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Theologies of the Eucharist II
The Anglican Tradition

1. The Founding Liturgies

The Mass of the Roman Rite
according to the Use of Sarum
IMAGINE that we are standing on a muddy road and blinking at two rows of houses aligned on either side of it. These houses are made of timber and mortar, with small windows of leaded glass; one has a slate roof, the rest are thatched. Wood-smoke rises from every chimney, and its smell saturates the atmosphere. So does a peculiarly sulphurous stench, like that of an open cesspool or a broken sewer. A window in one of the houses swings open, and a pair of hands flings the contents of a pot into the road. The same thing happens up and down the street. We suddenly realize that the road itself is the village’s sewer – and the reason for the pervasive stench. We’ve a feeling we’re not in Kansas anymore.

All of a sudden, a bell begins to ring, and its deep clangour makes the whole landscape vibrate. We try to locate where the sound is coming from; but before our eyes can catch up with our ears, a door nearby creaks on its hinges and we hear the murmur of two voices. A woman emerges; she is dressed in bulky layers, her head covered with a dull (or dingy) white cloth, her skirt ankle-length, and her feet shod in clogs. From other doorways other people step into the road, men as well as women, one with a small child on her left hip and another child walking at her right side. They all trudge up the roadway, moving away from us toward what looks like a church – a building of stone, with a massive tower in front. It is from there that the bell is sounding. There must be a service – which seems odd, because it is (when we last checked) Tuesday, not Sunday, and only just after dawn. Where are we? In our bewilderment we follow the people up to the church. Its doors – or at least, the left-hand section – is plastered with five or six notices. We scan them; most of them appear to be hand-written, but in a script so gnarled and loopy as to be illegible to us. Except for one line in a notice just above eye-level. The line is in something like block-letters and reads KIDTHORPE SAINCTE MARYES. Then we come upon a larger, official-looking notice, a proclamation of some sort. Its print is slightly (but only slightly) less gnarled than the hand-written notice, so that it takes us a while to figure out just the first paragraph. It says, “Henry the VIII, by the grace of God, King of England and of
France, Defensor of the Faith, Lord of Ireland, to all and singular our most loving, faithful, and obedient subjects, Greeting.” We skip to the end of the document and read that it had been issued “on the twelfth day of September in the twenty-first year of our reign”. We are in England, and the year is 1529.

Two women with three little girls and an infant rustle past us, and go through the open door. We decide to follow them, and enter the church just behind them. The first thing we notice are the burning torches attached to the pillars, and all the lighted candles. That, and the peculiar odour – a mix of human sweat and some sort of smokiness (is it incense?). A wide aisle runs up the length of the nave, the main body of the church, and rows of backless benches stand on either side of it. Some worshippers sit or kneel among these benches, while others kneel before statues or at one or another of the altars which line the walls of the side-aisles. These side-altars are separated from one another by wooden screens, so that each one is like a separate chapel. The same thing is true of the baptismal font to our right, at the back of the church near the entrance, except that its partitioning screens make it a roomier compartment.¹

A bell tinkles far away, up at the front. Hardly anyone in the congregation moves; each continues to do whatever she or he was doing, wherever he or she happened to be doing it. A male voice begins to sing a chant, and other male voices (maybe three or four) join in. The sound is oddly distant, as if it were coming from another room. Then we notice some movement. At the front of the nave there is a wall, with an open doorway in the centre. It is through this doorway that we see two figures draw up abreast of one another in front of the altar, fall to one knee, and rise. The shorter figure, wearing a hip-length white garment over black cassock, moves to the right, out of the door-frame. The other figure,

¹ “The plan of an English medieval parish church is the result of an attempt to combine into one whole a series of compartments: the nave, the aisles, the chantry chapels with their parclose screens, the transepts, and the long chancels and their aisles separated from the nave by a screen, rood-loft, and tympanum.” G. W. O. Addleshaw and Frederick Etchells, The Architectural Setting of Anglican Worship. An Inquiry into the arrangements for Public Worship in the Church of England from the Reformation to the present day (London: Faber and Faber, 1948), pp. 13-14.
wearing with a poncho-like red garment over a white gown, steps up to the altar, bends over it, and kisses its surface. That is our guess; for this priest is very far away; the room which we see through the door in the wall is almost as long as the nave.

Time passes, and the service proceeds. We cannot make much of it. The priest moves from the centre to one corner of the altar or the other and back again. Every so often, usually while the priest is moving, the choir raises another chant. We still cannot see them, though we have figured out that they must be behind that wall at the front, in the same room with the priest. We catch just enough of the words to realize that they are singing in Latin. As for the priest’s voice, we can barely hear it, even when he turns to face us and say something in our direction. For the rest, we see only his back or, when he moves, his profile.

Meanwhile, the people in the congregation carry on with their private devotions. Two of them, a man who looks middle-aged and an elderly woman, seem to be making the rounds of all the statues in the nave, from opposite directions. When the man comes to a statue, he kneels and murmurs a prayer, then rises and moves on to the next statue; the woman prefers to stand before each statue, and says her prayer there in a louder tone. The rest of the congregation, scattered along the benches, also pray aloud in low tones, some to the accompaniment of clacking prayer-beads, each at a different tempo. One woman holds a book and, judging by the number of times she crosses herself, she is evidently reading some sort of service from it.

Our eyes are now thoroughly used to the light, and we take in other details of the church. The wall at the front, we see, does not go all the way up to the roof; in the gap between its top and the ceiling of the church there is a truly massive wooden cross, with the figure of the dead Jesus affixed to it. The figure of a woman – the Blessed Virgin Mary – stands below and to the left, while the figure of a man – St John the Beloved Disciple – stands on the other side, its head tilted upwards towards the crucified Jesus. This is the rood, from the Old English word for “cross”. (Hence the wall on which it stands was known as the rood-screen.) Each panel of the screen itself is decorated with a painting,
many in very bright colours. One looks as if it depicts Saint George slaying the dragon.

Our survey of the church is interrupted by the jangling of bells, and we hear the choir launch into words we have heard before. “Sanctus, sanctus, sanctus,” they are singing. The priest is standing at the centre of the altar, his back to us, with both his arms outstretched. Then he pulls them in and performs some gestures which, from our vantage, look as if he were flapping his right arm in front of himself. The choir continues singing the whole time. In the congregation, those on the benches move to sit or kneel at the aisle; the middle-aged man and the elderly woman leave off their statue-pilgrimages and kneel in the aisle itself, the woman with some difficulty and, judging by the grimace on her face, with considerable pain. The choir stops singing. A minute of silence ensues, as the priest hunches over the altar. Then he straightens up, goes down on one knee, and the server rings a set of bells in his hand. Every head in the congregation looks up and tries to peer through door of the rood-screen. The priest stands and lifts a large white wafer just above the crown of his own head; the server jangles the bells again. The elderly woman calls out, “Higher, Ser Priest! heave higher!” The priest obliges, yanking the wafer a little bit higher, so that it clears the horizon of his head. Everybody makes the sign of the cross – thumb and index-finger from forehead to stomach, from the left shoulder across to the right shoulder. Some then kiss their fingers, others kiss their prayer-beads. The priest holds the wafer aloft for several seconds, then puts it down and genuflects a second time, to the jangling of the bells. A minute passes, in what sounds like silence. The bells jangle again as the priest genuflects; he stands up and judging by the movement of his elbows, lifts something, but not high enough for us to see. The bells are rung again; he genuflects, and the bells jangle a third time. Then he resumes the prayer, extending his arms and pulling them in again at regular intervals, his voice hardly more than a low murmur. Nobody in the congregation moves; they all seem to have retired back into their private devotions. Minutes pass before we hear anything from the altar. All of a sudden, the priest genuflects again and with a loud voice calls out something in what sounds like Latin. Everybody in the congregation makes the sign of the cross again. The priest turns and says something,
then swings around to say a prayer (in Latin), at the end of which we hear the voices of the choir call out a response. The priest bows over the altar for a minute or two, then appears to drain the cup.

At this point the woman who had been reading the book rises from her bench and walks up the aisle to the door of the rood-screen. We see the server’s arm reach out and tug the priest’s vestment. He turns his head to the side, then looks back and sees the waiting communicant. He goes to the side of the altar and, by means of a chain, lowers what appears to be a hanging lamp, except that it has no candle; he opens its lid and takes something out and puts it on a silver plate, then moves down the aisle. The woman kneels on the rood-screen step, and the priest slips a small wafer into her mouth. The woman goes back to her place, and the priest returns to the altar, where the server assists him in washing the plate and the cup. He resumes the service, his back to the congregation (and they at their devotions) until he suddenly wheels around to face us and says in a loud, clear voice, *Ite, missa est!* (“Go, Mass is over!”) And everybody goes. Or almost everybody. As we make our own way out of the church, we turn our heads for one last look. The elderly woman and the middle-aged man have resumed their tour of the statues, paying homage to the saint each one portrays.

2.

In 1529 England was still a very Catholic country, and very, very few of the English showed any signs of wishing it any different. The routines of the Catholic religion were as much a part of their daily existence as the routines of household and field, market and school, fishery and mine. Indeed, the routines of the Catholic religion overlapped and permeated the routines of secular life at almost every point. The Church had its own bureaucracy, which was in many ways far more efficient than the Crown’s bureaucracy. Whole sectors of social life came under the exclusive jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical courts; they probated wills, adjudicated marriage disputes, tried those accused of usury, heresy, or witchcraft, and dealt with all cases involving clergy. Needless to say, the Church, its bureaucracy, and its clergy occasionally gave cause for complaint, and important persons like the lawyer Sir Thomas More and the Dean of St Paul’s Cathedral,
John Colet, might call for a variety of reforms. But there was no widespread disaffection with the Church, and the religious revolution called Protestantism, which in the space of a decade had spread through much of Germany, was not even on the horizon of most of King Henry’s subjects. They continued to keep the festivals and fasts appointed by Holy Church; to go to private confession; to say their Paternosters and Hail Marys; to make pilgrimages to the shrine of this or that favourite saint, and to take part in festal processions in their own parishes; to pay their tithes and dues to the clergy; and above all, as we have just seen at Kidthorpe St Mary’s, to hear Mass.

Mass – the western Church’s name for the Holy Eucharist – was the linchpin of the Catholic religion. It was celebrated daily, even several times a day, and for any one of a wide variety of purposes. People might offer their petitions to God in the set offices of prayer or over a meal or before climbing into bed at night; but it was the sacrifice of the Mass that inscribed their needs, concerns, hopes, and desires on the agenda of heaven itself.

We might wonder how the subjects of Henry VIII (and the king himself) believed that the Mass could do such a thing for them. As we may have gathered during our visit to Kidthorpe St Mary’s, the liturgy was entirely in Latin; and Latin was “a tongue not understanded of the people”.\(^2\) Or at least, of all the people. In fact, Latin would have been understood of a great many more than we might expect. In the sixteenth century anybody who received a formal education – admittedly, a minority of Henry’s subjects – would have learned to read, write, and speak Latin. For it was not only the language of the Church. It was also the international language of scholarship and diplomacy; English lawyers needed to know it in order to read the statutes of the realm, and merchants did well to master it if they had dealings on the Continent. But fluency in Latin made little difference to a lay-person’s participation in the Mass. For, as we saw at Kidthorpe, the celebrant performed much of Mass in a low, purposefully inaudible voice, in what was effectively a separate room and at a considerable distance.

\(^2\) Articles of Religion, XXIV (“Of speaking in the Congregation in such a tongue as the people understandeth”); CanBCP 1962, p. 707.
from the congregation, with the doorway of the rood screen their only means of peering at what the priest was doing. And yet the vast majority of Henry’s subjects do not seem to have found anything objectionable about this manner of celebrating the eucharist. For the Mass was a mystery: it changed mere bread and wine into the true flesh and blood of Christ. And if the real body and blood of Christ lay under a veil – namely, the species, or appearances, of bread and wine – what better way to represent the mysteriousness of the Mass as a whole than by making its celebration as veiled as it was?

3.

So the mediaeval Church believed the eucharistic sacrament – and its liturgical celebration in “the miracle of the Mass” – to be identical with the reality that it was supposed to signify and represent. Unpacking this faith, defending it, making sense of it, absorbed the energies of the many generations of theologians and teachers. We may think that they had set themselves a very tall order. But then, mediæval Catholics were not Liberal Protestants avant la lettre, nor did they subscribe to the closeted dualism of modern secularism, liberal or otherwise. They did not assume that physical reality and spiritual matters are separate and opposite orders – and that the physical alone is what we mean by “real,” because reality is what human technology can measure, quantify, and thus “verify”. Whereas the spiritual must be (as Abraham Lincoln once put it) the sort of thing for the sort of folks who like that sort of thing – a harmless (though perhaps self-delusional) amusement so long as it is kept to oneself; but a danger if it is brought out into the open and made a topic of public discourse. On the contrary, mediævals took it for granted that the physical and the spiritual were distinct but inseparable aspects of a basically unified reality. That is why they decorated their churches with pictures and statues, often limned in rich, even garish colours; and that is how, when the priest elevated the Host after the words of institution, what their faith “saw” and worshipped was not just a consecrated cookie, but the most holy Body and Blood of God the Word made flesh.
This conviction of faith was nearly universal in mediaeval Christendom, for the Byzantine (Orthodox) church held it as much as the western (Catholic) church. The western church, however, defined its conviction under the name of an idea. The idea’s name was (and is) *transubstantiation*.

This term seems to have been coined by Rolando Bandinelli (later Pope Alexander III) in a treatise published around 1140. Bandinelli used this term as a shorthand for the change by which “the bread and wine are ... substantially converted into the real and true and life-giving flesh and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ”. The usage was officially endorsed in 1215 at the Fourth Lateran Council, which the Roman Catholic Church counts among the Œcuménical Councils; as such, its decrees are binding on all the faithful. Among its dogmatic canons, Lateran IV decreed:

There is one universal Church of the faithful, outside of which no one at all is saved, and in which Jesus Christ himself is both priest and sacrifice, whose body and blood are really contained in the sacrament of the altar under the visible forms of bread and wine – the bread being transsubstantiated into the body, and the wine into the blood, by the divine power; so that, for the sake of fulfilling the mystery of unity, we ourselves may receive from what is his, that which he himself has received from what is ours.

This decree did not fix any one explanation of the term as a doctrine necessary for salvation. It employed the term (in the verb’s participial form) simply to affirm the reality of Christ’s presence in the eucharistic sacrament. For another generation, a variety of theologians floated a variety of explanations; and so long as they affirmed the real presence of the substance of Christ’s flesh and blood, nobody seriously questioned their orthodoxy. By the mid-thirteenth century, however, this had changed; “transsubstantiation” had become the only permissible term for what happened when the eucharistic sacrament was consecrated. And the search was on to define, explain, and fix just what the term itself meant. The

---

3 [Dr. Reynolds usually preferred the unusual spelling “trans-substantiation”.]
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explanation which in the event satisfied the mediaeval Church the most, and which the Roman Catholic church has since made normative, was provided by Thomas Aquinas.

4.
Thomas was born around 1224 and became friar and priest of the Order of Preachers – the Dominicans. He spent most of his adult life lecturing on philosophical texts and *sacra doctrina* – “sacred teaching” or, as we would say, theology – in the Dominican faculties of various universities in France and Italy. His powers of concentration were legendary. He could stand in front of three different scribes and dictate three separate works to each one in turn, without losing the train of his thought in any of them. Though he died in 1274, just short of his fiftieth birthday, such powers allowed him to produce an awesome number of works, all of consistently high quality. But it is safe to say that his reputation rests principally on one work, *Summa theologiae*, “The Summary of Theology”. This was Thomas’s attempt to present a systematic account of Catholic theology “from soup to nuts”. It is in three parts: – Part I deals with the doctrine of God and the doctrine of creation. Part II, which is itself divided into two parts, discusses the doctrine of grace and the moral co-ordinates of human life under grace. Part III deals with the doctrine of Christ, who as Saviour is the fulfilment of all grace. It is in this third part that Thomas took up the doctrine of the eucharist, considered as a sacrament of Christ.

Thomas saw no contradiction between human reason and God’s revelation. He once said that God gives grace not to destroy creation but to make it perfect – to raise it above itself, so that the whole human being, through its reason, might actively share in God’s own life. This position made him ready to appropriate the system of Aristotle, though Aristotle had been a pre-Christian philosopher. In Thomas’s mind, if something was true, it was of God – whether the one who had said it was himself a Christian or not.

In line with several generations of Catholic teachers before him, and seeking to unpack the principle of transubstantiation proclaimed at Lateran IV, Thomas took up the concept of “substance” when he turned to expound the doctrine of the eucharist. According to Aristotle, “substance”
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is the underlying, invisible essence of a thing which makes it be what it is. The substance may be further specified by certain variable attributes, such as height, weight, colouring, and so forth, which Aristotle designated as “accidents”; but the “substance” of a thing is prior to its “accidents,” and sustains them. With this conceptual distinction, Thomas argued that it was the substance of Christ’s flesh that became present in the sacrament; and since substance is invisible, it is also, by definition, spiritual. Thus, Christ’s flesh could be said to be really present in its substance – which made it, precisely as flesh, a spiritual presence.

If this was what became “substantiated” in the eucharistic sacrament, Thomas still had to explain how it was substantiated. Here is where the preposition trans-, as in trans-substantiation, comes into play. In Thomas’s heyday – the middle decades of the thirteenth century – a number of explanations were in circulation. Some theologians said that, when Christ’s words of institution were spoken over the bread and the wine, each element’s substance – its invisible, underlying essence – was instantly annihilated and replaced by the substance of Christ’s flesh or blood, as the case may have been. Other theologians were bothered by the philosophical problems this posed. For though they confessed the real presence of Christ’s flesh and blood, they also felt it imperative to account for the fact that the appearances of bread and wine – in Aristotelian terms, their “accidents” – remained. According to Aristotle, you could not have accidents without a substance to sustain them. So, to deal with this problem and thus stave off any charge of philosophical incoherence, these other theologians scouted the notion of consubstantiation. That is to say, the substance of Christ’s flesh and blood became present “in, under, and (above all) with” the substance of the bread and the wine. The substance of the elements thus supported their accidents, their remaining appearances, even as the substance of Christ’s flesh and blood became the underlying reality which supported the substance of the elements.

Thomas was dissatisfied with both explanations. Remember, he said that grace does not destroy but perfects nature. In his mind, then, it violated the rule of grace to think that any substance was annihilated or destroyed by the presence of Christ’s substance. But by the same token, to say
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that the substance of the bread and wine endured with the substance of Christ’s flesh and blood was to suggest that the grace of Christ had somehow fallen short in its power to perfect a created substance. It was axiomatic for Thomas that all things, all substances, exist to serve God. Indeed, their service of God in the cause of our salvation was their perfection. So Thomas opted for a third explanation of what happened to the bread and wine at the words of institution. He spoke of conversion. When Christ’s words were spoken over the bread, a miracle, an act of sheer divine power, happened: the substance of the bread was instantaneously and completely changed into the substance of Christ’s flesh. The same happened when Christ’s words were spoken over the chalice: another miracle happened, wrought by Christ’s divine power, and the substance of the wine was instantaneously and completely changed into the substance of Christ’s blood. The accidents, the appearances, of both elements remained; but this, Thomas argued, was as it should be. For it was fitting that all created things, especially accidents, should be immediately supported and sustained by the grace of Christ. The appearances of bread and wine became, as it were, the garb of Christ; and it became the delight as well as the duty of faith to discern Christ’s reality through the habiliments – the accidents of shape, size, odour, and taste – of bread and wine.

Such was the teaching of Thomas Aquinas regarding the doctrine of transubstantiation; and transubstantiation expressed the eucharistic faith of the mediæval Catholic church, that the flesh and blood of Jesus Christ become really and actually present in the sacrament of the altar. But what, you may ask, drove this faith? What made transubstantiation “make sense”?

5.

The Catholic doctrine of the eucharist was anchored to the mystery of the Incarnation, the truth of faith that the second person of the most holy Trinity, God the Word, “became flesh and lived among us” (John 1.14). According to the classical teaching of the Church, this meant that human nature was perfectly united with the divine nature in the person of Jesus of Nazareth. There was a reason for this wondrous union. God the Word became a human being so
that humans might become “participants of the divine nature” (2 Peter 1.4). Christ’s own humanity served as the intersection between God and our humanity. As a result, we can only share in God’s life through the human life of the Word-made-flesh. That is the entry point for our communion with God, and we progress into God from the humanity that the Lord has in common with us. The bread and wine are changed into the flesh and blood of the incarnate Word because such a conversion fits in with, or suits, the larger purpose of God, a purpose which directly concerns human destiny, the transmutation of mortal human creatures into immortal beings through union with the divine Word who, for their salvation, himself became human.\(^4\)

The Catholic tradition assumed that this same mystery of Jesus Christ, the incarnate Word, was made actually present and fully available to the faithful in the eucharist. Christ became present through consecration and, because of his presence through the consecration, his sacrifice of himself on the cross some thirteen-to-fifteen hundred years earlier became available to believers to aid them in their present and particular needs.

1. **Consecration and communion.** The Catholic Church taught that Christ’s flesh and blood – Christ’s human nature – must become really present in the sacrament, in order to mediate his divine nature. This is why the Church endorsed the doctrine of transubstantiation. As I noted, this doctrine exploited the thought of the ancient Greek philosopher Aristotle, in particular the category he called *substance*. Aristotle had taught that each substance, in turn, was made

\(^4\) The principle involved here was recognised by Augustine in his *Confessions*. In Book VII, § 10.16, while speaking of a vision he experienced after he took to heart the philosophical spirituality of some Neo-Platonists, he wrote (addressing God): “I found myself far from you in a region of unlikeness [to you], as if I heard your voice from on high saying, ‘I am food for grown-ups. Grow, and you shall eat me – not that you will change me into yourself, as you change food into your flesh, but you will be changed into me.’ “ This passage carried eucharistic resonances for many mediæval theologians; Thomas Aquinas quoted it in his discussion of the eucharist, and his contemporary Bonaventure, Minister-General of the Franciscans, quoted it almost routinely in his homilies on Maundy Thursday and other writings which dealt with the eucharist.
up of “matter,” the basic stuff, and “form,” the quality which gave the matter its distinctive existence and shape. The Catholic tradition maintained that, in the Mass, the bread and wine were equivalent to the category of matter. The form was supplied by the words of Christ himself.

Who, on the night before he suffered, took bread in his holy and venerable hands; and while his eyes were lifted up to heaven to you, O God, his almighty Father, giving thanks to you, he blessed, broke, and gave to his disciples, saying: “Take and eat of this, all of you, FOR THIS IS MY BODY which is handed over for you.”

In the same way, after supper, taking also this glorious cup into his holy and venerable hands, and again giving thanks to you, he blessed and gave to his disciples, saying: “Take and drink of this, all of you, FOR THIS IS THE CUP OF MY BLOOD of the new and eternal testament [=covenant], the mystery of faith, which will be poured out for you and for many for the forgiveness of sins; as often as you do this, do it for the remembrance of me.”

As soon as the priest spoke the words “This is my body” over the bread, the substance or underlying reality of the bread was converted into the substance, the invisible underlying reality, of Christ’s human flesh.

All this applied to consecration, to the making of the sacrament. But consecration and the real presence of Christ were designed for a purpose – and that purpose was communion, the sharing of the whole Christ, divine and human.

Here Catholic spirituality faced a problem. Yes, we truly eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ. But communion is not a Christian form of cannibalism. So the Catholic tradition, at this point, resorted to metaphor: the receiving and consuming of Christ in the sacrament is only like the receiving and consuming of meat and drink – it is not the same as receiving and consuming meat and drink. The result could be disconcerting. On the one hand, when Catholic teachers spoke of Christ’s presence, they used terms of physical life. But when they turned to the reason for this presence, which was communion, they had speak in spiritual terms – in terms
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that not only transcended but even might be said to negate the physical order.

Medieval theologians were certainly aware of this dilemma, but its impact was weakened by the eucharistic practices of their age. The mediaeval Church had trouble making up its mind on the importance of communion. The Fourth Lateran Council (1215) – the same council which endorsed the term and concept of “transubstantiation” – took scandalised note of the fact that vast numbers of Catholics were not receiving communion from one year to the next; it therefore decreed that every Catholic must receive at least once a year, and at least at Easter. (This was the origin of the first rubric on page 66 of CanBCP 1962.) On the other hand, when fervour led many – most of whom were women – to seek daily communion, Church officials made life difficult for them. So long, long before our visit to Kidthorpe St Mary’s in 1529, the vast majority of layfolk had ceased to receive communion on a regular basis. Indeed, Thomas Aquinas himself could talk about communion as if it were an optional extra. “The perfection of the eucharistic sacrament,” he said, “is not in the communion of the faithful, but in the consecration of the matter.”

2. The sacrifice of the Mass. The humanity of Christ was important in the eucharist for another reason besides communion with his Godhead. In Catholic teaching and piety, the Mass was not only a sacrament of Christ in general. It was also, in particular, a sacrament of the sacrifice of Christ. This meant, every time the Church celebrated the eucharist, it was united with the one oblation of Christ once offered upon the cross. More than that: the Church co-operated with Christ’s human will in its union with his divine will. Because the Church was the body of Christ, it could offer the Mass “in Christ, and with Christ, and through Christ.” to apply the

---

5 *Summa theologiae* 3a.80.12 ad 2.
effects of his one sacrifice to particular situations on earth. Christ, the High Priest of our humanity, became present in the sacrament to offer up in himself the Church’s particular intentions – Eleanor Huswife’s plea for the safe delivery of her child; Roger Villein’s prayer for a good crop this year; Father Edward’s desire for strength to hold by his vow of abstinence; Judith Fear’s prayer for the repose of her departed mother’s soul. In the Mass, the Church joined these intentions to the flesh and blood of the Saviour and, through his humanity, in union with his divinity, offered them to the Father of glory.

Consecration and sacrifice – such was the double thrust of eucharistic spirituality in the later Middle Ages. It is, however, a curious fact of doctrinal history that theologians did not give a great amount of play to the sacrificial dimension of Mass until the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, in the wake of the pandemic known as the Black Plague. Aquinas assumed that the eucharist was a sacrifice and asserted the “fact,” but did not go out of his way to unpack the assumption in his Summa theologiae. Two centuries later, Gabriel Biel (1420-1495) produced a commentary on the Canon of the Mass which became a standard textbook in the schools of the western Church. Biel’s commentary emphasized the sacrificial nature of Mass; it was, he maintained, akin to a commercial transaction: We did our part of the bargain (or covenant) by obeying Christ’s command to “do this,” and God did his part of the same bargain by granting the requests that we attached to our obedient performance. The whole mystery was, of course, the will and work of God, and it was only by God’s grace that humans had any real part in its operation. Grace is not the easiest of theological concepts to master, and its development in Catholic teachings required high sophistication, as much in prayer as in intellect, to be understood. No wonder, then, that its nuances were weakened well before it reached ordinary folk in the tumble of their everyday needs and aspirations. What came through to them was not God’s loving will to make them partners in the divine life, but the fearful demands of God’s justice. Thus, the Mass loomed in their lives as the priest’s way of appeasing God for their sins – or of placating God into granting their requests.
The Founding Liturgies

6.

In 799 Charlemagne decreed that the Roman Rite – the liturgy used in the church of the city of Rome and most of the Italian peninsula – be the one and only rite used throughout the Frankish empire. Since his domain extended from the Atlantic in the west to the River Elbe in the east, and from the Baltic in the north to the Pyrenees and Sicily in the south, this decree made the Roman Rite – and especially the Mass of the Roman Rite – the sole authorized liturgy of the western Church. It remained so for seven centuries, until the Protestant Reformation; it still remains so for the Roman Catholic communion to this day.6

The Mass of the Roman Rite may have been universal in western Europe, but it was never invariable or uniform in content and ceremonial everywhere at once. Local churches – usually cathedral-churches – modified the rite in detail, almost always by way of adding new prayers and more specific rubrics (directions regarding ceremonial actions), to suit local custom. These regional modifications and adaptations were called “Uses”. At the end of the Middle Ages, the Catholic church in England (Ecclesia Anglicana) had five such Uses – Hereford (western England), Lincoln (eastern England), Bangor (Wales), York (northern England), and Salisbury (the Midlands). Of these five Uses, that of Salisbury – the Latin name of the city was Sarum – predominated in the English church. It was the Use that Thomas Cranmer and his reforming associates made the most use of when shaping The Book of Common Prayer of 1549 (EngBCP 1549) and, at one remove, the second Prayer Book of 1552 (EngBCP 1552). By the way, these Uses – these local variants of the Roman Rite – were abolished in the wake of the Council of Trent, and uniformity to the Missal of 1570 became the rule of the Roman Catholic day.

6 The Roman Rite underwent two substantial reforms – the Vatican prefers the word renewals – in the modern era. The first took place in the wake of the Council of Trent and resulted in the Missal of Pius V (1570), a.k.a. “the Tridentine Mass”. The second reform took place in the wake of Vatican II and resulted in the Missal of Paul VI (1970).
The Ordinary and Canon of Mass
according to the Use of the eminent and noble
[Cathedral] Church of Salisbury

The Ordinary of Mass

[THE PREPARATION OF THE PRESIDING PRIEST]
When Mass is to be said, while the priest puts on the sacred vestments, let him say the following Hymn,

COME, CREATOR Spirit,
visit the souls of thine own,
fill with heavenly grace
the hearts which thou didst create,
Thou who art called the Comforter,
the gift of God Most High,
life-refreshing spring, fire, charity,
and spiritual anointing:
Grace us with thy sevenfold gifts,
thou that art the finger of God’s right hand,
thou that art the Father’s true promise
who dost make our throats rich in praise.
Kindle light in our senses,
pour loving desire into our hearts,
thou who dost strengthen our body’s weakness
with the perpetual aid of thy power.
Drive back the foe far from us
and grant us peace without end:
with thee as our guide going before us
may we escape everything hurtful.
Grant that, by thee, we may know the Father
and acknowledge the Son,
and may believe at all times
thee, the Spirit, to be of both.
Praise be to the Father with the Son,
and likewise to the Holy Paaraclete;
and may the Son send to us

Verse. Send forth thy Spirit, and they shall be created:
Response. And thou wilt renew the face of the earth.
ALMIGHTY God, unto whom all hearts be open, all desires known, and from whom no secrets be hid, cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of thy Holy Spirit, that we may perfectly love thee and worthily magnify thy holy Name; through Christ our Lord. Amen.

Lord, have mercy.
Christ, have mercy.
Lord, have mercy.

Then shall follow the Antiphon:
I will go to the altar of God, to the God who rejoiceth my youth.

[Psalm 43.1-6]

Give judgement for me, O God, and defend my cause against the ungodly people: O deliver me from the deceitful and wicked man.
For thou, O God, art my strength: why hast thou put me from thee, and why go I so heavily while the enemy oppresseth me?
Send out thy light and thy truth, that they may lead me: and bring me unto thy holy hill, and to thy dwelling.
And I will go to the altar of God: to the God who rejoiceth my youth.
Upon the harp will I give thanks unto thee, O God, my God: why art thou so heavy, O my soul: and why art thou so disquieted within me?
O put thy trust in God: for I will yet give him thanks, who is the help of my countenance, and my God.

Glory be to the Father, and to the Son: and to the Holy Ghost: As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be: world without end. Amen.

He repeats the Antiphon: I will go to the altar of God, to the God who rejoiceth my youth.

THE LORD’S PRAYER

AVE MARIA

Hail, Mary, full of grace, the Lord is with thee. Blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb, Jesus. Holy Mary, Mother of God, pray for us sinners now and in the hour of our death.

INTROIT [ENTRANCE PSALM]
[for Sixth Sunday after Trinity: Ps. 26.7, 9, 1]
HARKEN UNTO my voice, O Lord, when I cry unto thee: have mercy on me and answer me: be thou my helper, do not forsake me, neither despise me, O God of my salvation. 

Ps. The Lord is my light and my salvation: whom then shall I fear?

Glory be to the Father, and to the Son: and to the Holy Ghost: As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be: world without end. Amen.

The Antiphon is repeated. Hearken unto my voice, O Lord, when I cry unto thee: have mercy on me and answer me: be thou my helper, do not forsake me, neither despise me, O God of my salvation.

When these sections are done, and the Introit of the Mass having begun, when the Gloria Patri after the Introit is begun, let the Priest approach with his own ministers to the step of the altar, and let him say the confession, the deacon assisting on the right hand, and the subdeacon on the left, beginning in this manner:

V. And lead us not into temptation. 
R. But deliver us from evil.
V. Confess ye to the Lord, for he is good.
R. For his mercy endureth for ever.

CONFITEOR
Let the Priest say:

I CONFESS to God, to blessed Mary, to all the saints, and to you [my brothers]: I have sinned very greatly in thought, word, and deed, by my own fault. I pray holy Mary, all the saints of God, and you, to pray for me.

MISEREATUR
Let the ministers respond:

ALMIGHTY GOD have mercy upon you,* and pardon all your sins, deliver you from all evil, preserve and confirm you in goodness, and lead you to everlasting life.

The Priest says. Amen.

And afterwards let [the Ministers] say the Confiteor, &c. When this has been said, let the priest say the Misereatur, as above.

* The Latin word here is vos, the formal or plural second-person. It survives in French (Vous) and German (Ihrt), as the way one addresses a superior or a stranger. The intimate address (tui/tui/du) is reserved to superiors addressing inferiors (children or servants) and friends. Until the eighteenth century, English had the same distinction: You (formal) and thou (intimate) But even to this day, Her Majesty the Queen is always addressed as Your Majesty, never as Thy Majesty.
ABSOLUTION

May God, the almighty and merciful, grant to you absolution and remission of all your sins, space for true repentance, amendment of life, grace, and the consolation of the Holy Spirit.

The ministers shall respond: Amen.

It is to be noted that, whoever performs the Office of Mass, the Bishop (if one is present) shall say the Confiteor, Misereor, and Absolution at the footpace of the altar.

Then the Priest shall say the verse:

Our help is in the name of the Lord:
R. Who hath made heaven and earth.
V. May the name of the Lord be blessed:
R. From this time forth and forevermore.

Priest: Let us pray.
[Various collects are to be offered.]

Then, when the prayers are finished, the Priest kisses the Deacon, then the Subdeacon, saying,
Receive the kiss of peace and love, that you may be worthy for the most holy altar, to effect the Divine Office.

This is always to be observed throughout the year, except only at Masses for the Dead, and on the three days before Easter.*

When these things are finished, the acolytes remove the candelabra (with the wax candles) from the altar's footpace. The Priest then goes to the centre of the altar and, in an inaudible voice, with his head bowed and his hands joined, says,

Take away all our iniquities, we beseech thee, O Lord, that we may be worthy to approach thy Holy of Holies with pure minds and hearts; through Christ our Lord.

Then the Priest stands upright and kisses the altar-top in its middle, makes the sign of the cross on his forehead, and says.

In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

Then the Deacon shall place incense in the thurible, first saying to the Priest, Bless. The Priest shall say, The Lord. May this incense be blessed by him in whose honour it is to be burnt. In the Name of the Father. &c.

* i.e. Maundy Thursday, Good Friday, Holy Saturday.
Then the Deacon, handing the thurible to the Priest, shall kiss his hand, and let the Priest cense the altar in the centre and at either corner, first on the right, then on the left side, and while passing from one corner to the other, in the centre.

Then the Priest himself is to be censed by the Deacon; and afterwards the Priest shall kiss the Gospel Book brought by the subdeacon. These things being done at the right-hand corner of the altar with the deacon and subdeacon, the Introit of the Mass shall follow, up to the Collect of the Day, or up to the Gloria in excelsis (when it is to be said). The Introit [verse] is to be repeated a third time; the Kyrie shall follow.

Lord, have mercy. Lord, have mercy. Lord, have mercy.
Christ, have mercy. Christ, have mercy. Christ, have mercy.
Lord, have mercy. Lord, have mercy. Lord, have mercy.

Then let the ministers approach the altar in order, with the two candlebearers in front, walking together, then the incense bearers; afterwards the subdeacon, then the deacon; after him, the Priest, the deacon and subdeacon being vested in chasubles. This done, let the priest and his own ministers take the seats prepared for them, and wait until the Gloria in excelsis, which should always be commenced at the middle of the altar (whenever it is said).

G LORY be to God on high, and in earth peace, good will towards men. We praise thee, we bless thee, we glorify thee, we give thanks to thee for thy great glory, O Lord God, heavenly King, God the Father almighty. O Lord, the only begotten Son, Jesu Christ; O Lord God, Lamb of God, Son of the Father, that takest away the sin of the world, have mercy upon us. Thou that takest away the sin of the world, receive our prayer. Thou that sittest at the right hand of God the Father, have mercy upon us. For thou only art holy; thou only art the Lord; thou only, O Christ, with the Holy Ghost, art most high in the glory of God the Father.

Amen.

(Gloria in excelsis is not said through the whole of Advent, nor from Septuagesima Sunday up to the Easter Vigil.)

As soon as Gloria in excelsis has been begun, the Priest shall turn and go to the right corner of the altar, the ministers accompanying him – the deacon on the right hand side and the subdeacon on the left hand side. They shall say the Gloria in a low voice.

This ended, and the Priest having made the sign of the cross on his own face, let him turn to the people, and elevating his arms a little and joining his hands, let him say:
The Lord be with you.

The choir shall respond,
And with thy spirit.
The Priest shall again turn toward the altar and say.
Let us pray.
Then he shall say

**The Collect**

[for the Sixth Sunday after Trinity Sunday]

O GOD, who hast prepared for them that love thee such good things as pass man’s understanding: Pour into our hearts such love toward thee, that we, loving thee in all things and above all things, may obtain thy promises, which exceed all that we can desire; through Jesus Christ our Lord, who liveth and reigneth with thee, in the unity of the Holy Spirit, God, world without end.

If any commemoration [of a saint] is to be observed, let the Priest say, Let us pray, as above. When several collects are to be said, then all the prayers shall be said under one through Jesus Christ our Lord, and one Let us pray – though the [additional] prayers must not exceed seven in number. At all times, while the Priest stands [at the altar] for the Mass, let the deacon stand directly behind him on the next step, and the subdeacon in like manner directly behind the deacon on the second step, in such a manner that as often as the Priest turns himself to the people, the deacon will likewise turn himself. In the meantime let the subdeacon assist … It is to be noted that whatever is said by the Priest before the Epistle, shall be performed at the right corner of the altar, except for the beginning of the Gloria in excelsis. Let it be likewise after the reception of the Sacrament. Everything else shall be performed at the centre of the altar, unless a deacon happens to be unavailable. After the Introit of the Mass, one of the candle-bearers shall carry the bread, the wine, and the water, which are appointed for the ministration of the Eucharist, and the other shall carry a basin with water and towels. It is permitted for the choir to enter [at any point] up to the completion of the first Collect.

At the beginning of the final prayer before the Epistle, the subdeacon shall go through the middle of the choir [chancel] into the pulpit to read the Epistle. The Epistle is to be read in the pulpit on every Sunday (and whenever the choir is conducted) throughout the year: also on Maundy Thursday, at the Easter Vigil, in Eastertide, and on All Souls’ Day. On all other festivals and weekdays, and on vigils [of feast-days], and in the four seasons outside the weeks of Eastertide, it shall be read at the chancel step as in Lent as well as outside Lent.
**EPISODE**

(of the Sixth Sunday after Trinity Sunday)

1 Peter 3.6-15

A reading from the Letter of the blessed Apostle Peter.

**BELOVED** : Be ye all of one mind, having compassion one of another, love as brethren, be pitiful, be courteous, not rendering evil for evil, or railing for railing: but contrariwise blessing; knowing that ye are thereunto called, that ye should inherit a blessing. For he that will love life, and see good days, let him refrain his tongue from evil, and his lips that they speak no guile: Let him eschew evil, and do good; let him seek peace, and ensue it. For the eyes of the Lord are over the righteous, and his ears are open unto their prayers: but the face of the Lord is against them that do evil. And who is he that will harm you, if ye be followers of that which is good? But and if ye suffer for righteousness’ sake, happy are ye: and be not afraid of their terror, neither be troubled; but sanctify Christ the Lord in your hearts.

*While the Epistle is being read, two boys in surplices shall bow to the altar before the step of the choir and go through the middle of the choir to the pulpit, and prepare to begin the Gradual with its proper verse. Whilst the gradual verse is being sung, two [men] from the upper rank [of the choir] shall put on silk copes to sing the Alleluia, and go to the pulpit through the middle of the choir. The Alleluia shall follow. When the Alleluia is finished, the Sequence [when one is appointed] shall follow.*

**GRADUAL**

Ps. 83.10, 9 [=84.9, 8]

**BEHOLD, O GOD** The choir shall accompany the cantors through to the end: our shield, and look upon thy servants. Verse. O Lord God of hosts, hear the prayers of thy servants. The choir shall repeat the Gradual.

**ALLELUIA**

**ALLELÜIA, allelúia.** Verse [Ps 20.1 (=21.1)]. The king shall joy in thy strength, O Lord; and in thy salvation how greatly shall he rejoice! Allelúia.

*At the end of the Alleluia, or of the Sequence, or of the Tract, the Deacon, before he advances to read the Gospel, shall cense the middle of the altar only. Then he shall take the Gospel Book, and bow to the Priest standing before the altar; with his face turned to the south, he shall say: Bid, sir, a blessing.*

**THE PRIEST shall reply,**

The Lord be in thy heart and in thy mouth to proclaim the holy Gospel of God. In the name of the Father, X and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit. Amen.
The Deacon shall proceed through the middle of the choir to the pulpit, solemnly bearing the Gospel-book itself in his left hand, preceded by the thurifer and the taper-bearers. And when he has arrived at the place for reading, the subdeacon shall take the Gospel-book, and he shall hold the Book standing on the Deacon’s left-hand side facing him. The taper-bearers shall turn to face the Deacon, one on his right and the other on his left. The thurifer shall stand behind the Deacon, facing him. And the Gospel shall always be read facing north.

Gospel
Matthew 5.20-24

Deacon. The Lord be with you.
Choir. And with thy spirit.

The Deacon shall make the sign of the cross with his thumb on the Book, then on his forehead, and on his breast.

Deacon. The continuation of the holy Gospel according to Matthew.

Choir. Glory be to thee, O Lord.

At that time, Jesus said to his disciples: Except your righteousness shall exceed the righteousness of the scribes and Pharisees, ye shall in no case enter into the kingdom of heaven. Ye have heard that it was said by them of old time, Thou shalt not kill; and whosoever shall kill shall be in danger of the judgment: But I say unto you, That whosoever is angry with his brother without a cause shall be in danger of the judgment: and whosoever shall say to his brother, Raca, shall be in danger of the council: but whosoever shall say, Thou fool, shall be in danger of hell fire. Therefore if thou bring thy gift to the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath ought against thee; leave there thy gift before the altar, and go thy way; first be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift.

As soon as the Gospel has been read, the Deacon shall kiss the Book; the Subdeacon shall immediately hold it out to him, and the Deacon shall carry it flat on his breast to the Priest and present it the Priest for him to kiss.

The Gospel being finished, the Priest standing at the middle of the altar shall begin the Nicene Creed.

I believe in one God the Father almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible: And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God; begotten of his Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of light, very God of very God; begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father; by whom all things were made; who for us men, and for our salvation, came down from heaven, and was made incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man; and
was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate. He suffered and was buried, and the third day he arose again according to the Scriptures, and ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of the Father: And he shall come again with glory, to judge both the quick and the dead. And I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father and the Son; who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified; who spake by the prophets. And I believe in one catholic and apostolic Church. I acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins. And I look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen.

The choir shall stand and be turned toward the altar from the beginning of the Creed for as long as they are singing; and they shall bow to the altar at three points — first, at the words And was made incarnate; secondly, at the words And was made man; thirdly at the words And was crucified also for us. Also at the end, from the words And the life of the world to come until the beginning of the Offertory.

Then the Priest, having turned to the people, shall say, The Lord be with you, and the choir shall reply, And with thy spirit. The Priest shall turn to the altar and say the Offertory.

**OFFERTORY**

Ps. 16.7a, 8

I will bless the Lord for giving me counsel: I have set God always before me: for he is at my right hand, lest I fall.

After the Offertory, the Deacon shall hand the cup with the paten and the sacrifice [i.e. the wafer called the Priest’s host] to the Priest, and shall kiss the Priest’s hand each time. When the Deacon receives the cup from the Deacon, he shall place it carefully in its proper place above the altar’s middle [i.e. on the top fold of the corporal], and with bent head, for a little while, let him elevate the cup with both hands, offering the sacrifice to the Lord, saying this prayer:

Receive, O Holy Trinity, this oblation, which I, an unworthy sinner, offer in thine honour, [and in honour] of the blessed Virgin and all the saints, for my sins and offences, for the salvation of the living, and for the repose of all the faithful departed. In the name of the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit, may this new sacrifice be acceptable to God Almighty.

This prayer having been said, he shall put the cup down and cover it with a corporal, and he shall reverently place bread on the corporal in front of the cup which contains wine and water; and he shall kiss the paten and set it on the altar to the right [of the sacrifice], covering it a little with the
corporal. This done, he shall take the thurible from the deacon and cense the sacrifice. And while he censes, he shall say the following verse:

LET MY PRAYER be set forth in thy sight, O Lord, as incense.

After this the Priest himself shall be censed by the Deacon. Then an acolyte shall cense the choir.

When these actions have been completed, the Priest shall go the the right corner of the altar and wash his hands, saying:

CLEANSE ME, O Lord, from every defilement of soul and body, that, being clean, I may be able to fulfill the Lord’s holy work.

Meanwhile the Deacon censes the altar on the left corner. When the Priest has washed his hands, he shall turn to the altar for the performance of the divine service. Standing before the altar, with head and body bowed and hands joined, he shall say this prayer:

HUMBLE IN SPIRIT and contrite in soul, may we be accepted by thee, O Lord; and in thy sight may our sacrifice this day be such as to be accepted by thee, and pleasing unto thee, O Lord my God.

And standing up, he shall kiss the altar on the right of the sacrifice, and give a blessing over the sacrifice; then he shall cross himself, saying: In the name of the Father, etc.

Then the priest shall turn to the people and in a low voice say:

PRAY for me, brothers and sisters, that this sacrifice, which is yours as well as mine, may be acceptable to the Lord our God.

The clerks reply privately

MAY THE GRACE of the Holy Spirit enlighten thy heart and thy lips, and may the Lord accept as worthy this sacrifice of praise from thy hands for our sins and offences.

The Bidding of the Bedes
[An exhortation instructing the people what they should pray for (“bedes,” < Anglo-Saxon beten, “to pray”). The bidding portions were read out entirely in English.]

YOU SHALL STAND UP and bid your bedes to our Lord Jesu Christ, and to our Lady Saint Mary, and to all the company of heaven, for the state of Holy Church and for our Mother Church of Rome; for our lord the Pope, for the patriarch of Jerusalem, for the cardinals, for the archbishop of Canterbury, for all archbishops and bishops, and especially for the bishop of N.; for the patron of this church; and for your ghostly father [i.e. the priest who is rector or vicar of the parish], and for priests and clerks that herein serve or
have served; for all men and women of religion [i.e. monks and
nuns], and for all other men of holy Church, and for all them that
have the state of holy Church in [their] keeping, that God in his
mercy grant them such grace so to maintain and keep it, that God
be therewith repaid. You shall bid for the Holy Land and the Holy
Cross, that God send it into Christian men’s hands when his will is.
You shall bid also for the peace of this land, and for our lord
the King, and for the Queen, and for dukes, earls, and barons, and
for all them that have the peace of this land to keep, that God for
his mercy send them good counsel and grace thereafter to work.
You shall bid for the mayor of this town, and for all the
community, and for all our parishioners that be here or elsewhere,
on water or on land, that God in his mercy grant them grace safe
to go and safe to come, and speed them in all their needs.
You shall bid for the good man and the good wife that this
day brought the loaf and the candle, and for all them that
first began and longest held on :
And for all women that be in our Lady’s bonds, that God for
his mercy so them unbind as it be best to life and to soul; and for
all that do truly their tithes and their offerings to God and to Holy
Church; and for all that do not, that God for his mercy send them
grace to come to amendment.
You shall bid for the sick of this parish here or elsewhere, and
principally for all that lie in deadly sin bound, that God send them
such health as it be best to life and to soul; and for all those that be
in good life, that God grant them grace to hold them therein, and
them that be not, to turn them to amendment.
You shall also bid that God for his mercy such weather to send
on earth, that the fruit that is therein thrive, and what is for to do,
turn Christian men to help.
You shall also bid specially for all that this church help with
any manner of thing whereby God and Saint N. [the patron saint
of the parish] the fairer are served and worshipped.
You shall also bid for yourself, that God for his mercy grant
you grace so your life here to lead, him for to please our soul to
save; and that it might be so for you, and for us, and for all
Christian people, say a Paternoster [the Lord’s Prayer] and Ave
Maria [Hail Mary] for charity.

The psalm Deus misereátur [Ps. 66 (=67)] is said, with Gloria Patri.

LORD, have mercy upon us. Christ, have mercy upon us. Lord,
have mercy upon us.
V. O Lord, show thy mercy upon us :
R. And grant us thy salvation.
V. Endue thy ministers with righteousness :
R. And let thy saints rejoice.
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V. O Lord, save the King:
R. And hear us when we call upon thee.
V. Save thy servant,
R. O God, who trusteth in thee.
V. Save thy people, and bless thine heritage.
R. Govern them, and lift them up for ever.
V. Peace be within thy stronghold,
R. And plenteousness within thy towers.
V. Lord, hear my prayer,
R. And let my cry come unto thee.
V. The Lord be with you.
R. And with thy spirit.

Priest. Let us pray.

O GOD, who pourest the gifts of charity into the hearts of thy faithful through the grace of the Holy Spirit: Grant unto thy servants and handmaids for whom we pray thy clemency, health of mind and body, that they may love thee with all their power, and perfect what is pleasing to thee with all love, and give peace in our time, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

You shall kneeling bid for your fathers’ souls, for your mothers’ souls, for your brothers’ souls, for your sisters’ souls, for your godfathers’ souls, for your godmothers’ souls, and for all your kin’s souls.

You shall also bid for all the souls whose bones rest in this church or churchyard, or in any other holy place, and for all the souls that have given in their life or bequeathed any manner good to this place, wherefore God’s service is the fairer done in this holy stead [=dwelling].

You shall also bid for all the souls that be in pain of purgatory, that God for his mercy for your bedes the rather bring them to bliss and to rest, and for all the souls you have had of their goods [i.e. for all who have given you hospitality or bequeathed you anything], wherefore you be in debt for to bid, and for all Christian souls, Pater noster and Ave Maria.

The psalm De profundis [Ps. 129 (=130)] is said, without Gloria Patri.

LORD, have mercy upon us. Christ, have mercy upon us. Lord, have mercy upon us.

Our Father which art in heaven....
V. Grant them eternal rest, O Lord:
R. And let light perpetual shine upon them.
V. From the gates of hell,
R. O Lord, deliver their souls.
V. I believe to see the goodness of the Lord:
R. In the land of the living.
V. The Lord be with you.
R. And with thy spirit.

Priest. Let us pray.

Absolve, we beseech thee, O Lord, the souls of thy servants the pontiffs and priests, and the souls of thy servants and handmaids our parents, fellow-parishioners, friends, and benefactors, and the souls of all the faithful departed, from every bond of their sins, that in the glory of the resurrection they may be revived and live among thy holy elect; through Jesus Christ our Lord.

May they rest in peace. Amen.

The Sermon

And turning to the altar, the Priest shall say the Secrets according to the number and order of those [collects] said earlier before the Epistle, beginning thus:

Let us pray.

Secret [= Prayer over the Gifts]

Be favourable, O Lord, to our supplications, and graciously receive the offerings of thy servants and handmaidens, that what individuals have offered for the honour of thy name, may be of aid to all for salvation; through our Lord Jesus Christ.

The Secrets having been said, he shall say aloud, World without end, not lifting up his hands until Lift up your hearts is said. And then the subdeacon shall receive the offertorium [a linen cloth for holding the paten] and the paten from the hand of the deacon; the paten itself is to be held [by the subdeacon] until the Lord's Prayer is said: at which point he shall commit the paten, covered with the offertorium, to the acolyte on the step (namely, the acolyte appointed to serve the deacon).

All prefaces to Mass shall begin in this manner throughout the year, on fast days as well as on feast days:

World without end. Amen.

Priest. The Lord be with you.
Choir. And with thy spirit.

Here the Priest shall raise his hands, saying:

Priest. Lift up your hearts [literally, Hearts on high!].
Choir. We have them with the Lord.

Priest. Let us give thanks unto the Lord our God.
Choir. It is fitting and right.

It is truly fitting and right, just and beneficial, at all times and in all places to give thanks unto thee, O Lord, holy Father, almighty
and eternal God, through Christ our Lord; through whom the angels praise, the dominions adore, the powers fear your majesty, and through whom the heavens, the hosts of heaven, and the seraphim together sing your praise with exultation; with whose voices, we pray, thou wouldest command ours also to be admitted in suppliant confession, as we say.

*While the Priest says the Sanctus, he shall briefly raise his arms and join his hands, up to the words In the name of the Lord: at which point she shall always make the sign of the cross on his face.*

**HOLY, holy, holy Lord God of hosts.**  
Full of thy glory are the heavens and the earth.  
Hosanna in the highest.  
Blessed is he who cometh in the name of the Lord.  
Hosanna in the highest.

*Then the Priest, with hands joined together and eyes lifted up, shall immediately begin the Canon of the Mass.*

**THEREFORE, most merciful Father, through thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord, we humbly ask (Let him bow down his body while he says:) and entreat thee (Here, standing upright, the Priest shall kiss the altar:) that thou accept and bless (Here let him make the sign of the cross three times over the chalice and the host, saying:) these X gifts, these X offerings, these X holy and unblemished sacrifices, which first of all we offer unto thee for thy holy catholic Church, the which mayest thou vouchsafe to keep in peace, watch over, make one, and govern in all the world, in union with thy servant N. our pope, and with N. our bishop, with N. our King, and with all true-hearted worshippers of the catholic and apostolic faith.

*Here let him pray for the living.*

**REMEMBER, LORD, thy servants and handmaids N. et N., and all who stand round about [this altar], whose faith is known and whose devotion is manifest unto thee, for whom we offer, or who offer for themselves and for all their own, this sacrifice of praise unto thee, for the redemption of their souls and for the hope of their salvation and health, and render their vows unto thee, the eternal God, living and true.**

**IN COMMUNION WITH, and venerating the remembrance of, above all the glorious ever-Virgin Mary, Mother of our God and Lord Jesus Christ, and also thy blessed apostles and martyrs Peter, Paul, Andrew, James and John, Thomas, James, Philip, Bartholomew,
Simon, and Thaddeus, Linus, Cletus, Clement, Xystus, Cornelius, Cyprian, Laurence, Chrysogonus, John and Paul, Cosmas and Damian, and all thy saints: by whose merits and prayers, grant that in all things we may be defended by the aid of thy protection; through the same Christ our Lord. Amen.

Here let the Priest look upon the host with great veneration, saying:

We therefore beseech thee, O Lord, that thou wilt graciously accept this oblation of our and all thy household’s bounden duty and service, and wilt order our days in thy peace; and grant us to be snatched from eternal damnation, and wilt command us to be counted among the flock of thine elect; through Christ our Lord. Amen.

Here again let him look upon the host, saying:

Which oblation, we implore thee, O God, mayest thou be pleased to make blessed, approved, ratified, reasonable, and acceptable in every way, that it may be unto us the Body and Blood of thy dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ our Lord;

Here the Priest shall lift up his hands and join them together; and after wiping his fingers he shall pick up the host, saying:

Who, on the day before he suffered, took bread in his holy and venerable hands, with his eyes lifted up to heaven (Here he shall lift up his eyes:) unto thee, O God, his almighty Father, (Here he shall bow and then rise a little, saying:) giving thanks unto thee, he blessed, broke (Here he shall break the host, saying:) and gave to his disciples, saying: Take and eat of this, all of you, for this is my Body.

These words must be spoken with one breath and in a single utterance, without any pause. After these words, the Priest shall bow to the host, then raise it above his forehead, that it may be seen by the people. Then he shall reverently put it back in front of the chalice in the manner of a cross made by the same. Then he shall uncover the chalice and hold it between his hands, not disuniting his thumb from his forefinger, except only while he blesses, saying thus:

Likewise after supper, taking also this glorious chalice into his holy and venerable hands, and again giving thanks unto thee (Here he shall bow, saying), he blessed and gave to his disciples, saying: Take and drink of this, all of you. (Here the Priest shall lift the chalice a little, saying:) for this is the cup of my blood of the new and eternal testament, the mystery of faith, which will be poured out for you and for many for the forgiveness of sins. (Here he shall lift
the chalice to his breast or further than his head, saying:) As oft as ye do this, ye shall do it for the remembrance of me.

Here let him replace the cup, and raise his arms in the form of a cross, his fingers being joined until the words from thy gifts.

WHEREFORE, O Lord, WE ALSO, thy servants and thine holy people, ARE MINDFUL of the blessed passion of Christ thy Son, our Lord and God, as well as of his resurrection from the dead and his glorious ascension into the heavens; and we offer unto thy splendid majesty, from thy presents and gifts, a pure X victim, a holy X victim, an unblemished X victim, the holy bread of eternal life and the cup of everlasting salvation;

OVER WHICH mayest thou be pleased to look with a merciful and serene countenance, and to accept them just as thou wast pleased to accept the gifts of thy servant righteous Abel, and the sacrifice of our forefather Abraham, and that which thy high priest Melchizedek did offer unto thee, a holy sacrifice, an unblemished victim.

Here the Priest, with body bowed and hands folded, shall say:

UMBLY do we implore thee, almighty God: Command these gifts to be borne by the hands of thine angel unto thine altar on high, in the sight of thy divine majesty, so that as many of us (Here standing erect, he shall kiss the altar on the right side of the sacrifice, saying:) as shall have received, from this participation of the altar, the most holy X Body and X Blood of thy Son, may be filled (Here he shall make the sign of the cross on his face) with every X heavenly blessing and grace; through the same Christ our Lord. Amen.

Here let him pray for the dead.

REMEMBER ALSO, O Lord, thy servants and handmaids N. and N., who have gone before us with the sign of faith and sleep in the sleep of peace. To them, and unto all who rest in Christ, we pray that thou wilt grant a place of refreshment, light, and peace; through the same Christ our Lord. Amen.

Here he shall strike his breast once, saying:

UNTO US sinners ALSO, your servants, who trust in the abundance of thy mercies, mayest thou be pleased to give some share and participation with thy holy apostles and martyrs, with John, Stephen, Matthias, Barnabas, Ignatius, Alexander, Marcellinus, Peter, Felicity, Perpetua, Agatha, Lucy, Agnes, Cecilia, Anastasia, and with all thy saints : into whose company admit us, we pray,
not as one who assesses merit but as one who esteems forgiveness; through Christ our Lord;

Through whom, O Lord, thou dost ever create, (Here he shall make the sign of the cross three times over the chalice, saying:) sanctify, enliven, bless, and bestow all these good things upon us:

Here let the priest uncover the cup, and make the sign of the cross with the host five times, first beyond the cup on every side, secondly even with the cup, thirdly within the cup, fourthly as the first, fifthly in front of the cup.

Through him, and with him, and in him, all honour and glory be unto thee, O God the Father almighty, in the unity of the Holy Spirit.

Here let the Priest cover the chalice and hold his hands still upon the altar until the Our Father is said, saying thus:

World without end. Amen.

Let us pray.

Taught by the saving precepts and formed by divine instruction, we are bold to say:

Here let the deacon take the paten, and hold it uncovered on the right side of the priest, with his arm stretched out on high, as far as to Mercifully grant.

Our Father which art in the heavens…. And lead us not into temptation.

The choir shall say.

But deliver us from evil.

The Priest privately says, Amen.

Free us, we pray, O Lord, from all evils, past, present, and yet to come; and by the intercession of the blessed and glorious ever-virgin Mary, the Mother of God, and of your holy apostles Peter and Paul and Andrew,

Here let the deacon give the paten to the Priest, kissing his hand, and let the priest kiss the paten. After this, let him put it to his left eye, then to his right eye. After this, let him make the cross with the paten above his head, and then lay it in its own place, saying:

Mercifully grant us peace in our time, that strengthened by the aid of thy loving-kindness, we may be always free from sin and safe from every anxiety;

Here let him uncover the chalice and, reverently bowing, let him take the Body [of Christ] and move it so it sits in the hollow of the chalice, while retaining it between his thumbs and forefingers; and let him break it into three parts whilst he says:
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(the first fraction) through our Lord Jesus Christ thy Son,

The second fraction:

who is God living and reigning with thee in the unity of the Holy Spirit.

Here let him hold the two portions in his left hand, and the third portion in his right hand at the rim of the chalice, while he says in a clear voice:

Throughout all ages and for ever.

Let the choir respond, Amen.

Here let him make three crosses within the chalice with the third portion of the Host, saying:

The peace of the Lord be always with you.

Let the choir respond.

And with thy spirit.

For the saying of the Agnus, let the deacon and subdeacon draw near to the Priest, both on his right hand, with the deacon nearer to him, and let them say privately.

O Lamb of God, that takest away the sin of the world, have mercy upon us.

O Lamb of God, that takest away the sin of the world, have mercy upon us.

O Lamb of God, that takest away the sin of the world, grant us peace.

Here making the sign of the cross with the third portion of the Host, he shall drop it into the sacrament of the Blood, saying as he does so:

Let this most holy commixture of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ be unto me, and unto all who receive it, salvation of mind and body; and a life-giving preparation both to merit and to receive eternal life. Through the same Christ our Lord. Amen.

Before the Peace be given, let the Priest say:

O Lord, holy Father, almighty, eternal God, grant unto me that I may so worthily receive this most holy Body and Blood of thy Son our Lord Jesus Christ, that through this [reception] I may merit to receive the remission of all my sins, be filled with thy Holy Spirit, and have thy peace: for thou alone art God, and there is none other beside thee, whose glorious kingdom and dominion shall endure for ever and ever. Amen.

Here let the Priest kiss the corporal on the right side, and the rim of the chalice, and afterwards the deacon, saying:

Peace be to thee and unto the Church of God.

Answer: And with thy spirit.
Let the deacon, on the right hand of the priest, receive the Pax [a tablet bearing a representation of the Crucifixion or other sacred subject, which was kissed] from him, and extend it to the subdeacon: Then, at the step of the choir, let the deacon himself bear the Pax to the directors of the choir: and let them convey the Pax to the choir, each one to his own part, beginning from the seniors.

After the giving of the Pax, let the priest say the following prayers privately, while holding the Host in both hands, before he communicates himself:

**OD THE FATHER, Fount and Source of all goodness, who, moved by compassion for us, didst will thine only begotten Son to descend to the low places of the world, and to take our flesh, whom I, unworthy, here hold in my hands:** (Here let the priest bow to the Host, saying:) I adore thee, I glorify thee, I praise thee, with complete intention of mind and heart: and I pray that thou mayest not forsake thy servants, but pardon our sins; that with pure heart and chaste body we may deserve to serve thee, who alone art God, living and true. Through the same Christ our Lord. Amen.

**LORD JESU CHRIST, Son of the living God, who, according to the will of the Father, with the Holy Spirit as co-worker, through thy death, hast given life to the world:** Deliver me, I beseech thee, by this thy most holy Body and Blood, from all my iniquities, and from all evils; and make me always to obey thy commandments, and never permit me to be separated from thee for ever. Who livest and reignest God, with God the Father and the same holy Spirit, throughout all ages. Amen.

**LET NOT THE SACRAMENT of thy Body and Blood, O Lord Jesu Christ, which, although unworthy, I presume to receive, be to me for judgement and condemnation, but may it avail, through thy mercy, for the salvation of my body and soul.** Amen.

**To the Body let him say, with humility, before he receives:**

**HAIL FOR EVERMORE, O most holy Flesh of Christ: to me before all things, and above all things, the greatest sweetness. The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ be to me, a sinner, the way and the life, in the name X of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.** Amen.

Here let him receive the Body, the sign of the cross first having been made with the Body itself in front of the mouth.

Then saying to the Blood with great reverence:

**HAIL FOR EVERMORE, heavenly drink, to me before all things, and above all things, the greatest sweetness. The Body and Blood**
of our Lord Jesus Christ be of profit to me, a sinner, for an everlasting remedy unto eternal life. Amen. In the name X of the Father, &c.

Here let him receive the Blood: which having been received, let him bow and say with devotion the following prayer:

GIVE THANKS UNTO THEE, O Lord, holy Father, almighty, eternal God, who hast refreshed me from the most sacred Body and Blood of thy Son our Lord Jesus Christ: And I pray that this sacrament of our salvation, which, unworthy sinner as I am, I have received, may come to me neither as the judgment or the condemnation that I deserve, but for the advancing of my body and the saving of my soul even unto eternal life. Amen.

This prayer having been said, let the Priest go to the right hand of the altar with the cup between his hands, his fingers being still joined as before, and let the subdeacon approach and pour into the cup wine and water; and let the Priest rinse his hands, lest any remains of the Body or Blood should be on his fingers or in the cup. After the first ablution, this prayer is said:

THAT WHICH we have received with the mouth, O Lord, let us take with a pure mind; and out of a temporal gift let it be for us an eternal remedy.

Here let him wash his fingers in the hollow of the chalice, with the wine poured in by the subdeacon; which being drunk up, let this prayer follow:

LET THIS COMMUNION, O Lord, purge us from sin and make us to be partakers of the heavenly remedy.

After receiving the ablutions, let the priest place the chalice upon the paten, that if any remain it may drop [on to the paten]; and afterwards bowing, let him say:

LET US ADORE the sign of the cross, by which we have received the sacrament of salvation.

Then let him wash his hands; meanwhile let the deacon fold up the corporal. When his hands are washed, and the Priest has returned to the right side of the altar, let the deacon hold the chalice up to the mouth of the Priest to consume whatever may have remained in it.

After that let him say the Communion with his ministers.

Communion [of Sixth Sunday after Trinity]

Ps. 27.4

ONE THING have I asked of the LORD, this one thing I seek : that I may dwell in the house of the LORD all the days of my life.
Then having made the sign of the cross on his face, let him turn to the people and, with his arms raised a little and hands joined, let him say:

The Lord be with you.

Let the choir answer:

And with thy spirit.

Then turning again to the altar, let him say:

Let us pray.

Then let him say the Prayer after Communion, according to the number and order of the collects said before the Epistle.

Prayer after Communion
[of Sixth Sunday after Trinity]

Grant, we beseech thee, O Lord, that those of us whom thou hast satisfied with the gift of heaven, may be cleansed from hidden sins, and freed from the snares of our enemies; through our Lord Jesus Christ.

Having finished the last Prayer after Communion, and having made the sign of the cross on his forehead, let the Priest again turn to the people, and say:

The Lord be with you.

Let the choir answer:

And with thy spirit.

Then let the deacon say:

Let us bless the Lord.

Let the choir answer:

Thanks be to God.

On other occasions is said:

Go, you are dismissed.

As often as Go, you are dismissed is said, it is always said facing the people; and when, Let us bless the Lord is to be said, it is said facing the altar.

These things said, let the Priest, with body bowed and hands joined together before the middle of the altar, say this prayer softly:

Let the homage of my service be pleasing unto thee, O Holy Trinity; and grant that this sacrifice which I, unworthy, have presented before the eyes of thy Majesty, may be acceptable unto thee and, by thy mercy, may avail to obtain remission [of sins] for me and for all those for whom I have offered it. Who livest and reignest, ever one God, world without end. Amen.

Which ended, let the Priest stand upright, making the sign of the cross on his face, and saying:

In the name X of the Father, &c.

And so, having bowed in reverence, they shall leave in the same order in which they approached the altar at the beginning of the Mass, wearing
the same vestments, with the acolytes and other ministers. And immediately after Thanks be to God, let the Office of None be begun in the choir, when it is said after Mass. But the priest in leaving shall say the Gospel [John 1.1-14].

IN THE BEGINNING was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. The same was in the beginning with God. All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made. In him was life; and the life was the light of men. And the light shineth in darkness; and the darkness comprehended it not. There was a man sent from God, whose name was John. The same came for a witness, to bear witness of the Light, that all men through him might believe. He was not that Light, but was sent to bear witness of that Light. That was the true Light, which lighteth every man that cometh into the world. He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not. He came unto his own, and his own received him not. But as many as received him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name: Which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God. And the Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us, (and we beheld his glory, the glory as of the only-begotten of the Father,) full of grace and truth.
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Theologies of the Eucharist II
The Anglican Tradition

1. The Founding Liturgies

*THE BOOKE OF COMMON PRAYER AND ADMINISTRACION OF THE SACRAMENTES* (1549)

The Supper of the Lord and the holy Communion, commonly called the Mass
INTRODUCTION

IN 1529, as Luther and his Protestant critics approached the parting of the ways, the England of King Henry VIII was still a very Catholic nation, still in loyal communion with the see of Rome. Indeed, Henry himself had written a tract against Luther’s doctrine of the sacraments, in which he asserted a high theory of papal supremacy.¹ But within seven years Rome had excommunicated Henry and declared the English Church to be in schism. The reason? In those few years Henry had compelled the English clergy to renounce their allegiance to the Pope and recognise himself as “the only Supreme Head of the English Church and Clergy”.

The English experience of the Reformation was unique in many respects, not least in the fact that Henry did not intend to make England a Protestant nation. He may have fallen out with the Pope, but he had not fallen in with Luther; and those of his subjects who espoused Lutheran opinions, even after the break with Rome, were liable to suffer the fatal consequences of Henry’s displeasure. The Henrician Reformation, then, bore more resemblance to a royal coup d’égli
de than to the Reformation which was taking place on the European mainland. It was also a graduated coup, not a sudden revolution. Henry proceeded by stages nicely calculated to assure maximum complaisance among the nobility and gentry, who dominated Parliament, while playing upon their fear of dynastic instability and consequent civil disorder. It may also possible, of course, that Henry had no clear plan set in his mind when he started his coup, but made it up as he went along.

Such a picture of a royal coup d’égli
de raises that bugbear of the Anglican sense of historical integrity, the great “D”-

¹ *Assertio Septem Sacramentorum* (1521). The Catholic tradition maintained (and yet maintains) that there are seven sacraments – baptism, confirmation, eucharist, penance, matrimony, holy orders, and unction. Luther argued that Christ had instituted only three sacraments – baptism, eucharist, and penance – and that the other four were merely human ordinances. Henry VIII “asserted” the full budget of seven. In gratitude, Pope Leo X gave Henry the title “Defender of the Faith” – a title still borne by the present monarch of Great Britain and Canada.
event – the Divorce of Henry VIII. But it cannot be avoided. There would have been no Anglican tradition without the English Reformation, and there would have been no English Reformation without Henry’s take-over of the English church; and Henry probably would not have thought to take over the Church had it not been for “the King’s Great Matter,” his suit for the annulment of his marriage to Catherine of Aragon.²

Henry VIII was Catherine of Aragon’s second husband. Her first husband, Arthur, had been Henry’s older brother. Arthur died shortly after his wedding (of unrelated causes). Henry VII of England, unwilling to lose dynastic ties with the Spanish Crown, arranged for Catherine to marry his second (and only surviving) son Henry. To do so, however, he had to obtain a dispensation from the Pope. For Church law took the principle, “And the two become one flesh,” very seriously. Thus, a man could not marry his deceased brother’s widow (nor a woman her deceased husband’s brother) because, once the first marriage had been consummated, the woman had become that man’s sister. Technically speaking, then, Prince Henry’s marriage to Catherine would have been incest.³ But the papacy, working on the principle that “some pigs are more equal than other pigs,” granted dispensations from the law to royal families and such nobility as could afford the prohibitive fees. Though one of the greatest tightwads ever to sit on the English throne, Henry VII felt that the dynastic

---

² In canon law, there is all the difference in the world between divorce and annulment. Divorce is the dissolution of a legally contracted and physically consummated marriage. By contrast, annulment declares that, for any one of a variety of impediments, a marriage ought not to have been contracted in the first place and thus was completely null and absolutely void. The two partners are then free to marry again without penalty.

³ By the way, thanks to Henry’s experience, the Church of England (until 1946) included a man’s Deceased Brother’s Wife and his Deceased Wife’s Sister, and a woman’s Deceased Sister’s Husband and her Deceased Husband’s Brother, within the prohibited degrees of marriage. The Anglican Church of Canada, following civil law, dropped these particular prohibitions in 1921.
benefits of keeping Catherine of Aragon in the family outweighed the personal satisfaction of keeping all that gold in his coffers. Pope Julius II duly granted the dispensation. Henry VIII and Catherine were married in June 1509, two months after Henry’s accession to the throne.

Over the next twenty years Catherine bore Henry many children, but only one survived infancy—a girl whom they named Mary. In a nation but one generation removed from the ravages of the dynastic “Wars of the Roses,” this inability to produce a healthy male heir roused serious fears among the nobles and gentry. Henry began to wonder whether God (rather than the Tudor gene-pool) might not be punishing him for something; and being an arm-chair theologian, he thought he found the reason in the fact that he had married his deceased brother’s wife, contrary to the law of God as set forth in the book of Leviticus.4 He insisted on placing his suit for annulment on the highest possible grounds, viz. that Julius II had not possessed the authority or the right to grant a dispensation for the marriage in the first place. In other words, he not only asked Clement VII for an annulment but also required the Pope to declare that one of his predecessors had violated the law of God— and, in effect, that no Pope had the power or the right to grant dispensation from God’s law. The situation was further complicated by a nasty turn of affairs in Italy. In 1527, just as Henry launched his suit, Rome was attacked and sacked by the army of Charles V, emperor

4 Leviticus 20.21: “If a man takes his brother’s wife, it is impurity; he has uncovered his brother’s nakedness; they shall be childless.” This provision seems to be aimed at a man who commits adultery with the wife of his living brother. Elsewhere, the Torah positively commands a man to marry the widow of his deceased brother, if that brother died childless—Deuteronomy 25.5-6: “When brothers reside together, and one of them dies and has no son, the wife of the deceased shall not be married outside the family to a stranger. Her husband’s brother shall go in to her, taking her in marriage, and performing the duty of a husband’s brother to her, and the firstborn whom she bears shall succeed to the name of the deceased brother, so that his name may not be blotted out of Israel.” Henry persistently slighted this ordinance; he thought that Christ had cancelled it in rebutting the Sadducees’ case of a widow and her late husband’s six brothers (Mark 12.19-27 and parallels).
of the Holy Roman Empire, and Pope Clement became Charles’s prisoner. Charles happened to be Catherine’s nephew; and, being a Habsburg, he frowned on anything that might impugn the family’s dynastic honour. Clement decided that the Habsburg devil he knew was more dangerous than the Tudor devil he didn’t know, and tried to “con” Henry with a bureaucratic shell game.

By 1530, after three years of papal stone-walling, Henry had had enough. Over the next four years he launched a series of manoeuvres which wrenched England from its historic allegiance to the papacy. These manoeuvres were his own form of shell game; but where Clement had played “Annulment, Annulment, who’s got the Annulment?,” Henry played “England, England, who’s got the Church of England?” His first major coup came in May 1532, when he bullied the Convocations of Canterbury and York into submitting to his sole jurisdiction. Two years later Parliament completed the coup by passing the Act of Supremacy, which declared Henry to be “the only Supreme Head in earth of the Church of England.”

It was on the basis of this statute that Henry instituted a number of particular reforms. He authorised an English version of the Bible to be placed in churches, and created a couple of new dioceses. He also dissolved all monastic houses and ordered the destruction of all saints’ shrines within his realm. But the Henrician Reformation turned out to be very selective, and decidedly unsystematic, in what it targeted for reform or, more often, spoliation. Apart from the monasteries, the infrastructure of the medieval Church of England remained more or less intact. So too did the doctrinal infrastructure of medieval Catholicism. In particular, Henry permitted no change in the eucharistic faith and practice of the English Church. In 1539 he even had Parliament enact the Six Articles, which (among other things)

---

5 Henry VIII, Edward VI, and Mary I were the only English monarchs to hold the title “Supreme Head of the Church”. Mary had the Act of Supremacy repealed (and the title thus abolished) shortly after her accession in 1553. When Elizabeth I came to the throne in 1558, a new Act of Supremacy was drafted, wherein she was styled (at her own insistence) “Supreme Governor of the Church of England”. This form of the title has been borne by every English monarch since 1559.
reasserted the doctrine of trans-substantiation, the appropriateness of withholding the chalice from the laity, and the efficacy of private Masses, as well as mandatory celibacy of the clergy.

In the last two years of his life Henry once again swung towards those nobles at his court who had made themselves the patrons of a greater Protestantization of the Henrician Church. Yet the liturgy of that Church continued to be the Mass of the Roman Rite (with references to the Pope excised), said or sung in Latin. It was clearly Henry’s intention that the liturgical ancien régime should endure after his death, for in his last will and testament he endowed several chantries to ensure that Masses would be offered for the repose of his soul.

Henry was nothing if not a control-freak. In the same will he tried to control in detail how his kingdom would be governed during the minority of his only surviving (and legitimate) son, Edward.6 The boy was just shy of his tenth birthday, so Henry set up a special council to oversee the government of the realm until Edward reached his majority. Because he feared (with good cause) the prospect of an “overmighty subject” exploiting the boy-king’s unripeness, Henry vested all authority in this council as a whole and expressly barred any one of its members from assuming the role and title of sole Protector of England. But it is the folly of control-freaks that they cannot imagine their own absence; and Henry VIII was no exception. His elaborate provisions for the governance of the kingdom after his death overlooked one crucial fact – that he himself would not be around to enforce them. Among others, Henry appointed his son’s maternal uncle, Edward Seymour, Earl of Hertford, to the protectorial council. Hertford, a favourer of Protestant policies, was the very model of a grieving subject at Henry’s death-bed; and as soon as Henry breathed his last, on 28 January 1547, Hertford proved to be the very model of a fast-moving opportunist. Within hours of Edward VI’s accession he had formed a cabal within the protectorial council. With this cabal’s aid and connivance Hertford engineered a take-over. The protectorial council abolished

---

6 Edward VI, born 1537, was Henry’s son by his third wife, Jane Seymour, who died within a few days of giving birth to him.
itself and, promptly reconstituting itself as the Privy Council, appointed Hertford sole Lord Protector of the Realm. Edward duly obliged his uncle and created him Duke of Somerset.

One of Somerset’s strongest allies was Thomas Cranmer, archbishop of Canterbury. It was no secret that the archbishop had long favoured a more thorough reformation of the English Church than Henry wished or allowed. So Somerset’s seizure of power made it possible for Cranmer to think seriously about implementing just such a programme. Somerset and the rest of the Privy Council gave him his head, and he did not waste time.

The very speed with which Cranmer moved indicates that his programme was no slapdash affair, invented on the run. The archbishop had clearly been doing a lot of thinking, a lot of writing, and a lot of hard editorial work in preparation for just such an opportunity as this. In July 1547 the Privy Council issued a set of Royal Injunctions, which ordained a wide range of liturgical reforms in all the parishes of the kingdom. The same month saw the publication of *Certain Sermons or Homilies to be declared and read by all parsons, vicars, or curates every Sunday in their churches where they have cure*. Henry VIII had agreed in principle to the drafting of such a book; but it is not at all certain that he would have agreed with what appeared in 1547. The Book contained twelve homilies, five of which promoted the unmistakably Protestant doctrine of justification by faith alone. In November of the same year, Edward’s government pushed through Parliament *An Act Against such persons as shall unreverently speak against the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, commonly called the Sacrament of the Altar; and for the receiving thereof under both kinds*. The first part of the Act was a sop to conservative churchmen, known as “Henrician Catholics” because they had accepted Henry’s supremacy over the Church so long as he maintained Catholic doctrine, worship, and practices. The second half of the Act, which ordained that the laity should receive the chalice as well as the host, let Henrician conservatives know that their days were numbered.

In March 1548 the government issued its first truly substantial reform of the Mass itself. Beginning on Easter Day of that year, and “until other order shall be provided,” all
churches throughout England and Ireland were commanded to use *The Order of the Communion*. This *Order* was not a complete liturgy in itself, but a communion rite in the strictest sense. It ordained that the Latin Mass be celebrated as usual until the celebrant had communicated himself. At that point, he was to “turn to them which be disposed to be partakers of the Communion” and read out an exhortation (in English) concerning worthy reception of the sacrament. This was followed by a sequence of texts familiar to older Anglicans, which here made their first appearance: the Invitation (“You that do truly and earnestly repent you...”), the General Confession, the Absolution and Comfortable Words, and the Prayer of Humble Access (“We do not presume...”). The sacrament was then to be administered in both kinds, each with an English formula. A blessing in English (“The peace of God which passeth all understanding...”) concluded the *Order*.

The Royal Proclamation which preceded this *Order* gave notice that it was an interim rite, to continue in use only until such time as the government had been able “further to travail for the reformation and setting forth of such godly orders as may be most for God’s glory, the edifying of our subjects, and for the advancement of true religion”. But the 1548 *Order of the Communion* was much more than a stopgap measure. It was purposely designed to heighten the importance of communion in relation to consecration. Its very length, and the fact that it was in English, made the receiving of the sacrament a second “peak” within the Mass. Though by no means radical in its Protestant bias, either in content or in form, it nevertheless accorded with the Protestant insistence on the paramount importance of communion.

Lambeth Palace, the archbishop of Canterbury’s official residence in London, must have been a very busy place throughout the rest of 1548, as Cranmer and his staff “further travailed for the reformation and setting forth of such godly orders” as were to be contained in *The booke of common prayer and administracion of the Sacramentes*. In January 1549 Parliament passed the first *Act of Uniformity*, which imposed this Book on the whole Church of England and specified that it was to come into use on Whitsunday (Pentecost) of that same year (9 June).
The heart of the first Prayer Book was its eucharistic liturgy, “The Supper of the Lord and the holy Communion, commonly called the Mass”. The text of this liturgy follows. It is, as one historian has noted, “an ingenious essay in ambiguity”. A good deal of its material came from the Roman Rite, as embodied in the Sarum Use. Hence, at first glance, it looks like a very Catholic liturgy. And the 1549 Mass needs several more glances before this first impression yields to the nuances of the text.

