exprest our humble and hearty thankfulness for so great and unexpected a benefit, had we not waited for a fit person to prefer to your grace to reap the fruits of that gift, his majesty hath been pleased to bestow upon us by your gracious hands. There was none fitter to present and recommend to your most honourable acceptance, than this very hopeful young man Mr. Daniel Brevin, of whom we conceive a good opinion, for his learning and piety, so that he shall be capable within a short time to serve in the ministry in this our isle; for we trust that is the end and intent of the bestowing of these places. We therefore with all humble submission beseech your grace to be pleased to accept of him, seeing he hath been persuaded to leave his hopes of preferment in the university of Saumur in France, where he hath proceeded master of arts with good approbation, and hath promised to be ready for the island's service when occasion shall be offered. Thus with our hearty prayers unto God for your long life and prosperity we ever remain

Your grace's most humble servants,

Ela Clock, rector of the parish of St. Ouen
Edela Selair, min.
Bea. Billon.
Ph. Carteret.
E. Carteret.
Carteret
P. Jautrait, min.
D. Gruchy, min.
Tho. Payne, min.
R. Collet, min.
Bandinel commissarius domini decari

Jersey 1st of April 1637

Appendix 2

The Correspondence of William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury and Chancellor of Oxford University regarding the incorporation of Daniel Brevint's Saumur M.A.

(May 19, 1637, From Laud to the vice chancellor.)

Sir,
I would have you send for Mr. Brevin, and let him know not only the difference of a master of art at Oxford and Saumure, but the ill consequences also, which may follow upon it, in case he should have his degree confirmed; and that I advise him to go the other way, and to stay half a year, and so to be created master, and that in the mean time I will speak with his friends here: but certainly for aught appears to me yet, or is like to appear, I will never give way to the confirming of his degree, things being at Saumure as you have reported them.

(Nov. 3 1637. Laud to the vice chancellor.)

Sir,
I am glad to hear the Guernsey man is so well a deserver in Jesus college, and as glad that he wants but a quarter of a year of full time to be a master of art. I pray persuade with the young man to stay, and then give him his degree with as much honour as you please. And you may tell Dr. Mansel [principal of Jesus] the jealousies which I have against the making of a precedent in the other way by incorporation, as the case stands. And though the marginal statute indulge to the king's subjects in his own universities, yet that is nothing to Saumure. And therefore certainly I shall not like that which is desired.

(November 1638  From the vice chancellor.)

Concerning the incorporation of the Guernsey man mentioned page 210, there hath at his humble suit been a new consideration taken by the vice-chancellor and the heads for the statutableness thereof. And it was found upon this review, that the statutes considered two sorts of men. The first are such as never have been members of our university or Cambridge. Of these treat the statutes, the first de incorporations, and seem to distinguish them into aliens and natives: the second sort are such as have been students sometime in either of the universities. As for the natives (in which number the Guernsey man is) the words of the statutes are, Quibus incorporari permittitur, et tempore in academia sua requisito, et praestitis orius exercitiis, gradus susceperint.

Upon which words the question was whether a native having taken a degree in a foreign university, might call that academiam suam, which is resolved by the use of the same word suos twice in the same paragraph, where it stands

---

1 i.e. of the original ms. It is the preceding letter.
indefinitely for any university, where either foreigner or native hath taken his degree. As in this form, —Ut admittature ad eundem gradum, &c. quibus ornatus est apud suos. Whereupon it was judged by the heads, that there was no bar in statute to exclude the Guernsey man (he producing first letters testimonial of the university, where he proceeded, that he had spent as much time in his studies there, as is required by the orders of that university, and that he had performed his exercise) from the benefit of incorporation.

Appendix 3

An account of the ordination of John Durell and Daniel Brevint. This version, also by Evelyn, is more detailed, and probably more accurately dated, than is that found in the usual editions of his Diary.

**Extract out of my Diary: Paris.**
1651. 1 of June, Trinity Sunday.

The Dean of Peterborough preach'd on XX John, 21, 22, That no man might assume to himself the ministry; but was to receive it, for 'tis said Receive, not take, the Holy Ghost, and our Lord Christ breath'd on His Apostles, inferring from hence the use of Ceremonys in the Church, on this and other solemn occasions, lawfully impos'd and recommended by the Superintendents and Governors of the Church for decency, order's sake, and edification: such as the laying on of hands, and other rites, as accompanied the inflation, &c. After this followed the ordination of two young students, Mr. Durell, since the Dean of Windsor, and Mr. Brevint, both of Jersey, after the Restoration Prebendary of Durham, who had passed their Academick studys att Caen, or Saumur, I know not whether.

The old and venerable Bishop of Galloway setting forth the dignity and weight of so sublime a calling as that to the ministry of the Gospel, previous to which he had made a very learned discourse concerning the orders and decrees of such as were admitted teachers and sufficiently qualifiyd and approv'd in the Primitive times, and antient church; concluded with an exhortation to the persons to be ordain'd, and the necessity of supplying the wants of the Church of England, lyeing under the persecution and calamity then tending to a total desolation, and the reproaches of the Roman Church, and other enemies and enthusiasts, and so few Bishops remaining amongst the English clergy, as durst publickly own this important service, by which the people were depriv'd of their lawfull pastors, wandering about and every day perverted by the new preachers under the usurpers. Upon which it was thought expedient those two persons (examin'd and qualify'd with good testimonials) shou'd be made Deacons and Priests att the same time. The Bishop being all this time seated in an arm'd chair near the altar cover'd with purple damask, and a canopy of the same. The Dean of P[eterborough] presenting the two persons to the Bishops, proceed'd with the Office or Ordination &c. There was an infinite croud of people, both French and others, who came out of curiosity, as well as such of the English Clergy, as were in Paris and of his Majesty's chaplains then in waiting, and assisting the Bishop with all decency and becoming gravity. There was also the Holy Sacrament, which I forgot to mention in its place, att which, I think, all the English communicated.

The wholy ceremony and service was perform'd in Sir Richard Browne's Chappell in the Fauxbourgs St. Germain, att whose table they all din'd, Bishop, Dean, &c.

Appendix 4

Dating Brevint's episcopal ordination.

The precise date of Brevint's episcopal ordination is difficult to establish. It is not known when Brevint received presbyterian ordination, as he must have done before taking up duties as Rector of Grouville following his ejection from Oxford. Certainly his father, Daniel Sr., who was at the time still Rector of St. John's was presbyterially ordained, as was Cosmo Brevint before him.

Evelyn's published Diary dates Daniel Jr.'s episcopal ordination in Paris to Trinity Sunday, 12 June 1650. Yet the ms. extract from the his diary included in Cosin's Correspondence (Surtees Society), written in Evelyn's hand, records the date as Trinity Sunday, 1 June 1651. (See above, Appendix 3).

The difficulties begin with the fact that in the mid-seventeenth century France was using "New Style" dating, that is, the Gregorian Calendar, while England was still using "Old Style," that is, the Julian, which differed at the time by ten days. An event taking place in Paris should be easy to date, except that it was a Church of England ordination in the chapel of the English Ambassador to France, and was recorded by his son-in-law, the famous English diarist; either style of dating could have been used. But again, for diplomatic reasons, Richard Browne's English chapel may have correlated its observance of the Liturgical Calendar with local Roman Catholic usage.

Complicating this is the change from reckoning New Year from Lady Day, 23 March, to 1 January. Thus events taking place between January and March might well be dated to either of two different years, e.g. 1650/51. Since, however, Brevint's ordination was apparently in June, this should not have been a contributing factor.

Nevertheless, in neither 1650 nor 1651 (old style) does 12 June fall on a Sunday; 1 June 1650 is not a Sunday, although 1 June 1651 is. This then would seem to be the most reliable date, but Evelyn's accounts remain inescrutable because neither date is Trinity Sunday, that is, the eighth Sunday following Easter. Easter 1650 fell on 14 April, (24 April n.s.), making Trinity Sunday June 9 (or 19). In 1651 Easter fell on 30 March (9 April), making Trinity May 25 (or 4 June). June 1 1651 is the First Sunday after Trinity.

Venables in the Dictionary of National Biography settled on 22 June 1651 for some unexplained reason, which was also a Sunday. The Bulletin of the Société Jersaiase VII notices the disagreement between the DNB and de Schicler's The Refugee Churches in England, which accepted Evelyn's other date of 12 June 1650.

To conclude: it seems best to retain the 1 June 1651 date which Evelyn's account preserved in Cosin's Correspondence records; it precedes the occupation of Jersey by Parliament, and it follows the death of Daniel Brevint Sr., who, if he was as convinced a Genevan presbyterian as is recorded, would have vigorously disapproved of his son's seeking episcopal orders. Having preached before the young Charles II and James II, and being brother-in-law to George Carteret, Brevint was now in the position of ecclesiastical advancement in the Church of England, which may partly explain his decision to be episcopally ordained.
He was not unique in his decision: Simon Patrick had received presbyterial ordination in 1648, but after reading Hammond and Thorndike sought out episcopal ordination from Joseph Hall in 1654. He was dean of Peterborough while Brevint was at Lincoln, and was consecrated Bishop of Chichester in 1688. If Brevint's reasons for reordination were similarly theological, they have not been recorded.
Appendix 5

Chasing down a bluff: Brevint's preferred Bible

In his discussion in Chapter VII of the Church's being joined into the sacrifice of Christ there is an puzzling sidetrack. In VII.9, Brevint writes:

The second necessary condition to the aforesaid imputation ... and to incorporate us into the sacrifice of Christ's body, is a serious resolution to piety, and universal consecrating both of our persons and of all our actions to God. "I am crucified with Christ, that I may live to God. Now it is not I that live, but Christ lives in me, and the life which I now lead in the Flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me." (Gal. 2. 19.)

This place must be so rendered according to the distinction of both the Greek Copies, and all the Oriental versions. And this act of the Church consecrating her self to God, and joining her self so to Christ as to make but one oblation with him, is the mystery represented by the daily sacrifice. (Exod. 29.38. Numb. 28. 3.)

Brevint here is anxious that the correct translation of Galatians be used in order to make his point. This poses the question of what the alternatives might have been, and when compared, there is indeed a difference in the text between Brevint's rendering and that of other translations available at the time.

Brevint, as above reads:

I am crucified with Christ, that I may live to God. Now it is not I that live, but Christ lives in me, and the life which I now lead in the Flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.

In the Latin, Geneva and Authorized Versions, the phrase "that I may live to God," precedes rather than follows "I have been crucified with Christ":

(19) for I through the Lawe am dead to the Lawe, and that I might liue unto God, I am crucified with Christ. (20) Thus I liue, yet not I nowe, but Christ liueth in mee: and in that I now liue in the flesh, I liue by the faith in the Sonne of God, who hath loued mee, and giuen himself for me. (Geneva, 1589)

(19) For I through the law am dead to the law, that I might live unto God. (20) I am crucified with Christ. Nevertheless, I live, yet not I, but Christ liueth in me, and the life which I now liue in the flesh, I liue by the faith of the sonne of God, who loued mee, and gave himself for mee. (AV, 1611)

(19) For I, through the Law, am dead to the law, that I may live to God: with Christ I am nailed to the cross. (20) And I live, now not I; but Christ liveth in me. And that I live now in the flesh; I live
in the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and delivered himself for me. (Riems-Douay 1582)

The variation in the versification amongst the versions provides a clue: Brevint places v. 20 as does the Vulgate, differently than do the others. There is, however, an old French translation of the Scriptures whose versification and text both match Brevint's at this point:

(19) Car par la Loy je suis mort à la Loy: & suis crucifié avec Iesus Christ, afin que je vive à Dieu. (20) Ainsi je vi, non point maintenant moy, mais Christ vit en moy: & ce que je vi maintenant en la chair, je ve en la foy du Fils de Dieu, qui m'a aimé, & s'est baïUB soy-mesme pour moy.²

This then would seem to be Brevint's preferred translation, and he is evidently aware that it differs from most English and the Latin translations. Wesley apparently was aware of it too, and simply omitted the troublesome clause. The Abridgement at this point reads: "I am crucified with Christ. Now I live not (saith the Christian) but Christ liveth in me. And the Life which I now live in the Flesh, I live by Faith in the Son of God."

However, Brevint is caught. Although differences in versification has been noted, there is no Greek variant of this passage on which to justify this minor change in wording.³ His caution that "This place must be so rendered according to the distinction of both the Greek Copies, and all the Oriental versions" seems to be merely an academic bluff should anyone point out that his translation does not match most of the others generally available. Why he should do this is unclear; a change in the wording of this passage has no effect on his argument.

---

² La Bible, par François Perrin, pour Antione Vincent, MDLXVI (1566, Trinity College, Toronto). This text does not match the 1669 French Bible translated from the Geneva for the Flemish Walloons:

(19) Car par la Loi je suis mort à la Loi: afin que je vive à Dieu. (20) Je suis crucifié avec Christ, & vis, non point maintenant moi, mais Christ vit en moi: & ce que je vis maintenant en la char, je vis en la fois de Fils de Dieu, qui m'a aimé, & qui s'est donné soy-mesme pour moi.

Appendix 6

Frontispieces.

The frontispiece used in all three editions of the *Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice* is worthy of some closer examination. It is of Jesus presiding at the Last Supper with John reclining on his breast. The man immediately to John's right in the engraving is also beardless and has closely cropped hair, which is unusual for such a picture. He is gazing steadily upon Jesus himself, and what little of his garb to be seen seems almost to be modern, with an open-necked collar. I think that this might well be a portrait of Brevint himself, though perhaps it may be the artist. The picture has a political slant as well: The table, patently too small for dinner for 13, is fully covered as though with a "Laudian" frontal, and there are two very tall candlesticks, one on either end of the mensa; perhaps indicating divine approbation of Caroline liturgical preferences. Thus from its outset the book reveals its political affiliation: Puritans would have hated this picture.

The candlesticks effectively divide the three central figures of Jesus, John, and presumably Peter, from the remaining disciples who are assembled in two symmetrical groups of five at either end of the table. The architecture of the very tall upper room is "classical revival" particularly with the temple-like portico with broken pediment framing Jesus from behind, indicating that the Last Supper is re-presented by the Holy Communion in the present; Judas is foreground left, complete with dagger and money bag. On the floor beside him is a large ornate basin containing vessels, presumably for footwashing.

The following two images are the same picture but have reproduced differently from the microform versions.
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Saul and Samuel at Endor. The first image depicts the antiChrist wearing the papal tiara; the second, apparently from the same edition of the book, has the hair and staff of the antiChrist altered, but in all other ways is identical.
Frontispiece from Wheatly's *A Rational Illustration of the Book of Common Prayer*.
Frontispiece from Taylor's *The Worthy Communicant*. 
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THE CHRISTIAN SACRAMENT AND SACRIFICE

A Note on the Text

The most recent edition of The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice in its entirety was printed in 1847, combined with Brevint’s Missale Romanum, (Oxford: for J. Vincent; London: Hatchard & Son, 1847) but it is no longer readily available. The editor’s name is not given, and whoever it was made many careless, though generally harmless, copying errors. A short biographical notice included by way of a preface was simply the entry from H.J. Rose’s Biographical Dictionary, supplemented by a commendatory paragraph taken from Waterland’s "The Christian Sacrifice Explained," (Waterland’s Works, 1823). Brevint’s works were to have been collected and printed in the Library of Anglo Catholic Theology, but such an edition, like the works of many other seventeenth century authors intended for inclusion, was never produced.

This present text has been prepared from the first Oxford edition, 1673 (Wing B 1198). The second and third editions of 1673 and 1679 are, apart from one or two minor alterations, materially identical, differing only in such minutiae as the decoration of capitals, correction of some misprints, and the placement of individual line endings, occasionally varying only by a word or two; even most of the page-breaks correspond. This present transcription has been compared with the Vincent 1847 edition, and any alterations, corrections or footnotes found in that edition are here indicated (V47). That edition silently corrected misprints, modernized spellings, occasionally made minor word changes, and freely interpreted the use of capital letters and punctuation (particularly exclamation points! in the prayers). Those changes have here been mostly ignored, but any exceptions appear in the footnotes. From internal evidence it is apparent that the Vincent editor used a copy of The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice from other than its first edition, probably the 1739 reprint.

Numbers in square brackets [ ] indicate pages in the original. The original spelling and punctuation have been retained, and misprints noted. I have, however, reduced the seventeenth century use of Capitals. Words in italics are so emphasized in the first edition, but their use is not entirely consistent between it and subsequent editions. Such decisions were largely made by the printer in any case, as were other minor choices such as whether to use digits or to spell numbers out, inter alia. In the places where italics were used to indicate quotations, I have substituted "quotation marks." Scripture references appearing within the text have been set off with added (parentheses). The pages of the epistle dedicatory were not originally numbered. Footnotes marked with an * asterisk or dagger † are original; numbered foot notes are editorial additions.

1 For example, on page 37, the number "12" in the first edition is printed "twelve" in the second; "and" on the title page is replaced with "&." Punctuation also seems to have been often at the discretion of the printer, and some minor variations in the use of commas has been noticed, but these sorts of differences have no material effect on the sense and meaning, and have not generally been noticed here.
THE CHRISTIAN
Sacrament and Sacrifice

By way of Discourse,
MEDITATION, & PRAYER
Upon
THE NATURE, PARTS,
and Blessings
OF THE
Holy Communion.