The first clue that the 1549 English Mass is up to something comes with the sequence of scriptural sentences which were to be said or sung during the offertory (see pp. 62-63 below). There was nothing especially Protestant about such sentences. In the Roman Rite, every Mass had a proper offertorium, which consisted of a scriptural verse or two (usually from a psalm) to be sung or said during the preparation of the gifts. The offertorium was followed by the super oblata (Prayer over the Gifts), also a variable proper, which specifically referred to the offering of these gifts to God for the sake of the eucharistic sacrifice. EngBCP 1549 has cut out the super oblata, but retains the offertorium with a drastically reduced number of variables. As a result, these sentences must bear the whole weight of the transition from the liturgy of the Word to the liturgy of the Lord’s Supper. None of them suggests that the bread and wine, or indeed anything else material, is offered to God. Instead, the sentences refer either to the spiritual self-oblation of the faithful, or to the duty of the faithful to support their priest in the gospel-style to which he should be accustomed.

The real doctrinal crunch came with the eucharistic prayer itself (see pp. 66-70 below). This prayer appears to be an “Englished” – and ingeniously streamlined – version of the Roman Canon (see Appendix, pp. 83-87 below). Like the Canon, it opens with a long intercession, then proceeds into the institution narrative, followed by the anamnesis (or memorial) and the oblation. But right after the institution narrative, the prayer is broken by a stern rubric:

---

BCP 1549 Introduction

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

At a stroke, the reformed English Mass of 1549 has abolished the one event of the mediaeval Mass which had been the focus and anchor of the people’s eucharistic piety – the greater elevations of the sacrament immediately following the words of institution. This was the single most obvious indication of the prayer’s – and the liturgy’s – Protestant intent.

The prayer’s memorial and oblation also merit close attention. The crucial words read:

Wherefore O Lord and heavenly Father..., we thy humble servants do celebrate and make here before thy divine Majesty, with these thy holy gifts, the memorial which thy Son hath willed us to make; having in remembrance his blessed passion, mighty resurrection, and glorious ascension; rendering unto thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same; entirely desiring thy fatherly goodness, mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving....

The memorial is the oblation. What is offered in this liturgy is not (as in the Roman Canon) the munera, the gifts of bread and wine, much less the person of the crucified Lord, but rather the Church’s remembrance of Christ. Out of this offering of remembrance followed a secondary oblation – namely, the communicants’ offering of “our self, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto [God].” The eucharist is a sacrament, a sign, and can only signify what already exists. So “this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving” can only be true if the whole of everyday life is a sacrifice to God – that is, a constant, a ceaseless remembrance of Christ in all one’s deeds and dealings with others.

It is here that the introductory rubrics at the beginning of the 1549 Mass gain force. They are concerned with discipline, and the discipline is communal. A parish community cannot offer the memorial of Christ – cannot be rightly remembering
Christ – if any of its members, by their day-to-day dealings with one another, show that they have forgotten what it means to be alive in Christ. For the eucharistic memorial is rightly celebrated only if the whole parish community, in each of its particular members, is itself a living sacrament of the mystical union betwixt Christ and his body.

In the event, EngBCP 1549 and its reformed Mass had a very short life. It was superseded just three years later by a second (and drastically revised) Prayer Book. There are hints that Cranmer himself never intended the 1549 rite to be anything more than a “trial use,” an experimental liturgy run up the flagpole (so to speak) to see who saluted – and how they saluted it. Protestant divines in England were generally disappointed. They felt that EngBCP 1549 did not go far enough in eradicating “popish superstitions”. They also began to practise “direct action” by destroying the stone altars in churches and replacing them with plain wooden tables. In the autumn of 1550 the Privy Council, ostensibly to forestall further disruptions, made the destruction of all stone altars official policy.

On the other side, as Cranmer and his fellow reformers expected, Henrician Catholics were appalled by EngBCP 1549. A number of them – such as Stephen Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, and Cuthbert Tunstall, bishop of Durham – nevertheless strove to make the best of it. They drove Cranmer to distraction by professing the 1549 English Mass to be a Catholic liturgy in all essentials. Other folk were less accommodating. In the summer of 1549 Cornwall rose in rebellion against the Prayer Book. The rebels demanded a restoration of the Latin Mass with all its customary bells and whistles. They did so as much for ethnic and cultural causes as for religious reasons. The Cornish rebellion never had a chance; it was brutally crushed well before the first frosts of

---

8 In the mid-sixteenth century, Cornwall and its people were still very Celtic. Between a third and a half of the county’s population spoke and understood only the Cornish dialect of the Celtic tongue; English was a foreign language and, worse, the language of an oppressor race. To be sure, Latin was also a foreign language, a tongue no more “understood of the people” than English. But its use in Mass had given it a kind of neutrality that English did not have for the Cornish.
autumn. But it had scared the government badly, and in its wake Somerset was toppled, summarily tried, and beheaded for high treason. The engineer of Somerset’s fall, the even more odious John Dudley, earl of Warwick, succeeded him as Lord Protector of the Realm and had the young king elevate him two steps in the peerage to be duke of Northumberland.

All these alarums and excursions appear to have had little impact on the course that Cranmer had set for the reformation of English liturgy and worship. It may be that Gardiner’s attempt to read traditional Catholicism into the 1549 rite egged the archbishop into implementing the next stage faster and sooner than he had originally planned. But it is almost certain that a next stage was already in the cards. Indeed, Cranmer was probably tinkering with the text of EngBCP 1549 before its official launch in June and well before the Cornish rebellion.

The short shelf-life of the first Prayer Book and its reformed English Mass might make you wonder why we even bother to have a look at it. The reason lies in its after-life. For the next three and a half centuries a line of Anglican liturgists regretted the suppression of the 1549 Mass. Its eucharistic prayer was adopted (with slight revision) in the Scots Prayer Book of 1637, in the liturgy of the Episcopal Church of Scotland (1764), and in the Prayer Book of the Episcopal Church of the United States (1789); and it is palpably the source of the eucharistic prayer contained in the proposed revision of the English Prayer Book of 1928. In short, the English Mass of 1549 has remained so deeply embedded in the eucharistic ethos of Anglicanism, that we cannot understand that ethos without reference to it.

In the present edition of the text, spelling and punctuation have been modernised throughout.
The Supper of the Lord  
and  
the holy Communion,  
commonly called the Masse

So many as intend to be partakers of the holy Communion, shall signify their names to the Curate⁹ over night, or else in the morning, afore the beginning of Matins, or immediately after.

And if any of those be an open and notorious evil liver, so that the congregation by him is offended, or have done any wrong to his neighbours, by word or deed: the Curate shall call him and advertise¹⁰ him, in any wise not to presume to the Lord's table, until he have openly declared himself to have truly repented and amended his former naughty¹¹ life, that the congregation may thereby be satisfied, which afore were offended, and that he have recompensed the parties whom he hath done wrong unto, or at the least be in full purpose so to do, as soon as he conveniently may.

The same order shall the Curate use with those betwixt whom he perceiveth malice and hatred to reign, not suffering them to be partakers of the Lord's Table until he know them to be reconciled. And if one of the parties so at variance be content to forgive from the bottom of his heart all that the other hath trespassed against him, and to make amends for

⁹ Curate: In the sense of the French word curé, meaning one who has the “cure” (i.e. pastoral care) of a parish.

¹⁰ advertise: give notice.

¹¹ naughty: not only “evil” or “bad,” but also “tending towards naught (nothingness)”. According to Augustine of Hippo, evil was the absence of a good, even of the absolute good, being itself, and thus an encroachment of the nothingness out of which all things were made.
that he himself hath offended: and the other party will not be persuaded to a godly unity, but remain still in his frowardness\textsuperscript{12} and malice; the Minister in that case ought to admit the penitent person to the holy Communion and not him that is obstinate.

Upon the day and at the time appointed for the ministration of the holy Communion, the Priest that shall execute the holy ministry shall put upon him the vesture appointed for that ministration: that is to say, a white alb plain, with a vestment\textsuperscript{13} or cope. And where there be many priests or deacons, there so many shall be ready to help the priest in the ministration as shall be requisite, and shall have upon them likewise the vestures appointed for their ministry, that is to say, albs with tunicles. Then shall the Clerks\textsuperscript{14} sing in English for the office (or Introit, as they call it) a Psalm appointed for that day.

The priest standing humbly afore the midst of the altar, shall say the Lord’s Prayer, with this Collect.

\textbf{Almighty God, unto whom all hearts be open, all desires known, and from whom no secrets are hid, cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of thy Holy Spirit, that we may perfectly love thee and worthily magnify thy holy Name; through Christ our Lord. Amen.}\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{12} frowardness: perverse stubbornness, obstinacy to the point of stupidity.

\textsuperscript{13} vestment: chasuble.

\textsuperscript{14} the Clerks: those members of the parish or collegiate staff who were in “minor orders” (porters, lectors [readers], exorcists, and acolytes), as distinct from bishops, priests, deacons, and subdeacons (“major orders”). The clerks normally constituted the choir.

\textsuperscript{15} In Sarum Use, the presiding celebrant was to say the Latin version of this collect (after Veni Creator Spiritus) while vesting in the sacristy for Mass. Its first known appearance is as the opening prayer of “Mass for the Grace of the Holy Spirit,” in a collection of Votive Masses made in the late eighth century.
¶ Then shall he say a Psalm appointed for the Introit: which Psalm ended, the Priest shall say, or else the Clerks shall sing.

iii.16 LORD, have mercy upon us.

iii. Christ, have mercy upon us.

iii. Lord, have mercy upon us.

¶ Then the Priest standing at God’s board shall begin,

G O L O R Y be to God on high.

The Clerks. And in earth peace, good will towards men.

We praise thee, we bless thee, we glorify thee, we give thanks to thee for thy great glory, O Lord God, heavenly King, God the Father almighty.

O Lord, the only begotten Son, Jesu Christ: O Lord God, Lamb of God, Son of the Father, that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us; thou that takest away the sins of the world, receive our prayer. Thou that sittest at the right hand of God the Father, have mercy upon us.

For thou only art holy, thou only art the Lord, thou only, O Christ, with the Holy Ghost, art most high in the glory of God the Father. Amen.

¶ Then the Priest shall turn him to the people, and say,

The answer. And with thy spirit.

The Priest. Let us pray.

¶ Then shall follow the Collect of the Day, with one of these two Collects following, for the King.

A LMIGHTY God, whose kingdom is everlasting, and power infinite, have mercy upon the whole congregation, and so rule the heart of thy chosen servant Edward the Sixth, our King and Governor, that he, knowing whose minister he is,17 may above all things seek thy honour and glory, and that we his subjects, duly considering whose authority he hath, may

---

16 iii: each of the petitions was to be said three times, making a “ninefold Kyrie”.

17 knowing whose minister he is: Cf. Romans 13.4 (“For [the ruler] is the minister of God to thee for good”).
faithfully serve, honour, and humbly obey him in thee, and for thee, according to thy blessed Word and ordinance; through Jesus Christ our Lord, who with thee and the Holy Ghost liveth and reigneth, ever one God, world without end. Amen.

A LMIGHTY and everlasting God, we be taught by thy holy Word that the hearts of kings are in thy rule and governance, and that thou dost dispose and turn them, as it seemeth best, to thy godly wisdom. We humbly beseech thee so to dispose and govern the heart of Edward the Sixth, thy servant our King and Governor, that in all his thoughts, words, and works, he may ever seek thy honour and glory, and study to preserve thy people committed to his charge, in wealth, peace, and godliness. Grant this, O merciful Father, for thy dear Son’s sake, Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

¶ The Collects ended, the Priest, or he that is appointed, shall read the Epistle, in a place assigned for the purpose, saying,

THE Epistle of Saint Paul, written in the Chapter of to the.

¶ The Minister then shall read the Epistle. Immediately after the Epistle ended, the Priest, or one appointed to read the Gospel, shall say,

THE Holy Gospel, written in the Chapter of.

¶ The clerks and people shall answer,

GLORY be to thee, O Lord.

¶ The priest or deacon then shall read the Gospel. After the Gospel ended, the priest shall begin,

BELIEVE in one God.

¶ The clerks shall sing the rest.

The Father almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible: And in one Lord Jesu Christ, the only begotten Son of GOD; begotten of his Father before all worlds, God of GOD, Light of light, very God of very GOD; begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father;
by whom all things were made; who for us men, and for our salvation, came down from heaven, and was made incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man; and was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate. He suffered and was buried, and the third day he arose again according to the Scriptures, and ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of the Father: And he shall come again with glory, to judge both the quick and the dead.

And I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father and the Son; who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified; who spake by the prophets. And I believe in one catholic and apostolic Church. I acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins. And I look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen.

¶ After the Creed ended, shall follow the Sermon or Homily, or some portion of one of the Homilies as they shall be hereafter divided; wherein if the people be not exhorted to the worthy receiving of the holy sacrament of the body and blood of our Saviour Christ, then shall the Curate give this Exhortation to those that be minded to receive the same.

DEARLY beloved in the Lord, ye that mind to come to the holy Communion of the body and blood of our Saviour Christ must consider what Saint Paul writeth to the Corinthians, how he exhorteth all persons diligently to try and examine themselves, before they presume to eat of that bread and drink of that cup. For as the benefit is great, if with a truly penitent heart and lively faith we receive that holy sacrament (for then we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ

---

18 or some portion of one of the Homilies as they shall be hereafter divided: A reference to Certayne Sermons or Homilies, published “by authority” in 1547. Most of the homilies contained therein were divided into two or three parts when they were reissued with The Second Book of Homilies, which contained a further twenty-one sermons, in 1571.

19 how he exhorteth ... and drink of that cup: Cf. 1 Corinthians 11.27-29.
and drink his blood: then we dwell in Christ and Christ in us; we be made one with Christ, and Christ with us): So is the danger great, if we receive the same unworthily. For then we become guilty of the body and blood of Christ our Saviour: we eat and drink our own damnation, not considering the Lord’s body; we kindle God’s wrath over us, we provoke him to plague us with divers diseases and sundry kinds of death. Therefore if any here be a blasphemer, adulterer, or be in any malice or envy or in any other crime: except he be truly sorry therefor, and earnestly minded to leave the same vices, and do trust himself to be reconciled to almighty God, and in charity with all the world; let him bewail his sins, and not come to that holy table, lest after the taking of that most blessed bread the devil enter into him, as he did into Judas, to fill him full of all iniquity and bring him to destruction both of body and soul.

Judge therefore yourselves, brethren, that ye be not judged of the Lord. Let your mind be without desire to sin; repent you truly for your sins past; have an earnest and lively faith in Christ our Saviour; be in perfect charity with all men: so shall ye be meet partakers of those holy mysteries. And

---

20 for then we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ and drink his blood: In the context of the times, the designation of communion as a spiritual eating and drinking could have been taken to imply a Reformed doctrine of the eucharist, as opposed to Roman Catholic and Lutheran teachings. For Reformed divines tended to insist not only on the distinction of the physical and spiritual orders, but also on their opposition. As Cranmer himself remarked in 1548, “The spirit and the body are contrary” [“Certayne notes touching the disputacions of the bysshoppes in the last parliament assembled of the Lordes Supper,” in Colin Buchanan, ed., Background Documents to Liturgical Revision 1547-1549. Grove Liturgical Study No. 35 (Bramcote, Notts.: Grove Books, 1983). p. 15.]

But one needs to exercise caution in this regard. Medieval Catholic divines, like Bonaventure and Thomas Aquinas, had always stressed that the only way to eat the flesh of Christ in sacramental communion is in a spiritual fashion. Technically speaking, therefore, this passage (and others like it in the present and in the next exhortation) should have been doctrinally unexceptionable to Catholics.
above all things, ye must give most humble and hearty thanks to God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, for the redemption of the world by the death and passion of our Saviour Christ, both God and man, who did humble himself even to the death upon the cross for us miserable sinners; which lay in darkness and the shadow of death, that he might make us children of God and exalt us to everlasting life. And to the end that we should remember the exceeding love of our Master and only Saviour Jesus Christ thus dying for us, and the innumerable benefits which by his precious blood-shedding he hath obtained to us, he hath left in those holy mysteries, as a pledge of his love and a continual remembrance of the same, his own blessed body and precious blood for us to feed upon spiritually, to our endless comfort and consolation. To him therefore, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, let us give, as we are most bounden, continual thanks, submitting ourselves wholly to his holy will and pleasure, and studying to serve him in true holiness and righteousness all the days of our life. Amen.

¶ In cathedral churches or other places where there is daily Communion, it shall be sufficient to read this Exhortation above written once in a month; and in parish churches upon weekdays it may be left unsaid.

¶ And if upon the Sunday or Holy Day the people be negligent to come to the Communion, then shall the priest earnestly exhort his parishioners to dispose themselves to the receiving of the holy Communion more diligently, saying these or like words unto them.

Dear friends, and you especially upon whose souls I have cure and charge, on next I do intend, by God’s grace, to offer to all such as shall be godly disposed the most comfortable sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, to be taken of them in the remembrance of his most fruitful and glorious passion; by the which passion we have obtained remission of our sins and be made partakers of the kingdom of heaven, whereof we be assured and ascertained, if we come to the said sacrament with hearty repentance for our offences, steadfast faith in God’s mercy, and earnest mind to obey God’s will and to offend no more. Wherefore our duty
is, to come to these holy mysteries with most hearty thanks
to be given to almighty God for his infinite mercy and
benefits given and bestowed upon us his unworthy servants,
for whom he hath not only given his body to death and shed
his blood, but also doth vouchsafe in a sacrament and
mystery to give us his said body and blood to feed upon
spiritually. The which sacrament being so divine and holy a
thing, and so comfortable to them which receive it worthily,
and so dangerous to them that will presume to take the same
unworthily: My duty is to exhort you in the mean season to
consider the greatness of the thing, and to search and
examine your own consciences, and that not lightly nor after
the manner of dissimulators with God, but as they which should
come to a most godly and heavenly banquet: not to come
but in the marriage garment required of God in scripture, 21
that you may (so much as lieth in you) be found worthy you
come to such a table. The ways and means thereto is.

First, that you be truly repentant of your former evil life,
and that you confess with an unfeigned heart to almighty
God your sins and unkindness towards his Majesty,
committed either by will, word, or deed, infirmity or
ignorance; and that with inward sorrow and tears you bewail
your offences and require of almighty God mercy and
pardon, promising to him, from the bottom of your hearts,
the amendment of your former life. And amongst all others, I
am commanded of God especially to move and exhort you
to reconcile yourselves to your neighbours whom you have
offended, or who hath offended you, putting out of your
hearts all hatred and malice against them, and to be in love
and charity with all the world, and to forgive other as you
would that God should forgive you. And if any man have
done wrong to any other, let him make satisfaction and due

---

21 in the marriage garment required of God in scripture: Cf.
Matthew 22:11-13 ("The kingdom of heaven is like unto a
certain king which made a marriage [wedding banquet] for his
son.... And when the king came in to see the guests, he saw
there a man which had not on a wedding garment, and he
saith unto him, 'Friend, how camest thou in hither, not having
a wedding garment?' And he was speechless. Then said the
king to the servants, 'Bind him hand and foot, and take him
away, and cast him into outer darkness, [where] there shall be
weeping and gnashing of teeth.' ")
restitution of all lands and goods wrongfully taken away or withheld, before he come to God’s board, or at the least be in full mind and purpose so to do, as soon as he is able; or else let him not come to this holy table, thinking to deceive God, who seeth all men’s hearts. For neither the absolution of the priest can anything avail them, nor the receiving of this holy sacrament doth anything but increase their damnation.

And if there be any of you whose conscience is troubled and grieved in anything, lacking comfort or counsel, let him come to me (or to some other discrete and learned priest, taught in the law of God) and confess and open his sin and grief secretly, that he may receive such ghostly counsel, advice, and comfort, that his conscience may be relieved and that of us (as of the ministers of God and of the Church) he may receive comfort and absolution, to the satisfaction of his mind and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness; requiring such as shall be satisfied with a general confession not to be offended with them that do use, to their further satisfying, the auricular and secret confession to the priest: nor those also which think needful or convenient, for the quietness of their own consciences, particularly to open their sins to the priest, to be offended with them that are satisfied with their humble confession to God and the general confession to the Church. But in all things to follow and keep the rule of charity, and every man to be satisfied with his own conscience, not judging other men’s minds or consciences; whereas he hath no warrant of God’s word to the same.  

22 And if there be any of you ... no warrant of God’s word to the same: This curious section reflects the Protestant movement’s ambivalence about auricular (or “private”) confession. Luther retained it, with baptism and the eucharist, as one of the three sacraments which alone had warrant in the gospel. (This made sense, given Luther’s contention that the gospel was about “the forgiveness of sins”). Reformed divines almost universally repudiated auricular confession as a superstitious abuse of the gospel, one which violated the principle of justification by faith alone. Here EngBCP 1549 adopts a “both/and” approach, thus mediating not only between Catholicism and Protestantism, but also between Evangelical Lutheran and Reformed Protestantism. This “both/and” provision would be retained in every version of
¶ Then shall follow, for the Offertory, one or more of these Sentences of holy Scripture, to be sung whilst the people do offer, or else one of them to be said by the Minister immediately afore the offering.

LET your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works and glorify your Father which is in heaven. Matt. v.

LAY not up for yourselves treasure upon earth, where the rust and moth doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal; but lay up for yourselves treasure in heaven, where neither rust nor moth doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through and steal. Matt. vi.

WHATSOEVER you would that men should do unto you, even so do you unto them; for this is the Law and the Prophets. Matt. vii.

NOT every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doth the will of my Father which is in heaven. Matt. vii.

ZACHE stood forth and said unto the Lord, Behold, Lord, the half of my goods I give to the poor, and if I have done any wrong to any man, I restore fourfold. Luke xix.

WHO goeth a-warfare at any time at his own cost? who planteth a vineyard and eateth not of the fruit thereof? or who feedeth a flock and eateth not of the milk of the flock? 1 Cor. ix.

If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great matter if we shall reap your worldly things? 1 Cor. ix.

Do you not know that they which minister about holy things live of the sacrifice? They which wait of the altar are partakers with the altar; even so hath the Lord also ordained that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel. 1 Cor. ix.

He which soweth little shall reap little, and he that soweth plenteously shall reap plenteously. Let every man do according as he is disposed in his heart, not grudgingly or of necessity, for God loveth a cheerful giver. II Cor. ix.

---

the present exhortation in subsequent revisions of the Prayer Book.
LET him that is taught in the word minister unto him that teacheth, in all good things. Be not deceived: God is not mocked; for whatesoever a man soweth, that shall he reap. *Gal.* vi.

While we have time, let us do good unto all men, and especially unto them which are of the household of faith. *Gal.* vi.

Godliness is great riches, if a man be contented with that he hath. For we brought nothing into this world, neither may we carry any thing out. *I Tim.* vi.

Charge them which are rich in this world, that they be ready to give and glad to distribute, laying up for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may attain eternal life. *I Tim.* vi.

God is not unrighteous, that he will forget your works and labour that proceedeth of love; which love ye have showed for his Name's sake, which have ministered to the saints and yet do minister. *Heb.* vi.

To do good and to distribute, forget not; for with such sacrifices God is pleased. *Heb.* xiii.

Whoso hath this world's good and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him? *I John* iii.

Give alms of thy goods, and turn never thy face from any poor man, and then the face of the Lord shall not be turned away from thee. *Toby* iv.

Be merciful after thy power: if thou have much, give plenteously; if thou hast little, do thy diligence gladly to give of that little; for so gatherest thou thyself a good reward in the day of necessity. *Toby* iv.

He that hath pity upon the poor, lendeth unto the Lord; and look, what he layeth out, it shall be paid him again. *Prov.* xix.

Blessed be the man that provideth for the sick and needy; the Lord shall deliver him in the time of trouble. *Psalm* xli.

¶ Where there be clerks, they shall sing one or many of the Sentences above written, according to the length and shortness of time that the people be offering.

¶ In the meantime, while the Clerks do sing the Offertory, so many as are disposed shall offer unto the poor men's box.
every one according to his ability and charitable mind. And at the offering days appointed, every man and woman shall pay to the Curate the due and accustomed offerings.

¶ Then so many as shall be partakers of the holy Communion shall tarry still in the quire, or in some convenient place nigh the quire, the men on the one side, and the women on the other side. All other, that mind not to receive the said holy Communion, shall depart out of the quire, except the Ministers and Clerks.

¶ Then shall the Minister take so much bread and wine as shall suffice for the persons appointed to receive the holy Communion, laying the bread upon the corporal, or else in the paten, or in some other comely thing prepared for that purpose: and putting the wine into the chalice, or else in some fair or convenient cup prepared for that use, if the chalice will not serve, putting thereto a little pure and clean water, and setting both the bread and wine upon the altar.

¶ Then the Priest shall say,

The Lord be with you.  
Answer. And with thy spirit. 

Priest. Lift up your hearts.  
Answer. We lift them unto the Lord. 

Priest. Let us give thanks to our Lord God.  
Answer. It is meet and right so to do.

Priest. It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty, that we should at all times, and in all places, give thanks unto thee, O Lord, holy Father, almighty, everlasting God.

¶ Here shall follow the proper Preface, according to the time, if there be any specially appointed, or else immediately shall follow, Therefore with angels, etc.

PROPER PREFACES

¶ Upon Christmas Day

Because thou didst give Jesus Christ, thine only Son, to be born as this day for us; who by the operation of the Holy Ghost was made very man of the substance of the Virgin
Mary his mother; and that without spot of sin, to make us clean from all sin. Therefore &c.

q Upon Easter Day

But chiefly are we bound to praise thee for the glorious resurrection of thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord; for he is the very Paschal Lamb which was offered for us and hath taken away the sin of the world; who by his death hath destroyed death, and by his rising to life again hath restored to us everlasting life. Therefore &c.

q Upon the Ascension Day

Through thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who after his most glorious resurrection manifestly appeared to all his disciples, and in their sight ascended up into heaven to prepare a place for us; that where he is, thither might we also ascend and reign with him in glory. Therefore &c.

q Upon Whit Sunday

Through Jesus Christ our Lord, according to whose most true promise the Holy Ghost came down this day from heaven, with a sudden great sound, as it had been a mighty wind, in the likeness of fiery tongues, lighting upon the Apostles, to teach them and to lead them to all truth, giving them both the gift of diverse languages, and also boldness with fervent zeal, constantly to preach the Gospel unto all nations; whereby we are brought out of darkness and error into the clear light and true knowledge of thee, and of thy Son Jesus Christ. Therefore &c.

q Upon the feast of the Trinity

It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty, that we should at all times, and in all places, give thanks unto thee, O Lord, almighty, everlasting God, which art one God, one Lord, not one only Person, but three Persons in one substance; for that which we believe of the glory of the Father, the same we believe of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, without any difference or inequality; whom the Angels.
After which Preface shall follow immediately.

Therefore with angels and archangels, and with all the holy company of heaven, we laud and magnify thy glorious Name; evermore praising thee, and saying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of hosts: heaven and earth are full of thy glory. Hosanna in the highest. Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord. Glory to thee, O Lord, in the highest.

This the Clerks shall also sing.

When the Clerks have done singing, then shall the Priest or Deacon turn him to the people, and say,

Let us pray for the whole state of Christ’s Church.

Then the Priest, turning him to the altar, shall say or sing, plainly and distinctly, this prayer following.23

Almighty and everliving God, which by thy holy apostle hast taught us to make prayers and supplications, and to give thanks for all men:24 We humbly beseech thee most mercifully to receive these our prayers, which we offer unto thy divine Majesty; beseeching thee to inspire continually the universal Church with the spirit of truth, unity, and concord: and grant that all they that do confess thy holy Name may agree in the truth of thy holy word, and live in unity and godly love. Specially we beseech thee to save and defend thy servant Edward our King, that under him we may be godly and quietly governed;25 and grant unto his whole Council, and to all that be put in authority under him, that they may

---

23 this prayer following (Almighty and everliving God ... our only Mediator and Advocate) represents an ingenious conflation of several sections in the Roman Canon which were themselves intercessory in character – Te igitur, Memento Domine, Communicantes, Memento etiam, and Nobis quoque – with an equally ingenious “protestantizing” of the themes involved therein.

24 Cf. 1 Timothy 2.1.

25 Cf. 1 Timothy 2.2.
truly and indifferently minister justice, to the punishment of wickedness and vice, and to the maintenance of God’s true religion and virtue. Give grace, O heavenly Father, to all bishops, pastors, and curates, that they may both by their life and doctrine set forth thy true and lively word, and rightly and duly administer thy holy sacraments. And to all thy people give thy heavenly grace, that with meek heart and due reverence, they may hear and receive thy holy word, truly serving thee in holiness and righteousness all the days of their life.26 And we most humbly beseech thee of thy goodness, O Lord, to comfort and succour all them, which in this transitory life be in trouble, sorrow, need, sickness, or any other adversity. And especially we commend unto thy merciful goodness this congregation, which is here assembled in thy Name, to celebrate the commemoration of the most glorious death of thy Son. And here we do give unto thee most high praise, and hearty thanks, for the wonderful grace and virtue declared in thy saints from the beginning of the world; and chiefly in the glorious and most blessed Virgin Mary, mother of thy Son Jesu Christ our Lord and God, and in the holy patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and martyrs, whose examples, O Lord, and steadfastness in thy faith, and keeping thy holy commandments, grant us to follow. We commend unto thy mercy, O Lord, all other thy servants, which are departed hence from us with the sign of faith, and now do rest in the sleep of peace: Grant unto them, we beseech thee, thy mercy, and everlasting peace; and that, at the day of the general resurrection, we and all they which be of the mystical body of thy Son, may all together be set on his right hand, and hear that his most joyful voice, Come unto me, O ye that be blessed of my Father, and possess the kingdom which is prepared for you from the beginning of the world.27 Grant this, O Father, for Jesus Christ’s sake, our only Mediator and Advocate.

O God, heavenly Father, which of thy tender mercy didst give thine only Son Jesu Christ to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption; who made there (by his

26 Cf. Luke 1.74 (Song of Zechariah).

27 Come unto me ... from the beginning of the world: Cf. Matthew 25.34.
one oblation of himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world; and did institute, and in his holy gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory of that his precious death, until his coming again: Hear us, O merciful Father, we beseech thee; and with thy Holy Spirit and word, vouchsafe to ble\text{X}ss and sanc\text{X}tify\text{28} these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ:\text{29} who, in the same night that he was betrayed, took bread, and when he had had given thanks, he brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, Take, eat, this is my body, which is given for you. Do this in remembrance of me. Likewise after supper he took the cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all, of this; for this is made by us. \text{Here the Priest must take the bread into his hands.} \text{Here the Priest shall take the Cup into his hands.} 

\text{28} The symbol $\times$ indicates that the priest was to make the sign of the cross over the elements while pronouncing these two words.

\text{29 and with thy Holy Spirit and word, vouchsafe ... Jesus Christ:} This epiclesis, the first to appear in a Western eucharistic prayer since antiquity, is probably derived from Pascasius Radbert, \textit{On the Body and Blood of the Lord 12.1}: “For the mystery is not produced by the merit of the human consecrator, but by the word of the Creator and the power of the Holy Spirit, so that nothing other than the flesh and blood which were created by the Holy Spirit may be believed with a true faith and tasted with a spiritual understanding.” In the Sarum Breviary (the version of the Roman Daily Offices used in Salisbury cathedral), this passage served as the fourth lesson at Matins on Sunday in the Octave of Corpus Christi.

\text{may be unto us:} This phrase has sometimes been taken to imply a less than “realistic” view of consecration. But the phrase \text{may be unto us} represents Reformed doctrine very deep “in the closet”. For its Latin equivalent in the \textit{Quam oblationem} of the Roman Canon (\textit{ut nobis corpus et sanguis fiat}) can be translated just as Cranmer has done.
my blood of the new testament,
which is shed for you and for many, for remission of sins. Do
this, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of me.

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

Wherefore O Lord and heavenly Father, according to the
institution of thy dearly beloved Son our Saviour Jesu Christ,
we thy humble servants do celebrate and make here before
thy divine Majesty, with these thy holy gifts, the memorial
which thy Son hath willed us to make; having in
remembrance his blessed passion, mighty resurrection, and
glorious ascension; rendering unto thee most hearty thanks
for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same;
entirely desiring thy fatherly goodness, mercifully to accept
this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, most humbly
beseeching thee to grant, that by the merits and death of thy
Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in his blood, we and all
thy whole Church may obtain remission of sins, and all other
benefits of his passion. And here we offer and present unto
thee, O Lord, our self, our souls and bodies, to be a
reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto thee; 30 humbly
beseeching thee, that whosoever shall be partakers of this
holy communion, may worthily receive the most precious
body and blood of thy Son Jesus Christ, and be fulfilled with
thy grace and heavenly benediction, 31 and made one body
with thy Son Jesu Christ, that he may dwell in them, and they
in him. And although we be unworthy, through our manifold
sins, to offer unto thee any sacrifice; yet we beseech thee to

30 And here we offer and present ... and lively sacrifice unto
thee: Cf. Romans 12.1.

31 humbly beseeching thee, that whosoever ... and heavenly
benediction: Cf. Roman Canon XII (Supplices tē): ut quotquot
ex hac altaris participatōne sacrosanctum Filii tui corpus et
sanguinem sumpserimus omni benedictione caelesti et gratia
repleamur (“that as many of us as shall receive, from this
participation of the altar, the most holy body and blood of
your Son, may be filled with every heavenly benediction and
grace”).
accept this our bounden duty and service, and command these our prayers and supplications, by the ministry of thy holy angels, to be brought up into thy holy tabernacle, before the sight of thy divine Majesty; not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences; through Christ our Lord; by whom, and with whom, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, all honour and glory be unto thee, O Father almighty, world without end. Amen.

Let us pray.

As our Saviour Christ hath commanded and taught us, we are bold to say: Our Father, which art in heaven, hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them that trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation. The answer. But deliver us from evil. Amen.

¶ Then shall the Priest say,

The peace of the Lord be always with you.
The Clerks. And with thy spirit.

The Priest.

Christ our Paschal Lamb is offered up for us, once for all, when he bare our sins on his body upon the cross; for he is the very Lamb of God, that taketh away the sins of the world: therefore let us keep a joyful and holy feast with the Lord.

¶ Here the Priest shall turn him toward those that come to the holy Communion, and shall say,

You that do truly and earnestly repent you of your sins to almighty God, and be in love and charity with your

---

32 and command these our prayers ... before the sight of thy divine Majesty: Cf. Roman Canon XII (Suplices tē); ... iube haec perferri per manus angeli tui in sublime altare tuum in conspectu divinae majestatis tuae (“command that these gifts be borne by the hand of your angel to your altar on high, in the presence of your divine majesty”).

33 Cf. 1 Corinthians 5.7, 8; 1 Peter 2.24; John 1.29.
neighbours, and intend to lead a new life, following the commandments of God, and walking from henceforth in his holy ways: Draw near and take this holy sacrament to your comfort, make your humble confession to almighty God and to his holy Church here gathered together in his Name, meekly kneeling upon your knees.

¶ Then shall this general confession be made, in the name of all those that are minded to receive the holy Communion, either by one of them, or else by one of the Ministers, or by the Priest himself, all kneeling humbly upon their knees.

ALMIGHTY God, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Maker of all things, Judge of all men, we knowledge and bewail our manifold sins and wickedness, which we from time to time most grievously have committed, by thought, word, and deed, against thy divine Majesty, provoking most justly thy wrath and indignation against us. We do earnestly repent and be heartily sorry for these our misdoings; the remembrance of them is grievous unto us, the burden of them is intolerable. Have mercy upon us, have mercy upon us, most merciful Father, for thy Son our Lord Jesus Christ’s sake, forgive us all that is past, and grant that we may ever hereafter serve and please thee in newness of life, to the honour of thy Name; through Jesus Christ our Lord.

¶ Then shall the Priest stand up, and turning himself to the people, say thus.

ALMIGHTY God, our heavenly Father, who of his great mercy hath promised forgiveness of sins to all them which with hearty repentance and true faith turn unto him, have mercy upon you, pardon and deliver you from all your sins, confirm and strengthen you in all goodness, and bring you to everlasting life; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

¶ Then shall the Priest also say,

HEAR what comfortable words our Saviour Christ saith to all that truly turn to him.
COME unto me, all that travail and be heavy laden, and I shall refresh you. 34 So God loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, to the end that all that believe in him should not perish, but have life everlasting. 35

¶ Hear also what Saint Paul saith.

THIS is a true saying, and worthy of all men to be received, that Jesus Christ came into this world to save sinners. 36

¶ Hear also what Saint John saith.

If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is the propitiation for our sins. 37

¶ Then shall the Priest, turning him to God’s board, kneel down, and say in the name of all them that receive the Communion, this prayer following.

We do not presume to come to this thy Table, O merciful Lord, trusting in our own righteousness, but in thy manifold and great mercies. We be not worthy to gather up the crumbs under thy Table; 38 but thou art the same Lord, whose property is always to have mercy. Grant us, therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the flesh of thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink his blood, in these holy mysteries, that we may continually dwell in him, and he in us, 39 that our sinful bodies may be made clean by his body, and our souls washed through his most precious blood. Amen. 40

---

34 Matthew 11.28.
35 John 3.16.
36 1 Timothy 1.15.
37 1 John 2.1.
38 We be not worthy ... under thy table: Cf. Mark 7.28.
39 so to eat ... and he in us: Cf. John 6.56.
40 that our sinful bodies ... through his most precious blood: This might be called the division-of-function motif: Christ’s body has the specific function of saving our bodies, and Christ’s blood has the specific function of saving our souls. The source of this motif is a commentary on 1 Corinthians by a fourth-century Latin Christian writer known as Ambrosiaster [Ad
¶ Then shall the Priest first receive the Communion in both kinds himself, and next deliver it to other Ministers (if any be there present) that they may be ready to help the chief Minister; and after to the people.

¶ And when he delivereth the sacrament of the body of Christ, he shall say to every one these words:

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

¶ And the Minister delivering the sacrament of the blood, and giving every one to drink once, and no more, shall say,

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

¶ If there be a Deacon or other Priest, then shall he follow with the chalice; and as the Priest ministereth the sacrament of the body, so shall he, for more expedition, minister the sacrament of the blood, in the form before written.

¶ In the Communion time the Clerks shall sing.

O LAMB of God, that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us.
O Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us.
O Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world, grant us thy peace.

Corinthos prima 11:26.1-3; CSEL vol. 81, pt 2, pp. 127.21 – 128.9]. Ambrosiaster broached the idea as a way of affirming that the eucharistic sacrament is given not just for the salvation of the body alone or of the soul alone, for the salvation of the whole human being. So important was this principle to the Catholic tradition, that its divines mustered Ambrosiaster (thinking he had been Ambrose) whenever they discussed communion.
¶ *Beginning so soon as the Priest doth receive holy Communion, and when the Communion is ended, then shall the Clerks sing the post-communion.*

¶ *Sentences of holy Scripture, to be said or sung every day one, after the holy Communion, called the post-communion.*

If any man will follow me, let him forsake himself, and take up his cross and follow me. *Matt. xvi.*

Whosoever shall endure to the end, he shall be saved. *Mark xiii.*

Praised be the Lord God of Israel, for he hath visited and redeemed his people: therefore let us serve him all the days of our life, in holiness and righteousness accepted before him. *Luke i.*

Happy are those servants whom the Lord, when he cometh, shall find waking. *Luke xii.*

Be ye ready, for the Son of man will come at an hour when ye think not. *Luke xii.*

The servant that knoweth his master's will, and hath not prepared himself, neither done according to his will, shall be beaten with many stripes. *Luke xii.*

The hour cometh, and now is, when true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth. *John iv.*

Behold, thou art made whole; sin no more, lest any worse thing happen unto thee. *John v.*

If ye shall continue in my word, then are ye my very disciples, and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free. *John viii.*

While ye have the light, believe on the light, that ye may be the children of light. *John xii.*

He that hath my commandments, and keepeth them, the same is he that loveth me. *John xiv.*

If any man love me, he will keep my word, and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and dwell with him. *John xiv.*

If ye shall bide in me, and my word shall abide in you, ye shall ask what ye will, and it shall be done to you. *John xv.*

Herein is my Father glorified, that ye bear much fruit, and become my disciples. *John xv.*

This is my commandment, that you love together as I have loved you. *John xv.*
If God be on our side, who can be against us? which did not spare his own Son, but gave him for us all. Rom. viii.

Who shall lay anything to the charge of God’s chosen? It is God that justifieth, who is that can condemn? Rom. viii.

The night is passed, and the day is at hand; let us therefore cast away the deeds of darkness, and put on the armour of light. Rom. xiii.

Christ Jesus is made of God unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctifying, and redemption; that, according as it is written, he which rejoiceth should rejoice in the Lord. I Cor. i.

Know ye not that ye are the temple of God, and that the Spirit of God dwelleth in you. If any man defile the temple of God, him shall God destroy. I Cor. iii.

Ye are dearly bought; therefore glorify God in your bodies, and in your spirits, for they belong to God. I Cor. vi.

Be ye followers of God as dear children, and walk in love, even as Christ loved us, and gave himself for us an offering and a sacrifice of sweet savour to God. Ephes. v.

¶ Then the Priest shall give thanks to God, in the name of all them that have communicated, turning him first to the people, and saying.

The Lord be with you.
The Answer. And with thy spirit.
The Priest. Let us pray.

Almighty and everliving God, we most heartily thank thee, for that thou dost vouchsafe to feed us in these holy mysteries, with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ; and hast assured us (duly receiving the same) of thy favour and goodness toward us; and that we be very members incorporate in thy mystical body, which is the blessed company of all faithful people, and be also heirs through hope of thy everlasting kingdom, by the merits of the most precious death and passion of thy dear Son. We therefore most humbly beseech thee, O heavenly Father, so to assist us with thy grace, that we may continue in that holy fellowship, and do all such good works as thou hast prepared for us to
walk in;⁴¹ through Jesus Christ our Lord, to whom with thee and the Holy Ghost, be all honour and glory, world without end.

¶ Then the Priest, turning him to the people, shall let them depart with this blessing:

The peace of God, which passeth all understanding, keep your hearts and minds in the knowledge and love of God, and of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord:⁴² And the blessing of God almighty, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, be amongst you and remain with you alway.

¶ Then the people shall answer, Amen.

¶ Where there are no Clerks, there the Priest shall say all things appointed here for them to sing.

¶ When the holy Communion is celebrate[d] on the workday, or in private houses, then may be omitted the Gloria in excelsis, the Creed, the Homily, and the Exhortation beginning, Dearly beloved, &c.

¶ Collects to be said after the Offertory, when there is no Communion: every such day, one.

Assist us mercifully, O Lord, in these our supplications and prayers, and dispose the way of thy servants toward the attainment of everlasting salvation; that among all the changes and chances of this mortal life, they may ever be defended by thy most gracious and ready help; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.⁴³

---

⁴¹ all such good works as thou hast prepared for us to walk in: Cf. Ephesians 2.10.

⁴² The peace of God ... and of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord: Cf. Philippians 4.7, 2 Peter 1.2.

⁴³ Roman Rite (Sarum Use) – Collect, Missa pro iter agentibus (“Mass for those going on a journey”): “Adesto, Domine, supplicationibus nostris, et uiam famulorum tuorum in salutis tuæ prosperitate dispone; ut inter omnes uiæ et uilæ hunius uarietates, tuo semper protegentur auxilio; per domino, &c.”
ALMIGHTY Lord and everlasting God, vouchsafe, we beseech thee, to direct, sanctify, and govern both our hearts and bodies in the ways of thy laws and in the works of thy commandments, that through thy most mighty protection, both here and ever, we may be preserved in body and soul; through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Amen.44

GRANT, we beseech thee, almighty God, that the words which we have heard this day without outward ears, may through thy grace be so grafted inwardly in our hearts, that they may bring forth in us the fruit of good living, to the honour and praise of thy Name; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

PREVENT us, O Lord, in all our doings with thy most gracious favour, and further us with thy continual help, that in all our works begun, continued, and ended in thee, we may glorify thy holy Name and finally, by thy mercy, obtain everlasting life; through &c.45

ALMIGHTY God, the fountain of all wisdom,46 which knowest our necessities before we ask47 and our ignorance in asking, we beseech thee to have compassion upon our infirmities; and those things which for our unworthiness we dare not and for our blindness cannot ask,
vouchsafe to give us for the worthiness of thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Almighty God, which hast promised to hear the petitions of them that ask in thy Son’s name, we beseech thee mercifully to incline thine ears to us that have made now our prayers and supplications unto thee; and grant that those things which we have faithfully asked according to thy will, may effectually be obtained to the relief of our necessity and to the setting forth of thy glory; through Jesus Christ our Lord.

For rain

O God, heavenly Father, which by thy Son Jesu Christ hast promised to all them that seek thy kingdom, and the righteousness thereof, all things necessary to the bodily sustenance: Send us, we beseech thee, in this our necessity such moderate rain and showers that we may receive the fruits of the earth, to our comfort and to thy honour; through Jesus Christ our Lord.

For fair weather

O Lord God, which for the sin of man didst once drown all the world, except eight persons, and afterward of thy great mercy didst promise never to destroy it so again: We humbly beseech thee, that although we for our iniquities have worthily deserved this plague of rain and waters, yet upon our true repentance thou wilt send us such weather whereby we may receive the fruits of the earth in due season, and learn both by thy punishment to amend our lives, and by the granting of our petition to give thee praise and glory; through Jesus Christ our Lord.

---


49 Cf. Psalm 17.5.

50 grant that those things which we have faithfully asked..., may effectually be obtained: Cf. Roman Rite – Collect, Trinity XXI: “Præsta ut quod fideliter petimus, efficaciter consequamur.”

51 Cf. Matthew 6.33.

52 Cf. Genesis 7.21-23, 9.11.
[ADDITIONAL DIRECTIONS]

¶ Upon Wednesdays and Fridays the English Litany shall be said or sung in all places, after such form as is appointed by the King’s Majesty’s Injunctions. And though there be none to communicate with the Priest, yet these days, after the Litany ended, the Priest shall put upon him a plain alb or surplice with a cope, and say all things at the altar appointed to be said at the celebration of the Lord’s Supper until after the Offertory. And then shall add one or two of these Collects aforewritten, as occasion shall serve by his discretion. And then turning him to the people, shall let them depart with the accustomed blessing. And the same order shall be used all other days, whensoever the people be customably assembled to pray in the church, and none disposed to communicate with the Priest.

¶ Likewise in chapels annexed, and in all other places, there shall be no celebration of the Lord’s Supper except there be some to communicate with the Priest. And in such chapels

53 chapels annexed: chantry-chapels. A chantry was an ecclesiastical office endowed by an individual for the purpose of ensuring that Mass would be offered in perpetuity for the repose of his or her soul. The endowment had to guarantee the stipend of the priest and the maintenance of the chapel where the dedicated Mass was said. The chapel might be an altar within a parish church, partitioned from the body of the church by screens, or it might be a separate building “annexed to” (on the grounds of) a parish church. A chantry priest might have other things to do, but his one daily duty was to say Mass for the soul of the chantry’s founder. He would normally have celebrated alone, except for a server to assist him; even then he would have been the only communicant. That is why “chapels annexed” were singled out in this rubric: chantries were the most egregious violation of the Reformation principle of communion as a communal event. In 1547 Parliament suppressed almost 2500 chantries; the expropriated endowments were supposed to have been devoted to education and other public works, but almost all of the money was grabbed by Edward VI’s councillors to keep themselves in the styles to which they were accustomed.
annexed, where the people hath not been accustomed to pay any holy bread, there they must either make some charitable provisions for the being of the charges of the Communion, or else, for the receiving of the same, resort to their parish church.

For avoiding of all matters and occasion of dissension, it is meet that the bread prepared for the Communion be made through all this realm after one sort and fashion: that is to say, unleavened and round, as it was afore, but without all manner of print and something more larger and thicker than it was, so that it may be aptly divided in divers pieces. And every one shall be divided in two pieces at the least or more, by the discretion of the Minister, and so distributed. And men must not think less to be received in part than in the whole, but in each of them the whole body of our Saviour Jesu Christ.

And forsomuch as the pastors and curates within this realm shall continually find at their costs and charges in their cures sufficient bread and wine for the holy Communion, as oft as their parishioners shall be disposed, for their spiritual comfort to receive the same: It is therefore ordered that in recompense of such costs and charges, the parishioners of every parish shall offer every Sunday, at the time of the Offertory, the just valour [value] and price of the holy loaf (with all such money and other things as were wont to be offered with the same) to the use of their pastors and curates; and that in such order and course as they were wont to find and pay the said holy loaf.

Also, that the receiving of the Sacrament of the most blessed Body and Blood of Christ may be most agreeable to the institution thereof, and to the usage of the primitive Church: In all cathedral and collegiate churches, there shall always some communicate with the priest that ministereth. And that the same may be also observed everywhere abroad in the the country, some one (at the least) of that house in every parish to whom by course (after the ordinance herein made) it appertaineth to offer for the charges of the communion, or some other whom they shall provide to offer for them, shall receive the holy Communion with the Priest.
The which may be better done for that they know before when their course cometh and may therefore dispose themselves to the worthy receiving of the Sacrament. And with him or them who doth so offer the charges of the Communion, all other who be then godly disposed thereunto shall likewise receive the Communion. And by this means the Minister having always some to communicate with him, may accordingly solemnize so high and holy mysteries, with all the suffrages and due order appointed for the same. And the Priest on the weekday shall forbear to celebrate the Communion except he have some that will communicate with him.

Furthermore, every man and woman to be bound to hear and be at the divine service in the parish church where they be resident, and there with devout prayer or godly silence and meditation to occupy themselves; there to pay their duties, to communicate once in the year at the least, and there to receive and take all other sacraments and rites in the Book appointed. And whosoever willingly, upon no just cause, doth absent themselves, or doth ungodly in the parish church occupy themselves, upon proof thereof, by the ecclesiastical laws of the realm to be excommunicate, or suffer other punishment as shall to the ecclesiastical judge (according to his discretion) seem convenient.

And although it be read in ancient writers that the people many years past received at the priest’s hands the Sacrament of the Body of Christ in their own hands, and no commandment of Christ to the contrary: Yet forasmuch as they many times conveyed the same secretly away, kept it with them, and diversely abused it to superstition and wickedness; lest any such thing hereafter should be attempted, and that an uniformity might be used throughout the whole realm, it is thought convenient the people commonly receive the Sacrament of Christ’s Body in their mouths, at the priest’s hand.
The Lord be with you.
And with your spirit.
Hearts on high!
We have them with the Lord.
Let us give thanks to the Lord our God.
It is fitting and just.

[Preafatio]
It is indeed fitting and just, right and salutary, that we should always and everywhere give thanks to you, O Lord, holy Father, almighty, eternal God, through Christ our Lord…. [At this point, the text of the Preface varied according to the liturgical season or occasion.] …. with whose voices, by your command, may ours also be admitted in supplication and praise, as we say,
Holy, holy, holy Lord God of hosts.
Heaven and earth are full of your glory.
Hosanna in the highest.
Blessed is he who comes in the name of the Lord.
Hosanna in the highest.

[Teigitur]
Therefore, most merciful Father, we humbly beg and beseech you, through your Son Jesus Christ our Lord, to accept and bless these gifts, these offerings, these holy and unblemished sacrifices, which we especially offer you for your holy catholic Church. Keep it in peace, watch over it, make it one, and govern it in all the world,

Priest. The Lord be with you.
Answer. And with thy spirit.
Priest. Lift up your hearts.
Answer. We lift them unto the Lord.
Priest. Let us give thanks to our Lord God.
Answer. It is meet and right so to do.

Priest. It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty, that we should at all times, and in all places, give thanks unto thee, O Lord, holy Father, almighty, everlasting God. 
¶ Here shall follow the proper Preface, according to the time, if there be any specially appointed, or else immediately shall follow. Therefore with angels, etc.

Therefore with angels and archangels, and with all the holy company of heaven, we laud and magnify thy glorious Name; evermore praising thee, and saying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of hosts: heaven and earth are full of thy glory. Hosanna in the highest. Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord. Glory to thee, O Lord, in the highest.

Let us pray for the whole state of Christ’s Church.

Almighty and everliving God, which by thy holy apostle hast taught us to make prayers and supplications, and to give thanks for all men: We humbly beseech thee most mercifully to receive these our prayers, which we offer unto thy divine Majesty; beseeching thee to inspire continually the universal Church with the spirit of truth, unity, and concord: and grant that all they that do confess thy holy Name may agree in the
in union with N. our pope and N. our bishop, and with all who worship according to the orthodox, catholic, and apostolic faith.

[Memento Domine]

Remember, Lord, your servants and handmaids, and all who stand around [this altar], whose faith you know and whose devotion you recognize, (for whom we offer or) who offer you this sacrifice of praise for themselves and for all their own, for the redemption of their souls, for the hope of their salvation and safety, and render their vows to you, the eternal God, living and true.

[Communicantes]

Joined in communion with, and venerating above all the memory of the glorious ever-Virgin Mary, Mother of God and our Lord Jesus Christ, and also of your blessed apostles and martyrs Peter, Paul, Andrew, James and John, Thomas, James, Philip, Bartholomew, Simon, and Thaddeus, Linus, Cletus, Clement, Xystus, Cornelius, Cyprian, Laurence, Chrysogonus, John and Paul, Cosmas and Damian, and all your saints: by whose merits and prayers grant that in all things we may be defended by the aid of your protection; through Christ our Lord.

truth of thy holy word, and live in unity and godly love. Specially we beseech thee to save and defend thy servant Edward our King, that under him we may be godly and quietly governed; and grant unto his whole Council, and to all that be put in authority under him, that they may truly and indifferently minister justice, to the punishment of wickedness and vice, and to the maintenance of God’s true religion and virtue.

Give grace, O heavenly Father, to all bishops, pastors, and curates, that they may both by their life and doctrine set forth thy true and lively word, and rightly and duly administer thy holy sacraments.

And to all thy people give thy heavenly grace, that with meek heart and due reverence, they may hear and receive thy holy word, truly serving thee in holiness and righteousness all the days of their life. And we most humbly beseech thee of thy goodness, O Lord, to comfort and succour all them, which in this transitory life be in trouble, sorrow, need, sickness, or any other adversity. And especially we commend unto thy Merciful goodness this congregation, which is here assembled in thy Name, to celebrate the commemoration of the most glorious death of thy Son.

And here we do give unto thee most high praise, and hearty thanks, for the wonderful grace and virtue declared in thy saints from the beginning of the world; and chiefly in the glorious and most blessed Virgin Mary, mother of thy Son Jesu Christ our Lord and God, and in the holy patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and martyrs, whose examples, O Lord, and steadfastness in thy faith, and keeping thy holy commandments, grant us to follow.
We therefore beseech you, O Lord, that you may graciously accept this oblation of our worship which we and all your household offer, and fix our days in your peace; and grant us to be snatched from eternal damnation and counted among the flock of your chosen people; through Christ our Lord.

We pray, O God, that you will deign to make this oblation blessed, approved, ratified, reasonable, and acceptable in every way, so that it may become for us the body and blood of your dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ our Lord;

Who, on the night before he suffered, took bread in his holy and venerable hands; and while his eyes were lifted up to heaven to you, O God, his almighty Father, giving thanks to you, he blessed, broke, and gave to his disciples, saying: Take and eat of this, all of you, for this is my body which is handed over for you.

We commend unto thy mercy, O Lord, all other thy servants, which are departed hence from us with the sign of faith, and now do rest in the sleep of peace: Grant unto them, we beseech thee, thy mercy, and everlasting peace; and that, at the day of the general resurrection, we and all they which be of the mystical body of thy Son, may all together be set on his right hand, and hear that his most joyful voice, Come unto me, O ye that be blessed of my Father, and possess the kingdom which is prepared for you from the beginning of the world. Grant this, O Father, for Jesus Christ's sake, our only Mediator and Advocate.

O God, heavenly Father, which of thy tender mercy didst give thine only Son Jesu Christ to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption; who made there (by his one oblation of himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world; and did institute, and in his holy gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory of that his precious death, until his coming again:

Hear us, O merciful Father, we beseech thee; and with thy Holy Spirit and word, vouchsafe to bless and sanctify these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may be unto us the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ;

who, in the same night that he was betrayed, took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, Take, eat, this is my body, which is given for you. Do this in remembrance of me.
Likewise after supper, taking also this glorious cup into his holy and venerable hands, and again giving thanks to you, he blessed and gave to his disciples, saying: Take and drink of this, all of you, for this is the cup of my blood of the new and eternal testament, the mystery of faith, which will be poured out for you and for many for the forgiveness of sins; as often as you do this, do it for the remembrance of me.

Wherefore, O Lord, we also, your servants and your holy people, are mindful of the blessed passion of Christ your Son, our Lord and God, as well as of his resurrection from the dead and his glorious ascension into the heavens; and we offer to your splendid majesty, from your presents and gifts, a pure victim, a holy victim, an unblemished victim, the holy bread of eternal life and the cup of everlasting salvation.

May you deign to look upon these gifts with a merciful and serene countenance, and to accept them just as you deigned to accept the gifts of your servant righteous Abel, and the sacrifice of our forefather Abraham, and what your high priest Melchizedek offered to you, a holy sacrifice, an unblemished victim.

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

Wherefore O Lord and heavenly Father, according to the institution of thy dearly beloved Son our Saviour Jesu Christ, we thy humble servants do celebrate and make here before thy divine Majesty, with these thy holy gifts, the memorial which thy Son hath willed us to make; having in remembrance his blessed passion, mighty resurrection, and glorious ascension; rendering unto thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same; entirely desiring thy fatherly goodness, mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, most humbly beseeching thee to grant, that by the merits and death of thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in his blood, we and all thy whole Church may obtain remission of sins, and all other benefits of his passion. And here we offer and present unto thee, O Lord, our self, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto thee; humbly beseeching thee, that whosoever shall be partakers of this holy communion, may worthily receive the most precious body and blood of thy Son Jesus Christ, and be fulfilled with thy grace and heavenly benediction, and made one body with thy Son Jesu Christ, that he may dwell in them, and they in him.
[Súpplices te]
We your suppliant people beg you, almighty God: Command these gifts to be borne by the hands of your angel to your altar on high, in the sight of your divine majesty, so that as many of us as shall have received, from this participation of the altar, the most holy body and blood of your Son, may be filled with every heavenly blessing and grace; through Christ our Lord.

[Meménto étiam]
Remember also, Lord, your servants and handmaids N. and N., who have gone before us with the sign of faith and sleep in the sleep of peace; we pray that you will grant to them, and to all who rest in Christ, a place of refreshment, light, and peace; through Christ our Lord.

[Nobis quoque]
To us sinners also, your servants, who trust in the abundance of your mercies, may you be pleased to give some share and participation with your holy apostles and martyrs, with John, Stephen, Matthias, Barnabas, Ignatius, Alexander, Marcellinus, Peter, Felicity, Perpetua, Agatha, Lucy, Agnes, Cecilia, Anastasia, and with all your saints: into whose company admit us, we pray, not as a judge of what we deserve, but as a generous bestower of forgiveness; through Christ our Lord;

[Per quem]
Through whom, O Lord, you ever create, sanctify, enliven, bless, and bestow all these good things upon us: through him, and with him, and in him, all honour and glory is yours, O God the Father almighty, in the unity of the Holy Spirit, for ever and ever. Amen.

And although we be unworthy, through our manifold sins, to offer unto thee any sacrifice; yet we beseech thee to accept this our bounden duty and service, and command these our prayers and supplications, by the ministry of thy holy angels, to be brought up into thy holy tabernacle, before the sight of thy divine Majesty; not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences;

through Christ our Lord; by whom, and with whom, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, all honour and glory be unto thee, O Father almighty, world without end. Amen.
Theologies of the Eucharist II
The Anglican Tradition

1. The Founding Liturgies

The boke of common prayer
and administracion of the sacramentes

(The Second Prayer Book, 1552)

The Order for the administration
of the Lord’s Supper,
or holy Communion

with the emendations and revisions
in the Prayer Book of the Elizabethan Settlement
(1559)
INTRODUCTION

SIXTY YEARS AGO, Dom Gregory Dix triggered a peculiarly Anglican debate when, in Chapter XVI of The Shape of the Liturgy, he called Thomas Cranmer by a name naughty among Anglicans. More than that, Dix applied the same naughty name to the 1552 Communion Order. This rite, as conservatively revised in 1559 and again in 1662, became the standard Anglican eucharistic liturgy; and, to a degree unmatched in other churches of the Reformation, it bore the burden and the heat of Anglican identity itself. This same Communion Order, Dix argued, “skilfully and unmistakably embodied” Cranmer’s own doctrine of the Lord’s Supper – and the theology so skilfully and unmistakably embodied therein was Zwinglian.1 That is to say, Dix maintained that Cranmer followed the lead of Hulderich Zwingli and considered the eucharistic sacrament to be nothing more than a “bare memorial,” a sign which served to remind faith of Christ and his atoning work but was entirely “bare” (or empty) of Christ himself.

Dom Gregory was as “high” in his churchmanship as an Anglo-Catholic could go without actually turning Roman. For him, then, Zwinglianism was not just naughty; it was a low-down dirty rotten heresy. But one did not have to be a hard-core Anglo-Catholic to take a dim view of Zwinglianism. The Anglican tradition as a whole has consistently rejected “bare memorialism”. Indeed, the XXXIX Articles of Religion insisted that

sacraments... be not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather they be sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace..., by the which [God] doth work invisibly in us.2

---


2 Article XXV; cf. Article XXVIII (“Of the Lord’s Supper”): CanBCP 1962, pp. 707-708, 709. The Articles of Religion were passed by the Convocations of Canterbury and York, and received royal assent, in 1571. For many years all clergy of the Church of England were required to “subscribe the Articles” (read them aloud and then sign their names to the text) before ordination, and again on taking up each new office or post; until the nineteenth century, students at Oxford and Cambridge were also required to subscribe the Articles before they received their degrees (and, at Oxford, upon matriculating as well). In the Anglican Church of Canada, subscription of the Articles has ceased to be a requirement; and even the general declaration of assent to their content
Hence, though Anglican divines had difficulty saying what exactly “the Anglican doctrine of the eucharist” might be, they could state most definitely that it was not Zwinglian. By slapping the naughty Zwinglian label on Cranmer’s doctrine, Dix had illegitimized Cranmer’s liturgy. It was as if “our incomparable Prayer Book liturgy” turned out to be not Anglican at all. Needless to say, Dix was perceived as having been very naughty himself, and a hot little controversy about the right label for Cranmer ensued. As Peter Brooks noted in his balanced and distinctly sober-minded study, *Thomas Cranmer’s Doctrine of the Eucharist* (1965), the whole argument generated more heat than light; Brooks therefore called for a moratorium on labelling (and, what often amounted to the same thing, libelling) Cranmer. Such a moratorium is still worth observing. Did Cranmer’s doctrine of the Lord’s Supper have a life beyond labels? And perhaps even more importantly, was the 1552 Communion Order as exact and straightforward an imprint of his eucharistic theology (however we end up defining it) as Dix insisted and as everybody else since then has assumed?

1.

**Partaking the godly nature of Christ**

Cranmer was one of those people who take a long time to make up their minds. He read and took notes, then thought a while, then read some more and thought some more, developing his position piece by piece, “here a little, there a little,” all the while refusing to make any public statements until he was sure of his own mind. This characteristic undoubtedly helped to save his career, even his life, while Henry VIII lived. But the same characteristic makes it difficult to pinpoint just when Cranmer reached his mature doctrine of the eucharist. He became archbishop of Canterbury in 1533; he did not make his first public commitment to an unmistakably Protestant view of the eucharist until 1548. *The book of common prayer and administracion of the sacraments* was issued in 1549. The following year, the archbishop published a full-length treatise: *A Defence of the true and catholike doctrine of the sacrament of the body and bloud of our sauiour Christ, with a confutacion of sundry errors (upon ordination)*, which replaced subscription, has since generally disappeared.

3 The notion that the 1552 Communion Order had been “born out of wedlock,” so to speak, was not new in Anglican circles. As early as 1695 the eccentric Edward Stephens had published a tract which denounced the Order as “the deformed, disordered Cranmerian Changeling” – a *changeling* being a child surreptitiously switched at birth and put in place of the legitimate infant.
concernyng the same, grounded and stablished upon Goddes woorde, & approued by the consent of the most auncient doctors of the Churche (London, 1550). This work did not make even one allusion to the just-published liturgy; its concern was purely doctrinal. It provoked a detailed response from Stephen Gardiner, sometime bishop of Winchester and the very model of a Henrician Catholic. Cranmer replied in largely repetitive detail with An answer unto a crafty and sophistickall cavillation devised by Stephen Gardiner, Doctor of Law, late bishop of Winchester, against the true and godly doctrine of the most holy Sacrament of the body and blood of our sauiour Iesu Christ (London, 1551). These two treatises form the essential basis for interpreting Cranmer’s doctrinal intentions in drafting the 1552 Communion Order.

A. Main Points and Problems. Apart from the problem of appropriate labelling, there is no real dispute about the basic elements of Cranmer’s eucharistology. These basic elements may be listed in five points:

1. Christ’s body and human nature are, and can be, nowhere else but in heaven.
2. “Eating the body of Christ and drinking his blood” is the definitive metaphor for “believing in Christ”. One does not need to “taste the Sacrament” in order to share the reality of such believing.

---


5 Gardiner’s work was entitled An explication and assertion of the true Catholique fayth touchyng the moost blessed Sacrament of the aulter, with confutacion of a booke written agaynst the same (London, 1550). It has never received a modern edition [but its text is included in Cranmer’s Answer, in the Parker Society edition].

6 The modern edition, which is used here, may be found in: Writings and Disputations of Thomas Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, Martyr, 1556, Relative to the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, ed. John Edmund Cox for the Parker Society (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1844), pp. 1-388.

7 “Christ, as concerning his bodily substance and nature of man, is in heaven and not present here with us in earth. For the nature and property of a very body is to be in one place, and to occupy one place, and not to be every where or in many places at one time. And though the body of Christ, after his resurrection and ascension was made immortal, yet the nature thereof was not changed; for then... it were no very body.” Defence III, 5 [Jenkyns 2, pp. 363-364]. Cf. the (so-called) Black Rubric, “The Order for the Administration of the Lord’s Supper, or Holy Communion,” below, pp. 136-37.
which is the mutual indwelling of Christ and the faithful in Christ’s mystical body. Faith in Christ is itself, by itself, sufficient to ensure the participation of Christ. Thus, Abraham and Moses, even though they lived so many centuries before he was incarnate and born, “ate” Christ as we do, by faith. Altogether this means that receiving the sacrament in the liturgy has no more real efficacy or necessity attached to it than private prayer, reading the Bible, doing the Daily Office, or preaching.

3. The bread and wine remain just what they are by nature. Their substance is not, and cannot be, converted into the substance of Christ’s flesh and blood. “How can a dumb or an insensible and lifeless creature [like bread] receive into itself any food and feed thereupon? No more is it possible that a spiritless creature [like bread] should receive any spiritual sanctification and holiness.”

Moreover, a substantial conversion of the elements would destroy the ability of the sacrament to signify, to be a sign of a divine reality.

Nevertheless,

4. The faithful do really, not just mentally, participate in the fullness of Christ. “For the sacramental bread and wine be not bare and naked figures, but so pithy and effectuous, that whosoever worthily eateth them, eateth spiritually Christ's flesh and blood, and hath by them everlasting life.”

5. Cranmer also insisted on the dignity and necessity of sharing the liturgical communion with others, in obedience to God’s commandment and invitation.

---

8 “They be twoo things to eate the sacrament and to eate the body of Christ/ The eating of the body of Christ is to dwell in Christe, and this may be thoo a man neuer tast the Sacrament.” Certayne notes touchyng the disputacions of the bysshoppes in the last parliament assembled of the Lordes supper, Saturday the ffirst day [December 15, 1548]; in Background Documents to Liturgical Revision 1547-1549, ed. Colin O. Buchanan, Grove Liturgical Study No. 35 (Bramcote, Notts.: Grove Books, 1983), p. 16.

9 Defence III, 2 [Jenkyns 2, p. 357]; Answer II, 74-78 [Cox (1844), pp. 74-78].

10 Answer I, 3 [Cox (1844), p. 11].

11 Defence III, 15 [Jenkyns 2, p. 422].

12 “The Order for the Administration of the Lord’s Supper,” First Exhortation (to be read at certayne tymes when the Curate shal see the people negligent to come to the holy Communion), below, pp. 127-128. See Alan Beesley, “Bibliographical Note: An unpublished source of the
The theological difficulties would seem to arise when one tries to reconcile either points (1) and (2) with point (4) or point (3) with point (5). Cranmer might insist that the faithful have substantial incorporation and participation in Christ. But as Cyril Richardson observed:

> The fundamental question to be asked is what such incorporation can possibly mean if the body of Christ, by being only in heaven, is inaccessible to the believer. How can its virtue and immortal properties be communicated if it is a self-enclosed object in a heavenly space?13

With respect to points (3) and (5), Dix made an equally trenchant observation. He admitted that the 1552 Communion Order was “the only effective attempt ever made to give liturgical expression to the doctrine of ‘justification by faith alone’ ”. But he immediately added:

> If in the end the attempt does not succeed – if we are left with a sense of the total disconnection of the token communion in bread and wine with that mental “eating and drinking of Christ’s Flesh and Blood”, i.e. remembering of the passion, which is for Cranmer the essential eucharistic action – that must be set down to the impossible nature of the task, not to the manner of its performance. Cranmer was in the end baffled like all the Reformers by the impossibility of reconciling the external rite of the eucharist and the scriptural evidence of the last supper with the idea that “we spiritually and ghostly with our faith eat Christ, being carnally absent from us in heaven, in such wise as Abraham and other holy Fathers did eat Him many years before he was incarnated and born...” The communion in bread and wine must be permanently irrelevant to such a conception, simply because Abraham did not receive it.14

No matter how one slices it, then, Cranmer would appear to have entangled himself in an egregious contradiction, both theologically and liturgically.

---


At the same time, it is important to realise that such a contradiction was well-nigh unavoidable, given the heritage of eucharistic spirituality that Cranmer and his contemporaries, Roman Catholic and Protestant alike, had inherited. Earlier on I noted how mediæval thought about the eucharist tried to play both sides of a dilemma. On the one hand, when it pondered the mystery of consecration, mediæval Catholicism endorsed a full-blown metabolic realism and asserted that the substances of bread and wine are converted into the substance of Christ’s real, historical flesh and blood. On the other hand, when it pondered the mystery of communion, mediæval Catholicism resorted to metaphorical discourse: receiving the flesh of Christ in the sacrament was only *like* eating food, *not the same as* eating flesh (or any other kind of food). In any case, from about the tenth century onward, most of the faithful satisfied themselves with what came to be called “spiritual communion,” whereby they beheld the elevated Host and adored the presence of the Saviour’s body by an act of mind and will, without consuming the sacrament at all.

Cranmer, like other reformers, picked up and developed this distaff side of medieval eucharistic spirituality, its metaphorical mode. In doing so, and in dissociating sacramental manducation from metaphorical or “spiritual” manducation, Cranmer sought to take with the utmost seriousness the metaphorical nature of scriptural language. The result, I suggest, is that we in turn should seek to appreciate his own doctrine in just those terms – as a eucharistology which deliberately accepts the nature of metaphorical discourse in its use of the metaphor of manducation.

**The nature of signs.** With this in view, it should come as no surprise that the most obvious feature of Cranmer’s mature doctrine of the eucharist was his polemic against the doctrine of transubstantiation. Cranmer deployed arguments which were already standard in Reformed controversial eucharistology. These centred upon the nature of a sacrament. For Cranmer, as for other Reformed divines, Augustine’s dictum was definitive: “In sacraments is to be considered, not what they be, but what they show; for they be signs of other things, being one thing and signifying another.” Transubstantiation, to Cranmer’s way of thinking, destroyed the integrity of a sign by asserting that the “substances” of Christ’s historical body and blood replaced the “substances” of bread and wine. For the integrity of a sign or a

---

15 Augustine, *Contra Maximinum* III, 22; quoted in *Defence* III, 11 and IV, 7 [Jenkyns 2, pp. 387, 439]. There are slight verbal differences in the two translations of the passage; I have used the version to be found in *Defence* IV, 7.
The English Communion Order 1552 / 1559

sacrament – the two words meant the same thing – required that it be other than the reality it signified. Cranmer was working with a concept of “sign” which denied any intrinsic relation between the sacrament-as-symbol and the reality it symbolises. The relation is wholly extrinsic and, in the strictest sense, metaphorical. It rests simultaneously on a similarity of action, and a dissimilarity of being, between sign and reality signified. Words for things in the natural order – “bread,” for instance, and “wine” – are to be taken in their literal meaning, for a thing is always itself and not another thing.17 Moreover, the words “This is my body”
cannot mean as the words seem and purport, but there must needs be some figure or mystery in this speech, more than appeareth in plain words. For by this manner of speech plainly understand [i.e. understood] without any figure as the words lie, can be gathered none other sense but that bread is Christ’s body and that Christ’s body is bread, which all Christian ears do abhor to hear. Wherefore in these words must needs be sought out another sense and meaning than the words themselves do bear.18

The “other sense” could only be metaphorical. So far as one thing acts or functions like another thing, that thing may be given the other thing’s name. According to Cranmer, this was precisely what happened in the eucharist. The “bread of life” discourse in John 6 stated that Christ was “the meat, drink, food and refreshing of the soul”. Therefore:

What thing is it that comforteth and nourisheth the body? Forsooth, meat and drink. By what names then shall we call the body and blood of our Saviour Christ (which do comfort and nourish the hungry soul) but by the names of meat and drink.19

16 “But forasmuch as [the corporal presence of the material bread and wine] is a most holy sacrament of our spiritual nourishment, which we have by the body and blood of our Saviour Christ, there must needs remain the sensible element, that is to say, bread and wine, without which there can be no sacrament.” Defence II, 8 [Jenkyns 2, p. 337]. Cf. ibid., I, 15 [Jenkyns 2, p. 306].

17 See Defence II, 2 [Jenkyns 2, p. 316].

18 Ibid., III, 7 [Jenkyns 2, p. 372].

19 Ibid., I, 10 [Jenkyns 2, p. 300].
Christ ordained the sacrament of his body and blood in bread and wine, to preach unto us that... as surely as we see the bread and wine with our eyes, smell them with our noses, touch them with our hands, and taste them with our mouths, so assuredly ought we to believe that Christ is our spiritual life and sustenance of our souls, like as the said bread and wine is the food and sustenance of our bodies. And no less ought we to doubt that our souls be fed and live by Christ, than that our bodies be fed and live by meat and drink.20

In his second treatise Cranmer expressed the same idea this way:

And therefore they [that were present at the last supper] might well know that Christ called the bread his body and the wine his blood for some figure, similitude and property of bread and wine unto his flesh and blood: for as bread and wine be foods to nourish our bodies, so is the flesh and blood of our Saviour Christ (being annexed unto his deity) the everlasting food of our souls.... And doth not the nature of sacraments require that the sensible elements should remain in their proper nature, to signify an higher mystery and secret working of God inwardly, as the sensible elements be ministered outwardly? And is not the visible and corporal feeding upon bread and wine a convenient and apt figure and similitude to put us in remembrance and to admonish us how we be fed invisibly and spiritually by the flesh and blood of Christ, God and man? And is not the sacrament taken away, when the element is taken away?21

Cranmer was exploiting a technique which Calvin called “the analogy of the sign”.22 The similarity between Christ’s body and blood on the one hand, and the bread and wine on the other, was based on the action of bread and wine in the physical organism when eaten and drunk.23

20 Ibid., I, 12 [Jenkyns 2, p. 303].
21 Answer I, 33 [Cox (1844), p. 37].
23 Speaking about consecration, Cranmer said: “Not that the bread and wine have or can have any holiness in them, but that they be used to an
Cranmer simply assumed, on Johannine authority, that naming Jesus “the meat drink, food and refreshing of the soul” was pellucidly meaningful, without problems, and definitive. But, we may ask, definitive for what? Cranmer may have centred his own eucharistic doctrine around the Johannine “bread of life” discourse, but he did not think that John 6 was a eucharistic text. On the contrary, he considered a eucharistic interpretation of John 6 irresponsible and perverse. Christ spoke in figures and metaphors in order to drive his hearers to “lift up their minds from earth to heaven, and from carnal to spiritual eating”;

and when he called his flesh “true bread,” he really meant “spiritual eating by faith”. In holy work, and represent holy and godly things.... [T]hey represent the very body and blood of Christ and the holy food and nourishment which we have by him.” Defence III, 15 [Jenkyns 2, pp. 413-414]. Cf. Answer I, 29 [Cox (1844), p. 34]: “Where you [i.e. Gardiner] speak of the miraculous working of Christ to make bread his body, you must first learn that the bread is not made really Christ’s body, nor the wine his blood, but sacramentally. And the miraculous working is not in the bread, but in them that duly eat the bread and drink that drink. For the marvellous working of God is in the feeding; and it is Christian people that be fed, and not the bread.”

24 Defence I, 2-16 [Jenkyns 2:292-308]. Cranmer considered this to be a sufficient exposition of eucharistic doctrine “for all that be humble and godly and seek nothing superfluous” [I, 16; Jenkyns 2, p. 308]. It is, in fact, little more than a mystagogical meditation on John 6. Cf. Answer to Gardyner I [Cox (1844), p. 36], where Cranmer dealt with “the ambiguity of Christ’s speeches”.

25 “... Christ in that place of John [6:51] spake not of the material and sacramental bread, nor of the sacramental eating, (for that was spoken two or three years before the sacrament was first ordained,) but he spake of spiritual bread..., and of spiritual eating by faith, after which sort he was at the same present time eaten of as many as believed on him, although the sacrament was not at that time made and instituted...” Defence II, 10 [Jenkyns 2, pp. 338-339]. This was a common position among the reformers. Cf. Martin Luther, The Babylonian Captivity of the Church [1520], in Luther’s Works: American Edition, ed. Jaroslav Pelikan and Helmut T. Lehmann, 55 vols. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1955ff), vol. 36, p. 19. See also Huldrych Zwingli, Letter to Matthew Alber concerning the Lord’s Supper [1524], in Huldrych Zwingli: Writings, trans. H. Wayne Pipkin, 2 vols., Pittsburgh Theological Monographs 13 (Allison Park, Penns.: Pickwick Publications, 1984), vol. 2, pp. 132-136. It may be noted that Zwingli based his doctrine of the eucharist on a non-eucharistic reading of John 6.

26 Defence III, 10 [Jenkyns 2, p. 378].
other words, John 6 and the metaphor of manducation referred to the global dynamics of believing in Christ, not to the eucharist.

**The dialectics of believing.** Cranmer, like Zwingli, identified the act of believing in Christ and the metaphor of “eating” Christ. “And this our belief in [Christ] is to eat his flesh and to drink his blood”\(^27\) – statements like this are peppered throughout Cranmer’s *Defence* and the *Answer*. The most obvious conclusion to be drawn from such a position was, that celebration and reception of the holy Communion might be dispensed with altogether. One need not receive the sacrament *in order to* participate in Christ, though one might receive the sacrament *because* one participated in Christ. To leave the matter there, however, is to miss the core of Cranmer’s thought.

We might catch a sense of this core by considering three quotations from Book I of Cranmer’s *Defence*.

[1.]

...[A]s all men of themselves be sinners, and sin be in God’s wrath, banished far away from him, condemned to hell and everlasting damnation, and none is clearly innocent but Christ alone: so every soul inspired by God is desirous to be delivered from sin and hell, and to obtain at God’s hands mercy, favour, righteousness and everlasting salvation.

And this earnest and great desire is called in Scripture the hunger and thirst of the soul....

And this hunger the silly, poor, sinful soul is driven unto by means of the law, which showeth her the horribleness of sin, the terror of God’s indignation and the horror of death and everlasting damnation.... And this feeling of her damnable condition, and the greedy desire of refreshing, is the spiritual hunger of the soul.

And whosoever hath this godly hunger is blessed of God, and shall have meat and drink enough.... And on the other side, they that see not their own sinful and damnable estate.... as they have no spiritual hunger, so shall they be not fed of God with any spiritual food. For as almighty God feedeth them that be hungry, so doth he send away empty all that be not hungry.\(^28\)

\(^{27}\) Ibid., III, 10 [Jenkyns 2, p. 382].

\(^{28}\) Ibid., I, 9 [Jenkyns 2, p. 298].
[2.]
And the true eating and drinking of the said body and blood of Christ is with a constant and lively faith to believe that Christ gave his body and shed his blood upon the cross for us, and that he doth so join and incorporate himself to us that he is our head and we his members, flesh of his flesh and bone of his bones, having him dwell in us and we in him.29

[3.]
All men desire to have God’s favour; and when they know the contrary, that they be in his indignation and cast out of his favour, what thing can comfort them? How be their minds vexed!... And in this sorrowful heaviness, holy Scripture teacheth them that our heavenly Father can by no means be pleased with them again but by the sacrifice and death of his only-begotten Son, whereby God hath made a perpetual amity and peace with us, doth pardon the sins of them that believe in him, maketh them his children, and giveth them to his first-begotten Son Christ, to be incorporate into him, to be saved by him, and to be made heirs of heaven with him. And in the receiving of the holy Supper of our Lord, we be put in remembrance of this his death, and of the whole mystery of our redemption.30

The most obvious point to be gathered out of these three hefty quotations is that believing in Christ/“eating” Christ involves not remembrance of the passion only, nor the mystical indwelling of Christ and the faithful only, but “the whole mystery of our redemption”.

Cranmer’s discussion of the soul’s spiritual hunger suggested that this hunger was a chronic condition. It was not something once suffered in the past and now, with conversion, for ever satisfied. It remained the perpetual foundation of human experience, religious or otherwise. The human soul would be for ever hungry “after her sort” – and the name sinner would for ever remain the fundamental definition of human. For this reason, believing in and “eating” Christ involved a continuous rehearsal of the whole history of salvation, from the conviction of sin to mystical participation of the risen and ascended Christ. In other words, the dynamics of believing/“eating” were essentially cyclical. To believe in Christ was not just to give assent to one or another proposition,

29 Ibid., I, 16 [Jenkyns 2, p. 306].

30 Ibid., I, 16 [Jenkyns 2, p. 307].
“Christ died for me” or “I am a member of Christ”. It was to pass through all the stages of faith, from despair to assurance of membership in Christ’s mystical body, each and every time the gospel of salvation was proclaimed and celebrated.

Within this pattern of faith there are perhaps three principal moments or stages: (1) conviction of sin, (2) remembrance of Christ’s passion and sacrifice on the cross, and (3) assurance of membership in Christ’s mystical body. The relation between stages (1) and (2) is not hard to recognise. The problem, as we have already noted, lies with the relation between stages (2) and (3). To speak of membership in Christ’s body is to imply participation in the substance of that body. But Cranmer insisted that Christ’s body is and can be nowhere else but in heaven. Such a doctrine would seem to make the body inaccessible to the faithful, or (better said) accessible to them only in a mental, not at all in a substantial, fashion.

Cranmer certainly offered a resolution to this problem. Commenting on a passage from Hilary of Poitiers’ *De trinitate*, he said:

... Christ in his incarnation received of us a mortal nature and united the same unto his divinity, and so we be naturally in him. And the sacraments of baptism and of his holy Supper, if we rightly use the same, do most assuredly certify us that we be *partakers of his godly nature*, having given unto us by him immortality and life everlasting, and so is Christ naturally in us. And so we be one with Christ and Christ with us, not only in will and mind, but also in very natural properties.31

Cranmer returned to the point a little further on in his argument, while commenting on a passage from Cyril of Alexandria’s commentary on John’s gospel (*In Ioannem* X, 13):

Although... Cyril doth say that Christ doth dwell corporally in us when we receive the mystical benediction, yet he neither saith that Christ dwelleth corporally in the bread, nor that he dwelleth in us corporally only at such times as we receive the sacrament, nor that he dwelleth in us and not we in him; but he saith as well that we dwell in him as that he dwelleth in us. Which dwelling is neither corporal nor local, but a heavenly, spiritual and supernatural dwelling, whereby, so long as we dwell in him and he in us, we have by him everlasting life. And therefore Cyril saith... that Christ is the vine and we the branches, because that by him we have life. For as the branches receive life and nourishment of the body

of the vine, so receive we by him the natural property of his body, which is life and immortality: and by that means we, being his members, do live and be spiritually nourished.\textsuperscript{32}

In both these passages, Cranmer seems to understand Christ’s humanity to be primarily his glorified humanity. For “the natural property of his body” is “immortality and life everlasting”. We share in this property in virtue of God the Word’s unitive action in the Incarnation itself. The one thing necessary is to share in Christ’s “godly nature”: since (as Chalcedonian orthodoxy confessed) the two natures in the Incarnate Word may never be divided, participation in Christ’s divine nature will grant, almost as a matter of course, participation in the human nature assumed and transfigured by the divine nature.\textsuperscript{33} What Cranmer does not make explicit, and what needs to be made explicit if his schema is to do the work he intends it to do, is the distinction between “human nature” and its fulfilment, between creation and new creation. For the whole schema depends upon a movement from a common human nature which Christ shares with us to a transformed and immortal human nature which we, as “partakers of his godly nature,” share with Christ.

All this may seem very abstract. Nevertheless, it does fit in with the pattern of faith which we noted earlier. The passion is the cause of our incorporation into Christ; and remembrance of the passion is the cause of our assurance that we are incorporate in Christ’s mystical body. This meant that the commemoration of the passion always referred to a transcendent reality, which Cranmer

\textsuperscript{32} Ibid., III, 15 [Jenkyns 2, pp. 410-411].

\textsuperscript{33} Both in his eucharistic treatises and, most obviously, in the second of The Forty-Two Articles (1553) Cranmer signalised his adherence to the terms of Chalcedonian christology. In the treatises, this adherence took polemical form. The Chalcedonian definition decreed that the two natures should be neither divided nor confused. Cranmer maintained that “the papists,” in their defence of transubstantiation, violated the dogma by confusing the natures (Defence III, 6): “Wherefore the papists, which say that the body of Christ is in an infinite number of places at one time, do make his body to be God, and so confound the two natures of Christ, attributing to his human nature that thing which belongeth only to his divinity, which is a most heinous and detestable heresy.” One might ask what Cranmer has done with the equally Chalcedonian principle of the communicatio idiomatum, “the mutual interchange of attributes” between Christ’s divine and human natures. One might also wonder whether Cranmer’s insistence on the location of Christ’s body in heaven alone does not, in fact, involve a division of the natures. This leads me to think that Cranmer was, in spite of himself, a closet Nestorian.
described in various terms but which always involved the participation of Christ’s mystical body, even a mystical exchange of attributes between Christ and the faithful.

Cranmer, then, differed from the mediæval Catholic tradition in that he considered Christ’s divine nature, not his human nature, to be the only possible agent in effecting the union between Christ and the faithful. The Incarnation was a work of sheer grace, for in the first instance it was the divine nature which united flesh to itself, not the flesh which united divinity to itself. The presence of Christ’s flesh in the sacrament thus became unnecessary. As Cranmer stated during the 1548 parliamentary debate: “To haue Christe present really here when I may receaue hym in faith, is not auayleable to do me goode.”

The point is, Cranmer disallowed any means between faith and the transcendent reality of God. The divine nature was immediately available to faith.

The role of the eucharist. Certain consequences follow. One could receive what the sacrament was instituted to signify, only if one already participated by faith in the reality itself. The principle at work here is, “Like attracts like” – membership in Christ’s mystical body attracts the properties of spiritual nourishment which inhere in Christ. But what are the conditions of this attraction? We might recall that Cranmer placed a condition on being a partaker of Christ’s godly nature: we can be such only “so long as we dwell in him and he in us”. This condition was, in fact, an invariable part of Cranmer’s affirmations about the participation in Christ. It implies, of course, that an individual could fall away from membership in Christ’s body – an odd notion, if we reflect upon Cranmer’s statements about our union with Christ by means of “his godly nature”. To insist that the divine nature alone acts to unite us to Christ is to place membership in Christ’s body within the realm of grace alone. To this extent, Cranmer was thinking – if not actually speaking – along the lines of predestination. Membership

34 Certayne notes touching the disputacions..., Weddingsday the 4 Day, in Background Documents, p. 32. Cf. Answer II, 190, III, 228 [Cox (1844), pp. 183, 219].

35 John Hooper (d. 1555), whose advocacy of extreme Protestantism made him a thorn in Cranmer’s flesh, stated this point succinctly in his Brief and Clear Confession of the Christian Faith, 67: In the Lord’s Supper, he said, “a man findeth and receiveth no more than he bringeth with him, saving peradventure the increase of faith, grace and virtue. And therefore they only find and receive Jesus Christ unto salvation, which through true and lively faith bring the same with them.” Later Writings of John Hooper, ed. C. Nevinson for the Parker Society (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1852), p. 49.
in Christ is a matter of foreordination and election to eternal life. One would think that individuals either belonged indefectably to the mystical body of Christ, in which case sin no longer had dominion in them – or, if not, they were just as indefectably damned; sin still defined them, and they could never belong to Christ’s body.

Here it may be useful to remember what Cranmer said in “Of Salvation” and “Of the True, Lively and Christian Faith,” two of the discourses that he wrote for the first Book of Homilies (1547). Cranmer, of course, denied that good works were necessary to justification, which was effected by grace alone. But he insisted that good works were the inseparable fruit, accompaniment, and evidence of faith, without which faith was “dead”. A “lively” (or living) faith invariably issued in works of repentance and charity toward neighbours. 36 If we wished to use the scholastic language familiar to Thomas Aquinas, we might say that, as the passion is the efficient cause of justification and participation in Christ’s mystical body is the final cause of justification, so faith bearing the fruit of good works is the formal cause of justification. 37 Hence Cranmer’s concern for “worthiness” in communicants and his insistence that the true sacrifices of Christians were the killing in themselves of “devilish pride, furious anger, insatiable covetousness, filthy lucre, stinking lechery, deadly hatred and malice, foxy williness, wolvish ravening and devouring, and all other unreasonable lusts and desires of the flesh”. 38 Such sacrifices meant, of course, walking in the paths of righteousness; and it was this righteousness, the righteousness of good works annexed unto faith, that belonged to the pattern of salvation as much as remembering the passion and assurance of mystical participation in Christ. Here, however, a


37 Cf. Thomas Aquinas, Summa theologiae 3a, 60, 3: “In a sacrament’s signifying of our sanctification, three things can be taken into consideration: the actual cause of our sanctification, which is the passion of Christ; the form of our sanctification, which consists in grace and the virtues; and the final end of our sanctification, which is eternal life.”

38 Defence V. 8 [Jenkyns 2, p. 454]. Cf. I, 15 [Jenkyns 2, p. 305], where Cranmer speaks about the unity which each member of a community ought to have with the others.
crucial ambiguity arises. Are works, as annexed to faith, “mere” evidences of justification – or do they, in however limited a fashion, have some part to play in the effecting of righteousness? To admit the latter option would seem to lead back into the works-spirituality which Cranmer expressly and vehemently repudiated. And yet Cranmer suggested that, properly speaking, there was no righteousness at all without works.39

Be that as it may, what is the role of the Lord’s Supper in this pattern? If all that I have said about Cranmer and the pattern of faith is fundamentally true, it follows that the Lord’s Supper was for him not a particular moment in the pattern, but rather a liturgical embodiment of the whole pattern. It was the enacted metaphor of manducation. That does not mean that it had a special efficacy in itself, for it still belonged to metaphorical discourse wherein the similitude of one thing to another is based on similarity of action and dissimilarity of being. It means that the Supper rehearsed for faith and represented to faith the whole movement from spiritual hunger to the satisfaction of that hunger in and by Christ. In short, as an enacted metaphor, the Lord’s Supper reported and (though Cranmer would not have used this word) dramatised the pattern of conversion which had (or should have) already taken place “elsewhere,” in the realm of faith alone.

2.

The 1552 Communion Order – Liturgy of the Lord’s Supper

We now turn to consider the 1552 Communion Order, the fruition and (as events had it) the final testament of Cranmer’s liturgical work. How far does this reformed liturgy reflect Cranmer’s theology?

Various rubrics in 1552 Order (and the revisions of 1559 and 1662) ordained that the principal service on Sunday should consist of Morning Prayer, Litany, and the Holy Communion. But the Communion Order itself was organised in such a way as to allow the separation of “the Ante-Communion” and “the Holy Communion”. The Ante-Communion – in effect, the Liturgy of the Word – included everything up to and including the collection of

39 In this Cranmer simply reflected the ambiguities which Reformed divinity never satisfactorily resolved. The rise of Calvinist ideology in the late sixteenth century, with its doctrinal emphasis on double predestination and its pastoral obsession with an assurance directly based on works as evidences of election, only exacerbated the problem.
alms and the intercession, the Prayer “for the Whole Estate of Christ’s Church Militant here in earth”. A rubric appended to the rite made provision for concluding the liturgy immediately after this Prayer. This option quickly became the norm almost everywhere in the Church of England; cathedrals were the only churches in which the full Order, with holy communion, had to be celebrated every Sunday. If there were a celebration of the Liturgy of the Lord’s Supper, it began immediately after the Prayer for Christ’s Church with the so-called “Long Exhortation”. Then followed:

- Invitation to Communion
- General Confession
- Assurance of Forgiveness (a.k.a. Absolution)
- Comfortable Words

- Sursum corda
- Preface and Sanctus
- Prayer of Humble Access
- Prayer over the bread and wine

- The Communion

- Lord’s Prayer
- Post-communion Prayers [choice of two]
- Gloria in excelsis
- Blessing

Dom Gregory Dix argued that the sequence from the Long Exhortation to “Lift up your hearts” was designed to replace the traditional offertory of bread and wine with a solafidian offertory – that is, with an offertory which reflected the doctrine of justification by faith alone. The gifts and oblations in this offertory were not material elements but the repentance of the intending communicants, with their thankful remembrance of Christ’s atoning death.40 Dix went on to argue that the prayer which has been called (since 1662) “the Prayer of Consecration” was in fact no such thing. The prayer as a whole, and the words of institution in particular, “are not prayer of the church but a ministerial act,” not a consecration in the Catholic sense but “the separation of the elements to their sacramental use” in a Protestant sense.41 Colin Buchanan and Richard Buxton, the most recent scholars to treat the 1552 Order in detail, accepted and refined Dix’s argument. Both

40 Dix, The Shape of the Liturgy (1945), pp. 662-663.

41 Ibid., 664-665.
agree that communion, not consecration, was the “peak” of the Order. In their view, this provides the governing principle by which all other elements in the rite ought to be interpreted. The insight is true, but we need to be careful in the way we apply it. The material from the Long Exhortation to the communion are not a seamless progression, an unbroken march, toward the latter. On the contrary, the material in question seems to present a series of dialectical cycles, each overlapping, each building upon its predecessor. In this light, I shall consider the “Supper sequence” in detail.

The Exhortations. Three “set” Exhortations preface the Supper sequence. The first was for use “at certain times when the Curate shall see the people negligent to come to the holy Communion”. It is, in some respects, an extended meditation on the parable of the wedding banquet (Matthew 22.1-14, Luke 14.16-24). It is interesting, too, for its elaboration of the parable in order to enforce the communal nature of the Lord’s Supper. But its note is pervasively comminatory. The second Exhortation was also for optional use, “at the discretion of the Curate”. It outlined the practical duties to be carried out in preparation for the Communion – self-examination “by the rule of God’s commandments,” repentance and confession “with full purpose of amendment of life,” and the making of “restitution and satisfaction according to the uttermost of your powers, for all injuries and wrongs done by you to any other”. The third Exhortation, as already noted, had to be read out at every celebration of the Lord’s Supper. For this reason alone it merits separate consideration.

The Long Exhortation – a very substantial piece of liturgical prose indeed – was basically a paraphrase of 1 Corinthians 11.27-31, with an embolism upon the paraphrase. Its purpose was to set forth the necessity of self-examination, repentance, and a “lively faith” for a true receiving of what the Supper offered:

For as the benefit is great, if with a truly penitent heart and lively faith we receive that holy sacrament (for then we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ, and drink his blood, then we dwell in Christ and Christ in us, we be one with Christ, and Christ with us) so is the danger great, if we receive the same unworthily.

We should note, first of all, the parenthetical affirmation of mystical union with Christ as the significance of the Supper. This mystical union, this spiritual eating and drinking of Christ’s flesh and blood, is (as Calvin expressed it) “the result and effect”43 of “a truly penitent heart and lively faith” – or, to put it another way, repentance and faith are the instrumental means of this mystical eating and drinking. This may seem odd, in light of Cranmer’s doctrinal insistence, in his Defence of the True and Catholic Doctrine of the Sacrament, that “believing on Christ” was not the instrumental means to, but the same as “eating Christ’s body and drinking his blood”. The words may indeed imply such a doctrine, but they do not quite say that “believing” is “eating” and “eating” is “believing”.

Be that as it may, the pattern represented in this Exhortation was a dialectic between faith in the gospel promise as attested by Scripture and repentance for those sins which were the cause of Christ’s death and passion. The penitential note certainly appears to dominate. But this note is matched with – and ultimately overborne by – another note, the kerygmatic assurance of God’s forgiveness for Christ’s sake. In the Exhortation itself, this shift takes place in the embolism upon the Pauline paraphrase:

Judge therefore yourselves, brethren, that ye be not judged of the Lord. Repent you truly for your sins past; have an earnest and lively faith in Christ our Saviour; amend your lives, and be in perfect charity with all men: so shall ye be meet partakers of those holy mysteries. And above all things, ye must give most humble and hearty thanks to God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, for the redemption of the world by the death and passion of our Saviour Christ, both God and man, who did humble himself even to the death upon the cross for us miserable sinners, which lay in darkness and the shadow of death, that he might make us children of God and exalt us to everlasting life.

The shift from judgement to kerygmatic assurance of forgiveness takes place at the words “And above all things....” It is this evangelical shift which governs the dynamics of the rest of the rite: no liturgical moment is complete unless it includes both the acknowledgement of human sin and the great “much more,” the staggering “nevertheless,” which divine grace addresses to that human, that sinner.

From Invitation to Communion. This sequence of texts repeats, in concrete liturgical form, this same dialectic of repentance, faith, and kerygmatic assurance.

From Invitation to Comfortable Words. The Invitation and General Confession embody the plea of repentant sinners. It should be noted, however, that this action is essentially reflexive. The Invitation and General Confession were never meant to bear the whole burden and heat of the penitential moment. They are the acknowledgement of a status already appropriated, and they depend upon the individual’s being already repentant, already “in love and charity with your neighbours,” and already resolved “to lead a new life”. On these conditions, the Absolution declares God’s mercy; and this declaration is “sealed” by the four scriptural sentences of the Comfortable Words. Indeed, the Comfortable Words are placed where they are so as to be the kerygmatic assurance itself; repentant sinners who intend to receive communion are being presented with actual words of God in which they may place their faith. It is precisely here that the 1552 Communion Order has a Lutheran whiff; for the heart of Luther’s spirituality, eucharistic and otherwise, was the hearing of God’s promise “clearly expressed in words, which the human then takes and keeps in a good, firm faith”. To set these Comfortable Words before the General Confession, as several “reordered traditional-language” Anglican rites do, is to mistake their role in the evangelical dialectic of the whole sequence.

Sursum Corda and Prayer of Humble Access. The Comfortable Words become the ground for the immediately following act of faith: “Lift up your hearts. Answer. We lift them up unto the Lord.” The General Preface (with five seasonal propers) and the Sanctus continue the faith-motif in thanksgiving and praise. Then the penitential note returns with the Prayer of Humble Access: the dialectical cycle begins all over again, as if thanksgiving and praise must collapse back upon its ground in the knowledge of one’s incontinent sinfulness before God. As it happens, the Prayer itself

---


captures this same dialectic in succinct and even rather beautiful form:

We do not presume to come to this thy Table, O merciful Lord, trusting in our own righteousness, but in thy manifold and great mercies. We be not worthy to gather up the crumbs under thy Table; but thou art the same Lord, whose property is always to have mercy….

Humans, who are nothing other than sinners, must be persistently “broken” upon the reality of their nature and upon the tremendous “nevertheless” which God addresses to that reality. But having said that, we should note that the Prayer of Humble Access goes on to say:

Grant us, therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the flesh of thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink his blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by his body, and our souls washed through his most precious blood, and that we may evermore dwell in him, and he in us.

This prayer thus modulates into the assurance-phase of the dialectic by connecting the eating of Christ’s flesh and the drinking of his blood with the indwelling of the faithful in Christ and of Christ in the faithful.

The Prayer of Humble Access is, of course, a prayer for communion – before what Anglicans later came to call “the Prayer of Consecration”. This very fact was one of the things which made some commentators label the 1552 Order a “disrupted” rite. For why would one pray for a worthy communion before one had prayed for consecration of the elements? The 1552 sequence (continued in EngBCP 1559 and 1662) is indeed problematic – but only if the second of these two prayers is considered a prayer for the consecration of the bread and wine. What if the second prayer is intended to be no such thing? What if it is designed to justify – be a warrant for – what the first prayer, the Prayer of Humble Access, had broached, namely, communion?

Table Prayer and Communion. The prayer over the bread and wine, which immediately follows the Prayer of Humble Access, runs through the kerygma and concludes with the recitation of the testamentum, the word-bequest contained in the institution

46 In the Scots liturgies of 1637 and 1764, in the American and English Prayer Books of 1928, and in the South African liturgy of 1929, the Prayer of Humble Access was restored to the position it held in EngBCP 1549, just before the communion.
narrative. There is no Amen. The absence of this acclamation, Dix argued, meant that the recital of Christ’s words were “not a prayer of the church but a ministerial act, the ‘preparing of the supper’.” I myself would argue that the absence of a people’s Amen was rather more evangelical in purpose. The people were to be left to meditate directly on Christ’s testamental words and to “eat” the meaning of the liturgy – the promise and bequest of Christ, the forgiveness of sins – by receiving the metaphors of bread and wine. The words of administration reinforce the point:

Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith, with thanksgiving.

Drink this in remembrance that Christ’s blood was shed for thee, and be thankful.

Again, the action on the communicants’ part is essentially reflexive: they receive the significance of the action by meditating on the worldly, metaphorical nature of the elements.

In summary, this sequence of material reduplicates the entire movement from conviction of sin and its attendant despair to metaphorical or symbolic participation in Christ’s mystical body and blood. But it reduplicates this movement not in a seamless progression from one, through all the intermediate stages, to the other. On the contrary, the liturgy moves through a series of dialectical cycles, each building upon its predecessor. The dialectic is repeated three times: in the Long Exhortation, again in the material from Invitation to the Sanctus, and yet again in the movement from the Prayer of Humble Access to the Communion. Each repetition forms a distinct cycle, and yet there is a real liturgical progression: as the Exhortation cycle moves into the penitential cycle, and as the penitential cycle moves into the communion cycle, the dialectic becomes more concentrated in its expression.

Concluding sequence. After the communion, the priest was instructed to recite the Lord’s Prayer, “the people repeating after him every petition”. He was then to say one of two appointed prayers, either “The Prayer of Oblation” or “The Prayer of Thanksgiving,” as they commonly came to be called. The Gloria in excelsis, “said or sung,” followed. A blessing concluded the rite.

Prayer of Oblation. Dix may have been right when he identified the sequence of Exhortation – General Confession as a sola fidian offertory. As we have seen, Cranmer insisted that the people must offer “spiritual sacrifices,” i.e. must renounce their sins, before coming to the Supper. Nevertheless, Protestant divinity generally maintained that it was only after communion that the people could offer any sacrifice at all. For it was only in response to God’s initiative and gift that sacrifice became possible; and the kind of
sacrifice in question was “a reasonable [i.e. spiritual], holy, and lively sacrifice” of “our selves, our souls and bodies”. It may be noted, however, that no special, objective gift was bestowed in sacramental communion, over and above that which the individual communicants had already appropriated in their daily lives. The Prayer, in fact, returns to the ground of that pattern. The priest, on behalf of the gathered communicants, beseech God

O Lord and heavenly Father, we thy humble servants entirely desire thy fatherly goodness, mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; most humbly beseech thee to grant, that by the merits and death of thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in his blood, we and all thy whole Church may obtain remission of sins, and all other benefits of his passion…. And although we be unworthy, through our manifold sins, to offer unto thee any sacrifice; yet we beseech thee to accept this our bounden duty and service, not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences…. 

It is almost (but not quite) as if communion had not happened. The people are back where they started, ready to begin the pattern of faith all over again, from conviction and acknowledgement of sin onward.

Prayer of Thanksgiving. The central motif in this Prayer is slightly different. It has to do with incorporation into Christ. God is thanked for feeding the communicants “with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of thy Son”. On the basis of this spiritual feeding, God is also thanked “for that thou... dost assure us thereby... that we be very members incorporate in thy mystical body, which is the blessed company of all faithful people”.47 The key word here is the verb assure, and it suggests that the fruit of communion is reflexive rather than actual. God’s giving of “the spiritual food” was a guarantee to faithful communicants that they already possessed incorporation into Christ. Thus, the giving and receiving of that gift depended on whether the communicants in question already inhabited and knew that they inhabited the mystical context. But this indwelling of Christ was itself conditional on the grace which would allow the faithful to “continue in that holy fellowship, and [to] do all such good works as [God has] prepared for us to walk in.” It is as Cranmer said in the Defence: the faithful “eat, drink and feed of Christ continually, so long as they be members of his body.”

47 The peculiar attribution of the “mystical body” to the Father was corrected in the 1662 revision to read “very members incorporate in the mystical body of thy Son”.
Gloria in excelsis, finally, gathers up the whole movement of the rite in a concentrated expression of praise and thanksgiving. Just as importantly, its christological lines renew the ground of the solafootian pattern. The threefold repetition of the line “[thou] that takest away the sins of the world,” and the acclamation of Christ as “thou that sittest at the right hand of God the Father,” offer hymnodic reinforcement to the basic terms and conditions of Christian life: Christ is in heaven and not here, and our relation to him is a relation of sinners to the atoning sacrifice. With this, and a blessing, the communicants are sent forth into the world to begin the cycles of conviction and repentant confession of sin, hearing God’s word of mercy and, on this twin basis, reflexive assurance of membership in Christ.

Cranmer’s doctrine of the eucharist was centred on a non-eucharistic interpretation of John 6 and the metaphor of manducation which it suggested. The metaphor could be sustained because Cranmer collapsed the sign into its global significance. To this end, he made the eucharistic liturgy into a reflexive performance which enacted this metaphor of manducation. Only, the 1552 Communion Order enacted the metaphor by means of distinct cycles, each of which repeated for the faithful the basic dialectics of their faith in ever more concentrated form.

Gregory Dix was surely right when he called the 1552 Communion Order “the only effective attempt ever made to give liturgical expression to the doctrine of ‘justification by faith alone’.” But he believed that the attempt was bound to fail as liturgy, because a solafootian programme will invariably find it impossible to give real value – that is to say, objective efficacy – to liturgical action. In this criticism Dix took as his norm the Catholic standpoint which Cranmer himself repudiated. This standpoint required that the economy of the Incarnation have a real analogue in the sacramental economy: participation in Christ’s divinity was necessarily mediated through Christ’s humanity. Hence, the necessity for the substantial presence of Christ’s historical flesh and blood in the sacrament. Hence, too, the necessity for liturgical communion. This may turn out to be the most satisfactory and adequate foundation for discourse about the eucharistic mystery. But it depends upon a series of hidden links, all of them arguments derived from the “appropriateness” of one point to the next. But the “appropriateness” in question is, at the turning-point in the system, essentially metaphorical. The Catholic tradition speaks of eating Christ’s body and drinking his blood. At the same time, it has consistently repudiated any account of this statement which might connote sacral cannibalism; and, despite its efforts to safeguard the objective reality of the event by speaking of
substantial presence, it has always fallen back on an essentially metaphorical ground by making the similarity between Christ’s body and the bread a similarity of action. It was precisely this point, and the threat of incoherence which it posed, that Cranmer sought to address and resolve. To this end he performed radical surgery, both theologically and linguistically. On the theological level, there was a certain consistency in Cranmer’s assertion that Christ’s divine nature alone, quite apart from his human nature (which remained “stuck” in heaven), effected the union of the faithful with Christ. If humans are saved by grace alone, it made sense that the sole agent in the union should be the source of grace itself, which is simply and only the divine nature. On the linguistic level, Cranmer simply collapsed the eucharistic sign into its transcendent significance. For Cranmer, celebrating the eucharist made sense only so far as a Christian community celebrated the already existent reality of its participation in Christ. If Cranmer had too naïve a concept of signs and their relation to the reality they signified, he nevertheless sought to restore the eucharist to its theological status in the context of the salvific economy. Thus, to accuse Cranmer of teaching that the eucharist was a “bare” sign, token, or memorial at best merely postpones – at worst sidetracks – the fundamental issue.

This brings us back to the question that I posed earlier when discussing Cranmer’s doctrine of the eucharist. I noted that theological discourse may involve a spirituality, a framing and orientation of approach, which is distinct from (though not necessarily opposed to) the exigencies of spirituality involved in constructing a liturgy. It may now be said that, in Cranmer’s case, there was indeed a distinction between his theological statements and the 1552 Communion Order – a distinction, not an opposition. Cranmer, in his theological spirituality, stressed the conditional nature of receiving what the Lord’s Supper signified – individuals received the meaning of the sacrament only “so long as” each one abided in Christ. But we also noted a certain unresolved ambiguity at this point. Cranmer insisted on the exclusive agency of Christ’s divine nature in uniting human creatures to himself, and thus ensured the absolute sovereignty of grace in the union. This motif moved in a predestinarian direction and suggested that the incorporated member of Christ, once a member, was always a member. And yet, as we also noted, there was a chronic dialectic whereby all faithful individuals, regardless of election, returned to the beginning of the conversion process as soon as they had completed it. Christian life involved a recurrent cycle, not a progressive transformation; and this was the cycle which the Lord’s Supper metaphorically enacted. Such is Cranmer’s theological spirituality of the eucharist. In constructing the 1552
Communion Order, then, Cranmer and his associates had a choice to make. If the analysis of the 1552 Order presented here holds any water, it means that Cranmer and his associates chose to construct that Order in such a way as to give the cyclical pattern greater force than the spirituality of election. There is, strictly speaking, no opposition between Cranmer’s theological spirituality and the liturgical spirituality embodied in the 1552 Order. But there is a distinct shift in emphasis from a spirituality of incorporation to a spirituality of cyclical dialectics.

This raises another, larger issue. Cranmer, like his contemporaries in the Protestant movement, sought to reverse the understanding reflected in the traditional tag, *Lex orandi legem statuat credendi*, “the law of praying constitutes the law of believing”. On the contrary, they held, the law of believing (and therefore theology) should determine the law of praying. The law of praying which Cranmer and his associates, as Reformed teachers and theologians, enforced upon the reformed Church of England, embodied a cyclical dialectic. It is here, rather than on the points of eucharistic presence and sacrifice, that I think Cranmer may be the more legitimately criticised. Worthy communicants might be assured that they were “very members incorporate in [the] mystical body [of Christ], which is the blessed company of all faithful people.” But the dialectics of the rite itself would forestall any conviction that this membership and incorporation in Christ was the enduring and definitive reality of their lives. Membership in Christ’s mystical body might be the ground of communion, but it was not a stable ground. For the dialectics of the pattern assumed that the communicants would begin the cycle all over again as soon they left the liturgy. Indeed, only thus could the communion be the enacted metaphor: it could only represent what went on elsewhere – and what went on elsewhere was a ceaselessly repeated cycle of conviction of sin, despair, hearing the gospel, repentance, faith in the merits of the Crucified, and renewed assurance of Christ’s indwelling. Now, the question which needs to be asked might go something like this. Is membership in Christ’s body – being alive with the life of him who died and rose again – the context and reality which defines baptised people? Or do humans who have been baptised into Christ remain always sinners and nothing more? For one cannot have it both ways. The foundation and elemental continuity in baptised life is either the disintegrating power of sin, or the grace of union with Christ. If we say the latter, the one necessity for receiving the eucharist is not recurrent acknowledgement of our incontinent sinfulness, but the renewed and deepening re-appropriation of being “in Christ”. Cranmer ultimately opted for the former answer. One may
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wonder if such an answer is as fully faithful to the gospel of God’s new creation in Christ Jesus as it seeks to be.

3. The Settlement of Religion

The second Prayer Book came into use on All Saints’ Day, 1552. It never had a chance. Within six months Edward VI was dead, and his elder half-sister Mary was on the throne. Mary was Henry VIII’s daughter by Catherine of Aragon, and she had never forgiven her father for his treatment of her mother or her mother’s religion. By the end of 1553 the English church once again celebrated the Latin Mass of the Roman Rite. Mary egged the bishops into conducting heresy trials, in an effort to extirpate Protestantism root and branch. Cranmer himself underwent a brutally lingering ordeal, twice recanting his Protestant opinions in hopes of the Queen’s pardon. He should have known that the chances of such a thing were those of the proverbial snowball in hell. In the end, on 21 March 1556, he went to the stake with dignity.

Thus, twenty-five years after Henry VIII broke with Rome, England’s experiment with Protestantism seemed to be over. And Mary’s Catholic restoration might well have worked – England might have been a Roman Catholic country to this day – if she had been able to bear a child, or had lived a decade longer. But she died on 17 November 1558, wracked with what seems to have been phlebitis and, still more, with a guilty sense of having failed God. She was succeeded by her half-sister Elizabeth.

Elizabeth I was the last and the greatest of the Tudor dynasty. She reigned for forty-four years and presided over that wondrous flowering of literature, music, and exploration, which we know as English Renaissance. For that reason alone it is easy to celebrate her as her subjects did – as Gloriana, the Virgin Queen, England’s beauteous Diana, the Protestant Deborah. But it is well to remember that Elizabeth was, before all else and on every level, a survivor – no doubt an enlightened survivor, but still a survivor, someone who basically sought nothing more than to make it to the end of the week and still be Queen of England.

Elizabeth’s own religious convictions were opaque. As Henry VIII’s daughter by Anne Boleyn, she was committed by heredity to the Protestant cause – after all, her very legitimacy depended on her father’s separation from Rome. But Elizabeth was just as far from being a Protestant zealot like her step-brother Edward as from being a Catholic zealot like her step-sister Mary. She might be described as a non-doctrinaire Christian, one who resisted religious ideology, whether Catholic or Protestant, but who preferred a good deal more Catholic ceremony in her religion than most
Protestants thought healthy. In any case, at her accession in November, 1558, the new Queen made it clear that she favoured moderate Protestantism and *The Book of Common Prayer* – preferably the 1549 version. Parliament insisted on the 1552 version, the second, more radically Protestant edition of the Prayer Book. After some quiet bargaining Parliament got its way. The 1552 Prayer Book, with a few modest revisions, once again became the liturgy of the Church of England.48

Many were dissatisfied even with this. During Mary’s Catholic reaction, leading English Protestants had fled abroad, to cities like Frankfurt, Geneva, and Zürich. There they absorbed the latest Reformed ideas, and several demanded that the English Protestant community move beyond the Edwardine settlement. The exiles at Frankfurt went through a bitter contest between those who wished to keep the 1552 liturgy and those who wished for a liturgy “more perfectly reformed”. In the end the conservatives won, both at Frankfurt and later when they returned to England. But the advocates of further reformation did not disappear, nor did they stay on the Continent. Throughout Elizabeth’s reign they continued to challenge the establishment and its liturgy. This was the origin of the Puritan movement – so called because its members wanted to *purify* the English church according to the model of “the best Reformed churches,” like Zürich and Geneva.

But what about the majority of English people? How did they react to the Elizabethan settlement of religion? The cities of London and Bristol, and the gentry of the Thames valley, Essex, and Kent, were reliably Protestant. The evidence suggests that the rest of the nation was not. Loyalty to “the old religion” remained very strong throughout Lancashire and the North of England, and for more than a decade the Elizabethan regime faced periodic uprisings, and many more abortive conspiracies, on its behalf. Elsewhere the temper of the people was, and remains, difficult to gauge. After all the changes and chances of the past thirty years – the Henrician shuffle, the Edwardine revolution, the Marian counter-revolution, and now the Elizabethan “settlement” – the majority of English people probably adopted a wary, wait-and-see attitude. But the longer Elizabeth survived on the throne, the more it appeared that the Protestant settlement would survive, too.

Making bets – increasingly sure bets – on an institution’s survival is not the same as a deep-seated love of all that it stands for. But in

48 The chief revisions were the expansion of the formula for administering the sacrament (see below), and the suppression of the so-called Black Rubric. [In addition, the phrase “from the detestable enormities of the bishop of Rome” was omitted from the Litany, and the “Ornaments Rubric” from the Act of Uniformity, was prefaced to Morning Prayer.]
the first twenty years of Elizabeth’s reign it was difficult to know what the established Church of England stood for, apart from “No Popery!” It had the powerful and tenacious reflexes of institutional life, but as a Protestant establishment it had as yet no living tradition of spirituality, no vital sense of its national mission. Most of its clergy had first entered the Church in the days of Henry VIII, and had survived the subsequent upheavals by conforming to each new settlement – hardly the best conditions for professional esprit de corps. Moreover, the Queen herself must be blamed for some of the Church of England’s weakness. Indeed, she did to the Church of England what (pace the 1998 movie Elizabeth, starring Cate Blanchett) she never allowed any man to do to her. By her cynical manipulation of episcopal appointments and ecclesiastical revenues in order to pad the royal exchequer, Elizabeth crippled the Church’s ability to mobilise its own resources to best advantage for its work and mission as an institution charged with the Christian well-being of the English people. But the Church of England and its Prayer Book liturgy did manage to hang on. By 1578, twenty years after Elizabeth came to the throne, an entire generation had grown up without any lively memories of the old religion, knowing only the Protestant establishment and worship according to the 1559 Prayer Book.

4. Sacrament Sunday

In the mid-Elizabethan Church of England, the Lord’s Supper was an extraordinary event. The Act of Uniformity which imposed the 1559 Prayer Book on England and its Church gave the rubrics of the Prayer Book the force of a statute of the realm; and one of those rubrics required that all subjects of the Queen receive the holy Communion at least three times a year. The evidence is spotty, but it seems that in most parishes throughout England the Supper was celebrated no more frequently than that. On all other Sundays of the year, therefore, the people had a service which combined (as the rubrics of the Prayer Book ordained) Morning Prayer, the Litany, the Ante-Communion, and one of the sermons appointed in The Book of Homilies. If it were “Sacrament Sunday” – as people called a Sunday when the Lord’s Supper was celebrated – the priest usually retired to the sacristy during the Offertory, took off his “choir” gown and donned a surplice over his cassock.

1. Principles. “The nearer our masses are to the first mass of Christ,” Martin Luther had written in 1520, “the better they undoubtedly are – and the further from Christ’s mass, the more dangerous.” All Protestant churches, including the Elizabethan
Church of England, agreed with this principle. It produced a strong emphasis on the “supperliness” of the Lord’s Supper. Since Christ’s last supper had been a meal, so should the eucharist be a meal — and since Christ’s last supper had been a meal with his disciples, so should the eucharist be now a communal meal. Hence, the rubrics of the English Communion Order required not only that there be “a good number to communicate with the Priest” but also that communicants should be as near as possible to the Lord’s Table for the entire celebration of the Supper.

2. Arrangements. All parties might agree on the principles, but implementing them was another matter. In the first place, the reformed Church of England had inherited buildings which were designed for celebrations of the Roman Mass — buildings with long, narrow chancels whose breadth was further reduced by clergy stalls. The funds simply did not exist to tear down all the churches in England and rebuild them according to reformed principles; so the Church of England adapted its celebration of communion to the architecture of its medieval buildings.

During the reign of Edward VI, then again at the outset of Elizabeth’s reign, the authorities had ordered (and enforced) the destruction of all stone altars. In their place churches were required to obtain a plain but decent table, low-slung, and portable. For most of the year, this table — the Lord’s Table — stood where the old altar had been, at the eastern end of the chancel. But on “Sacrament Sunday” it was moved down into the midst of the chancel (or even into the tower crossing, in front of the rood screen), and covered with “a fair white linen cloth”. The chancel was usually a fairly cramped area, what with its narrow construction and the old clergy-stalls. So, the Table could not be arranged “altar-wise,” with its ends on a north-south axis: instead, it had to be arranged “table-wise,” with its ends on an east-west axis.

3. Practice. At some point between the Collection of Alms and the General Confession — the moment seems to have varied from district to district — those who intended to make their communion left their pews in the nave, came forward, entered the chancel, and knelt around the Table, while the priest took up a position on its north (long) side. He thus faced the greater portion of his congregation across the Table.

The posture of the communicants became a chronic sore point in the Elizabethan Church. The Prayer Book required, for the sake of decency and good order, that all should receive the Sacrament kneeling. But the English church was an exception among Reformed churches. Across the Tweed, for instance, in the Church of Scotland, it was customary on Sacrament Sundays to clear the nave and to set out long trestle-tables and chairs, so that the
congregation might indeed sit down to eat the Lord’s Supper as a meal. English Puritans urged their own Church to adopt these arrangements or at least to change its mind and insist that communicants receive sitting – because, they argued, that was the posture of the disciples at the Last Supper. (They were wrong: Jesus and his disciples probably reclined on mats.) This debate went on for several generations, petering out only in the 1620s.

In any case, when it came time to distribute the sacrament, the priest made the rounds of the circle, administering the bread (as in the illustration), then the cup to each individual communicant where he or she knelt. On major festivals, when all parishioners were required to receive, the chancel could be very crowded indeed, and the priest had to weave his way through a kneeling mob. It may be wondered whether the people – thus cramped, jostled, and jostling – fully appreciated that the Lord’s Supper was a meal. But the arrangements certainly made people understand that holy Communion was something done with others – and done with others at very close quarters.

Such was the eucharist in the reformed Church of England around the year 1578. By that time it was the only form of the eucharist that the majority of Elizabeth I’s subjects had ever known. If the outward and visible forms of English religion were now firmly Protestant, there was still the question of the Church of England’s inward and spiritual commitments.

* 

Abbreviations

repl: the text in EngBCP 1552 is REPLACED by the 1559 text which follows.
omit: the 1552 text is OMITTED in EngBCP 1559
add: EngBCP 1559 ADDS the following text.
So many as intend to be partakers of the holy Communion, shall signify their names to the Curate over night, or else in the morning, afore the beginning of Morning Prayer or immediately after.

And if any of those be an open and notorious evil liver, so that the congregation by him is offended, or have done any wrong to his neighbours, by word or deed, the Curate having knowledge thereof, shall call him and advertise him, in any wise not to presume to the Lord's table, until he have openly declared himself to have truly repented and amended his former naughty life, that the congregation may thereby be satisfied, which afore were offended, and that he have recompensed the parties whom he hath done wrong unto, or at the least declare himself to be in full purpose so to do, as soon as he conveniently may.

The same order shall the Curate use with those betwixt whom he perceiveth malice and hatred to reign, not suffering them to be partakers of the Lord's Table until he know them to be reconciled. And if one of the parties so at variance be content to forgive from the bottom of his heart all that the other hath trespassed against him, and to make amends for that he himself hath offended: and the other party will not be persuaded to a godly unity, but remain still in his frowardness and malice: the Minister in that case ought to admit the penitent person to the holy Communion and not him that is obstinate.

The Table having at the Communion time a fair white linen cloth upon it, shall stand in the body of the church, or in the chancel, where Morning Prayer or Evening Prayer be appointed to be said. And the Priest, standing at the north side of the Table, shall say the Lord's Prayer, with this Collect following,

Almighty God, unto whom all hearts be open, all desires known, and from whom no secrets are hid, cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of thy Holy Spirit, that we may perfectly love thee and worthily magnify thy holy Name; through Christ our Lord. Amen.
Then shall the Priest rehearse distinctly all the Ten Commandments; and the people kneeling shall, after every Commandment, ask God’s mercy for their transgression of the same, after this sort.

Minister.

God spake these words and said, I am the Lord thy God: thou shalt have none other gods but me.

People. Lord, have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law.

Minister. Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image, nor the likeness of anything that in heaven above or in the earth beneath or in the water under the earth. Thou shalt not bow down to them, nor worship them: for I, the Lord thy God, am a jealous God, and visit the sin of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me, and shew mercy unto thousands in them that love me and keep my commandments.

People. Lord, have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law.

Minister. Thou shalt not take the Name of the Lord thy God in vain, for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his Name in vain.

People. Lord, have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law.

Minister. Remember that thou keep holy the sabbath day. Six days shalt thou labour and do all that thou hast to do, but the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God. In it thou shalt do no manner of work, thou and thy son and thy daughter, thy manservant and thy maidservant, thy cattle, and the stranger that is within thy gates. For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day. Wherefore the Lord blessed the seventh day and hallowed it.

People. Lord, have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law.

Minister. Honour thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be long in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee.

People. Lord, have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law.

Minister. Thou shalt not do murder.

People. Lord, have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law.

Minister. Thou shalt not commit adultery.

People. Lord, have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law.

Minister. Thou shalt not steal.
People. Lord, have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law.

Minister. Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour.

People. Lord, have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law.

Minister. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's house; thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife, nor his servant, nor his maid, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is his.

People. Lord, have mercy upon us, and write all these thy laws in our hearts, we beseech thee.

Then shall follow the Collect of the Day, with one of these two Collects following for the King, the Priest standing up and saying,

1559 J King repl: Queen

Let us pray.

Almighty God, whose kingdom is everlasting, and power infinite, have mercy upon the whole congregation, and so rule the heart of thy chosen servant Edward the Sixth, our King and Governor, that he, knowing whose minister he is, may above all things seek thy honour and glory, and that we his subjects, duly considering whose authority he hath, may faithfully serve, honour, and humbly obey him in thee, and for thee, according to thy blessed Word and ordinance; through Jesus Christ our Lord, who with thee and the Holy Ghost liveth and reigneth, ever one God, world without end. Amen.

1559 J Edward the Sixth, our King and Governor, that he... repl: Elizabeth, our Queen and Governor, that she...

Almighty and everlasting God, we be taught by thy holy Word that the hearts of kings are in thy rule and governance, and that thou dost dispose and turn them, as it seemeth best, to thy godly wisdom. We humbly beseech thee so to dispose and govern the heart of Edward the Sixth, thy servant, our King and Governor, that in all his thoughts, words, and works, he may ever seek thy honour and glory, and study to preserve thy people committed to his charge, in wealth, peace, and godliness. Grant this, O merciful Father, for thy dear Son's sake, Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

1559 J Edward the Sixth, thy servant, our King and Governor, that in all his thoughts... he may... committed to his charge... repl: Elizabeth, thy servant, our Queen and
Governor, that in all her thoughts... she may... committed to her charge...

Immediately after the Collects, the Priest shall read the Epistle, beginning thus,

The Epistle written in the Chapter of.

And the Epistle ended, he shall say the Gospel, beginning thus,

The Gospel written in the Chapter of.

And the Epistle and Gospel being ended, shall be said the Creed.

I BELIEVE in one God, the Father almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible: And in one Lord Jesu Christ, the only begotten Son of God; begotten of his Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of light, very God of very God; begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father; by whom all things were made; who for us men, and for our salvation, came down from heaven, and was made incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man; and was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate. He suffered and was buried, and the third day he arose again according to the Scriptures, and ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of the Father: And he shall come again with glory, to judge both the quick and the dead. And I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father and the Son; who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified; who spake by the prophets. And I believe in one catholic and apostolic Church. I acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins. And I look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen.

After the Creed, if there be no Sermon, shall follow one of the Homilies already set forth or hereafter to be set forth by common authority.

After such Sermon, Homily, or Exhortation, the Curate shall declare unto the people whether there be any Holy Days or Fasting Days the week following, and earnestly exhort them to remember the poor, saying one or mo[re] of these Sentences following as he thinketh most convenient by his discretion.

LET your light so shine before men, that they may see your good works and glorify your Father which is in heaven. Matt. v.
LAY not up for yourselves treasure upon earth, where the rust and moth doth corrupt, and where thieves break through and steal; but lay up for yourselves treasure in heaven, where neither rust nor moth doth corrupt, and where thieves do not break through and steal. *Matt.* vi.

WHATSOEVER you would that men should do unto you, even so do you unto them: for this is the Law and the Prophets. *Matt.* vii.

NOT every one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven. *Matt.* vii.

ZACHE stood forth and said unto the Lord, Behold, Lord, the half of my goods I give to the poor, and if I have done any wrong to any man, I restore fourfold. *Luke* xix.

WHO goeth a-warfare at any time at his own cost? who planteth a vineyard and eateth not of the fruit thereof? or who feedeth a flock and eateth not of the milk of the flock? *I Cor.* ix.

If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great matter if we shall reap your worldly things? *I Cor.* ix.

Do you not know that they which minister about holy things live of the sacrifice? They which wait of the altar are partakers with the altar; even so hath the Lord also ordained that they which preach the gospel should live of the gospel. *I Cor.* ix.

HE which soweth little shall reap little, and he that soweth plenteously shall reap plenteously. Let every man do according as he is disposed in his heart, not grudgingly or of necessity, for God loveth a cheerful giver. *II Cor.* ix.

LET him that is taught in the word minister unto him that teacheth, in all good things. Be not deceived: God is not mocked; for whatesoever a man soweth, that shall he reap. *Gal.* vi.

WHILE we have time, let us do good unto all men, and especially unto them which are of the household of faith. *Gal.* vi.

GODLINESS is great riches, if a man be contented with that he hath. For we brought nothing into this world, neither may we carry any thing out. *I Tim.* vi.

CHARGE them which are rich in this world, that they be ready to give and glad to distribute, laying up for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may attain eternal life. *I Tim.* vi.

GOD is not unrighteous, that he will forget your works and labour that proceedeth of love; which love ye have showed for his Name’s sake, which have ministered to the saints and yet do minister. *Heb.* vi.

TO do good and to distribute, forget not; for with such sacrifices God is pleased. *Heb.* xiii.
WHOSO hath this world’s good and seeth his brother have need, and shutteth up his compassion from him, how dwelleth the love of God in him? 1 John iii.

Give alms of thy goods, and turn never thy face from any poor man, and then the face of the Lord shall not be turned away from thee. Tob. iv.

Be merciful after thy power: if thou have much, give plenteously; if thou hast little, do thy diligence gladly to give of that little; for so gatherest thou thyself a good reward in the day of necessity. Tob. iv.

He that hath pity upon the poor, lendeth unto the Lord; and look, what he layeth out, it shall be paid him again. Prov. xix.

Blessed be the man that provideth for the sick and needy; the Lord shall deliver him in the time of trouble. Psalm xli.

Then shall the churchwardens, or some other by them appointed, gather the devotion of the people, and put the same into the poor men’s box. And upon the offering days appointed, every man and woman shall pay to the Curate the due and accustomed offerings. After which done, the Priest shall say,

Let us pray for the whole state of Christ’s Church militant here in earth.

Almighty and everliving God, which by thy holy apostle hast taught us to make prayers and supplications, and to give thanks for all men: We humbly beseech thee most mercifully to (accept our alms and) to receive these our prayers, which we offer unto thy divine Majesty; beseeching thee to inspire continually the universal Church with the spirit of truth, unity, and concord: and grant that all they that do confess thy holy Name may agree in the truth of thy holy word, and live in unity and godly love. We beseech thee also to save and defend all Christian Kings, Princes, and Governors, and specially thy servant Edward our King, that under him we may be godly and quietly governed; and grant unto his whole Council, and to all that be put in authority under him, that they may truly and indifferently minister justice, to the punishment of wickedness and vice, and to the maintenance of God’s true religion and virtue. Give grace, O heavenly Father, to all bishops, pastors, and curates, that they may both by their life and doctrine set forth thy true and lively word, and rightly and duly administer thy holy sacraments. And to all thy people give thy heavenly grace, and especially to this congregation here present, that with meek heart and due reverence, they may hear and receive thy holy word, truly serving thee in holiness and righteousness all the days of their life. And we most humbly beseech thee of thy goodness, O Lord, to comfort and succour all...
them, which in this transitory life be in trouble, sorrow, need, sickness, or any other adversity. Grant this, O Father, for Jesus Christ’s sake, our only Mediator and Advocate. Amen.

1559] Edward our King repl: Elizabeth our Queen

Then shall follow this Exhortation at certain times when the Curate shall see the people negligent to come to the holy Communion.

We be come together at this time, dearly beloved brethren, to feed at the Lord’s Supper; unto the which in God’s behalf I bid you all that be here present, and beseech you for the Lord Jesus Christ’s sake, that you will not refuse to come thereto, being so lovingly called and bidden of God himself. Ye know how grievous and unkind a thing it is when a man hath prepared a rich feast, decked his table with all kind of provision, so that there lacketh nothing but the guests to sit down – and yet they which be called, without any cause most unthankfully refuse to come. Which of you in such a case would not be moved? Who would not think a great injury and wrong done unto him? Wherefore, most dearly beloved in Christ, take ye good heed lest ye, withdrawing yourselves from this holy Supper, provoke God’s indignation against you. It is an easy matter for a man to say, I will not communicate because I am otherwise letted with worldly business; but such excuses be not so easily accepted and allowed before God. If any man say, I am a grievous sinner and therefore am afraid to come: wherefore then do ye not repent and amend? When God calleth you, be you not ashamed to say that ye will not come? When you should return to God, will you excuse yourself and say that you be not ready? Consider earnestly with yourselves how little such feigned excuses shall avail before God. They that refused the feast in the gospel because they had bought a farm or would try their yokes of oxen, or because they were married, were not so excused but compted unworthy of the heavenly feast. I for my part am here present, and according to mine office I bid you in the Name of God, I call you in Christ’s behalf, I exhort you as you love your own salvation, that ye will be partakers of this holy Communion. And as the Son of God did vouchsafe to yield up his soul by death upon the cross for your health, even so it is your duty to receive the Communion together in the remembrance of his death, as he himself commanded. Now, if you will in no wise this do, consider with yourselves how great and injury ye do unto God, and how sore punishment hangeth over your heads for the same. And whereas ye offend God so sore in refusing this holy banquet, I admonish, exhort, and beseech you, that unto this unkindness ye will not add any more. Which thing you shall do, if ye stand by as gazers and
lookers of them that do communicate, and be no partakers of the
same yourselves. For what thing can this be accounted else than a
further contempt and unkindness unto God? Truly, it is a great
unthankfulness to say nay when ye be called; but the fault is much
greater when men stand by and yet will neither eat nor drink this
holy Communion with other. I pray you, what can this be else but
even to have the mysteries of Christ in derision? It is said unto all:
Take ye and eat, Take and drink ye all, of this; do this in
remembrance of me. With what face, then, or with what
countenance shall ye hear these words? What will this be else but a
neglecting, a despising and mocking of the testament of Christ?
Wherefore, rather than you should so do, depart you hence and
give place to them that be godly disposed. But when you depart, I
beseech you ponder with yourselves from whom ye depart: ye
depart from the Lord’s table; ye depart from your brethren and
from the banquet of most heavenly food. These things if ye
earnestly consider, ye shall by God’s grace return to a better mind;
for the obtaining whereof, we shall make our humble petitions
while we shall receive the holy Communion.

And some time shall be said this also, at the discretion of the
Curate.

EARLY beloved, forasmuch as our duty is to render to almighty
God, our heavenly Father, most hearty thanks for that he hath
given his Son our Saviour Jesus Christ not only to die for us, but
also to be our spiritual food and sustenance, as it is declared unto
us as well by God’s word as by the holy sacraments of his blessed
body and blood; the which so comfortable a thing to them which
receive it worthily, and so dangerous to them that will presume to
take the same unworthily: My duty is to exhort you to consider the
dignity of the holy mystery and the great peril of the unworthy
receiving thereof, and to search and examine your own
consciences, as you should come holy and clean to a most godly
and heavenly feast; so that in no wise you come but in the
marriage garment required of God in scripture, and so come and
be received as worthy partakers of such a heavenly table. The way
and means thereto is,

First, to examine your lives and conversation by the rule of
God’s commandments, and wheresoever ye shall perceive
yourselves to have offended by will, word, or deed, bewail your
own sinful lives, confess yourselves to almighty God, with full
purpose of amendment of life. And if ye shall perceive your
offences to be such as be not only against God but also against
your neighbours, then ye shall reconcile yourselves unto them,
ready to make restitution and satisfaction according to the
uttermost of your powers for all injuries and wrongs done by you to any other, and likewise being ready to forgive other that have offended you, as you would have forgiveness of your offences at God's hand. For otherwise the receiving of the holy Communion doth nothing else but increase your damnation. And because it is requisite that no man should come to the holy Communion but with a full trust in God's mercy and with a quiet conscience: therefore if there be any of you which by the means aforesaid cannot quiet his own conscience, but requireth further comfort or counsel, then let him come to me (or to some other discrete and learned minister of God's Word) and open his grief, that he may receive such ghostly counsel, advice, and comfort as his conscience may be relieved, and that by the ministry of God's Word he may receive comfort and the benefit of absolution, to the quieting of his conscience and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness.

_Then shall the Priest say this Exhortation._

DEARLY beloved in the Lord, ye that mind to come to the holy Communion of the body and blood of our Saviour Christ must consider what Saint Paul writeth to the Corinthians, how he exhorteth all persons diligently to try and examine themselves, before they presume to eat of that bread and drink of that cup. For as the benefit is great, if with a truly penitent heart and lively faith we receive that holy sacrament (for then we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ and drink his blood; then we dwell in Christ and Christ in us; we be made one with Christ, and Christ with us): So is the danger great, if we receive the same unworthily. For then we become guilty of the body and blood of Christ our Saviour: we eat and drink our own damnation, not considering the Lord's body; we kindle God's wrath over us, we provoke him to plague us with divers diseases and sundry kinds of death. Therefore if any here be a blasphemer of God, an hinderer or slanderer of his word, an adulterer, or be in any malice or envy or in any other grievous crime: bewail your sins, and come not to this holy table, lest after the taking of that most blessed bread the devil enter into you, as he did into Judas, to fill him full of all iniquities and bring you to destruction both of body and soul.

Judge therefore yourselves, brethren, that ye be not judged of the Lord. Repent you truly for your sins past; have an earnest and lively faith in Christ our Saviour; amend your lives, and be in perfect charity with all men: so shall ye be meet partakers of those holy mysteries. And above all things, ye must give most humble and hearty thanks to God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, for the redemption of the world by the death and passion of our Saviour Christ, both God and man, who did humble himself even
to the death upon the cross for us miserable sinners, which lay in
darkness and the shadow of death, that he might make us children
of God and exalt us to everlasting life. And to the end that we
should alway remember the exceeding great love of our Master
and only Saviour Jesus Christ thus dying for us, and the
innumerable benefits which by his precious blood-shedding he hath
obtained to us, he hath instituted and ordained holy mysteries, as
pledges of his love and continual remembrance of his death, to our
great and endless comfort. To him therefore, with the Father and
the Holy Ghost, let us give, as we are most bounden, continual
thanks, submitting ourselves wholly to his holy will and pleasure,
and studying to serve him in true holiness and righteousness all the
days of our life. Amen.

Then shall the Priest say to them that come to receive the holy
Communion.

You that do truly and earnestly repent you of your sins to
almighty God, and be in love and charity with your
neighbours, and intend to lead a new life, following the
commandments of God, and walking from henceforth in his holy
ways: Draw near and take this holy sacrament to your comfort,
make your humble confession to almighty God, before this
congregation here gathered together in his holy Name, meekly
kneeling upon your knees.

Then shall this general confession be made, in the name of all those
that are minded to receive the holy Communion, either by one of
them or else by one of the ministers, or by the Priest himself, all
kneeling humbly upon their knees.

Almighty God, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Maker of all
things, Judge of all men, we acknowledge and bewail our
manifold sins and wickedness, which we from time to time most
grievously have committed, by thought, word, and deed, against
thy divine Majesty, provoking most justly thy wrath and
indignation against us. We do earnestly repent and be heartily
sorry for these our misdoings; the remembrance of them is grievous
unto us, the burden of them is intolerable. Have mercy upon us,
have mercy upon us, most merciful Father, for thy Son our Lord
Jesus Christ’s sake, forgive us all that is past, and grant that we may
ever hereafter serve and please thee in newness of life, to the
honour and glory of thy Name; through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Then shall the Priest, or the Bishop (being present), stand up and,
turning himself to the people, shall say thus.
ALMIGHTY God, our heavenly Father, who of his great mercy hath promised forgiveness of sins to all them which with hearty repentance and true faith turn unto him, have mercy upon you, pardon and deliver you from all your sins, confirm and strengthen you in all goodness, and bring you to everlasting life; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Then shall the Priest also say,

Hear what comfortable words our Saviour Christ saith to all that truly turn to him.

¶ Come unto me, all that travail and be heavy laden, and I shall refresh you.

So God loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, to the end that all that believe in him should not perish, but have life everlasting.

Hear also what Saint Paul saith.

¶ This is a true saying, and worthy of all men to be received, that Jesus Christ came into this world to save sinners.

Hear also what Saint John saith.

¶ If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is the propitiation for our sins.

After which the Priest shall proceed, saying.

Lift up your hearts.

Answer. We lift them up unto the Lord.

Priest. Let us give thanks unto our Lord God.

Answer. It is meet and right so to do.

Priest. It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty, that we should at all times, and in all places, give thanks unto thee, O Lord, holy Father, almighty, everlasting God.

Here shall follow the proper preface, according to the time, if there be any specially appointed, or else immediately shall follow: Therefore with angels, &c.

PROPER PREFACES

Upon Christmas Day, and seven days after.

Because thou didst give Jesus Christ, thine only Son, to be born as this day for us; who by the operation of the Holy Ghost was made very man of the substance of the Virgin Mary his mother; and that without spot of sin, to make us clean from all sin. Therefore &c.

Upon Easter Day, and vii days after.
BUT chiefly are we bound to praise thee for the glorious resurrection of thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord; for he is the very Paschal Lamb which was offered for us and hath taken away the sin of the world; who by his death hath destroyed death, and by his rising to life again hath restored to us everlasting life. Therefore &c.

Upon the Ascension Day, and vii days after.

THROUGH thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who after his most glorious resurrection manifestly appeared to all his disciples, and in their sight ascended up into heaven to prepare a place for us; that where he is, thither might we also ascend and reign with him in glory. Therefore &c.

Upon Whitsunday, and vi days after.

THROUGH Jesus Christ our Lord, according to whose most true promise the Holy Ghost came down this day from heaven, with a sudden great sound, as it had been a mighty wind, in the likeness of fiery tongues, lighting upon the Apostles, to teach them and to lead them to all truth, giving them both the gift of diverse languages, and also boldness with fervent zeal, constantly to preach the Gospel unto all nations; whereby we are brought out of darkness and error into the clear light and true knowledge of thee, and of thy Son Jesus Christ. Therefore &c.

Upon the feast of Trinity only.

IT is very meet, right, and our bounden duty, that we should at all times, and in all places, give thanks unto thee, O Lord, almighty, everlasting God, which art one God, one Lord, not one only Person, but three Persons in one substance; for that which we believe of the glory of the Father, the same we believe of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, without any difference or inequality; whom the Angels.

After which preface, shall follow immediately.

THEREFORE, with angels and archangels and with all the company of heaven, we laud and magnify thy glorious Name; evermore praising thee and saying: Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of hosts; heaven and earth are full of thy glory; glory be to thee, O Lord Most High.

Then shall the Priest, kneeling down at God’s board, say in the name of all them that shall receive the communion, this prayer following.
We do not presume to come to this thy Table, O merciful Lord, trusting in our own righteousness, but in thy manifold and great mercies. We be not worthy so much as to gather up the crumbs under thy Table; but thou art the same Lord, whose property is always to have mercy. Grant us, therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the flesh of thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink his blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by his body, and our souls washed through his most precious blood, and that we may evermore dwell in him, and he in us. Amen.

Then the priest standing up, shall say as followeth.

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, which of thy tender mercy didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption; who made there (by his one oblation of himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world; and did institute, and in his holy gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory of that his precious death, until his coming again. Hear us, O merciful Father, we beseech thee; and grant that we, receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine, according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ’s holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed body and blood: Who, in the same night that he was betrayed, took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, Take, eat, this is my body, which is given for you. Do this in remembrance of me. Likewise after supper he took the cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all, of this; for this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for you and for many, for remission of sins. Do this, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of me.

Then shall the Minister first receive the Communion in both kinds himself, and next deliver it to other ministers, if any be there present, that they may help the chief Minister; and after to the people in their hands kneeling. And when he delivereth the bread, he shall say,

Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith, with thanksgiving.

1559 repl:

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

\textit{And the Minister that delivereth the cup shall say.}

\textbf{Drink} this in remembrance that Christ’s blood was shed for thee, and be thankful.

\textbf{1559}] repl:\n
\textit{The blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life. Drink this in remembrance that Christ’s blood was shed for thee, and be thankful.}

\textit{Then shall the Priest say the Lord’s Prayer, the people repeating after him every petition.}

\textit{After shall be said as followeth.}

\textbf{O LORD} and heavenly Father, we thy humble servants entirely desire thy fatherly goodness, mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; most humbly beseeching thee to grant, that by the merits and death of thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in his blood, we and all thy whole Church may obtain remission of sins, and all other benefits of his passion. And here we offer and present unto thee, O Lord, our selves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto thee; most humbly beseeching thee, that all we which be partakers of this holy communion, may be fulfilled with thy grace and heavenly benediction. And although we be unworthy, through our manifold sins, to offer unto thee any sacrifice; yet we beseech thee to accept this our bounden duty and service, not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences; through Jesus Christ our Lord, by whom, and with whom, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, all honour and glory be unto thee, O Father almighty, world without end. Amen.

\textit{Or this.}

\textbf{Almighty} and everliving God, we most heartily thank thee, for that thou dost vouchsafe to feed us, which have duly received these holy mysteries, with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ; and dost assure us thereby of thy favour and goodness toward us; and that we be very members incorporate in thy mystical body, which is the blessed company of all faithful people, and be also heirs through hope of thy everlasting kingdom, by the merits of the most precious death and passion of thy dear Son. We now most humbly
beseech thee, O heavenly Father, so to assist us with thy grace, that we may continue in that holy fellowship, and do all such good works as thou hast prepared for us to walk in; through Jesus Christ our Lord, to whom with thee and the Holy Ghost, be all honour and glory, world without end. Amen.

Then shall be said or sung

G

lory be to God on high, and in earth peace, good will towards men. We praise thee, we bless thee, we glorify thee, we give thanks to thee for thy great glory, O Lord God, heavenly King, God the Father almighty. O Lord, the only begotten Son, Jesu Christ: O Lord God, Lamb of God, Son of the Father, that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us; thou that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us; thou that takest away the sins of the world, receive our prayer; thou that sittest at the right hand of God the Father, have mercy upon us. For thou only art holy, thou only art the Lord, thou only, O Christ, with the Holy Ghost, art most high in the glory of God the Father. Amen.

Then the Priest or the Bishop (if he be present) shall let them depart with this blessing.

T

he peace of God, which passeth all understanding, keep your hearts and minds in the knowledge and love of God, and of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord: And the blessing of God almighty, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, be amongst you and remain with you always.

Collects to be said after the Offertory, when there is no Communion: every such day, one. And the same may be said also, as often as occasion shall serve, after the Collects either of Morning Prayer and Evening Prayer, Communion, or Litany, by the discretion of the Minister.

Assist us mercifully.... [as in 1549]

O almighty Lord.... [as in 1549]

Grant, we beseech thee.... [as in 1549]

Prevent us, O Lord.... [as in 1549]

Almighty God, the fountain of all wisdom.... [as in 1549]

Almighty God, which hast promised.... [as in 1549]
[ADDITIONAL DIRECTIONS]

Upon the Holy Days, if there be no communicants, shall be said all that is appointed at the Communion until the end of the Homily, concluding with the General Prayer for the Whole Estate of Christ’s Church militant here in earth, and one or more of these Collects before rehearsed, as occasion shall serve.

And there shall be no celebration of the Lord’s Supper except there be a good number to communicate with the Priest, according to his discretion.

And if there be not above twenty persons in the parish of discretion to receive the Communion, there shall be no Communion except four, or three at the least, communicate with the Priest. And in cathedral and collegiate churches, where there be many priests and deacons, they shall all receive the Communion with the Minister every Sunday at the least, except they have a reasonable cause to the contrary.

Although no order can be so perfectly devised but it may be of some, either for their ignorance and infirmity or else of malice and obstinacy, misconstrued, depraved, and interpreted in a wrong part; and yet because brotherly charity willeth that, so much as conveniently may be, offences should be taken away; therefore we willing to do the same: Whereas it is ordained in the Book of Common Prayer, in the Administration of the Lord’s Supper, that communicants kneeling should receive the holy Communion; which thing being well meant, for a signification of the humble and grateful acknowledging of the benefits of Christ given unto the worthy receiver, and to avoid the profanation and disorder which about the Holy Communion might else ensue: Lest yet the same kneeling might be thought or taken otherwise, we do declare that it is not meant thereby that any adoration is done, or ought to be done, either unto the sacrament bread and wine there bodily received or unto any real and essential presence there being of Christ’s natural flesh and blood. For as concerning the sacramental bread and wine, they remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored: for that were idolatry to be abhorred of all faithful Christians. And as concerning the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ, they are in heaven and not
here: for it is against the truth of Christ’s true natural body to be in mo places than in one at one time.49

And to take away the superstition which any person hath, or might have, in the bread and wine: It shall suffice that the bread be such as is usual to be eaten at the table with other meats, but the best and purest wheat bread that conveniently may be gotten. And if any of the bread or wine remain, the Curate shall have it to his own use.

The bread and wine for the Communion shall be provided by the Curate and the churchwardens at the charges of the parish; and the parish shall be discharged of such sums of money or other duties which hitherto they have paid for the same by order of their houses every Sunday.

And note, that every parishioner shall communicate at the least three times in the year, of which Easter to be one, and shall also receive the sacraments and other rites according to the order of this Book appointed. And yearly at Easter, every parishioner shall reckon with his Parson, Vicar, or Curate, or his or their deputy or deputies, and pay to them or him all ecclesiastical duties accustomably due then and at that time to be paid.

49 This is “The Black Rubric,” so called because it was printed in black ink instead of red ink (as the word rubric means). It was not contained in the copy of the Prayer Book annexed to the Act of Uniformity when it was passed in April 1552; it was added in October of that year, by order of the government, while the Book was still in the press. Its position varies in printed copies of the 1552 Prayer Book. Suppressed in 1559, it was reinstated (apparently as an afterthought) in 1662, and placed after all other rubrics.
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2. Interpreting the 1559 Liturgy

1. Richard Hooker

*Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*

The Fifth Book
*Chapters 55-57, 67-68*
Introduction

The Elizabethan Church of England was a curious institution. On the one hand, the Statutes of the Realm\(^1\) made it the one and only church to which the subjects of the English Crown could legally belong. Any subjects who absented themselves from its public worship – and, in particular, from receiving the holy Communion on those Sundays when it was celebrated – were liable to fines, confiscation of property, and imprisonment. On the other hand, the Church as by Law Established did not always and everywhere command the loyalty of its statutory members.

The one group of disaffected subjects that caused the regime its greatest concern were the “recusants”\(^2\) – those who remained loyal to “the old religion” and, to one degree or another, continued to practise Roman Catholicism. Elizabeth’s councillors had a paranoid obsession about recusancy. To them, the English Catholics looked like made-to-order pawns of Spain, whose king, Philip II, had ambitions of restoring the English to the papal fold and (not coincidentally) making England a client-state of the Spanish empire.\(^3\) Matters came to a head in 1569, when recusants in Yorkshire, instigated and subsidised by Spanish agents, plotted a rebellion. Unfortunately for the rebels, operatives of Elizabeth’s spy-master, Sir Francis Walsingham, infiltrated the conspiracy in its earliest stages. This allowed Walsingham not only to stay posted on its progress but also to stage-manage its development. (It was in fact one of the very greatest coups in all the history of espionage.\(^4\))

---

1 Specifically, the Act of Supremacy, which declared the reigning monarch of England to be the Supreme Governor under Christ of the English Church and Clergy, and the Act of Uniformity, which made the attached copy of *The Book of Common Prayer* the one and only form of public worship that could be used in the Church of England – and thus, in England. Elizabeth I, exercising her prerogative as Supreme Governor, authorised a manual of private prayers, a Latin version of the Prayer Book (for places like the chapels of Oxford and Cambridge colleges, where Latin was “a tongue... understood of the people”), and orders of service for various special occasions.

2 “refuseniks” – from the Latin word *recusare*, “to refuse (to conform)”.

3 Philip was the widower of Elizabeth’s older sister Mary, and a Catholic zealot in his own right.

4 In the movie *Elizabeth* (1998), Walsingham was played by Geoffrey Rush as a saturnine enigma with a taste for torture and teenage males. The historical Walsingham was indeed saturnine and much feared by colleagues as well as enemies; but there is no evidence that he was a
The rebellion itself was a pitiful bust. Then Pope Pius V intervened. He issued a decree which excommunicated Elizabeth, released English Catholics from their allegiance to her, and promised plenary indulgence to anyone who assassinated her. This decree was supposed to have been published at the launch of the Northern Rebellion. It did not appear until early 1570 – several months after all the rebellion’s leaders had been rounded up and executed. At a stroke, the Pope had given the Elizabethan regime a legitimate pretext for regarding every English Catholic as, by definition, guilty of high treason; and Walsingham, a fierce Protestant, made sure that the heinousness of the papal decree received maximum publicity, in order to fan the nation’s commitment to Protestantism and “No Popery”.

In the wake of the Northern Rebellion, and for the rest of her thirty-three years on the English throne, Elizabeth’s energies were taken up by a very different internal challenge to the religious settlement. This challenge did not come from subjects who wished to overthrow her. On the contrary, the subjects in question were only too well aware that she was the sole surety of the Protestant religion and intended to do nothing which would imperil her security. Nevertheless, they had a problem with the Elizabethan Settlement of Religion, as deeply seated in its way as the recusants’ problem with it. They chafed under the Elizabethan Settlement because, in their opinion, it had not gone as far in reformation as it ought to have done. In their view, the established Church of England, though certainly Protestant, was not Protestant enough. They wanted a “pure” church, without any the vestiges of “popish superstition” that they detected lingering in the Church of England’s polity and most glaringly (they thought) in its Prayer

pederast – on the contrary, he was a stringently austere, committed Protestant in personal life and political counsel alike. In any case, the movie depicts the Northern Rebellion as if it happened within months of Elizabeth’s accession in 1558, rather than a full decade later.

5 It is important to point out that most leading recusants in England were thorough patriots, and Pius V’s decree appalled them as an egregiously stupid violation of their loyalty. Elizabeth herself loathed ideology of any sort and had an extreme prejudice against extreme measures; she routinely stymied Walsingham’s ruthless Protestantism, and thus ensured the continuing loyalty of the recusant community. By 1588, when Philip II launched his Armada against England, the security of her throne was – and was seen to be – such that she had no problem appointing Lord Howard of Effingham, who belonged to a notoriously recusant family, as Lord High Admiral.
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Book. Because they made such an issue of ecclesiastical “purity,” these subjects of Elizabeth I came to be called puritans.

Anglican mythology has made Puritanism out to be the ideological opposite of everything that Anglicanism might be said to stand for. One still comes across Anglican publicists who take it for granted that the subjects of Elizabeth (and, later, of James I and Charles I) had a clear and unambiguous choice between being “Anglican” (good) and being “Puritan” (misguided, if not bad). Such a view is hogwash. It assumes that Puritanism was a separate sect – which, whatever may have become the case after 1662, was certainly not the case under Elizabeth and the first two Stuarts. The overwhelming majority of those who willingly bore the badge of “puritan” (originally used as a sneer), or who could be considered “puritans” by association, were genuine members-in-good-standing of the established Church – and often members in far better standing than the good ol’ boys who jeered at them in the safety of the local tavern. In any case, it is nothing but undiluted anachronism to imagine that there was any clearly defined position known as “Anglicanism” during reigns of Elizabeth, James I, or Charles I. If a time-traveller into England during the last quarter of the sixteenth century, or the first half of the seventeenth, were to poll the population in order to find out how many were “Anglicans,” the pollster would be met with the look of the dumbfounded and the question, “What’s an ‘Anglican’?” If this time-travelling pollster were ask how many were members of the Church of England, the response would have been 99% affirmative – with only hardcore Catholic recusants and a nail-paring of Protestant “separatist” sects 6 in the remainder.

Nevertheless, Puritans constituted a truly distinct movement within the established Church of England. This is not to say that they formed a single party or front, all marching in lockstep to the drum-beat of the same ideology. The one thing they had in common was what the Prayer Book called “a lively faith,” and which more conventional members of the established Church would learn to call “Enthusiasm”. But it is a mistake to think that Puritanism, in Elizabeth’s day or after, constituted an underground resistance movement. From the 1560s onward, the mainstream of the movement, so far from resisting “the institutionalisation of Protestantism within the English state,” actually sought to secure the institutionalisation of their own brand of Reformed...

---

6 The most famous of these strains was the little sect of Yorkshire separatists who in 1620 chartered a ship named the Mayflower and sailed to New England, where they established Plimoth Plantation – the so-called Pilgrims.
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Protestantism. Elizabethan Puritans were not opposed to an established national Church. On the contrary, their aim was to make the established Church of England – preferably through parliamentary legislation, without “tarrying for the magistrate,” that is, Elizabeth I – conform to their agenda and thus become the vehicle of a state-sponsored revivalism.

This goal was the whole point of the aggressive campaign that Puritan ideologues waged against the establishment and especially EngBCP 1559. The campaign opened in April and May of 1572 when the House of Commons debated a proposed Act which suggested that EngBCP 1559 fell short of being “a godly order” and would have required a complete overhaul of its provisions. This Act never came to a vote. On May 22nd the Queen herself intervened and forbade the Commons to proceed any further with the matter, on the grounds that any and all questions about the Prayer Book belonged exclusively to her prerogatives as Supreme Governor of the Church.

A little over a month later a pamphlet entitled An Admonition to the Parliament hit the bookstalls. Written by two clergymen, John Field and Thomas Wilcox, An Admonition fleshed out the ideological platform of the thwarted legislation. “The restitution of true religion and reformation of God’s church,” it stated, consists “not only in abandoning all popish remnants both in ceremonies and regiment, but also in bringing in and placing in God’s church those things only which the Lord himself in his word commandeth.”\footnote{An Admonition to the Parliament (1572); in W. H. Frere and C. E. Douglas, eds., Puritan Manifestoes. A Study of the Origin of the Puritan Revolt. Church Historical Society Series Np. LXII (London: S.P.C.K., 1907), p. 8.} The success of such a restitution and reformation could be gauged by three tests:

The outward marks whereby a true Christian church is known are: preaching of the Word purely, ministering of the sacraments sincerely, and ecclesiastical discipline which consistseth in admonition and correction and faults severally.\footnote{Ibid.; Puritan Manifestoes, p. 9.}

In short, godly preaching, godly sacraments, and godly discipline. “Godliness” became a shibboleth of the Puritan movement, and a kind of shorthand symbol for their whole programme. But before the “godly” side of this programme could be instituted, the ungodly remnants of popery “both in ceremonies and regiment” had to be purged from the established Church. So the second part
of the *Admonition* vindicated (and expanded upon in detail) the list of features which the Commons bill had slated for abolition – for example, the requirement that clergy wear a surplice while celebrating the Lord’s Supper; that communicants be kneeling when they received the sacrament; the giving of a ring in matrimony; and the sign of the cross on the candidate’s forehead in baptism.

An *Admonition to the Parliament* also called for the “bringing in and placing in God’s church *those things only which the Lord himself in his word commandeth.*” This was the cornerstone of the Puritan programme – that “one only law, the Scripture, must be the rule to direct in all things, even so far as to the ‘taking up of a rush or straw’.” In other words, the Bible not only served as a repository of divine truth; it was also a body of divine legislation regulating every aspect of human life, individual and corporate. Nothing could or should be done unless it were specifically mandated in God’s Word written; and if God’s Word written did mandate something, it should be implemented exactly, and only so far as, the Scriptures allowed. Thus, “the Lord himself in his word” commanded that his disciples do his Supper in his memory; but the Lord himself in his word said nothing about kneeling while “doing this” – so, on the principle that “the nearer our masses are to the first mass of Christ, the better they undoubtedly are,” it was not only better but a non-negotiable matter of “godly discipline” to sit for communion, just as (the puritans supposed) Jesus and the twelve had done at the last supper.

One thing is missing from the account of Puritanism that I have just given. There was no mention of any doctrinal test. This may seem like an egregious oversight, given the way in which historical mythology has associated, even identified, the movement with Calvinism. It is true that the most prominent (or notorious) Puritan divines within the Church of England spouted Calvinist doctrine; but then, so did their most hard-bitten opponents in the establishment, such as Archbishop Whitgift. By the last twenty years of Elizabeth’s reign, Calvinism was simply the theological atmosphere and climate of the Church of England as a whole. So, something else distinguished puritans from their more conventional neighbours in the English church. And that was what Puritans called “the godly discipline”.

The basis of “the godly discipline” was not doctrinal orthodoxy so much as *experiential rectitude*, and the test of a person’s *bona fide* godliness was not the confession of correct opinions so much

---

9 Richard Hooker, *Of the Lawes of Ecclesiastiical Politie* II, 1, 2. Hooker was quoting from Thomas Cartwright’s *Reply to An Answer to the Admonition to the Parliament* (1573).
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as the profession of a verifiable conversion. The authenticity of one’s conversion to Christ was determined by its pattern, whether one’s narrative of the experience involved a progression through certain stages in a certain order and conformed to the procedural model of a “true” conversion. Very roughly speaking, the “true” convert’s narrative began with the hearing of God’s Word in such a way that the heart accused and convicted itself of sin, and acknowledged that one was damned. This led to a period of acute fear and despair, often quite prolonged; one usually strove to overcome or banish the despair by making oneself righteous through good deeds (“works-righteousness”). Sooner or later, though, one realised that these efforts were futile and merely served to make one doubly damnable; one thereupon fell into even deeper despair. But if the experience went according to plan, one eventually heard God’s promise of forgiveness through the alone only merits of Jesus Christ, and placed one’s entire faith and confidence in that promise. The end result was an infallible assurance that one was indeed numbered among the elect and saved. John Bunyan’s *The Pilgrim’s Progress* is not only a classic of English literature; it is also the classic expression of the Puritan “godly discipline”.

A Puritan, then, might be defined as “a revivalist Protestant”. For the typical Puritan, once having experienced “conversion of the heart,” was preoccupied by the day-to-day task, by the bread-and-butter issues, of sustaining one’s “godly” integrity in the midst of neighbours, servants, trades-people, and even clergy who showed no sign of sharing one’s inner sense of conviction. Thus, even as Field and Wilcox had called for an “ecclesiastical discipline which consisteth in admonition and correction and faults severally,” so English Puritans developed a “godly discipline” which went beyond questions of church polity and the correcting of institutional abuses. “The Discipline” involved rigorous self-examination and the examination of the lives of one’s “brothers and sisters” in the movement; it cultivated a special jargon, to be used only in the company of those same “brothers and sisters”; and it entailed a willingness to separate oneself from those who had not experienced “the godly motions of the Spirit” in conversion. A discipline of this sort was a recipe for an ecclesiola, a “little church”-within-the-Church; and such evidence as we have of parish life in the late Elizabethan church suggests that most puritans followed the recipe to one degree or another.

Nowhere did “the Discipline” have a more practical import and impact than in the matter of eucharistic communion. In common with every other Reformed rite, the English Communion Order laid down “a lively faith” as one of the minimum requirements for “a worthy receiving of the Lord’s Supper”. In the puritan view, only
“the godly” could possibly have such faith. That meant, all those who had not experienced a true “conversion of the heart” and were not living “the Discipline” must be unworthy communicants – and thus stood condemned not only in themselves but also as rocks of offence for “the godly”. Permission to exclude such persons from communion – and to admit only “the godly” – became one of the principal items on the Puritan agenda. Of course, this demand became a rock of offence – a scandal – to non-Puritan opinion. For it implicitly denied the national mission of the established Church, which was to minister to all subjects of the Crown.