----------------------------------
By DAN BREVINT D.D.
----------------------------------

At the THEATRE in OXFORD,
Anno Dom. 1673
To The
RIGHT HONOURABLE
The
Lady ELIZABETH CARTERET.  

This is one of the many tracts which I made at Paris on several subjects, at
the instance of those two incomparable Princesses,¹ who there for many years
continually employed me in their service. What use they were pleased to make of
them, your Ladyship knows best, being often admitted with [ii] some other
persons of quality, to their privat devotions; therefore when I present you with
these papers, I but repeat and ratify their gift, and by this public address pay
that respect which I owe (besides what is due upon other accounts) to that
singular esteem and kindness which they ever had for your Ladiship.

Those great and holy souls had no desire, more earnest then to contemplate
and embrace Christian religion² in its [iii] original beauty, & see it freed from
the encombrance which ordinary controversies most commonly throw upon it. And
really tho' they did understand all these scholastic points as well or better then
their teachers, (especially the Princess of Turenne, whose clear and quick
apprehension, and neat and unartificial eloquence were wonderful) yet they cared
so little for them, that they desplored very often the unhappy necessity that had
filled the [iv] Church with such weapons; and had so flanck't about (to use here
their expression) Jerusalem with bastions, that one could hardly see the temple.

I can assure you Madam, that upon this account the holy communion which
is as the tree of life in the paradise of God, the most generous plant in his
vineyard of the Church, hath bin the worst dealt with. For as it was most
despitefully treated by Popery: the Protestants did spend most of their care this
way to secure it, [v] whereby it could not be well expected that men thus taken
up in raising fences, in planting thorns and quicksets against wild bores, could
have much time to dress and improve better plants. Then came from Germany
Anabaptists, and from other parts Socinians, who pretend that the best way of
pruning luxuriant excrescencies, is to cut up by the roots.

Here then Madam, while the Romanists having made havock of the vineyard,
and [vi] laid it wast; the fatness of the ground brought forth that poisonous wild
vine of the Roman-Mass: and others left nothing but dead sapless branches and
dry leaves, the emty figures of fanatic heretics: I make it my endeavor to rescue
it out of the hands of such husbandmen, and to restore all back again both to the
full meaning and institution of Christ, who is the Planter as well as the Master of
the vineyard, and to the practice of the Holy [vii] Fathers, who for several
hundreds of years, dressed it, and made it bear excellent fruit. So here I take
no more notice of either Papists or Sectaries, no nor Protestants neither, then as
if the former had never appeared in the world to trouble and spoil the Church of

¹ The wife of Sir George Carteret, Governor of Jersey, and sister to Brevint's
eventual wife Anne; Sir George Carteret was from an old Jersey family, and
became Treasurer of the Navy at the Restoration.

² Charlotte du Turenne, daughter of the Duc de la Force (to whom John Durel
had been chaplain), wife of Marechal Vicompte de Turenne; and the Duchesse de
Bouillon, the Marechal's mother.

³ V47 "the Christian religion"
God, nor the latter to assert and redress it. The holy Sacrament being thus set at liberty, and enlarged to its full extent, will appear presently attended with all its duties and [viii] blessings, as the ladder of Jacob did, with ascending and descending angels. This may be soon perceived, by any one who will but take the trouble to read this book, so he do it with some attention, and distinctly in parcels; a caution which I desire may be adverted to. Chronicles, or eloquent discourses, may best please, when they are cursorily run over. But Mysteries must be studied, or they cannot be well understood; and God knows how much more is [ix] here required at our hands besides bare understanding. Therefore I have added to the discours that refers to advancing the mind in knowledge, meditation and prayer, the two usual attendants on devotion; which being joined together, are the only probable means of dealing successfully with holy things, and of attaining by the use, to the true end of this Sacrament, which aims at nothing less then a mutual communion between us [x] and Christ, even here on earth while we seem to be absent from him: and withall at such a reciprocal correspondence between God and his Church, as may both open our hearts toward him in holy duties and performances, and open his hand and bowels toward us in all necessary mercies.

I know Madam that for the confirming of all this, I need but appeal to your own experience. And tis partly on this account, that without so much as asking leave, I [xi] have made bold to put your name before this book: because it having bin first written for the peculiar use of two persons, whom God had sanctified in all respects much above the rate of these times; it seems to claim a special title to their acceptance and reading, who intimately knew the worth of those Princesses, and walk after their steps, at so near a distance as you Ladyship doth, to whom I am

MADAM

A most Humble and Faithful Servant,

Durham 1673.


DAN. BREVINT.

---

1 V47 "well be"
THE CHRISTIAN SACRAMENT
and Sacrifice.
By way of Discourse,
MEDITATION and PRAYER,
upon
THE NATURE, PARTS,¹
and Blessings
Of the Holy Communion.

SECTION I.
The Importance of well understanding the
Nature of this Sacrament.

1. The Sacrament instituted by Christ at the eve of his passion, which S. Paul calls the "Lords Supper," is without controversy one of the greatest mysteries of godliness, and the most solemn festival of the Christian religion. The holy Table, or Altar, which presents this sacred banquet, may, as well as the old Tabernacle, take to itself the title of *"Meeting":* since there the people must appear to worship God, and there certainly God is present to [2] meet and bless his people. At the place, and during the whole act of this Meeting with God, the Christian communicants are in a special manner invited to offer up to God their souls, their bodies, their goods, their vows, their praises, and whatsoever they can give: and God on the other side offers to us the Body and Blood of his Son, and all those other blessings withal, that will assuredly follow this sacred gift. For this must be granted, then⁴ the holy Communion is not only a Sacrament that the worshipper is to come to for no other purpose, then to receive; nor a Sacrifice only, where he should have nothing else to do, but to give: but it is as the great solemnity of the ancient Passover was, whereof it hath taken the place; a great Mystery consisting both of Sacrament and Sacrifice, that is, of the religious service, which the people owe to God, and of the full Salvation, which God is pleased to promise his people.

2. It may by this appear, how far it concerns every Christian not to err in a point, that makes the center both of his Happiness and his Duty: and that ties the very knot, which in a manner joins man with God. It was upon this account that the devil, who bore ever [3] an equal hatred both to what is holy to God, and to all what is conducive⁵ to the salvation of man, hath from the very beginning bin busie with this Sacrament: and hath ever since given the Church more trouble about the Body of Jesus Christ, then ever the angel suffered about the body of Moses. (Jude 9.) For the Body of Christ, as the Holy Fathers distinguish it, being of two sorts, to wit the Natural, which is in Heaven, and the

¹ parts = "excellences," not "components."
² נַהֲלַת מַעֲרֵם Tabernacle for appointed time & meeting.
³ Ex. 27: 19-21; Ex. 40: 2.
⁴ 2d ed: "that"
⁵ V47 "that is conducive"; 3d ed, "that is conducive."
Sacramental, which is blessed and given at the holy Table;¹ the primitive heretics, whom the spirit of Antichrist set up and animated against the Church, spent all their strength and their venim, at the very time, and in the face of the Apostles, in order to destroy the first, which is the human nature of Christ, and to reduce it to a Phantasm: and God knows whether the second, that is the Sacramental, receives at this day any better entertainment from the two contrary parties, who make it either a false god, or an empty ceremony. Of all these opposite enemies, the first, who assaulted his flesh, could in this impiety be but poor vain undertakers, this glorious body being highly exalted above their reach: but the second are on this account more dangerous, because the blessed Communion, which makes up this other body, may daily fall into the hands of either an idolatrous, or a profane abuser. Therefore it very much concerns them, whosoever have either any piety towards God, or any care of their own souls, to menage their devotions with such precaution and judgment, that this venerable Sacrament may be kept safe from the attempts of superstition and profaneness.

¹ V47 "See Tertullian, De Care Christi, § I. Qui fidel resurrectionis ante istos Sadducaeorum propinquos sine controveria moratam student inquietare, ut eam spem negent etiam ad carnem pertinere, merito quoque carnem Christi quaestionibus distraheunt, tanquam au nullam omnino aut quoque modo aliam praeter humanam, ne, si humanam constiterit fuisse, praesudicatum sit adversus illos, eam resugere omni modo, quae in Christo resurrexerit. -- Marcion ut carnem Christi negaret, negavit etiam nativitatem. -- Qui carnem Christi putativam introdixit, aeque potuit nativitatis quoque phantasmata confingere."
SECTION II.

Concerning the Sacrament, as it is a Memorial of the Sufferings and Death of Christ.

1. The blessed Communion was chiefly instituted by the Son of God, for a Sacrament in the Church: but when it is received by the Christian people, if this receiving of theirs be right, it must needs be attended with the addition of such other performances, as will make it also a Sacrifice. As it is a Sacrament, this great mystery shews three faces, looking directly towards three times, and offering to all worthy receivers three sorts of incomparable blessings; that of representing the true efficacy of Christ's sufferings, which are [5] past, whereof it is a Memorial: that of exhibiting the first fruits of these sufferings in real and present graces, whereof it is a moral Conveyance and Communication: and that of assuring men of all other graces, and glories to come, whereof it is an infallible pledge.

2. As this Sacrament looks back; it is an authentic memorial, which our Savior hath left in his Church, of what he was pleased to suffer for her. For tho' these sufferings of his were both so dreadful and holy, as to make the heavens mourn, the earth quake, and all men tremble: yet because great objects, how terrible and magnificent soever they be, whilst they last, are not less, then the smallest things, apt to be forgotten when they are gon: and so, there was small likelihood, that the passion of Jesus Christ, which was not seen upon the cross above the space of some few hours, could be well preserved in the memory of men throughout all ages; therefore our Savior was pleased at his last supper to ordain this Sacrament, as a holy memorial, representation, and image, of what He was about to suffer for that short time, to save his dear Church for ever. So that when Christian posterity, which had not seen the crucifixion of their savor, like the [6] young Israelites, that had not seen the killing of the first Passover, should come to ask after the signification of those things, this bread, this wine, the breaking of the one, and the pouring out of the other, and the participation of both; this sacred mystery might expose to faithful beholders as a present and constant object, both the martyrdom and the sacrifice of this crucified savior, giving up his flesh, shedding his blood, and pouring out his very soul for the expiation of their sins.

3. Therefore, as in the feasts of the Passover, the late Jews could say, "This is the lamb, these are the herbs, and this is the bread of affliction, which our Fathers did eat in Egypt"; because their latter feasts did so effectually represent the former, that the people, who did partake of those, had ground enough both to act and to speak as if they had bin present at this: So at our holy Communion which succeeds the Passover, and is undoubtedly no less a blessed, and powerful Sacrament to set before our eyes "Christ our Passover which is sacrificed for us," (I Cor. 5.7). "Our savior," says St. Augustain, "doubted not to say, 'This is my Body,' when he gave to his disciples the figure of his Body." Because especially, besides the commemoration, this Sacrament duly given, [7]

---

1 Matt. 27: 51-54
and faithfully received, makes the thing which it represents as really present for our use, and as really powerful in order to our salvation, as if the thing itself were newly done or in doing. "Eating this bread and drinking of this cup you set forth the death of the Lord." (I Cor. 11.26).

4. For certainly, not to mistake the meaning of Christ, nor to injure his Mystery; whencesoever with the primitive Church we call it a memorial, or a figure; great care must be taken lest we confound these venerable representations, which God himself hath set up in his Church, and for his Church, with those empty figures and marks which either some old tradition, or some private phansie may by chance have put in our way. Men of ordinary understanding do not regard with the same eye the armes and images of princes, which public authority hath set up in a public eminent place: and which a painter, to please his phansie, hath fixt in a private room. Without all doubt a wise traveller would be much more moved at the sight of the salt pillar, (if it did stand yet where it did) which God had set up purposely, where Lots wife lookt towards Sodom, then at some pricks of her feet (if they were to be seen yet) when she turned some other way. [8] And if we credit the history, that cross, which the first Christian Emperor is reported once to have seen in the air (which undoubtedly the hand of God, or an Angel had made appear with some design) could not but cause a greater respect, then that ordinary sign of the cross, which Christians have used on common occasions. Add what no body can deny, that all sorts of signs and monuments become more or less venerable according to the greater, or lesser worth of the objects, which they are made to represent. It had bin hard for Abraham, or for any devout patriarch, not to feel some motions of reverence and holy fear, when they did chance to pass again by Mamre, or by Moriah, or such other remarkable places where God had appeared to them: and who doubts but the very sight of Bethlehem, of the Mount of Olives, of Calvary, &c. which Christ honored with his presence when he was born, when he suffered, and when he went up to Heaven, did heat the primitive Christians with considerable flames of zeal, besides that usual faith and knowledge, which they had got by their reading? But when these signs and monuments, besides their ordinary use, bear withal as it were on their face the glorious [9] character of their institution from above, and with this institution the most express design that God hath thereby to revive in a manner, and to expose as full to all our senses, his Passion and sufferings, as if they had still there true being (as they have still the same virtue;) a discreet and pious beholder must needs look on these ordinances with these three degrees of devotion.

5. The first is, when he considers those great and dreadful passages which this Sacrament sets before him. I doe observe on this Altar some what very like the sacrifice and passion of my Savior. For thus the bread of life was broken: thus the Lamb of God was slain: thus his most precious blood was shed. And when I look upon the minister, who by speciall order from God his master distributes this bread and this wine, I conceive that thus verily God himself hath both given once to his Son to dye, and gives still the virtue of his death to bless

---

1 V47 "hath"
2 Constantine, 312 A.D. Some accounts describe the vision as the chi-rho, with the superscription "in hoc signo vinces."
and to save every soul that comes unfaignedly to him.

6. The second is an act of adoration and reverence, when he looks upon that good hand, that hath consecrated for the use of the Church the memorial of these great things. I cannot without some degree of devotion look on any object, that in any wise puts me in mind of the sufferings of my Savior: and if I did perceive but any cloud, somewhat like them, altho it were but casual, I would not neglect the accident that had caused that resemblance. But since the good hand of my God hath purposely contrived it thus, to set before me what I see; and since by his special appointment these representatives are brought in hither for this Church, and among all the rest for me: I must mind what Israel did, when the cloud filled the Tabernacle. I will not fail to worship God, as soon as I perceive these sacraments and gospel-clouds appearing in the sanctuary. Here I worship neither sacraments, nor tabernacle, but I will observe the manner, that Moses, David, and all Israel have taught me to receive poor elements with, after the institution of God hath once raised them to the estate of great mysteries. Neither the Ark nor any clouds were ever adored in Israel, tho some brutish heathen sometimes thought so: but sure it is, the Ark was considered quite otherwise then a chest, and the cloud then a vapor, as soon as God had hallowed them both, to be the signs of his presence. Therefore as the former people did never see the temple or the cloud, but that presently at that sight they used to throw themselves on their faces; I will never behold these better and surer sacraments of the glorious mercies of God, but as soon as I see them used in the Church to that holy purpose that Christ hath consecrated them to, I will not fail both to remember my savior who consecrated these sacraments, and to worship also my Savior whom these sacraments do represent. And God forbid, that, when I am able, I should not receive them, as my Savior himself was pleased to receive his own baptism, with devotion and prayer. (Luk. 3.21).

7. The third, which is the crown and the compleating of the two other, is such a vigorous and intense act of faith, as may correspond to the great end, which our Savior aimed at, when He instituted this sacrament. The main intention of Christ was not here to propose a bare remembrance: but over and above to enrich this memorial with such an effectual and real presence of continuing atonement, and strength, as may both "evidently set forth Christ himself crucified before our eyes," (Gal. 3.1.) and invite us to his sacrifice, not as done and gone many years since, but, as to expiating grace and mercy, still lasting, still new, still the same that it was, when it was first offered for us.

8. All those sacrifices under the Law, which had both their use and their strength limited, some to a year, some to a month, some to a day, were not less powerful at the last, then they were at the first moment of their proper duration: and they who lived or dyed within the twelfth month of the year, after the Feast of Propitiations, had as much benefit from that anniversary sacrifice, as they, who were upon the place and at the very day, when the high Priest did offer it. Upon the like, but infinitely better reason, the sacrifice of Jesus Christ being

---

1 2d ed. "heathens"
2 V47 "others"
appointed by God the Father for a propitiation that should continue throughout all ages, to the worlds end: and withal being everlasting by the priviledg of its own order, which is "an unchangeable priesthood," (Heb. 7.24.) and by his worth, who offered it, that is the Blessed Son of God, and by the power of the Spirit, by whom it was offered, which is the "eternal Spirit," (Hebr. 9.14.) all kinds of eternity thus concurring together to the sacrifice upon the cross, it must in all respects stand everlasting and eternal, and "the same yesterday, to day, and for ever." (Hebr.13.8.)[13]

9. Therefore this sacrifice being such, the holy Communion is ordained of Christ, to set it out to us as such, that is, as effectual now at this holy Table, as it was then at the very cross: and by the same proportion the act of worthy receivers, (besides remembrance and worship) must needs be this; first to elevate their faith, and stretch their very souls up to the mount, with the blessed Virgin, who stood nearest the sacrifice, or at the least with the disciples, who lookt on it at some distance: and then look up to the Victim, to "Jesus the everlasting mediator of the everlasting covenant" and to the "blood of sprinkling that speaks yet," and craves for "better things" (pardon and blessing) "then Abels did." (Hebr. 12.24.) Here faith must be as true a subsistence of those things past, which we believe, as 'tis of those other things yet to come, which we hope for. (Heb. 11.1).

10. At the approach therefore of this great mystery, and by the help of this strong faith, the worthy communicant being prostrated at the Lords Table, as at the very foot of his cross, shall with earnest sorrow confess and lament all his sins, which were the nails and spears that pierced our Savior. We our selves most chiefly, not Pilate, nor the [14] Jewes (for he would not have dyed for such alone) "we have crucifyed that just one. Men and brethren what shall we do!" (Act. 2.37). He shall fall amazed at that stroke of divine justice, that being offended but by men, could not be satisfied,1 nor appeased but by the sufferings and death of God. "How dreadful is this place!"2 how deep and holy is this mystery! Then he will fall again to worshipping, not less amazed at, then thankful for, those inconceavable mercies of God the Father, who so gave up his only Son, and for the mercies of God the Son, who thus gave himself up for us.

11. My Lord! and my God! I behold here in this bread made of a substance that was cut down, beaten, ground and bruised by men, all the heavy blows and plagues and pains, which my Savior did suffer from the hands of his murthersers: I behold in this bread dryed up, and baked and burnt at the fire, the fiery wrath also, which he suffered for me [15] from above, and from the hand of his own Father. My God, my God, why hast thou thus forsaken him! the violence of wicked men first hath made him a martyr, then the fire of Heaven hath made him a burnt sacrifice: and under both these sufferings, lo he is become to me the Bread of Life!

Let us then go, to take and eat it. For tho the instruments that bruised him be broken to pieces, and the direful flames that burned him be quite put out.

---

1 The 1st ed. misprinted "sanctified" which makes no sense in the context; 2d ed. corrects.
2 "Genesis 28:17; another reference to Jacob's ladder."
yet this bread, which is the Body of the Lord, continues new. The spears and
swords that slew, and the burnings that compleated the sacrifices, are many
years since scattered and spent; but the strength and sweet smell of the [16]
oblation is still fragrant, the blood still warm, the wounds still fresh, and "the
Lamb still standing as slain."* Any other bread by duration will alter, and any
other sacrifice will lose its strength; but Thou most eternal victim, offered up to
God through the eternal Spirit, by an everlasting Priest, and by an order which
can never be changed, Thou remainest alwayes the same; and as thy years shall
never fail, they shall never lose nor abate any thing of thy saving strength and
mercy: help O help me also, that they abate nothing of my faith. Help me to
grieve for the sense of my sins, and for that of thy pains, as those good souls
did, who saw thee suffer. † Let not my heart burn with less zeal (17) to follow
and serve thee now, when this bread is broken at this Table, then did the hearts
of thy disciples, when thou didst break it in Emaus. *† O Rock of Israel. Rock of
Salvation. Rock struck and cleft for me, let those two streams of blood, and
water, which once quished out of thy side, † when the curse of the Law, and the
Rod of Moses had opened it, bring down with them Salvation and Holiness into my
soul, the far distant from the mountain, where thou didst receive that deadly
blow. And let not my soul less thirst after them at this distance, then if I stood
upon Horeb, whence sprung this water, and near the very cleft of that rock, the
very wounds of my Savior (18) whence quished out this sacred blood. All the
distance of times and countries, how great soever, which is between Adam and
me, doth not keep his sin or his punishment any more from pursuing and reaching
me, then if I had bin born in his house: and notwithstanding this distance we sin
and dye after his image, as if we were immediatly sprung from his loines. Second
Adam, Adam descended powerful from above, let thy blood reach as far, and come
as freely both to save and to sanctify, as the blood of my first father did both
destroy and defile me. Blessed Jesu, who revivest by this Sacrament the memory
of thy sacrifice, quicken and strengthen my faith also, dispose my mind, prepare
my heart, and then bless (19) this thine ordinance. If "I but touch" (in that
manner I ought to do) "the hem of his garment,"* the garment of his passion,
virtue will proceed out of Him, it shall be done according to my faith: and my
poor soul shall be made whole." Amen.

---

1 The first three editions all read "words": 1739 edition, printed at the
recommendation of Waterland, reads "wounds" which V47 accepts.

2 * Rev. 5.6.
3 † Luke 23.27
4 † Luke 24.32
5 † Joh. 19.34.
6 Mark 5.28.
7 Mt. 8.8; Luke 7.7.
SECTION III.

Of the blessed Sacrament, as it stands for a Sign of present Graces.

1. The second face of the blessed Communion looks towards the present graces that attend the right use of it, first as a figure, whereby God represents, secondly as a moral instrument whereby he is pleased to convey, them unto the Church. First I say it marks and signifies these present graces. For being of its own nature a sacrament, that is, a sign of an Invisible Grace, it must principally stand to signify, and lead us to greater blessings. [20]

2. It is the ordinary way of God, when He either promises or bestowes on men any considerable blessing, to confirm his word and his gift with the addition of some signs. For this I need not to alleg other evidences then the Rainbow, 1 the Burning Bush, 2 Abrahams Furnace, 3 Gideons Fleece, 4 the Cloud, 5 the Ark, 6 &c. which for those times were sacraments of great things. God commonly sent no prophets, without giving them as it were a sacramental equippage, which could represent in some degree the message they had to deliver; witness the hairy mantels, 7 the rent garments, 8 the iron yoakes, 9 the Horses, 10 some times some kinds of life 11 or gesture, 12 wherein men might see before hand, the charges and sad predictions which they were to hear soon after. Our Savior did observe this same method, when he laid his hands on children, when he breathed upon his disciples, when he bad them to anoint the sick, and when he cursed the fig-tree. All men by a naturall instinct do somewhat like this when they second their expressions with some signs and motions of their body, tho they think of no mysteries. So that you hardly can hear any man being somewhat earnest and serious upon any matter, whether of request, or com-plaint, submission, or excuses, but you may see him at the same time either bowing the knee, or joining his hands, or uncovering his head, which acts are, in a manner, civil and natural sacraments, to confirm his expression.

3. The truth is, such is the disposition of most men, that how strongly soever they be perswaded of the truth, which they hear, yet will they be far better wrought upon towards their own perswasion when they see some signs of
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1 Gen. 9:13
2 Ex. 3:2
3 Gen. 15:17
4 Judges 6:37
5 Ex. 33:8-9
6 Ex. 25:10 & etc.
7 Zech. 13:4
8 Is. 37:1, Mt. 26:65, & etc.
9 Jer. 27:2, 28:14.
10 II Chron. 18:10
11 e.g. marrying a prostitute, Hosea.
12 e.g. lying on one side or the other for an extended period as a prophetic sign, Ezek. 4:4, 4:6.
this truth: and the true Israelite doubts not at all of the presence of his God, nor a faithfull disciple of the promise given him that he shall receive the Holy Ghost, when Moses and Christ have once passed their Word for these two things: yet will their faith be much strengthened, when one sees the ark and the cloud, which were the sacrament of that, and when the other receives the bread which was the sacrament of this. Now the mystery of the cross, and the salvation that followes it, is of that high and important nature, as might justly oblige the Son of God to propose them to his Church in the most suitable manner to work in men a deep impression. Therefore as God himself in order to satisfy Moses more fully that his people should not perish, nor so much as di-[22] minish under the thraldom of Egypt; shewed him a bush continuing still whole and entire in the midst of a great fire: and in order they might be more firmly perswaded, that tho' they were in a wilderness, they were under Gods protection, he made them go all the way under a cloud; that when soever there should happen any staggering in their belief, both Moses and the people might strengthen it, Moses by remembring the bush, and the people by minding the cloud; to the same purpose hath Christ ordained some visible signes in his Church, to compleat her common faith, and to assure this truth to every one who comes to him, that he shall be cleansed of his sins, as certainly as it is certain he sees some water which is the ordinary means for washing. and that he shall be kept up, and fed with a supply of all necessary blessings, as certainly and really, as it is real and certain he tastes and takes in this bread and wine, which are the ordinary means for preserving our life and strength.

4. Besides, because the sacraments are designed not only to perswade us more strongly of the truth and being of the things, but also to acquaint us more familiarly and sensibly with their condition and nature; these sacraments must [23] have in their natural constitution, some known qualities that make them fit for this sacramental office. Such hath the water for example, which was so deservedly chosen for the use of holy baptism, because of the proper virtue it hath of washing the things that are foul, of reviving and refreshing them that are dry, and of making fruitful the barren. Hereupon S. Austin saies plainly, that unless the holy sacraments had some such agreement with the holy things, which they are set up to represent, they could not be sacraments at all. (Epist. 23 ad Bonif.)

5. So the blessed Communion is made of two such elements, as can forthwith expose to the sight and sense of all men, the true ground of its sacramental and significative function. This function is twofold; the first to represent Christs sufferings: and the second to represent the blessing and the benefit which we receive from these sufferings. The first I say to represent Christs sufferings. This bread and wine could neither sustain nor refresh me, had not their intrinsical substance lost its first condition and estate: that is if
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1 The first three editions, and 1739, all read "breath" which V47 alters, undoubtedly correctly, to "bread."

2 2d ed. "from"

3 V47 "of"

4 That is, Augustine.
the one had never fallen under the sickle, the threshing, the millstone, the fire; and the other under the hook, the trampling, and the press of husbandmen: nor doth the Son of God save me, but by emptying himself in a manner, for a while of his first glory in Heaven: and by losing that second life which he had taken in Bethlehem. This Blessed Savior is not a Savior by the strength of all the miracles which He did about Judea, nor by any thing that He could suffer, as long as He would keep himself alive, when he was made fast to his cross. As the best harvest is not yet bread, as long as it stands in the field: nor is the best corn bread likewise as long as 'tis kept whole in the floor; both corn and harvest being no more then antecedent matter for mans food. Jesus living in Galilee, Jesus teaching about the Temple, Jesus commanding storms and waves, when he did walk upon the sea, if he had proceeded no further, could not have bin the Bread of life: it must be Jesus suffering, Jesus crucified, Jesus dying: the grinding mill, and the burning fire have of this corn made me this bread: and nothing less then cross, wounds, death, my Lord! my God! could of thy dearest Son make my Savior?

6. I say secondly, this Eucharistical Bread is instituted to represent the fruit and benefit which we receive both at the Holy Table, and upon all other occasions, from Christ's sufferings, to wit maintenance and improvement of life. As without bread and wine, or somthing answerable to it, the strongest bodies soon decay: so without the virtue of the Body and Blood of Christ, the best and holiest souls must infallibly starve and perish. The Body of the Lord as it was offered up to God in sacrifice, is the truth represented by the Passover: and as represented to us at the Holy Communion, is the truth and accomplishment typified by the manna. The one is, as it were the seed and the original principle when we are born: and the other as the bread wherewith we live. That is to say, as bread and wine do not produce, but keep up that animal life, which another Cause hath produced: so doth our Lord Jesus by a necessary and continual supply of strength and grace, represented by bread and wine, sustain, improve, and set forward that spiritual life and new being, which He hath procured us by his cross.

7. For Jesus the second Adam, being seiz'd, as He hung on the cross, with that deep sleep which God caused to fall upon him, gave this new being to his Church out of that side which at his passion was opened: and the blood and water, which then gushed out his wounds, are the true principles of life, by reason of which his spouse the Church may be called Eve, that is true and
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1 2d "flail"
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everlasting liver. Before she had this new original out of her Saviors passion, her husbands sleep, she by her old extraction was a very daughter of death, and a mother of such children, as could pretend to no better inheritance, then curse, and wrath. (Ephes. 2:2.) ¹ By the course of nature our life is but a sad progress from birth to death: and by the course of Gods justice a sadder motion, such as is that of condemned persons from prison to the place of their execution. But whilst we were daily passing on to that most dreadful punishment, the Son of God lookt on us, ² and took our condemnation upon himself, and under it dyed in our stead. Thus by the death and satisfaction of this Victim justice gave way to my release: God the Father forgave my sin, and God the Son procured my life. This grace is the first purchase of Christs blood, the first irradiation of Gods mercy, and the first breath of spiritual life in our nostrils.

8. But alas! how soon would this first life vanish away, were it not presently followed and supported by a second? How soon would the removal of the [27] former, be frustrated by the commission of other sins! And since I am no sooner born in sin then dead in it, how hard would it be without more help in this corrupted condition to keep dead Lazarus from rottenness! Therefore the Body and Blood of Christ once sacrificed on the cross (to help this first) procures a second life, that preserves, whomsoever it saves out of this stupid death in sin: it helps them out of the puddle, where they did ly like beasts without sense of danger, or shame: and it quickens these rotten trees for the producing of better fruit. The first life being opposite to condemnation and eternal punishment, belongs properly to the blood that hath satisfied divine justice, and so removed punishment: and the second which is opposite to stupid and senseless both falling into sin and lying in it, relates properly to the water, that after propitiation and pardon washes and sanctifies the sinner. These two lives are the two first effuxes, which proceeded out of Jesus Christ, when his body was pierced: and both are inseparable; as the blood and the water were, which flowed together out of his side. Let none, who finds himself clean from the filth and spots of his sin, be afraid of punishment for them, [28] "I have found a ransom for him."(Joh. 33.24.) for the water came not without the blood. But let every one that hath a mind to be safe from punishment which is taken off by the blood, seek for farther security in the purifying of himself from all the uncleanness of sin which the water is to wash away: for the blood came not without water. "Christ came not by blood alone, but by water and blood." (I Joh. 5. 6.)

9. Over and above these two lives, whereof one consists in pardon and removal of punishment; the other in sanctification, and enlivens us from dead works, so as not thenceforward to deserve it as before; there remains besides a third life, which consists in an absolute redemption from death and other miseries. This life, as to the sure title and right, is together with the two other purchased by the same sacrifice: but as to the real use and possession, it is reserved for us in Heaven, ³ and there "hid with Christ in God." (Coloss. 3.3.) Until it be revealed, we appear as if we were dead, these two jewels lying in, and being
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wrapped about, with the dark veils of human mortality, till that Christ becoming unto us actual redemption, as well as actual justice, and actual sanctification, this third life succeeds to break the cloud. [29]

10. Now the blessed Savior being by his sacrifice the author and giver of these three lives, shews himself by this sacrament to be the preserver of them also: and to this purpose sets up a Table by his Altar, where he engages most solemnly to feed and nourish our souls with the constant supply of his mercies to the very day of eternal salvation, as really as he gives and we receive these elements of bread and wine, which are the usual means of sustaining mortal bodies until the end of this short life. "My Father worketh hitherto and I work with him." (Joh. 5. 17.) God the father rested indeed upon the seventh day from the work of creating, and God the Son at the same day from the work of suffering: but neither of them will rest till the day of redemption from the work of preserving, both what the creation hath produced, and what the passion hath saved. In the first creation here is a man and a woman made of the flesh, and as it were of the very wounds of her husband: and there you find a tree planted to maintain both their life and strength. In the deliverance of Egypt, here is a people saved by the sacrifice of the passover: and lest so many rescued out of Egypt, should faint and starve in the desert, [30] there you see an angel leading them the way with his light, keeping them cool under the shadow of his cloud, and feeding them through all their journey with a miraculous sort of meat. Jesus is both in the original and progress of salvation the Truth foreshewed by these figures. When he dyed upon the cross, there he fulfilled that which had bin shadowed forth both by the sleep and wound of Adam, and by the killing of paschal lambs: and when he feeds from Heaven with a continual effusion of blessing those souls and lives which he hath bin pleased to redeem by the effusion of his own blood, he is the truth both of the tree and of the angel, which were appointed the one to maintain man, and the other to keep Israel.

11. Christ relates to these four figures as the body which fulfils them: and the Holy Communion relates to them on the other side, as an antitype, that is, as one image may relate to another, all to express the same object. Upon the breaking the one and pouring out the other of these consecrated elements, you see what Christ hath suffered, as upon the wound of Adam, and the death of the passover, Abel, Enoch, and Israel might partly see, what he should suffer: and upon the nourishing nature of this [31] bread, you see that which others have seen in the tree of life; and in the angel raining down manna, what he would give. But this is the advantage of the Holy Communion above all the ancient figures. Adam with his open side, and all sacrifices with their blood did foretel only Christs passion: and the tree of life with all its fruit, and the Angel with all his food did foretel only, his preserving grace: whereas this sacrament alone represents both his passion, and preserving, and besides these, another great mystery, by their mutual dependency. What wee take and eat, is made of a substance cut, bruised, and put to the fire; that shews my Saviors passion; and it was used in that manner that it may afford me wholesom food; that shews the benefit which both he gives and I receive out of this dreadful passion. The angels enjoy such an immortality, and wear such crowns as cost God nothing, but the pain he took to give them: ours are more precious and costly then so: our
inheritance in Heaven is not less then Akeldamah, a possession bought with Christ's blood. In this sacrament here is death represented, there life, the life is mine, the death my Saviors: and 6 blessed Jesus, this my life comes out of thy death, [32] and the salvation which I hope for, is purchased with all the pain and agonies which thou didst suffer.