Queen Elizabeth had not been amused by An Admonition to the Parliament, and Field and Wilcox soon found themselves enjoying the Crown’s hospitality at Newgate Prison. Elizabeth herself had an almost pathological distrust of ideology. Part of this distrust came of her experience during her sister’s reign, when Mary’s paranoid Catholicism had nearly sent Elizabeth to the block. She also distrusted ideology because it encouraged subjects to give their loyalty to something other than her own royal personage. So her reactions to Puritanism were governed by a bloody-minded insistence that everything stay exactly as it stood under the terms of the 1559 Settlement of Religion. She conceded nothing, and she made it brutally clear to her bishops that they were to concede nothing, either.10

Such a policy may have stonewalled the puritans, but it could not neutralize the threat that their movement posed to the Settlement, much less eradicate the movement itself. If anything, Elizabeth’s policy simply postponed the day of reckoning. Yet like the strategy of Fabius Cunctator (“the Delayer”) in dealing with the invasion of Italy by Hannibal and his Punic army, Elizabeth’s aggressively defensive postponement of a win-or-lose engagement with the Puritan insurgency gave the English hierarchy time and breathing-room in which to forge a response which would go beyond tactical counter-insurgency measures and could develop a strategic plan for defending the Settlement of Religion and the Church of England as established by the Settlement. Elizabeth finally found a voice committed to such a defence of the Settlement in John Whitgift (ca. 1530-1604), whom she appointed...

10 In 1577 Elizabeth went so far as to place her second archbishop of Canterbury, Edmund Grindal, under house arrest, and to suspend his administrative powers both as primate and diocesan, when he refused to order the suppression of “the prophesyings”. These were clergy support-groups (as we would call them) either organised or infiltrated by puritan cadres in order to promote the movement’s ideological and ecclesiastical agenda through Bible-study.
archbishop of Canterbury in 1583. Whitgift, though a true Calvinist in doctrine, was nonetheless an ardent defender of episcopacy in print – and, what is more, a scout, promoter, and patron of talent which could do the job even more effectively. His best “discovery” in this programme was a priest named Richard Hooker.

Hooker was born around 1554. Educated at Corpus Christi College, Oxford, he eventually became one of its Fellows and the University’s deputy professor of Hebrew. Since the statutes of Oxford and Cambridge required Fellows to be celibate (or at least unmarried), he resigned both of these posts on his marriage in 1584. Whitgift and other highly placed figures, however, knew A Good Thing when they saw one and took good care of him. He was appointed rector of a profitably endowed parish and to the post of Master of the Temple. The Temple was one of London’s four Inns of Court, the guilds (or societies) of barristers and barristers-in-training. As Master, Hooker was in effect the chaplain to the lawyers of the Temple. It was here that he went up against Walter Travers (1548-1635), the Reader\(^\text{11}\) of the Temple, an avid Calvinist and critic of the Elizabethan Settlement of Religion. Hooker made it his business not only to defend the Settlement and the established Church of England but also, as part of this defence, to critique the central tenets of Calvinist doctrine. This meant that, every day the High Courts were in session, the resident lawyers got “Canterbury in the morning and Geneva in the afternoon”. Travers’s hard-line “Genevan” lectures, which presented the established Church as barely closeted “Popery,” led Archbishop Whitgift to inhibit him; Hooker’s rather more nuanced defence of the establishment earned him appointment to two quiet, but wealthy, parishes, so that he could work on his masterwork, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*. He completed five of the projected eight books of this work before his death in 1600, around the age of forty-six. Books I through IV appeared in 1594, Book V three years later. He left drafts of Books VI –VIII, but these were not published until 1648 and 1662.

Hooker’s is a name that Anglicans like to conjure with; he has even been acclaimed as “the Father of Anglicanism”. That makes it sound as if he is to the Anglican tradition what Luther was to the Lutheran tradition, or Calvin to Calvinism, or even Thomas Aquinas to the Roman tradition. He was not. In his own day,

\(^{11}\) In the Elizabethan and Stuart Church of England, a Reader was a lecturer, normally in Holy Orders but without any sacramental or pastoral ministry.
Hooker’s works had nowhere near the popularity or influence of those by William Perkins (1558-1602), the *doyen* of Calvinist divines in the Elizabethan Church of England. Indeed, Hooker did not become a name to conjure with until the mid-nineteenth century. Since then, just as the Devil can cite the Scriptures to his own purposes, so partisans of all heights and depths in Anglicanism’s party-ridden heritage have sought to exploit Hooker for their several purposes.

Hooker’s *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* belonged to a very particular historical moment in the life of the English church: his purpose was limited and his focus (it is fair to say) parochial in a way that is not true of Thomas’s *Summa theologiae* or Calvin’s *Institutes of the Christian Religion*. Both Thomas and Calvin sought to give a systematic account of “the truth as it is in Jesus” for its own sake, that is, for the sake of making the intrinsic connectedness of all Christian teachings intelligible to the faith-guided mind. Hooker also sought to give a systematic account of Christian teaching – but for the sake of defending the Elizabethan Settlement of Religion, the Church of England (and its 1559 Prayer Book) “as by Law Established”. In other words, Hooker made the task of systematic theology serve a polemical purpose.

The target of Hooker’s polemic was the Calvinist wing of the Puritan movement. Not all Puritans were Calvinists, and not all Calvinists were Puritans; Elizabeth I’s hammerer of Puritanism, Archbishop Whitgift himself, was a Calvinist, as was nearly every other English divine of the period. But a wide circle of Calvinist divines tied their ideology to Puritanism’s “revivalist” outlook so successfully and so thoroughly that the leaders of the established Church came to view them as the Puritans *par excellence*. These “Puritan” divines – Walter Travers, William Perkins, and most especially Thomas Cartwright (1535-1603) – made the doctrine of double predestination the sun and the moon of their ecclesiology. They demanded “a more perfect reformation” which would have made the established Church of England a church of two circles. The inner circle would consist of “the godly,” the predestined elect who had assurance of their election; these were to have sole and exclusive right to receive the sacraments of salvation. The outer circle would consist of everybody else – the reprobates, predestined from all eternity to damnation, and thus ineligible ever to receive either Baptism or the Lord’s Supper *worthily*.

Against these Calvinist ideologues, Hooker set himself the task of defending not only the ecclesiastical *status quo* but also (and more crucially) the mission of the Church of England “as by Law Established” – its mission to *all* subjects of the English Crown without exception, its mission to bring every English man, woman, and child within the saving embrace of Christ, who on the cross...
“made... a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world”. Such a mission, as he understood it, called for the Church of England to be at once Catholic and Reformed – Catholic in theological principles, Reformed in doctrinal details. Hooker sincerely believed that the Reformed religion was the truest form of Christian truth. But he also, and even more firmly, believed that Reformed religion – at least in England – could only be true to itself if it were truly Catholic in the etymological sense, kat’(h)olos, “according to the whole,” the whole of the nation, the whole of the English people.

This programme led Hooker, in Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity, to attempt something more than tread “the Via Media,” the middle way between Rome and Geneva – a path which, as it wends, would have allowed him to rescue some bits from the slough of “Romish superstition” on the one hand and to defrost some of the sharper edges of the Calvinist ice-pack on the other. This is less a game-plan than a recipe for mix-and-match, live-and-let-live compromise, cluttered, incoherent, but comfy.12 Hooker’s aim, however, was not compromise so much as comprehension. The essence of comprehension is unity – a unity where basic principles and living details not only form but also can be seen to form a coherent whole. Hooker sought to construct a “unified field theory” of ecclesiastical polity, an account which would lay bare the theological foundations of governance in general and thus enable a coherent (and convincing) exposition of the reformed Church of England’s structure and life in detail.

Nowhere in Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity is Hooker’s purpose and programme more at work than in the Fifth Book. Here he applies the general principles expounded in Books I – IV to a very detailed exposition of the particular principles which governed EngBCP 1559. The Fifth Book Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity was, in effect, the first great commentary on the Book of Common Prayer, one which explores and unpacks the Prayer Book’s theological “reasons why”.

The reading which follows consists of five chapters from the Fifth Book. The first three chapters (55-57) deal with the christological (or, perhaps better said, the incarnational) foundation of sacramental theology. The second set of chapters (67-68) deals with the Eucharist in particular.

The text is taken from the awesomely critical edition (in eight volumes) of Hooker’s masterpiece, edited by W. Speed Hill under the auspices of Folger Shakespeare Library (Washington D.C.), and

12 Anglicans tend to think that their tradition has a genius for compromise. Anglicanism’s history has, with fairly depressing consistency, belied such a rosy self-image.
published by Harvard University Press. This edition is designed for use by experts; it is not student-friendly. The text reproduces the spelling and orthography of the original volumes as published in 1594 and 1597; and the notes, though superbly helpful, are published in separate volumes. I have modernised the spelling and orthography. Those footnotes preceded by RH are Hooker’s; all other footnotes are mine. When Hooker quotes a passage in Latin, I have normally (but not invariably) used Speed Hill’s translation. I have also, as a rule, supplied (in parentheses) the text of Scripture that Hooker cites in his marginal notes; I use the King James Version, even though Hooker died eleven years before it was published, because it was a very conservative revision of the so-called Bishops’ Bible, which was the Authorised Version in Hooker’s day, and is closest to the formal English idiom that he knew.

Note. It is worth pointing out that Hooker wrote Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity at the same time that William Shakespeare was producing his first great plays. There are some who maintain that his work is to English discursive prose what Shakespeare’s plays are to English drama and poetry. This claim is a bit of a stretch, but I (for one) will confess and will not deny, but confess, that Hooker must be counted among the greatest masters of English prose. The trouble is, Hooker’s English is very much of its era, when the language still retained a memory of Old and Middle English. What is more, formal English – the tongue as spoken and written by the educated classes – cultivated a close and conscious affinity to Latin. In Hooker’s day, and long after, educated Englishmen (and the rare Englishwoman, like the Queen herself) were thoroughly bilingual, as comfortable speaking, writing, and even thinking in Latin as in English. Indeed, one spoke and wrote English as if it were Latin.

Not that there was one single “correct” Latin style. An English orator (or writer) might choose to imitate of Tacitus, the first-century CE Roman historian, whose style is terse to the point of obscurity. Or one might choose to imitate Cicero, the greatest orator of the late Roman Republic, whose style is, to say the least, expansive, with rolling cadences (“periods”) and an intricate, jigsaw-like deployment of subordinate clauses. Hooker tends to be Ciceronian; and like his model, his discursive prose is oratory of a very high order indeed. It helps if one has studied Latin long enough to have slogged through Cicero’s treatise De Oratore (“Concerning the Orator”) in its original Latin. Failing that, remember that Hooker expected his prose to be read aloud – and, thus, heard. So I suggest that you read it aloud, for hearing his cadences will help to make his meaning clearer.
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Further Reading

FRANCIS PAgET. An Introduction to the Fifth Book of Hooker’s Treatise OF THE LAWS OF ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY (Oxford, 1899).

Paget (1851-1911) was Dean of Christ Church, Oxford, when he published this work; he became Bishop of Oxford two years later. This is still the finest commentary on the Fifth Book.

IZAAK WALTON. The Life of Mr Richard Hooker (London, 1665; often reprinted; an annotated version introduces Keble’s edition of Hooker’s Works).

Walton (1593-1683) was perhaps the greatest apologist – or publicist, depending on one’s point of view – that the Church of England ever had, because he produced a vision of what the English Church could (and should) look like through a series of five saints’-lives – those of John Donne, Sir Henry Wotton, George Herbert, Hooker, and Robert Sanderson. His Life of Mr Richard Hooker was the fourth in this series. It celebrates Hooker’s sanctity by way of making him a clueless egghead. As the following book convincingly demonstrates, Walton let himself be the tool of those engaged in a lawsuit with the heirs of Hooker’s widow over the ownership (copyright and thus profits) of his hitherto unpublished writings. Walton meant to discredit the widow (and her heirs), but did so by presenting Hooker as an uxorious geek – and, worse, as an ivory-tower fool.


A surprisingly entertaining correction of Walton’s hagiography. This book presents a full-blooded portrait of Hooker – not a clueless geek but a canny human being in marriage, and a clergyman who knew the ropes in the Elizabethan Church of England.
OF THE LAWS OF ECCLESIASTICAL POLITY:
THE FIFTH BOOK

Chapter 55

Of the personal presence of Christ everywhere,
and in what sense it may be granted he is everywhere present
according to the flesh.

§ 1. Having thus far proceeded in speech\textsuperscript{13} concerning the
person of Jesus Christ, his two natures, their conjunction, that
which he either is or doth in respect of both, and that which
the one receiveth from the other; sith\textsuperscript{14} God in Christ is
generally the medicine which doth cure the world, and Christ
in us is that receipt of the same medicine whereby we are
every one particularly cured: – Inasmuch as Christ’s
incarnation and passion can be available to no man’s good,
which is not made partaker of Christ, neither can we
participate him without his presence, we are briefly to
consider how Christ is present, to the end it may thereby
better appear how we are made partakers of Christ both
otherwise and in the sacraments themselves.

§ 2. All things are in such sort divided into finite and
infinite, that no one substance, nature, or quality can be
possibly capable of both. The world and all things in the
world are stinted; all effects that proceed from them, all the
powers and abilities whereby they work, whatsoever they
do, whatsoever they may, and whatsoever they are, is
limited. Which limitation of each creature is both the
perfection and also the preservation thereof. Measure is that
which perfecteth all things, because every thing is for some
end; neither can that thing be available to any end which is
not proportionable thereunto, and to proportion as well
excesses as defects are opposite. Again, forasmuch as nothing
doth perish but only through excess or defect of that, the due
proportioned measure whereof doth give perfection, it
followeth that measure is likewise the preservation of all
things. Out of which premises we may conclude not only that

\textsuperscript{13} speech: discourse, discussion.

\textsuperscript{14} sith: since.
nothing created can possibly be unlimited or can receive any such accident, quality, or property as may really make it infinite (for then it would cease to be a creature); but also that every creature’s limitation is according to his own kind – and therefore, as oft as we note in them anything above their kind, it argueth that the same is not properly theirs, but groweth in them from a cause more powerful than they are.

§ 3. Such as the substance of each thing is, such is also the presence thereof. Impossible it is that God should withdraw his presence from any thing, because the very substance of God is infinite. He filleth heaven and earth, although he taketh up no room in either because his substance is immaterial, pure, and of us in this world so incomprehensible, that albeit no part of us be ever absent from him who is present whole unto every particular thing, yet his presence with us we no way discern farther than only that God is present – which partly by reason and more perfectly by faith we know to be firm and certain.

§ 4. Seeing therefore that presence everywhere is the sequel of an infinite and incomprehensible substance – for what can be everywhere but that which can nowhere be comprehended?\(^{15}\) – to inquire whether Christ be everywhere is to inquire of a natural property,\(^ {16}\) a property that cleaveth

---

\(^a\) RH. Psalm 139.7, 8 ["Whither shall I go then from thy Spirit: or whither shall I go then from thy presence? If I climb up into heaven, thou art there; if I go down to hell, thou art there also.”] Jeremiah 23.24 ["Can any hide himself in secret places that I shall not see him, saith the Lord? Do I not fill heaven and earth, saith the Lord?"

\(^b\) RH. Ideo Deus ubique esse dicitur quia nulli parti rerum absens est; ideo totus quia non parti rerum partem sui præsentem præbet et alteri parti alteram partem, sed non solum universitati creaturæ verumtamen cullibet parti ejus totus pariter adest. Augustine. Epistola 57 ad Dardanum (= Ep. 187, § 5.17). ["God is therefore said to be everywhere because he is absent from no portion of reality; so the whole of God is said to be everywhere because he does not make one part of himself present to one part of reality and another part of himself present to another part; but his whole life is equally present not only to the totality of creation but even to every single part of it.”]

\(^{15}\) for what can be everywhere but that which can nowhere be comprehended?: The divine nature, having no boundaries, cannot be constrained and held in any one place; that is why it can be everywhere.
to the deity of Christ. Which deity being common unto him with none other but only the Father and the Holy Ghost, it followeth that nothing of Christ which is limited, that nothing created, that neither the soul nor the body of Christ – and consequently not Christ as man or Christ according to his human nature – can possibly be every-where present, because those phrases of limitation and restraint do either point out the principal subject whereunto every such attribute adhereth, or else they intimate the radical cause out of which it groweth. For example, when we say that Christ as man or according to his human nature suffered death, we show what nature was the proper subject of mortality; when we say that as God or according to his deity he conquered death, we declare his deity to have been the cause by force and virtue whereof he raised himself from the grave. But neither is the manhood of Christ that subject whereunto universal presence agreeth, neither is it the cause original by force whereof his person is enabled to be everywhere present. Wherefore Christ is essentially present with all things in that he is very God, but not present with all things as man because manhood and the parts thereof can neither be the cause nor the true subject of such presence.

§ 5. Notwithstanding – somewhat more plainly to show a true immediate reason wherefore the manhood of Christ can neither be everywhere present nor cause the person of Christ so to be – we acknowledge that [statement] of St Augustine concerning Christ [to be] most true: ‘In that he is personally the Word, he created all things; in that he is naturally man,

16 property: a characteristic attribute. Cf. the Prayer of Humble Access in EngBCP 1549-1662: “but thou art the same Lord, whose property is always to have mercy.”

5 RH. Quod ad Verbum attinet, creator est; quod ad hominem, creatura est. Aug. ep. 57 [= Augustine, Epistola 187, § 3.8]. Deus qui semper est et semper erat fit creatura. Leo de nativ. [“God who always is and always was, becomes a creature.” This is a paraphrase of statements which occur several times in Leo the Great’s Sermones in nativitate (“Sermons on the Nativity,” i.e. Christmas).] Multi timore trepidant ne Christum esse creaturam dicere complectantur. Nos proclamamus non esse periculum dicere Christum esse creaturam. Hieron. in epist. ad Ephe. 2 [“Many shake with fear lest they be compelled to call Christ a creature. We declare that there is no danger in saying that Christ is a creature.” Jerome (Hieronymus), Commentary on the Epistle to the Ephesians 2.10.]
he himself is created of God. And it doth not appear that any one creature hath power to be present with all creatures. Whereupon, nevertheless, it will not follow that Christ cannot therefore be thus present because he is himself a creature, forasmuch as only infinite presence is that which cannot possibly stand with the essence or being of any creature, as for presence with all things that are, sith the whole race, mass, and body of them is finite, Christ by being a creature is not in that respect excluded from possibility of presence with them. That which excludeth him therefore as man from so great largeness of presence is only his being man, a creature of this particular kind, whereunto the God of nature hath set those bounds of restraint and limitation, beyond which to attribute unto it anything more than a creature of that sort can admit, were to give it another nature, to make it a creature of some other kind than in truth it is.

§ 6. Furthermore, if Christ, in that he is man, be everywhere present, seeing this cometh not by the nature of manhood itself, there is no other way how it should grow but either by grace of union with deity or by the grace of unction received from deity. It hath been already sufficiently proved that by force of union the properties of both natures are imparted to the person only in whom they are, and not what belongeth to the one nature really conveyed or translated into the other; it hath been likewise proved that natures united in Christ continue the very same which they are where they are not united. And concerning the grace of union, wherein are contained the gifts and virtues which Christ as man hath above men, they make him really and habitually a man more excellent than we are; [but] they take not from him the nature and substance that we have, they cause not his soul nor body to be of another kind than ours is. Supernatural endowments are an advancement, they are no extinguishment of that nature whereto they are given. The substance of the body of Christ hath no presence, neither can have, but only local. It was not therefore everywhere seen, nor did it everywhere suffer death; everywhere could it not be entombed; it is not everywhere now, being exalted into heaven. There is no proof in the world strong to enforce that Christ had a true body but by the true and natural properties of his body. Amongst which properties, definite or local
presence is chief. How is it true of Christ, saith Tertullian, that he died, was buried, and rose again, if Christ had not that very flesh, the nature whereof is capable of these things—flesh mingled with blood, supported with bones, woven with sinews, embroidered with veins? If his majestical body have now any such new property, by force whereof it may everywhere really—even in substance—present itself, or may at once be in many places, then hath the majesty of his estate extinguished the verity of his [human] nature. Make thou no doubt or question of it, saith St Augustine, but that the man Christ Jesus is now in that very place from whence he shall come in the same form and substance of flesh which he carried thither, and from which he hath not taken the nature, but given thereunto immortality. According to this form he spreadeth not out himself into all places. For it behooveth us to take great heed lest, while we go about to maintain the glorious deity of him which is man, we leave him not the true bodily substance of a man. According to St Augustine’s opinion, therefore, that majestical body which we make to be everywhere present doth thereby cease to have the substance of a true body.

§ 7. To conclude:—We hold it in regard of the forealleged proofs a most infallible truth that Christ as man is not everywhere present. There are [those] which think it as infallibly true that Christ is everywhere present as man. Which peradventure in some sense may be well enough granted. His human substance in itself is naturally absent from the earth, his soul and body not on earth but in heaven only. Yet because this [human] substance is inseparably joined to that personal Word which by his very divine essence is present with all things, the nature which cannot have in itself universal presence hath it after a sort by being nowhere severed from that which everywhere is present. For inasmuch

---

d RH. Tertullian, De carne Christi [On the flesh of Christ 5, §§4-5].

e RH. Augustine, Epistola LVII, ad Dardanum [= Ep. 187, §3].

17 This is probably a reference to Martin Luther, who argued that, since the one person of Christ unites divinity and humanity, AND since divinity is omnipresent, Christ’s humanity in hypostatic union with his divinity must now be as capable of being present in every place, or in many places, at the same time. Luther’s teaching came to be labelled “ubiquitarianism,” from the Latin word ubique, “everywhere”.
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as that infinite Word is not divisible into parts, it could not in part but needs be wholly incarnate — and consequently wheresoever the Word is, it hath with it manhood. Else should the Word be in part or somewhere God only and not man; which is impossible. For the person of Christ is whole, perfect God and perfect man wheresoever — although, the parts of his manhood being finite and his deity infinite, we cannot say that the whole of Christ is simply everywhere, as we may [say] that his deity is, and that his person is by force of deity. For somewhat of the person of Christ is not everywhere in that sort — namely, his manhood, the only conjunction whereof with deity is extended as far as deity, the actual position restrained and tied to a certain place. Yet presence by way of conjunction is in some sort presence.

§ 8. Again, as the manhood of Christ may after a sort be everywhere said to be present because that person is everywhere present, from whose divine substance manhood is nowhere severed: so the same universality of presence may likewise seem in another respect appliable thereunto, namely, by co-operation with deity — and that, in all things. The light created of God in the beginning did first by itself illuminate the world; but after that the sun and moon were created, the world sithence hath by them always enjoyed the same. And that deity of Christ, which before our Lord’s incarnation wrought all things without man, doth now work nothing wherein the [human] nature which it hath assumed is either absent from it or idle. Christ as man hath 18 all power both in heaven and earth given him. He hath as man, not as God only, 19 supreme dominion over quick [i.e. the living] and dead. For so much his ascension into heaven and his session [i.e. sitting] at the right hand of God do import. The Son of God which did first humble himself by taking our flesh upon him, descended afterwards much lower and became according the flesh obedient so far as to suffer death, even the death of the cross, for all men, because such was his Father’s will. 20 The former was an humiliation of deity; the latter an humiliation of manhood. For which cause there

18 RH. Matthew 28.18.

19 RH. Romans 14.9.

20 RH. Philippians 2.9; Hebrews 2.9; Revelation 5.12.
followed upon the latter an exaltation of that which was humbled. For with power he created the world, but restored it by obedience. In which obedience as according to his manhood he had glorified God on earth, so God hath glorified in heaven that nature which yielded him obedience, and hath given unto Christ even in that he is man such fullness of power over the whole world, that he which before fulfilled in the state of humility and patience whatever God did require, doth now reign in glory till the time that all things be restored. He which came down from heaven and descended into the lowest parts of the earth is ascended far above all heavens, that sitting at the right hand of God he might from thence fill all things with the gracious and happy fruits of his saving presence. Ascension into heaven is a plain local translation of Christ according to his manhood from the lower to the higher parts of the world. Session at the right hand of God is the actual exercise of that regency and dominion wherein the manhood of Christ is joined and matched with the deity of the Son of God. Not that his manhood was before without the possession of the same power, but because the full use thereof was suspended till that humility which had been before as a veil to hide and conceal majesty were laid aside. After his rising from the dead, then did God set him at his right hand in the heavenly places far above all principality and power and might and domination and every name that is named not in this world only but in that which is to come, and hath put all things under his feet, and hath appointed him over all the head of the Church which is his body, the fullness of him who filleth

---

21 *patience*: “The suffering or enduring (of pain, trouble, or evil) with calmness and composure; the quality or capacity of so suffering or enduring.” OED, s.v., I.1.


23 In common with all Christian divines of whatever denomination, Hooker took it for granted that heaven is a location, a place with spatial co-ordinates, “Out beyond the shining / Of the furthest star”. The assumption is curious, because he and all other Christian divines of whatever stripe denied that God occupies, and is circumscribed by, a place in space.

24 RH. Ephesians 1.20.
Richard Hooker

all in all. The sceptre of which spiritual regiment over us in this present world is at the length to be yielded up into the hands of the Father which gave it, there being no longer on earth any militant Church to govern. This government therefore he exerciseth both as God and as man – as God by essential presence with all things, as man by co-operation with that which essentially is present. Touching the manner how he worketh as man in all things, the principal powers of the soul of man are the will and understanding, the one of which two in Christ assenteth unto all things, and from the other nothing which deity doth work is hid. So that by knowledge and assent the [human] soul of Christ is present with all things which the deity of Christ worketh. And even the body of Christ itself, although the definite limitation thereof be most sensible, doth notwithstanding admit in some sort a kind of infinite and unlimited presence likewise. For his body being a part of that nature which whole nature is presently joined unto deity wheresoever deity is, it followeth that his bodily substance hath everywhere a presence of true conjunction with deity. And forasmuch as it is by virtue of that conjunction made the body of the Son of God by whom also it was made a sacrifice for the sins of the whole world, this giveth it a presence of force and efficacy throughout all generations of men.

Albeit therefore nothing be actually

25 RH. Psalm 8.6: Hebrews 2.8. [The reference to all things being put under Christ’s feet does indeed derive from Psalm 8 and the quotation of that Psalm in Hebrews 2; but the rest of the sentence is actually quoting Ephesians 1.22: “And [God] hath put all things under his feet, and gave him to be the head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fullness of him that filleth all in all.”]

26 RH. 1 Corinthians 15.24. [regiment: rule or government. militant Church (on earth): the Church in this present age, fighting or struggling against sin. In mediaeval theology and spirituality “the Church Militant” was distinguished from “the Church Expectant” (those in purgatory) and “the Church Triumphant” (the saints in glory). In the Communion Order of the Prayer Book, the General Intercession was for “the Church Militant here in earth.”]

27 In this section, Hooker has been laying the ground for the view labelled “virtualism”. That is: Although Christ’s human body is not really, actually, “essentially,” or “substantially” present in the Eucharist (or anywhere else but in heaven), yet it is truly present in power (‘virtus’) and effect.
infinite *in substance* but God only, in that he is God, nevertheless as every number is infinite by possibility of addition, and every line by possibility of extension [is] infinite, so there is no stint which can be set to the value or merit of the sacrificed body of Christ: it hath no measured certainty of limits, bounds of efficacy unto life it knoweth none, but is also itself infinite in *possibility of application*. Which things indifferently\(^{28}\) every way considered, that gracious promise of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ concerning presence with his [disciples] to the very end of the world,\(^{29}\) I see no cause but that we may well and safely interpret he doth perform both as God by essential presence of deity and as man in that order, sense, and meaning which hath been showed.

### Chapter 56

*The union or mutual participation which is between Christ and the Church of Christ in this present world.*

§ 1. We have hitherto spoken of the person and of the presence of Christ. Participation is that mutual inward hold which Christ hath of us and we of him,\(^{30}\) in such sort that each posseseth other by way of special interest, property, and inherent copulation. For plainer explication whereof we may, from that which hath been before sufficiently proved, assume to our purpose these two principles: that [1] *every original cause imparteth itself unto those things which come of it*, and [2] *Whatever taketh being from any other, the same is after a sort in that which giveth it being.*

\(^{28}\) *indifferently*: impartially, without prejudice or bias.

\(^{29}\) Cf. Matthew 28.20b (“And, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.”)

\(^{30}\) Cf. The Prayer of Humble Access, EngBCP 1549/1559’1662: “Grant us, therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the flesh of thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink his blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by his body, and our souls washed through his most precious blood, *and that we may continually dwell in him, and he in us.*”
§ 2. It followeth hereupon that the Son of God, being light of light, must needs be also light in light. The persons of the Godhead, by reason of the unity of their substance, do as necessarily remain one with another as they are of necessity to be distinguished one from another, because two are the issue of one, and one the offspring of the other two, only of three one not growing out of any other. And sith [since] they all are but one God in number, one indivisible essence or substance, their distinction cannot possibly admit separation. For how should that subsist solitarily by itself which hath no substance [i.e. essence or being] but individually the very same [substance] whereby others subsist with it – seeing that the multiplication of substances in particular is necessarily required to make those things subsist apart, which have the self-same general nature; and the Persons of the Trinity are not three particular substances to whom one general nature is common, but three that subsist by one substance which itself is particular, yet they all three have it, and their several ways of having it are that which maketh their personal distinction? The Father therefore is in

---

31 Cf. Nicene Creed (EngBCP 1549/1552/1559): “And [I believe] in one Lord Jesu Christ, the only begotten Son of God; begotten of his Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of light, very God of very God....”

32 RH. In the bosom of the Father. John 1.18. Ecce dico alium esse Patrem et alium Filium: non divisione alium sed distinctione. Tertullian, contra Praxeam [9.1] (“Mark well what I say: the Father is one and the Son is another – not by way of division but by way of distinction”). Nec in numerum pluralem defluat incorporea generatio, nec in divisionem cadit ubi quiete nasciture nequaquam a generante separatior. Rufinus, Commentarius in symbolum apostolorum [Commentary on the Apostles’ Creed, 6] (“An incorporeal begetting does not result in a plural number [of beings], neither does it end up in a division where the One who is begotten is never separated from the One who begot Him”).

33 because two are the issue of one, and one the offspring of the other two: the Son and the Spirit are the “issue” of the Father; the Spirit is the “offspring” of the Father and the Son. only of three one not growing out of any other: In this rather obscure qualification, Hooker means that God’s unity of being/essence/substance is not the exclusive property (or product) of any one of the three Persons – that is to say, the one divine essence is possessed by each Person individually but not separately from the other Persons.
the Son, and the Son in him: they both in the Spirit, and the Spirit in both them. So that the Father’s first offspring, which is the Son, remaineth eternally in the Father; the Father eternally also in the Son no way severed or divided, by reason of the sole and single unity of their substance. The Son in the Father as light in that light out of which it floweth without separation; the Father in the Son as light light in that light which it causeth and leaveth not. And because in this respect his [i.e. the Son’s] eternal being is of the Father, which eternal being is his life, therefore he by the Father liveth.

§ 3. Again, sith [since] all things do accordingly love their offspring as [they] themselves are more or less contained in it, he which is thus the Only-begotten must needs be in this degree the Only-beloved of the Father. He therefore which is in the Father by eternal derivation of being and life from him, must needs be in him through an eternal affection of love.

§ 4. His incarnation causeth him also as man to be now in the Father, and the Father to be in him [as man]. For in that he is man, he receiveth life from the Father as from the fountain of that everliving deity, which in the Person of the Word hath combined itself with manhood and doth thereunto impart such life as to no other creature besides him is communicated. In which consideration likewise, the love of the Father towards him [as man] is more than it can be towards any other, neither can any attain unto that perfection of love which he beareth towards his heavenly Father. Wherefore God is not so in any, nor any so in God, as Christ, whether we consider him as the personal Word of God or as the natural Son of Man.

§ 5. All other things that are of God have God in them, and he them in himself likewise. Yet because their substance and his wholly differeth, their coherence and communion,

---

34 In this intricate rhetorical question Hooker is trying to abridge many volumes of discourse on the three-personed God. His point goes something like this: the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit may be distinguished (but not separated) by the way in which each possesses the one divine essence. There is a “property” proper to the Father as Father, a “property” proper to the Son as Son, and a “property” proper to the Spirit as Spirit – even as each Person co-inhabits one and the same being (the technical terms for this is “perichoresis”).

either with him or amongst themselves is in no sort like unto that before mentioned [i.e. the coherence and communion of the Father and the Son]. God hath his influence [inflowing] into the very essence of all things, without which influence of deity supporting them their utter annihilation could not choose but follow. Of him all things have both received their first being and their continuance to be that which they are. All things are therefore partakers of God; they are his offspring; his influence is in them; and the personal wisdom of God is for that very cause said to excel in nimbleness or agility, to pierce into all intellectual, pure, and subtle spirits, to go through all, and to reach unto everything which is. Otherwise how should the same wisdom be that which supporteth, beareth up, and sustaineth all? WHATSOEVER God doth work, the hands of all three Persons are jointly and equally in it, according to the order of that connexion whereby they each depend upon [one] another. And therefore albeit in that respect the Father be first, the Son next, the Spirit last (and consequently nearest unto every effect which growth from all three), nevertheless they all being of one essence are likewise of one efficacy. Dare any man – unless he be ignorant altogether how inseparable the Persons of the Trinity are – persuade himself that every of them may have their sole and several possessions, or that we being not partakers of all can have fellowship with any one [of them]? The Father as goodness, the Son as wisdom, the Holy Ghost as power do all concur in every particular outwardly issuing from that one only glorious deity which they all are. For that which moveth God to work is goodness,

36 RH. Wisdom of Solomon 7.23 (“[God is] kind to man, steadfast, sure, free from care, having all power, overseeing all things, and going through all understanding, pure, and most subtil, spirits.”)

37 RH. Hebrews 1.3 (“[The Son of God] who being the brightness of [the Father’s] glory, and the express image of his person, and upholding all things by the word of his power, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high....” KJV.)

38 That which is proper to each hypostasis or person, as Father, as Son, and as Holy Spirit.

39 RH. John 14.23 (“Jesus answered and said unto him [Judas, not Iscariot], If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him.”)
and that which ordereth his work is wisdom, and that which perfecteth his work is power. All things which God in their times and seasons hath brought forth were eternally and before all times in God, as a work unbegun is in the artificer which afterward bringeth it unto effect. Therefore, whatever we do behold now in this present world, it was enwrapped within the bowels of divine mercy, written in the book of eternal wisdom, and held in the hands of omnipotent power, the first foundations of the world being as yet unlaid. So that all things which God hath made are in that respect the offspring of God: they are in him as effects in their highest Cause; he likewise actually is in them, th’assistance and influence of his deity is their life.

§ 6. Let hereunto saving efficacy be added, and it bringeth forth a special offspring amongst men containing them to whom God hath himself given the gracious and amiable name of sons, we are by nature the sons of Adam. When God created Adam, he created us, and as many as are descended from Adam have in themselves the root out of which they spring. The sons of God we neither are all nor any one of us otherwise than only grace and favour. The sons of God have God’s own natural Son as a second Adam from heaven, whose race and progeny they are by spiritual and heavenly birth. God therefore loving eternally his Son, he must needs eternally in him have loved and preferred

---

40 RH. Acts 17.28-29 (“For in him we live, and move, and have our being; as certain also of your own poets have said, For we are also his offspring. Forasmuch then as we are the offspring of God, we ought not to think that the Godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone, graven by art and man’s device.”); John 1.4, 1.10 (“In him was life; and the life was the light of men.... He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not.”); Isaiah 40.26 (“Lift up your eyes on high, and behold who hath created these things, that bringeth out their host by number: he calleth them all by names by the greatness of his might, for that he is strong in power; not one faileth.”)

41 RH. 1 John 3.1 (“Behold, what manner of love the Father hath bestowed upon us, that we should be called the sons of God....”)

42 RH. 1 Corinthians 15.47 (“The first man is of the earth, earthy: the second man is the Lord from heaven.”)
before all others them which are sithence [ever since] descended and sprung out of him. These were in God as in their Saviour and not as in their Creator only. It was the purpose of his \textit{saving} goodness, his \textit{saving} wisdom, and his \textit{saving} power which inclined itself towards them.

§ 7. They which were thus in God eternally by their intended admission to life, have by vocation or adoption God actually now in them, as the artificer is in the work which his hand doth presently frame. Life, as all other gifts and benefits, growth originally from the Father, and cometh not to any of us but \textsuperscript{44}by the Son, nor by the Son to any of us in particular but \textsuperscript{45}through the Spirit. For this cause the Apostle [Paul] wisheth ro rhw church of Corinth \textsuperscript{46}the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost. Which three St Peter comprehendeth in one, \textit{the participation of divine nature}. We are therefore in God through Christ eternally according to that intent and purpose whereby we were chosen to be made his before the world itself was made; we are in God through the knowledge which is had of us and the love which is borne towards us from everlasting. But in God actually are no longer than from the time of our actual adoption into the body of his true Church, into the fellowship of his children. For his Church he knoweth and loveth, so that they which are in the Church are thereby known to be in him. Our being in Christ by eternal foreknowledge saveth us not without our

\textsuperscript{43} RH. Ephesians 1.3-4 ("Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath blessed us with all spiritual blessings in heavenly places in Christ: according as he hath chosen us in him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy and without blame before him in love.")

\textsuperscript{44} RH. 1 John 5.11 ("And this is the record, that God hath given to us eternal life, and this life is in his Son.")

\textsuperscript{45} RH. Romans 8.10 ("And if Christ be in you, the body is dead because of sin; but the Spirit is life because of righteousness. [8:11 But if the Spirit of him that raised up Jesus from the dead dwell in you, he that raised up Christ from the dead shall also quicken your mortal bodies by his Spirit that dwelleth in you."])"

\textsuperscript{46} RH. 2 Corinthians 13.13.

\textsuperscript{47} RH. 2 Peter 1.4.
actual and real adoption into the fellowship of his saints in this present world. For in him we actually are by our actual incorporation into that society which hath him for their head and doth make together with him one body – he and they in that respect having one name; for which cause, by virtue of this mystical conjunction, we are of him and in him, even as though our very flesh and bones should be made continue with his. We are in Christ because he knoweth and loveth us even as parts of himself. No man actually is in him but they in whom he actually is. “I am the vine and you are the branches. He which abideth in me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit, but the branch severed from the vine withereth.” We are therefore adopted sons of God to eternal life by participation of the only-begotten Son of God, whose life is the \textsuperscript{54}wellspring and cause of ours. It is too cold an interpretation whereby some men expound our being in Christ to import nothing else but only that the self-same nature, which maketh us to be men, is in him, and maketh him man ass we are. For what man in the world is there which hath not so far forth communion with Jesus Christ? It is not this that can sustain the weight of such sentences [authoritative statements] as speak of the mystery

\footnotesize{RH. Colossians 2.10 (“And ye are complete in him, which is the head of all principality and power....”)}

\footnotesize{RH. 1 Corinthians 12.12 (“For as the body is one, and hath many members, and all the members of that one body, being many, are one body: so also is Christ.” KJV.)}

\footnotesize{RH. Ephesians 5.30 (“For we are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones.”)}

\footnotesize{RH. John 15.9 (“As the Father hath loved me, so have I loved you: continue ye in my love.”)}

\footnotesize{RH. 1 John 5.12 (“He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life.”)}

\footnotesize{RH. John 15.5-6.}

\footnotesize{RH. John 14.19 (“Yet a little while, and the world seeth me no more: but ye see me: because I live, ye shall live also.”); Ephesians 5.23 (“For the husband is the head of the wife, even as Christ is the head of the church: and he is the saviour of the body.”)}
of our 55 coherence with Jesus Christ. The Church is in Christ as Eve was in Adam. Yea, by grace we are every one of us in Christ and in his Church, as by nature we are in those our first parents. God made Eve of the rib of Adam. 56 And his Church he frameth out of the very flesh, the very wounded and bleeding side of the Son of Man. His body crucified and his blood shed for the life of the world are the true elements of that heavenly being, which maketh us 57 such as [he] himself is, of whom we come. For which cause the words of Adam may be fitly the words of Christ concerning his Church: “Flesh of my flesh and bone of my bones, a true native extract out of mine own body.” 58 So that in him, even according to his manhood, we according to our heavenly being are as branches in that root out of which they grow. To 59 all things he is life, and to men light as the Son of God; to the Church, both life and light 60 eternal by being by being made Son of Man for us, and by being in us a Saviour whether respect [consider] him as God or as man. Adam is in us as an original cause of our nature and of that corruption of nature which causeth death; Christ [is in us] as the 61 cause original of restoration to life. The person of Adam is not in us but his nature and the corruption of his nature derived into all men by propagation; Christ, having Adam's nature as we have,

55 **RH.** John 14.20 ("At that day ye shall know that I am in my Father, and ye in me, and I in you.") John 15.4 ("Abide in me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself, except it abide in the vine; no more can ye, except ye abide in me.")

56 See Genesis 2.21-23.

57 1 Corinthians 15.48 ("As is the earthy, such are they also that are earthy: and as is the heavenly, such are they also that are heavenly. And as we have borne the image of the earthy, we shall also bear the image of the heavenly.")

58 Genesis 2.23. The pleonasm ("a true native extract...") is a paraphrase of the Hebrew text, but true to its meaning.

59 **RH.** John 1.4 ("In him was life; and the life was the light of men.")

60 **RH.** John 6.57 ("As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father: so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me.")

61 **RH.** Hebrews 5.9 ("And being made perfect, he [the Son] became the author of eternal salvation unto all them that obey him..")
but incorrupt, deriveth not nature but incorruption and that immediately from his own person into all that belong unto him. As therefore we are really partakers of the body of sin and death received from Adam, so except we be truly partakers of Christ, and as really possessed of his Spirit, all we speak of eternal life s but a dream.

§ 8. That which quickeneth us is the Spirit of the second Adam, and his flesh [is] that wherewith he quickeneth. That which in him made our nature uncroppt was the union of his deity with our nature. And in that respect the sentence of death and condemnation which only taketh hold upon sinful flesh could no way possibly extend unto him. This caused his voluntary death for others to prevail with God, and to have the force of an expiatory sacrifice. The blood of Christ, as the Apostle witnesseth, doth therefore take away sin, because through the eternal Spirit he offered himself to God without spot. That which sanctified our nature in Christ, that which made it a sacrifice available to take away sin, is the same which quickeneth it, raised it out of the grave after death, and exalted it unto glory. Seeing therefore that Christ is in us as a quickening Spirit, the first degree of communion with Christ must needs consist in the participation of his Spirit which Cyprian in that respect termeth germanissimam societatem, the highest and best society that can be between man and him which is both God and man.

§ 9. These things St Cyril duly considering, reproveth their speeches which taught that only the deity of Christ is the vine whereupon we by faith do depend as branches, and that neither his flesh nor our bodies are comprised in this

62 RH. 1 Corinthians 15.45, 22 (“And so it is written, The first man Adam was made a living soul; the last Adam was made a quickening spirit.” “For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive.”)


64 RH. Cyp. De caena Do. Cap 6. [In fact, Arnold of Bonneval (mid-12th century) was the author of this treatise De coena Domini (“Concerning the Lord’s Supper”), 6. In the sixteenth century, this work was attributed to Cyprian of Carthage (d. 250), and included in editions of Cyprian’s Works.]

65 RH. Cyril in Joh. I. 10. cap 13. [Cyril of Alexandria (d. 444), Commentary on the Gospel of John, Book 10, Chapter 13.]
resemblance. For doth any man doubt but that even from the flesh of Christ our very bodies do receive that life which shall make them glorious at the latter day, and for which they are already accounted parts of his blessed body? Our corruptible bodies could never live the life they shall live, were it not that here they are joined with his body which is incorruptible, and that his [body] is in ours as a cause of immortality, a cause by removing through the death and merit of his own flesh that which hindered the life of ours. Christ is both as God and as man that true vine whereof we both spiritually and corporally are branches. The mixture of his bodily substance with ours is a thing which the ancient Fathers disclaim. Yet the mixture of his flesh with ours they speak of, to signify what our very bodies, through mystical conjunction, receive from that vital efficacy which we know to be in his, and from bodily mixtures they borrow divers similitudes rather to declare the truth than the manner of coherence between his sacred [body] and the sanctified bodies of saints.

66 RH. Nostra quippe et ipsius conjunctio nec miscet personas nec unit substantias, sed affectus consociate et confoederat voluntates. Cyprian, de coena Domini [6]. ["But the conjunction of us and Him neither mixes the persons nor unites the substances, but it does ally the affections and confederates wills."]

67 RH. Quomodo dicunt carnem in corruptionem devinire et non percipere vitam, quae a corpora Domini et sanguine alitur? Irenaeus, Adversus haereses 4.34 [Irenaeus (d. ca. 202), Against the Heresies 4.18.5: "How can they say that flesh passes into corruption and does not partake of life, when it is nourished by the body and blood of the Lord?"]

68 RH. Unde considerandum est non solum aequalis seu conformitate affectionum Christum in nobis esse, verumetiam participation naturali [id est reali et vera] quemadmodum si quis igne liquifacet ceram alii cerae similiter liquefactae ita miscuerit ut unum quid ex utrique factum videature, sic communicatione corporis et sanguinis Christi ipse in nobis est and nos in ipso. Cyril in Joh. lib. 10. cap. 13. [Cyril of Alexandria, Commentary of John’s Gospel, Book 10, chapter 13: For here it must be specially noted that Christ says that he shall be in us, not by a certain relation only by way of the affections, but also by a natural participation. As when one entwines some wax with other wax and melts them by fire, the result is that they become one: so through the participation of Christ’s body and his precious blood, he in us and we also in him are co-united."]
§ 10. Thus much will not Christian man deny, that when Christ sanctified his own flesh – giving as God and taking as man the Holy Ghost – he did not this for himself only but for our sakes, that the grace of sanctification and life which was first received in him might pass from him to his whole race, as malediction came from Adam unto all mankind. Howbeit because the work of his Spirit to those effects is in us prevented by sin and death possessing us before, it is of necessity that as well our present sanctification unto newness of life, as the future restoration of our bodies, should presuppose a participation of the grace, efficacy, merit, or virtue of his body and blood; without which foundation first laid, there is no place for those other operations of the Spirit of Christ to ensue. So that Christ imparteth plainly himself by degrees. It pleaseth him in mercy to account [account] himself incomplete and maimed 69 without us. But most assured we are that we all receive of his fullness, because he is in us as a moving and working cause, from which many blessed effects are really found to ensue – and that, in sundry both kinds and degrees, all tending to eternal happiness. It must be confessed that of Christ, working as a Creator and a Governor of the world by providence, all are partakers – [but] not all [are] partakers of that grace whereby he inhabiteth [those] whom he saveth. Again, as he dwelleth not by grace in all, so neither doth he equally work in all them in whom he dwelleth. 70 Whence is it (saith St Augustine) that

69 RH. Ephesians 1.23. Ecclesia complementum ejus qui implet omnia in omnibus: to πλήρωμα τοῦ πάντα εν πλήρωμιν. [In the Great (a.k.a. Bishops') Bible, which was the Authorised Version in Hooker's day, Ephesians 1.22-23 reads: "And [God] hath made all things subject under [Christ's] feet, and hath appointed him over all things to be the head of the Church, Which is his body, even the fullness of him that filleth all in all things." In a marginal comment, this Version interprets “fullness” as meaning “the great love of Christ toward his Church, that he counteth not himself perfect without us which are his members.”]

70 RH. Augustine, ep. 57 [Letter 57, to Dardanus. – Some thirty-five years ago I took a course in Sacramental Theology from Attila Mikloshazy, S.J., at St Basil’s College. (Ansley Tucker and I were the only two non-Roman Catholics in the class.) A student once asked Fr Mikloshazy to elucidate the doctrine of predestination. “God loves all people enough,” he replied, “he just loves some people more.” This is the sense of what Augustine – and Hooker – were saying.]
some be holier than others are, but because God doth dwell is some more plentifully than in others? And because the divine substance of Christ is equally in all, his human substance equally distant from all, it appeareth that the participation of Christ, wherein there are many degrees and differences, must needs consist in such effects as being derived from both natures of Christ really into us are made our own – and we, by having them in us, are truly said to have him from whom they come; Christ also more or less to inhabit and impart himself as the graces are few or more, greater or smaller, which really flow into us from Christ. Christ is whole with the whole Church, and whole with every part of the Church, as touching his person, which can no way divide itself or be possessed by degrees and portions. But the participation of Christ importeth – besides the presence of Christ’s person, and besides the mystical copulation thereof with the parts and members of his whole Church, – a true, actual influence of grace, whereby the life which we live according to godliness is his, and from him we receive those perfections wherein our eternal happiness consisteth.

§ 11. Thus we participate Christ partly by imputation, as when those things which he did and suffered for us are imputed unto us for righteousness; partly by habitual and real infusion, as when grace is inwardly bestowed while we are on earth and afterwards more fully, both our souls and bodies made like unto his in glory. The first thing of his so

---

71 RH. Galatians 2.20 (“I am crucified with Christ: nevertheless I live: yet not I, but Christ liveth in me: and the life which I now live in the flesh I live by the faith of the Son of God, who loved me, and gave himself for me.”)

72 imputation. God the Father is willing to account believers righteous, not in their own right, but because he accepts the righteousness of his Son in whom they have faith. Cf. the hymn by William Bright (1824–1901): “Look, Father, look on his anointed face, / And look on us only as found in Him.”

73 RH. Isaiah 53.5. Ephesians 1.7. (“But he was wounded for our transgressions, he was bruised for our iniquities: the chastisement of our peace was upon him; and with his stripes we are healed.” “In whom we have redemption through his blood, the forgiveness of sins, according to the riches of his grace....”)
infused into our hearts in this life is the Spirit of Christ, whereupon – because the rest of what kind soever do all both necessarily depend and infallibly also ensure – therefore th’apostles term it sometime “the seed of God,” sometime the “pledge of our heavenly inheritance,” sometime “handsel” or “earnest of that which is to come”. From hence it is that they which belong to the mystical body of our Saviour Christ, and be in number as the stars of heaven, divided successively by reason of their mortal condition into many generations, are notwithstanding coupled every one to Christ their Head and all unto every particular person amongst themselves, inasmuch as the same Spirit, which anointed the blessed soul of our Saviour Christ, doth so formalize, unite, and actuate his whole race, as if both he and they were so many limbs compacted into one body, by being quickened [enlivened] all with one and the same soul.

§ 12. That wherein we are partakers of Jesus Christ by imputation agreeth equally unto all that have it. For it consisteth in such acts and deeds of his as could not have longer continuance than when they were in doing, nor at that very time belong unto any other but him from whom they came; and therefore, how men either then, or before, or since then should be made partakers of them, there can be no way imagined but only by imputation. Again, a

74 RH. Romans 8.9. Galatians 4.6. (“But ye are not in the flesh, but in the Spirit, if so be that the Spirit of God dwell in you. Now if any man have not the Spirit of Christ, he is none of his.” “And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father.”)

75 RH. 1 John 3.9 (“Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin; for his seed remaineth in him: and he cannot sin, because he is born of God.”)

76 RH. Ephesians 1.14 (“Which is the pledge of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession, unto the praise of his glory.”)

77 RH. Romans 8.23 (“And not only they, but ourselves also, which have the firstfruits of the Spirit, even we ourselves groan within ourselves, waiting for the adoption, to wit, the redemption of our body.”) [Handsæl is now obsolete English; it means the first instalment of a payment; “firstfruits” is a synonym, in the biblical sense of offering to God the first produce of flocks and herds and fields and vineyards and orchards, each in their season, because the people owe their land to God.]
deed must either not be imputed to any [other], but rest altogether in him whose it is – or if at all it be imputed, they which have it by imputation must have it such as it is whole. So that degrees being neither in the personal presence of Christ, nor in the participation of those effects which are ours by imputation only, it resteth that we wholly apply them to the participation of Christ’s infused grace – although even in this kind also, the first beginning of life, the seed of God, the firstfruits of Christ’s Spirit be without latitude. For we have hereby only the being of the sons of God, in which number how far soever one may seem to excel another, yet touching this – that all are sons – they are all equals, some happily [as it happens] better sons than the rest are, but none any more a son than another.

§ 13. Thus therefore we see how the Father is in the Son, and the Son in the Father; how they both are in all things, and all things in them; what communion Christ hath with his Church; how his Church, and every member thereof, is in him by original derivation, and he personally in them by way of mystical association wrought through the gift of the Holy Ghost, which they that are his [i.e. Christ’s] receive from him; and together with the same, what benefit soever the vital force of his body and blood may yield – yea, by steps and degrees, they receive the complete measure of all such divine grace as doth sanctify and save throughout, till the day of their final exaltation to a state of fellowship in glory with him whose partakers they are now in those things that tend to glory. As for any mixture of the substance of his flesh with ours, the participation which we have of Christ includeth no such kind of gross surmise.

Chapter 57

The necessity of Sacraments unto the participation of Christ.

It greatly offendeth that some, when they labour to show the use of the holy sacraments, assign unto them no end but only to teach the mind, by other senses, that which the Word [of God] doth teach by hearing. Whereupon how easily neglect
Richard Hooker

and careless regard of so heavenly mysteries may follow, we see in part by some experience had of those men with whom that opinion is most strong. For where the Word of God may be heard, which teacheth with much more expedition and more full explication anything we have to learn, if all the benefit we reap by sacraments be instruction, they which at all times have opportunity of using the better mean to that purpose will surely hold the worse in less estimation. And unto infants which are not capable of instruction, who would not think it a mere superfluity that any sacrament is administered, if to administer the sacraments be but to teach receivers what God doth for them? There is of sacraments, therefore, undoubtedly some other more excellent and heavenly use.

§ 2. Sacraments, by reason of their mixed nature, are more diversely interpreted and disputed of than any other part of [the Christian] religion besides, for that in so great store of properties belonging to the selfsame thing, as every man’s wit [understanding] hath taken hold of some especial consideration above the rest, so they have accordingly seemed one to cross another as touching their several opinions about the necessity of sacraments – whereas in truth their disagreement is not great. For let respect be had to the duty which every communicant doth undertake, and we may well determine concerning the use of sacraments that they serve as [1] bonds of obedience to God, [2] strict obligations to the mutual exercise of Christian charity,\(^{78}\) [3] provocations [incentives] to godliness, [4] preservations from sin, [5] memorials of the principal benefits of Christ. Respect the time of their institution, and it thereby appeareth that God hath annexed them for ever unto the New Testament, as other rites were before with the Old. Regard the weakness which is in us, and they are warrants for the more security of our belief. Compare the receivers of them with such as receive them not, and sacraments of marks of distinction to separate God’s own [people] from strangers.\(^{79}\) So that in all these respects they are found to be most necessary.

\(^{78}\) charity here means self-giving love (in Greek \textit{agapē}; in Latin \textit{caritas}), not the word’s corruption in modern English to mean a hand-out to street-people or anybody else who is “less fortunate” than oneself.
§ 3. But their chiefest force and virtue [i.e. efficacy] consisteth not herein, so much as in that they are heavenly ceremonies which God hath sanctified and ordained to be administered in his Church, first as marks whereby to know when God doth impart the vital or saving grace of Christ unto all that are capable thereof, and secondly as means conditional which God requireth in them unto whom he imparteth grace. For sith [since, because] God in himself is invisible, and therefore cannot by us be discerned [to be] working: therefore, when it seemeth good in the eyes of his heavenly wisdom that men for some special intent and purpose should take notice of his glorious presence, he giveth them some plain and sensible token whereby to know what they cannot see. For Moses to see God and live was impossible. Yet Moses by fire knew where the glory of God extraordinarily was present. The angel by whom God endued the waters of the pool called Bethesda with supernatural virtue [power] to heal, as not seen of [by] any, yet the time of the angel’s presence known by the troubled motions of the waters themselves. Th’apostles, by fiery tongues which they saw, were admonished when the Spirit, which they could not behold, was upon them. In like manner it is with us. Christ and his Holy Spirit with all their blessed effects – though entering into the soul of man we are not able to apprehend of express how – do notwithstanding give

79 *strangers* is a fair rendering of the word “Gentiles,” i.e. those who do not belong to God’s chosen people. “Gentiles” is an English transliteration of the Latin word used in the Vulgate, meaning “races” or “nations”; in the Greek New Testament, the word is *ethnoi*.

80 *means conditional* refers to things which constitute God’s “terms and conditions” of being eligible to receive the grace of Christ.

81 RH. Exodus 3.2 (“And the angel of the LORD appeared unto him in a flame of fire out of the midst of a bush: and he looked, and, behold, the bush burned with fire, and the bush was not consumed.”)

82 RH. John 5.4 (“For an angel went down at a certain season into the pool, and troubled the water: whosoever then first after the troubling of the water stepped in was made whole of whatsoever disease he had.”)

83 RH. Acts 2.3 (“And there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and it sat upon each of them.”)
notice of the times when they use to make their access, because it pleaseth almighty God to communicate by sensible means those blessings which are incomprehensible.

§ 4. Seeing therefore that grace is a consequent of sacraments, a thing which accompanyeth them as their end, a benefit which he that hath receiveth from God himself, the Author of sacraments, and not from any other natural or supernatural quality in them: it may be hereby both understood that sacraments are necessary, and that the manner of their necessity to life supernatural is not in all respects as food unto natural life, because they contain in themselves no vital force or efficacy; they are not physical but moral instruments of salvation, duties of service and worship, which unless we perform as the Author of grace requireth, they are unprofitable. For all receive not the grace of God which receive the sacraments of his grace. Nor is it ordinarily his will to bestow the grace of sacraments on any, but by the sacraments. Which grace also they that receive by sacraments or with sacraments, receive it from him and not from them. For of sacraments the very same is true which Solomon’s wisdom observeth in the brazen [brass] serpent, \textit{He that turned towards it was not healed by the thing he saw but by thee, O Saviour of all}. This therefore the necessity of sacraments.

§ 5. That saving grace which Christ originally is or hath for the general good of his whole Church, by sacraments he severally deriveth into every member thereof; sacraments serve as the instruments of God to that end and purpose – moral instruments, the use whereof is in our hands, the effect his. For the use, we have his express commandment; for the effect, his conditional promise; so that without our obedience to the one, there is of the other no apparent assurance, as contrariwise where the signs and sacraments of his grace are

not either through contempt unreceived, or received with
contempt, we are not to doubt but that they really give what
they promise, and are what they signify. For we take not
baptism nor the Eucharist for bare resemblances or memorials
of things absent, neither for naked signs and testimonies
assuring us of grace received before, but – as they are in deed
and verity – for means effectual whereby God, when we take
the sacraments, deelivereth into our hands that grace
available unto eternal life, which grace the sacraments
represent or signify.
§ 6. There have grown in the doctrine concerning
sacraments many difficulties for want of distinct explication
what kind or degree of grace doth belong unto each
sacrament. For by this it hath come to pass that the true
immediate cause why baptism, and why the Supper of the
Lord, is necessary, few do rightly and distinctly consider. It
cannot be denied but sundry the same effects and benefits
which grow unto men by the one sacrament may rightly be
attributed unto the other. Yet then doth baptism challenge to
itself but the inchoation [beginning] of those graces, the
consummation whereof dependeth on mysteries ensuing. We
receive Christ Jesus in baptism once as the first beginner, in
the Eucharist often as being by continual degrees the finisher
[fulfiller, fulfillment] of our life. By baptism therefore we
receive Christ Jesus, and from him that saving grace which is
proper unto baptism. By the other sacrament we receive him
also imparting therein himself, and that grace which the
Eucharist properly bestoweth. So that each sacrament having

RH. Dum homini bonum invisibile redditur, foris ei ejusdem significatio
per species visibilies adhibetur, ut foris excitetur et intus reparetur. In
ipsa vasis specie virtus exprimitur medicinae. Hugo de Sacram. l. 1. c. 3.
Si ergo vasa sunt spiritualis gratiae sacramenta, non ex suo sanant, quia
vasa aegrotum non currant sed medicina. Idem. l. 1. c. 3. [Hugo of St
Victor, De sacramentis, <‘Concerning the sacraments’>1.9.2: “While an
invisible good is given back to the human being, outwardly by visible
means a representation of the same is afforded him, so that he may be
outwardly aroused and inwardly healed.... In the very nature of the
vessel is expressed the power of the medicine it contains.” “If therefore
sacraments are vessels of spiritual grace, they do not heal in and of
themselves, because the vessels do not heal the sick person, but the
medicine in them.” Hugo of St Victor (d. 1142) was one of the very
greatest of all early scholastic theologians, and his De sacramentis one of
the classics of mediaeval theology.]
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both that which is general or common, and that also which is peculiar unto itself, we may hereby gather that the participation of Christ which properly belongeth to any one sacrament is not otherwise to be obtained but by the sacrament whereunto it is proper.

[Readings Richard Hooker, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* V (1597, 67-68)]
2. George Herbert
(1593-1633)

Communion Poems from

*The Temple*
[George Herbert 1593-1633, Portrait by George White 1674, National Portrait Gallery]
Introduction

GEORGE Herbert was a Latinist, a poet, and a priest of the reformed Church of England, who died of tuberculosis at the rectory of Bemerton, his rural Wiltshire parish, on 1 March 1633. During his brief lifetime – he died just short of his fortieth birthday – Herbert had published only one work, a collection of Latin verse in memory of his late mother. Six months after his death another book of his appeared in print, a slender volume of English lyrics entitled The Temple. Sacred Poems and Private Ejaculations. This work has become a classic in two fields at once – English literature and Christian spirituality. The reputation of Herbert himself has matched the double status of his little book: literary critics rank him as a Major Poet, and the Anglican communion honours him as a Saint. That puts him, and his work, in very select company. In the Christian tradition, only Ephrem of Edessa, John of the Cross, and John Donne share with Herbert such double “canonisation” as major poets and authentic saints.

The basic evidence of Herbert’s sanctity is The Temple itself. The voice of the poems sounds like the voice of someone who has experienced the harshness of grace as well as its sweetness and is all the more genuinely in love with God in Christ Jesus. The testimony of such a literary voice cries out for narrative confirmation: the reader wants to know about the actual life of the poet. The editor of the first edition of The Temple, Nicholas Ferrar, acknowledged

---

1 Both CanBCP 1962 and the BAS, like most other Calendars in the Anglican communion, commemorate Herbert on 27 February. The reason: 1 March is the feast of David, patron saint of Wales. The antiquity and universality of David’s commemoration on that date gives him precedence over any other saint.

2 To seventeenth-century readers, “Ejaculations” meant heart-felt prayers uttered out loud, verbal outbursts either of joyful worship or of penitent sorrow. The Evangelical Christian’s “Praise the Lord!” is an ejaculation in this sense.

3 Ephrem of Edessa (ca. 306-373) is commemorated by the Eastern Orthodox Church on 28 January, by the Roman Catholic Church on 9 June, and by the Episcopal Church of the United States on 10 June. John of the Cross (1542-1591) is commemorated by the Roman Catholic Church on 14 December, and by the Anglican Church of Canada (BAS, with Teresa of Avila) on 15 October. John Donne (1572-1631) is commemorated by the Church of England, the Episcopal Church of the United States, and the Anglican Church of Canada (BAS) on 31 March.

4 Ferrar himself is commemorated in the BAS Calendar on 3 December. He and Herbert became friends around 1626, when Herbert was
the possibility of such a response to Herbert’s poetry. So, in a short preface to the first edition, Ferrar sketched Herbert’s character in terms that made him out to be “justly a companion to the primitive saints, and a pattern or more for the age he lived in.” Ferrar was not alone in his opinion. Even Herbert’s older brother Edward, writing a decade later, acknowledged that “his life was most holy and exemplary, in so much that about Salisbury, where he lived beneficed for many years, he was little less than sainted”. The definitive apotheosis of Herbert came in 1670, when an Anglican publicist named Izaak Walton published *The Life of Mr George Herbert*. Walton, though he had been born in the same year as Herbert and had belonged to Donne’s circle, had to confess that Herbert himself was “to me a stranger as to his person, for I have only seen him”. But these shortcomings did not prevent him from composing a circumstantial and very attractive portrait of A Saint For Our Time. Walton’s *Life of Mr George Herbert* is itself a classic of Anglican hagiography; and as a masterpiece in its own genre, it has shaped and determined how people read Herbert’s poetry.

Walton, then approaching eighty, presented Herbert as an archetype of The Good Churchman – as a paragon of the Church of England’s golden age during the reign of Charles I, when clergy renounced worldly ambition, strictly observed the Prayer Book, walked in the paths of holiness, and (above all) practised quietness.

rebuilding the church of Leighton Bromswold, a few kilometers south of the Ferrar household at Little Gidding.

5 *The Life of Edward, First Lord Herbert of Cherbury, written by himself*, ed. J. M. Shuttleworth (London: Oxford University Press, 1976), pp. 8-9. Edward Herbert (1582-1648) served James I as a diplomat; he went on to gain some repute both as an historian and as an essayist on philosophical and theological questions. His testimony about his younger brother is all the more credible because he went on to remark: “he was not exempt from passion and choler [i.e. a quick temper tinged with arrogance], being infirmities to which all our race is subject; but that excepted, without reproach in his actions.”

6 In the last thirty years a succession of scholars – starting with David Novarr’s *The Writing of Walton’s “Lives”* (1958) – have shown that Walton was either misleading or downright wrong in his use of the facts he had, not shy about inventing more convenient facts, and grossly simplistic (when not tendentious) in his overall interpretation Herbert’s life. An American scholar, Amy M. Charles, has striven to set the record straight (or as straight as the evidence will permit) in *A Life of George Herbert* (1977). But it must be admitted that, for literary style, imaginative power, and sheer attractiveness, Walton’s *Life of Mr George Herbert* will continue to hold the primary place.
It was a lovely vision at a time when Anglicanism was still recovering from the trauma it had suffered during the English Civil Wars.

Walton was, of course, “remembering with advantages”. The Church of England under James I and Charles I had borne little resemblance to Walton’s embodiment of it in the figure of George Herbert. But still more seriously, Walton refused to admit the evidence of The Temple itself. Herbert’s voice is anything but meek, self-deprecating, or quiet. He himself spoke of “my sudden soul”; and such a soul has a voice that is profoundly unquiet – by turns angry and penitent, cunning and submissive, self-pitying and obedient, triumphant and perplexed. Herbert’s sanctity is not that of achieved perfection, impregnable in its purity. It is the sanctity of a very proud man who learns obedience through his perplexity. The holiness of “holy Mr Herbert” resides in his continuous acknowledgement of a sinner’s confusion at finding that he is loved by, and so cannot help but love, a God of ruthless mercy.

This unquiet love is never more evident than in the Communion poems of The Temple. Indeed, as the late Constantine Patrides once observed, “The Eucharist is the marrow of Herbert’s sensibility.” What makes these poems so characteristic of the eucharistic ethos of the reformed Church of England, and yet so uniquely Herbert’s, is their invariable focus on the supperliness of the Lord’s Supper. The rediscovery of communion as a meal was one of the great breakthroughs of Reformed spirituality. But no other Anglican poet, no other Anglican divine, seizes so totally upon the activity of eating and drinking as the very essence of the eucharist. It is as if feasting at the Lord’s table were the one moment when the sinner can least escape the ruthlessness of Love.

FURTHER READING

More than thirty years ago a Lutheran scholar argued that there should be a moratorium on writings about Luther. The same argument could be made about Herbert studies. There is such a thing as too much. What follows is not just the tip of the Herbert-studies iceberg; it is a micron on the peak of the tip of Herbert-studies.

The Works of George Herbert, ed. with commentary by F. E. Hutchison (Oxford, 1941) is the standard edition. Hutchison

collated the surviving manuscripts (where available) with the first-published editions; where the two diverged, he preferred the manuscripts.


The Hutchison version has prevailed in most subsequent editions.

AMY M. CHARLES, _A Life of George Herbert_ (Ithaca/London: Cornell University Press, 1977)

This is a full-bore revisionist correction of Walton’s _Life_.


* 

The Agony

Philosophers have measur’d mountains,
Fathom’d the depths of seas, of states, of kings,
Walked with a staff to heaven, and traced fountains:

But there are two vast, spacious things,
The which to measure it doth more behove,
Yet few there are that sound them – Sin and Love.

Who would know Sin, let him repair8
Unto Mount Olivet; there shall he see
A man so wrung with pains, that all his hair,
His skin, his garments bloody be.

Sin is that press and vice,9 which forceth pain
To hunt his cruel food through ev’ry vein.

Who knows not Love, let him assay10

---

8 _repair_. To go [to someplace] on a regular or habitual basis.

9 _press and vice_. _Press_ as in (1) winepress and (2) an instrument of torture. _A vice_ was also an instrument of torture, but here with the double intende of wickedness – our vices torture Christ.

10 _assay_. Test, as in taste-testing wine.
And taste that juice, which on the cross a pike
Did set again abroach;\(^{11}\) then let him say
If ever he did taste the like.
Love is that liquor sweet and most divine,
Which my God feels as blood, but I as wine.

\(^{\ast}\)

**THE H. COMMUNION**

Not in rich furniture or fine array,
Nor in a wedge of gold,\(^ {12}\)
Thou, who for me wast sold,
To me dost now thy self convey;
For so thou shouldst without me\(^ {13}\) still have been,
Leaving within me sin:

But by way of nourishment and strength
Thou creep’st into my breast,
Making thy way my rest,
And thy small quantities my length;
Which spread their forces into every part,
Meeting sin’s force and art.

Yet can these not get over to my soul,
Leaping the wall that parts
Our souls and fleshy hearts;
But as th’ outworks, they may control
My rebel-flesh, and carrying thy name,
Affright both sin and shame.\(^ {14}\)

---

\(^{11}\) that juice, which on the cross a pike / Did set again abroach. Casks of wine are said to be *broached* (opened), so that the wine may run out.

\(^{12}\) a wedge of gold. An allusion to Joshua 7.21-26, the story of one Achan, who looted the conquered Canaanites, taking and burying, among others things, "a wedge of gold weighing fifty shekels".

\(^{13}\) without me. outside me.

\(^{14}\) Yet can these not get over to my soul... Affright both sin and shame. The elements of bread and wine (*these*) alone have no power to affect the soul. Nevertheless, in Holy Communion, they are like the ramparts of the soul, considered as a besieged city, warding off the attacks of the flesh.
Only thy grace, which with these elements comes,
   Knoweth the ready way,
   And hath the privy key,
   Op’ning the soul’s most subtle rooms;
While those\textsuperscript{15} to spirits refined, at door attend
   Despatches from their friend.

Give me my captive soul, or take
   My body also thither.
Another lift like this will make
   Them both to be together.

Before that sin turned flesh to stone,
   And all our lump to leaven,\textsuperscript{16}
A fervent sigh might well have blown
   Our innocent earth to heaven.

For sure when Adam did not know
   To sin, or sin to smother,
He might to heav’n from Paradise go,
   As from one room t’ another.
Thou hast restored us to this ease
   By this thy heavenly blood;
Which I can go to when I please,
   And leave th’ earth to their food.

\footnote{\textit{those}. I.e. \textit{these elements} mentioned in the first line of this stanza, the bread and the wine.}

\footnote{\textit{turned] all our lump to leaven}. Cf. 1 Corinthians 5.6-8 (KJV): “Your glorying is not good. Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump? Purge out therefore the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened. For even Christ our passover is sacrificed for us: Therefore let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness; but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth.”}
O gracious Lord, how shall I know
Whether in these gifts thou be so
   As thou art ev’rywhere;18
Or rather so, as thou alone
Tak’st all the lodging, leaving none
   For thy poor creature there?19

First I am sure, whether bread stay
Or whether bread do fly away
   Concerneth bread, not me.
But that both thou and all thy train
Be there to thy truth and my gain,
   Concerneth me and thee.

And if in coming to thy foes
Thou dost come first to them, that shows
   The haste of thy good will.
Or if that thou two stations makest
In bread and me, the way thou takest
   Is more, but for me still.

Then of this also I am sure,
That thou didst all these pains endure

17 This poem is taken from the Williams Manuscript, which is in Herbert’s own hand; but it was not included in The Temple. Many scholars have argued that it reflects an earlier phase of Herbert’s thinking about the eucharist, and that he deleted the poem from the final text of The Temple because his mature view had become more “Catholic”. Another explanation is that the poem’s polemical tone and content just did not suit the devotional purpose of the volume. The Temple aimed at converting the heart; and Herbert realised that refuting Roman Catholic and Lutheran doctrines of the Real Presence, as this poem attempts to do, simply had no place in such a programme.

18 Whether in these gifts thou be so / As thou art ev’ry-where. A reference to the Lutheran doctrine of consubstantiation, which was based on the principle of ubiquity – i.e. that Christ’s human body and blood are “in, under, and with” the consecrated bread and wine by virtue of his divinity’s power to be present everywhere at once.

19 thou alone / Tak’st all the lodging, leaving none / For thy poor creature there. A reference to the Roman Catholic doctrine of transsubstantiation, which maintained that the substance of Christ’s body and blood replaces the substance of the bread and wine.
To abolish sin, not wheat.
Creatures are good, and have their place;
Sin only, which did all deface,
Thou drivest from his seat.

I could believe an Impanation\textsuperscript{20}
At the rate of an Incarnation,
If thou hadst died for bread.
But that which made my soul to die,
My flesh and fleshly villainy,
That also made thee dead.

That flesh is there, mine eyes deny –
And what should flesh but flesh descry,
The noblest sense of five?
If glorious bodies pass the sight,
Shall they be food and strength and might
Even there, where they deceive?

Into my soul this cannot pass;
Flesh (though exalted) keeps his grass
And cannot turn to soul.
Bodies and minds are different spheres,
Nor can they change their bounds and meres,
But keep a constant pole.

This gift of all gifts is the best,
Thy flesh the least that I request.
Thou took’st that pledge from me:
Give me not that I had before,
Or give me that, so I have more –
My God, give me all thee.

*\

AARON\textsuperscript{21}

Holiness on the head,
Light and perfections on the breast,

\textsuperscript{20} Impanation. The notion that Christ is now “enbreaded” (Latin \textit{panis}, “bread”) as he was once incarnated, “enfleshed” (Latin \textit{caro, carnis}, “flesh”).

\textsuperscript{21} Herbert here does a Christian “riff” on the priestly vesture of Aaron, as described in Sirach 45.6-13 (cf. Exodus 28).
Harmonious bells below, raising the dead
To lead them unto life and rest:
Thus are true Aarons drest.

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 drest.
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 drest.

Christ is my only head,
My alone only heart and breast,
My only music, striking me ev’n dead,
That to the old man I may rest,
And be in him new drest.

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 drest.

* 

THE INVITATION

Come ye hither all, whose taste
Is your waste;
Save your cost, and mend your fare.
God is here prepared and drest,
And the feast,
God, in whom all dainties are.

Come ye hither all, whom wine
Doth define,
Naming you not to your good:
Weep what ye have drunk amiss,
And drink this,
Which before ye drink is blood.

Cf. Exhortations in the Communion Order of EngBCP 1552/1559.
Come ye hither all, whom pain
Doth arraign,
Bringing all your sins to sight:
Taste and fear not; God is here
In this cheer,
And on sin doth cast the fright.

Come ye hither all, whom joy
Doth destroy,
While ye graze without your bounds:
Here is joy that drowneth quite
Your delight,
As a flood the lower grounds.

Come ye hither all, whose love
Is your dove,
And exalts you to the sky:
Here is love, which having breath
Ev’n in death,
After death can never die.

Lord, I have invited all,
And I shall
Still invite, still call to thee:
For it seems but just and right
In my sight,
Where is All, there all should be.

* 

THE BANQUET

Welcome, sweet and sacred cheer,
Welcome dear;
With me, in me, live and dwell:
For thy neatness passeth sight,
Thy delight
Passeth tongue to taste or tell.

O what sweetness from the bowl
Fills the soul,
Such as is and makes divine!
Is some star (fled from the sphere)
Melted there,
As we sugar melt in wine?
Or hath sweetness in the bread
   Made a head
To subdue the smell of sin;
Flowers, and gums, and powders giving
   All their living,
Lest the Enemy should win?

Doubtless, neither star nor flower
   Hath the power
Such sweetness to impart:
Only God, who gives perfumes,
   Flesh assumes,
And with it perfumes my heart.
But as pomanders and wood
   Still are good,
Yet being bruised are better scented:
God, to show how far his love
   Could improve,
Here, as broken, is presented.
When I had forgot my birth,
   And on earth
In delights of earth was drowned;
God took blood, and needs would be
   Spilt with me,
And so found me on the ground.

Having raised me to look up,
   In a cup
Sweetly he doth meet my taste.
But I still being low and short,
   Far from court,
Wine becomes a wing at last.

For with it alone I fly
   To the sky,
Where I wipe mine eyes, and see
What I seek, for what I sue:
   Him I view,
Who hath done so much for me.

Let the wonder of his pity
   Be my ditty,
And take up my lines and life:
Hearken under pain of death,
   Hands and breath;
Strive in this, and love the strife.

* 

LOVE (III)

Love bade me welcome: yet my soul drew back,
Guilty of dust and sin.
But quick-eyed Love, observing me grow slack
From my first entrance in,
Drew nearer to me, sweetly questioning,
If I lacked any thing.

“A guest,” I answered, “worthy to be here.”
Love said, “You shall be he.”
“I the unkind, ungrateful? Ah my dear,
I cannot look on thee.”
Love took my hand, and smiling did reply,
“Who made the eyes but I?”

“Truth, Lord, but I have marred them: let my shame
Go where it doth deserve.”
“And know you not,” says Love, “who bore the blame?”
“My dear, then I will serve.”
“You must sit down,” says Love, “and taste my meat.”
So I did sit and eat.
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1. Stephen Reynolds

Sacrifices by Resemblance
The Protestant Doctrine of Eucharistic Sacrifice
in Late Elizabethan and Early Stuart Divinity

But for the Christian sacrifice itself..., what the ancient Church
understood thereby, what and wherein the nature of this sacrifice
consisted, is a point, though most needful to be known, yet beyond
belief obscure, intricate and perplexed.²

Thus Joseph Mede, a Cambridge divine of Laudian bent,³ in 1635.
The more things change the more they remain the same: the most
recent Anglican debate on eucharistic sacrifice also concerned “what
the ancient Church understood thereby”.⁴ Such a focus is
unavoidable, even necessary, in an ethos which has so often
presented itself as walking right humbly in the paths of Christian

¹ This is a slightly revised version of an article first published in Toronto Journal of Theology 3/1 (Spring 1987), pp. 79-99.


³ A Laudian was a churchman associated with the programme and policies of William Laud (1573-1645), dean of Gloucester 1616, bishop of St David’s 1621, Bath and Wells 1626, London 1628, archbishop of Canterbury 1633. Laud asserted the need for a “churchly” discipline based on “the beauty of holiness,” in opposition to the Puritan movement’s “godly discipline”.

antiquity. But it does seem odd that modern Anglican scholars have devoted so little study to the way in which the question of eucharistic sacrifice was handled in their own tradition, particularly during that century between the Armada and the Glorious Revolution which so often passes for the classical age of Anglican divinity. It is as if scholars feel they have exhausted what the Elizabethan and Stuart Church of England understood thereby once they have noted the ceaseless efforts to demonstrate how “the sacrifices of Masses... were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits”.  

5 I should like to argue that English doctrine was a tad more “obscure, intricate and perplexed” than this flat negation suggests. For even as they repudiated “the sacrifices of Masses,” English divines canvassed sacrifices in the Lord’s Supper.

What did this mean? In seeking an answer, I have focussed on English divinity between William Perkins, the doyen of “conformable” high Calvinist divines in the late Elizabethan church,  

6 and the Laudian publicists who engaged in the “altar controversy” of 1636-1637. I have chosen this period, not because it witnessed a significant change in the English church’s attitude toward eucharistic sacrifice, but precisely because it witnessed hardly any change at all.

It is common, I know, to label Perkins and other English Calvinists as “puritans” and thus to exclude them as representatives of an “Anglican” mainstream in the period. But we might remember that Perkins himself lived and died in communion with the Church of England as by law established – and that, among English churchmen of all stripes, his published works consistently outsold those of, say, Richard Hooker. In any case, the idea that Calvinism had no share in the native and authentic ethos of the English church was itself an invention of those churchmen, usually bundled together under the label of “Laudians,” who opposed and sought to counteract puritan influences in the Jacobean era. It justly infuriated mainstream

5 *The Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion*, Article XXXI, “Of the one Oblation of Christ finished upon the Cross”.

6 **William Perkins** (1558-1602), priest, Fellow of Christ’s College, Cambridge 1584-1594, and a prolific author whose writings helped to define *Calvinism* both as a doctrinal ideology and as a spirituality. Known as “painful Mr Perkins,” not because it hurt to read or listen to him, but because he *took pains* to elucidate the knottier issues of Scripture and theology and make them comprehensible to a wide audience.
churchmen like John Davenant, bishop of Salisbury and a Calvinist, who did not understand “why that should now be esteemed puritan doctrine, which those held who have done our Church the greatest service in beating down Puritanism”. We need not take at face value the Laudians’ conviction that, in opposition to puritanism, they alone represented the authentic ethos of the reformed Church of England. Indeed, on the question of sacrifice in the Lord’s Supper, Calvinist divines like Perkins and Thomas Morton – himself bishop of Chester, then of Lichfield and Coventry, finally of Durham – happened to be the English church’s most articulate spokesmen. In dealing with the Caroline altar controversy, therefore, we must ask not who was challenging the consensus, but whether anyone publicly challenged the consensus on matters of fundamental importance.

With this question in mind, I propose the following outline. I do not start, as so much Anglican historiography continues to do, with the Laudians’ self-estimation and then read it back into the ecclesiastical situation under Elizabeth I and her first two Stuart successors. Instead, I begin by examining the Elizabethan and early Stuart consensus on “a sacrifice in the Lord’s Supper” and then proceed, in light of that consensus, to look at the Laudians and the Caroline “altar controversy”.

I.

The Church of England received a reformed liturgy before it received any reformed articles of religion; and the 1552 Order for the administracion of the Lordes supper or holy Communion, modestly revised in 1559, remained the English rite under Elizabeth I and her first two Stuart successors. It may be well, therefore, to open the discussion with this liturgy.

In the entire English Communion Order there is but one unmistakable expression of a sacrifice offered by humans directly to God. It occurs at the end of the rite, in the first of two alternative prayers appointed to be said after the receiving of the Sacrament. The priest, speaking on behalf of the communicants, asked God the Father “mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving” and “to grant that, by the merits and death of thy Son

---

7 John Davenant (1572-1641), Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, Cambridge, 1609; leader of English representatives at Synod of Dort (Dortrechte), 1618; bishop of Salisbury, 1621.