12. Here Melchisedek and Aaron wait upon Jesus Christ at this table, as Moses and Elias did on the Mount: these two great priests stand to foreshew, what Christ alone is to perform. For there is Aaron the priest with blood, and here Melchisedek with bread. There Aaron breaks, sheds and destroies: here Melchisedek feeds and blesses. Nay, both are in Jesus Christ. First Christ appears to sacrifice (upon the cross) as Aaron did at his altar, with flesh and blood: and as in Melchisedeks case and figure, with his own flesh, and his own blood. Then as Aaron did use to enter once every year into the sanctuary, Christ once for all is ascended into Heaven thence to bless us. (Act. 3.26.) And this blessing, is the strength, the food and refreshment, which Melchisedek brought in a figure; that with the help of these good things both Abraham and his followers, that is all sincere Christians, may cheerfully go on their way not withstanding their own weakness, and all the dangers of their life. Thus here is a double blessing which I wait for; both what Aaron shewed by his blood, and what Melchisedek shewed by his bread.[33]

13. Author of my salvation, and of these mysteries which express it, bestow on me these two blessings, which this sacrament shews together: grace for grace; mercy, and strength to keep mercy. Hosanna O Son of David, save and preserve. Save me that I may not fall under the hand of the destroyer, and preserve me that after this salvation I never fall by my own hand. But keep and set forward in me notwithstanding all mine infirmities the work of thy faithful mercies. Grant that I may not increase my guilt, by my abusing of what thou gavest. My Savior, my preserver, give me always what thou givest once. Create a new heart within me; but bless and keep what thou createst: and [34] increase more and more what thou plantest. O Son of God and Tree of Life, feed with thy sap this tender branch which without thee cannot but wither; and strengthen in thee a bruised reed, which without thee cannot but fall. Father of everlasting compassions, forsake not in the wilderness a feeble Israelite, whom thou hast brought a little way out of Egypt: and let not this poor soul of mine, which thou hast blessed with some desires, and helped a while with some tendency towards an eternal salvation, ever faint and fall from the right way. The angel in the wilderness could undoubtedly rain as much manna, as the paschal lambs could shed blood; Jesu, the truth both of those [35] lambs and of that angel, thou art as able to perfect me with thy blessings out of thy throne, as thou wilt to redeem me by thy sacrifice on thy cross. Jesus author, object and truth of this which by
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thine appointment I am bidden now to take, perform in me by thy sufferings what thou dost exhibit: eternal life, by this thy body broken; give also nourishment and maintenance thereby to this same life, for this is the Bread of Heaven. Amen. [36]
SECTION IV

Concerning the Communion, as it is not a Representation only, but a Means of Grace.

1. Hitherto we have considered this holy sacrament, first as a standing memorial of that passion, wherein Christ Jesus once offered himself up to God as sacrifice: and secondly as a sign of that nutritive and corroborative grace (the true efflux of that sacrifice) by which sign he daily offers himself to us under the notion of meat. "For his flesh is meat indeed, and his blood is drink indeed." (Joh. 6.55.) And I ingeniously confess that the most general use of the blessed communion runs upon these two notions: and that these two main resemblances between the bread, and Christ's body, which qualify the consecrated bread (and the consecrated wine in the same manner) to bear the character of a sacrament, do likewise sufficiently qualify it, to bear another honor, which it enjoys, of being called the Lords Body. However it is most certain, that when the fathers call it so, (which Christ himself taught them to do) they justify both his and their [37] speech upon the account of resemblance, and of this commerce, (most usual between representations and objects represented) of enterchanging their own names. Read the 23. Epist. of St. Austin ad Bonif.

2. So for example, in the prophetic visions and dreams, which most commonly were nothing else then extemporary sacraments of things then revealed by God, those are most constantly said to be these. The 7 ears of corn are 7 years, by the interpretation of Joseph. (Gen. 41.26.) The seven stars are seven angels, in the Revelation of St. John 1.20. The Sower is the Son of Man, the tares are the wicked, the harvest is the end of the world, in the parables of Jesus Christ (Matth. 13.37.38.39.) If by chance we meet with pictures, that represent the tabernacle, or the ornaments of Aaron; we usually say, pointing at some of these figures, "this is the outward court, this is the Sanctuary, here is the brazen altar, and there you see the plate of pure gold, that none was allowed to wear, except the high priest of Israel": just as walking in the palaces and galleries of great persons, we say without thinking to speak improperly, that we have seen the 12 Sibyls, the 12 Cesars, the temple of Ephesus, &c. that is, the representations of all these. Now 'tis certain that no visions nor images have ever bin more intended for this end of representing, then the true sacraments have bin: therefore it were most unreasonable to think, that these sacred images should want that priviledg which all other (altho casual and profane) are allowed to have, viz. to take the name of their objects. Nay, since the paschal lamb, the circumcision and the baptism have it (for one is called the passover, the other the covenant, and the other the burial of Christ) why should the Holy Communion be without it? Besides it is not concevable that Christ, who had yet in his hands that Paschal bread which was called by the Jews the Bread of Affliction which their Fathers did eat in Egypt, because it was the memorial of it, may not be understood after the same manner, when a moment after he calls it his body.
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3. Nevertheless, altho the literal and immediate sense of these words "This is my Body," come to no more; as Tertullian, and S. Augustin with many more have in express terms declared it: and as all ancient liturgies must needs understand it, whencesoever they call the eucharist, Type, Image, or Figure; for the [39] proper and immediate use of images is to represent things. If they chance also to have them in themselves, or to convey them over to others, it is upon another account, as being vessels or utensiles, &c. which office is extrinsic to sacraments; nevertheless I say the end of the blessed Communion, the exigency and pious desire of communicants, and the strength of other places of Scripture require a great deal more in the eucharist then a mere memorial or representation.

4. 1. **The proper end of the holy Communion;** which is, to make us partakers of Christ in another manner and degree, when with faith and repentance wee take and tast those holy mysteries, then when with the like dispositions wee do hear the Holy Gospel. 2. **The exigency, and honest desire of communicants;** who seek no more for a bare representation or remembrance of Christ crucified, at this Holy Table, then Mary and other devout women did for winding sheets or napkins about his grave. I want and seek my Savior himself: and I watch for all the opportunities of coming to his sacrament, for the same purpose, that once made S. Peter and S. John run so fast to his sepulcher; because I hope to find him there. 3. Lastly, the [40] full sense and importance of other places in Scripture, which allow the Holy Communion, a much greater vertue then is that of representing only. "The cup of blessing which wee bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?" (I. Cor. 10. 16.) For whether the word, which wee render "communion" be taken in an active sense, as 'tis often for communication; the holy Eucharist is a means of communicating the Blood of Christ: or tho we take it but in a neuter and intransitive sense; yet the holy Eucharist will be still a mystery, wherein one way or other true Christians shall find, not a commemoration or representation only, but a communion also with the Blood so represented and remembred.

5. The real efficacy which the Holy Communion hath to convey grace and blessing on the true Christian receiver, is evidently demonstrated by the opposite efficacy it hath to convey a curse and destruction on the profane. "Whosoever" says S. Paul, "eats of this bread unworthily, eats damnation to himself." Now certainly this would be as much to think unworthy as to eat unworthy of this holy bread, to think it might be really pernicious when it is abused, but not really blissful and saving in its right use; and that this bread, which we eat of, should be an [41] effectual communion to procure death, but merely sacramental only to shew, and not to procure salvation. S. Paul sets out the character of the unworthy communicant, by "not discerning the Lords Body": and thereby declares him "guilty of the very body and blood of Christ." That is to say, that whosoever offers to abuse the sacrament, plunges himself into their crime, who have abused Christ himself: and that that villain goes hand in hand with Judas, with Pilate, with both Jews and Romans who murthered Him. What therefore can be thought of those good souls, who approach to this sacrament with faith, humility, and a trembling reverence, but that they will return home as much justified and full of grace after their devout, as the other shall full loaded with damnation, after their impious usage: and that God will be as merciful in reckoning those among the righteous Mary, Joseph, Nicodemus, as He is just against these, when upon this account he shuts up their souls with the sinners,
that in very deed crucified him. And God forbid that the Body of Christ, who came to save, not destroy, should not diffuse as much of its savor of life for the life and salvation of devout souls, as it doth, of its savor of death for the [42] death of the impious. (2 Cor. 2. 16.)

6. The manner of this real communication and conveyance, is the great unfathomable mystery, which the Holy Fathers have ever admired: and which therefore we neither need, nor do take upon us to explain. The shepherds think themselves happy with the message brought to them by an angel, "This day is born to you a savior," (Luke 2. 11.) tho they know nothing of the way of his most miraculous birth: and the honest Israelites ought not to receive manna less thankfully (as they do not less effectually) tho they know neither of what matter, nor by what means the heavens, the air, or the clouds can thus every morning shed about their tents this strange meat. I must not wonder if the waies of the Lord be unknown to me in his miracles, since they are so very often in his most ordinary works. And if David, tho a prophet, cannot think upon that natural virtue, which makes bones and veins every day out of that seed, that is apparently nothing like to all these parts of mans body, but he cries out "I have bin strangely and wonderfully made!" (Ps. 139. 13.) Who am I to pretend to a clear understanding of that hidden and incomprehensible wisdom, wherewith God is pleased to make [43] out of water, or wine, or bread (in themselves weak elements) strong and supernatural organs for mens souls and salvation?

7. It is true indeed, that bread, wine, and water can without much ado come up so high as to become a sacrament to signify: since the act of signifying depends meerly on institution. Yet this institution, such as may make a sacrament, must needs proceed both from a divine and an almighty origine. Divine I say; to give a sacred character: and almighty withal; to justify and maintain it. For example, after the flood no man or angel had authority to make of the rainbow a mystery, that should signify the worlds preservation from drowning: and if either men or angels had taken on them that liberty; none of them had the power to make it true; that is, to make it a standing infallible evidence that the world shall never perish by water. So in the Church neither apostles nor bishops have any more right to confer either upon the water of baptism, or upon the bread and wine of the Holy Communion, a sacramental or representative office, then they have power to make good their representation by conferring the blessings promised by it. And it is [44] specially to this purpose, that most of the expressions and epiphonemas of the holy doctors are to be understood, when they stand somtimes amazed at the infinit power of God, either in the institution,or the use of these mysteries: God alone being able to raise, water or blood any thing else to the order of sacraments. But to raise them a step higher, that is to the dignity of standing for true means and instruments, which may convey on' us those graces, which by their proper institution they represent; there is the Finger of God indeed, and there is a fitter matter for mens admiration, then mens knowledge.

8. Here then I come to Gods altar with a full perswasion that these words "This is my body," promise me more then a figure: that this holy banquet is not a representation made of outward shews without substance: and that it is not so
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dangerous a mystery but that the religious use of it may convey to me (at the least) as many, and as great blessings, as the profane abuse of it may throw on the abuser plagues and curses. But how these mysteries become in my behalf the supernatural instruments of such blessings; it is enough for me to admire. One thing I know (as said the blind man after he had re-[45]eived his sight. S. Joh. 9. 15') "he laid clay upon mine eyes, and behold I see." He hath blessed and given me this bread, and my soul received comfort. I verily believe that clay hath nothing in it self, that could have wrought such a miracle, as Israel never saw the like: and I know as much of this bread, that it is not such a jewel as may contain in its substance, or impart from it self to others, grace, holiness, and salvation, which is the juice and the substance of Christ's Body. Only I am perfectly satisfied, that 'tis the constant way of God, to produce his greatest works, at the presence (tho not by the virtue) of the most useless instruments. At the very stroke of a rod, he parted once in two the red Sea. At the blowing of some trumpets, He tumbled down massy strong walls. At some few washings in Jordan, he cured Naaman of a plague, which naturally was incurable: and as soon as but a shadow did pass by, or some oyl was dropped down, or some cloaths were touched, present virtue went out, not of rods, or trumpets, or shade, or clothes, but of Himself. "Virtue," says he, "is gon out of me": and thus he cured the sick, &c. Since then he hath instituted and adopted unto himself the sacraments of the Gospel, [46] as the representative of his sacred Body and Blood: why may he not take the same course for the dispensing of his mercies, at the use of his ordinances? and why should not his very body pour out effusions of life as well when we take in his sacraments, as when others did touch his clothes, which surely had less privilige?

9. Under the Law, the right hand of the Lord had the preeminence, the right hand of the Lord brought these mighty things to pass, either when the red Sea opened a way for Israel, or when the rock of Horeb powred rivers to refresh them. Now under the Gospel, it is Christ himself with his Body and Blood once offered to God upon the cross, and ever since standing before him in Heaven as the "Lamb slain." (Rev. 5. 6.) who fills his Church continually with the propitiations and perfumes of his sacrifice, when after the receiving of the holy sacrament, faithful communicants return home richer then they came, with the first fruits of salvation. For baptismal water, and consecrated bread and wine, can contribute no more to it, then the Rod of Moses, or the oyl of the apostles did, which was no more then their motion and their presence. But yet since these simple moti-[47] ons and inconsiderable presences are so closely
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attended by Christ's institution and working, that he is pleased to attribute to them the blessing wrought out by himself,' (I Pet. 3. 21.) O my God whensoever thou wilt bid me, "go and wash in Jordan", or be "baptised and wash away my sins," I will doubt no more to be made clean either of my leprosy, or of my sins, then if I had bin bathed in thy Blood: and whensoever thou wilt be pleased to say unto me, go, take and eat this bread, which I have blessed, and which now I have given thee, I will doubt no more of being fed with the true Bread of Life, then if I were eating thy very flesh.

10. In this manner faithful communicants eat as effectually of the Body of Jesus Christ by receiving its strength and virtue, as the saints eat of the Tree of life. (Rev. 22. 2.) because they eat the fruit of that tree: or Israel did drink of the rock, (I Cor. 10.4) because they did drink of the stream that flowed from it. Once my savior could say, that some body had touched him, the they had touched but his clothes, because a woman had reached both her faith and her hand so near as to be healed by the divine warmth and virtue that proceeded then out of him, as [48] if she had touched his very flesh. The truth is, we really touch, have or enjoy the thing it self, when we are within that distance, where we may enjoy its virtue. So the Church was "clothed with the sun" (Rev. 12.1) because shee had all about her its brightness: and by the holy baptism we are said to "put on Christ" (Galat. 3.27) because we then receive the robes of his righteousness, and that which was typified by that garment which God made of skins (which implies the death of victims) to cover Adams nakedness. 2

11. This victim having bin offered up both in the fulness of times, 3 and in the midst of the habitable world, which properly is Christ's great temple, and thence being carried up to Heaven, which is his proper sanctuary, thence he spreads all about us salvation, as the burnt offering did its smoke: as the golden altar did its perfumes: and as the burning candlesticks its lights. And thus Christ's Body and Blood have every where, but most especially at the Holy Communion a most true and real presence. When he offered himself upon earth, the vapor of his atonement went up, and darkned the very sun: and by rent ing the great vail, it cleerly shewed he had made a way into Heaven. 4 Now [49] since He is gon up to Heaven, thence he sends down on earth the graces that spring continually both from his everlasting sacrifice, and from the continual intercessions which attend it. So that it is in vain to say, "who will go up into Heaven?" since without either ascending or descending, this sacred body of Jesus fills with atonement and blessing the remotest parts of this temple.

12. Of these blessings, Christ from above is pleased to dispense sometimes more, somtimes less, into these inferior courts of the people, either according to the several degrees of their faith, or according to the several wales and times, which he hath appointed to them, for presenting themselves nearer to him. All
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worshippers do not come to him with the same faith: nor have all seasons and waies, (tho approved and appointed by him) the same or equal privilaged: And his ordinances in the Church, as well as his stars in heaven, differ in glory one from another. Fasting, prayer, hearing of the Word, public and private services, and all like holy duties, are all very good vessels to draw water from this well of salvation: but yet they are not all equal. The blessed Communion must exceed as much in blessings, when well used, as it ex [50] ceeds in danger of a curse, when it is not. "In all places," saies God where I "record my Name, there I will come to thee, and bless thee." (Exod. 20.24). But in those places and ordinances, which he hath in an especial manner set out to record his Passion, and to renew the sacrifice of his body; he will certainly come with such a fulness of blessings, as attend this sacred body, which is the proper seat of blessings: the bread which we do break, being the communion of his body: just as the eating of the unleavened loaves were" (out of Jerusalem) the communion to the passover, which was the type of Christ crucified. "Christ our passover," saies the Apostle, "is sacrificed for us: therefore let us keep the feast, &c." (I Cor. 5.7.8)

13. Our life in general is the time of this festival: and the blessed Communion, is the Bread and Wine of the banquet. Therefore as they of Israel, who for some lawful impediment could not eat the Lamb in Jerusalem, nor durst, because of the Law, sacrifice and eat it at home, had nevertheless the benefit both of the passover and other holy things of the temple, by virtue of privat feastings, which they were allowed to keep with unleavened bread and bitter herbs in the country. Our Eucharistic-[51] cal eating supplies now this very office: and derives on worthy communicants, as far as their salvation is concerned, the virtue of Christ's sacrifice, in as large and saving a manner, as if they were present at his altar, and at the hour of his Passion. "The Lord bless thee out of his holy seat." For then it was the kindness of the Lord towards his first people (as certainly he hath no less mercy for the second) virtually to diffuse the propitiation and strength of holy things from his palace, into their tents; and to bless them both inherently with all the graces, and imputatively with all the right, which could be conferred on them whose fault 'tis not, if they cannot either eat the passover nearer the temple, or wait upon Christ at his cross.