Jesus Christ, and through faith in his blood, we and all thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins and all other benefits of his passion”. The prayer then continued:

And here we offer and present unto thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy and lively sacrifice unto thee, humbly beseeching thee, that all we which be partakers of this Holy Communion, may be fulfilled with thy grace and heavenly benediction. And although we be unworthy, through our manifold sins, to offer unto thee any sacrifice, yet we beseech thee to accept this our bounden duty and service, not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences, through Jesus Christ….

The position of this oblation, after the receiving of Communion, as well as the prayer's linking of “our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving” with “the merits and death” of Christ, suggests a reflexive concept of sacrifice. That is to say, sinner-humans could offer sacrifice to God only as a response or reaction to God's initiative in bestowing grace, in this instance, the grace of spiritual participation in Christ. Even then, the only sacrificial response they could offer to this gift was themselves, their souls and bodies. All this – the position of the oblation, its personal rather than material nature, and the fact that the English rite refers to no other oblation save Christ’s “one oblation of himself once offered” – suggests a concept of sacrifice which was, in the strictest possible sense, solafidian.

Before we take this as the last word on sacrifice in the English liturgy, we might flip a few pages back and consider two other moments in the English rite. The first moment is the offertory, which included not only the scriptural sentences introducing the collection of alms and the collection itself, but also the long intercessory prayer “for the whole estate of Christ's church militant here in earth”. Of the twenty offertory sentences provided, ten refer to the duty of providing for the needs of the poor, four to the duty of providing for the minister’s needs, and the rest to the duty of walking in holiness and righteousness. The intercessory prayer, immediately following the collection, included a brief oblation of the alms: “We humbly beseech thee most mercifully to accept our alms and to receive these our prayers which we offer unto thy divine majesty…” The alms and the prayers thus became sacrificial actions offered to God for his acceptance – and that, before the reception of the grace of communion. This might suggest that certain human acts, eleemosynary in character, did indeed represent, on the part of the offering individuals, something more than a merely imputed righteousness.
The offertory, however, was not intrinsically connected to the Supper itself. For the service might be – and, from 1559 until the end of the nineteenth century, usually was – concluded at the end of the intercessory prayer, with the addition of “one or more” of the collects specially provided for just this purpose. Immediately after the Intercession came the texts of three Exhortations. Only the third, commonly called “the Long Exhortation,” had to be read out at every celebration of the holy Communion; and its reading marked the beginning of the Supper-rite proper. All three, however, recommended the same discipline of preparation for a worthy receiving, for the sort of receiving whereby “we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ, and drink his blood... we dwell in Christ and Christ in us, we be one with Christ, and Christ with us” The point of this discipline was that each intending communicant should renew herself or himself in the dynamics of grace, in that transcendent context of which the Supper was both a sign and a pledge. And the instrumental means of this renewal was, of course, faith – faith in the sense of assurance.

Assurance is a reflexive event: one may know something immediately, but one can be assured of it only by a considered act of judgment. Such acts of judgment require evidence on which to work. And what was the evidence? Not any subjective state of mind; English protestants in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries abhorred “enthusiasm” as keenly as their eighteenth-century progeny. Instead, assurance found its evidence in the performance of “the duties of the moral law”. The second Exhortation in the Communion Order called upon intending communicants

so to search and examine your own consciences, as you should come holy and clean to a most godly and heavenly feast, so that in no wise you come but in the marriage garment, required of God in Holy Scripture, and so come and be received as worthy partakers of such a heavenly table. The way and means is: First to examine your lives and conversation by the rule of God’s commandments, and whereinsoever ye shall perceive yourselves to have offended, either by will, word, or deed, there bewail your own sinful lives, confess yourselves to Almighty God, with full purpose of amendment of life.

This Exhortation was obviously meant to be read out on a Sunday before the Communion Sunday; and so the discipline it recommended was to be performed before the celebration of holy Communion – not during the celebration, as in the General

---

9 “And to the end that we should alway remember the exceeding great love of our master and only Saviour Jesus Christ... he hath instituted and ordained holy mysteries, as pledges of his love....” EngBCP 1552/1559, Communion Order, Third Exhortation.
Confession, for then it was too late. In other words, the sacrifice one offered in the Supper was the thankful assurance of a heart already forgiven, of a conscience actually pure.

Gregory Dix argued that these reflexive acts, repentance, assurance and thanksgiving, coming as they did “in the position of the old ‘offertory prayers,’ between the offering of alms and the dialogue and preface,” replaced bread and wine as the “elements” which were presented and offered up to God in the Lord’s Supper of the reformed Church of England. This is true, so far as it goes. What needs to be brought out more clearly is, that the essential sacrifice ought to have taken place before, and therefore outside, the eucharist itself. But, as we have already seen, this same act constituted the oblation which was offered after communion. In other words, an English communicant of the early seventeenth century was supposed to have been making the same sacrifice coming and going. This suggests that the faithful offered in the Supper itself no kind of oblation which was proper to the Supper itself, no kind of oblation which could not be performed equally well outside the liturgical enactment of the eucharistic mystery. Indeed, the sacrifice in question – personal in nature and moral in its reference – was the precondition for “a worthy receiving,” and unless a person had already made it before entering the parish church on Communion-Sunday, he or she could not be said to be grounded in Christ, in that mystical context which the Supper signified and confirmed.

II.

When late Elizabethan and early Stuart divines took up the issue of eucharistic sacrifice, they tended to use their Church’s Communion Order less as a direct source than as a resource of exemplary texts for positions already adopted; and the positions they adopted tended to be those outlined by continental Protestant divines such as Philip Melanchthon, John Calvin, and Heinrich Bullinger. For these reformers the issue had not been whether the Lord’s Supper involved a sacrifice, but rather what kind of sacrifice it involved. English divines generally followed them in distinguishing and opposing two kinds of sacrifice. On the one hand there was sacrifice “properly” so called.


As defined by William Perkins, this was “a sacred or solemn action in which man offereth and consecrateth some outward bodily thing unto God for this end, to please and honour him thereby”. Convention qualified this kind of sacrifice as “propitiatory” or “expiatory,” and assumed that it involved the destruction of a material victim. On the other hand there were sacrifices so called “improperly, that is, only by way of resemblance”. Again, convention qualified this other kind of sacrifice as “eucharistical” and, above all, as “spiritual”.

Needless to say, English divinity believed that humans dwelling in the shadow of the Cross could no longer offer proper sacrifice, because Christ “made there (by his one oblation of himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world”. It was the crime of the Roman church to have claimed that the priest “in this sacrament offers Christ's body and blood to God the Father really and properly under the forms of bread and wine”. Roman Catholics thus impugned the uniqueness of the Saviour’s oblation of himself, denied the perfect sufficiency of his atonement for sins, and blasphemed against his eternal priesthood. But English divines never denied that Christians could, indeed should, offer sacrifices improperly so called, that is, spiritual sacrifices.

Once this was allowed, English divinity had to identify those aspects of the eucharist which might be accounted sacrificial.

---

12 William Perkins, *A Reformed Catholike: or, A Declaration shewing bow neere we may come to the present Church of Rome in sundrie points of Religion: and wherein we must for ever depart from them* (Cambridge, Printed by John Legat, 1598), p. 204.


Sacrifices by Resemblance

Lancelot Andrewes, in a sermon delivered in 1592, maintained that the Lord’s Supper was a sacrifice in three ways: (1) in that “we not only use it as a nourishment spiritual..., but as a means also to renew a covenant with God by virtue of [Christ’s once-for-all] sacrifice”; (2) in that “the bread which we break is the partaking of Christ’s true body – and not of a sign, figure or remembrance of it”; and (3) in that “as in the former [breaking of bread] Christ communicateth himself to us, so we in this latter communicate ourselves with our poor brethren, that so there may be a perfect communion”.

William Perkins also allowed “three respects” in which the eucharist might be “truly” (but not “properly”) called a sacrifice: (1) so far as it was “a memorial of the real sacrifice of Christ,” containing “a thanksgiving to God for the same”; (2) so far as “every communicant doth there present himself, body and soul, a living, holy and acceptable sacrifice unto God”; and (3) in respect of “that which was joined with the sacrament, namely the alms given to the poor as a testimony of our thankfulness unto God”.

Finally, Thomas Morton, in his exhaustive review of the eucharistic controversy with Rome, Of the Institution of the Sacrament of the Blessed Body and Blood of Christ (1631), settled on four “sorts of spiritual sacrifices”: (1) “the sacrifice of mortification in act and of martyrdom in vow”; (2) “a sacrifice eucharistical,” that is, “our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving”; (3) “a sacrifice latreutical, that is, of divine worship”; and (4) “a sacrifice propitiatory”.

For English divinity, then, the primary (but not the only) mode of sacrifice in the eucharist was taken to be the commemoration of Christ’s sacrifice on the Cross. But, we might ask, in what sense is a reflexive act like commemoration a sacrificial event? Richard Field, in Of the Church (1606), arguing the primitive doctrine of the western


17 Perkins, Reformed Catholike, p. 205.

18 Morton, Of the Institution 6.7.3 [sig. (H)v]. In instancing the first three sorts of sacrifice, Morton quoted phrases from the first post-communion prayer in the English Communion Order. I should also point out that Morton launched into a controversial discussion of propitiatory sacrifice without making it immediately clear that he meant it to be the fourth sort. This did not appear until Book 6.12.1 [sig. (I4)v].
Sacrifices by Resemblance

Church against “Romish” innovations by an analysis of no less an authority than the Roman Canon itself, suggested that the commemorative sacrifice in the Lord’s Supper was twofold, inward and outward: outward, as the taking, breaking and distributing the mystical bread, and pouring out the cup of blessing, which is the communion of the blood of Christ. The inward consisteth in the faith and devotion of the Church and the people of God, so commemorating the death and passion of Christ their crucified Saviour and representing and setting it before the eyes of the Almighty, that they fly unto it as their only stay and refuge, and beseech him to be merciful unto them for his sake that endured all these things to satisfy his wrath and work their peace and good.\textsuperscript{19}

The eucharistic memorial was more than a retrospective act. It involved a pleading of Christ’s once-for-all sacrifice; and this pleading translated the remembrance into an eternal or mystical present, where God was reminded of the oblation rendered by his only Son. Thomas Morton carried this idea one step further when he used the authority of Ambrose to argue a twofold oblation of Christ:

Saint Ambrose [set] forth two kinds of offerings of Christ, here on earth and above in heaven... And this our offering of him he calleth but an image, and that above he calleth the truth: clearly shewing that we have in our offering Christ’s body only as it is crucified, which is the object of our commemoration. But the same body, as it is now the personal subject of a present time and place, they behold it in heaven; even the same body which was once offered on the Cross by his passion, by presentation in heaven, here in the Church only by our representation sacramentally on earth.\textsuperscript{20}

The commemorative sacrifice was not only the pleading of a past event. It was also an image, a shadow, a reflection of that event’s heavenly consummation. But the image of a thing is not the thing itself: Morton’s statement depends upon an implicit opposition


\textsuperscript{20} Morton, \textit{Of the Institution} 6.5.5 [sigs. (E2)r-(E2)y]. Morton was citing Ambrose, \textit{De officis} I, § 48. Calvin, in his polemics against the Roman doctrine of the Mass, made a great deal of Christ’s heavenly priesthood. Morton, as here, and Perkins [note 15 above] picked up on this theme, but did not really develop it. The motif of “the altar in heaven” did not become a major theme in English eucharistic spirituality until later in the seventeenth century, when Jeremy Taylor, John Bramhall, and Daniel Brevint (among others) made it the focus of their treatments of eucharistic sacrifice.
between the earthly image and the heavenly reality it represented. The commemorative sacrifice on earth did not participate in the original, once-for-all sacrifice, any more than a reflection in a mirror really participates in the being of the person therein reflected.

On the flip-side of this theological problem lay a problem more narrowly sacramental. As Field’s assertion of a twofold sacrifice in the eucharistic memorial bears witness, English divinity knew that it had to relate the spiritual act of anamnesis to the necessarily visible action of the eucharistic liturgy. One way of doing this was to insist, as Andrewes had done, that “the partaking of Christ’s true body,” the liturgical act of communion itself, was one of the modes of sacrifice; but Andrewes — and possibly Richard Hooker\(^{21}\) — were the only divines in the Elizabethan and early Stuart periods who explicitly make this connection. Another way, which we saw not only in Andrewes but also in Perkins, was to include alms among the spiritual sacrifices; an odd expedient, we might think, since alms are by definition “some outward bodily thing”. But English divines resorted to other aspects of the liturgy in their need to tie the inward to the outward. Perkins, for instance, offered this explanation as to how reformed Christians might believe that “the very body of Christ is offered in the Lord’s Supper”:

> For as we take the bread to be the body of Christ sacramentally by resemblance and no otherwise, so the breaking of bread is sacramentally the sacrificing or offering of Christ upon the cross.\(^{22}\)

By “the breaking of bread” Perkins obviously meant the *fractio panis* in the eucharistic rite itself. This ritual action was not prescribed in the rubrics of the English rite until the 1662 revision. Nevertheless, the fraction seems to have been so widely practised in the late Elizabethan and early Stuart church, as to make its symbolic connection with the commemoration of Christ’s sacrifice something of a commonplace among English divines. “The breaking of the bread,” declared the red-hot puritan William Bradshaw, “signifieth, in


a mystery, the breaking of Christ’s body, that is, all the unspeakable torments that he suffered in his own person for our sins.” Likewise Andrewes, the very opposite of any kind of puritan, maintained that the eucharist might indeed be considered a sacrifice “in the representation of the breaking the bread and the pouring forth the cup”. And we saw Field allude to the same actions in the extended quotation above. But in all of these instances, the sacrificial value of the fraction, as a ritual act in the Lord’s Supper, was more or less purely metaphorical. The “matter” of the sacrifice was not Christ himself, but the action’s extrinsic resemblance to the destruction of a victim and, more importantly, the commemoration of Christ’s sacrifice which this resemblance was supposed to occasion in the minds of the faithful.

Here, perhaps, we come to the doctrinal crunch. Even if a liturgical event like the fraction was assigned a sacrificial significance, and even if this event could have this significance nowhere else but in the Lord’s Supper, it nevertheless remained that the action itself did not constitute a sacrifice. The real sacrifice consisted, as Field implied, “in the faith and devotion of the Church and people of God” – that is, in the intellectual and affective act of commemoration and thanksgiving to which the outward actions moved the beholders. It was this faith and devotion – allied, to be sure, with the dominical words of institution – that gave the outward actions their significance. The Lord’s Supper might provide a particular occasion for the “sacrifice” of a commemoration of Christ crucified, but the nature of the sacrifice thus occasioned remained the same as the everyday sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving which any Christian might perform. English divines thus tended to slide the liturgical action, considered as a sacrifice “by resemblance,” back into the transcendent context which made it meaningful. The only exceptions were Andrewes and possibly Hooker, both of whom


24 Lancelot Andrewes, First Answer to Cardinal Perron; in Minor Works, Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology (Oxford: J. H. Parker, 1854), p. 20. By “the pouring forth the cup” Andrewes probably meant the cup-ritual practised in nearly all Reformed liturgies of the time: a flagon of wine was placed on the Table, and the wine was blessed in this container; then, just before the Communion, the wine was poured from the flagon into the cup. This action was supposed to bear a likeness to the outpouring of blood from the pierced side of the Saviour on the Cross.

25 Morton, Of the Institution 6.3.7 [sig. (C2)r].
identified the liturgical act of communion as one of the modes of sacrifice.

Perkins originally had defined “improper” sacrifice simply, and with no further qualification, as “the duties of the moral law”. For these were the “everyday” dimension of spiritual sacrifice, of which the liturgical dimension was an enacted sign or metaphor. The everyday oblation by which individuals performed the duties of the moral law provided the evidential guarantees of faith-as-assurance, and assurance was the ground and context of “a worthy receiving”. But all this also made the sacrifice in the eucharist valid *ex opere operantium*, not *ex opere operato*. Morton made the point in a backhanded way while trying to deny “the papists” the use of a standard biblical text, Malachi 1.11. Irenaeus, he said,

plainly putteth the difference to be made by Malachi between the sacrifices as they were the offerings of wicked Jews and the sacrifices of godly Christians. And he giveth this reason, because the Jews (saith he) offered up their oblations with wicked hearts, but the Christians perform theirs with pure consciences.

The sacrifice in the eucharist was not constituted by the things offered – bread, wine, the alms – nor even by the actions performed with these things. For the enactment of the liturgy, and particular actions in the liturgy, were acceptable to God only so far as the offerers were themselves acceptable to God, in virtue of their “pure consciences”.


27 As Perkins argued in Point XIX of *The Reformed Catholike*, pp. 295-304. The phrases *ex opere operantium* and *ex opere operato* were scholastic coinages based on Augustine’s doctrine of what constituted a valid sacrament. *Ex opere operantium* means that a sacrament is valid by virtue of the moral character of the person performing the work; *ex opere operato* means that a sacrament is valid by virtue of the work itself being performed according to the mind and intention of the Church. Augustine and, with him, the subsequent Catholic tradition maintained that the moral character of the presiding celebrant had nothing to do with a sacrament’s validity; it was valid *ex opere operato*.

28 “For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same my name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering: for my name shall be great among the heathen, saith the LORD of hosts.”

29 Morton, *Of the Institution* 6.4.3 [sig. (D3)v]. The citation is *Adversus haereses* IV, § 34.
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We may now take up Morton’s surprising concession of “a sacrifice propitiatory”. Morton of course denied that Protestants offered this kind of sacrifice as a sacrifice “which pacifieth the wrath of God and pleaseth him by its own virtue and efficacy”. Instead, Morton argued, Protestants offered a sacrifice which was truly (if “improperly”) propitiatory in the sense that it pleased God “by complacency”. The sacrifice in question, the liturgical commemoration of Christ’s sacrifice, was pleasing to God for no other reason but that God, in his sovereign will and unconditioned freedom, had chosen to appoint and accept such sacrifice. Having thus redefined “propitiatory,” Morton went on to maintain:

... Protestants, celebrating the eucharist with faith in the Son of God, and offering up to God the commemoration of his death, and man’s redemption thereby..., and thereby pouring out their whole spirit of thankfulness unto God...: All these (I say) and other duties of holy devotion being performed not according to man’s invention..., but to that direct and express prescript and ordinance of Christ himself – it is not possible, but that their whole complemen tal act of celebration must needs be, through God’s favour, propitious and well-pleasing in his sight.30

Daring as Morton’s appropriation of the term “propitiatory” may have been, it worked upon a principle which the great Calvin himself had sketched. For Calvin had maintained that spiritual sacrifices in the eucharist included not only the believer’s self, but also his or her “good works” – and that such sacrifices “from the hands of those whom he has reconciled to himself by other means” were “pleasing and acceptable to God”.31 God may have ordained that humans should offer him spiritual sacrifices, and he may always have taken the initiative by bestowing sufficient grace to enable their performance, but the humans thus engraced still had to enact their own freedom in such a way as to offer the sacrifices. When they made their commemorative oblation in the Lord’s Supper, then, redeemed humans performed towards God a free activity which, precisely as such, was well-pleasing in God’s eyes. Spiritual sacrifices and their representation in the Lord’s Supper were, in a word, meritorious. Morton, of course, did not use the word. Nevertheless, it is hard to see what else he meant. Spiritual sacrifices may have been meritorious only “by complacency,” that is, by God’s entirely

30 Ibid., 6.12.1 [sig. (I4)v]; cf. 6.7.3 [sig. (H2)v].

gracious decision to regard them as such, and not intrinsically; but they still were reckoned unto the offering humans as righteousness.

III.

From the mid-1620s onward, the English nation’s paranoid fear of “The Popish Plot” entered one of its active phases. Nothing did more to feed these suspicions than the activities of the Laudian party. Adversarial in temperament, impatient of theological debate, Laudian churchmen typically concerned themselves with those matters where piety and ecclesiastical discipline intersected. This led them to seek reforms in the conduct of public worship, which they regarded as unconscionably sloppy and irreverent. “But this is the misery,” William Laud himself complained, “tis superstition nowadays for any man to come with more reverence into a church than a tinker and his bitch come into an ale-house.” Taking the Chapel Royal and certain cathedrals for their model, Laud and those who shared his mind sought to remedy the situation by insisting that parishes should alter their arrangements for holy Communion and, in particular, their disposition of the Lord’s Table.

English custom since 1559 had been to treat the Table as a portable piece of furniture – in the indignant words of John Pocklington, himself a red-hot Laudian, “to make a Daedalus-engine of the Lord’s Table, and so to set the Church on wheels, and to run it in and out of the pious and reverend practice of holy and unreproved antiquity.” Of all the measures which the Laudians took to establish

32 “It was not so much doctrine as discipline which was the distinguishing mark of the Laudian; Arminian he may have been in the broad sense, but he was an Arminian with a belief in a ‘godly discipline’ as rigid as an presbyterian Puritan.” T. M. Parker, “Arminianism and Laudianism in Seventeenth-Century England,” Studies in Church History 1, ed. C. W. Dugmore and Charles Duggan (London: Thomas Nelson & Sons, 1964), pp. 33-34.

33 William Laud, A speech delivered in the Starr-Chamber on Wednesday, the XIVth of June, MDCXXXVII. at the Censure of John Bastwick, Henry Burton, and William Prinn; Concerning pretended Innovations in the Church (London, Printed by R. Badger, 1637), p. 46.

34 John Pocklington, Altare Christianum: or the dead Vicars plea. Wherein the Vicar of Gr. being dead, yet speaketh and pleadeth out of Antiquity, against them that hath broken down his Altar (London, Printed by R. Badger, 1637), p. 67. For an account of pre-Laudian arrangements and Laudian reforms, see G. W. O. Addleshaw and Frederick Etchells, The Architectural Setting of Anglican
their discipline of reverence, however, none so outraged bien-pensant Protestantism as their practice of bowing towards the Table and, worse, their insistence that good Protestants might call the Table itself an *altar*. In conservative eyes and ears, such behaviour and such language constituted a palpable endorsement of that “Romish” doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice which the Church of England expressly denounced and repudiated.

Conservative rage simmered throughout the 1620s with very few outlets. In the event, it was the Laudian publicist Peter Heylyn who turned up the heat. His tract, *A coale from the altar* (1636), attacked a letter written in 1627 by John Williams, then bishop of Lincoln, in which the bishop had reprimanded the “laudianizing” Vicar of Grantham, one Titley. Williams replied to Heylyn with *The Holy Table, Name and Thing* (1637). This brought forth Laudian counter-blows, for example, Heylyn’s own *Antidotum Lincolnense* (1637) and John Pocklington’s *Altare Christianum* (1637). The contro-versy died down towards the end of 1637, after Williams was convicted and imprisoned on an unrelated charge of suborning jurors.

Williams and other conservative anti-Laudians concen-trated on the implications of calling the Table an *altar*. As Williams remarked:

> We have no altar in regard of an oblation, but we have an altar – that is, a table – in regard of a participation and communion there granted unto us. The proper use of an altar is to sacrifice upon, the proper use of a table is to eat upon.

In the first sentence Williams seemed to concede the name altar, so long as it was understood to mean table; in the second sentence he seemed to take back the concession. In this he reflected English divinity’s attempt to deal with the fact that (as Perkins had expressed it) “the ancient Fathers have called the sacrament an unbloody sacrifice, and the Table an altar, and the ministers priests, and the whole action an oblation”. Perkins (and others) insisted, with some justice, that the Fathers had used such terms metaphorically and

---


35 John Williams, *The Holy Table Name and Thing More antiently, properly, and literally used under the New Testament, then that of an Altar* (Lincoln, n.p., 1637), p. 17. This passage comes from Williams’s “Letter to the Vicar of Grantham,” which prefaced the work. The last sentence in the quotation is itself a quotation from Nicholas Ridley’s “Reasons why the Lord’s board should rather be after the form of a table, than of an altar” (1550).
“only by resemblance”. Moreover, English divines went on to imply that these terms, though permissible in the time of the Church’s innocence, were no longer so: the Roman church had put the Fathers’ language to superstitious use, so that the ancient terminology, even when rightly understood, could no longer serve as an example for present usage. As it happens, the Laudians never questioned the standard interpretation, that the Fathers’ intent in speaking of an altar and an unbloody sacrifice had been metaphorical. But they refused to see why the same terminology, thus qualified, was impermissible in a truly reformed Church. After all, they argued, the ancient Church was the norm according to which the Church of England had reformed itself. Since the ancient Church had called the Lord’s Table an altar, the Laudians maintained, so could they and all other English Protestants.

For the rest, Laudian publicists cleaved to the Reformed consensus in the matter of eucharistic sacrifice. Heylyn and Pocklington simply repudiated any idea that the eucharist might be a real, expiatory sacrifice: the only sacrifices available to Christians were improper in denomination and spiritual in nature. Archbishop Laud himself, in his *Conference with Mr Fisher the Jesuit*, spoke of three sorts of sacrifice, which bore close resemblance to Perkins’s three respects:

For, at and in the eucharist, we offer up to God three sacrifices: one by the priest only, that is, the commemorative sacrifice of Christ’s death, represented in bread broken and wine poured out; another by the priest and people jointly, and that is the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving for all the benefits and graces we receive by the precious death of Christ; the third by every particular man for himself only, and that is the sacrifice of every man’s body and soul, to serve him [i.e. Christ] in both all the rest of his life for this blessing bestowed on him. Now, thus far

---


these dissenting churches agree, that in the eucharist there is a sacrifice of duty and a sacrifice of praise and a sacrifice of commemoration.\textsuperscript{39}

Heylyn, for his part, argued for two kinds of spiritual sacrifices, “spiritual” and “mystical”. Spiritual sacrifices, he said, were the sort which anybody might perform in private, “whereof there is not anything visible”. Mystical sacrifice was the liturgical commemoration of Christ’s sacrifice:

which purposely is represented unto the eye, that it may strike the deeper into the heart. The breaking of the bread, and the effusion of the wine, are they not sensible representations of [Christ’s] death for us, the offering up of his body on the Cross, and shedding his most precious blood for our redemption?\textsuperscript{40}

Pocklington made a similar distinction. On the one hand, he said, there were those sacrifices which any Christian might offer, such as “fasting, prayer, mortification, alms-deeds, praising of God, reading and preaching of God’s Word”. On the other hand, there was “the sacrifice of the altar, wherein the death and passion of Jesus Christ is commemo-rated in the consecration of the bread and wine and breaking and delivering them to the faithful,” which was “the peculiar function of the priest to perform.”\textsuperscript{41} Such distinctions served to reinforce the hierarchical order and discipline so dear to the Laudians. Still, the essential doctrine would appear to coincide with that set forth by Perkins, Field and Morton: the Lord’s Supper was a sacrifice only in an “improper” or metaphorical sense, by virtue of the extrinsic resemblance which certain actions had to Christ’s real oblation of himself on the Cross. Indeed, Heylyn and Pocklington cut nowhere near as close to Romanism as Morton had done when he attempted to give the word “propitiatory” a meaning which would be acceptable in Reformed divinity.

The most original contribution to the English doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice was, in fact, made just before the outbreak of the altar controversy. This was Joseph Mede’s \textit{The Christian Sacrifice}, a


\textsuperscript{40} Heylyn, \textit{Antidotum Lincolnense}, sig. Bb2r.

\textsuperscript{41} Pocklington, \textit{Altare Christianum}, pp. 103-104.
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discourse which Mede delivered in 1635 in the chapel of Christ’s College, Cambridge. Mede’s concern was with the doctrine of Christian antiquity, but he took it for granted that, once this was established, it was binding on the Church of England. Mede believed that “the 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.”

According the mind of the ancient Church, Mede argued, the eucharist had been

An oblation of thanksgiving and prayer to God the Father through Jesus Christ and his sacrifice commemorated in the creatures of bread and wine, wherewith God had first been agnized [i.e. acknowledged].

In ancient usage, Mede went on to say, the bread and wine had been

first presented as symbols of praise and thanksgiving, to agnize God the Lord of the creature...; then, by invocation of the Holy Ghost, made symbols of the body and blood of Christ... So that the whole Service consisted throughout of reasonable part and of a material part, as of a soul and a body.

Field would have found this twofold interpretation unexceptionable; even Morton allowed that the bread and wine, as such, did indeed constitute “the subject matter of the eucharist,” and therefore the subject matter of a sacrifice, “but unproperly”. Mede perhaps showed his Laudian bent when, as Heylyn and Pocklington were to do, he insisted that the true Christian sacrifice was “not the private prayer of every Christian,” but “the public prayer of the Church as a body... , which the Church offered unto God when she presented herself before him, as one body in Christ by the mystical communication of his body and blood”. But Mede went beyond Morton, beyond even Heylyn and Pocklington. By insisting that the elements symbolized first creation, then the redemptive body and blood of Christ, Mede gave the elements a sacrificial value in their own right. He carried through on this insight when he refined his original definition of sacrifice. He disposed of the conventional dichotomy, which designated sacrifices as either “proper” or

---


44 Morton, Of the Institution 6.5.1 [sigs. (D4)v-(E)r].
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“improper,” by insisting that neither the matter nor the method constituted sacrifice. To his mind, a sacrifice was

an offering whereby the offerer is made partaker of his God’s table, in token of covenant and friendship with him…. Or more explicity thus: an offering unto the divine Majesty of that which is given for the food of man, that the offerer, partaking thereof, might, as by way of pledge, be certified of his acceptation into covenant and friendship with his God, by eating and drinking at his table.46

Mede here touched all the right Reformed bases. As he did so, however, he developed an idea which Andrewes had broached when he identified “the partaking of Christ’s true body” as a mode of Christian sacrifice. As for Andrewes, so for Mede, the true eucharistic sacrifice was the “banquet of heavenly food” itself. Mede’s contribution was to lay bare the idea’s exegetical foundations and then deliberately to build upon them. He thus discovered an intrinsic connection between spiritual sacrifice and the Lord’s Supper, a connection which could not be simply resolved into the everyday sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving.

Mede’s discourse did not see print until 1648, a full decade after its author’s death. So far as I have been able to discover, it had no impact whatever upon “the altar controversy” of 1636-1637. But Mede was not alone in thinking that an oblation of bread and wine must be made explicit, and that this oblation must be directly related both to the memorial of Christ's sacrifice and to the communion. About the same time, north of the Tweed, the Scottish bishops were engaged in drafting a version of the English Communion Order for use in their own Church. Under the influence of James Wedderburn, bishop of Dunblane, they came up with a rite whose Prayer of Consecration clearly took as its norm the English canon of 1549. This Scottish prayer included the 1549 epiclesis, in the same position, just before the institution-narrative:

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

The Scots prayer acknowledged the bread and wine to be of God's
creation, but it did not expressly offer them – yet. The oblation came
immediately after the institution-narrative, at which point a rubric
directed the presbyter to say “this memorial or prayer of oblation”:

Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, according the institution of thy
dearly beloved Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, we thy humble servants do
celebrate and make here before thy Divine Majesty, with these thy holy
gifts, the memorial which thy Son hath commanded us to make; having
in remembrance his blessed passion, mighty resurrection, and glorious
ascension; rendering unto thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable
benefits procured unto us by the same. And we entirely desire thy
Fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and
thanksgiving, most humbly beseeching thee to grant, that by the merits
and death of thy Son Jesus Christ....

The rest of this prayer duplicated the wording of the first post-
communion prayer of 1552, which we discussed earlier. But the ethos
of the 1552 prayer had been drastically reoriented. In the Scots Prayer
of Consecration the phrase, “this our sacrifice of praise and
thanksgiving,” no longer referred to an act of remembrance which
took place more or less exclusively within the minds of the human
subjects. The commemorative oblation was now tied to the physical
elements of bread and wine, which themselves had become, in the
strictest possible sense, consecrated symbols of Christ’s body and
blood. Wedderburn and the Scots bishops had discovered a mode of
sacrifice which was specific to the eucharistic liturgy – and they had
realized this mode of sacrifice within the liturgy itself.

The new Scots rite came into use on Sunday, 23 July 1637. Rioting
broke out in Edinburgh, and use of the new Book was soon
afterwards suspended. This rejection of the 1637 liturgy by Scots
Presbyterians had less to do with its content than with the fact that it

47 “The Order of the Administration of the Lord’s Supper, or Holy
Communion, being the Text of the Scottish Liturgy of 1637,” in W.
Jardine Grisbrooke, ed., Anglican Liturgies of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth
one of those ironies of liturgical history, placing the epiclesis before the
institution-narrative has become known as “the Roman position”.

48 Ibid., p. 178.
had been composed, and imposed, by bishops.\(^49\) In any case, with its still-birth, we come to the end of our period. In England, the Laudians seemed triumphant: 1635-1636 had seen a second wave of leading puritans emigrate to the Massachusetts Bay in despair; Bishop Williams had been silenced; the conservative opposition had been given food for thought in the brutal sentences passed on Burton, Bastwick, and Prynne; and parishes began to acquiesce in the “Laudianisation” of their chancels. But the disaster in Scotland presaged the greater disaster of civil war; and the calm which appeared to surround the question of eucharistic sacrifice was soon to be swallowed up in the wrath of more political sacrifices.

The English “altar controversy,” with its Scots dénouement, thus seems to offer nothing more than a definitive example of *odium theologicum*, a prime instance of divines arguing at cross-purposes with one another, about issues more cosmetic than substantial. But before we leave the matter there, we might note one point. Laud by implication, Mede, Heylyn and Pocklington by express statement, all made the liturgical act more than an enacted metaphor or sign of the everyday “sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving,” as it had been for Perkins and Morton. Because the public celebration of the Lord’s Supper represented a commemoration of Christ’s sacrifice which could only be performed by priest and people together, it was the normative kind of spiritual sacrifice – and, because normative, it really was a different kind of sacrifice. Certain consequences follow. If the liturgy itself is the norm of spiritual sacrifice, the primary offering subject is not the individual, but the gathered community of the Church; and if the ecclesial community is the primary subject of spiritual sacrifice, it would need only a small step forward to speak of such sacrifice as the enactment of Christ’s mystical body, as the participation of Christ’s members in the primordial work of their head and high priest. But this interpretation, this drawing-out of implications, would still be ours, not the Laudians’. Only Mede seems to have had the theological acumen to recognise that the Laudian perspective might be developed along such lines; only the Scots bishops had the liturgical nerve to give this insight concrete expression in the Church’s *lex orandi* itself.

IV.

In this essay I have concentrated a great deal of attention on one problem posed by the doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice, namely, the problem of identifying a sacrificial dimension specific to the
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eucharistic liturgy. Elizabethan and early Stuart divines tended to make anamnesis the primary mode of eucharistic sacrifice; and Morton went so far as to suggest that the very performance of the anamnesis was a meritorious act, “through God’s favour propitious and well-pleasing in his sight”. Nevertheless, English divines, including Morton, found it difficult to stabilize this act in relation to its concrete liturgical expressions, such as the fraction. Their doctrinal assumptions about the Supper meant that any liturgical “moment” to which they assigned a sacrificial value could be resolved, with very little residue, into the significance of other actions, actions essentially mental or affective. With Andrewes, however, we see a willingness to consider the communion itself a distinct spiritual sacrifice. The Laudians’ emphasis on “the external decent worship of God” pushed this willingness one step further, but only Joseph Mede and the Scots liturgy of 1637 made serious efforts at consummating it.

This problem is not peculiar to sixteenth- and seventeenth-century divines working within a Reformed ethos. It is an authentic question for anyone who delves into eucharistic theology. English theologians of the period may or may not have been right in their estimate of the Roman Catholic doctrine of eucharistic sacrifice. But surely they were on to something when they insisted that Christian sacrifice, whatever its expression, must be seen as a response to the divine initiative, not only in salvation through Christ Jesus but also, as Mede realised, in the primordial act of creation. The eucharist is but a particular celebration of this creative and re-creative initiative. It cannot take place, as it were, on a clean slate every time. It depends upon the whole history of God’s faithfulness, to our forebears and to us now, for the matter of celebration. The eucharist – and so, its sacrificial dimension – is an act either done in, or in search of, a transcendent context.

Having said this, we may nevertheless feel that two issues still remain. The first has to do with the relation between Christ’s sacrifice and the memorial-oblation in the Lord’s Supper. Calvinists, “moderation-men,” and Laudians shared in common the assumption that “proper” sacrifice must involve the destruction of a material victim; and this assumption grounded their common outrage at Rome’s claim that the Mass constituted a “proper” oblation and sacrifice. But we may ask whether the physical destruction of Christ was in truth the essence of his sacrifice – whether, in truth, it was not instead his unconditional obedience to the will of his Father in heaven. In the moment in Gethsemane Christ did not will the Cross in itself: he willed his Father’s will – and therefore the Cross. Now, in what substantial respect is this different from the spiritual sacrifices which English divines insisted upon? For those sacrifices were supposed to be actions performed in obedience to – or, better said, in
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conformity with – the will of God expressed in the initiative of grace. If the eucharist is a means of participating the life of Christ, expounding the question of eucharistic sacrifice then becomes a matter of explicating how redeemed humanity participates in the sort of sacrifice, and in the depth of that sort of sacrifice, which Christ offered.

This brings us to the second issue which eucharistic sacrifice posed for the English divines and still poses for us – the relation between our contingent, “anamnetic” participation in Christ’s sacrifice and the necessarily visible, necessarily physical action of the eucharistic liturgy. Elizabethan and early Stuart divinity bore witness that here we cannot help but resort to symbolism and to the hermeneutics of symbolism. Their witness, however, also revealed some of the difficulties in this resort. We know our participation in Christ only by means of symbols, whether these be visual or verbal – and it is well to remember that words are indeed symbols, diverse from, never equivalent to their objects. So, how do we sustain the integrity of the symbols themselves, their integrity precisely as real means of God’s grace and our response, against the tendency to say that they really do not matter – and against the no less unhappy tendency to make them so diverse from their object that they are isolated in their integrity and sapped of their efficacy as means of participating Christ? These questions remain.
2. Peter Heylyn

A COALE FROM THE ALTAR.

OR, AN ANSWER TO A Letter not long since written to the Vicar of GR. against the placing of the Communion Table at the East end of the Chancell, and now of late dispersed abroad to the disturbance of the Church.

First sent by a Judicious and Learned Divine for the satisfaction of his private Friend; and by him commended to the Presse for the benefit of others.

HEB. 13. 10. Wee have an Altar, whereof they have no right to eate, which serve the Tabernacle.

LONDON, Printed for ROBERT MILBOVRNE, at the signe of the Vnicorne neere Fleet-bridge. 1636.

THE PRINTER TO THE READER.

I Am to adversee thee, good Reader, of some certain things, for thy better understanding of this Treatise. First, that whereas thou shalt find here three several characters [i.e. fonts], thou wouldst take notice that the Roman [font] is the words of the Author; the Italic [font], matter of distinction, partly but principally of quotation by him used; and that the English letter [“black letter” font] doth exhibit to thee the words and periods of the Epistle, or Discourse, which is here confuted. Secondly, that howsoever the Letter by him here replied unto, be scattered up and down, and in divers hands; yet because possibly the copy of the same hath not
hitherto been seen of all who may chance cast their eyes upon this Treatise; and partly, that the world may see that he hath dealt truly with the Epistoler, and not omitted any argument or authority by him produced: – the very Letter itself is herewith printed and bound together with it, though it be apocrypha. Last of all, I must let thee know, that whereas the Acts and Monuments, otherwise called The Book of Martyrs, being a book which the Epistoler makes much use of, is of a different Edition in the reply from that which is so often cited in the Letter; and that there have been many editions of the same: That which the Author deals in, is the last edition printed at London in three volumes, Anno [in the year] 1631. I have no more to say unto thee, but wish thee good luck in the name of the Lord. And so adieu.

50 Acts and Monuments of matters happening in the Church, by John Foxe (1516-1587), was basically a collection of passion-narratives: it told the stories of the Protestant martyrs under “Bloody” Mary. The first English edition appeared in 1563; Foxe revised and enlarged the book for each new edition in his lifetime. It was so strongly endorsed (and promoted) by the bishops that it came to have the status of an official document of the Church of England; many parish-churches placed a folio copy of Foxe’s Book of Martyrs beside the Bible, so that the people could both read the Word of God and learn how English Protestants had suffered and died for its sake.
A COALE FROM THE ALTAR.

OR,

An Answer to a Letter,
not long since written to the Vicar of GR.
against the placing of the Communion-Table at the East End of the Chancel, &c.

THE INTRODUCTION.

SIR,

I HAVE read your Letter, and cannot but extremely wonder that you should be so easily overweighed as I see you are. You say that you were willing once, of your own accord, to have removed your Communion Table unto the east end of your chancel, according as it is in his Majesty’s chapel, and generally in all collegiate and cathedral churches; and that you had intended so to do, had you not met with a Discourse written in way of Letter to the Vicar of GR[antham]. (and as you have taken it upon common report) by a Reverend Prelate of this Church; whose arguments have so prevailed with you, that you are almost taken off from that resolution, though it be now exacted of you by your Ordinary [i.e. diocesan bishop]. It seems you are not rightly balanced, when you can be so easily induced to change your purposes; especially as the case now is, which requires more of your obedience than your curiosity. And should we all be so affected, as to demur on the commands of our superiors, in matters of exterior order and public government, till we are satisfied in the grounds and reasons of their commandments; or should we fly off from our duty, at sight of every new device that is offered to us: we should soon find a speedy dissolution both of Church and State. Yet notwithstanding, since you desire that I would give you satisfaction in the present point by telling you both what I think of the Discourse which hath so swayed you, and what may be replied against it, in maintenance of the Order now commended unto you: I will adventure on the second, if you will excuse me in the first. You say, and probably believe so too, that it was written by a Reverend Prelate,51 and indeed by some passages

51 The “Reverend Prelate” in question was John Williams (1586-1650), bishop of Lincoln (1627-1641), archbishop of York (1641-1650). Despite Heylyn’s (perhaps disingenuous) skepticism, Williams was indeed the author of the Letter to the Vicar of Grantham.
therein it may so be thought; for it is written as from a Diocesan unto
a private parish priest in his jurisdiction: and then, I hope, you cannot
justly be offended, if I forbear to pass my censure upon my betters.
Yet so far I dare give you my opinion of it, that I am confident it can
be none of his who is pretended for the author, nor indeed anyone’s
worthy to be advanced – I will not say unto so high a dignity in the
Church, but – to so poor a vicarage as his was, to whom the Letter
was first written. Nay, to speak freely to you, I should least think it
his, whom you entitle to it on uncertain hearsays, of all men’s else: in
that he hath been generally reported to be of extraordinary parts in
point of learning, and of most sincere affections unto the Orders of
the Church; no shew or footstep of the which, or either of them, is to
be found in all that Letter. And I dare boldly say, that when it comes
unto his knowledge what a poor trifling piece of work some men (the
better to endear the cause by so great a name) have thus pinned upon
him, he will not rest till he have traced this fame to the first original –
and, having found the authors of it, will con [see fit to acknowledge]
them little thanks for so great an injury. For my part, I should rather
think, that it was writ by Mr. Cotton of Boston,52 who meaning one
day to take sanctuary in New England, was willing to do some great
act before his going, that he might be the better welcome when he
came amongst them: or by some other neighbouring zealot, whose
wishes to the cause were of more strength than his performance; and
after spread abroad of purpose, the better to discountenance that
uniformity of public order, to which the piety of these times is so
well inclined. Further than this, I shall not satisfy you in your first
desire; but hope that you will satisfy yourself with this refusal.

For the next part of your request, that I should let you see (if at
least I can) what may be said in answer unto that Discourse which
hath so suddenly overswayed you, I shall therein endeavour your
satisfaction: though my discretion for so doing, may perhaps prove

52 John Cotton (1584-1648), lecturer of Boston, England, who emigrated to
its namesake, Boston in the Massachusetts Bay Colony, in 1632. In
Elizabethan and early Stuart England, town councils could endow
lectureships in one or another of the town’s parishes; councils with
Puritan sympathies used such positions to accommodate divines, like
Cotton, who had conscientious objections to episcopacy and the Prayer
Book. Cotton made himself famous among English Puritans, and
notorious to the established Church’s hierarchy, as a red-hot promoter of
Presbyterian views. He seems to have emigrated to New England out of
despair for “a more perfect reformation” in England. The Bay Colony
embraced him enthusiastically, and he became one of the voices that
defined what came to be called “the New England Mind”.
the second Holocaust that shall be sacrificed on those altars, which are there opposed. And this I shall the rather do, because you say that the Discourse or Letter is now much sought after, and applauded, and scattered up and down in several copies – of purpose, as it were, to distract the people, and hinder that good work which is now in hand. In answer to the which, I shall keep myself unto my pattern, and to the business which is chiefly there insisted on – grounding myself especially on the self-same authors and authorities, which are there laid down (though not laid down so truly, at least not so clearly, as they ought to be). Nor had I here said anything touching the preamble thereunto, but fallen directly on the main: but that, methinks, I meet with somewhat which seems to cast a scorn upon the reverence appointed by the Canon unto the blessed name of JESUS; which the Epistoler, whosoever he was, would have so performed, that they which use it, do it Humbly, and not Affectedly, to procure Devotion, not Derision of the Parishioners. That herb, according as the saying is, hath spoiled all the pottage. For when the Church commands that at the name of JESUS, due and lowly reverence shall be done by all persons present, and this to testify (as the Canon saith) our inward humility, why should we think of any man who obeys the Canon, that he doth rather do it out of affectation, than affection? rather “affectedly” than “humbly,” as his own phrase is. Such censurers of the hearts of other men had need be careful of their own.

For the next caution, that those which use it, do it to procure devotion of the people, and not derision; it is more unseasonable: There being none, I think, who ever used it otherwise, than having testified their own humility and devotion, to procure the like devotion & humility in other men: none, I dare boldly say, that did ever use it, to procure derision of their parishioners, no more than David, when he danced before the ark, intended to make sport for jeering Michal. And therefore the Epistoler must either mean that doing

53 Pottage. A vegetable stew.

54 2 Samuel 6:12-16: “And it was told king David, saying, The LORD hath blessed the house of Obed-edom, and all that pertaineth unto him, because of the ark of God. So David went and brought up the ark of God from the house of Obed-edom into the city of David with gladness. And it was so, that when they that bare the ark of the LORD had gone six paces, he sacrificed oxen and fatlings. And David danced before the LORD with all his might; and David was girded with a linen ephod. So David and all the house of Israel brought up the ark of the LORD with shouting, and with the sound of the trumpet. And as the ark of the LORD came into the city of David, Michal Saul’s daughter looked
reverence at the name of the Lord JESUS is of itself so vain a thing, that it must needs procure *derision* from the lookers on; or else, that honest and conformable men, should rather choose to disobey the Church, and the Canons of it; than by obedience to the same incur the censure of some few who as they *walk in the counsel of the ungodly*, so do they also *sit in the seat of scorners*.\(^{55}\) This said, we will descend to those three particulars, which are insisted on in that epistolary Discourse. viz. First: The having of an Altar at the upper end of the quire. Secondly: The placing of the Table altar-wise. Lastly: The fixing of it in the quire that so it may not be removed into the body of the church: which things, the Vicar, as it seems, did both approve of and desire, and was therein crossed and opposed by the Epistoler; how justly, and on what sure grounds, we shall see in order.

**SECTION I.**

AND first of all he saith in his said Letter to the Vicar, That if he should erect any such *Altar*, his discretion would prove the only *Holocaust* which would be sacrificed thereon. Why so? Because he had subscribed when he came to his place, that that other oblation which the Papists were wont to offer upon their Altars is a *blasphemous figment and pernicious Imposture*, Article 31.\(^{56}\) And here I cannot but observe that there is little fair dealing to be looked for from this Epistoler that falters thus in the beginning, there being no such clause in all that Article. The Article hath nothing in it, either of Papists, Altars, or that other oblation which is here thrust into the text, only to make poor men believe that by the Doctrine of the Church in her public Articles, Altars and Papists are mere relatives; that so whoever talks of Altars, or placing of the Table Altar-wise, may be suspected presently to be a Papist, or at least popishly affected. As for that other oblation which the Papists were wont to offer upon their Altars, that’s said to be a *blasphemous figment and*

through a window, and saw king David leaping and dancing before the LORD; and she despised him in her heart.”

\(^{55}\) Psalm 1.1.

\(^{56}\) “The offering of Christ once made is that perfect redemption, propitiation, and satisfaction for all the sins of the whole world, both original and actual; and there is none other satisfaction for sin but that alone. Wherefore the sacrifices of Masses, in the which it was commonly said that the Priest did offer Christ for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, were blasphemous fables and dangerous deceits.” *The Articles of Religion* [1574] XXXI.
pernicious imposture; therefore the only holocaust remaining to be sacrificed, the discretion of the Vicar. What, had he sacrificed his discretion only, and no more than so? The Article goes further sure, for it determineth positively that *The sacrifices of Masses in the which it was commonly said, that the Priests did offer CHRIST for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt, was blasphemous fables and pernicious deceits.* And therefore had the Vicar of Gr. erected, or intended to erect, an Altar for such a sacrifice, he had not only sacrificed his discretion on it, but also his religion – and been no longer worthy to be called a son of the Church of England. But then as sure it is, the Church admits of other sacrifices and oblations, although not of those [*for the quick and the dead, to have remission of pain or guilt*] – as viz. of the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving (Hebrews 13.15),\(^{57}\) as also of the oblation of our whole selves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice to Almighty GOD (Romans 12.1)\(^{58}\) – both which, she teacheth us to offer to him as *our bounden duty and service* is in the holy Sacrament.\(^{59}\) And not so only, but she alloweth of a commemorative sacrifice, for a perpetual memory of Christ’s precious death, of that *his full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world*, to be continued till his coming again:\(^{60}\) When therefore it is said in the First Homily of the Sacrament, alleged by the Epistoler, that we ought to take heed lest the Lord’s Supper (not the Communion, as he lay it down) of a memory

---

\(^{57}\) “By him [viz. Christ] therefore let us offer the sacrifice of praise to God continually, that is, the fruit of our lips giving thanks to his name.”

\(^{58}\) “I beseech you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, that ye present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God, which is your reasonable service.” Heylyn is actually quoting EngBCP’s “Prayer of Oblation” after Communion; see next footnote.

\(^{59}\) “And here we offer and present unto thee, O Lord, our selves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto thee; most humbly beseeching thee, that all we which be partakers of this holy communion, may be fulfilled with thy grace and heavenly benediction. And although we be unworthy, through our manifold sins, to offer unto thee any sacrifice; yet we beseech thee to accept this our bounden duty and service, not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences; through Jesus Christ our Lord.”

\(^{60}\) “….who made there (by his one oblation of himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world; and did institute, and in his holy gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory of that his precious death, until his coming again.” EngBCP 1559 Communion Order, Prayer of Consecration.
be made a sacrifice.\textsuperscript{61} it reflects not on any of the sacrifices before allowed of. The Church is constant to herself (though her doctors [i.e. teachers] are not) and thus discovers and expounds her own intentions: We must then take heed (saith the Homily) lest of the memory, it be made a Sacrifice; lest of a Communion, it bee made a private eating; lest of two parts, we have but one; lest applying it for the dead, we lose the fruit that be alive. By which it is most manifest, that the Sacrifice rejected in the Homily is that which is cried down in the Book of Articles: which the Epistoler had no reason to suspect was ever thought on, much less aimed at, by the Vicar of Gr., though he desired to have an Altar – i.e. to have the Communion Table placed Altar-wise at the upper end of his quire – or used the name of Altar for the holy Table. For it is granted afterwards by the Epistoler, that the Lord’s Table anciently was called an Altar, because of the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; for which he voucheth Archbishop Cranmer and others; and cites the \textit{Acts and Monuments}, page 1211 (which is Part 2, page 700 of my edition).

2 AS for the Canons of the Convocation, Anno 1571. out of which is alleged, that not the Vicar, but the Church wardens are to provide for the Communion; and that not an Altar, but a faire joined Table: it’s plain they tell us no such matter, or not so much unto his purpose, as he would persuade us. All that those Canons say, is this, and that in plain affirmative terms, without those negations; \textit{Aeditui curabunt mensam ex asseribus composite junctam, quae administrationi sacrosanctae Communionis inserviat; & mundum tapetem qui illam contegat} – that the Church-wardens shall provide a decent joined Table for the Communion, and see that it be orderly covered with an handsome Carpet. And there was reason why this care (for so much as concerned the providing of these things) should be imposed on the Church-wardens, rather than upon the Minister; viz. because the Table and the carpet both were to be fitted and provided at the charge of the Parish. But the said Canons do not tell us that the Church-wardens shall provide this Table, exclusively of the Vicar, without his counsel; or that they shall appoint either of what fashion it shall be, or whether it shall stand in the body of the church, or in

\textsuperscript{61} “We must then take heed, lest of the memory, it be made a sacrifice; lest of a communion, it be made a private eating; lest of two parts, we have but one; lest applying it for the dead, we lose the fruit that be alive.” \textit{Certain Sermons or Homilies to be declared and read by all parsons, vicars, or curates every Sunday in their churches where they have cure. The Second Book} (1571), Sermon 15, “An Homily of the worthy receiving and reverend esteeming of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ”.
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the chancel – or whether in the chancel it shall be placed at the upper end, like an Altar; or in the middle, like a Table. For any thing those Canons tell us, the Vicar was to have a greater hand in ordering the said Table, being so provided, than the Church-wardens were, or ought to have: as one that better understood what was convenient in and for God’s service, than they did or could. Nor did the Vicar any thing in this case against the Canon, for he provided not the Table; nor caused any Altar to be built of new; but only caused the Table, which he found provided by the Church-wardens, to be disposed of to a more convenient place, than before it stood in. So that the allegation was as needless as the reprehension without ground. Only it pleaseth the Epistoler, to give some countenance to the vestry-doctrine of these days; in which the Churchwardens and other elders of the vestry would gladly challenge to themselves the supreme disposing of all ecclesiastical matters in their several parishes, leaving their Minister (in towns corporate especially) to his meditations – as if he only were intended for a looker on, a dull Spectator of their active undertakings.

3 For, besides what is here ascribed to the Church wardens, and denied the Vicar or Incumbent; it followeth in the next place, save one, that Vicars were never enabled to set up Altars, but allowed once, with others (i.e. the Churchwardens) to pull them down. Injunct. 1o Eliz. for Tables in the Church.\textsuperscript{62} Whereas indeed the Curate or the Minister in that Injunction is the principal man, and the Church-wardens, or one of them, are added for assistance only; perhaps, because they were to bear the charges [expenses] of it. For it is ordered that no Altar be taken down but by the oversight of the Curate of the church, and the Church-wardens, or one of them at the least, wherein no riotous or disordered manner to be used. Not pulled down therefore, as the Epistoler hath it, which implies a riot or a popular fury; but taken down in faire and orderly manner: and that not by the Church-wardens as the principal men, but by the Curate chiefly, and any one of the Churchwardens whom he pleased to choose. It’s true indeed, the Bishop of the diocese is he to whom the ordering of these things doth of right belong; and in the preface to the Common Prayer Book it is so appointed. For in the said Preface it is said, that “forasmuch as nothing almost can be so plainly set forth but doubts may arise in the use and practice of the same: to appease all such diversities (if any arise) and for the resolution of all doubts concerning the manner how to understand, do, and execute the things contained in this Book, the parties that so doubt shall

\textsuperscript{62} The first article of the Injunctions issued by Elizabeth I in 1559.
always resort unto the Bishop of the Diocese,” &c. But then, it is as true, or at least more fit, that he should send his resolutions to the priest than to the parish; the Curate having taken an oath of canonical obedience to him, which the people have not. When therefore it is said in the beginning of the Letter, that the Churchwardens were appointed to remove the Table, as whom it did principally concern under the Diocesan; but that is but another smack of the said vestry-doctrine: and was there placed in front to delight the people, who need, God wot, no such encouragements to contemn their Parsons, being too forward in that kind of their own accord.

4 For the remaining passage in this first Paragraph, where it is said, that Altars were removed by Law, and Tables placed in their stead, in all or the most churches in England; and for the proof thereof, the Queen’s Injunctions cited, as if they did affirm as much. It’s plain that there is no such thing in the said Injunction. The Queen’s Injunctions An[n]. 1559 tell us of neither “all” nor “most,” as it is alleged, but only say that “in many and sundry parts of this Realm the Altars in the churches were removed and Tables placed for the administration of the holy Sacrament,” &c. Sundry and many is not all nor most, in my poor conceit. And it is plain by that which follows, not only that in other places the Altars were not taken down upon opinion of some further order to be taken in it by the Queen’s Commissioners; but it is ordered, “That no Altar shall be taken down without the oversight of the Curate and one of the Churchwardens at the least” – and that, too, with great care and caution, as before is said. Nay, the Commissioners were contented well enough that the Altars formerly erected might have still continued; declaring, as it doth appear by the said Injunction, that the removing of the Altars seemed to be a matter of no great moment. And so it is acknowledged by this Epistoler, in the following paragraph, where he confesseth it in these words: It seems the Queen’s Commissioners were content, that they (the Altars) should stand, as we may guess by the Injunctions 1559…. The Queen’s Commissioners, as they had good authority for what they did; so we may warrantably think that they were men of special note and able judgements. And therefore, if they were contented that the Altars formerly erected should continue standing (as the Epistoler confesseth), it is a good argument that in the first project of the Reformation, neither the Queen nor her Commissioners disallowed of Altars, or thought them any way unservice-able in a Church reformed. So that for aught appears unto

63 God wot. God knows.
the contrary, neither the Article, nor the Homily, nor the Queen's
Injunctions, nor the Canons of 1571, have determined any thing: but
that as the Lord's Supper may be called a sacrifice, so may the holy
Table be called an Altar; and consequently, set up in the place, where
the Altar stood.

5 Now as there is alleged no Canon, Ordinance, or Doctrine,
which if examined rightly, doe declare against it; so there is much that
may be said in defence thereof: and of that much we will use nothing,
but that which will agree with the capacity of the meanest man, and
shall be proved by that authority which the Epistoler trusts to most
in all this business, even *The Acts and Monuments*. To which we shall
adjoin, for our more assurance, the testimony of two Acts of
Parliament; one under King Edward the Sixth, th'other under Queen
Elizabeth. First, for *The Acts and Monuments*, we find, that not a few of
those which suffered death for their opposing of the grosse and
carnal doctrine of transubstantiation, did not only well enough
endure the name of Altar, but without any doubt or scruple called the
Lord's Supper, sometimes a Sacrifice and many times the Sacrament
of the Altar. So speaks Iohn Frith: “Secondly, they examined me,
touching the Sacrament of the Altar, Whether it was the very Body of
Christ or not.” *Acts and Monuments*, part. 2. pag. 307. John Lambert,
thus: “As concerning th'other six Sacraments, I make you the same
answer, that I have done unto the Sacrament of the Altar, and no
other.” pag. 401. And in another place: “CHRIST, being offered up
once for all in his own proper person, is yet said to be offered up not
only every year at Easter, but also every day in the celebration of the
Sacrament; because his oblation, once for ever made, is thereby
represented.” pag. 435. Archbishop Cranmer also, though he
opposed the Statute of the Six Articles, particularly that of
transubstantiation, 64 which he thoroughly canvassed, yet at the phrase
or term of “Sacrament of the Altar” he took no offence, but useth it
as formerly had been accustomed (pag. 443).

6. Nor was it a new name taken up of late, but such as some of
them acknowledge to be derived from pure antiquity – and those too,
such as lived and suffered, after the name of Altar had been left out
of the Book of Common Prayer, which was last established. John
Philpott, thus: “That partly because it is a Sacrament of that lively
Sacrifice which CHRIST offered for our sins upon the Altar of the
Cross; and partly because that Christ's body crucified for us was that
bloody Sacrifice which the blood-shedding of all the beasts offered
upon the Altar in the old Law did prefigurate and signify unto us.

64 The Statute of the Six Articles.
Heylyn, *A Coale from the Altar* (1637)

The old Writers do sometimes call the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of CHRIST, amongst other names which they ascribe thereunto, the Sacrament of the Altar.” Part. 3. pag. 23. Thus Bishop Latimer plainly granteth, “that the Lord’s Table may be called an Altar, and that the Doctors call it so in many places, though there be no propitiatory Sacrifice, but only CHRIST.” Pag. 85. And lastly, Bishop Ridley doth not only call it *the Sacrament of the Altar*, affirming thus, “that in the Sacrament of the Altar is the natural body and blood of CHRIST,” &c. pag. 492. But in reply unto an argument of the Bishop of Lincoln’s, taken out of Cyril [of Alexandria], doth resolve it thus, “That the word ALTAR in the Scripture, signifieth as well the Altar whereupon the Jews were wont to offer their burnt Sacrifices as the Table of the Lord’s Supper – and that St Cyril meaneth by this word ALTAR, not the Jewish Altar, but the Table of the Lord; and by that saying, Altars are erected in Christ’s name: Ergo [therefore], CHRIST is come; he meaneth that the Communion is administered in his remembrance. Ergo, CHRIST is come.” pag. 497. Which being the language of the Prelates, and other learned men then living, it is no marvel, if in the Parliament, 1. Edw. 6. cap. 1., the same name occur. The Parliaments, in matters which concerned God’s Service, did then use to speak according as the Church had taught them. Now in that Parliament, however it was resolved, that the whole Communion should be restored, which in effect, was a plain abolition of the former Masse; yet is that Act which so restores it, entitled, *An Act against such persons as shall speak irreverently against the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of CHRIST, commonly called, The Sacrament of the Altar; and for the receiving thereof under both kinds*. And in the body of the Act, there is special order taken for a writ to be directed to the Bishop of the Diocese on such delinquencies; where it is called expressly, *Sacro sanctum Sacramentum Altaris*; “the [most] holy Sacrament of the Altar”. Which being repealed by Queen Mary in the first Parliament of her reign, because of the Communion under both kinds in the same allowed of; was afterwards revived by Queen Elizabeth, both the head and body, and every branch and member of it 1. Eliz. cap. 1. So that we have a Sacrifice, and an Altar, and a Sacrament of the Altar, on all sides acknowledged; neither the Prince or Prelates, the Priest or people, dissenting from it: some of those terms, being further justified by the Statute laws.

SECTION II.

NEXT, for the second point – the standing of the Communion Table *altar-wise* – the said Epistoler thus declares himself to the Vicar of Gr.: *If you mean* (saith he) *by Altar-wise that it should stand in that place of the chancel where the Altar stood, I think somewhat may*
be said for because the Injunctions 1559 did so place it. And I
conceive it to be the most decent situation when it is not used, and
for use too, where the quire is mounted up by steps, and open, so
that he that officiates may be seen and heard of all the congregation.
Such an one I hear your chancel is not. But if you mean by
Altarwise, that it should stand along close by the wall, so as you be
forced to officiate at one end thereof (as you may have observed in
great men’s chapels) I do not believe that ever the Communion
Tables were (otherwise than by casualty [accident]) so placed in
country [rural] churches. This I have laid together, as being but a
preamble to the next discourse; and rather matter of opinion and
hearsay than of proof, reason, or authority: For it stands only on “I
think,” and “I conceive,” and “I have heard,” and “I believe not” – which
no man can interpret to be demonstrations. Therefore to look upon
the passage, as it lieth together, we have a plain confession that, if by
placing of the Table “Altarwise” is meant the setting of it in that
place where the Altar stood; there is then somewhat, at the least, to
be said for that, because the Injunctions did so place it; and next an
absolute revocation of the said confession; where it is said that, if by
“Altarwise” is meant that it should stand along close by the wall, then
he believeth not that ever the Communion Table was so placed
(unless by casualty [accident]) in country churches. Quo teneam nodo?
This is just fast and loose, and I know not what; the reconciliation of
two contradictions. The Queen’s Injunctions were set out for the
reglement [regulation] and direction of all the churches in this
kingdom, and it is said in them that “the holy Table in every Church
shall be decently made” (in case the Altars were removed, which they
left at liberty) “and set in the place where the Altar stood, and there
commonly covered, as thereto belongeth”. If in the place where the
Altar stood, then certainly it must stand along close by the wall,
because the Altars always stood so – and that as well in country
churches, as in great men’s chapels, all being equally regarded in the
said Injunctions, as in the Preface to the same doth at full appear.
Whereas in case the Table were to stand with one end toward the east
great window, as is after said; it could not possibly stand in the place
where the Altar did, as the Injunctions have appointed: the Altar
taking up much room to the north and south, which the Table placed
endlong doth not take up; and contrary, the Table taking up much
room to the east and west, which the Altar did not. However we may
take what is given us here by the Epistoler, where he affirms, that
placing of the Table where the Altar stood, is the most decent
situation when it is not used, and for use too, where the quire is
mounted up by steps and open, so that he that officiates may be seen
and heard of all the Congregation; and such an one, as he had heard, the Vicar’s chancel was not. Whether the chancel at Grantham: was mounted up by steps or not is no great matter. In case it were not so, it might have easily been done, without much charge: and those of Grantham: were the more beholdings to this Epistoler, for taking so much pains to save their purses. If it were mounted up by steps, and that it were most decent for the Tables to be placed thereon, why not as well along the Wall as with one end thereof to the East great Window?

2. For this, there are three reasons given us. First, because then the country people would suppose them dressers, rather than Tables. Secondly, because the Queen’s Commissioners for ecclesiastical matters directed that the Table should stand, not where the Altar, but where the steps of the Altar formerly stood. Orders 1561. And thirdly, because the Minister appointed to read the Communion, (which he, the Vicar, out of the Book of Fast 10. of the King [in the first year of Edward VI’s reign], was pleased, as the Epistoler phraseth it, to call Second Service 65) is directed to read the Commandments, not at the end but at the north side of the Table, which implies the end [of the Table is] to be placed towards the east great Window. Rubrick before the Communion. 66 And would the people take the Table, if placed Altarwise, to be a dresser, not a table? I now perceive from whom it was that Mr. Prynne 67 borrowed so unmannerly and profane a phrase, whereof I thought him formerly to have been the author, “Lame Giles his haltings” – and from whom also he did borrow the quotations in his Appendix against bowing at the name of JESUS, the mistakes and all. Viz. Rubrick for the Communion. Queen Elizabeth’s Injunctions (Injunc. for Tables in the Church), The Booke

65 The Second Service was the common title of the Communion Order. The First Service on a Sunday morning consisted of Morning Prayer and the Litany, after which there was normally a brief break while the priest retired to the sacristy to put on the surplice he was required to wear for the Ante-Communion and (if it was to be celebrated) the Lord’s Supper. See below, ¶ 5.

66 “The Table having at the Communion time a fair white linen cloth upon it, shall stand in the body of the church, or in the chancel, where Morning Prayer or Evening Prayer be appointed to be said. And the Priest, standing at the north side of the Table, shall say the Lord’s Prayer, with this Collect following.” [italics added].

67 William Prynne
of Canons, Anno 1571. p. 18. I say, and the mistakes and all: for both with him, and this Epistoler, it is p. 18. whereas indeed in the old Book, which was that meant by the Epistoler, it is p. 15. which plainly shews out of whose quiver Mr. Prynne did steal those arrows. Just in that scornful sort, Doctor Weston, the then Dean of Westminster, did in a Conference at Oxford with Bishop Latimer call the Communion Tables, as in King Edward's reign they had been placed in some churches, by the name of “oyster-boards”, Acts & Monuments, Part. 3. p. 85. And so he called in a sermon at St. Paul’s Cross also, p. 95. The like did Doctor White, the then Bishop of Lincoln, in a Conference with Bishop Ridley, where he doth charge the Protestants in King Edward’s days, for setting up “an oyster table instead of an Altar,” p. 497. The Church of England is in the meantime but in sorry case. If she appoint the Lord’s Board to be placed like a common table, the Papists they will call it an oyster-table – [but] if like an Altar, the Puritans, and Mr. Prynne, will call it a dresser-board. A slovenly and scornful term, as before was said, and such as doth deserve no other answer than what the marginal notes in the Acts and Monuments give in the one place to the Dean of Westminster. viz. “The blasphemous mouth of Doctor Weston, calling the Lord’s Table an oyster-board,” pag. 85; or what they give in th’other place to the Bishop of Lincoln; viz. “Bishop White blasphemously called the Board of the Lord’s Supper an oyster-table,” pag. 497. I would there were no worse notes in the Acts and Monuments.

3. AS for the Orders published by the Queen’s Commissioners, Anno. 1561. they say indeed (as is alleged) that in the place where the steps were, the Communion Table shall stand – but then they say withal, which is not alleged, that “there be fixed on the wall over the Communion Board the tables of God’s Precepts imprinted for the said purpose”. And in The Book of Advertisements entitled, “Articles of Advertisement for due order in the public administration of Common Prayer and the holy Sacraments;” and published in Anno 1565, it is ordered thus: The Parish shall provide a decent table, standing on a frame, for the Communion Table, which they shall decently cover with a carpet of silk or other decent covering, and with a white linen cloth in the time of the Administration: And shall

68 In all parish churches and chapels of the Church of England, the two “tables” (tablets) of the Ten Commandments (“God’s Precepts”) were to be hung on the east wall, under the east window, where the Lord’s Table usually stood. A few churches in England and in Canada (especially the Maritime Provinces) still display these relics. A later mandate required churches to display the Royal Arms above the Commandments.
set the Ten Commandments upon the east wall, over the said Table.” Which put together make up this construction, that the Communion Table was to stand above the steps, and under the Commandments – and therefore all along the wall on which the Ten Commandments were appointed to be placed; which was directly where the Altar had stood before. And in this wise we must interpret the said Orders and Advertisements; or else the Orders published 1561, must run quite cross to the Injunctions published 1559 but two years before – which were ridiculous to imagine in so grave a state.

4. Nor doth it help the cause undertaken by the Epistoler, that the Minister appointed to read the Communion is directed to read the Commandments, not at the end, but at the north side of the Table: there being no difference in this case between the north end, and the north side, which come both to one. For in all quadrilateral and quadrangular figures, whether they bee a perfect square, which Geometricians call quadratum, or a long Square (as commonly our Communion Tables are) which they call oblongum: it’s plain that if we speak according to the rules of Art – as certainly they did which composed that rubric – every part of it is a side; however custom hath prevailed to call the narrower sides by the name of ends. When therefore he that ministreth at the Altar stands at the north end of the same, as we use to call it; he stands no question at the north side thereof, as in propriety of speech we ought to call it; and so implies not (as it is supposed by the Epistoler) that the end, or narrower part thereof, is to be placed towards the east great window. And this interpretation of the rubric, I the rather stand to, because that in the Common Prayer book done into Latin by command and authorized by the great Seale of Queen Elizabeth, Anno 2do [secundo, in the second year]. of her reign, it is thus translated: Ad ejus mensae septentrionalem partem, Minister stans, orabit orationem Dominicam. viz. That “the Minister standing at the North part of the Table, shall say the Lords Prayer.” And I presume no man of reason can deny, but that the northern end or side, call it what you will, is pars septentrionalis, “the northern part;” though I expect ere long, in spite of dictionaries and the grammar, to hear the contrary from this trim Epistoler. So that the Rubric is fulfilled as well by standing at the northern end, the Table being placed where the Altar stood; as standing at the northern side, in case it stood with one end towards the east great window, as the Epistoler would fain have it.

5. For the Parenthesis, I might very well have passed it over as not conducing to this purpose; but that it seems to cast a scorn on them by whose direction The Book of the Fast, in 1o. of the King, was
drawn up and published, as if it were a novelty or singular device of theirs to call the latter part of Divine Service by the name of “Second Service” – whereas indeed the name is very proper for it, and every way agreeable both to the practice of antiquity and the intentions of this Church at that very time when the Book of Common Prayer was first established. For if we look into the Liturgy of our Church, immediately after Athanasius’ Creed, we shall find it thus: “Thus endeth the Order of Morning and Evening Prayer throughout the whole year” – i.e. the form of Morning and Evening Prayer for all days equally, as well the working days as the holy days, without any difference. Then look into the first rubric before the Communion, and we find it thus: “So many as intend to be partakers of the holy Communion, shall signify their names unto the curate over night, or else in the morning before the beginning of Morning Prayer, or immediately after.” Where clearly it is meant, that there should be some reasonable time between Morning Prayer and the Communion. For otherwise, what leisure could the Curate have, to call before him “open and notorious evil livers, or such as have done any wrong unto their neighbours by word or deed, and to advertise them, in any wise not to presume to come unto the Lord’s Table, till they have manifested their repentance, and amended their former naughty lives, and recompensed the parties whom they have done wrong unto”? Or what spare time can we afford him between the reading pew and the Holy Table to reconcile “those men betwixt whom he perceiveth malice and hatred to reign; and on examination of their dispositions, to admit that party, who is contented to forgive, and repel the obstinate,” according as by the rubric he is bound to do. Which, being compared with the first rubric after the Communion, where it is said that “upon the Holy Days, if there be no Communion, shall be said all that is appointed at the Communion, until the end of the Homily, concluding with the Prayer for the whole state of Christ’s Church militant here on earth,” &c. makes it both manifest and undeniable, that the distinction of the First and Second Service is grounded on the very meaning of holy Church; however the Epistoler doth please to slight it.

6. That which next follows is a Confirmation only of what went before: Viz. that The Ministers standing at the north side of the Table was no new direction in the Queen’s time only, but practised in King Edward’s reign; that in the plot of our Liturgy sent by [John] Knox, and Whittingham to Master Calvin in the latter end of Queen Mary, it is said that “the Minister must stand at the north side of the Table” (that only was put in to shew that he had the book entitled, The Troubles of Frankfurt) that in King Edward’s Liturgies,
the Minister standing in the midst of the Altar, (i.e. with his back
turned towards the people) 1549, is turned into his standing at the
north side of the Table, 1552. And finally, that this last Liturgy was
revived by Parliament, 1o. Eliz. [in the first year of Elizabeth's
reign]. This we acknowledge to be true, but it adds nothing to the
reasons produced before: and so perhaps it is as true that it was used
so, when this Letter was written, in most places of England; which in
this kind had too much deviated from the ancient practice. But where
it followeth in the next place, that What is done in chapels or
cathedral churches is not the point in question, but how the Tables
are appointed to be placed in parish churches: I think that therein the
Epistoler hath been much mistaken. For certainly the ancient orders
of the Church of England have been best preserved in the chappels of
the King’s Majesty, and the cathedrals of this Kingdom; without
the which perhaps, wee had before this been at a loss amongst our
selves for the whole form and fashion of Divine Service. And
therefore if it be so in the chapels and cathedral churches, as the
Epistoler doth acknowledge; it is a pregnant argument, that so it
ought to be in the parochial [churches]; which herein ought to
president and conform themselves according to the pattern of the
mother churches. And I would fain learn of this doughty disputant,
why he should make such difference between the chapels and
cathedral churches on the one side and the parochials on the other: as
if some things which were not warranted by law were used in the
one; and such as are allowed by law were not permitted to the other.
The laws and canons now in force look alike on all. And therefore
here must be some cunning, to make the chapels and cathedrals guilty
of some foul transgression, some breach of law and public order; the
better to expose them to the censure of a race of men who like them
ill enough already.

7. AS for that fancy which comes next, that In some chapels and
cathedrals, the Altars may be still standing for to make use of their
covers and ornaments, Tables may be placed in their room [in the
spot where the altars stand], of the same length and fashion the
Altars were of, it’s but a thrifty dream and a poor conjecture.
Questionless, neither the Chapels Royal nor any of the cathedral
churches have hitherto been so low brought – God’s Name be
praised! – but that they have been able to provide themselves of
convenient ornaments, without being any way beholding to their
former Altars. However, if it were lawful in cathedral churches either
to suffer the old Altars to continue standing or to set up Tables in
their places, of the same length and fashion that the Altars were of,
only in point of thrift to save greater charges: I hope it will be thought more lawful, by indifferent [impartial] men, to place the Table Altar-wise in parochial churches, in point of decency and due obedience unto public order. That Altars do stand still in the Lutheran churches, (the doctors and divines whereof he doth acknowledge afterwards to be sound Protestants) by the Epistoler is confessed, though it makes against him: as also that the Apology for the Augustan Confession doth allow it. And he confesseth, too, not only that they stood a year or two in King Edward’s time, as may appear by the Liturgy printed 1549, but that the Queen’s Commissioners were content they should stand, as before we noted. What, stood they but a year or two in King Edwards time? Yes, certainly they stood four years at the least in that Prince’s reign. For in the first year of King Edward, being 1547, was passed that Statute entitled, An Act against such persons as shall speak irreverently of the Sacrament of the Altar (Anno 1548). The Common Prayer Book was confirmed by Parliament (although not published till the next year); wherein the word “Altar” is oft used, and by the which it seems the Altars did continue as before they were. Anno. 1550, A Letter in the King’s name from the Lords of the Council came to Bishop Bonner for abrogating Private Masses; wherein it is appointed that the holy blessed Communion be ministered at the High Altar of the Church, and in no other places of the same. Act. and Monum. Part. 2. p. 662. And in the year 1550, which was the fourth year of [Edward VI’s] reign, came out an Order from the Council unto Bishop Ridley, for taking down the Altars in his Diocese, pag. 699. So long it seems they stood without contradiction; and longer might have stood perhaps, if Calvin had given way unto it; of which more hereafter.

8. IN the meantime; from matter of evidence and authority, we must proceed next unto point of reason, and then go on again unto matter of fact; as the way is led by the Epistoler, whom we must follow step by step in all his wanderings. And in this way he tells us. That the Sacrifice of the Altar being abolished, these (call them what you will) are no more Altars, but Tables of stone or timber, and that it was alleged so 24 November, 4o. Edw. 6 [in the fourth year of Edward VI]. And was it so alleged, that the Sacrifice of the Altar was abolished? I believe it not. It was alleged indeed that “the form of an Altar was ordained for the Sacrifices of the Law [of Moses];

69 The Defence of the Augsburg Confession (1530) was written by Philip Melanchthon, Luther’s closest protégé and a brilliant theologian in his own right. The Augsburg Confession (in Latin, Confessio Augustana) remains to this day one of the definitive statements of Lutheranism.
that both the Law and the sacrifices thereof do cease, and therefore that the form of the Altar ought to cease also” (Acts and Monuments, part. 2. pag. 700). The Sacrifice of the Altar, and the Sacrifices of the Law, are two different things: it being told us by Saint Paul that we (the Christians) have an Altar, whereof they have no right to eat, which served the Tabernacle (Hebrews 13.10). That Altar, and that Sacrifice, must continue always. And were it granted, as it need not, that since the Law and sacrifices thereof be both abolished, therefore the form of the Altar is to be abolished: yet would this rather help than hurt us. For the Communion Table standing in the body of the church or chancel hath indeed more resemblance to Altars, on which the Priests did offer either sacrifice or incense under the Law; than if it did stand altar-wise, close along the wall, as did the Altars afterwards in the Christian Church: the one of them, which was that for Sacrifice, standing in atrio sacerdotum, “in the middle of the priests’ court, without outside the Temple; the other being that of incense, in templo exteriori, even “in the outward part of the temple,” and not within the Sanctum Sanctorum ["the Holy of Holies"], as our Altars do.

9. That the said Tables of stone or timber (though placed Altarwise, for so I take it is his meaning) may be well used in kings’ and bishops’ houses where there are no people so void of understanding, as to be scandalized, we are glad to hear of – and if it be not true, would to God it were. However we may safely say, that a small measure of understanding is in this kind sufficient to avoid offence: there being none so weak of wit, who may not easily be persuaded (if at least they will, or that their leaders will permit them) that the disposing of God’s Table rather to one place than another, it is not considerable in itself or otherwise material in his public worship, further than it conduceth unto order and uniformity. If any be so void of understanding (which wee hardly think) and plead their weakness in this point, as did the brethren in the Conference at Hampton Court; we ask them with His Majesty of happy memory [James I], not whether 45 years but whether 80 years be not sufficient for them to gather strength and get understanding; whether they be not rather headstrong than not strong enough. Conference at Hampton Court, pag. 66. For it may very well be thought that it is not any want of understanding, but an opinion rather that they have of their understandings, which makes some men run cross to all public order, and take offence at anything whereof themselves are not the authors.

10. That which next followeth, viz. that on the orders for breaking down of Altars, all dioceses did agree upon receiving Tables, but not upon the fashion or form of Tables, is fairer in the
flourish than in the fact. For in the Act. & Mon. p. 1212, which there is cited, being of my edition part 2, pag. 700, there is no such matter. It is there said indeed, that on receipt of His Majesty’s Letters sent to Bishop Ridley, the Bishop did appoint the right form of a Table to be used in all his diocese [of London]: but that it was appointed so in all other dioceses (as the Epistoler hath affirmed) doth not appear by any thing in that place remembered. And though he did appoint it so, yet possibly it may be doubted whether the people fully understood his meaning – it being there said that, after the exhortation of the said Bishop Ridley, there grew a great diversity about the form of the Lord’s Board, some using it after the form of a Table and some of an Altar. So that the difference was not about the having of a Table, wherein (it seems) most men were ready to obey the King’s command and the bishop’s order; but in the placing of the same: some men desiring that it should be placed after the fashion of an Altar, others more willing that it should be used like a common table; in which both parties followed their own affections, as in a thing which had not been determined of but left at large.

11. That which comes after is well said, but not well applied. It is well said, that in the Old Testament one and the same thing is termed an Altar and a Table – an Altar in respect of what is there offered unto God, and a Table in regard of what is there participated by men, as for example by the priests. By this might better have been applied and used to justify the calling of the Communion Table by the name of Altar, in respect of those oblations made to God, as the Epistoler doth acknowledge afterwards. That of the Prophet Malachi 1. verse 7,⁷⁰ is indeed worth the marking, and doth demonstrate very well that in the Old Testament, God’s Altar is the very same with God’s Table; but how it answereth to that place of the Hebrews, 13. 10 is beyond my reach, the Prophet speaking of that Altar and those sacrifices whereof we have no right to eat which live under the Gospel; and the apostle of that Altar and that sacrifice whereof they have no right to eat which live under the Law. In case that passage had been urged by the Vicar of Grantham, as the Epistoler hath informed us (for we take his word) against some of his fellow Ministers, as before him it was by Master Morgan against Peter Martyr [Vermigli] in maintenance of an Altar in the Christian Church: however it might possibly have been answered otherwise by the Respondent, sure it had never been well answered by that text of Malachi.