14. Thus the great and holy mystery extends and communicates the death of the Lord, both as offering himself to God, and as giving himself to men. As he offered himself to God; it enters me both into that mysterial Body, which is reputed as dead with Christ, and into their society, a priviledged and communion, for whom he was pleased to dye: it sets me among the precious stones of Aarons ephod (Exod. 28.) close to the breast, and on the very shoulders of that eternal priest, whilst he offers up him-[52] self and intercedes for his spiritual Israel:
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and by this means it conveys to me the "communion of his sufferings." (Philip. 3.10.) whence will infallibly proceed another communion in all his graces and glories. Under the second notion, as he offers himself to men; the holy Eucharist is, after the sacrifice for sin, the true festival and sacrifice of peace offerings, and the table purposely set up to receive those mercies, that are sent down from the Altar. "Take, and eat, this is my Body which was broken for you. And this is the Blood that was shed for you."

15. Here then I wait at the Lords Table, that both shews me what an apostle, who had Heaven for his school, had the greatest mind to see and learn, and offers me the richest gift, that a Saint can receive on earth, the Lord Jesus crucified.

Amen Jesu, my Lord and my God, give me all this which thou showest: and grant withal that I my both devoutly take, and faithfully keep, what thou art pleased to give. Bless [53] this thine own ordinance, and make it of a true sign, an effectual Means of thy grace: then bless and sanctify my Heart also, and make it a fit temple for thy mercies. Certainly thou wilt deal with me in these thy mysteries, O God of truth, according to thy faithfulness; but dispose also my heart so towards the right using of them, that I may safely wish it may be done according to my faith. O Father which art in Heaven, here I offer up to thee my soul, and thou offerest to my thy Son. The oblation which I make is alas an unclean habitation to receive the Holy One of Israel: and a tent infected with leprosy, I therein to lodg the Saint of the Lord. Come in nevertheless, come in high and E- [54] ternal priest, but wash thy house at thy coming. Let no ill savor of the grave, no more then that of Lazarus, keep thee so far from the sepulcher, and from the vile condition wherein I ly, but that thy power with thy voice, and thy blood with thySacrament, may reach to me to raise me up; And let none of those uncleannesses, that after the Law of Moses, did defile them who came too near, keep off the great Saint of the Lord from touching, and healing me. Evil Spirits enter somtimes into swept houses, to make them foul. 2 But O holy and hallowing Spirit of God draw night unto my soul, which of it self is foul already, to make it clean. I am a poor [55] sinful, and unless thou help, a lost person, but yet such as I am sinful and lost, I wait for thy salvation. Come in, O Lord, with thy Salvation to a dying man, to make him whole; to a sinner tyed hand and foot with the bonds of iniquity, to release him: to one who confesses his sins, to absolve him. Finally come in as my Savior, as thou didst to the Publican, both to make me better and to save me. O let this day salvation come to this house." Amen.

1 Lev. 13,14.
2 * Matt.xii. (V47 adds: 43,44,45.)
3 Luke 19:9
SECTION V.

Of the Blessed Communion as being a Pledg
of the Happiness and Glory
to come.

1. The blessed Communion opens such a treasure of blessings on the two sides which look towards the past or present time, (as I have considered it) as it may very well take up both all the eyes of cherubins in beholding the mysteries, and all the hands of the numerous Israelites in gathering up all the manna, that it contains: yet it hath one other side or prospect more, which goes beyond the two former, as much as the future blessings exceed the present, and as the glory, which we hope for, exceeds the small degree of grace, which we possess. The blessed Communion which is a special instrument ordained of Christ both to present a new (as to our use) his Passion, and to convey on us the present graces, which flow out of this passion, doth there with all assure us likewise of all the happiness to come; whereof the received graces are a hopeful earnest, and this sacrament under this third notion, is a certain pledg.

2. Now, tho what is given before [57] hand for earnest, and what is engaged by way of pledg, come all to one, in point of validity and obligingness: yet they quite differ many times both in their use and in their intrinsical value. Whence it comes to pass that earnest may be allowed upon account for part of the payment which is promised; whereas pledges are recalled, and taken back; as the seal and staff of Juda once were. (Gen. 38). Thus for example, zeal, charity, and these degrees of holiness, which God bestowes at the use of holy sacraments, will remain still ours in Heaven, and there make part of our happiness: whereas the sacraments themselves shall be kept back, and shall not appear more in Heaven then did the cloudy pillar in Canaan, or do now the shadows of the Law under the time of the Gospel. Certainly we shall have no need, either of these sacred images of Christ, when we shall see him face to face, or of these pledges to assure us of that glory, which is to be revealed, when we shall actually possess it. But till that day, the holy Communion hath this third use, namely of being a pledg and assurance from the Lord, that in his good time he will crown us with everlasting happiness.

3. Our blessed Savior pointed at it, [58] when he said to his Disciple,¹ the Holy Cup being in his hand, that he would drink no more of that fruit, till he should drink it new in the Kingdom of his Father. (Luk. 22.18.) In the real purpose of God, his Church and Heaven go both together: That being the way that leads to this, as the Holy Place, to the Holyest: and both Holy Place, and Holyest come to this one thing, which Christ calls the Kingdom of God. Let them not, whom He hath invited to eat and drink at Abrahams Table, trouble themselves about the room where our blessed Savior will feed them; for tho it were but in this inferior part of the kingdom, where this Patriarck was faithful it is² a sufficient assurance, that in time He will also make them sit in that other

---

¹ sic 1st and 3d eds.; 2d and V47: "disciples"
² 1st ed. originally reads "it it"; corrected in 2d.
palace, where this holy Man is now happy: and whosoever are admitted to the dinner of the Lamb slain, (Matth. 22.4.) unless they be wanting to themselves, must not doubt of being admitted to that wedding supper of the same Lamb, who once was dead, but now is "living for ever." (Luk. 14.16. Revel. 19.9.)

4. The consequence and connexion that these two festivals have one with the other, was most sweetly alluded to by our Savior, when he asked the disciples, [59] who talked of sitting at his right hand in his glory, whether they could pass to it through the same baptism and the same cup. (Mark, 10. 37.38.) And S. Paul meant as much, when he said that by the holy Eucharist we set forth the Lords death "til he come." (I. Cor. II.26.) Both referring and continuing this holy mystery to the second coming of Christ, not only as to the end, where it must cease: but chiefly as to the scope, that it looks to; and to that happiness at his coming, where it must be fulfilled. And truly, since our Savior scarce ever speaks of his own death, but as a forerunner and preparative to his resurrection: and often joines in one clause, and delivers as it were with one breath, both his crucifixion and his glory, (Mark. 10.34.) it is very fit, unless we put asunder these two things, which Christ commonly did put together, that the sacrament which he instituted purposely to represent the one, which is already accomplished, should at the least cast an eye towards the other, which we look for.

5. Nay, it must look and lead that way upon another and much stronger necessity. Our Savior hath given us three kinds of life by his Passion, and he promises to nourish and maintain us in every [60] one of them, by these tokens of bread and wine, which he hath made his Sacrament. This Sacrament affords help and improvement for two as tis said before, but there is a third more, that we are not yet come to: This is that eternal Life, for which this present world is too vile an element, and we our selves as yet too vile vessels. Till we acquire by grace and pious endeavors a greater perfection; and till we grow to that stature as may fit us to bear up that weight of eternal glory: we are neither of age to enjoy our inheritance, nor of ability to manage well that great estate, and wear those noble ornaments that attend it: and therefore it lyes hidden from us with Christ in God, and as it were under his custody. "I know whom I have believed, and I am persuaded he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day." (2. Tim. I.12) that is; by faith we deposit this great treasure in the hands of God to keep: and God by this Sacrament assures us and engages himself, that he will both keep it safe for us, and restore it to us whenever we are fit for it.

6. This third use is the crown and the accomplishment of the two other: and tho the Sacrament hath three faces, and looks three several wales, the [61] past, the present, and the future; yet as to the main end, these three aim at one and the same Glory. The first use of this Sacrament is to set out as new and fresh the great and holy sufferings, which have purchased our title to everlasting happiness: the second is both to represent the quality, and to afford us the help of all necessary graces (true effluxes of these sufferings) to capacitate us towards it: and the third is to assure us that when we are capacitated by these graces; God, and his Christ will faithfully surrender to us the purchase itself, that is, eternal happiness. And these three parts put

1 1st ed. originally reads "it it"; corrected in 2d.
together make up the proper and true sense of these words, "Take and eat this is my Body": for the consecrated bread is not said to be the Lords Body only, because it represents the Lords Body, but because also as to our present use on Earth, it doth as good as exhibit it: and as to our happiness in Heaven bought with the price of this Body, it is the most solemn instrument to assure our title to it.

7. Thus the consecrated elements are no more the Body and Blood of Christ, in that sense that pictures and maps set about rooms, are commonly called 
Kings and Countries only because they represent them: but as patents also 
grant-[62] ed by Kings, or other deeds and evidences left in our houses by our ancestors, are called lands, estates, and manors, because they convey over to us 
most really both the title and possession of all the goods which they mention. 
Represent to your mind Jacob dividing among his children every parcel of his 
estate, and withal surrendering the titles that belong to each division; take thou 
this, Joseph, this is the field, which my Grand Father Abraham bought of 
Hephron, and you Manassehs, come you hither, this is the Land, which I got from 
the Amorite. It is most certain that the surrendering such instruments, (altho in 
themselves but papers, or parchments) is in very deed nothing less then giving 
away the very lands: and deeds and lands may very well go together under one 
name, since by giving whether deeds or lands, whether patents, or priviledges, 
fathers and other benefactors do both intend and effect the same thing. If it 
happen somtimes among men that right and possession take not one way: that our 
best titles are laid aside: and that we cannot enjoy those estates, whereof either 
our Kings, or fathers have left us most clear evidences; this falls out so by 
unhappy encounters of either weakness, [63] or injustice, or ignorance, which 
are not to be found in Christ. Here then Christ our blessed savior being 
desirous before his death, as by a deed of his last will, to settle upon his true 
disciples both such a measure of his grace in this life, as might in part make them 
holy, and after this life such a fullness of all blessings, as might make them 
eternally happy; he delivers into their hands, by way of instrument and 
conveyance, the blessed Sacrament of his Body and Blood (the true root and stem 
of all blessings) in the same manner, as to his intention, but in a surer way, as to 
the event and effect, as Kings use to bestow dignities by the bestowing of a 
staff, or sword, and fathers pass as much as they please of their estates on their 
children, by giving them some few writings.

8. The true reason of all this, is because the giver is not able to transfer 
into his friends hands houses and lands, because they are of an immoveable 
nature: and therefore this must be supplyed by substituting in stead of lands, 
some ceremonies, forms, or tokens, which may visibly pass from hand to hand: 
and shew to all ends and purposes both the intention, that the one hath to pass 
away, and the power, which the other hath to take and enjoy [64] what is given 
him. Now Christ and his estate, his happiness and his glory, his eternity and his 
Heaven, are not things that may be moved more easily, then the mountains or the 
earth: and therefore not to be disposed of in any other real manner, then great 
immoveable estates are. Therefore the Kingdom of Israel was once conferred 
upon David, with some drops of that sacred oil, which Samuel poured on his head. 
(I Sam. 16. 13) The Body and Blood of Jesus Christ is in full value, and Heaven 
with all its fullness is in sure title instated on true Christians by those small 
portions which they receive at the Blessed Communion: The Minister of Christ 
having, as to this effect, as much power from his master, for what he acts, as
any prophet or any angel ever had; for what they did.

9. Hence it appears, what crime it is "not to discern the Lords Body." It is to do worse than Esau did, who sold his birthright for a trifle: it is to value at the same rate the anointing of a prophet, and the composition of a perfumer: it is to take the Lords Body for a despicable morsel of bread. In a word, 'tis to perform the action of a beast, that devours but the gross and earthy matter of this Sacrament: and have [65] nothing of a christian or rational creature, who elevates his soul to that Body, which by Christ's institution it represents, and to the price of that Body, which it promises. For since the proper essence of sacred signs or sacraments consists not in what they are in their nature, but in what they signify by divine institution; hence it happens infallibly, that when the sacraments are abused, the injury must needs light, not upon them in their own natural being, Bread, Wine, and Water, which upon this account are not at all considerable; but upon the holy mysteries, the Body and Blood of Christ himself, who is the main object of their formal being, that is, their signification. And therefore the Apostle speaks most exactly, when he saith that whosoever eats of this bread unworthily, doth not discern, or doth not sanctify, but uses as a common and profane thing, the very Body of Jesus Christ. 1

10. 3 In this profane want of discerning, 'tis hard to say whether the sin, or the punishment be the greater. For the sin is abominable, since not the bread, but Christ himself suffers the wrong: the bread being not here concerned at all, nor more abused by the villain that abuses the sacrament, then is the earth, the [66] water or any other common matter of human bodies, by the murtherer, that kills a man: or then are brass and marble by the rebels, who pull down their princes statues: or then parchment, paper, and ink, by that unnatural son, who tears and tramples upon the deeds, and the last will of his father. Only there is this difference, that in these last instances, the outrage proceeds but from the earth, the brass, the marble, the paper, and other such common matter, to the man, king, or fathers persons, who should have bin considered, and who alone suffer the wrong: whereas in the abusing the blessed sacraments the sin flys a great deal higher, namely to the very face of Jesus Christ, for whose Body and Blood they stand. So that as the Holy Communion is not exposed in the Church under the notion of Bread and Wine: the faithful communicants do appear there to receive Christ, and the faithless to abuse him.

11. But if this attempt is impious, the punishment that attends it, is most dreadful. It is a very sad mischance when dogs or apes tear like lose paper all to fitters' the titles and assurances of a good estate: and who would not pitty that wretch, who in his mad passion had thrown into the sea, the very keyes, [67] which were given him, to justify the propriety of vast treasures, in such houses, as these keyes might open. Blind villains, you cannot discern, either among these papers, the original deeds of your estate: or among all these instruments

---

1 I Cor. 11: 29
2 1 Cor. 11:29.
3 1st three editions misprint "11" but correctly number the next paragraph 11 also. 1739 corrects.
4 V47 "tatters"
the keys, that might both assure and give you admittance to immense riches. Whosoever you eat of this bread, and drink of this cup thus unworthily; unhappy men, you do not discern the pledges of your salvation: nay most impious as you are, you neither discern nor will honor the Body and Blood of your Savior, which would bring salvation to you. At once both impious and unhappy men, you despise and cast away from you, both the Salvation and the Savior!

12. Lord Jesu! who hast ordained this mystery for a Communion of thy Body: for a Means of advancement and proficiency in holiness; and for an infallible Pledge of eternal salvation, which thou hast purchased by thy Body, and which thou preparst thy people to [68] receive by this proficiency in holiness; now Lord in mercy look on me, help my unbelief, increase my faith, and order the soul of thy servant, who is to take these holy things. Then since thou thy self originally givest them, (tho not immediatly, but by the ministry of thy disciples, *1) In giving them bless them also: and bless them whilst I receive them: that they may be efficacious to settle me in the communion of thy sufferings which they exhibit and shew forth: to feed me with that living Bread, which they present: and to sanctify me for that eternal happiness, which they promise. O Lord thou knowest my simpleness, my growing is not hid [69] from thee: look on a poor sinner at thy table, as thou didst on him who hung by thy cross. O Lord my God, remember me now, when thou art come into thy Kingdom. *2 Amen.

13. Eternal Priest, who art gone up on high, there to receive gifts for men; fill my heart I beseech thee with blessings out of thy holy seat, as now thou fillest my mouth with the holy things of thy church: and so dispose me by thy grace to eat both spiritually and really the flesh of that sacrifice, which thou didst offer without the gate, *3 and which this sacrament sets before me here in thy courts, that thence I may be admitted into that Holy- [70] eat sanctuary, which thy sacrifice hath opened, and which this sacrament invites me to. This is the bread which the Lord hath prepared for his children, and which he sends me now by the hand of one of his angels. O that in the strength of this meat, I may walk as Elijah did, my fourty daies, or as Israel, my fourty years, and come at last to that holy mountain, where without the help of any bread, or the ministry of any angels, I shall see my God face to face. *4 Eternal, and blessed, and blessing Spirit of God, bless me now, and help me to drink so worthily of this fruit of the vine, that I may drink it new in the Kingdom of my Father. *5 Amen.

1 * Joh. 4. 1,2.
3 Heb. 13:12
4 Gen. 32:30; I Cor. 13:12
5 Matt. 26: 29
SECTION VI.

Of the Holy Eucharist, as it implies a Sacrifice. And first of the Commemorative Sacrifice.

1. It is a certain truth that there never was on earth a true religion without some kind of sacrifices: and 'tis a very great lye to say that now the Christian should want them. The Jews and the pagans, who first aspersed the Church of Christ with this slander, did it upon such a reason, as became them, because they saw neither altars set up, nor beasts slain and burnt among them. Thus the pagans accused the Jews of adoring nothing but clouds, because they had not gods of stone, or silver in their synagogues: and thus silly men may think now, that the world is destitute of angels, because they do not appear so often as they did in ancient times, in the shape and forms of men. The truth, is as what appeared like a body, was not an angel: nor what was stone, or silver could be a god: neither the slaughter of poor beasts could ever be true sacrifices. "Thou delightest not in oblations, the Sacrifice of God is a broken Spirit." Many among the Jews much less quick sighted than the prophets were, confessed as much: nor certainly could any reason permit them to imagine, that flesh and blood, which in all their Scriptures pass both for the weakest and the vilest of things, could be the best and the soundest part of sacrifices.