⁷⁰ “Ye offer polluted bread upon mine altar; and ye say, Wherein have we polluted thee? In that ye say, The table of the LORD is contemp-tible.”
12. Where it is next said, that we have no Altar in regard of oblation, but we have an Altar in regard of participation and communion granted to us: were it no otherwise than it is here said, yet here we are all allowed an Altar, in regard of participation and communion; which is enough to justify both the situation of the Table altarwise and the name of Altar – and that too in the very instant of receiving the Communion. Now for the proof that we have an Altar also in regard of oblation, we need look no further than into the latter end of this second paragraph; where howsoever the Epistoler doth suppose that the name of Altar crept (he might as well have said, it came) into the Church in a kind of complying in phrase with the people of the Jews, as Chemnitus, Gerardus, and other sound Protestants were of opinion – where by the way, we may perceive that some may be sound Protestants, though they like of Altars – yet he acknowledgeth withal that it was so called, partly in regard of those oblations made upon the Communion Table for the use of the priest and the poor, whereof we read in Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Tertullian, and other ancient writers; and partly, because of “the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving,” as Archbishop Cranmer and others thought (Acts & Monum. pag. 1211. which is Part 2. pag. 700. of my edition). Whereby it seems that, besides the complying in phrase with the Jews (which the Christians of the primitive times had little care of, when there was not greater reason to persuade them to it, the Communion Table was called an Altar both in regard of the oblations there made to God for the use of his priests and of his Poore; as also of the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, which was there offered to him by the congregation. And therefore, as before we found an Altar in regard of participation and communion; so here we have an Altar in respect of oblation also.

13. This, though it be so clear a truth, that the Epistoler could not deny it; yet pulls he down with one hand what he was after forced to set up with the other. For so it followeth in the Letter: The use of an Altar is to sacrifice upon, and the use of a Table is to eat upon: And because Communion is an action most proper for a Table, as an Oblation is for an Altar; what then? therefore the Church in her Liturgy and Canons calling the same a Table only, do not you call it an Altar? This is indeed the inference which is made from the former principles. But if the principles be true, as indeed they are not, there being an Altar in the Temple, which was not made to sacrifice upon, as the Altar of Incense; and a Table also in the Temple, which was not made to eat upon, as the Table for the Shew-bread: another, and
a worse conclusion would soon follow on it – which is, that men would think it necessary to sit at the Communion. For if Communion be an action most proper for a table, as it is affirmed, and that the use of a table to be eat upon, as is also said: the inference will be very strong, that therefore we are bound to sit at the Communion, even as we doe at common tables which wee eat upon. A thing much sought for by some men, as if not only a great part of their Christian liberty, but that their whole Religion did consist therein; but brought into the churches first by the modern Arians (who stubbornly gain-saying the divinity of our Lord and Saviour, thought it no robbery to be equal with him, and sit down with him at his Table;) and for that cause most justly banished the reformed Church in Poland. For so it was determined there in a general synod, Anno. 1583. *Ne sessio sit in usu ad mensam Domini* [“That sitting not be used at the Lord’s Supper”]. The reason was, *Nam haec ceremonia, ecclesiis christianis & coetibus Evangelicis non est usitata; tantum propria infidelibus Arianis, Domino pari solio sese colocantibus*: “Because it was a thing not used in the Christian Church, but proper to the Arians only, who thought themselves hail-fellows with their Lord and Saviour; and to them we leave it.”

14. WE are now come unto the story of the change, the change of Altars into Tables, and the reasons of it, which is thus delivered: *In King Edward’s Liturgy of 1549, it is everywhere, but in that of 1552 it is nowhere called an Altar, but the Lord’s Board. Why? Because the people being scandalized herewith in country churches, first beats them down *de facto,* then the Supreme Magistrate by a kind of Law puts them down *de jure,* and setting Tables in their rooms, took from us, the children of the Church and Commonwealth, both the name and nature of former Altars. Whatever may be said of the change in the public Liturgy, the reason here assigned for taking down of Altars is both false and dangerous. Nor is it altogether true that in the Liturgies here remembered, the name of Altar is used only in the one; though true it be, that that of the Lord’s Board, or Table, is used only in the other. Though the Epistoler had not, perhaps, the leisure to search the Liturgy of 1549, where it is once called God’s Board and once his Table (as viz. in the Prayer, “We do not presume,” &c. and in the rubric of the same):71 yet he could not be ignorant that it was so observed in his own author, the *Acts and Monuments,* and in the page by him often quoted. Where it is said that “The Book of Common Prayer calleth the thing whereupon the

---

71 “Then shall the Priest, turning him to God’s board, kneel down, and say in the name of all them that receive the Communion, this prayer following, We do not presume to come to this thy Table, O merciful Lord....”
Lord’s Supper is ministered, indifferently, a Table, an Altar, or the Lord’s Board, without prescription of any form thereof either of a Table, or of an Altar; so that whether the Lord’s Board have the form of an Altar or of a Table, the Book of Common Prayer calleth it both an Altar and a Table. For as it calleth it an Altar, whereupon the Lord’s Supper is ministered, a Table and the Lord’s board: so it calleth the Table, wherein the holy Communion is distributed with Lauds and Thanksgivings unto the Lord, an Altar: For that there is offered the same sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving” (Part. 2. pag. 700). And this I have the rather laid down at large to shew with what indifferency these names of Table, Board, and Altar, have been used before; and may be used for the present: as also in what regard the Lord’s Table may be called an Altar. And this according unto Master Foxe’s marginal note, in the selfsame page; viz. “The Table: how it may be called an Altar, and in what respect” – which shewes that he allowed it to be called an Altar, though this Epistoler doth not like it.

15. NOW as the story of the change is not altogether true, so the reason there assigned is both false and dangerous. First, it is false: the alteration not being made because the people were scandalized with Altars in country churches. The people were so far from being scandalized with having Altars, that in the counties of Devon and Cornwall they rose up in arms, because the Mass was taken from them (Act. and Monum. Part. 2. pa. 666). And if we look into the story of those times, we shall quickly find that it was no scandal taken by the people, which did occasion that or any other change in the Common Prayer Book, but an offence conceived by Calvin. It seems that Bucer had informed him of the condition of this Church and the public Liturgy thereof, and thereupon he wrote to the Duke of Somerset, who was then Protector, Epistola ad Bucerum. In which his Letter to the Duke, he finds great fault with the commemoration of the dead, which was then used in the celebration of the Lord’s Supper, though he acknowledgeth the same to be very ancient; calling it by the name of a piece of leaven, Quo missa integra sanctae coenae quodammodo acefieret, “wherewith the whole Communion was made sower”. Other things in the Liturgy he found fault withal, and then adviseth, Illa omnia abscendi semel, that “they should all at once be cut off for ever” (Epist. ad Protectorem Angliae). Nor stayed he here, but he solicited Archbishop Cranmer to the same effect, an. 1551, being the year before the alteration made (as by the placing of that Letter doth appear), complaining in the same unto him that in the Church of England there was yet remaining a whole mass of Popery, which did not only blemish and obscure, but in a manner overthrow God’s holy worship. So that however in his Answer to the Devonshire men, the King had formerly affirmed that the Lord’s
Supper, as it was then administered, was brought even to the very use, as CHRIST left it, as the Apostles used it, and as the holy Fathers delivered it (Act. and Monum. Part. 2. pa. 667): yet to please Calvin, who was all in all with my Lord Protector, and as it seems had took upon him to write unto the King about it, Epistol. ad Farellum 1551, the Liturgy then established was called in by Parliament – though in the very Act itself they could not but acknowledge that the said Book of Common Prayer was both agreeable to God’s Word, and the Primitive Church (5. & 6. of Edw. 6. cap. 1). So that the leaving of the word, Altar, out of the Common Prayer Book last established, and other alterations which were therein made, grew not from any scandal which was taken at the name of Altar by the country people; but from the dislike taken against the whole Liturgy by Calvin, as before I said.

16 AS false it is, but far more dangerous, which is next alleged; viz. that The people being scandalized in country churches, did first de facto beat down Altars, and then the Prince, to countenance, no doubt, and confirm their unruly actions, did by a kind of Law put them down de jure. Where is it said in all the Monuments of our Church or State, that ever in the former times, the country people took upon them to be reformers of the Church; or that in this particular they did de facto beat down Altars? This is fine doctrine, were it true, for the common people – who questionless will hearken to it with a greedy ear, as loving nothing more then to have the sovereignty in sacred matters, and who being led by a precedent more than they are by the law or precept – think all things lawful to be done, which were done before them. But sure the people never did it. For in the letters sent in the King’s name to Bishop Ridley, it is said that it was come to the King’s knowledge how the Altars within the most part of the churches of this Realm, being already upon good and godly consideration taken down, there did remain Altars in diverse other churches (Acts and Monuments, Part. 2. pag. 699). So that the Altars were not generally taken down throughout the Kingdom – and those which were took down, were taken down on good and godly consideration; which certainly implies some order and authority from those who had a power to do it: Not beaten down de facto by the common people in a popular humour, without authority or warrant. And had they all been beaten down de facto by the common people, that kind of Law which after put them down de jure had come too late to carry any stroke in so great a business – unless perhaps the King was willing on the post-fact to partake somewhat of the honour; or durst not but confirm the doings of disordered people, by a kind of Law. A kind of Law? And is the edict and direction of the
King in sacred matters but a kind of Law? The people’s beating down the Altars was, as it seems, a powerful law, a very club-law at the least, against which was no resistance to be made; the Prince’s edict to remove them but a kind of Law, which no man was obliged unto nor had regarded, but that they found it sorted with the people’s humour. Just so he [the Epistoler] dealt before with the Queen’s Injunctions. The Queen’s Injunctions had appointed that the Holy Table in every Church should be decently made and set up in the place where the Altar stood. And thereupon it is resolved by the Epistoler that, if by placing of the Table Altarwise is meant the setting of it in that place of the chancel where the Altar stood, there may be somewhat said for that, because the Injunctions did so place it. The edict of King Edward but a kind of Law? the order of Queen Elizabeth but a kind of… somewhat? This is no mannerly dealing with Kings and Queens, my good Brother of BOSTON.

17. YET such a kind of Law it was, that being seconded by a kind of somewhat in the Queen’s Injunctions 1559, referring to that order of King Edward, it hath taken from us, the children of the Church and Commonwealth, the name & nature of former Altars. The children of the Church? And who are they? Those only which are bounded intra partem Donati, “the lot and portion of the brethren of the Dispersion” – those who have kept their children’s foreheads from the sign of the Cross, their knees from bowing at the blessed name of JESUS, or doing honour to him in his holy Sacrament; those who have kept their hands from paying their duties to the Priest; their eyes from being defiled with looking on prohibited vestments, such as have formerly been abused to idolatrous services. Those doubtless are the children of the Church here meant, which must not use the name of Altars; as if it were the Shibboleth of their profession.72 From us, the children of the Church? Yes, marry,73 Sir. Now judge, if

72 See Judges 12.5-6: “And the Gileadites took the passages of Jordan before the Ephraimites: and it was so, that when those Ephraimites which were escaped said, Let me go over; that the men of Gilead said unto him, Art thou an Ephraimite? If he said, Nay; Then said they unto him, Say now Shibboleth: and he said Sibboleth: for he could not frame to pronounce it right. Then they took him, and slew him at the passages of Jordan: and there fell at that time of the Ephraimites forty and two thousand.”

73 An exclamation expressing surprise or indignation, probably derived from a Middle English oath, “by Mary!” (the Blessed Virgin Mary). This expression was already becoming obsolete in Heylyn’s day.
Heylyn, A Coale from the Altar (1637)

at the least you know a cat by her claw, if that which I at first suspected be not come about. For but with half an eye one may see by this, of what strain the Epistoler is, or else unto what party he applies himself in all this business. As for the children of the Commonwealth, it's time that criticism were forgotten, and that they were the children of the Kingdom, too. We live (we praise God for it) in a monarchy, not in a democracy. And therefore they that go about to coin distinctions between the welfare of the King and [that of] the Commonweal may perhaps pass for subtle sophister, but never shall attain the honour to be thought sound subjects of the English Crown.

18. BUT it is time we should proceed, and leave these children of the Church and the Commonwealth to their grand directors; who, though in other things they are all for novelties, new forms of prayer, new rites and ceremonies of Religion (if they brook of any), new offices in the dispensation of God’s Word and Sacrament; must yet affect the name of Table, even for pure antiquity: the name of the Lord’s Table, being told them to be no new name, and therefore none to be ashamed of it. A thing that might have well been spared, there being none so void of piety and understanding as to be scandalized at the name of the Lord’s Table – as are some men, it seems, at the name of Altar: saving that somewhat must be said to persuade the people that questionless such men there are, the better to endear the matter. Nor is the name of Altar so new a name that any man should be ashamed thereof, as if it were a term taken up of late, in time of Popery. For whereas the Epistoler pleadeth, That Christ himself did institute the Sacrament upon a Table, and not upon an Altar, and that the name of Table is in the Christian Church, 200. years more ancient than the name of Altar, as is most learnedly proved out of St. Paul, Origen, and Arnobius, by Bishop Jewel, against Harding of Private Masse. p. 143: It may be possible that neither CHRIST our Saviour’s institution will of necessity infer the use of Tables – Tables, I mean, placed Table-wise, towards the east great window, as before was said – nor Bishop Jewel’s proofs come home to the point in hand. For howsoever our Saviour instituted this holy Sacrament at a Table, not at an Altar, yet is the Table, in regard of that institution, but an accessory and a point of

74 Sophister = sophist, someone who parses philosophical (or theological) statements in a pedantic way, not for the sake of attaining truth but in order to gain advantage and control over an opponent’s argument.
circumstance; nothing therein of substance, nothing which is to be considered as a principal. For if it were a matter of substance that it was instituted at a Table, then must the fashion of that Table—being, as it is conceived, of an oval form—be a matter of substance also; and compassed round about with beds, as then the custom was, for the communicants to rest upon whilst they do receive. But herein is the Table no more considerable, than that it was first instituted after Supper in an upper chamber, distributed amongst twelve only; and those twelve, all men; and those men, all priests—which no man is so void of sense, as to imagine to be things considerable in the administration of this holy Sacrament. And yet should this be granted too, that in the having of a Table we must conform ourselves to the LORD’s example: yet for the situation of that Table, I doubt it would be hardly proved by the Epistoler that the two ends thereof did stand East and West; or that there was a great window in the east end of the [upper] chamber, towards the which the Table was placed end-long, at the institution; as he [the Epistoler] would have it now at the ministration.

19. AS little comfort can he find in Bishop Jewel, or in St. Paul, Origen, and Arnobius, by him alleged. Of St. Paul there is nothing said in all that Section (it is the 26 of the third Article) which concerns this matter, nothing that sets forth the antiquity of the name of Table. St. Paul is cited once only in that whole Section, and the place cited then is this; Quomodo dicet Amen ad tuam gratiarum actionem (1 Cor. 14).75 So that unless this argument be good, [namely, that] “the people cannot say Amen to prayers made in a strange tongue, because they know not what is said, ergo, the name of Table is 200 years more ancient than the name of Altar,” there is not any thing alleged from St. Paul which can advantage the Epistoler for the point in hand. Indeed, from Origen, and Arnobius, it is there alleged that generally the Gentiles did object against the Christians of those times that they had neither Altars, Images, nor Temples; Obijcit nobis quod non habeamus imagines, aut aras, aut templas [He objects to us because we do not have images or altars or temples]. So Origen, Contra Celsum 1. 4. Nos accusatis quod nec templum habeamus, nec imaginis, nec aras [You accuse us because we have not temples not images nor altars]. So saith Arnobius, lib. 2. Contra Gentes. But unto this objection we need no better answer than Bishop Jewel’s own in the selfsame Section: viz. that “then the faithful, for fear of tyrants, were fain to meet together in private houses, in vacant places, in woods and forests and

75 1 Corinthians 14.16: “Else when thou shalt bless with the spirit, how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned say Amen at thy giving of thanks, seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest?”
caves under the ground.” But we will further say withal that though the Christians had some churches in those perilous times, yet were they not so gorgeous, nor so richly furnished, as were the temples of the Gentiles. And so both Origen and Arnobius must be understood, not that the Christians in their times had at all no temples, or at the least no Altars in them: but that their churches were so mean that they deserved not the name of temples; and that they had no Altars for bloody and external sacrifices, as the Gentiles had.

For otherwise it is most certain that the Church had Altars, both the name and the thing; and used both name and thing a long time together, before the birth of Origen, or Arnobius. After Tertullian, who lived in the same age with Origen (but sometime before) and a full hundred years before Arnobius, hath the name of Altar; as a thing used and known in the Christian Church, as in his rhetorical question, Nonne solemnior erit statio tua si et ad aram Dei steteris? (Lib. de oratione, cap. 14: “Will not thy station” – or form of Devotion then in use – “be thought more solemn, if thou dost stand by or before the Altar?”) And in his book de Poenitentia, he remembereth geniculationem ad aras, “kneeling or bowing of the knee before the Altar”. Before him, Origen, or Arnobius, flourished Irenæus, who proves the Apostles to be priests because they did Deo et Altari servire, “attend the service of the Lord, and wait upon him at the Altar”. Whereof see lib. 4. Adversus haereses, cap. 20. And so St Cyprian, who lived before Arnobius, though after Origen, doth call it plainly, Altare Dei, “God’s Altar” (Ep. lib. 1. C. 7. ad Epictetum). See the like in the 8. and 9. Epistolae. of the same book also. But to go higher yet, Ignatius useth it in no less than three of his Epistles: ος επι εν θυσιαστήριον ad Magnes. εν θυσιαστήριον εκκλησια, ad Philadelph. “One Altar, and one Altar in every church”; and finally in his Epistle ad Tarsens. he termes it θυσιαστήριον του Θεου, “God’s altar,” as both Tertullian and St Cyprian did after call it. So in the Canon of the Apostles, which though not writ by them, are certainly of good antiquity, the same word θυσιαστήριον doth occur in the 3, 4. and 5. Canons. And above all indeed St Paul in his Habemus altare, Heb. 13. 10. In which place, whether he mean the Lord’s Table or the Lord’s Supper, or rather the Sacrifice itself which the Lord once offered; certain it is that he conceived the name of Altar neither to be impertinent nor improper in the Christian Church. So that for aught appears in the ancient Writers, the name of Altar is as old as the name of Table; indifferently and promiscuously used without doubt or scruple. Nor doth that reverend Bishop Jewel deny but that the Lord’s Table ancietly was called an Altar, and citeth elsewhere divers of the Fathers which did call it so (wherein consult
his 13 Articles and 6th section – though now it be resolved by this Epistoler that the name being so many years abolished, it is in his judgment fitter that the Altar (if we will needs call it so) should according to the Canon stand table-wise, than that the Vicar’s table, to trouble the poor town of Grantham, should stand Altarwise. This is indeed the thing most aimed at in all this business, only the pleasing of the people. It was to please the people who, as it is affirmed in the beginning of this letter, had taken some umbrages and offence at the placing of the table where the Altar stood; that the Churchwardens were appointed to remove it into the middle of the chancel. It was to please the people, that the authority of the Churchwardens is advanced so high above their Minister’s. And now for fear of troubling the poor people, we must not use the name of Altars, or place the table Altarwise; lest they should take it for a dresser and in a pious fury break it all in pieces – as, they are told, their ancestors had done de facto in King Edward’s reign.

SECTION III.

WE are now come to the last part of this Epistle, viz. the fixing of the Altar (or Communion Table) at the upper end of the quire: And unto this it is thus said by the Epistoler, viz. that the standing of the table in the higher part of the church, he had declared his assent already in opinion; but that it should be fixed there was so far from being canonical that it is directly against the Canon. It may be neither so, nor so. Not so for certain in the first [point]. For in the Vicar’s judgement, the Communion Table ought to stand like an Altar, all along the wall; and in the opinion of the Epistoler, although he be content that it should stand above the steps, yet he would have it placed table-wise, with one end towards the east great window – which certainly is no assent in, but a diversity of opinion. And for the second [point], howsoever it be ordered in the rubric, that the Communion table shall stand in the body of the church or in the chancel (and not, or of the chancel, as the Epistoler hath informed us); where Morning and Evening Prayer are appointed to be read: yet his illation⁷⁶ thereupon, that seeing Morning and Evening Prayer be appointed to be read in the body of the church (as in most country churches, he saith, it is), therefore the Table should stand most canonically in the body of the church; is both uncertain and unsound. For seeing it is ordered in the Book [of Common Prayer] itself that “Morning and Evening Prayer shall be used in the accustomed place

⁷⁶ illation. A conclusion drawn upon stated premises or propositions.
of the Church, Chapel, or Chancel, except it shall be otherwise
determined by the Ordinary of the place,” he must first shew us
where it was determined by the Ordinary of the place, that Morning
and Evening Prayer shall be said only in the body of the church,
before he venture on such new and strange conclusions. And for the
rubric, it saith only that it shall so be placed in Communion time;
And that too [is] to bee understood, according as it hath been since
interpreted by the best authority, not as if ordered upon any dislike of
placing the Communion Table where the Altar stood, but as
permitting it to the discretion of the Ordinary to set, or cause it to be
set in the time of the administration of the Sacrament, so as it might
be most convenient for the communicants, who in the former times,
as it is well known, had rather been lookers on the Sacrament than
partakers of it.

2 THE like construction is also to be made of the Queen’s
Injunction 1559, which is next alleged, and of the 82nd Canon now
in force, being a recital and confirmation of that part of the
Injunction where it is said that In the time of the Communion, the
Table shall be placed in so good sort within the chancel (the 82nd
Canon hath it within the church or chancel) as thereby the Minister
may more conveniently be heard by the communicants. Which plainly
is a matter of permission rather than command – yea, and a matter of
permission only in such times and places where otherwise the
Minister cannot conveniently be heard of the communicants. So that
in all the lesser churches, such as our country churches for the most
part are, and in all others where the Minister standing at the Altar
may be heard conveniently, the Table may stand Altar-wise in the
time of ministration, without breach of Canon. And this in the
Epistoler’s judgement – the ablest Canonist, no doubt, in the Church
of England, who hath already freely granted that placing of the Table
Altar-wise is the most decent situation when it is not used, and for
use too, where the quire is mounted up by steps and open (which may
soon be done), so that he which officiates may be seen and heard of
all the congregation. This was the thing the Vicar aimed at – of
whom we have no cause to think, or reason to conceive, that he
intended so to fix his Table unto the wall, or to incorporate it into
the same, as the Altars were; that there should be no moving or
removing it, on just and necessary causes, but that in correspondence
unto former practice, and the Injunction of the Queen, he thought
the place where formerly the Altar stood to be fittest for it, at least
out of the time of the ministration – and in that time too, if he might
be heard conveniently of the congregation. And whether he might or
no, no doubt he better knew than this extravagant Epistoler; and so
in that respect might be as well master of the people’s ears, as he in
Tacitus, whom this Epistoler hath remembred, was of his own.

3. I SAY according unto former practice and the Queen’s
Injunction. For if we look into the former practice – either of the
chapels of the King (the best interpreter of the Law, which himself
enacted), wherein the Communion Table hath so stood as now it
doeth since the beginning of Queen Elizabeth, what time that rubric in
the Common Prayer Book was confirmed and ratified, or of
collegiate and cathedral churches, the best observers of the form and
order of God’s public Service – the Vicar had good warrant for what
he did. And for the Injunctions, howsoever it be said in them, that
“in the time of the Communion the Table shall be placed in so good
sort within the chancel, as thereby the Minister may more
conveniently be heard,” being a matter of permission only, if
occasion be: yet it is ordered in the same that after the Communion
done, from time to time, the same holy Table shall be placed where it
stood before, that is, where formerly the Altar stood. So that the next
clause of this Epistoler, wherein it is referred to the Vicar’s
judgement, Whether this Table, which like Daedalus his ensigns
moves and removes from place to place, and that by the inward
wheels of the Church Canon, be fitly resembled to an Altar, that stirs
not an inch; might have well been spared: as not being likely to be any
part of the Vicar’s meaning. For we may reasonably presume that it
was only his intent to keep the Table free from irreverent usage; and
by exalting it to the highest place to gain the greater reverence to the
blessed Sacrament from the common people who, if infected with
the fancies of these latter days, are like enough to thrust it down into
the belfry or some worser corner. Nor say I so without good reason,
it being so resolved of in the Altare Damascenum, that any place , be it
what it will, is good enough for the Lord’s Table, the Communion
ended: “De loco ubi consistat cur solliciti, cum quovis loco vel
angulo extra tempus administrationis, collocari possit?” pa. 718 –
“What need they be so careful” (say those factious spirits which
composed that book) “how to dispose or place the Table; seeing that
out of the time of the ministration, it may be put in any place or
corner whatsoever it be.” High time assuredly, that such profaneness
should be met with.

4 Ther is one only passage more to be considered in this letter,
for the close of all, and that is this; that If we doe desire to know out
of Eusebius, Augustine, Durandus, and the fifth Council of
Constantinople, how long Communion Tables have stood in the
midst of the Church, we should read Bishop Jewell against Harding, Art. 3. p. 143. and we shall be satisfied. And read him though we have, yet we are not satisfied. Eusebius tells us of the Church of Tyre, that being finished, and all the seats thereof set up, the Founder after all placed the most holy Altar in the midst thereof, and compassed it about with rails, to hinder the rude multitude from pressing near it. This proves not necessarily that the Altar stood either in the body of the Church, or in the middle of the same, as the Epistoler doth intend when he saith the middle. The Altar, though it stood along the eastern wall, yet may be well interpreted to be εν µεσω, in the middle of the Chancel, in reference to the north and south, as it since hath stood. And were it otherwise, yet this is but a particular case of a church in Syria, wherein the people being more mingled with the Jews than in other places, might possibly place the Altar in the middle of the church, as was the Altar of Incense in the midst of the Temple, the better to conform unto them. For if, as Bishop Jewell saith in the self-same place, The holy Table was called an Altar, only in allusion to the Altars in the old Law: they might as well be placed in those first times, and bordering places, in the middle of the church also by the like allusion. And some such thing had been – no doubt in consideration – not only in placing of the Altar in the midst of the Temple; but in the whole fabric and structure of it, which came very near unto that model: the gate or entrance of this church [of Tyre], being directly open to the East, Euseb. Hist. lib. 10. cap. 4 [Eusebius, History of the Church, Book 10, chapter 4], as was the gate of Solomon’s temple. However in this church of Tyre, we have an Altar, as Eusebius calls it; and more than that, a rail about it – neither of which, it seems, this Epistoler likes of.

5 That of the fifth Council of Constantinople, as it is there called, being indeed the Councell sub Agapeto & Menna against Anthimus & Severus, affirms as much in sound, as the Epistoler doth intend; but if examined rightly, concludes against him. It is there said, that in the reading of the Diptychs, the people with great silence, gathered together about the Altar, and gave ear unto them. Where, although kukloV, in it selfe doth signify a Circle; yet kuklw tou kusiasthriou, cannot bee properly interpreted, round about the Altar, so as there was no part thereof which was not compassed with the people: no more than if a man should say, that hee had scene the King sitting in his throne, and all his Noblemen about him, it needs, or could bee thought, that the throne was placed in the very middle

[77 the better to conform unto them – i.e. to make it easier for Jews to think or believe that Christianity was their religion, too.]
of the Presence; as many of the Nobles being behind him, as there was before him. And certainly, if the man of God in the description of God's throne in the kingdom of Heaven, had any reference or resemblance (as no doubt he had) unto the thrones of kings on earth; wee have hit right enough upon the meaning of κυκλῳ του θυσιαστηριου in the aforesaid Council: it being said in the 4th chapter of the Revelation, vers 6. that round about the throne, κυκλῳ του θρονου, were four beasts full of eyes; and chap. 7. ver. 11. that all the Angels stood κυκλῳ του θρονου, round about the throne. So that for all is said in the fifth Council of Constantinople, the Altar might and did stand at the end of the Chancel, although the people came together about it to heare the Diptychs; i. e. the Commemoration of those famous Prelates, and other persons of chiefe note, which had departed in the faith. The like mistake there is, if it be lawfull so to say, in the words of S. Austin. That which hath beene alleaged from him, being the 46 Sermon, not the 42, is this, CHRISTVS quotidie pascit. Mensa ipsius est illa in medio constituta. Quid causae est O Audientes, ut mensam videatis, & ad epulas non accedatis. Which BP. Jewell thus translateth, Christ feedeth us daily, and this is his Table here set in the middest. O my hearers, what is the matter, that ye see the table, and yet come not to the meat. But clearely, Mensa illa in medio constituta, is not to be interpreted, The table set here in the middest, as it is translated, but The table which is heere before you: According to the usuall meaning of the Latine phrase, afferre in medium; which is not to be construed thus, to bring a thing precisely into the middle, but to bring it to us, or before us. As for that passage from Durandus, where it is said, that he examining the cause, why the Priest turneth himselfe about at the Altar, yeelds this reason for it, In medio Ecclesiae aperni os meum: that proves not that the Altar stood in the middest of the Church, but that the Priests stood at the middest of the Altar. It is well known, that many hundred yeares before hee was borne, the Altars generally stood in the Christian Churches, even as now they doe.

Now that wee may as well say somewhat in maintenance of the Altars standing in the East part of the Church; as wee have answered those authorites which were produced by the Epistolier, for planting of it in the middlest wee will alleage one testimonie, and no more but one, but such a one as shall give very good assurance of that generall usage, and in briefe is this: Socrates in his Ecclesiastical Historie, lib. 5. c. 21. speaking of the different customes in the Christian Church, saith of the Church of Antioch, the chiefe City of Syria, that it was built in different manner from all other Churches.
How so? Because the Altar was not placed to the East-ward, but to the Westward. Nicephorus, Hist. lib. 12. cap. 24. observes it generally of all the Altars in that City, and note's withall, that they were situate in a different manner from all other Altars. And howsoever possibly in some other places which they knew not of, the Altars might stand West-ward, as they did in Antioch, or to some other point of heaven, as the North, or South, if any stood so: yet it is manifest by this, that in the general practice of the Church, the Altars used to stand to the Eastward only. So that for ought appears unto the contrary in this Epistle, the Vicar of Gr. might very safely hold his three Conclusions, at the first remembered. First, that an Altar may be used in the Christian Church; Secondly, that the Table may stand Altar-wise, the Minister officiating at the North-end thereof; And thirdly, that the Table may stand constantly in the upper part of the Chancell, close along the wall, not to be taken down, either in the First, or Second Service, especially, if the Minister there standing may be seen and heard of all the Congregation. With the which Summarie of mine I had concluded this reply, had I not found this Item given unto the Vicar in the close of all, that by that time he had gained more experience in the cure of Souls, he should find no such Ceremony, as Christian Charitie, where if his meaning be, that Christian Charitie is in itselfe more precious than any Ceremony, no doubt it will be easily granted: it being by St. Paul preferred before Faith and Hope. But if he mean, that they which have the cure of Souls should rather choose to violate all the Orders of holy Church, and neglect all the Ceremonies of the same; then give offence unto the Brethren, the Children of the Church, as before he called them: it is like many other Passages before remembered, only a trick to please the people, and put the reins into their hands, who are too forwards in themselves to contemne all Ceremony, though in so doing they doe break in sunder the bonds of Charitie.

7. I have now ended with the Letter, and for your further satisfaction will lay down somewhat, touching the ground or reason of the thing required: not in it selfe, for that is touched upon before, but as it either doth relate unto the King, the Metropolitan, or in your case, the Ordinary, which requires it from you. For the true ground whereof you may please to know, that in the Statute 1o. Eliz. cap. 2. whereby the Common Praier booke now in use, was confirmed and established, it was enacted, That if there shall happen any irreverence or contempt to be used in the Ceremonies or Rites of the Church, by misusing the Orders appointed in the same: that then the Queenes Majestie, by the advise of her Commissioners for causes Ecclesiasticall, or of the Metropolitan, might ordaine or publish such
further Ceremonies or Rites as may bee most for the advancement of
Gods glorie, the edifying of his Church, and the due reverence of
Christ's holy Mysteries and Sacraments. A power not personall to the
Queene onely, when she was alive; but such as was to be continued
also unto her successours. So that in case the Common Praier booke
had determined positively, that the Table should be placed at all times
in the middle of the Church or Chancell, which is not determined of;
or that the Ordinarie of his owne autoritie, could not have otherwise
appointed, which yet is not so: the Kings most excellent Majestie, on
information of the irreverent usage of the holy Table by all sorts of
people (as it hath bee accustomed in these latter daies) in sitting on
it in time of Sermon, and otherwise prophaneely abusing it, in taking
Accounts, and making Rates and such like businesses; may by the last
clause of the said Statute, for the due reverence of Christ's holy
Mysteries and Sacraments, with the advice and counsell of his
Metropolitan, command it to bee placed where the Altar stood, and
to be railed about for the greater decencie. For howsoever in the Act,
the Queen be onely named, not her Heires and Successours; yet
plainly the autoritie is the same in them, as it was in her; which may
be made apparant by manie Arguments drawne from the Common
Law, and the Act it selfe. First, from the purpose of that clause,
which was to fence the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, then
used, from all irreverence and contempt: and for the publishing of
such other Rites and Ceremonies, as might in further time be found
convenient, for the advancement of Gods glorie, the edifying of his
Church, and the procurement of due reverence to Christ's holy
Sacraments. But seeing that the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church,
were not onely subject unto Irreverence and contempt in the said
Queenes time, but are, and have been sleighted, and irreverently
abused in time of her Successors: the Act had ill provided for the
Churches safetie, in case, the power of rectifying what was amise,
either by ordering of new Rites, or stablishing the old, did not belong
aswell to her Successours, as it did to her. Next, from the verie
phrase and stile which is there used. For it is said, the Queene, with
the advice of the Metropolitan might ordaine and publish, &c. the
Queene indefinitely, and the Metropolitan indefinitely, If then by
Queene indefinitely be onely meant, the person of the Queene then
being, not her Heires and Successours; by Metropolitan indefinitely,
wee must also meane the Metropolitan then being, and not his
Successours: and then the power heere given the Queene, had bee

determined with the death of Arch-bishop Parker, which was some
28 yeares before her owne. Thirdly, from another clause in the selfe
same Act, where it is said, that If any person being twice convict (of
depraving the booke of Common Praier, &c.) shall off end againe the
third time, and be thereof lawfully convict, hee shall forfeit for his
third offence, to our Soveraign Lady the Queene, all his Goods and Chattels, &c. where, though the Queene be onely named, the penaltie of the Law may be, and is most justly taken by her Heires and Successours; or else there were no remedy, at this time, by the Lawes provided, for the third Contempt. Fourthly, from the usuall forme of those Acts and Statutes, which were made purposely for the particular and personall profit, safetie, and advantage of the said Queene, which are distinguished from others by this note or Character, viz. This Act to continue, during the Queenes Majestyes life that now is onely. Such is the Act, against rebellious assemblies, 1. Eliz. cap. 16. Those against such as shall rebelliously take, or conspire to take from the Queenes Majestie any of her Towers, Castles, &c. 14. Eliz. cap. 1. And against such, as shall conspire, or practise the enlargement of any Prisoner committed for High Treason. cap. 2. That against seditious, Words and Rumors uttered against the Queenes most excellent Majestie. 23. Eliz. ca. 2. And finally, that for the safety of the Queenes royal person, and the continuance of the Realme in Peace, An. 27. ca. 1. In the which last, although it bee not said expressly that it shal dure no longer then her natural life, yet the word, Person, in effect, doth declare as much. Fiftly, from a resolution in the Law, in a case much like: it being determined by that great Lawyer Ploydon, that if a man give Lands to the King by deed inrolled, a Fee simple doth passe, without these words, Successours and Heires; because in Judgement of Law, The King never dieth. Coke on Lit. pag. 9. b. And last of all, it may be argued, that the said clause or any thing therein contained, is not indeed Introductorie of any new power, which was not in the Crowne before; but rather Declaratorie of an old, which anciently did belong to all Christian Kings (as before any of them to the Kings of Judah) and among others to ours also: who, with the Counsell of their Prelates, and other Clergie, might, and did induce such Rites and Ceremonies into the Churches of, and in their severall kingdoms, as were thought most convenient for God's publick Service; till at the last, all Ecclesiastical autortie was challenged and usurped by the See of Rome. Which is the answer and determination of Sir Robert Coke, in Cawdries case, being the fifth part of his Reports, entituled, De jure Regis Ecclesiastico; where hee affirmeth, that if the Act of Parliament, 1o. Eliz. 2. cap. 1. whereby it was enacted, That all Ecclesiastical power and autortie, which heretofore had bee, or might lawfully be exercised or used for the visitation of the Ecclesiastical state, and persons, and for reformation of all, and all manner Errors, Heresies, Schisms, Abuses, and Contempts, Offences, and Enormities, should bee for ever united and annexed to the Imperiall Crowne of this Realme: Was not an Act introductory of a new law, but confirmative of an old, for that this Act doth not
annex any jurisdiction to the Crowne, but that which was in truth, or of right ought to bee by the ancient Lawes of the Realme, parcell of the Kings Jurisdiction, and united to the crowne Imperiall. By this Authoritie the Altars were first taken downe in King Edwards reigne, though countenanced and allowed of in the Common-prayer Booke, then by Law established; the better, as the cause is pleaded by Bishop Ridley, to avoyd superstition, Actes and Monum. Part. 2. pag. 700. and by the same, or by that mentioned, 1o. Eliz. cap. 2. his Majestie now being, might appoynt the Table to bee set up, where formerly the Altar stood, (had it been otherwise determined in the Rubrick, as indeed it is not) to avoyd prophanenesse.

8. I Will adde one thing more for your satisfaction, which perhaps you know not; And that is, that his sacred Majestie hath hereupon already declared his pleasure, in the Case of Saint Gregories Church neere Saint Pauls in London, and thereby given encouragement to the Metropolitans, Bishops, and other Ordinaries, to require the like in all the Churches committed to them. Which resolution of his Majestie, faithfully copied out of the Registers of his Councell-Table, I shall present herewith unto you, and so commend my selfe to you, and us all to the grace of God in JESVS CHRIST.
At Whitehall, the third of November. 1633.
Present, the KING’s most excellent Majesty.
Lo: Archbish. of Cant.
Lo: Keeper.
Lo: Archbish. of Yorke.
Lo: Treasurer.
Lo: Privie Seale.
Lo: Duke of Lennox.
Lo: High Chamberlain.
Lo: Chamberlaine.
Ear: of Bridgewater.
Ear: of Carlile.
Lo: Cottington.
Mr. Treasurer.
Mr. Comptroller.
Mr. Secretary Cooke.
Mr. Secret. Windebanke.

THis day was debated before his Majestie, sitting in Counsell, the Question and Difference which grew about the Removing of the Communion Table in Saint Gregories Church, neere the Cathedrall Church of Saint Paul, from the middle of the Chancell to the upper end, and there placed Altar-wise, in such manner as it standeth in the sayd Cathedralls and Mother Church, (as also in all other Cathedralls, and in his Majesties owne Chappell) and as is consonant to the practise of approved Antiquitie. Which removall, and placing of it in that sort, was done by Order of the Deane and Chapter of St. Pauls, who are Ordinaries thereof, as was avowed before his Majestie by Doctor King, and Doctor Montfort, two of the Prebends there. Yet some few of the Parishioners, being but five in number, did complaine of this Act by Appeale to the Court of Arches, pretending that the Booke of Common-prayer, and the 82. Canon doe give permission to place the Communion Table, where it may stand with most fitnesse and convenience. Now his Majestie having heard a particular relation made by the Counsaile of both parties, of all the carriage and proceedings in this cause, was pleased to declare his dislike of all Innovation, & receeding from ancient Constitutions, grounded upon just and warrantable reasons, especially in matters concerning Ecclesiasticall Orders and Government, knowing how easily men are drawne to affect Novelties, and how soone weake judgements in such cases may bee overtaken and abused. And he was also pleased to observe, that if those few Parishioners might have their wills, the difference thereby from the foresaid Cathedrall or Church, by which all other Churches depending thereon ought to be
guided, would be the more notorious, & give more subject of Discourse and Disputes that might be spared, by reason of the neereness of St. Gregories, standing close to the wall thereof. And likewise, for so much as concerns the liberty given by the said Common booke, or Canon, for placing the Communion Table in any Church or Chappell with most conveniencie; that libertie is not so to be understood, as if it were ever left to the discretion of the Parish, much lesse to the particular fancie of any humerous person, but to the judgement of the Ordinarie, to whose place and function it doth properly belong to give direction in that poynet, both for the thing it selfe, and for the time, when and how long, as he may finde cause. Vpon which consideration his Majestie declared himselfe, That hee well approved and confirmed the Act of the said Ordinarie, and also gave commandement, that if those few Parishioners before mentioned, do proceed in their said Appeale, then the Deane of the Arches, (who was then attending at the hearing of the Cause) shall confirme the said Order of the aforesaid Deane and Chapter.

A COPIE OF THE LETTER
WRITTEN to the Vicar of GR:
against the placing of the Communion Table at the East end of the Chancell.

SIR,

WIth my very hearty Commendations. When I spake with you last, I told you that the standing of the Communion Table, was unto me a thing so indifferent, that unlesse offence and vmbrages were taken by the Towne against it, I should never move it, or remove it. That which I did not then suspect, is come to passe. The Alderman whom I have knoune this 17. or 18. yeares, to bee a discreet and modest man, and farre from any humour of innovation, together with the better sort of the Towne, have complained against it: And I have (without taking notice of your Act, or touching in one sillable upon your reputation) appointed the Church Wardens (whom it principally doth concern under the Diocesan) to settle it for this time, as you may see by this Copy inclosed.

Now for your owne satisfaction, and my poore advise for the future, I have written unto you somewhat more at large, then I vse to expresse my selfe in this kinde.
I doe therefore (to deale plainly) like many things well, and disallow of some things in your carriage of the businesse. It is well done that you affect decency and comlinesse, in the officiating of GOD's Divine Service; That you president your selfe with the formes in his Majesties Chappels, and the Quires of Cathedrall Churches (if your Quire, as those others, could containe your whole congregation;) that you doe the reverence appointed by the Canon to the blessed name of IESVS, so it be done humbly, and not affectedly, to procure Devotion, not derision of your Parishioners, and that you do not maintaine it Rationibus non cogentibus, and so spoile a good Cause with bad arguments. These things I doe allow and practise. But that you should be so violent and earnest for an Altar at the upper end of the Quire; That the Table ought to stand Altarwise; That the fixing thereof in the Quire is Canonically, and that it ought not to bee removed to the body of the Church; I conceive to be in you so many mistakings.

For the first, if you should erect any such Altar, which (I know you will not) your discretion will prove the onely Holocaust to be sacrificed thereon. For you have subscribed when you came to your place, that That other Oblation which the Papists were wont to offer upon their Altars, is a Blasphemous figment, and pernicious imposture, in the thirty one Article: And also, that we in the Church of England ought to take heed, lest our Communion of a memory, be made a Sacrifice: In the first Homily of the Sacrament. And it is not the Vicar, but the Church-wardens, that are to provide for the Communion, and that not an Altar, but a faire joyned Table: Canons of the Convocation, 1571. pag. 18. And that the Altars were removed by Law, and Tables placed in their stead, in all, or the most Churches in England, appeares by the Queens Injunctions, 1559. related unto, and so confirmed in that point by our Canons still in force. And therefore (I know) you will not change a Table into an Altar, which Vicars were never inabled to set up, but allowed once with other's to pull downe. Injunction of 1o. Elizab. for Tables in the Church.

For the second point. That your Communion Table is to stand Altarwise, if you meane in that place of the Chancell, where the Altar stood, I thinke somewhat may be said for that; because the Injunctions 1559. did so place it; And I conceive it to be the most decent situation, when it is not used, and for use too, where the Quire is mounted up by steps, and open, so that hee that officiates may bee scene and heard of all the Congregation. Such an one I heare your Chancell is not. But if you meane by Altar-wise, that the Table should stand along close by the wall, so as you be forced to officiate at one
end thereof (as you may have observed in great men's Chappells:) I do not believe that ever the Communion Tables were (otherwise than by casualtie) so placed in Countrey Churches. For, besides that, the Countrey-people would suppose them Dressers, rather than Tables; And that Qu. Elizabeths Commissioners for causes Ecclesiasticall, directed that the Table should stand, not where the Altar, but where the steps of the Altar formerly stood. Orders 1561. The Minister appointed to reade the Communion (which you, out of the booke of Fast in 1o. of the King, are pleased to call, Second Service) is directed to reade the Commandements, not at the end, but at the North-side of the Table, which implies the end to bee placed towards the East great Window, Rubrick before the Communion. Nor was this a new direction in the Queenes time only, but practised in king Edward's raigne, for in the plot of our Liturgie sent by Mast Knox, and Whittingham to Master Calvin in the raigne of Queene Mary, it is said, that the Minister must stand at the North-side of the Table. Troubles at Frankford. pag. 30. And so in King Edward's Liturgies, the Ministers standing in the middest of the Altar, 1549. is turned to his standing at the North-side of the Table, 1552. And this last Liturgie was revived by Parliament, 1o. Eliz. cap. 2. And I believe it is so used at this day in the most places of England. What you saw in Chappels, or Cathedrall Churches is not the point in question, but how the Tables are appointed to be placed in Parish Churches. In some of the Chappels and Cathedrals, the Altars may be still standing, for ought I know; or to make use of their Covers and Ornaments, Tables may be placed in their roome, of the same length and fashion the Altars were of. Wee know the Altars stand still in Lutheran Churches; And the Apologie for the Augustan Confession, Art. 12. doth allow it. The Altars stood a yeare or two in King Edwards times, as appeares by the Liturgie printed 1549. and it seems the Queens Commissioners were content they should stand, as we may guesse by the Injunctions, 1559. But how is this to be understood? The Sacrifice of the Altar abolished, these (call them what you will) are no more Altars, but Tables of Stone or Tymber; and so was it alleged 24 Novem. 4o. Edw. 6. 1549. Sublato enim relativo formali, manet absolutum & materiale tantum. And so may be well used in Kings and Bishops houses, where there are no people so void of understanding, as to bee scandalized. For upon the Orders of breaking downe Altars, all Dioeceses did agree upon receiving Tables, but not upon the fashion and forme of the Tables. Acts and Monum. pag. 1212. Besides that, in the old Testament, one and thesame thing is termed an Altar and a Table. An Altar, in respect of what is there offered unto God, and a Table in respect of what is there participated by men, as for example, by the Priests; So have you God's Altar; the verie same with God's Table in Malachie 1. v. 7. The place is worth
Heylyn, *A Coale from the Altar* (1637)

the marking. For it Answers that very Objection out of Heb. 13. 10.
which you made to some of your fellow Ministers; and one Master
Morgan before you to Peter Martyr, in a Disputation at Oxford.

Wee have no Altar in regard of an Oblation, but wee have an Altar in
regard of Participation, and Communion granted unto us. The use of
an Altar is to Sacrifice upon, and the use of a Table is to eate upon;
and because Communion is an Action most proper for a Table, as an
Oblation is for an Altar, therefore the Church in her Liturgie, and
Canons, calling the same a Table onely, doe not you call it an Altar?
In King Edwards Liturgie of 1549. it is every where, but in that of
1552. it is no where called an Altar, but the Lords Boord. Why?
Because the people being scandalized herewith in Countrey Churches,
first beats them downe de facto, then the supreme Magistrates by a
kind of Law puts them down de jure, and setting Tables in their
roomes, tooke from us, the Children of the Church and Common-
wealth, both the name and the nature of former Altars, as you may
see. Injunction 1559. referring to that order of King Edward in his
Councell mentioned, Acts and Monum. pag. 1211. And I hope you
have more Learning than to conceive the Lords Table to be a new
name, and so to bee ashamed of the Name. For, besides that CHRIST
himselfe instituted this Sacrament upon a Table, and not upon an
Altar, as Archbishop Cranmer observes, and others, Acts and
Monum. pag. 1211. it is in the Christian Church 200 yeares more
ancient, than the name of an Altar, as you may see most learnedly
prooved out of Saint Paul, Origen, and Arnobius, if you doe but reade
a Booke that is in your Church, Iewel against Harding of Private
Masse. Art. 3. p. 143. And whether this name of Altar crept into the
Church in a kinde of complying in phrase with the people of the
Iewes, as I have read in Chemnittius, Gerardus, and other sound
Protestants, (yet such as suffer Altars to stand); or that it proceed
from these Oblations made upon the Communion Table, for the use
of the Priest, and the poore, whereof wee reade in Iustin Martyr,
Iraeneus, Tertullian, and other ancient Writers; or because of the
Sacrifice of Praise, and Thankesgiving, as Arch-bishop Cranmer, and
others thought, Acts and Monuments, pag. 1211. the name being now
so many yeares abolished, it is fitter in my Judgement, that the Altar
(if you will needes so call it) should according to the Canon, stand
Tablewise, than your Table to trouble the poore Towne of Gr.
because erected otherwise.

Lastly, that your Table should stand in the higher part of the Church,
you have my assent already in opinion: but that it should be there
fixed, is so farre from being Canonickall, that it is directly against the
Canon. For what is the Rubrick of the Church, but a Canon? And the
Rubrick saith, it shall stand in the body of the Church, or of the Chancell, where Morning prayer, and Evening prayer be appointed to be read; If therefore Morning and Evening prayer bee appointed to be read in the body of the Church, (as in most countrey Churches it is) where shall the Table stand most Canonically? And so is the Table made removeable, when the Communion is to be celebrated, to such place as the Minister may be most conveniently heard by the Communicants, by Qu. Eliz. Injunct. 1559. And so saith the Canon in force, that in the time of the Communion, the Table shall bee placed in so good sort within the Church and Chancel, as therby the Minister may be more conveniently heard, Can. 82. Now judge you whether this Table (which like Daedalus his Engines, mooves and remooves from place to place, and that by the inward wheeles of the Church Canons) bee fitly resembled by you to an Altar, that stirres not an inch, and supposed to be resembled canonically. And if you desire to know out Eusebius, and Augustine, Durandus, and the fifth Councell of Constantinople, how long Communion Tables have stood in the midst of the Church, reade a Booke, which you are bound to reade, and you shall bee satisfied. Iewel against Harding of private Masse. Art. 3. p. 145. The Sum of all is this.

1. You may not erect an Altar, where the Canons onely admit a communion Table.

2. This Table must not stand Altarwise, and you at the North end thereof, but Tablewise, as you must officiate at the Northside of the same.

3. This Table ought to bee laid up (decently covered) in the Chancell onely, as I suppose, but ought not to be officiated upon, either in the first or second Service (as you distinguish) but in that place of the Church or Chancell, where you may be seene and heard of all; Though peradventure you be with him in Tacitus, Master of your owne, yet are you not of other mens eares; and therefore your Parishioners must be Judges of your audiblenesse in this case.
Whether side soever (you or your Parish) shall yeeld to th'other, in this needlesse Controversie, shall remaine, in my poore iudgement, the more discreet, grave, and learned of the two: And by that time you have gained some more Experience in the Cure of Soules, you shall finde no such Ceremonie, as Christian Charitie, which I recommend unto you, and am ever, &c.

FINIS.
3. Joseph Mede
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MALACHI 1.11
Ab ortu solis usque ad occasum, magnum erit nomen meum in gentibus, et in omni loco offeretur incensum nomini meo, et munus purum; quia magnum erit nomen meum in gentibus, dicit Dominus exercituum.

From the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering: for my name shall be great among the heathen, saith the LORD of hosts.

CHAPTER I.

This place of Scripture, howsoever now in a manner silenced and forgotten, was once – and that in the eldest and purest times of the Church – a text of eminent note and familiarly known to every Christian, being alleged by their pastors and teachers as an express and undoubted prophecy of the Christian sacrifice, or solemn worship in the eucharist, taught by our blessed Saviour unto his disciples to be observed of all that should believe in his name; and this so generally and grantedly as could never have been, at least so early, unless they had learned thus to apply it by tradition from the apostles.

For in the age immediately succeeding them, being the second hundred years after Christ, we find it alleged to this purpose by Justin Martyr and Irenaeus, the pillars of that age; the former of them

---

78 Justin Martyr. Martyred at Rome, ca. 167 (feast, 1 June). A Greek-speaking native of Palestine, he converted from Platonism to the Church and made a career of advocating Christianity as “the true philosophy”. Justin’s major surviving works are: First Apology (ca. 148), a defence of Christianity addressed to the emperor Hadrian; Second Apology (ca. 155); and Dialogue with Trypho the Jew, a lengthy response to Jewish theological arguments against Christianity.
flourishing within little more than thirty years after the death of St John, and the latter a disciple of Polycarp, St John’s scholar. In the age following, or third saeculum, it is alleged by Tertullian, Zeno Veronensis, and Cyprian; in the fourth saeculum by Eusebius, Chrysostom, Hierome, and Augustine – and in the after ages, by


80 Polycarp. Bishop of Smyrna, martyr 156 (feast, 23 February). Traditionally thought to have been (as Mede puts it) “St John’s scholar,” i.e. a disciple of St John the Apostle and Evangelist. A contemporary account of his martyrdom is one of the great classics of early Christian literature.

81 Saeculum. Latin, “century”.

82 Tertullian. Ca. 160 – ca. 225, the first great Latin theologian; a native of Carthage in Roman North Africa. A prolific (and brilliant) defender of Catholic teaching against paganism and various Christian heresies. Towards the end of his life, associated himself with Montanism, a movement which combined extreme asceticism and ecstatic mysticism.


84 Cyprian. Bishop of Carthage, martyred 258 (feast, 13 September). Wrote a variety of treatises regarding the nature and discipline of the Catholic Church; also known for the collection of his letters to a variety of correspondents.

85 Eusebius. Ca. 260 – ca. 340, bishop of Caesarea Maritima, a major port on the coast of Palestine (in what is now Israel). Chiefly known for his *Ecclesiastical History*, the first serious effort to tell the story of the Church from the age of the Apostles to Eusebius’s own day. Mede cites two of Eusebius’s other works, *Demonstratio evangelica* (“Demonstration of the Gospel”) and *In laude Constantini*, a eulogy of the emperor Constantine.


87 Hierome. I.e. Jerome (ca. 342-420; feast, 30 September). Roman priest and scholar, responsible for producing the standard Latin version of the Bible known as the Vulgate. Also wrote commentaries on many books of the Bible, and produced an enormous correspondence. Mede does not actually cite any of Jerome’s works.

88 Augustine (354-430; feast, 28 August), bishop of Hippo Regius 396-430.
whom not? Nor is it alleged by them as some singular opinion or private conceit of their own, but as the received tradition of the Church. Whence in some liturgies – as that of the Church of Alexandria, commonly called the Liturgy of St Mark – it is inserted into the hymn or preface which begins, 

Αληθως εστιν αξιον και δικαιον, “It is truly meet and right”; the conclusion of the hymn or laud there being: 

Ευχαριστουντες προσφεροµεν την λογικην και αναιµακτην λατρειαν ταυτην την προσφερει σοι Κυριε παντα τα εθνη απο ανατολον ηλιου και μεγε δυσµων, οτι µεγα το ονοµασου εν πασι τοις εθνεσι και εν παντι τοπω τω ονοµατιτω αγιω σου, και θυσι και προσφορα, “Giving thanks, we offer unto thee, O Lord, this reasonable and unbloody service, even that which all nations from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same offer unto thee: for thy name shall be great among all nations, and in every place incense is offered unto thy holy name, and sacrifice and oblation.” Thus you see the antiquity of tradition for the meaning and application of this prophecy.

But for the Christian sacrifice itself, whereunto it is applied, what the ancient Church understood thereby, what and wherein the nature of this sacrifice consisted, is a point, though most needful to be known, yet beyond belief obscure, intricate, and perplexed. He that shall make trial will find that I say true. A reverend and learned prelate of ours acknowledges as much.89

I have acquainted myself long with this argument and spent many a thought thereabout, using the best means I could conceive to be informed. Namely, not so much to rely upon the opinions of modern Apud veteres patres, saith he, ut quod res est libere fateamur, de sacrificio corporis Christi in eucharistia incruento frequens est mentio, quae dici vix potest quantopere quorundam, alioqui doctorum hominum ingenia exercerit, torserit, vexaverit, “To speak the plain truth, in the writings of the ancient Fathers there is frequent mention of ‘the unbloody sacrifice of the body of Christ in the eucharist’ – a point which hath beyond expression puzzled and vexed the minds of several men otherwise not unlearned.” The reason of this obscurity hath grown partly from the changing of the notion of the Church thereabout in following times, partly by the controversies of this last age, whilst each party, finding the knot and studying not so much the right way of untying it as how to give the least advantage to the adverse party, have infinitely entangled the same and made it more indissoluble than before.

I have acquainted myself long with this argument and spent many a thought thereabout, using the best means I could conceive to be informed. Namely, not so much to rely upon the opinions of modern

89 A reverend and learned prelate of ours. Mede means Thomas Morton (1564-1659), who was Bishop of Durham at the time. The work from which Mede quotes is Morton’s Of the Institution of the Sacrament of the Blessed Bodie and Blood of Christ (London, 1631), Book VI.
writers as to peruse and compare the passages of the ancients themselves and their forms of liturgies, out of which I was assured the truth might be learned, if I were but able to understand them.

What I have found and learned, I desire to give an account of in this place, as I shall have occasion – the argument being such as befits no other auditory but the schools of the prophets. Nor will the discourse be unprofitable for such as mean to be acquainted with the writings of the Fathers and antiquities of the Church, there being nothing in them so like to stumble the reader as this.

To come then to the matter, where I will chalk out my discourse in this order:

First, I shall premise, as the ground thereof, a definition of the Christian sacrifice as the ancient Church meant it;

Secondly, explain the meaning of my text by application thereto;

Thirdly, prove each part of the definition I shall give by the testimonies of the Fathers, councils, and liturgies of the first and best ages, interlacing therewith such passages as may make for the better understanding either of the testimonies I bring or of the matter itself for which they are brought.

CHAPTER II.

To begin with the first, the definition of the Christian sacrifice.

Under which name first know that the ancient Church understood not, as many suppose, the mere sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, but the whole sacred action or solemn service of the Church assembled, whereof this sacred mystery was then a prime and principal part and (as it were) the pearl or jewel of this ring, no public service of the Church being without it. This observed and remembered, I define the Christian sacrifice, _ex mente antiquæ ecclesiæ_, “according to the meaning of the ancient Church,” in this manner: –

AN OBLATION OF THANKSGIVING AND PRAYER TO GOD THE FATHER THROUGH JESUS CHRIST, AND HIS SACRIFICE COMMEMO-RATED IN THE CREATURES OF BREAD AND WINE, WHEREWITH GOD HAD FIRST BEEN AGNIZED. So that this service, as you see, hath a double object or matter: first, praise and prayer, which you may call _sacrificium quod_;

---

90 the _schools of the prophets_. i.e. Christ’s College and the other colleges of Cambridge and Oxford.

91 _agnized_. Acknowledged, confessed.

92 _sacrificium quod_. “the sacrifice which” (is being offered).
secondly, the commemoration of Christ’s sacrifice on the cross, which is *sacrificium quo*, “the sacrifice whereby the other is accepted”. For all the prayers, thanksgivings, and devotions of a Christian are tendered up unto God in the name of Jesus Christ crucified. According whereunto we are wont to conclude our prayers with “through Jesus Christ our Lord”. And this is the specification whereby the worship of a Christian is distinguished from that of the Jew. Now that which we in all our prayers and thanksgivings do vocaly when we say *per Iesum Christum Dominum nostrum*, the ancient Church, in her public and solemn service, did visibly by representing him according as he commanded, in the symbols of his body and blood. For there he is commemorated and received by us for the same end for which he was given and suffered for us – that through him, we receiving forgiveness of our sins, God our Father might accept our service and hear our prayers we make unto him.

What time, then, so fit and seasonable to commend our devotions unto God as when the Lamb of God lies slain upon the holy table and we receive visibly, though mystically, those gracious pledges of his blessed body and blood? This was that sacrifice of the ancient Church the Fathers so much ring in our ears: the sacrifice of praise and prayer through Jesus Christ, mystically represented in the creatures of bread and wine.

But yet there is one thing more my definition intimates, when I say THROUGH THE SACRIFICE OF JESUS CHRIST COMMENOMATED IN THE CREATURES OF BREAD AND WINE, WHEREWITH GOD HAD FIRST BEEN AGNIZED. The body and blood of Christ were not made of common bread and common wine, but of bread and wine first sanctified by being offered and set before God as a present to agnize him the Lord and Giver of all, according to that, *Domini est terra et plenitudo ejus*, “The earth is the Lord’s, and the fullness thereof.” \(^93\) And *let no man appear before the Lord empty*. \(^94\) Therefore as this sacrifice consisted of two parts (as I told you) – of praise and prayer, which in respect of the other I call *sacrametum quod*, and of the commemoration of Christ crucified, which I call *sacrametum quo*, – so the symbols of bread and wine traversed both, being first presented as symbols of praise and thanksgiving to agnize God the Lord of the creature in the *sacrametum quod*, then by invocation of the Holy Ghost made the symbols of the body and blood of Christ in the *sacrametum quo*. So that the whole

\(^93\) Psalm 24.1.

\(^94\) Deuteronomy 16.16.
service throughout consisted of a reasonable\textsuperscript{95} part and of a material part, as of a soul and a body – of which I shall speak more fully hereafter, when I come to prove this I have said by the testimonies of the ancients.

\section*{Chapter III.}

And this is that sacrifice which Malachi foretold the Gentiles should one day offer unto God: \textit{In omni loco offeretur incensum nomini meo et mincha}\textsuperscript{96} purum, quoniam magnum erit nomen meum in gentibus, dicit Dominus exercituum, “In every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure mincha, saith the Lord of hosts.” Which words I am now, according to the order I propounded, to explicate and apply to my definition.

Know therefore that the prophet, in the foregoing words, upbraids the Jews with despising and disesteeming their God forasmuch as they offered unto him for sacrifice not the best, but the lame, the torn, and the sick, as though he had not been the great King, Creator, and Lord of the whole world, but some petty god, and of inferior rank, for whom anything were good enough. If I be a Father, where is mine honour? If I be \textit{Dominus}, where is my fear? saith the Lord of hosts unto you, O priests that despise my name! And ye say, Wherein have we despised it? Ye offer polluted bread upon mine altar – and ye say, Wherein have we polluted thee? In that ye say, The table of the Lord is contemptible, or not so much to be regarded.\textsuperscript{97} That is, “You think so, as appears by the baseness of your offering; for the present shews what esteem the giver hath of him he honoureth therewith. But you offer that to me which ye would not think fit to offer to your \textit{Pro-rex} or governor under the king of Persia – which shews you have but a mean esteem of me in your hearts, and that you believe not I am He that I am,\textsuperscript{98} because you see me acknowledged of no other nation but yours, and that ye have been subdued by the Gentiles and brought into this miserable and despicable condition wherein you now are. You imagine me to be some topical god, \textsuperscript{99} and as of small

\textsuperscript{95} reasonable: In this case, “spiritual,” on the ancient principle that the reason or understanding was the most spiritual part of human nature.

\textsuperscript{96} mincha: Hebrew, “offering”.

\textsuperscript{97} Malachi 1.6, 7.

\textsuperscript{98} Cf. Exodus 3.14, Isaiah 43.13.

\textsuperscript{99}
jurisdiction, so of little power. But know that howsoever I now seem to be but the Lord of a poor nation, yet the days are coming when from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same my name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place incense shall be offered to my name, and a pure offering; for my name shall be great among the heathen, saith the Lord of hosts.”

It follows: Though you have profaned it, in that you say, The table of the Lord is contemptible — whereas I am a great King, and my name shall be dreadful among the heathen.

This is the dependence and coherence of the words. Now apply them. Incense, as the Scripture itself tells, notes the prayers of the saints. It was also that wherewith the remembrance was made in the sacrifices or God put in mind. Mincha, which we turn munus, is oblatio farrea, an offering made of meal or flour baked or fried, or dried or parched corn. We, in our English, when we make distinction, call it a meat-offering, but might call it a bread-offering; of which the libamen, or the drink-offering, being an indivisible concomitant, both are implied under the name Mincha, where it alone is named.

The application, then, is easy: incense here notes the rational part of our Christian sacrifice, which is prayer, thanksgiving, and commemoration; mincha, the material part thereof, which is oblatio farrea, or a present of bread and wine.

But this mincha is characterised in the text with an attribute not to be overpast, “a pure mincha”: In omni loco offeretur incensum nomini meo, et Mincha purum, “In every place incense shall be offered to my name, and a pure mincha.” The meat-offering which the Gentiles should one day present the God of Israel with, should be munus purum or, as the Septuagint, θυσια καθαρα. Let us learn if we can what this purity

---

99 a topical god: a deity belonging only to a particular place (topos).

100 Malachi 1.12.

101 Malachi 1.14.

102 Revelation 8.3.

103 turn: translate.

104 munus: Latin, “gift” or “sacrifice”.

105 rational: like the word “reasonable” above (Note 17), this connotes “spiritual” or “immaterial”.

106 overpast: overlooked.
is, and wherein it consisteth, or in what respect the Gentiles’ oblation is so styled.

1. Some of the Fathers take this “pure offering” to be an offering that is purely or spiritually offered. The old sacrifices both of the Jew and Gentile were offered in a corporeal manner, by slaughter, fire, and incense. But this of Christians should be offered only λογω ευχης και ευχαριστιας, “by way of prayer and thanksgiving,” as Justin Martyr expresses it. Whence it is usually called λογικη και αναιµακτος θυσια, “a reasonable and unbloody sacrifice,” namely, of the manner of offering it. Not that there was no material thing used therein, as some mistake, – for we know there was bread and wine, – but because it is offered unto God immaterially, or λογικως only, which the Fathers in the first Council of Nicea call αθυτας θυεσθαι, “to be sacrificed without sacrificing rites”. This sense of pure sacrifice is followed by Tertullian, as may appear by his words Ad Scapulam where, speaking of the Christian liturgy, Sacrificamus (saith he) pro salute imperatoris; sed, quomodo præcepit Deus, purâ prece. Non enim eget Deus, conditor universitatis, odoris aut sanguinis aliarum; hac enim daemonorum pabula sunt, “We offer sacrifice for the health and welfare of the emperor, but it is, according as God hath commanded, the sacrifice of pure prayer. For God, the Maker of the world, stands not in the need of the smell or savour of any creature – these are the food and diet which the devils love.” Also in his third book against Marcion, cap. 22: In omni loco offeretur sacrificium nomini meo, “In every place sacrifice shall be offered to my name,” et sacrificium mundum, “and a pure sacrifice” – that is, saith he, gloria relatio, benedictio, laus, et hymni, “giving glory to God, blessing, praise, and hymns,” which he presently calls munditias sacrificiorum, “the purities of sacrifices.” The same way go some others. But this sense, though it fitly serves to difference our Christian sacrifice from the old sacrifices of the Jews and Gentiles, and the thing itself be most true, yet I cannot see how it can agree with the context of our prophet, where the word incense (though, I confess, mystically understood) is expressed together with “a pure offering”. For it would make the literal sense of our prophet to be absurd and to say, “In every place incense is offered to my name, and an offering without incense.” And yet this would be the literal meaning, if pure here signified “without incense”.

107 θυσια καθαρα (thusia kathara): Greek, “a pure (or unblemished) sacrifice”.

108 λογικως (logikos): Greek, “reasonably, spiritually, immaterially”.

109 Ad Scapulam: “For Scapula”.
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2. Let us hear therefore a second interpretation of this purity of the Christian mincha, more agreeable to the dependence of the words; and that is, a conscientia offerentis, “from the disposition and affection of the offerer,” according to that of the Apostle, Titus 1.15, 16: To the pure all things are pure; but unto them that are defiled and unbelieving is nothing pure, but even their conscience is defiled. They profess they know God, but in works they deny him. The Jews’ offering was profane and polluted because it proceeded not out of a due belief and a conscience thoroughly persuaded of the greatness of their God, that he was the Creator and Lord of the whole earth, but rather some petty and particular god, like the gods of other nations. But the Gentiles, who should see him not only the God of one nation, but universally acknowledged over all the earth, should have no such reason to doubt but firmly believe him to be the great God, Creator of heaven and earth, and worship him as such – and so their offering be a pure offering, not polluted with unbelief. And it is to be observed that all the ancient Christian liturgies begin with this acknowledgment. For the sum of the eucharistical doxology, when the bread and wine is first presented before God, is comprehended in that of the Apocalypse, Thou art worthy, O Lord, to receive glory, and honour, and power; for thou hast created all things, and for thy pleasure they are and were created.110

And to this way of interpreting the purity of the Christian sacrifice – to wit, from the conscience and affection of the offerers – the Fathers mostly bend. Irenæus, lib. 4, chap. 34:111 Sacrificia non sanctificant hominem, non enim indiget Deus sacrificio; sed conscientia eius qui offerat sanctificat sacrificium, pura existens: Quoniam igitur cum simplicitate ecclesia offerit, iuste munus eius purum sacrificium apud Deum deputatum est, “Sacrifices do not sanctify a man, for God stands not in need of any of our sacrifices; but the conscience of him that offers, being pure, sanctifies the sacrifice … And because the Church offereth with simplicity (that is, with a conscience purified from all malice and hypocrisy), rightly therefore is her oblation accounted by God a pure sacrifice.” And a little after: Oportet enim nos oblationem Deo facere, et in omnibus gratus inventiri fabricatoris Dei, in sententia pura et fide sine hypocrisi, “For it behooveth us to present God with our oblations, and in all things to be found thankful unto God our Maker, with pure minds and faith unfeigned, with steadfast hope and fervent love offering unto him the first-fruits (or a present) of his creatures.” Neither is Tertullian, whom I alleged before for the other interpretation, averse from this. For in his fourth book Contra Marcionem, c. 1, Sacrificium

110 Revelation 4.11.

111 = Adversus haereses 4.18.1. Mede was using either the edition of Erasmus (Basle, 1526) or that of François Feuardent (Paris, 1575).
purum, “a pure sacrifice – that is,” saith he, simplex oratio de conscientia pura, “sincere prayer proceeding from a pure conscience.” But this conscientious purity they seem to restrain, at least chiefly, to freedom from malice, as that singular purity whereby this Christian sacrifice is differed from that of the Jew, because none can offer it but he that is in charity with his brother; according to that of the gospel, When thou bringest thy gift unto the altar, and rememberest thy brother hath aught against thee, Go first and be reconciled to thy brother, &c. And therefore in the beginning of this Christian service, the deacon was anciently wont to cry, Μη τις κατα τινος, “Let no man have aught against his brother”; and then followed osculum sanctum, “the kiss of reconciliation”. Thus the Fathers of the first Council of Nicea took sacrificium purum – as appears Canon 5, where they expound δωρον καθαρον to be that which is offered πασης µικροψυχιας αναιρουµενης, omni simultate deposita, “all malice and hypocrisy, and the like instances of an unworthy and ignoble spirit, being laid aside”.

But according to this exposition, the purity of the Christian sacrifice will not be opposite to the pollution of the Jewish in the same kind, as it would if more generally taken, but in another kind. And so the sense stands thus: “You will not offer me a pure offering, but the Gentiles one day shall – and that with a purity of another manner of stamp than that my law requires of you.” And thus I have told you the two ways according to which the ancients understood this purity; and I prefer the latter, as I think they did.

3. But there is a third interpretation, were it backed by their authority (which I confess it is not), which I would prefer before them both; and I think you will wonder with me they should be so silent therein. Namely, that this 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. This the antithesis of this sacrifice to that of the Jews might seem to imply. For the Jews are charged with offering polluted bread upon God’s altar, whereby what is meant the words following tell us: If you offer the blind for sacrifice, is it not evil? and if you offer the lame and sick, is it not

---

112 Matthew 5.23, 24.

113 Apostolic Constitutions VIII, 12, 2. The deacon was to make this announcement at the beginning of the offertory.

114 δωρον καθαρον (dōron katharon): Greek, “a pure (or unblemished) gift”.
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Thus having absolved the two first things I propounded – given you a definition of the Christian sacrifice and explained the words of my text, – I come now to the third and longest part of my task, to prove each particular contained in my definition by the testimonies and authorities of the ancient Fathers and writers of the first and purest ages of the Church. The particulars I am to prove are in number six:

1. That this Christian service is an oblation, and expressed under that notion by the utmost antiquity;
2. That it is an oblation of thanksgiving and prayer;
3. An oblation through Jesus Christ commemorated in the creatures of bread and wine;
4. That this commemoration of Christ, according to the style of the ancient Church, is also a sacrifice;
5. That the body and blood of Christ in this mystical service was made of bread and wine which had first been offered unto God, to agnize him the Lord of the creature;
6. That this sacrifice was placed in commemoration only of Christ's sacrifice upon the cross, and not in a real offering of his body and blood anew.

When I shall have proved all these by sufficient authority, I hope you will give me leave to conclude my definition for true, that the Christian sacrifice, according to the meaning of the ancient Church, was an oblation of thanksgiving and prayer to God the Father, through the sacrifice of Jesus Christ commemorated in the creatures of bread and wine, wherewith God had first first been agnized.

Let us begin then with the first, THAT THIS CHRISTIAN SERVICE IS AN OBLATION, AND UNDER THAT NOTION EXPRESSED BY ALL ANTIQUITY. The names whereby the ancient Church called this service are: προσφορα, “oblation”; θυσια, “sacri-fice”; ευχαριστια,

---

115 Malachi 1.8.
“eucharist” (a word, if rightly understood, of equipollent sense); θυσια αινεσεως, “a sacrifice of praise”; θυσια λογικη και αναιµακτος, “a reasonable and unbloody sacrifice”; sacrificium mediatoris, “the sacrifice of our Mediator”; sacrificium altaris, “the sacrifice of the altar”; sacrificium pretii nostri, “the sacrifice of our ransom”; sacrificium corporis et sanguinis Christi, “the sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ”. It would be infinite to note all the places and authors where and by whom it is thus called. The four last are St Augustine’s; προσφορα, “oblation,” and θυσια, “sacrifice,” are to be found with Justin Martyr and Irenaeus, whose antiquity is the age next the apostles. “But,” you will say, “the Fathers even so early had swerved from the style of the apostolic age, during which these kind of terms were not used, as appears by that we find them not anywhere in their epistles and writings.” But what if the contrary may be evinced, that this language was used even while the apostles yet lived? For grant that they are neither found in the Acts of the Apostles nor in St Paul’s and St Peter’s writings. Yet this proves not they were not used in the apostles’ times, no more than that ευχαριστια, “eucharist,” was not, whose case in this point is the same with the other. But know, that to confine the apostles’ age within the limits of St Paul’s and St Peter’s lives is a general mistake, for the apostles’ age ended not till St John’s death anno Christi 99 – and so lasted as long (within a year or thereabouts) after St Paul’s and St Peter’s suffering as it was from our Saviour’s ascension to their deaths, that is, one and thirty years. And this too for the most part was after the excidium or destruction of Jerusalem, in which time it is likely the Church received no little improvement in ecclesiastical rites and expressions, both because it was the time of her greatest increase and because, whilst the Jews’ polity stood, her polity, for all its full establishment, stood in some sort suspended. This appears by St John’s writings, which are the only scripture written after that time, and in which we find two ecclesiastic terms of Λογος for the deity of Christ, and κυριακη ηµερα for the first day of the week; neither of both seeming to have been in use in St Paul’s and St Peter’s times. And why may we not believe the like happened in others, and by name in these now questioned?

Which, that I may not seem only to guess, I think I can prove by two witnesses which then lived: the one Clemens, he whose name St Paul says was written in the book of life; and the other Ignatius.  

---

117 Λογος (Logos): Greek, “Word”; see John 1.1.

118 κυριακη ηµερα (kyriaké hémera): Greek, “the Lord’s day,” i.e. Sunday.

119 Philippians 4.3.
Clemens,\textsuperscript{121} in his undoubted Epistle \textit{ad Corinthos} – a long time missing but now of late come again to light, – in this epistle the word \textit{προσφορα} \textsuperscript{122} is three times used of the Christian service. “All those duties,” saith he, “which the Lord hath commanded us to do, we ought to do them regularly and orderly, \textit{kata kairous teetaimenous tas te prosforas} \textit{kai leitourgias epitelleisthai}, “our oblations and divine services to celebrate them on set and appointed times.” And a little after: \textit{Oi oun tois prosetetajmenois kairois poionntes tas prosforas euten euprosdektai te kai makarioi, tois gar nomimoi tou despoto akolouthontes ou diamarti-nousi}, “They therefore that perform their oblations on set and appointed times are acceptable to God and blessed; for observing the commandments of the Lord, they offend not.”\textsuperscript{123}

The other, Ignatius, in his Epistle \textit{ad Smyrnenses} hath both \textit{προσφορα} and \textit{θυσια}. \textit{Non licet}, saith he, \textit{absque episcopo oute baptizerei oute prospherein oute vusian proskomizeinoue do chyn epitellein}, “It is not lawful without the bishop either to baptize or to make offering, or to celebrate the sacrifice, or to communicate.”\textsuperscript{124} Where \textit{προσφορα} he calls, in a stricter sense, the

\textsuperscript{120} \textbf{Ignatius}, bishop of Antioch, martyr, ca. 115 (feast, 17 October). Nothing for certain is known about him apart from the seven letters he wrote while en route from Antioch to execution in Rome. While staying at Smyrna, on the Mediterranean coast of Asia Minor, he wrote a letter each to the churches at Ephesus, Magnesia, and Tralles, whose hospitality he had enjoyed on the way, and a fourth letter to the church at Rome in anticipation of his arrival there. From Troas, he wrote three more letters; one to the church at Philadelphia, another to the church at Smyrna, and a third (the seventh) to its bishop, Polycarp, personally.

\textsuperscript{121} \textbf{Clemens}: Clement of Rome, flourished ca. 100 (feast, 23 November). Usually designated bishop of Rome. In the last decade of the first century, Clement wrote a letter to the church of Corinth (\textit{Epistola prima ad Corinthos}); a second letter to Corinth under Clement's name exists, but it is the work of a much later hand. Mede is quoting from the “first” letter.

\textsuperscript{122} \textit{προσφορα} (phosphora): Greek, “offerings, oblations”.

\textsuperscript{123} Clement, \textit{First Epistle to the Corinthians} 40.1-2, 4.

\textsuperscript{124} Ignatius, \textit{Letter to the Church of Smyrna} 8.2.
first part of this sacred and mystical service, to wit, the thanksgiving wherein the bread and the wine, as I told you, were offered unto God to agnize his dominion. θυσια he calls the mystical commemoration of Christ’s body and blood, and δοχη the receiving and participation of the same. For know that θυσια and προσφορα are sometimes used for the whole action, and sometimes thus distinguished.

Of the genuineness of this Epistle the learned doubt not; but if anyone do, I suppose they will grant that Theodoret had his genuine Epistles. Let them hear then a passage which he, in his third Dialogue, cites out of the Epistles of Ignatius against some heretics: Ἐυχαριστίας καὶ προσφοράς οὐκ ἀποδέχονται, διὰ τὸ μὴ ὁμολογεῖν τὴν εὐχαριστίαν σαρκά εἶναι Σωτηρίου ἵνα ὁ Χριστός τοῦ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁµαρτίων ἡ µον παθοῦσαν, “They do not admit (or allow of) eucharists and oblations because they do not acknowledge the eucharist to be the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ which suffered for our sins.” 125 Here you see oblations and eucharists exegetically joined together. And so I think I have proved these terms of προσφορά and θυσια to have been in use in the Church in the latter part of the apostles’ age.

But what if one of them, namely θυσια, were used sooner, even in St Paul’s and St Peter’s times? In the first Epistle of Peter, chap. 2.5: You are, saith he, speaking to the body of the Church, an holy priesthood to offer πνευµατικας θυσιας, spiritual sacrifices to God by Jesus Christ. In the Epistle to the Hebrews 13.15: By him – that is, through Christ our altar – let us offer θυσιαν αἰνεσεως δια παντος τω Θεω, the sacrifice of praise to God continuously. Why should I not think St Paul and St Peter speak here of the solemn and public service of Christians, wherein the passion of Christ was commemorated? I am sure the Fathers frequently call this sacrifice “the sacrifice of praise”. And in some

* <Marginal note, 1672 ed.:> The ancient Latin translation renders δοχην επιτελειν, agapen facere, ‘to celebrate the feast of charity,’ which at first did accompany the eucharist.

<In fact, the best Greek MSS simply read: ουτε βαπτιζειν ουτε αγαπην ποιειν ("either to baptize or to do agape"), without any mention of προσφερειν or θυσια.>

125 Theodoret (ca. 393 – ca. 466), bishop of Cyrrhus, a city in Syria. Prominent during the christological controversies which led up to the council of Chalcedon (451) as a vigorous defender of Nestorius and the views of the school of Antioch regarding Christ and the interpretation of Scripture. The passage cited is Ignatius, Letter to the Church of Smyrna 7.1. The best Greek MSS of Ignatius’s letter read ευχαριστίας καὶ προσευχής ("eucharists and prayers") instead of ευχαριστίας καὶ προσφοράς.
ancient liturgies, immediately before the consecration, the Church gives thanks unto God for choosing them to be an holy priesthood to offer sacrifices unto him, as it were alluding to St Peter. Thus you see, first or last, or both, the words προσφορα and θυσια were no strangers to the apostles’ age.

I will now make but one quaere and answer it, and so conclude this point: Whether these words or names were used – seeing that they were used – properly or improperly of the subject we speak of? I answer briefly: This Christian service, as we have defined it, is an oblation properly. For wheresoever anything is rendered or presented unto God, there is truly and properly an oblation, be it spiritual or visible it matters not. For oblatio is the genus. And Irenaeus tells me here: Non genus oblationum reprobatum est: oblationes enim et illic, oblationes autem et hic, sacrificia in populo, sacrificia et in Ecclesia; sed species immutata est tantum, “For offerings in the general are not to be reprobated; there were offerings there (viz. in the Old Testament), there are also offerings here (viz. in the New Testament), there were sacrifices among the people (that is, the Jews), there are sacrifices also in the Church; but the specification only is changed.” But as for θυσια or “sacrifice,” according to its prime signification, it signifies a slaughter-offering, as in Hebrew, so in Greek of θυω, macto, “to slay”; as the angel (Acts 10.13) says to St Peter, Πετρα, θυσον και φαγε, “Peter, kill and eat.” Now we in our Christian service slay no offering, but commemorate him only that was slain and offered upon the cross. Therefore our service is called θυσια improperly and metaphorically. But if θυσια be synecdochically taken for an offering in general, as it is both in the New Testament and elsewhere, then the Christian sacrifice is as truly called θυσια as προσφορα or ευχαριστια.

126 quaere: query, question.

* <Marginal note:> Hebr. 5.7, 8; Chap. 13.15; 1 Pet. 2.5.

127 genus: a general class of concepts which have certain attributes in common.

* <Marginal note:> Lib. 4.34 < = Adversus haereses 4.18.2.>

128 synecdochically: when a whole category is used to represent one of its parts or vice versa, when a part is used to represent the whole category. Here, offering is the designated category of things, and θυσια is one specific kind of offering. Mede argues that θυσια may be used to represent the whole category of “offering” and every other specific kind of offering as well.
CHAPTER V.

NOW I come to the second particular contained in my definition – to prove THAT THE CHRISTIAN SACRIFICE, ACCORDING TO THE MEANING OF THE ANCIENT CHURCH, IS AN OBLATION OF THANKSGIVING AND PRAYER.

1. My first author shall be Justin Martyr in his Dialogue with Trypho the Jew. Where, to the evasion of the Jews, labouring to bereave the Christians of this text by saying it was meant of the prayers which the dispersed Jews at that time offered unto God in all places where they lived among the Gentiles; which sacrifices, though they wanted the material rite, yet were more acceptable unto God in regard of their sincerity than those profaned one at Jerusalem, and not that here was meant any sacrifice which the Gentiles should offer to the God of Israel: – to this evasion Justin replies: ‘That prayers and thanksgivings made by those that are worthy are the only sacrifices that are perfect and acceptable unto God, I do also affirm; for these are the only sacrifices which Christians have been taught they should perform.’ If you ask where and how, he tells you ‘in that thankful remembrance of their food both dry and liquid, wherein also is commemorated the passion which the Son of God suffered by himself.’

2. My next author shall be Tertullian Ad Scapulam, in the place before alleged. It is a description of the eucharist wherein, as I have already told you, the bread and wine were first presented unto God, as the primitia or kind of first-fruit offering, to agnize him the Giver of ‘our food both dry and liquid,’ and then consecrated to be the symbols of the body and blood of Christ.
ordoris et sanguinis alicujus; haec enim demoniorum pabula sunt. The Gentiles
so thought that their gods were refreshed and nourished with the
smell and savour of their sacrifices. Besides, in his third book Contra
Marcionem, chap. 22: In omni loco sacrificium nominem meo offertur, et
sacrificium mundum, “In every place sacrifice shall be offered to my
name, and a pure sacrifice” – to wit, saith he, gloriae relatio, benedictio,
laud, et hymni, “giving glory to God, blessing, praise, and hymns.” And
Lib. 4, cap. 1: Sacrificium mundum, scilicet simplex oratio de conscientia pura,
“A pure sacrifice, namely sincere prayer from a pure conscience.”

3. Thirdly, Clemens Alexandrinus, Lib. 7 Stromateis: 133 Ἡμεῖς δὲ εὐχής
tιμώμεν τὸν Θεόν, “We (Christians) honour God by prayer,” and
tau τήν τὴν θυσίαν ἀριστην καὶ ἀγιωτάτην αναπημίων, το ἀγιωτάτου Λόγου
gεραιοντες δι’ ου παραλαμβάνομεν τὴν γνώσιν, “and this we send up unto him as the best and holiest sacrifice,
honouring him by that most sacred Word whereby we receive
knowledge, that is, Christ.” Again: Ἡ τοιαύτῃ εἰς ἑκκλησίας λογος ἐστιν ἀπό τῶν ἁγιων
ψυχῶν ἁγίωτα μιωμένος, “The sacrifice of the Church is an oration exhaled from
sanctified souls.” He speaks not of the private prayer of every
Christian but of the public prayer of the Church as a body – as will be
evident to him that reads the place, and appears by the words quoted,
Θυσία τῆς ἑκκλησίας “the sacrifice of the Church,” and ἀπὸ τῶν ἁγιων
ψυχῶν ἁγίωτα μιωμένος, “exhaled,” not from a sanctified soul, but “from sanctified souls”. For to private prayer was
not given this title of “the Christian sacrifice,” but unto the public,
which the Church offered unto God when she presented herself
before him as one body in Christ, by the mystical communication of
his body and blood.

4. This my next author, Cyprian, will make plain in his Epistola 16
ad Mosen et Maximum. Nos quidem, saith he, vestri diebus et noctibus
memores, et quando in sacrificiis precem cum pluribus facimus et in successu
privatis precibus oramus, “We indeed are mindful of you day and night,
both when we in our sacrifices pray publicly with others and when
we pray privately in our retirements.” 134 Where we see the sacrifice of

133 Clemens Alexandrinus (Clement of Alexandria), d. ca. 210 (feast, 5
December). Teacher in the catechetical school of Alexandria and, after
Origen (see fn. 76, p. 25 below), the greatest speculative theologian of the
third century Church. Author of many works, in Greek prose which is
often stunningly lyrical; Mede cites Clement’s Stromateis (“Miscellanies”).

134 Epistola 16 ad Mosen et Maximum: “Letter 16 to Moyses and
Maximus”. In modern editions of Cyprian’s correspondence, this is
actually Letter 37. 1. 2, his second to Moyses and Maximus “and to the
other confessors”.
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prayer to be *cum precem cum pluribus facimus*, “when we pray publicly with others,” and distinguished from that we do *cum in secessu privatis precibus oramus*, “when we pray privately in our retirements”.

These authorities are all within the first three hundred years. To which I will add one of the fourth, Optatus Milevit-anus, Lib. 6 *contra Parmenianum*, where he thus expostulates with the Donatists for breaking and defacing the altars of the Catholics: *Quid est enim tam sacrilegum*, saith he, *quam altaria Dei, in quibus et vos aliquando obtulistis, frangere radere, removere, in quibus vota populi et membra Christi portata sunt, quo Deus omnipotens invocatus sit?* “For what is there so sacrilegious as to break and deface, yea and quite take away the altars of God whereon ye yourselves have sometimes offered – those altars which did bear both the prayers of the people and the body and blood of Christ, that so almighty God might be invoked?” Mark here *altaria Dei in quibus vota populi et membra Christi portata sunt*, and gather hence what parts the Christian sacrifice consisted of: *vota populi* are the prayers of the Church, *membra Christi* the body and blood of Christ which the prayers were offered with, both of them upon the altar. For it is worthy your notice that the ancient Church had no other place whereat she offered her public prayers and orisons but that whereon the memory of the body and blood of Christ was celebrated; that as they were joined in their use, so they might not be severed in their place.

According to which use, and agreeable to this passage of Optatus, speaks the Council of Rheims, commanding that the table of Christ – that is, the altar – to be reverenced and honoured *quia corpus Domini ibi consecratur et sanguis eius hauritur; preces quoque et vota populi in conspectu Dei a sacerdote offeruntur*, “because there the body of Christ is consecrated and his blood is drunk; there also the prayers and desires of the people are offered up by the priest before God.”

Furthermore, that the Christian sacrifice was an oblation of prayer, and consisted in invocation, is also another way to be evinced; namely, because the Fathers, when they speak thereof, use the terms of *prayer, oblation, and sacrifice* promiscuously and interchangeably one for the other, as words importing the same thing.

---

135 Optatus Milevitanus (flourished ca. 370), bishop of Milevis, a city in North Africa. The only thing known about Optatus is the treatise here cited by Mede, *Contra Parmenianum Donatistam* (“Against Parmenian the Donatist”). Donatism was a North African movement whose members claimed to be the only true Catholic Church because "their" bishops had not compromised the faith in any way during the Great Persecution at the end of the third century. Optatus defended the integrity of the official Catholic Church in North Africa.
Tertullian, *Exhortatio ad chastitatem*, dissuading a widower from marrying again because it would be uncomely in the sacrifice of the Church to make mention (as the manner then was) of more wives than one, and that too by the mouth of an once-married priest, speaks thus: *Neque enim pristinam poteris odisse, cui etiam religiosior resertas affectionem, ut iam receptae apud Deum, pro cuius spiritu postulas, pro qua oblationes annuas reddis. Stabis ergo ad Dominum cum tot scoloribus quot in oratione commenoras? et offers pro duabus? et commendabis illas duas per sacerdotem de monogamia ordinatum? circumdatum virginibus et univiris? et ascendet sacrificium tuum cum libera fronte? “For thou canst not hate thy former wife, for whom thou reservest a more religious affection as being received already with the Lord, for whose Spirit thou makest request, for whom thou renderest yearly oblations. Wilt thou then stand before the Lord with as many wives as in thy prayers thou makest mention of? and wilt thou offer for two? and commend these two by a priest ordained after his having been but once married? encompassed with virgins and with women but once married? and shall thy sacrifice ascend freely and confidently?” Here *postulatio* and *oblatio*, “request” and “oblation,” *oratio* and *offerre*, “prayer” and “to offer,” *oratio* and *sacrificium*, “prayer” and “sacrifice,” are interchangeably put one for one another. So also in his book *De oratione* are *oratio* and *sacrificium*, where he speaks of the kiss of peace and reconciliation used at the eucharist: *Quae oratio, saith he, cum divortio sancti osculi integra? quale sacrificium, a quo sine pace reeditur? “What prayer can be complete that is without the kiss of peace? what kind of sacrifice is that, from which Christians come away without the kiss of peace?”

Augustine, *De civitate Dei*, Book 8, chap. 17, speaking of the honour of martyrs: “We do not sacrifice to martyrs,” saith he. “Who among the faithful, while the priest was standing at the altar built for the honour and worship of God, – nay, though it were over the holy body of the martyr, – I say, who ever heard the priest to say thus in prayer: ‘To thee, O Peter,’ or ‘O Paul, do I offer sacrifice?’” Here *sacrifice* is expounded by *prayers*, and *prayers* put for *sacrifice*.

And Book 22, chap. 8, concerning one Hesperius, a man of quality in the city whereof Austin was bishop, who, by the affliction of his cattle and servants, perceiving his country-grange liable to some malignant power of evil spirits, “entreated our presbyters in my absence,” saith St Austin, “that some one of them would go to the place, through the prevalency of whose prayers he hoped the evil spirits would be forced away. Accordingly one of them went thither and offered there the sacrifice of Christ’s body, praying earnestly with all his might for the ceasing of that sore affliction; and it ceased forthwith through God’s mercy.” The priest was entreated to pray there; he went, and *offered sacrifice* – and so prayed.
For this reason the Christian sacrifice is among the Fathers, by way of distinction, called θυσια αινεσεως, sacrificium laudis, that is, “(a sacrifice) of confession and invocation of God” – namely to difference it from those of blood and incense. Augustine, Book I Contra adversarium legis et prophetarum, cap. 20: “The Church offereth to God the sacrifice of praise (in the body of Christ), ever since the fulfilling of that in Psalm 50, The God of gods hath spoken and called the earth from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof.” Again, Epistle 86: “The sacrifice of praise is continually offered by the Christian Church dispersed all the world over.” And elsewhere. And amongst the Greek Fathers this term is so frequent as I shall not need to quote any of them.

Now this joining of the prayers of the Church with the mystical commemoration of Christ in the sacrament of his body and blood was no after-invention of the Fathers, but took its original from the Apostles’ times and the very beginning of Christianity. For so we read of the first believers (Acts 2.42) that they were προσκαρτερουντες τη διδαχη των αποστολων και τη κοινωνια, και τη κλασει του αρτου και ταις προσευχαις, which the Vulgar Latin turns: Ierant autem perseverantes in doctrina apostolorum, & communicabant in oratione et fractione Eucharistiae – “And they persevered in the doctrine of the apostles and in the communication of the breaking of bread and prayers.” But the Syriac <version reads>: Perseverantes erant in doctrina apostolorum, אראבר סטיא אמשתתפשים וה געלהא וקפלא, et communicabant in oratione et fractione Eucharistiae – “They persevered in the doctrine of the apostles, and communicated in prayer and in breaking of the eucharist.” That is, they were assiduous and constant in hearing the apostles and in celebrating the Christian sacrifice. Both which translations tell us breaking of bread and prayers are to be referred to κοινωνια, “communion,” as the exegesis thereof – namely, that this communion of the Church consisted in the breaking of bread and prayers. And so the conjunction και <is> to be exegetically taken, as if the Greek were rendered thus: “They persevered in hearing the teaching of the apostles and in communion,” that is to say, “in the breaking of bread and prayers.” And who knows not that the synaxis of the ancient Christians consisted of these three parts, of hearing the Word of God, of prayers, and commemoration of Christ in the eucharist. Our translation therefore here is not so right, which refers κοινωνια to αποστολων and translates it “the

136 synaxis: Greek, the liturgical assembly; hence, the eucharistic liturgy itself.

137 our translation: a reference to the King James Version, which translates Acts 2.42, “And they continued steadfastly in the Apostles’ doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers.”
fellowship of the apostles”.

The antiquity also of this conjunction we speak of appears out of Ignatius in his Epistle to the Ephesians. Where, speaking of the damage which schismatics incur by dividing themselves from the communion of the Church, he utters it in this manner: Μηδεις πλανασθω. Εαν μη τις η εντος του θυσιαστηριου, υστερειται το αρτου του Θεου. Ει γαρ ενος και δευτερου προσευχη τοσαυτην ισχυν εχει οστε τον Χριστον εν αυτοις εσταναι, ποσοι μαλλον η τε του επισκοπου και πασης της εκκλησιας προσευχη, συμφωνος ανιουσα προς Θεον, πεισει παραχεθεναι αυτοις παντα τα εν Χριστω αιτηµατα.138 “Let no man,” saith he, “deceive himself. Unless a man be within the altar, he is deprived of the bread of God. And if the prayer of one or two be of that force as to set Christ in the midst of them, how much more shall the joint prayer of the bishop and whole Church, sent up to God, prevail with him to grant us all our requests in Christ?” These words of Ignatius directly imply that the altar was the place, as of “the bread of God,” so of the public prayers of the Church – and that they were so nearly linked together that he that was not “within the altar,” that is, who should be divided therefrom, had no benefit of either.

CHAPTER VI.

The second Particular thus proved, the third comes next in place – which is, THAT THIS OBLATION OF THANKSGIVING AND PRAYER WAS MADE THROUGH JESUS CHRIST COMMEMORATED IN THE CREATURES OF BREAD AND WINE. Namely, they139 believed that our blessed Saviour ordained this sacrament of his body and blood as a rite to bless and invoke his Father by, instead of the manifold and bloody sacrifices of the Law. For that those bloody sacrifices of the Law were rites to invoke God by is a truth, though not so vulgarly known, yet undeniable – and may, on the Gentiles’ behalf, be proved out of Homer and other authors. On the Jews’ behalf, it may be proved by that speech of Saul, 1 Samuel 13.12,

138 Ignatius, To the Ephesians 5.2. The phrases, ἵνα τον Χριστον εν αυτοις εσταναι, and προσευχη, συμφωνος ανιουσα προς Θεον, πεισει παραχεθεναι αυτοις παντα τα εν Χριστω αιτηµατα, are not in modern critical editions.

139 they: the ancient Church Fathers.
when Samuel expostulated with him for having offered a burnt-offering. I said, saith he, ‘The Philistines will come down upon me to Gilgal, and I have not made supplication to the Lord.’ I forced myself therefore, and offered a burnt-offering. Upon which place Kimchi notes that “sacrifice was a rite or medium whereby prayer was usually presented unto God.” The same is likewise true of their hymns and doxologies, as is to be seen 2 Chronicles 29.27, and by the words of the Chaldee paraphrast Jonathan upon Exodus 38.8, concerning the women that assembled at the door of the tabernacle. “The women,” saith he, “which came to pray stood at the door of the tabernacle by their oblation, and they praised and confessed; afterwards they, returning to their husbands, brought forth righteous children.” It is further confirmed for invocation in general by that which the Scripture so often reports of Abraham and Isaac, that they built altars where they came and there they called upon the name of the Lord. But the altar was a place for sacrifice.

Instead therefore of the slaying of beasts and burning of incense, whereby they called upon the name of God in the Old Testament, the Fathers, I say, believed our Saviour ordained this sacrament of bread and wine as a rite whereby to give thanks and make supplication to his Father in his name. The mystery of which rite they took to be this: That as Christ, by presenting his death and satisfaction to his Father, continually intercedes for us in heaven, so the Church on earth semblably approaches the throne of grace by representing Christ unto his Father in these holy mysteries of his death and passion. Vetere enim, saith Cassander, in hoc mystico sacrificio non tam peractae semel on cruce oblationis, cujus hic memoria celebratur, quam perpetui sacerdoti et jugis sacrificii quod quotidie in calis sempiternus sacerdos offerit, rationem habuerunt; cujus hic imago per solemnes ministrorum preces exprimitur, “The ancients did not, in this mystical sacrifice, so

---

**140 The Chaldee paraphrast Jonathan.** This refers to a Targum, or paraphrase, of the prophetical books of the Old Testament in Aramaic (“Chaldee”); probably executed in Palestine and officially sanctioned, it was in circulation by the middle of the third century C.E.

**141** Genesis 12.7; 13.4; 26.25; 33.20.

**142 semblably:** in like fashion, similarly.

**143 Cassander,** Georg (1513 – 1566), Roman Catholic theologian who sought to reconcile Roman and Protestant teachings with a view to reunification of western Christendom. His writings left most Protestant divines unsatisfied, and his works were subsequently placed on the Roman Index of Prohibited Books.
much consider and respect the oblation once made upon the cross, the memory whereof is here celebrated, as the everlasting priesthood of Christ and the perpetual sacrifice which he, our high priest for ever, doth continually offer in heaven; the resemblance whereof is here on earth expressed by the solemn prayers of God’s ministers.”

This a reverend and famous divine of blessed memory, once of this society and interred in this place, saw more clearly or expressed more plainly than any other Reformed writer I have yet seen, in his Demonstratio Problematis and title De sacrificio Missæ, where he speaks thus: Veteres caenam Domini, seu totam caenæ actionem, vocarunt sacrificium variis de causis: quia est commemoratio, adeoque repræsentatio Deo Patri, sacrificii in cruce immolati, “The ancient Fathers used to call the Supper of the Lord, or the whole action of the Supper, a sacrifice – and that for diverse reasons: …. because it is a commemoration and also a representation unto God the Father of the sacrifice of Christ offered upon the cross.” He goes on: Hoc modo fideles etiam inter orandum Christum offerunt Deo Patri victimam pro suis peccatis, dum se libent mente affectuque ad sacrificium ejus unicum feruntur, ut Deum sibi habant fiantque propitium, “In this sense the faithful in their prayers do offer Christ as a sacrifice unto God the Father for their sins, in being wholly carried away in their minds and affections unto that only and true sacrifice, thereby to procure and obtain God’s favour to them.” That which every Christian doth mentally and vocally, when he commends his prayers to God the Father through Jesus Christ, making mention of his death and satisfaction, that in the public service of the Church was done by that rite which our Saviour commanded to be used in commemoration of him.

These things thus explained, let us now see by what testimonies and authorities it may be proved the ancient Church had this meaning.

---

144 A reverend and famous divine of blessed memory, once of this Society and interred in this place: Mede here means William Perkins (1558-1602), Fellow of Christ’s College, Cambridge, and the leading Calvinist divine in the late Elizabethan Church of England; known as “the painful Mr Perkins” – not because of the pain his advocacy of the Calvinist doctrine of double predestination gave, but because of the pains he took in proclaiming the gospel and in developing means of assurance for those whose consciences were troubled. In this place means Christ’s College Chapel, where Mede delivered his “common-place”.

145 Demonstratio Problematis: “Explanation of the issue <be-tween the Church of England and the Church of Rome>”.

146 De sacrificio Missæ: “Concerning the sacrifice of the Mass”.
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I will begin with St Ambrose,\textsuperscript{147} because his testimony is punctual to our explication. Offic., lib. I, cap. 48: \textit{Ante}, saith he, \textit{agnus offerebatur, offerabatur et vitulus: Nunc Christus offeritur, sed offeretur quasi homo, quasi recipiens passionem; et offer seipsum quasi sacerdos, ut peccata nostra dimittat; hic in imagine, ibi in veritate ubi apud Patrem pro nobis quasi advocatus intervent}, “Heretofore (under the Law) was wont to be offered a lamb and a bullock (Exodus 29). But now (under the Gospel) Christ is offered. But he is offered as a man and as one that suffered, and he also, as a priest, offers himself for the forgiveness of our sins. Here (on earth) this is done in a resemblance and representation; there (in heaven) in truth, where he, as our advocate, intercedes for us with his Father.”

An author which Cassander in his \textit{Considerations} quotes without name expresses this mystery fully. \textit{Non impie à nobis}, saith he, \textit{Christus occiditur, sed pie sacrificatur; et hoc modo mortem Dominii annunciamus donec veniat. Hoc enim hic per eum humiliter agimus in terris, quod pro nobis ipse potenter (sicut filius pro sua reverentia exaudiendus) agit in caelis, ubi apud Patrem pro nobis quasi advocatus intervenit; cui est pro nobis intervenire, carnem quam pro nobis et de nobis sumpsit, Deo Patri quodammodo pro nobis ingerere, “Christ is not wickedly slain by us, but piously sacrificed; and thus we shew the Lord’s death till he come.\textsuperscript{148}} For we by him do that here on earth in a meaner way which he as a ‘Son to be heard for his reverence or piety doth for us in heaven powerfully and prevailingly, where he as our advocate mediates for us with the Father; whose office it is to intercede for us, and to present that flesh which he took for us, and of us, to God the Father in our behalf.”

My next author shall be Eusebius, \textit{Demonstratio Evangelii}, lib. I, cap. 10, where mentioning that of the 23 Psalm, \textit{Thou hast prepared a table before me, &c. Thou anointest my head with oil. Palam, saith he, in his mysticum significat unctionem, “Herein are plainly signified the mystical unction,”\textsuperscript{149} και τα σεµνα της του Χριστου τραπεζης θυµατα, veneranda mensa Christi sacrificia,}

\begin{flushright}
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{148} 1 Corinthians 11.26.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textit{* <Marginal note:>} So the Vulgar Latin \textit{i.e. the Vulgate}, Hebr. 5.7 renders \textit{εισοκουσθείς απο της ευλαβείας}, which (according to Grotius and others) should be rendered \textit{exauditus (i.e. liberatus) a metu}. The like phrase in Psalm 22.22.
\end{flushright}

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{149} unction: i.e. anointing.
\end{flushright}
“and the venerable sacrifices of Christ’s table” — he means the symbols of the body and blood of Christ — δι’ ὧν καλλιερουντες, τας αναιµους και λογικας αυτω τε προσηνεις θυσιας δια παντος βιου τω επι παντων προσ-θερειν Θεο δια του παντων ανωτατου Αρχιερεως αυτου δεδιδαγµε θα, “whereby propitiating God we are taught to offer up all our life long unto the Lord of all unbloody and reasonable sacrifices most acceptable to him by his most glorious high priest, Jesus Christ.” Here Eusebius affirms that Christians are taught to offer unto God “reasonable and un-bloody sacrifices,” that is, prayer and thanksgiving; δια σεµνων της Χριστουτραπεζης θυµατων καλλιερουντες, “propitiating (or finding favour with) God through the venerable mysteries of Christ’s table”. For καλλιερειν is litare, i.e. propitiare or placere numen, votum impetrare, ευαρεστειν, gratum facere.

Next I produce Cyril of Jerusalem (or more likely John, his successor), author of those five Catecheses mystagogicae. In the last of which, relating and expounding the meaning of that which was said or done in the celebration of the eucharist according to the use of his time, amongst other things he says thus: Μετα το απαρτισθηναι την πνεµατικην θυσιαν, την αναιµακτον λατρειαν, “After that spiritual sacrifice, the unbloody service” — that is, after the thanksgiving and invocation of the Holy Ghost upon the bread and wine to make it the body and blood of Christ (of which he was speaking before) — “was done,” επι της θυσιας εκεινης του Ίλασµου, παρακαλουµεν τον Θεον υπερ κοινης των εκκλησ-

150 litare: to make atonement; i.e. propitiare or placere numen; to appease or placate divine power (numen); votum impetrare: to obtain what one has prayed for.

151 ευαρεστειν: to be well-pleasing.

152 gratum facere: to find favour with [God].

153 Cyril, bishop of Jerusalem, c. 349 - 386 (feast, 18 March). Author of a set of Catechetical Lectures which he delivered to baptismal candidates at Jerusalem before he became bishop. A set of Catecheses mystagogicae (“Mystagogical Lectures”), which taught the newly baptized about “the mysteries” (i.e. baptism and the eucharist), has also passed under his name; but, as Mede notes, these lectures were probably by Cyril’s successor as bishop, John.
And this is that, if I mistake not, which Tertullian means liber de Oratione, cap. 11, where he says of the Christians that they did dominica passione modulari, et orare. Nos veri, saith he, non attollimus tantum manus, sed etiam expandimus; et dominica passione modulantes et orantes confitemur Christo; id est, Christum, “We do not only lift up but spread forth our hands; and praying with the Lord’s passion (that is, by the commemoration thereof in the eucharist), we confess unto Christ, that is, confess and acknowledge Christ” – according to the dialect of the Scripture confitemur Domino for confitemur Dominum. 157 For by

154 Mystagogical Catecheses V.8.

155 Mystagogical Catecheses V.9 (on the commemoration of the departed in the Great Thanksgiving).

156 Mystagogical Catecheses V.10 (on the prayer for the departed in the Great Thanksgiving).

157 confitemur Domino: “we confess to the Lord”; confitemur Dominum: “we confess (praise) the Lord”.

158 [Greek text]

The Christian Sacrifice
commemorating Christ and offering our prayers to the Father in his name, we confess and acknowledge him to be our mediator. So Eusebius de laude Constantini\textsuperscript{158} calls it επικλησιν Χριστου\textsuperscript{159} ευχας δι’ αυτου προς τον των ολων Θεον αναπεµπειν, “to send up prayers in his name to the God of all.”

The same with Tertullian means St Austin, describing the Christian sacrifice to be \textit{immolare Deo in corpore Christi sacrificium laudis,}\textsuperscript{160} lib. I Contra adversarium legis et prophetarum cap. 20.\textsuperscript{161} Eclesia, saith he, \textit{immolat Deo, in corpore Christi, sacrificium laudis, ex quo Deus deorum locutas vocavit terram a solis ortu usque ad occasum, Psal. 50.1}, “The Church offereth unto God the sacrifice of praise in the body of Christ, ever since the fulfilling of that in Psalm 50, \textit{The God of gods hath spoken, and called the earth from the rising of the sun to the going down thereof}.”

Lastly, that the representation of the body and blood of Christ in this Christian service was intended and used as a rite whereby to find grace and favour with God when the Church addressed herself unto him – which is that I undertook to prove – is apparent by a saying of Origen,\textsuperscript{162} Homilia 13 in Leviticum. Where, treating of the shew-bread which was continually set before the Lord with incense for a memorial of the children of Israel, that is, to put him in mind of them, he makes it in this respect to have been a lively figure of the Christian eucharist. For, saith he, \textit{ista est commemoratio sola, quæ propitium facit Deum hominibus}, “That’s the only commemoration which

\textsuperscript{158} \textit{de laude Constantini}: “In praise of Constantine”. This book consists of two different works: (1) the oration that Eusebius delivered before Constantine on the thirtieth anniversary of the emperor’s reign (335), and a treatise that he presented to Constantine at the dedication of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre in Jerusalem (335).

\textsuperscript{159} επικλησιν Χριστου: invocation of Christ.

\textsuperscript{160} \textit{immolare Deo in corpore Christi sacrificium laudis}: to offer God the sacrifice of praise in the body of Christ.

\textsuperscript{161} St Austin … lib. I Contra adversarium legis et prophetarum cap. 20: Augustine, \textit{Against an Opponent of the Law and the Prophets}, Book I, chapter 20.

\textsuperscript{162} Origen (ca. 185 – ca. 254). The single most influential theologian in early Christian history; every major Christian thinker for the next three centuries was moulded, either positively or by reaction, by his speculative genius. Certain of his teachings, in a diluted and somewhat warped form, were condemned in 400; he was formally declared a heretic at the second council of Constantinople in 543, almost three centuries after his death.
renders God propitious to men.”

All these testimonies have been express for our purpose, that the thanksgivings and prayers of the Church in the Christian sacrifice were offered unto the divine Majesty through Christ commemorated in the symbols of bread and wine, as by a medium whereby to find acceptance.

There is, besides these, an usual expression of the Fathers when they speak of the eucharist, which though it be not direct and punctual as the former, yet I verily believe it aimed at the same mystery. Namely, when they say that in this sacrifice they offer praise and prayer to God the Father through Jesus Christ the great high priest. I will quote an example or two. Clemens, or the author of the Constitutions,163 lib. 2, cap. 29, al. 25: ‘Τύμης σήμερον, ὦ εἰπισκόποι, εἰς τὸ λάως ὑμῶν ἱερεῖς καὶ λειταῖ παρεσσοτες τῷ θυσιατῷ Κυρίου τοῦ Θεοῦ ὑμῶν, “You,” saith he, “O bishops, are now unto your people as priests and levites, standing at the altar of the Lord our God,” καὶ προσαυτός το αὐτω τὰς λογικὰς καὶ αναμακτοὺς θυσίας, διὰ Ἰησοῦ τοῦ μεγάλου Ἀρχιερέως, “and offering unto him reasonable and unbloody sacrifices through Jesus Christ the great high priest.”

The same Clemens, in a more undoubted writing of his, to wit his Epistola ad Corinthios, quoting that of the 50th Psalm after the Septuagint, Θυσία αἰνεσεως δοξασει µε, και εκει οδος, η δειξο αυτω το σωτηριον του Θεου, “The sacrifice of praise shall glorify me, and there is the way wherein I shall shew to him that sacrificeth the way of God.” “This is the way,” saith Clemens, that is, the sacrifice of praise is the way, εν η ευροµεν το σωτηριον ηµων, Ἰησου Χριστου, “wherein we have found our salvation, Jesus Christ, the high priest of all our offerings.”164 The Fathers are wont to expound this place of the eucharist; and therefore I doubt not but Clemens means of the same, and tells us that in this sacrifice Christ, the high priest of our offerings, is found, that is, represented and commemorated.

In the same style speaks Justin Martyr, Dialogus cum Tryphone.165

---

163 Clemens, or the author of the Constitutions: The so-called Apostolic Constitutions is a fourth-century document, composed in Syria, which contains comprehensive and detailed instructions concerning the discipline of the Church as well as the full text of an elaborate eucharistic liturgy (Book VIII). It was ascribed to Clement of Rome (see fn. 42, p. 13 above), in order to give it the authority of near-apostolic antiquity.

164 I Clement 35.12 – 36.1.

165 Dialogue with Tryphone, 117.
There is not any sort of men in the world, whether barbarians or Greeks, or of what denomination soever amongst whom prayers and thanksgivings are not made to the Father and Maker of all through the name of the crucified Jesus.” He is speaking of the Christian sacrifice and our text in Malachi, *In omni loco offeretur incensum nomini meo*: where note that by *nomen Dei*, “the name of God,” he under-stands Christ, through whom in this sacrifice our devotions are offered. So doth Irenaeus and others. Irenaeus, lib. 4, cap. 33: *Quod est aliquid nomen quod in gentibus glorificatur, quam quod est Domini nostri, per quem glorificatur Pater et glorificatur homo? Quoniam ergo nomen filii proprium Patris est, et in Deo omnipotente per Iesum Christum offeret ecleasia, bene ait secundum utraque, Et in omni loco offeretur incensum nomini meo, et sacrificium purum*, “What other name is there that is glorified among the Gentiles than the name of our Lord, by whom the Father is glorified and man also is glorified? And because the name of the Son is the Father’s, and in almighty God, the Church offers through Jesus Christ; well saith the prophet in respect of both, *And in every place incense shall be offered to my name, and a pure sacrifice.*”

Now how this incense and sacrifice, which the prophet saith the Gentiles should offer to the name of God, may be expounded <as meaning> “offered by the name of God,” to wit, “by Christ,” Origen, *lib. 8 contra Celsum* will inform us. Τον ενα Θεον και τον ενα ‘Υιον, αυτον και λογον και εικονα, τον κατα το δυνατον ηµιν ικεσιαις και αξιωσεσι σεβοµεν, προσ-αγοντες το Θεω τον ολον τας ευχας δια του µονογενους αυτου, ‘Ω ΠΡΟΤΟΝ ΠΡΟΣΦΟΜΕΝ ΑΥΤΑΣ, αξιουντες αυτον ιλασµον οντα [peri] των αµαπτιων υµων, προσεπαιδαιως ος Αρχιερεα, και ΕΥΧΑΣ και τας ΘΥΣΙΑΣ και τας ΕΝΤΕΥΞΕΙΣ υµων τω επι πασι Θεω, “We worship,” saith he, “as we are able, with our prayers and supplications the one God and his only Son, the Word and Image of God, Jesus Christ; offering to the God of the universe our prayers by his only-begotten Son, TO WHOM WE FIRST OFFER THEM, beseeching him that he, being the propitiation” – i.e. propitiator – “for our sins, would vouchsafe as our high priest to present our PRAYERS and SACRIFICES and INTERCESSIONS to God most high.” The sum whereof is this: That which we offer to the Father by Christ, we offer first to Christ, that he, as our high priest, might present it to his Father.

---

166 *Adversus haereses*, 4.17.6.
More passages hath Origen in the same books of this kind, but I will not weary you too much in this rugged way. Only I will add that out of this which we have hitherto discoursed and proved may be understood the meaning and reason of that decree of the third council of Carthage and Hippo – namely, Ut nemo in precibus vel Patrem pro Filium, vel Filium pro Patre, nominet. Et cum altari assistitur, semper ad Patrem dirigatur oratio, “That none in their prayers should name either the Son for the Father or the Father for the Son; and that, when they stand at the altar, they ought always to direct their prayer to the Father.” The reason? Because the Father is properly the object εις ο, “to whom,” the Son only δι ω, “by whom,” in this mystical service; and therefore to direct here our prayers and thanksgivings to the Son were to pervert the order of the mystery – which is, as hath been proved, AN OBLATION OF PRAISE AND PRAYER TO GOD THE FATHER THROUGH THE INTERCESSION OF JESUS CHRIST, REPRESENTED IN THE SYMBOLS OF BREAD AND WINE.

CHAPTER VII.

The fourth particular propounded was this: THAT THE SACRAMENT OF THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST – or Lord's Supper, or the commemoration of Christ in the creatures of bread and wine – IS ALSO A SACRIFICE, ACCORDING TO THE STYLE OF THE ANCIENT CHURCH.

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. And such a sacrifice is this of the New Testament – a sacrifice wherein another sacrifice, that of Christ's death upon the cross, is commemorated. Thus the papists gain nothing by this notion of antiquity, and our asserting the same. For their tenet is, that Christ in this sacrifice is really and properly sacrificed – which we shall shew in due time that the ancients never meant.

To begin with this: THAT THE LORD’S SUPPER, OR THE MYSTICAL RITE OF THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST, IS A SACRIFICE. As in the Old Testament the name of sacrifice was otherwhile given to the whole action in which the rite was used, sometimes to the rite alone; so in the notion and language of the ancient Church sometimes the whole action or Christian service (wherein the Lord's Supper was part) is comprehended under that name, sometimes the rite of the sacred supper itself is so termed – and truly, as ye shall now hear.
The resolution of this point depends altogether upon the true definition of a sacrifice, as it is distinguished from all other offerings. Which, though it be so necessary that all disputation without it is vain, yet shall we not find that either party interessed in this question hath been so exact therein as were to be wished. This appears by the differing definitions given and confuted by divines on both sides. The reason of which defect is, because neither are from the notion of Scripture but built upon other conceptions. Let us see therefore if it may be learned out of Scripture what that is which the Scripture, in a strict and special sense, calls a sacrifice.

Every sacrifice is an oblation or offering, but every offering is not a sacrifice in that strict and proper acceptation we seek. For tithes, first-fruits, and all other called beave-offerings in the law <of Moses>, and whatsoever indeed is consecrated unto God, are oblations or offerings; but none of them sacrifices, nor ever so called in the Old Testament.

What offerings are then called sacrifices? I answer: burnt-offerings, sin-offerings, trespass-offerings, and peace-offerings. These, and no other, are called by that name. Out of these, therefore, must we pick the true and proper ratio and nature of a sacrifice.

It is true indeed that these sacrifices were offerings of beasts, of beeves, of sheep, of goats, of fowls. But the ratio or essence of anything consists not in the matter thereof – as the gowns we wear are still the same kind of apparel, though made of differing stuffs. These sacrifices also were slain and offered by fire and incense. But neither is the modus of anything the ratio or essential form thereof. That therefore may have the nature and formale of a sacrifice which consists of another matter and is offered after another and differing manner. Those we call sacraments of the Old Testament, circumcision and the passover, were by effusion of blood. Ours are not, and yet we esteem them nevertheless true sacraments. So it may be here.

To hold you therefore no longer in suspense. A sacrifice, I think, should be defined thus: AN OFFERING WHEREBY THE OFFERER IS MADE PARTAKER OF HIS GOD’S TABLE, IN TOKEN OF COVENANT AND
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167 Interessed: having a part or share.

168 true and proper ratio... of sacrifice: “reason,” in the sense of “the intrinsic organising principle”.

169 modus: mode or manner of existence.

170 formale: a term derived from Aristotelian philosophy, de-noting the principle which imposes form and order upon matter.
FRIENDSHIP WITH HIM, &c. Or more explicately thus: AN OFFERING UNTO THE DIVINE MAJESTY OF THAT WHICH IS GIVEN FOR THE FOOD OF MAN, THAT THE OFFERER PARTAKING THEREOF MIGHT, AS BY WAY OF PLEDGE, BE CERTIFIED OF HIS ACCEPTATION INTO COVENANT AND FELLOWSHIP WITH HIS GOD, BY EATING AND DRINKING AT HIS TABLE. St Augustine comes toward this notion when he defines a sacrifice, though in a larger sense, opus quod Deo nuncupamus, reddimus, et dedicamus hoc fine, ut sancta societate ipsi adhaeramus, “that which we devote, dedicate, and render unto God for this end, that we may have an holy society and fellowship with him.” For to have society and fellowship with God, what is it else but to be in league and covenant with him?

In a word, a sacrifice is oblatio fœderalis. For the true and right understanding whereof, we must know that it was the universal custom of mankind, and still remains in use, to contract covenants and make leagues and friendship by eating and drinking together. When Isaac made a covenant with Abimelech, the king of Gerar, the text saith: He made him and those that were with him a feast; and they did eat and drink, and rose up betimes in the morning, and swore one to another, Gen. 26.30, 31. When Jacob made a covenant with Laban, after they had sworn together, he made him a feast and called his brethren to eat bread, Gen. 31.54. When David made a league with Abner upon his promise to bring all Israel unto him, David made Abner and the men that came with him a feast, 2 Sam. 3.20. Hence in the Hebrew tongue a covenant is called berîth, of brh, “to eat,” as if they should say “an eating”. Which derivation is so natural that it deserves to be preferred before that from the other significa-tion of the same verb, which is “to choose”. And this will suffice for the custom of the Hebrews.

Now for the Gentiles. Herodotus tells us the Persians were wont to contract leagues and friendship inter vinum et epulas, “in a full feast,” whereat their wives, children, and friends were present. The like Tacitus reports of the Germans. Amongst the Greeks and other nations, the covenanters are bread and salt together. Unto which comes near that ceremony somewhere used at weddings, that the bridegroom, when he comes home from church, takes a piece of cake, tastes it, then gives it to his bride to taste it likewise as a token of the covenant made between them. The emperor of Russia at this day, when he would shew extraordinary grace and favour unto any, sends him bread and salt from his table. And when he invited Baron Sigismund, the Emperor Ferdinand’s ambassador, he did it in this
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171 oblatio fœderalis: “a federal oblation,” i.e. a sacrifice which ratifies or renews a covenant (fœdus).
form: *Sigismunde, comedes sal et panem nostrum nobiscum*, “Sigismund, you shall eat our bread and salt with us.” Hence that symbol of Pythagoras, αρτον μη καταγνυειν, “Break no bread,” is interpreted by Erasmus and others to mean “Break no friendship.” Moreover, the Egyptians, Thracians, and Lybians in special are said to have used to make leagues and contract friendship by presenting a cup of wine one to another; which custom we find still in use amongst our western nations. And what is our “I’ll pledge you” but “I take it as a pledge of league and friendship from you”? Yea, it is a rule in law that if a man drink to him against whom he hath an accusation of slander or other verbal injury, he loses his action because it is supposed he is reconciled with him.

Such now as were these covenant-feastings and eatings and drinkings in token of league and amity between men and men, such are sacrifices between man and his God *epulæ fœderales*, “federal feasts,” wherein God deigneth to entertain man to eat and drink with or before him, in token of favour and reconcile-ment. For so it becomes the condition of the parties that he which hath offended the other and seeks for favour and forgiveness should be entertained by him to whom he is obnoxious and not è contra – that is, that God should be the *convivator*, the entertainer or maker of the feast, and man the *conviva* or guest. To which end the viands for this sacred *epulum* were first offered unto God and so made his, that he might entertain the offerer and not the offerer him. For we are to observe that what the fire consumed was accounted as God’s own mess and called by himself the meat of his fire-offerings. The rest was for his guests, which they were partakers of either by themselves, as in all the peace-offerings, or by their proxies the priests, as in the rest, to wit, the holocausts, the sin- and trespass-offerings. The reason of which difference was, I suppose, because the one was *ad impetrandum* or *renovandum fœdus*, “for the making” or “renewing the covenant,” wherefore therefore an mediator was needful; the other, to wit, peace-offerings, *ad conferandum et consignandum*, “for the confirming the covenant” only, wherein therefore they addressed themselves before the divine Majesty with greater confidence. If any shall object that the holocaust was wholly burnt and consumed and so nobody partaker thereof, I answer: It is true the beast which was slain was wholly burnt and so all of it as it were God’s mess; but there was a meat-offering and drink-offering annexed thereunto as a part of the holy feast, of which a handful only was burned for a memorial, the
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172 *the Emperor Ferdinand*: Ferdinand II, Holy Roman emperor 1619-1637.

173 *mess*: a meal or a serving of food.
remainder was for the priests to eat in the holy place. Besides, burnt-offerings were regularly accompanied with peace-offerings, as you shall find them in Scripture ordinarily joined together. Now in these the people that offered had the greatest share. In a word, that those who offered sacrifice, both among Jews and Gentiles, were partakers of the same, is a thing to be taken for granted – as appears by the warning God gave the Israelites, Exodus 34.12, 15, that they should make no covenants with the inhabitants of the land lest, when they went a-whoring after their gods and offered a sacrifice unto them, they might call them, and they also eat of their sacrifice. Also by that Psalm 106.28, They joined themselves to Baal-peor, and ate the sacrifices of the dead. By that of St Paul, Hebrews 13.10, We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve at the tabernacle. So that of this there need be no question.

It remains only to prove that these epulae were epulae fœderales, “federal feasts,” and so our definition will stand good. Now this will appear first in general by that expression of Scripture wherein the covenant which God makes with man is expressed by eating and drinking at his table. Luke 13.26: Those to whom the Lord opens not, plead for themselves, We have eaten and drunk in thy presence, and thou hast taught in our streets, &c. <Luke> Chap. 22.29, 30: Our Saviour tells his disciples, I appoint you a kingdom as my Father hath appointed unto me, that ye may eat and drink at my table in my kingdom. Apocalypse 3.20: Behold, I stand at the door and knock; if any man hear my voice and open the door, I will come in unto him and will sup with him, and he with me. But these passages, you will say, shew rather how fitly sacrifices might be feasts of amity between God and men, than prove they were so indeed. Hear therefore such proofs as I think come home to the point.

First. Every sacrifice, saith our Saviour (Mark 9.49), is salted with salt. This salt is called (Leviticus 2.13) the salt of the covenant – that is, a symbol of the perpetuity thereof. Now if the salt which seasoned the sacrifice were sal fœderis Dei, “the salt of the covenant of God,” what was the sacrifice itself but epulum fœderis, “the feast of the covenant”?

Secondly. Moses calls the blood of the burnt-offerings and peace-offerings wherewith he sprinkled the children of Israel when they received the Law, the blood of the covenant which the Lord made with them: This is, saith he, the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath made with you, Exodus 24.8.

Thirdly. But above all, this may most evidently be evinced out of the 50. Psalm, the whole argument whereof is concerning sacrifice. There God saith, verse 5: Gather my saints together unto me, which make covenant with me by sacrifice. And verse 16, of the sacrifices of the wicked and such as amend not their lives: Unto the wicked God saith, What hast thou to do to declare my statutes and take my covenant in thy mouth, seeing thou hatest instruction, &c.? Statutes here are rites and ordinances, and particularly those of sacrifice, which whoso bringeth unto God, and
thereby supplicates and calls upon his name, is said to *take the covenant of God in his mouth* – forasmuch as to invoke God with this rite was to do it by way of commemoration of his covenant and to say, “Remember, Lord, thy covenant,” and “For thy covenant’s sake, Lord, hear my prayer and supplication.” For what hath man to do with God, to beg any favour at his hands, unless he be in covenant with him? Whereby appears the reason why mankind, from the beginning of the world, used to approach their God by this rite of sacrificing, that is, *ritus fœderali*, “by a federal rite”.

Fourthly. I add in this last place, for a further confirmation yet, that when God was to make a covenant with Abram, Genesis 15, he commanded him to offer him a sacrifice, verse 9: *Offer unto me*, saith he (so it should be turned), *a heifer, a she-goat, and a ram, each of three years old, a turtle-dove, and a young pigeon*. All which he offered accordingly and divided them in the midst, laying each piece or moiety one against the other; and when the sun went down God, in the likeness of a smoking furnace and burning lamp, *passed between the pieces* and so (as the text says) *made a covenant with Abram*, saying, *Unto thy seed will I give this land,* &c. By which rite of *passing between the parts* God condescended to the manner of men. And note here that the Gentiles, and Jews likewise, in their more solemn covenants between men and men, which were made under pain of curse or execration, used this rite of sacrifice whereby men covenanted with their God, as it were to make their God both a witness and party with them. And here the Jews cut the sacrifice in sunder and *passed between the parts* thereof, as God did here with Abram – which was as much as if they had said, “Thus let me be divided and cut in pieces if I violate the oath I have now made in the presence of my God.” The Gentiles, besides other ceremonies, used not to eat at all of these sacrifices but to fling them into the sea or bury them in the earth – as if they had said, “If I break covenant, thus let me be excluded from all amity and favour with my god, as I am now from eating of his sacrifice.” Hence came those phrases of *l’kârâth berîth* in the Hebrew, of *ferire, percutiere et icere fœdus* in Latin, of ὀρκια τιµνειν in Homer, “to cut” or “strike a covenant,” à *ferendiis, percutiendiis, et secandis sacrificiis in fœderibus sanciendiis*, “from the custom of striking and cutting the sacrifices asunder at the making of covenants between man and man”. Though this manner of speech may be also derived from their ordinary *epula fœderales*, wherein they killed beasts, which the ancients in their ordinary diet did not.

Having thus seen what is the nature of a sacrifice, and wherein the *ratio* or essential form thereof consisteth, it will not be hard to judge

---

174 moiety: half of two portions or shares.
whether the ancient Christians did rightly in giving the eucharist that name or not. For that the Lord’s Supper is *epulum fœderale*, “a federal feast,” we all grant. And our Saviour expressly affirms it of the cup in the institution: *This cup is the rite of the new COVENANT in my blood, which is poured out for many for the remission of sins* — evidently implying that the bloody sacrifices of the Law, with their meat- and drink-offerings, were rites of an old covenant, and that this succeeded them as the rite of the new; that that was contracted with the blood of beeves, sheep, and goats, but this founded in the blood of Christ. This parallel is so plain as I think none will deny it. There is nothing then remains to make this sacred *epulum* a full sacrifice but that the viands thereof should be first offered unto God, that he may be the *convivator*, we the *conviva* or the guests.

**Chapter VIII.**

My last task was to prove that not only the whole action of the celebration of the Eucharist, according to the definition I gave thereof, but even the 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. To evidence which I shewed that a sacrifice was nothing else but a sacred feast, namely, *epulum fœderale*, wherein God mystically entertained man at his own table, in token of amity and friendship with him. Which that he might do, the viands of that feast were first made God’s by oblation, and so eaten of, not as of man’s but of God’s provision.

There is nothing then wanting to make this sacred *epulum*, of which we speak, full out a sacrifice but that we shew that the viands thereof were in like manner first offered unto God, that so being his, he might be the *convivator*, man the *conviva* or the guest. And this the ancient Church was wont to do; this they believed our blessed Saviour himself did when, at the institution of this holy rite, he took the bread and the cup into his sacred hands and looking up to heaven gave thanks and blessed. And after his example they first offered the bread and wine unto God to agnize him the Lord of the creature, and then received them from him again in a banquet as the symbols of the body and blood of his Son. This is that I am to prove out of the testimonies of antiquity not long after but next unto the apostles’ times, when it is not likely the Church had altered the form they left her for the celebration of this mystery.

I will begin with Irenaeus as the most full and copious in this
point. He, in his fourth book, cap. 32, speaks thus: *Dominus discipulis suis dans consilium primitias Deo offerre ex suis creaturis, non quasi indigenti, sed ut ipsi nec infructuosi nec ingrati sint; dicens, Hoc est corpus meum, et calicem similiter, qui ex creatura est, quae est secundum nos, sum sanguinem confessus est; et novo testamento novam dicit oblationem, quam ecclesia ab apostolis accipiens offerit Deo, ei qui alimenta nobis præstat, primitias suorum munera in novo testamento.* “Our Lord counselling his disciples to offer unto God the first-fruits (or a present) of his creatures, not for that God hath any need thereof, but that they might shew themselves neither unfruitful nor ungrateful, he took that bread which was made of his creature and gave thanks, saying, *This is my body*; and he likewise acknowledged the cup, consisting of the creature which we use, to be his blood; and thus taught the new oblation of the New Testament, which the Church receiving from the apostles offers throughout the world unto God that feeds and nourisheth us, being the first-fruits of his own gifts in the New Testament.”

And cap. 34: *igitur ecclesiæ oblatio quam Dominus docuit offerri in universo mundo, purum sacrificium reputatum est apud Deum; et acceptum est ei, non quod indiget unobis sacrificium, sed quoniam is qui offerit glorificatur ipse in eo quod offerit, si acceptetur munus ejus. Per munus enim erga Regem bonos et affectio ostenditur,* “Therefore the oblation of the Church which our Lord taught and appointed to be offered through all the world, is accounted a pure sacrifice with God and is acceptable unto him, not because God stands in need of our sacrifice, but because the offerer is himself honoured in that he offers, if his present be accepted. For by the present it appears what affection and esteem the giver hath for the King he honoureth therewith.” He alludes to that in Malachi 1.14, *I am a great King, saith the Lord of hosts.*

Ibid.: *Oportet nos oblationem Deo facere, et omnibus gratos inveniri Fabricatori Deo — Primitias earum, quae sunt ejus, creaturarum offerentes; et banc oblationem ecclesia sola purum offerit Fabricatori, offerens ei cum gratiarum actione ex creatura ejus,* “It behoveth us to present God with our oblations and in all things to be found thankful unto God our Maker…, offering unto him the first-fruits of his creatures; and it is the Church only that offers this pure oblation unto the Creator of the world, while it offers unto him a present out of his creatures with thanksgiving.”

In the same place: *Offerimus autem ei, non quasi indigenti, sed gratias agentes dominationi ejus, et sanctificantes creaturam,* “But we offer unto him not as if he needed, but as giving thanks to his sovereignty, and
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175 in his fourth book, cap. 32: *Adversus haereses* 4.17.5.

176 And cap. 34: *Adversus haereses* 4.18.1.
sanctifying the creature.” He alludes again to that in this chapter of Malachi, verse 6: If I be Dominus, where is my fear, saith the Lord of hosts unto you, O priests that offer polluted bread upon mine altar?

My next witness shall be Justin Martyr in the time elder than Irenaeus, though I reserved him for the second place. He in his Dialogue with Tryphon (the place before alleged) telleth the Jew that the sacrifices of Christians are ευχαι και ευχαριστιας, “supplications and giving of thanks,” ταυτα γαρ μονα και Χριστιανοι παρελαβον ποτειν, επ’ αναμνεσις δε της τροφης αυτου ξερας τε και υγρας, and that “these are the only sacrifices which Christians have been taught they should perform in that thankful remembrance of their food both dry and liquid”; εν η και του παθους ο πεπονθε δι’ αυτου ο Ὅιος του Θεου μεμνηται, “wherein also is commemorated the passion which the Son of God suffered by himself.” Here is a twofold commemoration witnessed to be made in the eucharist: the first, as he speaks, of our “food dry and liquid,” that is, of our meat and drink, by agnizing God and recording him the Creator and Giver thereof; the second, of the passion of Christ, the Son of God, in one and the same food. And again, in the same Dialogue, Panem eucharistiae in commemorationem passionis sua Christus fieri tradidit, “Christ hath taught us that the eucharistical bread should be consecrated for the commemoration of his passion,” ινα αμα ευχαριστωµεν το Θεο υπερ τε των τον κοσµον εκτικεναι συν πασι τοις εν αυτω δια τον ανθρωπον και υπερ του απο της κακίας εν η γεγοναµεν ελευθερωκεναι ηµιας και τας αρχας και τας εξουσιας καταλελυκεναι τελειαν καταλυσιν δια του παθητουγενοµενου κατα την βουλην, “that withal we may give thanks to God for having made the world with all things therein for man, and for having freed us from that evil and misery wherein we were, and having utterly overthrown principalities and powers by him that became possible according to his counsel and will.” To which he immediately subjoins the text 177 and applies it to the eucharist. Thus Justin Martyr.

My third witness is Origen in his 8th book Contra Celsum. “Celsus,” saith he, “thinks it seemly we should be thankful to demons and offer them Χαριστηριαι; but we think him to live most comely τον μεµνηµενον τις ο Δηµιουργικης, that remembers who is the Creator, unto whom we Christians are careful not to be unthankful, with whose benefits we are filled and whose creatures we are.”

177 the text: Malachi 1.11.

* <Marginal note:> Thank-offerings, or grateful acknowledgements.
Εστι δὲ καὶ συμβολὸν ἡμῖν τῆς πρὸς Θεόν εὐχαριστίας, ἄρτος εὐχαριστία καλουμένος. “And we have also a symbol of our thanksgiving unto God, the bread which is called εὐχαριστία.” Where note that the eucharistical bread is said to be a symbol not only of the body and blood of Christ, but a symbol of that thanksgiving which we render to the Creator through him.

Again, in the same book where Celsus likewise would have mankind thankful unto demons, as those to whom the charge of things here upon earth is committed, and to offer unto them Ἀπαρχὰς καὶ εὐχὰς, “first-fruits and prayers,” Origen thus takes him up: Κέλσος μὲν, ὡς αγνοοῦν Θεόν, τὰ Χαριστηρία αποδίδοτο. ημεῖς δὲ τῷ τοῦ παντὸς Δημιουργῷ ευχαγεσούντες, και τοὺς μετ’ εὐχαριστίαις καὶ εὐχῆς τῆς ἐπὶ τοῖς δοθεῖσι προσαγομένους ἄρτους εὐθυμούν, σωμά γενομένους, διὰ τὴν εὐχὴν, αἰγίνων τι, “Let Celsus, as being void of the true knowledge of God, render εὐχαριστία to the demons. As for us Christians, whose only desire is to please the Creator of the universe, we eat the bread that was offered unto him with prayer and thanksgiving for his gifts, and then made a kind of holy body by prayer.” Mark here: bread offered unto God with prayer and thanksgiving pro datis, “for that he hath given us,” and then by prayer made a holy body, and so eaten.

Thus much out of Fathers, all of them within less than two hundred and fifty years after Christ, and less than one hundred and fifty years after the death of John.

The same appears in the forms of the ancient liturgies. As that of Clemens, where the priest in the name of the whole Church assembled speaks thus: (a) Προσφέρομεν σοι τῷ Βασιλείᾳ καὶ Θεῷ, “We offer unto thee, our King and God,” κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ διάταξιν, “according to his” – that is, Christ’s – “appointment,” τὸν ἄρτον τούτον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τούτο, “this bread and this cup”; εὐχαριστούντες σοὶ δὲ αὐτοῦ εἰς κατηχίσασας ἡμᾶς εστανεὶ εὐσπιτεὶν σοῦ καὶ πρεσβευεῖν σοὶ, καὶ αἰτοῦμεν σε ὅπως εὐμενῶς εἰπελειψης ἐπὶ τὰ προκειμένα δώρα ταῦτα εὐσπιτεῖν σοῦ, σοῦ αὐλείν Θεοῦ, καὶ εὐδοκησῆς εἰς εἰς τιμὴν τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, “giving thanks unto thee through him, for that thou hast vouchsafed us” – he speaks of the whole Church – “to stand before thee and to minister unto thee. And we beseech thee, thou God that wantest nothing, that thou wouldest look favourably upon these gifts here set before thee, and accept them to the honour of thy Christ,” &c.178

Again: (b) ‘Ὑπερ του δωρου προσκοµισθεντος Κυριω τω Θεω δεηθωμεν οπως ο αγαθος Θεος προσδεξηται δια της μεσιτειας του Χριστου αυτου εις το επουρανιον αυτου θυσιαστηριον εις οσμην ευωδιας, “For the gift or oblation that is offered to the Lord our God, let us pray that our good God would receive it, through the mediation of his Christ, to his heavenly altar for a sweet-smelling savour.”

Yea, in the Canon of the Roman Church, though the rite be not used, yet the words remain still, as when the priest, long before the consecration of the body and blood of Christ, prays: Te igitur, clementissime Pater, per Iesum Christum filium tuum Dominum nostrum, supplices rogamus et petimus, uti accepta habeas et benedicas haec dona, haec munera, “We humbly beseech and entreat thee, most merciful Father, through Jesus Christ thy Son, our Lord, to accept and bless these gifts, these presents” – and other like passages, which now they wrest to a new-found oblation of the body and blood of Christ, which the ancient Church knew not of.

But of all others, this rite is most strongly confirmed by that wont of the ancient Fathers to confute the heretics of those first times, who held the Creator of the world to be some inferior deity and not the Father of Christ, out of the eucharist. For, say they, unless the Father of Christ be the Creator of the world, why is the creature offered unto him in the eucharist as if he were? would he be agnized the Author and Lord of that he is not?

Hear Irenaeus, Adversus haereses, lib. 4, chap. 34: Haereticorum synagogæ, saith he, non offerunt [eucharisticam oblationem quam Dominus offerri docuit; alterum enim præter fabricatorem, dicentes Patrem, i deo quæ secundum nos creaturæ sunt, offerentes ei cupidum aliens ostendunt eum et aliena concupiscentem, “The synagogues of the heretics do not offer [the very eucharistical oblation which our Lord taught and appointed to be offered,] for they affirming another besides the Creator of the world to be the Father of Christ do therefore, while they offer unto him the creatures which are here with us, represent him to be desirous of that which is another’s and to cover that which is not his.” And a little after: Quomodo autem constabit eis, eum panem in quo gratia acta sunt, corpus esse Domini sui, et calicem sanguinis ejus, si non ipsum Fabricatoris mundi filium dicant, id est, verbum ejus per quod lignum fructificat, et defluant fontes, et terra dat primum quidem gramen, post deinde spicam, deinde plenum triticum in spica? “How shall it appear to them that that bread for which thanks have been given is the body of their Lord, and that cup the cup of his blood, if they deny him to be the Son of the Creator of the world, that is to say, to be the Word of him by whom the tree brings forth

179 Ibid., VIII.13.3.
fruit, fountains send forth water, and the earth brings forth first green corn like grass, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear.”

From the same ground Tertullian argues against Marcion, *Contra Marcionem*, lib. 1, chap. 23: *Non putem*, saith he, *impudentiorem quam qui in aliena aqua alii Deo tinguitur, ad alienum calum alii Deo expanditur, in aliena terra alii Deo sternitur, super alienum panem alii Deo gratiarum actionibus fungitur*, “I cannot conceive anyone more impudent than he that is baptized to a God in a water that is none of his, that in prayer to a God spreads forth his hands towards an heaven that is none of his, that prostrates himself to a God upon an earth that is not his, that gives thanks to a God for that bread which is none of his.”

Origen against the same heretic useth the same argument. *Dialogus aduersus Marcionem 3 paulo ante finem*: 

> Dominus aspiciens in cœlum gratias agit. Ecquid non agit conditori gratias? Cum panem accepisset et poculum, et beneficisset, quid alterine pro creaturis conditoris beneficis? an potius illi qui effecit et exhibuit? “Our Lord looking up to heaven gave thanks. What? did not he give thanks to the Creator of the world? When he took the bread and the cup, and blessed, did he bless and give thanks to any other for the creatures of God the Maker of the world, and not rather bless and give thanks to him who made them and gave them us?”

Lastly, this oblation of bread and wine is implied in St Paul’s parallel of the Lord’s Supper and the sacrifice of the Gentiles. *Ye cannot*, saith he, *be partakers of the table of the Lord and the table of devils* – namely, because they imply contrary covenants incompatible one with the other, a sacrifice (as I told you) being *epulum fœderale*, “a federal feast”. Now here it is manifest that the table of devils is so called because it consisted of viands offered to devils – for so St Paul expressly tells us – whereby those who eat thereof, eat of the devil’s meat. *Ergo*, the table of the Lord is likewise called his table, not because he ordained it, but because it consisted of viands offered unto him.

Having thus, as I think, sufficiently proved what I took in hand, I think it not amiss to answer two questions which this discourse may beget.

The first is: How the ancients could gather out of the institution, that our Saviour did as hath been shewed? I answer: They believed that he did as the Jews were wont to do; but they did thus. How, you

---

180 *the earth brings forth first green corn like grass, then the ear, after that the full corn in the ear*: Cf. Mark 4.28.

181 *paulo ante finem*: “a little before the end of the chapter”.

182 1 Corinthians 10.21.
will say, doth this appear? I answer: It may appear thus. The Passover was a sacrifice, and therefore the viands here, as in all other holy feasts, were first offered unto God. Now the bread and wine which our Saviour took when he blessed and gave thanks, was the mincha or meat-offering of the Passover. If then he did as the Jews used to do, heagnized his Father and blessed him by oblation of these his creatures unto him, using the like or the same form of words: “Blessed be thou, O Lord our God, the King of the world, which bringest forth bread out of the earth.” And over the wine: “Blessed be thou, O Lord our God, the King of the world, which createth the fruit of the vine.” Moreover, the Church ab initio applied that precept of our Saviour, Matthew 5.23, If thou bring thy gift to the altar, &c., to the eucharist. For they believed that he would not enact a new law concerning legal sacrifices which he was presently to abolish, but that it had reference to that oblation which was to continue under the gospel.

The other question is: If all this be so, how is not our celebration of the eucharist defective, where no such oblation is used? I answer: This concerns not us alone but all the churches of the West of the Roman communion who, as in other things they have depraved this mystery and swerved from the primitive pattern thereof, so have they for many ages disused this oblation of bread and wine and brought in, in lieu thereof, a real and hypostatical oblation of Christ himself. This blasphemous oblation we have taken away, and justly, but not reduced again that express and formal use of the other. Howsoever, though we do it not with a set ceremony and form of words, yet in deed and effect we do it so often as we set the bread and wine upon the Holy Table. For whatsoever we set upon God’s table is ipso facto dedicated and offered unto him, according to that of our Saviour, Matthew 23.19, τὸ θυσιαστήριον αγιαζει τὸ δωρον, The altar sanctifies the gift — that is, consecrates it unto God and appropriates it to his use. In which respect it were much to be wished that this were more solemnly done than is usual -- namely, not until the time of the administration, and by the hand of the minister in the name and sight of the whole congregation standing up and showing some sign of due and lowly reverence, according as the deacon was wont to admonish the people in ancient liturgies,

\[\text{183 Mede quotes the Hebrew texts of both berakoth; only the English translations supplied in Worthington’s edition (1672), p. 375, are given here.}\]

\[\text{184 \textit{ab initio}. “from the beginning”.}\]
Κύριοι μετὰ φοβου καὶ τρόμου ἐστωτες ὲμεν προσφερεῖν, “Let us stand in an upright posture before God to offer with fear and trembling.”

CHAPTER IX.

The sixth and last thing to be proved was, THAT CHRIST IS OFFERED IN THIS SACRIFICE COMMEMORATIVELY ONLY, AND NOT OTHERWISE.

Though the eucharist be a sacrifice – that is, an oblation wherein the offerer banquets with his God, – yet is Christ in this sacrifice no otherwise offered than by way of commemoration only of his sacrifice once offered upon the cross – as a learned prelate of ours hath lately written, objectivé only, not subjectivé. And this is that which our Saviour himself said when he ordained this sacred rite, This do in commemoration of me.

But this commemoration is to be made to God his Father and is not a bare remembering or putting ourselves in mind only (as is commonly supposed), but a putting of God in mind. For every sacrifice is directed unto God, and the oblation therein, whatsoever it be, hath him for its object and not man. If therefore the eucharist be a commemorative sacrifice of Christ, as ours grant, then must the commemoration therein be made unto God. And if Christ therein be offered objectivé, that is, as the object of the commemoration there made (as the learned bishop speaks) – if the commemoration of him be an oblation of him, to whom is this oblation, that is, commemoration, made but unto God?

Well, then, Christ is offered in this sacred supper not hypostatically, as the papists would have him, for so he was but once offered, but commemoratively only. That is, by this sacred rite of

---

185 Apostolic Constitutions VIII.12.2. This was one of a series of admonitory acclamations which followed the Peace and introduced the Offertory.

186 as a learned prelate of ours hath lately written: Thomas Morton, Of the Institution of the Sacrament (1631), Bk. VI – see fn. 12, p. 4 above.

187 objectivé only, not subjectivé: our commemoration of Christ’s passion, as opposed to Christ himself as a personal subject, constitutes the cause for our sacrifice.

188 not hypostatically … but commemoratively only: According to the dogmatic decree of the council of Chalcedon (451), Jesus Christ is ben
bread and wine we represent and inculcate\textsuperscript{189} his blessed passion to his Father; we put him in mind thereof by setting the monuments thereof before him; we testify our own mindfulness thereof unto his sacred Majesty; that so he would, for his sake, according to the tenor of his covenant, in him be favourable and propitious unto us miserable sinners.

That this and no other offering of Christ in the blessed eucharist the ancient Church ever meant or intended, I am now to shew by authentical testimonies.

First, by the constant form of all the liturgies; in which, after the reciting of the words of institution, is subjoined, \textit{Μεµνηµενοι προσφεροµεν, Communicantes or Commemorando offerimus, “Commemorating” or “By commemorating, we offer.”}

\begin{quote}
Clemens: \textit{Μεµνηµενοι τοινυν του παθους αυτου και του θανατου και της αναστασεως και της εις ουρανους επανοδου — προσφεροµεν σοι τω Βασιλει και θεω τον αρτον τουτον και το ποτηριον τουτο, “Therefore commemorating his passion and death, and resurrection from the dead and ascension into heaven … , we offer to thee, our King and God, this bread and this cup.”\textsuperscript{190} Mark here “commemorating, we offer” – that is, “We offer by commemorating.” But this commemoration is made unto God to whom we offer. This is the tenor of all the Greek liturgies – save that some, instead of “We offer unto thee this bread and this cup,” have: \textit{Προσφεροµεν σοι την φοβεραν ταυτην και αναιµακτην θυσιαν, “We offer unto thee this dreadful and unbloody sacrifice,” as that of Jerusalem, called St James his Liturgy; others, την λογικην ταυτην και αναιµακτην λατρειαν, “this reasonable and unbloody service,” as that of St Chrysostom; others, \textit{τα σα εκ των σουν, “thine own of thine own,” as that of Basil and of Alexandria (called St Mark’s); but all, Μεµνηµενοι προσφεροµεν, “Commemorating, we offer.”}
\end{quote}

\textit{prwtoin kai mia hypostasis en duo phusein, “one person and hypostasis in two natures”. Hence in Catholic teaching, the Incarnation is often described as “the Hypostatic Union,” meaning the person (hypostasis) of Christ unites divinity and humanity. In this context, then, Mede means that the Church offers up a commemoration (anamnesis) of Christ, not the actual person of Christ, the Word made flesh.}

\textsuperscript{189} inculcate: attempt to impress Christ’s passion upon the Father by persistent repetition.

\textsuperscript{190} \textit{Apostolic Constitutions} VIII.12.38 (Anamnesis).
In the same form runs the *Ordo Romanus*:  

**Memores nos servi tui, sed et plebs tua sancta Christi filii tui Domini Dei nostri, tum beata passionis, necnon ab inferis resurrectionis, sed et in calum gloria ascensionis, offerimus praecrara majestati tuae, de tuis donis ac datiis, hostiam puram, sanctam, hostiam immaculatam, panem sanctum vitae aeterna et calicem salutis perpetuae, “We, O Lord, thy servants, as also thy holy people, being mindful both of the blessed passion and resurrection from the dead, as also the glorious ascension into heaven, of the same Christ thy Son, our Lord, offer unto thy excellent Majesty, of thy own gifts, a pure sacrifice, a holy sacrifice, an immaculate sacrifice, the holy bread of eternal life and the cup of everlasting salvation.” Note here also **Memores offerimus**, “Being mindful of,” or “Commemorating, we offer.” Which Ivo Carnotensis explains thus: 

**MEMORES OFFERimus MAJESTATI TUÆ (id est, saith he, oblatam commemoramus per hac dona visibilia) HOSTIAM PURAM SANCTAM, IMMACULATAM &c.** 

Et hanc veri sacrificii commemorationem postulat sacerdos ita Deo Patri fore acceptam, sicut accepta fuerunt munera Abel &c. **REMEMBERING or BEING MINDFUL, WE OFFer TO THy MAJESTY A PURE, HOLY, AND IMMACULATE SACRIFICE** — “that is,” saith he, “we commemorate the same offered unto God by these visible gifts. And the priest accordingly prays that this commemoration of the true sacrifice may in like manner be acceptable to God the Father as the gifts of Abel were accepted of him.”

Thus he. **Memores** therefore, in the Latin Canon, is **commemorantes**, which the Greek expresses better μεμνημενοι. Of the sense whereof that we may not doubt, hear the explication of that great council of Ephesus in this manner: Καταγγελλόντες.

---

191 *Ordo Romanus*: “The Roman Order,” i.e. the Roman Mass.

192 **Ivo Carnotensis** (ca. 1040 – 1115), bishop of Chartres (hence *Carnotensis*) and major influence on the development of canon law and its interpretation in the Roman tradition. PL 161-162.

193 as the gifts of Abel were accepted of him: Ivo (like Mede) has been commenting on the *UNDE ET MEMORES*, the section of the Roman Canon which immediately follows the institution narrative. Here he alludes to the very next section, the *SUPRA QUA*: *Supra quae propitio ac sereno vultu respicerre digneris et accepta habere sicuti accepta habere dignatus es munera puere tuo iusti Abel, et sacrificium patriarchae Abraham, et quod tibi obtulit sumnum sacrificios tuos Melchisedech, sanctum sacrificium, immaculatam hostiam* (“May you deign to look upon these gifts with a merciful and serene countenance, and to accept them just as you deigned to accept the gifts of your righteous servant Abel, and the sacrifice of our forefather Abraham, and what your high priest Melchizedek offered to you, a holy sacrifice, an unblemished victim”).
τον θανατὸν τοῦ μονογενοῦς Ὕιου τοῦ Θεοῦ, τουτεστιν Ἱησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τὴν τε ἐκ νεκρῶν αναβιῶσιν, καὶ τὴν εἰς οὐρανοὺς αναλημφθεῖν ομολογοῦντες, τὴν αναμνησίαν εἰς ταῖς εκκλησίαις τελοῦμεν θυσίαν, “Shewing forth the death of the only-begotten Son of God, that is, of Jesus Christ, as also confessing his resurrection and ascension into heaven, we celebrate in our churches the unbloody sacrifice (or service).” Μεμνημένοι, “commemorating,” therefore is shewing forth and confessing. But unto whom should we confess but unto God? To him therefore, and not unto ourselves, is that αναµνησις or commemoration to be made which Christ commended to his Church when he said, Do this εἰς τὴν εἰμὶν αναµνησιν, for my commemoration or in remembrance of me.

In this council of Ephesus, Cyril of Alexandria195 was chief actor and president; and it is to be noted that the liturgy of the church of Alexandria (usually called St Mark’s) hath, instead of μεµνηµένοι, the selfsame words Καταγγελλόντες καὶ ομολογοῦντες, “shewing forth and confessing” which I now quoted out of the council for an explication of the same; which argues, as I take it, Cyril to have been the pen-man of the decree of the council, and the liturgy of his church to have then run in this form.

I shall need allege no more of the Latin liturgies. There is no material difference amongst them, so that if you know the form of one, you know of all. I will add only out of St Ambrose an explication following those words of the institution, Do this in remembrance of me, expressed in this manner: Mandans et dicens ad eos, Quotiescunque hoc feceritis, toties commemorationem mei facietis, mortem meam praedicabis, resurrectionem meam annuntiabis, adventum sperabis donec iterum adventiam, “commanding and saying to them, ‘As often as ye shall do this, ye shall commemorate me, declare my death, shew forth my resurrection, express your hope of my coming, until I come

194 that great council of Ephesus: Held in 431, it is the third of the four general councils of the Church which the Anglican tradition has acknowledged as genuinely ecumenical – and whose decrees our tradition therefore has received as binding dogma. The principal decree of Ephesus acclaimed the blessed Virgin Mary as Theotokos, “God-bearer” or “the Mother of God”.

195 Cyril of Alexandria, bishop of Alexandria, 412 – 444. His genuine dismay at the theological implications of what Nestorius, bishop of Constantinople, had to say about the person of Christ – not to mention his political desire, stemming from the traditional rivalry between the sees of Alexandria and Constantinople, to denigrate the authority of Nestorius – led to the council of Ephesus in 431, at which Cyril won a nearly total condemnation of Nestorius’ teachings.
This may suffice for liturgies. Now let us hear the Fathers speak.

I quoted heretofore a passage out of Justin Martyr affirming a twofold αναµνησις or commemoration to be made in the eucharist: the one of “our food, dry and liquid” (as he speaks), that is, of our meat and drink, by agnizing and recording him the Lord and Giver of the same; the other an αναµνησις in the same food του παθους του Υιου του Θεου, “of the passion of the Son of God”. The first of these commemorations is made unto God. For to whom else should we render our thankful-ness for the creature? Ergo the second, the commemoration of the passion of the Son of God, is made to him likewise.

My next Father is Origen, Homilia 13 in Leviticus, chap. 24, where, comparing the eucharist to the shew-bread which was every Sabbath set for a memorial before the Lord: Ista est, saith he, meaning the eucharist, commemoratio sola, qua propitium facit Deum hominibus, “That is the only commemoration which renders God propitious to men.” Where note both that this commemoration is made unto God as that of the shew-bread was, and that the end thereof is to make him propitious unto men, according to that of St Augustine, lib. 9, chap. 13:

Illa quæ in cena Christus exhibet, Fides accepta interponit inter peccata nostra et iram Dei, tanquam satisfactionem et propitiationem, “Those things which Christ exhibits in his supper, faith, having received them, interposeth them as a satisfaction and propitiation between our sins and God's wrath.”

My next witness is Eusebius, Demonstratio evangelii, lib. 1, chap. 10: Μετα παντα οιον τι θαυµασιον θυµα και σφαγιον εξαιπετον τω Πατρι καλλιερησαµενος, υπερ των απαντων ηµων ανθηνεκε σωτηριας, μνεµην και ηµιν παραδους αντι θυσιας το Θεο διηνεκως προσφερειν, “After all other things done,” saith he, speaking of Christ, “he made that so wonderful an oblation and excellent sacrifice to God for the salvation of us all, appointing us to offer continually unto God a remembrance thereof instead of a sacrifice.” And again, toward the end of that chapter, having cited the place of Malachi which I have chosen for my text and alluding thereunto:

“Θυμιωµεν τον προφετικον θυµιαµα, “We offer the incense spoken of by the prophet.” Θυμικαι και θυμιωµεν τοτε µεν την µνεµην του µεγαλου θυµατος κατα τα σπος αυτου παραδουτα µυστη−ρια επιτελουν τες και την υπερ σωτηριας ηµων ευχαριστιαν δι’ ευσεβων ωµων τε και ευχων το Θεο προσκοµιζοντες τοτε σφας αυτους όλους καθερουντες αυτο, και το γε Αρχιερει αυτου, Λογο αυτο, σωµατι και ψυχη ανακειµενοι, “We offer sacrifice and incense while we celebrate the remembrance of the great sacrifice
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according to the mysteries given to us by him, and offer the eucharist with holy hymns and prayers to God for the salvation of our souls, as also in that we consecrate ourselves wholly unto him and dedicate ourselves, both soul and body, to his high priest, the Word.”

But above all other, St Chrysostom speaks so full and home to the point as nothing can be more, to wit, Homilia 17 in Episolam ad Hebraeos, upon these words chap. 9, verse 26: But now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. Τι ουν; ημείς καθ’εκαστήν ημεραν ου προσφερομεν; “What then?” saith he, “do not we offer every day?” He answers: Προσφέρομεν μεν, αλλ’αναμνησιν ποιούμενοι τοι θανάτου αυτου,και μια εστιν αυτη, και ου πολλαι, “We offer indeed, but it is by making a commemoration of his death; and this sacrifice is one and not many.” — πως μια, και ου πολλαι; “But how is it one and not many?” επει απαξ προσηνεχθη, ουχ ωσπερ εκεινη η εις τα σχια τον αιων. Τουτο εκεινης τυπος εστι και αυτη εκεινης, “because it was once offered, not as that which was carried into the Holy of holies. That was the figure of this, and this [the truth] of that.” And a little after: Ὁ Αρχιερευς ηµων εστιν ο την θυσιαν την καθαιρουσαν ηµας προσενεγκων. Εκεινην προσφεροµεν εν και νυν, την τοτε προσενεχθεισαν, την αναλωιον. Τουτο εις αναμνησιν γινεται του τοτε γινοµενου. Τουτο γε ποιειτε, φησιν, εις την εµην αναμνησιν. Ουκ αλλην θυσιαν, καθαπερ ο αρξιερευς τοτε, αλλα την αυτην αει ποιοµεν, μαλλον την αναμνησιν εργαζοµεθα θυσιας, “He (that is, Christ) is our high priest who offered that sacrifice which purifieth us. The same do we also offer now that then was offered, and yet is unconsumed. This is done in remembrance of that which was then done. For Do this, saith he, in remembrance of me. We offer not another, not a different sacrifice, as the Jewish high priest did of old, but still one and the same – or rather, we perform the remembrance of a sacrifice.” What can be more express than this?

Primasius 196 is short, but no less to the purpose. Offerunt quidem, saith he, sacerdotes nostri, sed ad recordationem mortis ejus, in 10. cap. ad Hebraeos, “Our priests indeed offer, but it is in remembrance of his death.” St Augustine calls it Memoriale sacrificium, “a sacrifice by way of remembrance,” in his book against Faustus.

196 Primasius, bishop of Hadrametum in North Africa, mid-6th century. Known for an important early commentary on the book of Revelation. The commentary on the Letter to the Hebrews (part of a commentary on the whole Pauline corpus), from which Mede quotes here, is no longer considered to be by Primasius, but by an unknown contemporary Italian divine.
In a word, the sacrifice of Christians is nothing but that one sacrifice of Christ, once offered upon the cross, again and again commemorated. Which is elegantly expressed by those words of St Andrew recorded in the history of his passion, written by the presbyters of Achaia. Where Aegeas the proconsul requiring him to sacrifice to idols, he is said to have answered thus: *Omnipotenti Deo, qui unus et verus est, ego omni die sacrifico, non thuris fumum nec taurorum nugentium carnes nec bircorum sanguinem, sed immaculatum agnum quotidie in altari crucis sacrifico; ejus carnes postquam omnis populus credentium manducaverit, et ejus sanguinem biberit, Agnus qui sacrificatus est integer perseverat et vivus,* “I sacrifice daily to almighty God, but what? Not the smoke of frankincense, nor the flesh of bellowing bulls, nor the blood of goats. No, but I offer daily the unspotted Lamb of God on the altar of the cross, whose flesh and blood, though all the faithful eat and drink of, yet after all this notwithstanding, the Lamb that was sacrificed remains entire and alive still.” This riddle, though Aegeas the proconsul were not able to unfold, I make no question but you are. And here I conclude.
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Introduction

Queen Elizabeth I died on 24 March 1603. She was succeeded by her first cousin twice removed, James VI of Scotland.\(^1\) Having grown up under the tutelage of aggressively Calvinist Presbyterian clergy, James VI was not prone to sympathise with the Puritan ideologues who greeted him on his entry into England as James I. But he had also learned the wily skills of a survivor; and where Elizabeth had dealt with Puritan projects in a disdainful and sometimes brutally confrontational manner, James dealt with the Puritans by co-opting their leaders. Elizabeth had banished them from court and sometimes put them in prison; James made them bishops. And James’s policy worked. Puritanism lost its edge, and it became increasingly difficult to distinguish its adherents from the mainstream of the established Church. As a result, the Jacobean Church of England entered an era of relative equipoise.

It did not last, of course. James’s policy did not completely unravel nor did the Church lose its equipoise all at once, but both faced external complications which generated internal pressures. In 1618 a general war of religion – the Thirty Years’ War – broke out in central Europe. For the first fifteen years, the Protestant cause suffered one catastrophe after another, and in many quarters English public opinion wanted their nation to declare war on dastardly Spain, in aid of the embattled Protestants in Germany. James I realised that his three kingdoms (England, Scotland, and Ireland\(^2\)) could not muster the military might necessary for a serious intervention in the war without bankrupting the royal exchequer; and besides, he was a genuine man of peace, who regarded war, any war, as an absolute, unmitigated disaster and thus the last (and worst) possible option. So he used all his survivalist skills to stay out of the European conflict and, with an innocence which only irritated the belligerent parties, kept offering his good offices as an honest broker and mediator.\(^3\) But James

---

\(^1\) James was the only son of Mary, Queen of Scots, by her second husband Henry Stuart, Lord Darnley. Mary herself was the granddaughter of Henry VIII’s sister Margaret, who was the consort of James IV of Scotland.