2. Of all the carnal sacrifices, which the Jews do reduce to six kinds (besides many more oblations) none ever had any saving reality, as to the washing away of sins but in dependance on Jesus Christ our Lord: and as to our service and duty towards God, which they were also to represent, none had this second end so fully performed under the Law, as it must be under the Gospel. The blessed communion alone, when whole, and not mutilated, concenter and brings together these two great ends (full expiation of sins, and acceptable duty to God) towards which all the old sacrifices never look't, but as either simple engagements, or weak shadows. As for the first, which is expiation of sins; 'tis most certain that the sacrifice of Jesus Christ alone hath bin sufficient for it: and that if all both men and angels were joined to it, it were not to add too, but to receive from its fulness. It is most certain also, that this great sacrifice being both of an infinit virtue to satisfy the most severe justice, and of (73) an infinite virtue to produce at once all the effects, that can be expected of it; it were impiety to think, it should need to be don again, as weak and infirm causes must, in order to make up by degrees and at several times their full effect. This was perhaps the want of faith, which the holy Scripture taxes in Moses (Num. 20.12) (which it is hard to find in any thing els) to strike a second time, and without order, that mysterious rock, which to strike once had bin enough: for this second blow could proceed but of a faithless mistrust that the first, which alone was commanded, could not suffice. But it were a much greater offence both against the Blood of Christ, to question its infinit worth, and against the

1 i.e. "lack."
2 Psalm 51:17
3 V47 "pass"
infinitness and immensity of this worth, to charge it with some eminence, which any reiteration should fill up. Therefore as the expiatory sacrifice, which Christ offered upon the cross, was infinitely able to do at once whatever an infinite number of other sacrifices had bin able to do, either all together at one time, or each of them severally during the succession of all ages; the offering of it must needs be one only: and the reiteration of it were not only superfluous as to its real effect, but also most injurious to [74] Christ in the very thought and attempt.

3. Nevertheless this sacrifice which by a real oblation was not to be offered more than once, is by an Eucharistical and devout commemoration to be offered up every day. This what the Apostle calls, "to set forth the death of the Lord"; to set it forth I say as well before the eyes of God his Father, as before the eyes of all men: and what S. Augustin did explain, when he said that the holy flesh of Jesus Christ was offered up in three manners; by prefiguring sacrifices under the Law, before his coming into the world: in real deed upon the cross: and by a commemorative sacrament, after he is ascended into Heaven. All comes to this first, that the sacrifice, as tis it self and in it self, it can never be reiterated; yet by way of devout celebration and remembrance it may nevertheless be reiterated every day. Secondly, that whereas the Holy Eucharist is by it self a sacrament, wherein God offers unto all men the blessings merited by the oblation of his Son; it likewise becomes by our remembrance, a kind of sacrifice also; whereby, to obtain at his hands the same blessings, we present and expose before his eyes that same holy and precious oblation once offered. Thus the ancient Israelites did continually represent their solemn prayers to God, that covenant which he had made once with Abraham Isaac and Jacob their forefathers. Thus did the Jews in their captivity turn their faces towards either the country or the temple where the mercy seat and the ark were, which were the memorial of his promises, and the sacramental engagement of his blessings. And thus the Christians in their prayers do every day insist upon, and represent to God the Father the meritorious passion of their Savior, as the only sure ground, whereon both God may give, and they obtain the blessings, which they do pray for. Now, neither the Israelites had ever temple or ark or mercy seat, nor the Christians have any ordinance, devotion or mystery, that may prove to be such a blessed and effectual instrument to reach to this everlasting sacrifice, and to set it out so solemnly before the eyes of God Almighty, as the Holy Eucharist is. To men it is a sacred table, where God's Minister is ordered to represent from God his master the passion of his dear Son, as still fresh and still powerful for their eternal salvation: and to God it is an Altar whereon men mystically present to him the same sacrifice as still bleeding and still sueing for expiation and mercy. And because it is the high Priest himself, the true Anointed of the Lord, who hath set up most expressly both this Table and this Altar for these two ends, namely for the communication of his Body and Blood to men, and for the representation and memorial of both to God; it cannot be doubted, but that the one must be most advantageous to the penitent sinner, and the other most acceptable to that good and gracious Father, who is alwaies pleased in his Son, and who loves of himself the repenting and the sincere return of his children.

1 1 Cor. 11: 26.
2 V47 "sacrifice."
3 V47 omits "it."
(Luke 15.22)

4. Hence one may see both the great use and advantage of more frequent communion; and how much it concerns us, whenever we go to receive it, to lay out all our wants, and pour out all our grief, our prayers, and our praises before the Lord in so happy a conjuncture. The primitive Christians did it so, who did as seldom meet to preach or pray, without a communion, as did the old Israelites, to worship without a sacrifice. On solemn days especially, or upon great exigencies they ever used this help of sacramental oblation as the most power-

[77] ful means the Church had to strengthen their supplications, to open the gates of Heaven, and to force in a manner God and his Christ to have compassion on them. The people of Israel for the better performance of prayer and devotion went up to the tabernacle and the temple, because (besides other motives) both these were figures of that Body which was to be sacrificed. Wherefore Christ calls his Body "this temple." (Joh. 2. 19) and the first Christians went up to their churches, there to meet with these mysteries, which do represent him both as already sacrificed, and yet as in some sort offering and giving up himself. Those in worshiping ever turned their eyes, their hearts, their hopes towards that altar and sacrifice, whence the High Priest was to carry the blood into the sanctuary: and these looking toward the cross and their crucified Savior there, through his sufferings hope for a way towards Heaven; being encouraged to this hope by the very memorial, which they both take to themselves and shew to God of these sufferings. Lastly, Jesus our Eternal Priest, being from the cross, where he suffered without the gate, gone up into the true Sanctuary which is Heaven, there above doth continually present [78] both his Body in true reality, and us as Aaron did the twelve Tribes of Israel in a memorial, (Exod. 28. 29.) and on the other side we beneath in the Church present to God his Body and Blood in a memorial, that under this shadow of his cross, and image of his sacrifice, we may present our selves before him in very deed and reality.

5. O Lord who seest nothing in me, that is truly mine, but dust and ashes, and which is worse, sinful flesh, and blood; look upon what I have of thee, some small remnant of thine image, some small beginnings of thy grace, and some light sparks of thy spirit. But because all these are defective, supply them, O Lord, with thy mercy, and with the sacrifice of thy Son. Not unto us, O Lord, not unto us, but to thy Name, and thine Anointed give [79] the praise. Turn thine eyes, O Merciful Father, to the satisfaction and intercession of thy Son, who now sits at thy right hand; to the seals of thy covenant, which lye before thee upon this Table: and to all the wants and distresses, which also thou seest in my heart. O Father, glorify thy Son whom thou hast sent into this world; O Son bless thou this Sacrament which thou hast ordained for thy Church, and send with it some influence of that Spirit whom thou hast promised to all Flesh; that by the help of these mercies, the world, the Church, our flesh and souls may glorify thee now and ever Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Amen. [80]

---

1 Ps. 115:1.
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SECTION VII.

Concerning the Sacrifice of our own Persons.

1. It is either the error, or the incogitancy of too many Christians, which makes them somtimes beleive and oftener live, as if under the Gospel there were no other sacrifice but that of Christ upon the cross. It is very true indeed there is no other, nor can there be any other sufficient, and proper for this end, of satisfying Gods justice, and expiating our sins. "I have troden the Winepress alone, and of the People there was none with me; I looked and there was none to help." (Esay. 63. 3. 5.)¹ In this respect, tho the whole Church should in a body, offer up her self as a burnt sacrifice to God, yet could she not contribute more, towards the bearing up or bearing away "the wrath to come,"² then all those innocent souls, who stood neer Jesus Christ when he gave up the ghost, did towards the darkning of the sun, or the shaking of the whole earth.³ But that which is not so much as useful, much less necessary to this eternal sacrifice, which alone could redeem mankind, is indispensably both necessary and useful, that we may have a [81] share in this redemption. So that if the sacrifice of our selves, which we ought to offer up to God, cannot procure salvation; it is absolutely necessary to receive it.

2. As the old Law never introduced Aaron officiating before the Lord, without the whole People of Israel, represented both by the twelve stones on his ephod and the two other on his shoulders (Exod. 28. 12. 30). The Gospel most commonly describes Jesus Christ and his Church, not only as two parties, that do nothing the one without the other, but somtimes also as one person alone: as particularly, I. Cor. 12. 12.¹ Christ acts, officiates and suffers for his Body, in that manner that doth become the head: and the Church imitates and follows all the motions and sufferings of this heavenly and holy head, in such a manner as is possible to its weak members.

3. The main if not the whole divinity of S. Paul as well in point of faith, as of Christian life, runs upon this conformity both of actions and sufferings: And that of S. Iohn likewise upon this same communion. The truth is, our Savior had neither birth nor death nor resurrection here on earth, but such as we ought to conform us to: as he hath neer-[82] ther ascension, nor throne, nor everlasting life, nor glory, but such as we may also have in Heaven common with him.

4. This conformity or likeness to Christ, which (as the Hebrewes use to spake,) is the foundation and Pillar, that is, the grand principle of the whole Christian institution, relates more directly to our duty about his sufferings; and

¹ Isaiah.
³ Matt. 27: 45, 51.
⁴ 1 Corinthians 12:12: "For just as the body is one and has many members, and all the members of the body, though many, are one body, so it is with Christ."
then to our happiness about his exaltation. And the communion, which is the other great fundamental, that S. Iohn hath still in his mouth, points more at this, and presupposes that: And both make up a full comment upon the words which our Savior so often commanded his Disciples, to follow him; thereby signifying both the labor, and the success of this most important Journey, for without doubt we shall follow him into Heaven, if we will follow him here on earth: and we shall have communion with him in his glory, if we will keep conformity with him here in his sufferings.

5. These three expressions to follow, to be like or have conformity, and to have communion, which are the most essential clauses in the charter and charge of christianity, are not to be limited to the imitation of Christ's morals on-[83] ly, as when he bids us "be holy as he is holy," &c.¹ but they oblige all his disciples to follow and imitate him likewise, as much as in them lies, throughout all the other parts of his life, and the very functions of his offices. For we must be regenerated in his birth, dye on his cross, be buried in his grave, bear his shame in his tribulations; in a word, Christ and Christians are and must be continually together, "Where I am there my servant shall be also." (Ioh. 12. 26.) But of all these duties the most fundamental and most indispensable, is that of bearing part of his cross and dying with him in sacrifice.

6. Never did the Son of God intend any more to offer himself for his people, without his people, then did the High Priests² of the Law to offer themselves² for Israel without his ephod, the memorall of them. Christ presented himself to God, in this great temple, which is the world, at the head of whole mankind, as did the first born of Egypt, who also did prefigurate him every one in his house, at the head of his family. He came as a voluntary victim to the altar, being attended on by his Israel, who as it were with their hands laid all their sins upon his head.³ There-[84] fore as it was necessary, that they, who sought for attonement, should wait upon the sacrifice: and that whosoever would escape the destroyer, or other plagues, should keep themselves within that house, where either the first born, or the Paschal Lamb was destroyed: by the same necessity, whosoever do pretend to eternal salvation, must needs appear within that house, about that altar, and that cross, whereon this first born of every creature, and this eternal both priest and sacrifice was pleased to offer up himself.

7. By this standing and appearing at the altar under the Law the sinners indeed did not dye; the victim alone being burned and destroyed: but because they laid their hands on it, when it was dying, and fell (for prayer and worship) on their faces down to the ground, when it did fall bleeding to death, they were as well as the very victim, reputed to offer up themselves. So the truest Christians likewise are neither crucified, nor destroyed in that manner, that
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their Master and Savior was: yet, 1. because they look towards, and cast
themselves upon his cross and sufferings, as the only means both of expiating for
their sins, and of salvation for their souls, 2. because of the great and [85]
sharp grief, which they do suffer who sincerely think on the Son of God thus
dying, and which is more, thus dying only for their sakes; which to them is as it
was to the Blessed Virgin a sword to pierce their hearts, 3. because their whole body of sin, being by
this crucifixion, really overmastered and wounded, there remains no life in them,
but what they may, and will offer up and dedicate to Gods service; the Savior
thus offering himself, and the saved so united to him by faith, so plunged both
into the communion of, and grief for his sufferings, and so resign'd up and
consecrated to his will for the remnant of their life, are both accounted before
God for one and the same sacrifice.

8. It is the same, first by imputation, such as were the first fruits and the
jump: (Rom. 11. 16) The eares of corn and the harvest, which were both
together involved in, and made holy by one offering. (Levit. 23. 10.11). In this
sense Jesus Christ dying upon the cross, was made the first fruits of them that
offer themselves to God, that they may be sanctified by his death and sacrifice.
"If one be dead then all are dead"; 5 as he was made "the first fruits of them that
sleep." [86] that they should be quickned by his resurrection. But secondly as
the lump or mass may in some case either lose or not get at all the priviledg
and holiness of the first fruits, (for example, a few sheaves of corn, which the
worshippers had offered unto the Lord, could by no means sanctify that harvest
which afterwards should be eaten in the service or in the temple of an idol) Two
real actions are required to make good this imputation, and to join the Christians
to the sacrifice of Christ their head.

9. The first is, that they endeavor to crucify their sinful members as
really as Christ himself had his sinless body crucified. So that the feet, that
before did run to evil, the violent hands that did injure, the greedy eyes that did
covet, and all those members of the flesh, that were weapons of wickedness, may
by this cross and sacrifice be most really bound, and in a good measure destroyed
as to their corruption. "I do glory in the Cross of Jesus Christ, by which the
world is crucified unto me, and I unto the world." (Galat. 6. 14.) So Jesus
Christ, and his whole Church, and in this Church every true penitent sinner
being joined all together, do make up that compleat sacrifice, which seems to have
bin prefigurated by the sacrifice at the [87] consecration of Aaron, (Exod.
29.13.14.) whereof the kidneys and the fat about the inwards, were burnt as a
sweet smelling oblation on the altar: but all the flesh, the skin, the feet, the
dung (instruments and emblems of sin) were thrown and burnt without the camp.
For Jesus Christ and his Church so concur together in one oblation, that the
blessed Savior contributes all that can go up into Heaven to please and appease
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God: and we on our part do contribute, but what deserves to be removed out of the way, the corruption and smell of sin. The second necessary condition to the aforesaid imputation (for no imputation either to life or death can be just without some real grounds to support it) and to incorporate us into the sacrifice of Christ's body, is a serious resolution to piety, and universal consecrating both of our persons and of all our actions to God. "I am crucified with Christ, that I may live to God. Now it is not I that live, but Christ lives in me, and the life which I now lead in the Flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me." (Gal. 2. 19.) This place must be so rendred according to the distinction of both the Greek Copies, and all the Oriental versions. [88] And this act of the Church consecrating her self to God, and joining her self so to Christ as to make but one oblation with him, is the mystery represented by the daily sacrifice. (Exod. 29.38. Numb. 28. 3.)

10. This sacrifice did consist of two parts. The first and chiefest was the Lamb, that did foreshew the Lamb of God; and the second was the Meat and drink-Offering made of flower mingled with oyl and wine: all which being but an additional thrown on the lamb, morning and evening, was counted but for one and the same sacrifice. Those secondary oblations so thrown and burnt upon the main sacrifice, signified properly these offerings, which Christians must present to God, of themselves, of their goods, and of their praises. From this meat and drink offering which was added to more substantial sacrifices, came the bread and wine to be used at the celebration of Christ's death. Which bread in the Communion considered as sacrament, signifes the natural, but considered as sacrifice, it represents the mystical Body of Christ, that is his Church. "For we that are many" saith the Apostle (I Cor. 10.17) "are one Bread." To this purpose the holy Martyr Ignatius (Epist. Rom.) being ready to be offered up by Mart-[89] tyrdom, said he was the wheat of God, which was to be ground by beasts teeth. Soon after the church added oyl and frankincense to bread and wine, to make up the whole Meat Offering which consisted of these four things. The truth is, all what we can offer upon our own account, is but such an oblation as this meat and drink offering of Moses was, that cannot be presented but by the virtue and merits of Jesus Christ, who supports it: and that can never ascend up to Heaven but along with the sacred smoke of that great Burnt Sacrifice, which is to carry it up thither. For on the one side our own persons, our works, or any thing else that may be ours, are by themselves but weak, unsubstantial kinds of offerings, which cannot be presented unto God, otherwise but as these additional oblations, which from themselves fall to the ground; unless a more solid sacrifice do sustain them: And on the other side, this solid and fundamental sacrifice upholds, saves and sanctifies, but those persons and things, that according to the Law of Moses his' meat offerings, are thrown into this his fire, are hallowed upon his altar, and are together with him consecrated to God by him.

11. For this cause it is, that as soon [90] as the Prophet had preached the coming of this everlasting sacrifice, and the propitiation and happiness, which it would spread over all the world; he foretels at the same time, that the apostles
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and their successors: (whom he designs by expressions proper to that oeconomy, under which he did live) should bring the nations from all parts of the earth, as "an Offering unto the Lord." (Esay. 66.) And to the same purpose St. Paul himself speaks of his evangelical office as of a sacrificing priesthood; and of the gentiles, whom he did convert to Christ, as of so many sacrifices which he presented to the Lord. "I exercise," saies he, "in the Gospel a holy Sacerdotal Priesthood" (for the word ἱερεύτης signifies both) "that the Olibation of the Gentiles may be acceptable, being sanctified by the holy spirit." (Rom. 15. 16) Hence proceeds that method, which he observes most constantly, never to preach the faith in Jesus Christ, without inviting presently the behelvers to offer up unto God, either the bodies and souls: as Rom. 12. or their works' of holiness, of praise, of charity, &c. as every where else. And these are the spiritual offerings which every true Christian must join to cast upon the fundamental sacrifice of Christ Jesus.

12. We know indeed that the universal Assembly of Christians could never meet at the same time, or place, either to follow Christ in a body, when he went to offer himself for them; or to fall upon their faces and prostrate themselves to the ground, when he bowed his head under their sins: Providence that scatters men up and down throughout all places and times of the world, permitting no possibility of such a general meeting. But the sacrifice of Christ, tho it was confined to few hours and to a small parcel of ground as to the suffering; yet being everlasting, infinit, and still the same, as as to the sufficiency and virtue of it, coextends it self most perfectly to all both times and places, when and where those scattered members, will ever come to offer up themselves to God with their head. And besides this, the second part of his sacerdotal office, which consists in interceding, continuing still in the very act, till the worlds end; They that could not embrace his cross, and join with him at that same time that he offer'd himself, may do it every day, and humble themselves like poor victims loaden with sins and miseries, at the same time, that now he continues still actually interceding. So in all places, at all times, [92] and upon any emergencies, whensoever the behelvers will present themselves unto God, both with and by his Son Jesus, they may still receive the favor of acceptance, and that real efflux of saving odor from Christ, which was represented by that typical holiness, which the additional oblation did receive from the principal sacrifice, when it was adjoined to it. Whereas it is most certain, that all the merit and blood of Christ shall no more save men that will not draw neer and join themselves to conformity and communion of his death; then the continual and other burning sacrifices, were ever able to consecrate, that meat, that wine, that oyl, and that frankincense, which were not brought, nor burned upon the same altar with them.

13. Now tho all men be called to this conformity and communion in the sufferings of Christ, from the time of those sufferings, until there be no times' at all: and altho the daies of our present life, have all the priviledg which these seven feast daies once had, when every one might gird his loins, eat his unleavened bread, and kill his own bullock, as the priest did sacrifice the paschal
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lamb; (which bullock was superadded to the paschal lamb, that both [93] might better suffice for the 7 Festival days, besides its other ritual and figurative importance as a sacrifice:) it is certain, nevertheless that there are two more special and extraordinary days, wherein Christians are invited by more urgent and proper circumstances, to present their souls and bodies by way of second offering upon the sacrifice of their Savior. The first is past, and that was when the Savior offered himself to death: when heaven and earth, temple and graves shook at the blow that killed him; when pious souls either stood immovable as the blessed Virgin hard by his cross, or in a manner crucified themselves, beating their breasts as the daughters of Jerusalem: and when every disciple might by the very conjuncture of all the things he saw, be moved to say as Thomas, "let us go and let us dy with him." (Joh. 11. 16.) The other time most favorable and proper, next to that of his real passion, is that of the holy Communion; which, as it hath bin explained, is a sacramental passion, where tho the body be broken, and the blood shed but by way of representative Mystery, yet both are as effectually, and as truly offered for our own use, if we go to it worthily, as when [94] that holy and divine lamb did offer himself the first time.

14. Therefore whosoever Christians approach to this dreadful mystery, and to the Lamb of God "lying and sacrificed" (as some say that the holy Nicene Council speaks) "upon the holy Table"; it concerns their main interest in point of salvation, as well as in other duties, to take a special care, not to lame, and deprive the grand sacrifice of its own due attendance. But to behave themselves in that manner, that, as both the principal and additional sacrifices, were consumed by the same fire, and went up towards Heaven in the same flame; So Jesus Christ and all his members, may jointly appear before God: this in a sacramental mystery, these with their real bodies and souls, offering themselves at the same time, in the same place, and by the same oblation. So that whosoever are attending on this sacrifice, since they do it in remembrance of their Savior, once really dead, and every day sacramentally dying for them (do this in remembrance of me) they do it in such a manner, 1. as may become faithful disciples, who are resolved to dy both for and with their master: 2. as true and sincere members that cannot outlive their own head; 3. [95] and 3. as truly penitent sinners who dare not look for any share in the glory, and redemption, and session at the right or left hand of their Savior, unless after their way they undergo the same baptism, unless they will drink the same cup: and unless they enter really into the communion of that sacrifice and those sufferings, which their master, their head, and their Savior hath passed through, and which this very sacrament engages them to.

15. Now, this communion doth require, first a conformity of actions, that may in some sort correspond to all what Christ hath done as priest: secondly another conformity of mortifications, and passions, that may likewise answer to
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whosoever he hath suffered as a voluntary victim. As priest; (for in this occasion all Christians after the example of their Savior, become priests, since they offer themselves to God) to follow all the steps, and take upon them all the preparations, the course of life and the like dispositions of mind, which were seen in this blessed Melchisedeck, when he presented himself to God. To this effect the faithful worshipper, presenting that soul and body, which God fitted him with at his coming into this world, will lay them down at the Altar. [96]

Lo! I come, if this soul and body may be useful to any thing, here they are both to do thy will O God. * And hereafter if it please thee, to use that power which thou hast, as creator over dust and ashes, over weak flesh and blood, over a brittle vessel of clay, over the work of thine own hands; Lo here they are to suffer also thy good pleasure. I do now protest to my God, that if he please to afflict me either with pain or dishonor, I will humble my self under it, "and be obedient unto death, even unto the death of the cross." † Whatever may happen to me either from the Jews, or Gentiles, from my neighbors, or from strangers, since it is my [97] God that employes them, tho they neither know, nor think it so; unless at the same time God help me to some lawful means of securing my self against their wrongs. I will not hereafter "open my mouth before the Lord," who doth strike me, except only to sing the Psalm, after I have eaten some bitter herbs that belong to this Passover; and to bless the Lord who gave them me; and intreat him for the wicked, who perhaps hath maliciously gathered them. Hereafter no man can take away anything from me, no life, no honor, no estate, since I am ready of my self to lay them down, as soon as I can perceive that God requires them at my hands. Nevertheless, "O Father, if thou [98] be willing, remove this cup from me;" yet if I must drink it, "thy will be don." ‡ What kind soever of suffering hereafter may trouble my flesh, or what kind soever of agonies may perhaps worse trouble my spirit, following the example of this high priest, in the midst of his bitterest pains, "O Father, into thy hand" § I will ever remit my life, and the dearest concernsments that attend it. And if thou be pleased, that either I live yet a while, or not; I will with my Savior "bow down my head," † † I will adore thee under my burthen, and humble my self under thy hand; I will give up all what † † thou wilt be pleased to ask, goods.
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joys, &c. until at last "I surrender and give up the Ghost." [99]

16. To this first part of our conformity with Christ as priest, must be referred, whatsoever we read he did from his last Passover to his Passion, as far as we can imitate it: as when he washed the feet of his disciples: when he prayed for his murderers: when he received with mild reply the rashness of him that struck him, comming all the rest to God: when he took that charitable care of gently restoring the ear to an insolent fellow named Malchus: when his dissmallest agonies never kept him from comforting a penitent, "this day shalt thou be with me in paradise:" (Luk. 23.43) nor from instructing good pious souls, "ye daughters of Jerusalem weep not," &c. nor from interceding for his cruellest enemies, "Father forgive them for they know not what they do." nor from taking care for his relations, "woman behold thy son" &c. (Ioh. 19.26) Hereupon the success of these both active and passive dispositions must needs be this, that God looking first to Abel, and finding him endued with that spirit of humility, of charity, of meekness, and of patience, "which was also in Christ Jesus," (Phil. 2.5,) he certainly will be pleased to look also upon his sacrifice, (Genes. 4.4.)

17. Besides this first conformity of holy dispositions, and as it were sacerdotal ornaments, between Jesus and his disciples, considered as they are priests: there must needs be also a conformity of death and passion between them, being considered as sacrifices. The first conformity, which regards personal and priestly endowments, is never so exact, nor so full, as to adorn inferior priests with all the proper attire of Aaron; his golden plate, his embroidered ephod, or his miter, or his breast plate: yet it is never so defective, but that he and they may without indecency, notwithstanding the inequality of their garments, officiate at one altar. The second conformity which regards the sacrifice, is yet much shorter than the first, being between things, not only unequal in degrees of perfection, but different in their nature. For really the sacrifice of a living creature, as the lamb was, could not differ so much in nature from dead and inanimate offerings, such as the meal, the oil, and the wine were, which as secondary sacrifices were added to the first; as the sacrifice of Jesus Christ differs from what poor Christians, either are in their nature, or can offer up to God in sacrifice. For of these two sacrifices as to their proper conditions, the one is Divine, all-[101] mighty, and all holy; and the other is human, infirm, and sinful. And as to their several ends, the one is made to procure and work expiation, and the other only to get some capacity to receive it. The first and prime sacrifice imparts to the second its righteousness; and the second is thrown upon the first as a burthen, only to charge it with all its sins. Nevertheless as under the Law, the Lamb, and the oblation added to it, did join in one sacrifice, because both were offered upon one altar, and consumed by one fire: so under the Gospel Christ and his people are accounted for one oblation, when both in their own proper way are consecrated by the same cross, and are in some manner alike obedient to death. "For we have bin planted together in the likeness of his death, knowing this that our Old Man is dead," &c. (Rom. 6.5,6.)

18. By this likeness or conformity of sufferings Christ is dead once to satisfy the rigor of the Law, and so must Christians destroy their sins and mortifie themselves, that they may observe hereafter the righteousness of the Gospel. Christ during that terrible storm that made him weep and cry aloud. (Matt. 27.46.50 Luk. 23.46 Heb. 5.7.) did suffer such a heavy punishment as might [102] satisfy Gods justice: And his Mystical Body must every day both
undertake and suffer such fatherly corrections as may overmaster their own sins. In a word, the Holy Savior was willing to be crucified, because this dismal execution was indispensably necessary to turn away the wrath to come: and his true members must be willing to crucifie themselves with him, because this discipline is as indispensably necessary to destroy in them by degrees that inward corruption which would bring back again this wrath.

19. O Father of Mercies I beseech thee, both by the merits of thy Son, who now intercedes in Heaven, and by that bloody sacrifice which he hath offered on the cross, (whereof thou seest the Sacrament upon this Table) this day be pleased to receive me into the communion of his sufferings, and hereafter into the communion of his glory. Cast [103] not away from thee in displeasure the elevation of these hands, which I will fasten to his cross, so far as they may not offend, and which I do now stretch before thee with a true desire that hereafter they may serve thee; neither despise the sacrifice of a poor soul, which also his cross hath wounded with the sense of her misery, and by this wound laies it open, both to pour out her own prayers, and to gasp after thy mercies. O God and Father, bestow on me such a measure of that Spirit, through which thy Son offered himself, * as may sanctifie for ever, the body and soul which now I offer; and may likewise help me to perform the service which I do promise. A spirit of [104] contrition, that I may sufficiently detest those sins, which did deliver my God to death: then a spirit of holiness, that I may never be tempted to them any more then a crucified man can be tempted. O let this crucified body, which I present to thee for such, never be untied from his cross, either to fall to those vanities, that have crowned his head with thorns; or to follow unjust pleasures, that have filled his dear soul with greed, that have filled his entrails with gall. Arm and Rod of the Lord, who in thine anger didst revenge all these sins upon my Savior, in thy mercy correct and destroy them also in me. So my God accept of a heart, that [105] sheds now before thee its tears, as a poor victim does its blood: and that raises up unto thee all its desires, its thoughts, its zeal, as a burnt offering doth its flames. Finally since my sacrifice can be neither, holy, nor accepted, being alone: Accept of it, O Father, as it is an oblation supported by that Sacrifice, which alone is able to please thee. Receive it clothed with the righteousness of thy Son, and made acceptable with that holy perfume that rises from of his Altar: And grant that he who sanctifies, and they who are by him sanctified, may be joined in one passion, and may enjoy hereafter with thee the same glory. Our Father which art in Heaven, &c. [106]
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SECTION VIII

Concerning the Oblation of our Goods and
Alms, or the Sacrifice of
Justice.

1. It is an express and often repeated Law of God by Moses, and no where
repealed\(^1\) by Christ, that no worshipper shall presume to appear before him with
empty hands. Sincere Christians must have them full at the receiving of the holy
Communion, with four distinct sorts of sacrifices. 1. The Sacramental and
commemorative Sacrifice of Christ. 2. The real and actual sacrifice of
themselves. 3. The free will offering of their goods. 4. The peace offering of
their praises.

2. The first as representing the sacrifice offered on the cross, is the
ground of the three others, especially of the second: which must no more be
separated from it, then parts are from the whole, or the body from its head.
These two are so close coupled together, that St. Austin *\(^2\) more then once, by
the Body of Christ in the holy Communion, understands Christ\'s mystical Bo\(\text{[107]}\)
dy, which is the Church. And St. Cyprian *\(^3\) saies expressly, that Christ and
his people are contained and united together in the Holy Cup (that being
represented by the wine, this represented by the water;) so that Christ is not
there without his people, nor the people without their Savior.

3. The third and fourth, which are the sacrifices of our goods and of our
praises, are appendages following after the second, that is, the sacrifice of our
own selves, by as natural a consequence, as the fruits and leaves follow the tree,
and as what we have or what we can, must needs come after what we are. All the
world know how that blemish and lame sacrifices were abominable under the Law:
and certainly bodies without heads, souls without their faculties, and persons
without their proper duties, are not better under the Gospel. Such mutilated
sacrifices cannot suit with that of Christ, which was perfectly whole and entire.
Therefore as when we once offer our selves to God, our souls and bodies, become
attending sacrifices on the sacrifice of Jesus Christ: so must by the same equity,
all our goods and services, by way of second--\([108]\) any oblations attend the
sacrifice of our persons. And as the lamb, in the daily sacrifice was never
offered without its meat oblation, nor this meat oblation without its incense, its
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wine, its oil: So the Eternal Son and Lamb of God, who was pleased to offer himself for me, must neither be offered without me; nor whencesoever I offer up my self, both by him and with him, must I appear as a dry and unsavory meat offering without juice, without sweet smell, without all the holy dispositions of readiness and joy to obey and please my God in all good works, whereof the incense, the wine, and the oil, were under the Law sacred emblemes. In a word, whencesoever we offer our selves, we offer by the self same act, all that we have, all that we can: and so consequently we do engage for all, that it shall be dedicated to the Glory of God, and that it shall be surrendered into his hands, employed to such uses, upon such occasions and times, as he will be pleased to appoint.

4. Hear then, "my son" (as saies the wise man) "look to theye feet, when thou entrest into the house of God, lest thou offer the Sacrifice of fools." (Eccles. 5.1.)

It is the sacrifice as well as the part of a fool to offer the person without the [109] goods that attend it, as it were the bones without the sinewes and the flesh that cover them. It is the same act of an impious wretch to mangle, and to mutilate, either the holy Sacrifice which Jesus hath made to his father, or the holy Sacrament which he hath ordained to his Church, or that holy Oblation, which after his Sacrifice and at his Sacrament he is pleased to require of us. And after we have presented it, it is an act, not only of great impiety, but of as great a sacrileg, as was that of Ananias, to withdraw without leave, any part of that whole which we have devoted to Gods service.

5. It behoves not Israel alone to go forth out of Egypt with all their children and cattle, and goods, to offer them unto the Lord, that he may take either all, or such a part, as he will be pleased to chuse; (Exod. 10. 25,26). All the Gentiles were likewise to go and give themselves up to Gods service with their gold, their silver, their dromedaries, and their chariots laden 3 with their cheifest substance: The Egyptians with all their wealth: Tyre and Sidon with their merchandise: (Esay. 23. 18. and 60. 6, 7, 9). The wise men with their frankincense, their myrrh and their gold: and so every sinner at his [110] conversion to God, was to consecrate all to Jesus Christ, and to the service of his Church. From that very moment, that by any real act of conversion, of faith, of repentance, or of vow, we have given up our selves to Christ, who hath likewise given himself for us; as by virtue of this mutual communion, all what he possesses becomes ours, namely his grace, his immortality, his glory; and so he bestowes it upon us, according to the times, and degrees which he sees best for our salvation: by the same consequence, all whatsoever we have doth become his, so that he may take it after in what proportion and season soever he shall see best for his glory. The two asses which he sent for by his disciples, that he might ride on them to Jerusalem, 4 and the chamber which he commanded to be ready, that he might eat the Passover in it, were not so absolutely his, as are our lives, our goods, &c. whencesoever "the Lord hath need of them": (Matt. 21. 2,3.
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Luk. 22.11). Those things were his only by the right of propriety, which, as to a Soveraign Lord and God, is naturally reserved upon any thing which he creates or saves; but these are his besides, because we with our selves have given them. When he [111] calls for the former, to deny them were injustice, but to deny these latter, were a visible sacriledg: all what we are, what we can do, and what we can give, even to the least vessel in our houses, being involved and made holy, in this one consecration. "In that day shall there be upon the very Bridles of the Horses holiness unto the Lord: and every pot in Jerusalem and Juda shall be holy unto the Lord." (Zechar. 14. 20, 21.)

6. This consecration whereby the worshipper offers and resigns up all himself, and all his concerns to God, if it be well don, and duly performed, is, first as for our souls and bodies a Christian apotheosis, if I may use this word, which both makes them capable of the sacrifice and grace of Christ, and raises and prefers them to the very nature, that is the condition of holiness and immortality of God. Secondly as to the consecrated things; it is a miraculous priviledg, which in the end infinitely multiplies every thing, which is thus parted with; it blesses the use of it altho it be but presented, as long as we can enjoy it, and finally exchanges it, when we can enjoy it no more, for such advantageous returns, as may be conceived to be, not such as when water was turned into wine, or dirt [112] into gold, but such, as if we conceive a glass of water, turned into streams of everlasting comforts, the dust of Israel into so many stars of Heaven, small cottages of clay into royal palaces; and vain declining shadows into real and eternal possessions: "Thou hast bin faithful in a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things," &c. (Matth. 25.21.) But if the Law of these consecrations be not well performed; if Levi come to serve Ashtaroth, after he hath dedicated himself to God; and if the offerings of the people, be employed to profane uses after they have toucht Gods altar; then there are as many and as heavy curses to be lookt for, as on the other side upon a better use, there are many and great blessings to be expected. So that upon all considerations, both of prudence, and of duty; first we must give up all to God: next after we have given we must fly all, not only as two most odious sins, but also as two most terrible mischeifs, the sacriledg in withdrawing at any time when God demands it, what hath bin thus consecrated to him; and the profaneness in mispending upon superfluous, or worse uses, what of it he is pleased to allow to our proper necessities, and other lawfull conveniencies. [113]

7. Now tho the Christ our blessed Savior, by that everlasting and ever same Sacrifice of himself, offer himself virtually upon all occasions: and we on our side, also offer our selves, as is ours, with him several other wais, besides that of the holy Communion: as at our conversion, and first act of faith in him, Christ (saies St. Austin,) 2 "is sacrificed for the salvation of every sinner, at the very moment he repents and beleives him to have bin sacrificed"; and at our baptism, "For every one offers the sacrifice of the passion of the Lord, at that time, that he is consecrated by the faith of this Passion, and
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baptised a Christian," saith the same father; and the "Baptism of Christ is the blood of Christ," saith another. Nevertheless because Christ offers himself for us at the holy Communion in a more solemn and public sacramental way; (thence it comes, that the memorial of the sacrifice of Christ thereby celebrated, takes commonly the name of the sacrifice it self, as St. Austin explains it often) we are then obliged in a more special manner, to renew all our sacrifices, all the vows of our baptism, all the fruits of our conversion, and [114] all the particular promises, which it may be we have made, either at our repenting of some sin, or at our deliverance from some eminent danger, or at the recovery out of some grievous sickness, or at the receiving some other signal mercy, whether for our selves, or for our friends. "I will go into thy house with burnt offerings, I will pay thee my vows, which my lips have uttered, and my mouth hath spoken, when I was in trouble." (Psal. 67. 13. 14.) Then and there at the altar of God must we, both discharge all the vows, which for some hindrance or other, we had not yet the convenience to fulfil; and set afresh from communion to communion, as they did the Shew-loaves from Sabbath to Sabbath, all those other performances, which by their nature, and our duty, can never be fulfilled, but with the very end of our daies.

8. So shall the new Israel tread on the pious steps of the old, who ever from time to time reiterated, either in Mispha, or in Gilgal, &c. that Covenant which the Lord had made with him in Sinai. It is true, the Lord did not then again repeat the thunder, that once made the mountains tremble; as in our churches he doth not reiterated that very passion, that made the powers of Heaven mourn and shake: Nevertheless as Josuah, Asa, Jonas, Jehojadah, and other such holy men, could from their Master assure the people, that the covenant which they did renew, for example, in Shechem, (Jos.24.25. 2 Chr. 15.12. and 23.16.) was not less powerful, either to bless the observers, or to destroy the offenders thereof, then it was when Moses, and the holy angels publish it at the first upon Sinai: So now the ministers of our Lord Jesus Christ, having in their hands the sacraments of the Gospel, (true seals and tables of the new Law) may both produce and give them out as evidences; that the sacrifice of their Master is not less able to save mens souls, when it is offered to men, and sacramentally offered again to God, at the holy Communion, then when it was newly offered upon the cross. And this is the reason, wherefore all faithful Christians ought then as effectually to reinforce all their oblations, their
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vows, their contritions, and their protestations, "Men and Brethren what shall we do? And God forbid that I should ever glory but in the Cross of my Savior;" as the Israelites did by protesting upon the like occasions, "We will obey the Lord our God and the Lord is the God, the Lord is the God." [116] (1 King. 18.39) both Israelites and Christians seconding their protestation of obedience, and their prostrations of body and resignations of their minds, with secondary sacrifices: those of bulls and rams: these of alms and pious works.

9. By this it is easy to see, that our holy Eucharistical Communions are much correspondent to those feasts, that did call the people of Israel together, first to appear and prostrate themselves before the Lord with sacrifices for their sin: and then to lay upon the altar that other kind of sacrifices which they used to call * Peace Offerings, and which were ordained to express both their thankfulness to God, and their charity to men. And in this friendly concurrence both of mysteries, and of holy duties that attend them, all respects duly observed, Moses may still with the same power command both new and old Israel, "thou shalt keep the feast unto the Lord thy God, with a Tribute of a free will offering of thine hand which thou shalt give unto the Lord thy God, according as the Lord thy God hath blessed thee: And thou shalt rejoice before the Lord thy God, thou and thy Son and thy Daughter, the [117] Levite, the stranger the Fatherless and the Widow. And you shall not appear before the Lord empty. Every man shall give according to the blessings of the Lord thy God which he hath given thee." (Deut. 16, 10,11.)

10. The first Christians ever took it, and constantly practised it so. For whosoever they met at their devotions, whereof the Holy Communion was the most ordinary and the most essential part, they did make the use of all their goods to be common among themselves: and the distribution of this blessed sacrament was so constantly attended by the distribution of their offerings, that it is somewhat hard to discern which of the two the Apostolical History intends to signify by the "breaking of bread," so often mentioned in the Acts. Some pious and learned men have thought that this largeness and frequency of offerings,* which in the primitive times was all the stock they had for pious uses, made that article which immediately follows that of the Church, that is, the communion, or communication of the saints. But however tho this were not the article of faith there meant, yet it was an act of piety so frequent, and so essential in those daisies, that St. Luke would place it amongst those other sacred functions, that comprehend the whole duty of and service of the Church. "They continued stedfastly in the doctrine of the Apostles and in the communion, and in the breaking of bread, and in prayer." (Act. 2.24.) Thus were the primitive Christians literally and punctually such as holy David had prophesied they should be, a people that would come and offer themselves, with their free will offerings.
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to Christ, "in the Day of his Power;" and of that glorious effusion of graces, that like to a celestial dew, would appear wonderful by a thick and sudden producing of subjects and soldiers ready armed for his service. (Psal. 110)

11. For this purpose it was that the Bishops had in their churches, two tables. One of them was ἐσω τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου καὶ περιπετέαματος i.e. within that space where the ministers did officiate at the altar, and where were curtins purposely shut to keep non-Communicants from the sight of and access to the Holy Mysteries. The other was where the people could freely come to offer their gifts, part whereof afterwards was brought by the deacons to the communion table. Hither were brought the free will offerings of the people, bread, wine, oil, wool, sometimes cloth, silver, and any thing else, that might be useful to the Church, (till by express [119] Canons of the Church, * those oblations in kind were limited to such things only, as could be employed about the sacraments and service of the Church) and all this was offered up to God by all Christians, by way of a daily sacrifice. And when the Christians had offered up to God their goods, the priest who did receive them, did solemnly pray to God, that he would be pleased "to look on their oblations, as he did once on them' of Abel, of Noah, and of Abraham." Out of these oblations, the elements of the holy Communion were taken forth and presented at the other table, where they were blest by the bishop or priest, and distributed by him to the people as from God, to assure them he had accepted, of both their persons, and offerings, and that instead of the bread and wine, which they had offered upon his altar, as either the first fruits, or the representatives of all their goods, he was pleased to return to them not simple bread, and simple wine, but such blessed Bread and Wine, as were both the sacred Mysteries of the Body and Blood of his Son, and an infallible surety of all things depending thereon. This is the reason; why, because primitive Christians never received those holy mysteries, but after they had made their offerings; [120] and because those very Mysteries, which they received, were commonly taken, as to the matter, from that Bread and Wine, which they had before offered; The Holy fathers, (for instance S. Ireneus) * who then had no occasion to be so exact, or cautious as to distinguish precisely the nature of two sacred offices, which went constantly together, do not scruple to speak of the blessed Communion, promiscuously as Sacrament, or Sacrifice.

12. Now to bring all this more home; The Law of antient Israel, the practise of the primitive Church, and the very equity of the thing itself, do sufficiently testify, that we ought not in these, more then in the former ages, to appear before the Lord with empty hands: that it is not more fit for worshippers now then it was then, to present their persons, without their goods, as it were trees, without their sap and fruit: and that these same nations, which in the prediction of Esay, were at their first coming, to bring and consecrate both themselves and their gold unto the Lord, must not be now less liberal, when by their sacrifice, they appear to renew the vows of their former consecration; as surely God is not, up-[121] on the same occasions less mercifull, when by his holy
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Sacrament he renews unto them the covenant of his saving grace. Therefore he
gave that comes rich, is bound to appear before his Savior, with his hands full of such
free will offerings, as he may take out of his abundance, as did in Israel the
husbandman out of a plentiful harvest, when the Lord had blessed his field. He
that is less able, must offer out of what he can either get by his labor, or spare
by his parcimony: as the poor widow did, when she offered her mite. In a word
every one, whether he be rich or poor, is to lay down at the offerings of God,
according as the same God hath either blessed or spared him. (I Cor. 16. 2.)

13. The quantity of these oblations, whether extraordinary, as upon a
communion day, or more ordinary, as upon other daily occasions, is wholly left to
the discretion of the Christian worshipper. And whereas God by his Law, did
deal with the Israelites, as fathers do with children in an age unfit to guide it
self, prescribing to them the measure, the time, and the manner of every thing,
which they were either to do, or to give, our Savior hath by the Gospel freed all
Christians from this punctual pedagogy, leaving them, as [122] men able to give
an account of themselves, both to their own judgement, and to the direction of his
spirit; But if this different way of the Gospel discharges Christians now adaeus
from the subjection of doing punctually, and literally every thing, which the
ancient Israel were to observe; it certainly obliges them to do more as to the
matter, and to do it in a better manner. And God forbid that this honor and
liberty, which he vouchsafes us above what he did to the Jews, should be taken
by us, either as a permission or as an occasion of being worse. Therefore God in
former times did give special Laws to his people for every thing they were to do,
in point either of piety, or charity; for example they were to give the tenth part
of whatsoever they could gather out of their fields, their trees and their flocks,
besides another tenth part every third year, that is a thirtieth part every year:
and what ever could grow of itself, during the vacancy of every seventh year:
They were bound moreover to many other charitable waies of helping the poor, as
to lend them money without taking either use or pawn: and to leave in their fields
and vineyards so much of their corn, and fruits behind, as could re-[123]
compence the labor and diligence of many honest neighbors, who, at the end of
the year, had no other harvest then this gleaning. And altho all this was
charity, yet it was among the people of Israel called justice, because it was
commanded by Law, and that they were obliged to pay these almes, as strictly as
any other debt. 1 Here then a downright Christian will do well to take notice, of
what all these charges may come to, and what proportion they will bear with the
estate and revenue that God blesses him with, that so he may contribute towards
works of piety and charity, not only so much but more; and if not in the very
same, yet in as good a kind as the Jews did. So that he may go beyond them in
charity, whom the Gospel commands us to exceed in all other virtues, as we
exceed them in blessings. 2

14. The time of these oblations is not more limited then their measure. At
first S. Paul had appointed the first day of the week, that is the Lords day, for
the gathering of those charitable assistances, and, as he calls them, "acceptable
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sacrifices," (I. Cor. 16.2. Phil. 4. 18.) which were to be sent to the poor brethren of Jerusalem: because even from that time, that day was in a [124] more special manner consecrated to the solemn ministry of prayers, of preaching, and of communion. Now, tho the danger of profaneness, which then was less to be feared, hath in our daies made the use of this Sacrament much less common then that of preaching and prayer: Nevertheless since by these two holy exercises, both God speaks to us, and we to him; this should be warning enough, not to presume to appear before him without a gift. And that we may both bear up the more easily the expenses of this weekly sacrifice, and diffuse more universally the sweet savor thereof into all the parts of our life; it would be a piece of holy prudence, to take care that every day should both bear some part of the burthen, and have some share of the holiness. And that by a daily attending to this service, the rich be still industrious to defalk some larger portions of his abundance; the poor to steal some thing out of his necessaries: and the middle conditioned man to spare what he can out of all his competence. But specially when the good Providence lets fall into our hand some considerable advantages, then let him who will grow rich in God, look upon those temporal occasions, as a propitious time of harvest; whereof he [125] must be sure to reserve the first fruits to God: and let him have a place in his house, like the treasury in the temple, where he may daily cast in his talent, or his didrachm, or his mite, according as God daily blesses him: and whence he must be sure to take nothing, but for a special holy use, as if he did take it from Gods altar.

15. It is true indeed that not only this, but also any thing else that we have at home, is already consecrated, since God having given it to us, we have given it back again unto God. For whencesoever we gave him up our own persons, all our goods were involved in this general consecration, and thereby became ipso facto holy offerings unto the Lord. But as these holy offerings under the Law were of two sorts, some which the worshipper, and his wife, and children might eat; some of which it was not lawful for any to eat, except the priests only; my meaning is that the truly pious Christian should gather day by day, and by little and little (both to make his devotion less burthensom, and by a continual application to this work, to sanctify the whole course of his life the better) a magazine of holy things of this last kind, which may be only employed to God and his Churches service. [126]

16. But at the same instant that the Christian worshipper shall take the materials of his good works, out of this store, he must have a great care to draw withal out of the good treasure of his heart the fire, and the frankincense, that is, the zeal and the holy thoughts that may improve, and raise good moral works, to the being of religious sacrifices. And as without doubt, at first, he had a care not to lay aside these first fruits, in a corner of his house, either negligently or rudely, as some do throw their alms into beggars hands, or as Judas did his thirty pieces into the Temple; so he must not forget himself so much, as to take them thence, and bestow them on the Body or members of Christ, that is, the Church and his neighbor, but with such pious elevations and applications of his mind, as may become both that majesty which he adores, and the pious and holy act, that he intends. Let him do it, whether at his door, or in the way, or in the Temple, it matters not; for the hour is long since come, that religious acts, or
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worshippings, are confined neither to "this mountain, nor to Jerusalem;"
(Joh.4.21) wheresoever God gives thee the occasion and power to perform any
holy work, there he makes holy Ground for thee: only this work, to be holy, and
[127] becoming a worshipper, must by all means be done "in Spirit and in Truth."
This Spirit will teach us, what flesh and blood cannot do, both to perceive, and
consider, not an angel only, as the patriarchs often did, but Christ himself, in
the condition of an afflicted Church, for example, or of an honest distressed
friend; and then at such occasions to lay our liberalities, with that same mind and
thought that a true worshipper would lay his oblations, upon the altar, where he
knows that Christ will most effectually both find it, and accept of it. Once He
received the gold the myrrh and the frankincense, which the wise men gave
Joseph; He did also receive the goods which Susanna, and other religious women
did put in the hands of his disciples; since that time the Church and all her
distressed members have bin instated by Christ himself most expressly into the
place of these happy persons; and as if they had bin for this purpose created
Christ's solemn officers and angels, about the time that he was to suffer and to
leave his beloved disciples, he promised them both to accept, and account as
bestowed on himself, these small offerings, which for his sake we should deposite
in their hands. (Mat. 25.40, 45.) [128]

17. This same spirit, and this actual application, is the only means that
we can have to raise up good moral works, and to make them true "heave-
offerings." Without this elevation, what we give, may in it self be a good deed,
to us a considerable expense, and to other men some benefit; but to God, it is no
sacrifice; or it is such a sacrifice, as sends up no savor above: but either like
the oblation of Cain, falls all down to ashes and dust, or like the alms of Pharisees
to such a paltry reward, as we get perhaps from men. (Gen. 10. Mat. 6.)

18. All these considerations and pious intentions of the soul, which to the
worshipper must be instead of the sacerdotal utensils, and to the oblation,
instead of the fire and frankincense, are much revived and stirred up by the
circumstantial solemnity and holiness of the blessed Communion. Look to the
adoration of the Ancient Israelites. "I was, &c." (Deut.26.)

I Dare appear before the Lord with all my sins and my sorrows; It is very
just also, that I should appear with these few blessings, which are mine; they are
mine [129] by thy favor, and "having received them of thy hand, now do I offer
them to thee." * Forgive I beseech thee my sins, deliver me from my sorrows,
and accept of this small blessing. Accept of this my sacrifice, as thou diidst of
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that of Abel, of Abraham, and of Noah; or rather look in my behalf on that only true Sacrifice, whereof here is the Sacrament; the Sacrifice of the only unspotted Lamb: the Sacrifice of thine own Son, of thine only begotten Son, of thy Son proceeding from thee, to dy for me. O let him again come from thee to me; let him come now as the only begotten of the Father full of grace and of truth to bless me, Amen, Amen.

FINIS.

\footnote{John 1:14}
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