\(^2\) England and Scotland did not become a single kingdom until the passage of the Act of Union in 1707; before that, they were united only by the fact that they happened to share the same monarchs. Ireland remained a distinct kingdom, with its own Parliament in Dublin, until the second Act of Union in 1801.

\(^3\) James suffered a peculiar disadvantage as a potential mediator: his only daughter Elizabeth had married Frederick, the Elector Palatine. In 1618...
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could not control his subjects’ feelings. Many veered toward paranoid Protestantism, and came to view the king’s resolute refusal to embroil his kingdoms on the side of the Protestant princes as offering aid and comfort to “the Popish Plot”.

It was in this atmosphere that a new party began to make its presence felt. It was a party of dissent – paradoxically, of dissent on behalf of the established Church. Its members saw the puritan movement dominating the ethos of the Church and dictating the terms of discussion; and they decided that it was time to do unto Puritanism what Puritanism had done unto the established Church. This new party had two circles, each of which reinforced the other. One circle gravitated around Richard Neile, who subsequently became archbishop of York. This circle sought to attack Puritanism through a critique of Calvinism. Since you could not have Puritanism without Calvinism, Neile’s protégés realised, it was necessary to discredit Calvinism – and in particular, the doctrine of double predestination, which had come to be regarded as the pith and marrow of the Calvinist system. This was a dangerous tack to take, for in 1618 the Synod of Dortrecht – the only thing remotely like an ecumenical council ever held by the Reformed churches – had condemned one Jacobus Arminius for denying predestination tout court and had reasserted the doctrine of double predestination in all its rigour. And sure enough, when Richard Montagu, one of Neile’s protégés, published a diatribe against Calvinism, a firestorm of controversy fell on him.

The other circle of this anti-Puritan party came to be identified with William Laud, who became bishop of St David’s in 1621; Charles I made him archbishop of Canterbury twelve years later.

Czech rebels expelled imperial officials from Prague and invited Frederick to become King of Bohemia. He accepted and moved to Prague with Elizabeth. It proved to be a bad career move. In 1620 imperial forces overran not only Bohemia but also the Palatinate, and Frederick and Elizabeth – “the Winter King and Queen of Bohemia” – fled to the Netherlands. James I offered to mediate, but his offers always came with a condition – that the Palatine be restored to his son-in-law. The Hapsburg emperor and the Hapsburg king of Spain would hear of no such thing.

4 This doctrine maintains that God, from all eternity, has foreknown, chosen, and destined each and every individual human by name either for salvation or for damnation. Calvin had indeed taught this doctrine, but it does not loom anywhere near as large in his writings as it did in the subsequent ideology of Calvinism.

5 Dortrecht is a city in the Netherlands, then known as the United Provinces. The English called it “Dort”; hence, in most Anglophone historical literature, the council question is called the Synod of Dort.
Laud was a short man, even by seventeenth-century standards, florid in complexion, quick-tempered, physically clumsy, and a demon for organisation. He distrusted the approach taken by Neile’s circle, because he saw any and all controversy as the bane of the Church. Even if one were on the side of the angels, Laud thought, it was still dangerous to indulge in controversy, for one could never control it – and Laud believed in control. He was an authoritarian of the first water. He also understood that the Puritan movement derived much of its attractiveness and almost all of its resilience from “the godly discipline”. So the answer to “the Puritan problem,” as Laud saw it, was not a head-on confrontation through polemics. The answer lay in the Church’s development of a distinct discipline of its own.

Laud’s idea of a churchly discipline was summarised in the line, “The beauty of holiness”. By this he meant “the external decent worship of God”. In the conduct of the Church’s liturgy, one ought to take pains to show outwardly – in gestures, actions, apparel, ornaments, arrangement of furniture, even architecture – the reverence that one felt inwardly. “For my own part,” Laud once said, “I take myself bound to worship with body as well as in soul whenever I come where God is worshipped.” If anything, such a statement means that Laud’s “church discipline” was profoundly sacramental in principle. The outward sign – whatever it might be, a bow of the head, a surplice, a frontal, an organ, the arrangement of the sanctuary – not only acted as a metaphor of the reverence due to a sacred reality but also embodied and enacted that reverence.

It was no coincidence, then, that the Laudian discipline tended to focus on the eucharist and, more particularly, how it was (or ought to be) celebrated. As noted in the introduction to the 1552 Communion Order, and in the reading from Addleshaw and Etchells, the English customarily did Lord’s Supper as a kneeling mob surrounding a table placed lengthwise in the midst of the sanctuary. Sensible people recognised the unsatisfactory nature of this set-up, especially during the administration of the sacrament; the priest’s efforts to weave his way through the throng of communicants made accidents – the scattering of crumbs, the spilling of the cup – all too frequent a happening. Laud came up with a solution. On Sacrament Sunday, he decided, the holy table

6 Psalm 96.9: “O worship the LORD in the beauty of holiness.”

7 William Laud, A Speech Delivered in the Starr-Chamber, on Wednesday the XIVth of June, MDCXXXVII. At the Censure of John Bastwick, Henry Burton, & William Prinn: Concerning pretended Innovations in the Church (London, 1637), p. 43.
should not be moved from the eastern end of the sanctuary into
the chancel aisle, but should remain where it was, standing
“altarwise” – that is, with its ends on a north-south axis. He also
preferred (but did not insist) that it be enclosed by a rail which ran
the breadth of the sanctuary. The priest then stood (or knelt) at the
north end of the table, his right profile to the people. This allowed
the people to see all his actions during the celebration. At the
communion, the people were to come forward by rows and kneel
along the rail; the priest could then administer the sacrament “with
the more readiness and decency”.

These arrangements entailed a setting apart of the holy table;
and Laudians did not shy away from the behavioural implications
of such a segregation of chancel and sanctuary. They made a point
of bowing towards the table whenever they approached it or
crossed in front of it; and they took to calling it the altar. As Laud
himself explained in a speech delivered before the court of the Star
Chamber:

And you, my honourable Lords of the Garter, in your great
solemnities, you do your reverence – and to almighty God, I
doubt not. But it is versus altare, “towards his altar,” as the
greatest place of God’s residence upon earth. I say “the
greatest,” yea, greater than the pulpit. For there ’tis, Hoc est
corpus meum, “This is my body.” But in the pulpit ’tis at most
but Hoc est verbum meum, “This is my word.” And greater
reverence no doubt is due to the body than to the word of
our Lord. And so, in relation, answerably [greater reverence is
due] to the throne where his body is usually present than to
the seat whence his word useth to be proclaimed.8

In the atmosphere of paranoid Protestantism which then infested
the English, such language, such a perspective, could only be
inflammatory. Fencing in the table, bowing to it, and calling it an
altar violated the rule of the Seven Last Words of the Church, “We
never did it that way before!” – and in early seventeenth-century
England, anything which violated that rule was, by definition,
“popery”.9
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8 Ibid., p. 47.

9 The late Fr Roland Palmer, of the Society of St John the Evangelist at
Bracebridge, told a story of the days when the Cowley Fathers staffed
several rural parishes in the diocese of Algoma. One Sunday, Fr Palmer
had to be away from one of the churches in his charge, and he arranged
for another priest (not a Cowley Father) to celebrate Mass in his place.
He asked the church-warden to look after the visiting priest. Two Sundays
later, Palmer returned to the church and sought out the warden. “How
Matters did not come to a head until 1636, when one of Laud’s protegés, Peter Heylyn, published a response to a letter which had been circulating for almost a decade. This letter was addressed to a certain Mr Titley, a parish priest in the diocese of Lincoln who had come to blows with his wardens about the Lord’s table. Mr Titley called it an altar, ostentatiously bowed to it, and insisted on fixing it against the eastern wall of the chancel for celebrations of the Lord’s Supper. His wardens no less ostentatiously pulled the table back out into the midst of the chancel, and proceeded to use it as a hat-rack. Mr Titley, on entering the church to celebrate the Eucharist, swept the hats on to the floor and singlehandedly pushed the altar back against the wall. This contest went on for several months, with Titley nailing the altar to the floor on Saturday night and the wardens coming in early Sunday morning to rip out the nails and move the table into the chancel aisle – only to see Titley restore it to the wall before he began the service. The letter roundly criticised Titley for his actions, and detailed the reasons why the author thought him wrong. The chief reason was that the name altar implied a sacrifice; but the reformed Church of England vigorously repudiated the notion that the Eucharist was a sacrifice; therefore, the name altar was not allowable. Heylyn believed that the letter to Titley had been written by John Cotton, the puritan lecturer in Boston, who had since sailed to that city’s namesake in Massachusetts Bay Colony. As a matter of fact, the letter had been written by John Williams, the bishop of Lincoln. This did not become common knowledge until Williams himself wrote a very funny (and truly learned) response to Heylyn’s diatribe. The battle over the appropriateness of naming
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10 One of the ways in which the Puritan movement sought to circumvent the Established Church’s procedures for ordaining, installing, and licensing parish clergy was by endowing “lectureships,” each attached to a parish church. Parish clergy who sympathized with the Puritan movement connived with this arrangement; those clergy who sided with the Established Church often found themselves locked in intra-parochial battles with the lecturers and their supporters. Mr Cotton lost his battle with the rector of Boston, Lincolnshire, which is why he emigrated to Massachusetts Bay.
the Lord’s table an *altar* was joined; the controversy continued until the outbreak of the English civil war six years later.

Many scholars now argue that the English civil war was merely one sequence in a round of overlapping civil wars which afflicted the British Isles in the 1640s and 1650s. The round actually began in Scotland, not in England, the same year that Williams and Heylyn exchanged diatribes over the name *altar*. The precipitant was the introduction of the Scots Prayer Book of 1637.

Even before he succeeded Elizabeth, James VI of Scotland had laboured to bring the Scots Kirk into closer affinity with the English Church. He re-introduced episcopacy, though his bishops were more like “superintendants,” in a manner acceptable to Presbyterian principles, than their quasi-monarchical counterparts in the Church of England. He also commissioned and urged these bishops to devise a Scots Book of Common Prayer which would take its cue from EngBCP 1559 and replace *The Book of Common Order*, which the Scots reformer John Knox (ca. 1513-1572) had developed from the church-orders of Geneva and Zürich. Various draft proposed services were produced over the years, but none went any further than the King’s eyes before he died (in England) in 1625.

His son and heir, Charles I, did not at first quicken the pace of Anglicising the Kirk; he did not even go to Edinburgh for his coronation as King of the Scots until 1633, eight years after his coronation as King of England. Soon afterwards, however, on William Laud’s advice, he initiated a “renewal” of the Scots episcopate which gave the Kirk’s bishops power and authority equal to that of the English episcopate. And he prodded the Scots bishops to produce a Book of Common Prayer for the Kirk. James Wedderburn, bishop of Dumblane, took the King’s commission to heart and shepherded the small Prayer Book editorial committee into producing a complete Scots BCP by the end of 1636. He also energised and (quite frankly) goaded his episcopal colleagues into approving it.

The Scots House of Bishops submitted their BCP to the King for his own approval; and the King asked Laud, by now archbishop of Canterbury, to vet it. Laud displayed an unwonted degree of caution. Wedderburn & Co. had adopted both the structure and most of the contents of EngBCP 1559. But they had also introduced (via the rubrics) specific names and titles for various sections of the liturgy – for example, “collect for purity” (“Almighty God, unto whom all hearts are open…..”), “prayer of humble access” (“We do not presume…..”), and “prayer of consecration”. In the lattermost case, they went even further and restored much of the prayer as it
stood in EngBCP 1549; and in the Intercession they also included 1549’s thanksgiving for the saints and its petition for the repose of the dead. Laud, it seems, personally sympathised with these “enrichments,” but worried about the way they would be received. In the event, the archbishop’s anxieties were not so great as to make him nix the proposed Scots BCP either in parts or in whole.

Laud had done right to worry. The new Scots Prayer Book was scheduled to come into use on Sunday, 2 July 1637. That morning, the dean of St Giles, Edinburgh, entered his stall and began the service by reading one of the scriptural sentences which introduced Morning Prayer. He never finished the sentence. Somebody threw his or her prayer-stool at him, and a riot erupted. The dean beat a very hasty retreat. Similar disruptions occurred in every other church where the clergy tried to conduct service according to the new Prayer Book. The riots, in fact, had been organised by Presbyterian clergy and their allies among the Scots nobility. They did not object to the Prayer Book as such; they objected to the fact that it had been produced by bishops. Anything that Wedderburn and his fellow bishops had put forth would have received the same rough handling. The Scots privy council almost immediately suspended use of the Book, and King Charles confirmed their decision “for the time being”. The situation continued to unravel, and a year later Charles declared the Scots to be in rebellion. “The First Bishops’ War,” as it came to be called, was a debacle for the king; his troops never even crossed the Tweed into Scotland. He tried again two years later; this time, the Scots invaded England. Charles had emptied his exchequer in the process, and was forced to call Parliament for the first time in eleven years.

The English House of Commons wanted to make up for lost opportunities; under very able leadership, they used London mobs to blackmail the King. Parliament impeached Archbishop Laud and the Earl of Strafford for “high crimes and misdemeanours.” and they were thrown into the Tower of London. Strafford did not get a trial; Parliament simply passed an Act of Attainder which summarily convicted him of high treason and sentenced him to death.11 With mobs at the gates of Whitehall Palace baying for Strafford’s blood, Charles took fright and gave his Royal Assent to
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11 Thomas Wentworth (1594-1641) had been one of the principal leaders of the opposition to the Crown in the Commons in the late 1620s; Charles persuaded — Wentworth’s erstwhile associates said, suborned — him into taking the side of the Crown. Charles created him Earl of Strafford, then sent him to Ireland as Lord Lieutenant; he vigorously, and very effectively, straightened out Irish affairs — then was recalled to England and, as Laud’s closest ally, tried to do the same there. His impeachment and attainder were Parliament’s partisan pay-back for his switching to the Crown’s side some twenty years earlier.
the Act. A week later, Strafford was beheaded. For the rest of his life, right up to the day of his own beheading eight years later, Charles I bemoaned and did penance for that moment of royal pusillanimity. Laud, who was forced to watch Strafford’s execution from the window of his Tower cell, commented in his diary that he and Strafford had served “a mild and gracious prince who knew not how to be, or to be made, great”.

Less than a year later, in August 1642, Charles felt he had no choice but to raise the royal standard against Parliament. The English civil war had begun.

The war lasted four years, though Charles’s cause was to all intents and purposes lost after the battle of Naseby in 1645. His attempt to renew the war in 1647 convinced the leaders of Parliament’s army that he had to be eliminated; and on 30 January 1649, after a show-trial, Charles Stuart, king of England, Scotland, and Ireland, Defender of the Faith, Supreme Governor of the Church of England, was beheaded. The English Parliament abolished the monarchy and declared England to be a republic.

The Scots took umbrage at the high-handedness of their erstwhile allies in executing the man who had been, after all, their king, too; they crowned the late king’s eldest son, Charles II, and forthwith declared war on England. A series of defeats at the hands of Oliver Cromwell and his army only whetted the Scots’ appetite for revenge, and they actually invaded England in 1652. They got as far as Worcester before Cromwell annihilated their forces; Charles II fled and, in a remarkable display of royal acting ability and disguise, together with the aid of several recusant families, he eluded the republican dragnet and made it to France. Scotland did not fare so well. It was deprived of its independence and united with England under occupation (and administration) by English forces. Nor did the English Republic survive very long. By 1654 Cromwell had established what was, in effect, a military dictatorship and had himself declared Protector of England.

This was a very dark time for those who remained loyal to “the sober principles and old establishment of the Anglican Church”.12 In 1643, at the height of the civil war, Parliament had abolished the office of bishop and outlawed all use of the Prayer Book. Its victory in the war enabled these acts to take effect; and Cromwell’s troops routinely harassed those citizens who insisted on attending Prayer Book services. Indeed, Anglicans and Roman

---

12 John Fell, *The Life of Dr Henry Hammond* (London, 1661). This is the Fell of the rhyme: “I do not love thee, Doctor Fell;/ The reason why I cannot tell;/ But this alone I know full well:/ I do not love thee, Doctor Fell.”
Catholics were the only people in England whose forms of religion were not tolerated.

Things changed dramatically following the death of Cromwell in 1658. His son Richard succeeded him; but “Black Dick” (he had his father’s dark complexion) lacked the charisma, mind, and ruthlessness to control the major generals and colonels of the army, who quickly fell out with one another. Early in 1660 Major-General Monck, commander of the English forces occupying Scotland, marched several of his regiments south and occupied London; once there, he declared himself (and his forces) in favour of Charles II. The young king “came into his own” in May of the same year.\(^{13}\)

Even before the thirty-year-old monarch stepped back on to English soil to nearly universal rejoicing, he had recognised that his regime would have to address the matter of religion. In a statement to the nation issued from his exiled court in Holland, Charles declared “a liberty to tender consciences,” such that “no man shall be disquieted or called in question for differences of opinion in matters of religion, which do not disturb the peace of the kingdom”.\(^{14}\) Charles had inherited neither his father’s devout religiosity nor his genuine personal commitment to cause of the Church of which he was the Supreme Governor. At the same time, this relaxed attitude toward religion (and morality) meant that his

\(^{13}\) In 1664 Charles II, exercising his prerogative as Supreme Governor of the Church of England, ordered three services to be inserted in EngBCP 1662: “A Form of Prayer with Thanksgiving to be used yearly upon the Fifth day of November,” commemorating the foiling of the so-called Gunpowder Plot in 1606; “A Form of Prayer to be used yearly upon the Thirtieth day of January, being the Day of the Martyrdom of K. Charles the First”; and “A Form of Prayer with Thanksgiving to be used yearly upon the Twenty-ninth day of May, being the Day of His Majesty’s Birth, and happy Return to His Kingdoms”. (The last observance was commonly called “Oak Tree Day,” because Charles II, during his flight after the Scots’ defeat at Worcester in 1652, had spent a couple of days hiding in the limbs and leaves of an oak tree.) These three services remained in the Prayer Book until 1854, when Queen Victoria, exercising her prerogative as Supreme Governor, ordered their removal and the observance of the three days to be suspended.

\(^{14}\) The Declaration of Breda, 4/14 April 1660; in Gerald Bray, ed., Documents of the English Reformation (Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press, 1994), p. 545. (England continued to use the Julian Calendar until 1754, when it finally adopted the Gregorian Calendar, some two centuries after the rest of Europe. This accounts for the ten-day gap in the date of the Breda Declaration’s issuance in 1660.)
profession of tolerance was as much a matter of personal preference as of political discretion. Nevertheless, political discretion most certainly had a hand in leading Charles to espouse “liberty to tender consciences”. For the English Presbyterians, disaffected with the Cromwellian regime’s toleration of any and every Protestant sect, had mobilised their considerable resources in the political nation to ensure Charles’s peaceful restoration. In short, Charles owed the Presbyterians a very large political debt. He was also perceived to owe an even larger debt to those who, during the republican Commonwealth and Cromwell’s dictatorship, had remained loyal to the memory of his father, to “the old establishment of the Anglican Church,” and to himself. Indeed, no group perceived the debt more acutely than these loyalists themselves, and they intended to collect it with hefty interest.

Charles II, then, faced a problem of extreme delicacy. He undoubtedly had a prejudice against Presbyterians as a class, for during his sojourn in Scotland in 1650-1652 he had been bullied by the Presbyterian dominies and humiliated by the Presbyterian lords. Charles never forgot a slight, and rarely remembered a loyalty; and if he did not get mad at his enemies, he nevertheless made sure that others got even with them on his behalf. That is where Anglican loyalists proved most serviceable to him. As Supreme Governor of the Church, he moved quickly to fill the numerous sees which had been vacant for almost twenty years; and he filled them with men who had led the Anglican underground during the interregnum.

Charles thereupon convened a conference of Anglican and Presbyterian divines at Savoy House, and charged them with the task of negotiating a new religious settlement. The Presbyterians proved no match for the episcopalian contingent, led by Gilbert Sheldon, the newly appointed bishop of London. Sheldon and his fellow-bishops made a great show of earnestly entertaining Presbyterian proposals, then smoothly sank each one in a procedural morass. It did not hurt Sheldon’s plan that the Presbyterians bickered as much among themselves as with the episcopalians. They knew that they wanted a thorough-going revision of the liturgy, but they could not agree about which features of the old Prayer Book might remain and which features had to be changed. One of their number, Richard Baxter, even presented a draft service-book, the so-called Savoy Liturgy, which he had put together all on his own. Baxter himself seems to have envisioned this liturgy not as a replacement of the Prayer Book, or even as a free-standing book which might be used with or instead of the Prayer Book, but as a set of alternatives to be incorporated into the Prayer Book itself, alongside the traditional forms. The
bishops all but ignored it because Baxter’s own colleagues did not unite behind it. To be sure, Sheldon also sidelined the two die-hard Laudians on his own side, Matthew Wren of Norwich and John Cosin of Durham, who strenuously urged their colleagues to adopt several features of the 1637 Scots Liturgy, including its eucharistic prayer. By and large, their wish-list suffered the same fate as the Presbyterians’ proposals; the ScotBCP 1637’s label for the eucharistic prayer, “the Prayer of Consecration,” was adopted, but not the Scots prayer itself. Wren and Cosin grumbled in private, but in public they toed Sheldon’s line. The Presbyterians, for their part, found themselves alternately outmanœuvred and stonewalled; several of them simply gave up the struggle and threw in their lot with the episcopalians, while Baxter and most of the others simply withdrew.

The Savoy Conference thus looked like a resounding victory for the episcopal party and “the old establishment of the Anglican Church”. Over the next few years, Parliament would pursue the implications of this victory by enacting a series of statutes, collectively known as “the Clarendon Code”. This Code extended the civil “disabilities” suffered by Romanist recusants since the reign of Elizabeth I to Protestant “Dissenters,” a.k.a. “the Nonconformists” – as Protestants not belonging to the established Church of England are still called in England to this day. The so-called “Clarendon Code” excluded all those who refused to conform to the 1662 Act of Uniformity – who, for reasons of conscience, refused to receive the Holy Communion in the Church of England, or even to attend its services. Presbyterians like Baxter, Baptists like John Bunyan (of The Pilgrim’s Progress fame), Congregationalists like the hymnodist Isaac Watts, and Quakers like William Penn (founder of the colony of Pennsylvania) were made to suffer the same range of civil and social “disabilities” or penalties as Roman Catholic recusants – that is, they were deprived of the

---

15 So called after Charles II’s chief minister, Henry Hyde, Earl of Clarendon. The nickname was a cruel irony, because Clarendon himself deplored these measures; he earnestly believed that reconciliation, not revenge, should be the order of the Restoration’s day.

16 The consciences of some Nonconformists were more elastic than others’. In order to vote in parliamentary and municipal elections and hold office under the Crown, they showed up in their parish churches once a year to make their communion. They were derisively known as “occasional Conformists”.
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right to vote in civil elections – until the 1820s. One statute, the “Five Mile Act,” even forbade any clergyman of a Dissenting (or Nonconformist) sect to come within a five-mile radius of any city or town in the realm.

The hierarchy of the Church of England, from the two archbishops down to the most indigent curates in the poorest rural parishes, tended to behave rather like the Bourbons of France, of whom it was said, “They have learned nothing, and forgotten nothing.” To be sure, the hierarchy had learned something from the established Church’s twenty years in internal exile. But it was not the lesson of reconciliation. They had learned that rebellion was a sin, and that regicide (murder of kings) was equivalent to blasphemy against the Holy Spirit – that is, it would never be forgiven. The Church proclaimed Charles I to be a martyr of Christ simply because he had been consecrated as the Lord’s Anointed at his coronation. The Church went further. It made Non-Resistance to Kings a doctrine necessary for salvation. In principle, this doctrine meant that “the king can do no wrong,” precisely because he was the Lord’s Anointed.

Charles II had, and continues to have, a reputation as the most randy monarch ever to sit on the English throne. The reputation is deserved. He honoured his wife, Catherine of Braganza, in everything except sleeping with her. For the rest, he was a multi-tasking adulterer with a constantly refreshed seraglio of “favourites”. His promiscuity posed a challenge for even the strongest advocates of the doctrine of Non-Resistance; but they, and most other clergy, thought discretion the better part of lèse

---

17 The Penal Laws were gradually repealed during the first decades of the nineteenth century, culminating in the repeal of the statutes against Roman Catholics – the “Catholic Emancipation” of 1829.

18 See Matthew 12.31.

19 This, incidentally, was the closest the Church of England has ever come to “canonisation”. The Service for the Thirtieth of January, however, made provision only for Morning and Evening Prayer; it did not ordain a celebration of the Holy Communion. So, technically speaking, Charles I was not “raised to the altar,” as is the case in Roman Catholic canonisations.
majesté, and turned a blind eye to the shenanigans of the Lord’s Anointed.

Gratitude was not one of Charles’s more outstanding traits. But he came as close to gratitude as his personality allowed when the hierarchy of the established Church, under William Sancroft (Archbishop of Canterbury from 1677), rallied to him during the so-called Exclusion Crisis of 1678 – 1681. The rock-solid support of the clergy, and their unabashed, even aggressive politicking in alliance with “Tory” gentry in countless parishes throughout the kingdom, allowed the King to weather the storm and finally win one of the most stunning “Come-Back Kid” political victories of all time. His triumph gave him a new and unwonted respect for the

---

20 Lèse majesté is not only contempt for the “majesty” of the Sovereign but also a matter of exposing the Sovereign to the contempt of his or her subjects. It is tantamount to treason.

21 One exception to this rule was Thomas Ken (1637-1711; commemoration, 22 March). As one of the teaching masters at Winchester College, he had a house within the cathedral close. When the King paid a visit to Winchester in 1683, his entourage included one of his mistresses, the actress Nell Gwyn. Ken was told that he would have to move out of his chambers so that Miss Gwyn might have decent accommodation. He refused. The following year, the bishopric of Bath and Wells fell vacant; Charles is reported to have said, “I can think of no one better than that black [i.e. dark-complexioned] little priest who refused Nell his house.” Ken remained bishop of Bath and Wells until, as one of the Seven Bishops, he was deposed in 1690 for refusing to swear the oath of allegiance to William III and Mary II.

22 The Exclusion Crisis was precipitated by the murder of a London magistrate named Godfrey in 1678: his mangled body was discovered in a suburban park, and the crime’s senselessness (why slaughter a respectable, knighted magistrate?) caused a kingdom-wide sensation. A defrocked clergyman named Titus Oates (1649-1705) used the case to rehabilitate his own condition by promoting, by means of serial perjuries, the conspiracy-theory that “Papists” had plotted to assassinate Charles and put his younger brother James, Duke of York, on the throne. Oates’s lies had legs because James had converted to Roman Catholicism around 1672 – and, since Charles was without legitimate issue, James was their Heir-Apparent. In an officially Protestant nation, that made a lot of his subjects, high and low, very nervous. Closeted republicans like the Earl of Shaftesbury exploited the public nervousness and Oates himself to mount a parliamentary campaign to exclude James from the succession – and, in effect, to reduce Charles II himself to a mere figurehead-monarch. Oates was subsequently exposed as a pathological liar whose perjuries had caused innocent Romanists and a few no less innocent Church-of-England-men to be executed for high treason. He spent the rest of his life in prison. Charles II himself, it must be admitted, displayed a degree of cool
clout of Sancroft and the hierarchy of the established Church of England.

The Restoration Church of England could not have intervened in the Exclusion Crisis to such effect unless it had achieved a measure of internal peace and equipoise. Granted, this equipoise came at the cost of excluding a fairly sizeable minority of English Protestants, those who refused to conform to the Restoration’s religious settlement of 1662. But it also allowed the Restoration Church of England to “stand for something” – that is, to achieve a kind of consensus about its purpose and mission. For that reason, the Church of England in the years between 1660 and 1688 may be a truer template of the Anglican ethos than the troublous “alarums and excursions” between the Elizabethan Settlement of 1559 and the aftershocks of the English Civil War. The Restoration’s effects gave the Church of England a liberty that it had not known before – not a freedom of the sort where “the best lack all conviction, while the worst / Are full of passionate intensity,”23 but of the sort borne upon a genuine conviction that it had a necessary witness to bear in doctrine, in order, in spirituality, and (not least) in liturgical worship alike.

Indeed, the Communion Order of EngBCP 1662 – its eucharistic liturgy – came to be the heartland of the Restoration Church’s spirituality. Most parishes in the two kingdoms24 probably

---

23 W. B. Yeats, “The Second Coming”.

24 The Restoration in Scotland restored episcopacy in the established Kirk (Church of Scotland); it also imposed the use of EngBCP 1662, instead of restoring ScotBCP 1637. Presbyterianism, however, had very deep roots in the Lowlands, where it was not just a badge but something like a brand seared into the Lowland-Scots’ national identity. As a consequence, both episcopacy and the Prayer Book generated a constant and continuing resentment – or, this being Scotland, more like a clan’s grudge against another clan – among large swaths of the Lowland population. Most of this resentment passively bided its time; but some Presbyterian zealots, known as “Covenanter,” practiced a form of resistance which can only be described as more aggressive than passive. The Caroline regime did not hesitate to respond with extreme negative terminations; some marble statuary in the foyer of Knox College represents (in a rather romantic way) the drowning death of a Covenanter woman “martyr” who was chained to rocks on Scotland’s North Sea coast. Check it out. – It must also be said that the Highland clans, resenting the power of the Lowland lairds, had continued to resist the Presbyterian reformation and remained either Roman Catholic or Episcopalian.
celebrated the full liturgy, with communion, no more frequently after the Restoration than before the Civil War – that is, five or six times a year. Yet there were at least two signs that the Eucharist lay at the centre of Restoration spirituality. The first was the proliferation of manuals directing lay-people how to prepare for a worthy receiving of the sacrament. Such manuals would not have been published in such numbers except to meet a desire felt by a fair range of devout (and affluent) Church-people. Secondly, a few parishes in London and in several other towns instituted a weekly Communion, usually at 7:30 or 8:00 o’clock on Sunday mornings. Some of these early Communion-services were meant to accommodate household-servants, so that they could “make their communion” and get back home in time to prepare Sunday dinner for their masters.25 Why provide such a celebration unless there were a wish, a desire, even a demand for it?26 In any case, the Church of England underwent not only a restoration but also a

25 Aristocrats, merchant-princes, and large numbers of “the middling sort,” ate dinner – the main meal of the day – between one and three o’clock. On Sundays, this made sense: in most parishes, the Morning Service (Morning Prayer, Litany, and Ante-Communion, with sermon or homily) began no earlier than ten o’clock and lasted up to three hours. A household therefore needed a staff of servants to prepare dinner while their master and his family were at church, so that it could be served when the family returned. As a consequence, most servants rarely had an opportunity to attend Sunday services. (Throughout my own childhood and youth, it was as a law of the Medes and the Persians which can never be changed <Daniel 6.15> that the Reynoldses’ Sunday dinner be at one o’clock: this was possible only because my mother hardly ever went to church. After my father retired, the main meal of every day, seven days a week, occurred with a rigidly unaccommodating invariability at one o’clock.)

26 When I was a curate of the cathedral-church of St John the Baptist in St John’s, Newfoundland (1978-1981), a parishioner named Gerald explained why he and his wife Doreen invariably came to the 8 o’clock liturgy and then returned to attend the 11 o’clock service: “Ye come at eight to make yer communion, and come back at eleven to worship.” Gerald had been a life-long parishioner of the cathedral parish. In his childhood and youth, during the 1920s and 30s, the cathedral was still a bastion of High-and-dry Sunday Anglicanism: 8 o’clock Holy Communion, followed at 11:00 by Morning Prayer, Litany, and Holy Communion. Gerald, on another occasion, explained to me that “sound” churchmen received fasting, then went home to “break fast” and have breakfast before returning for “the main service” at 11:00 – and that only the aged, decrepit, feeble, and those he described as “wobbly” (meaning “of loose or unsound character”) received the sacrament at 11:00.
genuine rebirth, at the core of which lay a revival of its eucharistic life.

In class I will hand out copies of an engraving of the Communion Service in 1714, the Frontispiece from Charles Wheatly’s *The Church of England Man’s Companion: Or, A Rational Illustration of the Harmony and Usefulness of the Book of Common Prayer* (2nd edition, London, 1714).\(^{27}\)

The engraving, the illustration facing the title-page, shows the High-church party’s ideal of an Anglican celebration of the Eucharist between 1660 and 1860 – only the fashions worn by the communicants would have changed significantly.

By the way, the black-gowned figure in the foreground, standing with (and instructing) a layman just outside the chancel-arch, is a priest, wearing what clergy of the established Church of England were expected to wear as their everyday dress at the time – a cassock, somewhat looser-fitting than is customary now, with tabs at the neck, and an outer gown (the equivalent of an academic gown). This clerical attire had survived the Reformation through the seventeenth century, and would continue to be the ordinary, everyday garb of clergy, in private and in public, at home and on the street as well as in church, until the middle of the eighteenth century.

This engraving is not just another pretty picture. It also serves as an Anglican icon of what the celebration of the Lord’s Supper was supposed to mean. The scriptural citations in the nimbus around Christ’s head are Hebrews 9.22-23 (“And almost all things are by the Law purged with blood: and without shedding of blood is no remission [of sins]. It was therefore necessary that the patterns of things in the heavens should be purified with these [rites], but the heavenly things themselves with better sacrifices than these”) and Hebrews 7.25 (“Wherefore [Christ] is able also to save them to the uttermost, that come unto God by him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them.”)

The Letter to the Hebrews is not the most pellucid writing in New Testament, and its translation in the “King James” Version does nothing to make it any clearer. But the icon deploys the two citations in the nimbus to provide scriptural warrants for the doctrine pictured by the entire engraving. And the doctrine thus pictured is fairly clear: – The real altar, and thus the really real

\(^{27}\) Wheatley (1686-1742) was a priest and Fellow of St John’s College, Oxford. The first edition of his definitely High-church commentary on EngBCP 1662 appeared in 1710. It remained a standard textbook well into the nineteenth century.
celebration of the sacrifice, is on high, eternal in the heavens. Our celebrations of the Lord’s Supper at altars on earth are but "patterns of things in the heavens" – though it must be said that the engraving pictorially suggests that what the priest does at the earthly altar really and truly participates in the fulfilled sacrifice and eternal intercession that Christ offers at the altar on high.

We have met this eucharistic vision before, several times before – starting with the *Supplices te* of the Roman Canon: “Humbly do we implore thee, almighty God: Command these gifts to be borne by the hands of thine angel unto thine altar on high, in the sight of thy divine majesty, so that as many of us as shall have received, from this participation of the altar, the most holy Body and Blood of thy Son, may be filled with every heavenly blessing and grace.” The more doctrine changes, it would seem, the more it remains the same.

Here I ask you to read the Communion Orders of ScotsBCP 1637 and EngBCP 1662. How do they compare with EngBCP 1552/1559? What eucharistic piety and/or spirituality does each “incarnate”? 
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CUM PRIVILEGI/M6r /
The order of the Administration of the Lords Supper, or holy Communion

So many as intend to bee partakers of the holy Communion, shall signifie their names to the Presbyter or Curate over night, or else in the morning, afore the beginning of Morning prayer, or immediately after.

And if any of those bee an open and notorious evil liver, so that the congregation by him is offended, or have done any wrong to his neigh-bours, by word or deed: the Presbyter or Curate having knowledge thereof, shall call him, and advertise him, in any wise not to presume to the Lords Table, until he have openly declared himself to have truly repented and amended his former naughty life, that the Church may thereby bee satisfied, which afore was offended, and that he have recom-pensed the parties whom he hath done wrong unto, or at the least de-clare himself to be in full purpose so to do, as soon as he conveniently may.

The same order shall the Presbyter or Curate use with those betwixt whom he perceiveth malice and hatred to reigne, not suffering them to be partakers of the Lords Table, untill he know them to be reconciled. And if one of the parties so at variance be content to forgive from the bottom of his heart all that the other hath trespassed against him, and to make amends for that he himself hath offended, and the other party will not be persuaded to a godly unity, but remain still in his frowardnesse and malice: the Presbyter in that case ought to admit the penitent person to the holy Communion, and not him that is obstinate.

The holy Table having at the Communion time a Carpet, and a faire white linen cloth upon it, with other decent furniture, meet for the high mysteries there to be celebrated, shall stand at the uppermost part of the Chancell or Church, where the Presbyter standing at the north-side or end thereof, shall say the Lords prayer, with this Collect following for due preparation.

/ M6r /

OUR Father, which art in heaven, hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdome come. Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, as wee forgive them that trespass against us. And leade us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil. Amen.

A Mighty God, unto whom all hearts be open, all desires known, and from whom no secrets are hid: cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of thy holy Spirit, that we may perfectly love thee and worthily magnifie thy holy Name; through Christ our Lord. Amen.
¶ Then shall the Presbyter, turning to the people, rehearse distinctly all the **TEN COMMANDEMENTS**: The people all the while kneeling, and asking God mercy for the transgression of every duty therein; either according to the letter, or to the mysticall importance of the said Commandement.

**God** spake these words and said, I am the Lord thy God: thou shalt have none other gods but me.

**People.**

Lord have mercy upon us, and encline our hearts to keep this Law.

**Presbyter.**

Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image, or the likenesse of any thing that is in heaven above, or that is in the earth beneath, or that is in the water under the earth. Thou shalt not bow down thy self to them, nor serve them: for I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me: and shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my Commande-ments.

**People.**

Lord have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts, &c.

**Presbyter.**

Thou shalt not take the Name of the Lord thy God in vain, for the Lord will not hold him guiltlesse that taketh his Name in vain.

**People.**

Lord have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts, &c.

**Presbyter.**

Remember the Sabbath day, to keep it holy. Six dayes shalt thou labour, and do all thy work. But the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God: in it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattell, nor thy stranger that is within thy gates. For in six dayes the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day: wherefore the Lord blessed the seventh day, and hallowed it.

**People.**

Lord have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts, &c.

**Presbyter.**

Honour thy father and thy mother: that thy dayes may be long upon the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee.

**People.**

Lord have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts, &c.

**Presbyter.**

Thou shalt not kill.

**People.**
Lord have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts, &c.

**Presbyter.**

Thou shalt not commit adultery.

**People.**

Lord have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts, &c.

**Presbyter.**

Thou shalt not steal.

**People.**

Lord have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts, &c.

**Presbyter.**

Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour.

**People.**

Lord have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts, &c.

Thou shalt not covet thy neighbours house; thou shalt not covet thy neighbours wife, nor his man-servant, nor his maid-servant, nor his ox, nor his asse, nor any thing that is thy neighbours.

**People.**

Lord have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts, &c.

Then shall follow one of these two Collects for the King, and the Collect of the day, the Presbyter standing up, and saying,

Let us pray.

**Almighty God, whose kingdome is everlasting, and power infinite, have mercy upon thy holy Catholike Church, and in this particular Church in which we live so rule the heart of thy chosen servant CHARLES our King and Governor, that he (knowing whose minister he is) may above all things seek thy honour and glory, and that we his subjects (duely considering whose authority hee hath) may faithfully serve, honour, and humbly obey him, in thee, and for thee, according to thy blessed Word and ordinance, through Jesus Christ our Lord, who with thee and the Holy Ghost liveth and reigneth, ever one God, world without end. Amen.**

**A**lmighty and everlasting God, we be taught by thy holy Word, that the hearts of Kings are in thy rule and governance, and that thou doest dispose and turn them as it seemeth best to thy godly wisdome: We humbly beseech thee so to dispose and governe the heart of CHARLES thy servant our King and Governor, that in all his thoughts, words, and works, he may ever seeke thy honour and glory, and study to preserve thy people committed to his charge, in wealth, peace, and godlinesse: Grant this, O mercifull Father, for thy dear Sonnes sake Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

**/ M8v /**
Immediately after the Collect the Priest shall read the Epistle, saying, 
The Epistle written in the Chapter of at the verse. And when 
he hath done, he shall say: Here endeth the Epistle. And the Epistle 
ended, the Gospell shall bee read, the Presbyter saying: The holy Gospel is 
written in 
the Chapter of at the verse. And then the people all standing up 
shall say: Glory be to thee, O Lord. At the end of the Gospel, the 
Presbyter shall say: So endeth the holy Gospel. And the people shall 
answer: Thanks be to thee, O Lord. And the Epistle and Gospel being 
ended, shall be sung or said this Creed, all still reverently standing up.

Believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of 
Heaven and Earth, and of all things visible and invisible: and in 
one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of God, 
begotten of his Father before all worlds, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one 
substance with the Father; by whom all things were made: who for 
us men, and for our salvation, came down from heaven, and was 
made incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was 
made man; and was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate. He 
suffered, and was buried, and the third day he arose again 
according to the Scriptures, and ascended into heaven, and sitteth 
at the right hand of the Father. And he shall come again with 
glory, to judge both the quick and the dead: whose kingdom shall 
have no end. And I believe in the holy Ghost, the Lord and giver 
of life, who proceedeth from the Father and the Son, who with 
the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified, 
who spake by the prophets. And I believe one Catholike and 
Apostolique Church. I acknowledge one Baptisme for the remission 
of sins. And I look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of 
the world to come. Amen.

After the Creed, if there be no Sermon, shall follow one of the Homilies 
which shall hereafter to set forth by common authority. 
After such Sermon, Homily, or exhortation, the Presbyter or Curate shall 
declare unto the people whether there bee any Holy-dayes, or Fasting-

dayes the week following, and earnestly exhort them to remember the 
poore, saying (for the offertory) one or moe of these sentences following 
as hee thinketh most convenient by his discretion, according to the length, 
or shortnesse of the time that the people are offering. 
And in processe of time it came to passe, that Cain brought of 
the fruit of the ground an offering unto the Lord: and Abel, he also 
brought of the firstlings of his flock, and of the fat thereof. And the 
Lord had respect unto Abel, and to his offering: but unto Cain and 
to his offering he had not respect. Gen. 4.3.
Speak unto the children of Israel, that they bring me an offering: of every man that giveth it willingly with his heart, yee shall take my offering. Exod. 23.2.

Ye shall not appear before the Lord empty: every man shall give as he is able, according to the blessing of the Lord your God which he hath given you. Deut. 16.26.

David blessed the Lord before all the congregation: and said, Blessed be thou, O Lord God, for ever and ever. Thine, O Lord, is the greatnesse, and the glory, and the victory, and the majesty: for all that is in the heaven and in the earth, is thine: thine is the kingdome. O Lord, and thou art exalted as head above all: Both riches and honour come of thee, and of thine own do wee give unto thee. I know also my God, that thou tryest the heart, and hast pleasure in uprightnesse. As for me, in the uprightnesse of my heart I have willingly offered all these things. And now have I seen with joy thy people which are present here, to offer willingly unto thee. 1 Chron. 29.10.

Give unto the Lord the glory due unto his name, bring and offering, and come into his courts. Psal. 96.8.

Lay not up for your selves treasures upon earth, where moth and rust doth corrupt, and where theeves breake through and steal. But lay up for your selves treasures in heaven, where neither moth nor rust doth corrupt, and / Ntv / where theeves doe not break through and steal. Matth. 6.19.20.

Not everie one that saith unto me, Lord, Lord, shall enter into the kingdome of heaven: but he that doth the will of my Father which is in heaven. Mat. 7.12.

Jesus sate over against the treasurie, and beheld how the people cast money into it: and many that were rich cast in much. And there came a certain poore widow, and she threw in two mites, which make a farthing. And he called unto him his disciples, and saith unto them, Verily I say unto you, that this poore widow hath cast more in, then all they which have cast into the treasurie. For all they did cast in of their abundance: but she of her want did cast in all that she had, even all her living. Mat. 12.41, 42, 43, 44.

Who goeth a warfare any time at his own charges? who planteth a vineyard, and eateth not of the fruit thereof? or who feedeth a flock, and eateth not of the milk of the flock? I Cor. 9.7.

If we have sown unto you spirituall things, is it a great matter if we shall reap your carnall things? I Cor. 9.11.

Do ye not know that they which minister about holy things, live of the things of the temple? and they which wait at the altar, are partakers with the altar? Even so hath the Lord also ordained, that they which preach the Gospel, should live of the Gospel. I Cor. 9.13, 14.
He which soweth sparingly, shall reap sparingly: and he which soweth bountifully, shall reap bountifully. Every man according as he purposeth in his heart, so let him give; not grudgingly, or of necessity: for God loveth a cheerfull giver. 2 Cor. 9.6, 7.

Let him that is taught in the word, communicate unto him that teacheth, in all good things. Be not deceived. God is not mocked: for whatesoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap. Galat. 6.6, 7.

Charge them that are rich in this world, that they be not high minded, nor trust in uncertain riches, but in the living God, who giveth us richly all things to enjoy. That they do good, that they be rich in good works, ready to distribute, willing to communicate: laying up in store for themselves a good foundation against the time to come, that they may lay hold on eternall life. I Tim. 6.17, 18, 19.

/ N1r / God is not unrighteous, to forget your work and labour of love, which ye have shewed toward his name, in that ye have ministered to the saints and do minister. Heb. 6.10.

To do good, and to communicate forget not, for with such sacrifices God is pleased. Heb. 13.16.

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

Let us pray for the whole state of Christs church militant here in earth.

Almighty and everliving God, which by thy holy apostle hast taught us to make prayers and supplications, and to give thanks for all men: We humbly beseech thee, most mercifully (to accept our almes, and)† to receive these our prayers, which we offer unto thy divine Majestie, beseeching thee to inspire continually the universall church with the spirit of truth, unitie, and concord: and grant that all they that do confesse thy holy name, may agree in the truth of thy holy word, and live in unity and godly love. We beseech thee also to save and defend all Christian Kings, Princes, and Governours, and specially thy servant Charles our King, that under him we may be godly and quietly governed: and grant unto his whole counsell, and to all that be put in

† [Rubric in the margin:] If there be no almes given to the poore, then shall the words (of accepting our almes) be left out unsaid.
authority under him, that they may truely and indifferently minister justice, to the punishment of wickednesse and vice, and to the maintenance of Gods true religion and vertue. Give grace (O heavenly Father) to all Bishops, Presbyters, and Curates, that they may both by their life and doctrine set forth thy true and lively word, and rightly and duey administer thy holy sacraments: and to all thy people give thy heavenly grace, that with meek heart, and due reverence, they may hear and receive thy holy word, truly serving thee in holinesse and righteousnesse all the dayes of their life. [And we commend especially unto thy mercifull goodnesse the congregation which is here assembled in thy name to celebrate the commemoration of the most precious death and sacrifice of thy Son and our Saviour Jesus Christ. ]‡ And we most humbly beseech thee of thy goodnesse, O Lord, to comfort and succour all them, which in this transitory life be in trouble, sorrow, need, sickness, or any other adversitie. And we also blesse thy holy name for all those thy servants, who having finished their course in faith, do now rest from their labours. And we yeeld unto thee most high praise and hearty thanks for the wonderfull grace and vertue declared in all thy saints, who have been the choice vessels of thy grace, and the lights of the world in their severall generations: most humbly beseeching thee, that we may have grace to follow the example of their stedfastnesse in thy faith, and obedience to thy holy commandements, that at the day of the generall resurrection, we, and all they which are of the mysticall body of thy Son, may be set on his right hand, and hear that his most joyfull voice, Come yee blessed of my Father, inherit the kingdome prepared for you from the foundation of the world. Grant this, O Father, for Jesus Christs sake, our only Mediatour and Advocate. Amen.

‡ Then shall follow this Exhortation at certain times when the Presbyter or Curate shall see the people negligent to come to the holy Communion.

We be come together at this time (dearly beloved bre-thren) to feed at the Lords Supper; unto the which in Gods behalfe I bid you all that be here present, and beseech you for the Lord Jesus Christs sake, that yee will not refuse to come thereto, being so lovingly called and bidden of God himself. Ye know how grievous and unkinde a thing it is when a man hath prepared a rich feast, decked his table with all kinde of provision, so that there lacketh nothing but the guests to sit down, and yet they which be called, (without any cause) most unthankfully refuse to

‡ [Rubric in the margin:] When there is no communion, these words thus inclosed [ ] are to be left out.
come. Which of you in such a case would not be moved? Who would not think a great injury and wrong done unto him? Wherefore, most dearly beloved in Christ, take ye good heed, lest ye withdrawing your selves from this holy Supper, provoke Gods indignation against you. It is an easy matter for a man to say, I will not communicate because I am otherwise letted with worldly busines: but such excuses bee not so easily accepted and allowed before God. If any man say, I am a grievous sinner, and therefore am afraid to come: wherefore then do ye not repent and amend? When God calleth you, be you not ashamed to say, You will not come? When you should return to God, will you excuse your self, and say that you be not ready? Consider earnestly with your selves, how little such feigned excuses shall availe before God. They that refused the feast in the Gospel, because they had bought a Farame, or would try their yokes of Oxen, or because they were married, were not so excused but counted unworthy of the heavenly feast. I for my part am here present, and according to mine office I bid you in the Name of God, I call you in Christs behalf, I exhort you as you love your own salvation, that ye will be partakers of this holy Communion. And as the Son of God did vouchsafe to offer up himself by death upon the cross for our salvation: even so it is your duty to receive the Communion together in the remembrance of his death and sacrifice, as hee himself commanded. Now if you will in no wise thus do, consider with your selves how great an injurie you do unto God, and how sore punishment hangeth over your heads for the same. And whereas you offend God so grievously in refusing this holy banquet, I admonish, exhort, and beseech you, that unto this unkindnes you will not adde any more: Which thing ye shal do, if ye stand by as gazers, and lookers on them that do communicate, and be not partakers of the same your selves. For what thing can this be accounted else, then a further contempt and unkindnesse unto God? Truely, it is a great unthankfulnesse to say nay when ye are called: but the fault is much greater when men stand by, and yet will not receive this holy sacrament which offered unto them. I pray you, what can this be else, but even to have the mysteries of Christ in derision? It is said unto all: Take ye, and eat; Take and drink ye all of this, Do this in remembrance of me. With what face then, or with what countenance shall ye heare these words? What will this be else, but a neglecting, a despising and mocking of the testament of Christ? Wherefore rather then ye should so do, depart you hence, and give place to them that be godly disposed. But when you depart, I beseech you ponder with your selves, from whom ye depart; ye depart from the Lords table, ye depart from your brethren, and from the banquet of most heavenly food. These things if yee earnestly consider, yee shall by Gods grace return to a better
minde: for the obtaining whereof, we shall make our humble petitions, while we shall receive the holy Communion.

**AND SOMETIME SHALL BE SAID THIS ALSO, AT THE DISCRETION OF THE PRESBYTER OR CURATE.**

Early beloved, forasmuch as our duty is to render to almighty God our heavenly Father most hearty thanks for that he hath given his Son our Saviour Jesus Christ not only to die for us, but also to be our spirituall food and sustenance, as it is declared unto us, as well by Gods word as by the holy sacrament of his blessed body and bloud, the which so comfortable a thing to them which receive it worthily, and so dangerous to them that will presume to receive it unworthily: my duty is to exhort you to consider the dignitie of the holy mysterie, and the great perill of the unworthy receiving thereof, and so to search and examine your owne consciences, as you should come holy and clean to a most godly and heavenly feast; so that in no wise you come but in the marriage garment required of God in holy scripture, and so come and be received, as / N3r / worthy partakers of such a heavenly Table. The way and meanes thereto is: First, to examine your lives and conversation by the rule of Gods commandments, and wherein soever ye shall perceive your selves to have offended, either by will, word, or deed, there bewaile your own sinfull lives, confesse your selves to Almighty God, with full purpose of amendement of life. And if yee shall perceive your offences to be such, as be not only against God, but also against your neighbours: then ye shall reconcile your selves unto them, ready to make restitution and satisfaction according to the uttermost of your powers, for all injuries and wrongs done by you to any other, and likewise being ready to forgive other that have offended you, as you would have forgiveness of your offences at Gods hand: for otherwise the receiving of the holy Communion doth nothing else but increase your damnation. And because it is requisite that no man should come to the holy Communion, but with a full trust in Gods mercy, and with a quiet conscience: therefore if there be any of you, which by the means aforesaid, cannot quiet his own conscience, but requireth further comfort or counsell, then let him come to mee, or to some other discrete and learned Presbyter or Minister of Gods word, and open his griefe, that he may receive such ghostly counsel, advice, and comfort, as his conscience may be relieved, and that by the ministery of Gods word he may receive comfort, and the benefit of absolution, to the quieting of his conscience, and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfullnesse.


9. Then shall the Presbyter say this exhortation.

Dear beloved in the Lord, ye that mind to come to the holy Communion of the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ, must consider what S. Paul writeth to the Corinthians, how he exhorteth all persons diligently to try and examine themselves, before they presume to eat of that Bread, and drink of that Cup. For as the benefit is great, if with a true penitent heart and lively faith wee receive that holy Sacrament: (for then we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ, and drink his blood; then we dwell in Christ, and Christ in us; wee be one with Christ, and Christ with us) So is the danger great, if we receive the same unworthily: for then we be guilty of the body and blood of Christ our Saviour, we eat and drink our own damnation, not considering the Lords body: we kindle Gods wrath over us: we provoke him to plague us with divers diseases and sundry kindes of death. Therefore if any of you be a blasphemer of God, an hinderer or slanderer of his word, an adulterer, or be in malice, or envy, or in any other grievous crime: bewaile your sinnes, and come not to this holy table; lest after the taking of that holy sacrament, the devil enter into you, as he entered into Judas, and fill you full of all iniquities, and bring you to destruction both of body and soul. Judge therefore your selves (brethren) that ye be not judged of the Lord. Repent you truly for your sinnes past: have a lively and stedfast faith in Christ our Saviour. Amend your lives, and be in perfect charitie with all men, so shall ye be meet partakers of those holy mysteries. And above all things, ye must give most humble and hearty thanks to God the Father, the Sonne, and the holy Ghost, for the redemption of the world, by the death and passion of our Saviour Christ, both God and man, who did humble himself even to the death upon the crosse for us miserable sinners, which lay in darknesse and the shadow of death, that he might make us the children of God, and exalt us to everlasting life. And to the end that we should allway remember the exceeding great love of our Master and only Saviour Jesus Christ, thus dying for us, and the innumerable benefits which by his precious blood-shedding hee hath obtained to us, he hath instituted and ordained holy mysteries, as pledges of his love, and continuall remembrance of his death, to our great and endless comfort. To him therefore, with the Father, and the holy Ghost, let us give (as we are most bounden) continuall thanks, submitting our selves wholly to his holy will and pleasure, and studying to serve him in true holinesse and righteousnesse all the dayes of our life. Amen.

/ N4r /
THEN SHALL THE PRESBYTER SAY TO THEM THAT COME TO RECEIVE THE HOLY COMMUNION THIS INVITATION,

You that do truly and earnestly repent you of your sinnes, and be in love and charity with your neighbours, and intend to lead a new life, following the Commandements of God, and walking from henceforth in his holy wayes: Draw neere, and take this holy Sacrament to your comfort, make your humble confession to Almighty God, before this Congregation here gathered together in his holy Name, meekely kneeling upon your knees.

Then shall this generall confession be made, in the name of all those that are minded to receive the holy Communion, by the Presbyter himself, or the Deacon, both he and all the people kneeling humbly upon their knees.

Almighty God, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, maker of all things, judge of all men, we acknowledge and bewaile our manifold sins and wickednesse, which we from time to time most grievously have committed, by thought, word, and deed, against thy divine Majesty, provoking most justly thy wrath and indignation against us. We do earnestly repent, and be heartily sorry for these our misdoings, the remembrance of them is grievous unto us, the burthen of them is intolerable. Have mercy upon us, have mercy upon us, most mercifull Father, for thy Sonne our Lord Jesus Christes sake, forgive us all that is past, and grant that wee may ever hereafter serve and please thee, in newnesse of life, to the honour and glory of thy Name, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

Then shall the Presbyter or the Bishop (being present) stand up, and turning himself to the people, pronounce the absolution, as followeth.

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, who of his great mercy hath promised forgivenesse of sins to all them which with hearty repentance and true faith turn unto him: have mercy upon you, pardon / N5v / and deliver you from all your sins, confirme and strengthen you in all goodness, and bring you to everlasting life, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THEN SHALL THE PRESBYTER ALSO SAY,

Heare what comfortable words our Saviour Christ saith unto all that truly turn to him.

Come unto me, all that travail and be heavy laden, and I shall refresh you. So God loved the world, that hee gave his only begotten Sonne: that
whosoever beleeveth in him, should not perish, but have life everlasting. †

¶ Hear also what Saint Paul saith.

This is a faithfull saying, and worthy of all acceptation, that Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners.‡

¶ Hear also what Saint John saith.

If any man sinne, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous: and he is the propitiation for our sinnes."  

¶ After which the Presbyter shall proceed, saying,

Lift up your hearts.

ANSWER.

We lift them unto the Lord.

Presbyter.

Let us give thanks to our Lord God.

ANSWER.

It is meet and right so to do.

Presbyter.

It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty, that we should at all times, and in all places, give thanks unto thee, O Lord, holy Father, almighty, everlasting God.

¶ Here shall follow the proper Preface according to the time, if there bee any especially appointed: or else immediately shall follow, Therefore with Angels and Archangels, etc.

Proper prefaces.

¶ Upon Christmas day, and seven dayes after.

Because thou didst give Jesus Christ, thine only Son, to be born as on this day for us, who by the operation of the holy Ghost, was made very man, of the substance of the blessed virgin Mary his mother, and that without spot of sin, to make us clean from all sin. Therefore with angels, and archangels, etc.

¶ Upon Easter day, and seven dayes after.

Ut chiefly are we bound to praise thee, for the glorious resurrection of thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord: for he is the very
Paschall lambe, which was offered for us, and hath taken away the sin of the world, who by his death hath destroyed death, and by his rising to life again, hath restored to us everlasting life. Therefore with angels, etc.

¶ UPON THE ASCENSION DAY, AND SEVEN DAYS AFTER.

Through thy most dearly beloved Sonne Jesus Christ our Lord, who after his most glorious re-surrection manifestly appeared to all his Apostles, and in their sight ascended up into heaven, to prepare a place for us, that where he is, thither might we also ascend, and reign with him in glory. Therefore with angels, and archangels, etc.

¶ UPON WHITSUNDAY, AND SIX DAYS AFTER.

Through Jesus Christ our Lord, according to whose most true promise the holy Ghost came down this day from heaven, with a sudden great sound, as it had been a mighty winde in the likenesse of fierie tongues lighting upon the Apostles, to teach them, and to lead them to all truth, giving them both the gift of divers languages, and also boldnesse with fervent zeal constantly to preach the Gospel unto all nations, whereby we are brought out of darknesse and errour, into the clear light, and true knowledge of thee, and of thy Son Jesus Christ. Therefore with angels, etc.

/ N6v /

¶ UPON THE FEAST OF TRINITY ONELY.

It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty, that we should at all times, and in all places, give thanks unto thee, O Lord Almighty, and everlasting God, which art one God, one Lord, not one onely person, but three persons in one substance. For that which we beleeve of the glory of the Father, the same we beleeve of the Sonne, and of the holy Ghost, without any difference or inequality. Therefore with angels, etc.

¶ AFTER WHICH PREFACES SHALL FOLLOW IMMEDIATELY THIS DOXOLOGIE.

Therefore with Angels and Archangels, and with all the company of heaven, we laud and magnifie thy glorious Name, evermore praysing thee, and saying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of hosts. heaven and earth are full of thy glory. Glory be to thee, O Lord most high.
¶ Then the Presbyter standing up, shall say the prayer of consecration, as followeth, but then during the time of consecration, he shall stand at such part of the holy Table, where he may with the more ease and decency use both his hands.

A

mighty God, our heavenly Father, which of thy tender mercy didst give thy onely Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the Cross for our redemption, who made there (by his one oblation of himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world, and did institute, and in his holy gospel command us to continue, a perpetuall memory of that his precious death and sacrifice, untill his coming again: Hear us, O mercifull Father, we most humbly beseech thee, and of thy almighty goodnesse vouchsafe so to bless and sanctify with thy Word and holy Spirit these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may bee unto us the

Nēr / body and bloud of thy most dearly beloved Son; so that receiving them according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christs holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of the same his most precious body and bloud: who, in the same night that he was betrayed, took bread,† and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, Take, eat, this is my body, which is given for you. Do this in remembrance of me. Likewise after supper he took the cup,‡ and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, saying, Drinke ye all of this, for this is my bloud of the new testament, which is shed for you, and for many, for remission of sins; do this as oft as ye shall drink it in remembrance of me.

¶ IMMEDIATELY AFTER SHALL BE SAID THIS MEMORIAL OR PRAYER OF OBLATION, AS FOLLOWETH.

W

Herefore O Lord and heavenly Father, according to the institution of thy dearly beloved Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, we thy humble servants do celebrate and make here before thy divine Majestie, with these thy holy gifts, the memoriall which thy Son hath willed us to make, having in remembrance his blessed passion, mighty resurrection, and glorious assension, rendering unto thee most heartie thanks for the innumerable

† [Rubric in the margin:] At these words (took bread) the Presbyter that officiates is to take the Paten in his hand.

‡ [Rubric in the margin:] At these words (took the cup) he is to take the chalice in his hand, and lay his hand upon so much, be it in chalice or flagons, as he intends to consecrate.
benefits procured unto us by the same. And we entirely desire thy Fatherly goodnesse, mercifullly to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, most humbly beseeching thee to grant, that by the merits and death of thy Sonne Jesus Christ, and through faith in his bloud, we (and all thy whole church) may obtain remission of sinnes, and all other benefits of his passion. And here wee offer and present unto thee, O Lord, our selves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto thee, humbly beseeching thee, that whosoever shall be partakers of this holy communion, may worthy receive the most precious bodie and bloud of thy Son Jesus Christ, and be fulfilled with thy grace and heavenly benediction, and made one bodie with him, that he may dwell / N7v / in them, and they in him. And although wee be unworthie, through our manifold sinnes, to offer unto thee any sacrifice: yet we beseech thee to accept this our bounden dutie and service, not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences, through Jesus Christ our Lord; by whom, and with whom, in the unitie of the Holy Ghost, all honour and glory be unto thee, O Father almightie, world without end. Amen.

¶

THEN SHALL THE PRESBYTER SAY: AS OUR SAVIOUR CHRIST HATH COMMANDED AND TAUGHT US, WE ARE BOLD TO SAY,

O®

Our Father, which art in heaven, hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, as wee forgive them that trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation: but deliver us from evil. For thine is the kingdome, the power, and the glory, for ever and ever. Amen.

¶ Then shall the Presbyter kneeling down at Gods board, say in the name of all them that shall communicate, this collect of humble access to the holy communion, as followeth.

W®

We do not presume to come to this thy Table (O merciful Lord) trusting in our own righteousnesse, but in thy manifold and great mercies. We be not worthie so much as to gather up the crumbs under thy Table. But thou art the same Lord, whose propertie is alwayes to have mercie: grant us, therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the flesh of thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink his bloud, that our sinfull bodies may be made cleane by his body, and our souls washed through his most precious blood, and that wee may evermore dwell in him, and he in us. Amen. / N7r /

¶ Then shall the Bishop, if he be present, or else the Presbyter that celebrateth, first receive the communion in both kindes himself, and next
deliver it to other Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons (if any be there present) that they may help him that celebrateth; and after to the people in due order, all humbly kneeling. And when he receiveth himself, or delivereth the bread to others, he shall say this benediction.

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

HERE THE PARTE RECEIVING SHALL SAY, AMEN.

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

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

HERE THE PARTY RECEIVING SHALL SAY, AMEN.

¶ When all have communicated, he that celebrates shall go to the Lords table, and cover with a fair linen cloth, or corporall, that remaineth of the consecrated elements, and then say this collect of thanksgiving, as followeth.

Almighty and everliving God, wee most heartily thank thee, for that thou doest vouchsafe to feed us, which have duely received these holy mysteries, with the spirituall food of the most precious body and bloud of thy Sonne our Saviour Jesus Christ, and doest assure us thereby of thy favour and goodnesse towards us, and that we be very members incorporate in thy mysticall body, which is the blessed companie of all faithfull people, and be also heires through hope of thy everlasting kingdome, by the merits of the most precious death and passion of thy dear Sonne: We now most humbly beseech thee, O heavenly Father, so to assist us with thy grace, that we may continue in that holy fellowship, and do all such good works as thou hast prepared for us to walk in, through Jesus Christ our Lord; to whom with thee and the holy Ghost, be all honour and glorie, world without end.

¶ THEN SHALL BE SAID OR SUNG, GLORIA IN EXCELSIS, IN ENGLISH AS FOLLOWETH.

Glorie be to God on high, and in earth peace, good will towards men. We praise thee, we blesse thee, wee glorifie thee, wee give thanks to thee for thy great glorie, O Lord God, heavenly King, God the Father Almightie, O Lord the only begotten Sonne, Jesu Christ, O Lord God, Lamb of God, Son of the Father, that takest away the sinnes of the world, have mercie upon us. Thou that takest away the
sinnes of the world, have mercie upon us. Thou that takest away the sinnes of the world, receive our prayer. Thou that sittest at the right hand of God the Father, have mercie upon us: for thou only art holy, thou only art the Lord, thou only, O Christ, with the holy Ghost, art most high in the glorie of God the Father. Amen.

¶

Then the Presbyter, or Bishop, if he be present, shall let them depart with this blessing.

The peace of God which passeth all understanding, keep your hearts and mindes in the knowledge and love of God, and of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord: and the blessing of God Almighty, the Father, the Son, and the holy Ghost, be amongst you, and remain with you alwayes. Amen.

/ N8r /

¶ After the divine service ended, that which was offered shall be divided in the presence of the Presbyter, and the Church-wardens, whereof one half shall be to the use of the Presbyter to provide him books of holy divinity: the other half shall be faithfully kept and employed on some pious or charitable use, for the decent furnishing of that Church, or the publike relief of the poore, at the discretion of the Presbyter and Church-wardens.

Collects to be said after the Offertory, when there is no Communion; every such day one or more. And the same may be said as often as occasion shall serve, after the Collects either of Morning and Evening prayer, Communion, or Letany, by the discretion of the Presbyter or Minister.

Assist us mercifully, O Lord, in these our supplications and prayers, and dispose the way of thy servants toward the attainment of everlasting salvation, that among all the changes and chances of this mortall life, they may ever be defended by thy most gracious and ready helpe, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

A Almighty LORD and everlasting God, vouchsafe we beseech thee, to direct, sanctifie, and governe both our hearts and bodies in the wayes of thy Laws and in the works of thy Commandements, that through thy most mighty protection, both here and ever, we may be preserved in body and soul, through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Amen.
Rant we beseech thee Almighty God, that the words which wee have heard this day without outward eares, may through thy grace be so grafted inwardly in our hearts, that they may bring forth in us the fruit of good living, to the honour and praise of thy Name, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Revent us, O LORD, in all our doings, with thy most gracious favour, and further us with thy continuall help, that in all our works begun, continued, and ended in thee, we may glorifie thy holy Name, and finally by thy mercy obtain everlasting life, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Almighty GOD the fountain of all Wisdome, which knowest our necessities before we ask and our ignorance in asking: we beseech thee to have compassion upon our infirmities, and those things which for our unworthinesse wee dare not, and for our blindnesse wee cannot ask, vouchsafe to give us, for the worthinesse of thy Sonne Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Almighty GOD, which hast promised to hear the petitions of them that ask in thy Sons Name, we beseech thee mercifully to incline thine ears to us, that have made now our prayers and supplications unto thee, and grant that those things which we have faithfully asked according to thy will, may effectually bee obtained, to the relief of our necessitie, and to the setting forth of thy glory, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

UPON the Holy-dayes (if there be no Communion) shall be said all that is appointed at the Communion, untill the end of the Homily, concluding with the generall prayer. (for the whole estate of Christs Church militant here in earth) and one or more of these Collects before rehearsed, as occasion shall serve.

And there shall be no publick celebration of the Lords Supper, except there bee a sufficient number to communicate with the Presbyter, according to his discretion.

And if there bee not above twenty persons in the parish, of discretion to receive the Communion: yet there
shall be no Communion except foure or three at the least, communicate with the Presbyter.
¶ And in Cathedral and Collegiat churches, where there be many Presbyters, and Deacons, they shall all receive the Communion with the Presbyter that celebrates every Sunday at the least, except they have a reasonable cause to the contrary.
¶ And to take away the superstition, which any person hath or might have in the Bread and Wine, (though it be lawfull to have wafer bread) it shall suffice that the Bread be such as is usuall: yet the best and purest Wheat Bread that conveniently may be gotten. And if any of the Bread and Wine remaine, which is consecrated, it shall be reverently eaten and drunk by such of the communicants only as the Presbyter which celebrates shall take unto him, but it shall not be carried out of the Church. And to the end that there may be little left, he that officiates is required to consecrate with the least, and then if there be want, the words of consecration may be repeated again, over more, either bread or wine: the Presbyter beginning at these words in the prayer of consecration (our Saviour in the night that he was betrayed, took, etc.)
¶ The Bread and Wine for the Communion, shall be provided by the Curate and the Church-wardens at the charges of the Parish.
¶ And note that every parishioner shall communicate at the least three times in the year, of which Pasch or Easter shall be one, and shall also receive the Sacraments and observe other Rites, according to the order in this book appointed.
The Preface

T hath been the wisdom of the Church of England, ever since the first compiling of her public Liturgy, to keep the mean between the two extremes, of too much stiffness in refusing, and of too much easiness in admitting any variation from it. For, as on the one side common experience sheweth, that where a change hath been made of things advisedly established (no evident necessity so requiring) sundry inconveniences have thereupon ensued; and those many and greater that the evils that were intended to be remedied by such change: So on the other side, the particular forms of divine worship, and the rites and ceremonies appointed to be used therein, being things in their own nature indifferent and alterable, and so acknowledged; it is but reasonable that upon weighty and important considerations, according to the various exigency of times and occasions, such changes and alterations should be made therein as to those that are in place of Authority should from time to time seem either necessary or expedient. Accordingly we find that in the reigns of the several princes of blessed memory since the Reformation, the Church, upon just and weighty considerations her thereunto moving, hath yielded to make such alterations in some particulars as in their respective times were thought convenient: yet so, as that the main body and essentials of it (as well in the chiefest materials as in the frame and order thereof) have still continued the same unto this day, and do yet stand firm and unshaken, notwithstanding all the vain attempts and impetuous assaults made against it by such men as are given to change and have always discovered
a greater regard to their own private fancies and interests, than to that duty they owe to the public.

By what undue means and for what mischievous purposes the use of the Liturgy (though enjoined by the laws of the land, and those laws never yet repealed) came, during the late unhappy confusions, to be discontinued, is too well known to the world, and we are not willing here to remember. But when, upon his Majesty's happy Restoration, it seemed probable that, amongst other things, the use of the Liturgy would also return of course (the same having never been legally abolished) unless some timely means were used to prevent it; those men, who under the late usurped powers had made it a great part of their business to render the people disaffected thereunto, saw themselves in point of reputation and interest concerned (unless they would freely acknowledge themselves to have erred, which such men are very hardly brought to do) with their utmost endeavours to hinder the restitution thereof. In order whereunto divers pamphlets were published against the Book of Common Prayer, the old objections mustered up, with the addition of some new ones, more than formerly had been made, to make the number swell. In fine, great importunities were used to His Sacred majesty that the said Book might be revised, and such alterations therein and additions thereunto made as should be thought requisite for the ease of tender consciences. Whereunto His Majesty, out of his pious inclination to give satisfaction (so far as could be reasonably expected) to all his subjects of what persuasion soever, did graciously condescend.

In which review we have endeavoured to observe the like moderation as we find to have been used in the like case in former times. And therefore of the sundry alterations proposed unto us, we have rejected all such as were either of dangerous consequence (as secretly striking at some established doctrine or laudable practice of the Church of England, or indeed of the whole Catholic Church of Christ), or else of no consequence at all, but utterly frivolous and vain. But such alterations as were tendered to us – by what persons, under what pretences, or to what purpose soever tendered – as seemed to us in any degree requisite or expedient, we have willingly and of our own accord assented unto: not enforced so to do by any strength of argument.
convincing us of the necessity of making the said alterations. For we are fully persuaded in our judgements – and here we profess it to the world – that the Book, as it stood before established by law, doth not contain in it anything contrary to the word of God or to sound doctrine, or which a godly man may not with a good conscience use and submit unto, or which is not fairly defensible against any that shall oppose the same; if it shall be allowed such just and favourable construction as in common equity ought to be allowed to all human writings, especially such as are set forth by authority, and even to the very best translations of the holy Scripture itself.

Our general aim therefore in this undertaking was not to gratify this or that party in any their unreasonable demands, but to do that which to our best understandings we conceived might most tend to the preservation of peace and unity in the Church: the procuring of reverence and exciting of piety and devotion in the public worship of God; and the cutting off occasion from them that seek occasion of cavil or quarrel against the Liturgy of the Church. And as to the several variations from the former Book, whether by alteration, addition, or otherwise, it shall suffice to give this general account: – That most of the alterations were made either

First, for the better direction of them that are to officiate in any part of divine service (which is chiefly done in the Calendars and Rubrics);

Or, secondly, for the more proper expressing of some words or phrases of ancient usage in terms more suitable to the language of the present times, and the clearer explanation of some other words and phrases that were either of doubtful signification or otherwise liable to misconstruction;

Or, thirdly, for a more perfect rendering of such portions of holy Scripture as are inserted into the Liturgy; which, in the Epistles and Gospels especially, and in sundry other places, are now ordered to be read according to the last translation; 

And that it was thought convenient that some Prayers and Thanksgivings, fitted to special occasions should be added in

28 the last translation: that is, the Authorized (or King James) Version.
their due places, particularly for those at Sea; together with an Office for the Baptism of such as are of Riper Years – which, although not so necessary when the former Book was compiled, yet by the growth of Anabaptism, through the licentiousness of the late times crept in amongst us, is now become necessary, and may be always useful for the baptizing of natives in our Plantations and others converted to the faith. If any man who shall desire a more particular account of the several alterations in any part of the Liturgy, shall take the pains to compare the present Book with the former, we doubt not but the reason of the change may easily appear.

And having thus endeavoured to discharge our duties in this weighty affair, as in the sight of God, and to approve our sincerity therein (so far as lay in us) to the consciences of all men – although we know it impossible (in such variety of apprehensions, humours, and interests as are in the world) to please all; nor can expect that men of factious, peevish, and perverse spirits should be satisfied with anything that can be done in this kind by any other than themselves: – yet we have a good hope that what is here presented, and hath been by the Convocations of both Provinces with great diligence examined and approved, will be also well accepted and approved by all sober, peaceable, and truly conscientious sons of the Church of England.

29 Anabaptism: A blanket term to cover a wide variety of Protestant sects which repudiated infant baptism and practised “believer’s baptism”. Hence the name “anabaptist,” derived from Greek, which means “rebaptizer”. The Ana-baptists were targets of harsh polemics and even harsher persecution by the established churches of Europe, Protestant as well as Roman Catholic. Thus, for the Revisers of the English Prayer Book, it was a term of abuse. They were referring primarily to the Baptists.
The Order for
the administration of the Lord’s Supper,
or holy Communion

a  So many as intend to be partakers of the holy Communion, shall signify their names to the Curate at least some time the day before.

b  And if any of those be an open and notorious evil liver, so that the congregation by him is offended, or have done any wrong to his neighbours, by word or deed, the Curate having knowledge thereof, shall call him and advertise him, in any wise not to presume to the Lord’s table, until he have openly declared himself to have truly repented and amended his former naughty life, that the congregation may thereby be satisfied, which afore were offended, and that he have recompensed the parties whom he hath done wrong unto, or at the least declare himself to be in full purpose so to do, as soon as he conveniently may.

c  The same order shall the Curate use with those betwixt whom he perceiveth malice and hatred to reign, not suffering them to be partakers of the Lord’s Table until he know them to be reconciled. And if one of the parties so at variance be content to forgive from the bottom of his heart all that the other hath trespassed against him, and to make amends for that he himself hath offended: and the other party will not be persuaded to a godly unity, but remain still in his frowardness and malice; the Minister in that case ought to admit the penitent person to the holy Communion and not him that is obstinate. Provided that every Minister so repelling any, as is specified in this or the next preceding paragraph of this rubric, shall be obliged to give an account of the same to the Ordinary within fourteen days after at the farthest. And the Ordinary shall proceed against the offending person according to the Canon.
The Table having at the Communion time a fair white linen cloth upon it, shall stand in the body of the church, or in the chancel, where Morning Prayer or Evening Prayer be appointed to be said. And the Priest, standing at the north side of the Table, shall say the Lord’s Prayer, with the Collect following, the people kneeling.

1 Our Father, which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy Name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth as it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, As we forgive them that trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation, But deliver us from evil. Amen.

2 The Collect
Almighty God, unto whom all hearts be open, all desires known, and from whom no secrets are hid, cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of thy Holy Spirit, that we may perfectly love thee and worthily magnify thy holy Name; through Christ our Lord. Amen.

3 Then shall the Priest rehearse distinctly all the Ten Commandments; and the people kneeling shall, after every Commandment, ask God’s mercy for their transgression thereof for the time past, and grace to keep the same for the time to come, as followeth.

i Minister. God spake these words and said, I am the Lord thy God: thou shalt have none other gods but me.
People. Lord, have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law.

ii Minister. Thou shalt not make to thyself any graven image, nor the likeness of anything that in heaven above or in the earth beneath or in the water under the earth. Thou shalt not bow down to them, nor worship them: for I, the Lord thy God, am a jealous God, and visit the sin of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me, and shew mercy unto thousands in them that love me and keep my commandments.
People. Lord, have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law.
iii  Minister. Thou shalt not take the Name of the Lord thy God in vain, for the Lord will not hold him guiltless that taketh his Name in vain.
   People. Lord, have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law.

iv Minister. Remember that thou keep holy the sabbath day. Six days shalt thou labour and do all that thou hast to do, but the seventh day is the sabbath of the Lord thy God. In it thou shalt do no manner of work, thou and thy son and thy daughter, thy manservant and thy maidservant, thy cattle, and the stranger that is within thy gates. For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day. Wherefore the Lord blessed the seventh day and hallowed it.
   People. Lord, have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law.

v Minister. Honour thy father and thy mother, that thy days may be long in the land which the Lord thy God giveth thee.
   People. Lord, have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law.

vi Minister. Thou shalt not do murder.
   People. Lord, have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law.

vii Minister. Thou shalt not commit adultery.
   People. Lord, have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law.

viii Minister. Thou shalt not steal.
   People. Lord, have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law.

ix Minister. Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbour.
   People. Lord, have mercy upon us, and incline our hearts to keep this law.

x Minister. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour’s house; thou shalt not covet thy neighbour’s wife, nor his servant, nor his maid, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor anything that is his.
   People. Lord, have mercy upon us, and write all these thy laws in our hearts, we beseech thee.
4 Then shall follow one of these two Collects following for the King, the Priest standing up as before, and saying,

Let us pray.

5 ALMIGHTY God, whose kingdom is everlasting, and power infinite, have mercy upon the whole congregation, and so rule the heart of thy chosen servant CHARLES, our King and Governor, that he, knowing whose minister he is, may above all things seek thy honour and glory, and that we his subjects, duly considering whose authority he hath, may faithfully serve, honour, and humbly obey him in thee, and for thee, according to thy blessed Word and ordinance; through Jesus Christ our Lord, who with thee and the Holy Ghost liveth and reigneth, ever one God, world without end. Amen.

Or

6 ALMIGHTY and everlasting God, we be taught by thy holy Word that the hearts of kings are in thy rule and governance, and that thou dost dispose and turn them, as it seemeth best, to thy godly wisdom. We humbly beseech thee so to dispose and govern the heart of CHARLES, thy servant, our King and Governor, that in all his thoughts, words, and works, he may ever seek thy honour and glory, and study to preserve thy people committed to his charge, in wealth, peace, and godliness. Grant this, O merciful Father, for thy dear Son's sake, Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

7 Then shall be said the Collect of the Day. And immediately after the Collect the Priest shall read the Epistle, saying. The Epistle [or, The portion of Scripture appointed for the Epistle] is written in the ——— Chapter of ————, beginning at the ———— Verse. And the Epistle ended, he shall say. Here endeth the Epistle. Then shall he read the Gospel (the people all standing up) saying. The holy Gospel is written in the ——— Chapter of ———— beginning at the ———— Verse. And the Gospel being ended, shall be sung or said the Creed following, the people still standing, as before.

8 I BELIEVE in one God the Father almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible:

And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only begotten Son of GOD:

begotten of his Father before all worlds, God of GOD, Light of light, very God of very God; begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father; by whom all things were made; who for us men, and for our salvation, came down from heaven, and was made incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man; and was
crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate. He suffered and was buried, and the third day he arose again according to the Scriptures, and ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of the Father: And he shall come again with glory, to judge both the quick and the dead.

And I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father and the Son; who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified: who spake by the prophets. And I believe in one catholic and apostolic Church. I acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins. And I look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen.

9 Then the Curate shall declare unto the people what holy days or fast days are in the week following to be observed. And then also (if occasion be) shall notice be given of the Communion; and Briefs, Citations, and Excommunications read. And nothing shall be proclaimed or published in the church during the time of public service but what is prescribed in the rules of this book, or enjoined by the King, or by the Ordinary of the place.

Then shall follow the Sermon, or one of the Homilies already set forth or hereafter to be set forth by authority.

10 Then shall the priest return to the Lord's Table and begin the Offertory, saying one or more of these Sentences following, as he thinketh most convenient in his discretion.

[Sentences, as in EngBCP 1549, No. 23 a – t]

11 Whilst these Sentences are in reading, the deacons, churchwardens, or other fit persons appointed for that purpose, shall receive the alms for the poor and other devotions of the people, in a decent bason to be provided by the parish for that purpose; and reverently bring it to the priest, who shall humbly present and place it upon the holy Table.

And when there is a Communion, the priest shall then place upon the Table so much bread and wine as he shall think sufficient.

After which done, the priest shall say,

12 Let us pray for the whole state of Christ's Church militant here in earth.
ALMIGHTY and everliving God, which by thy holy apostle hast taught us to make prayers and supplications, and to give thanks for all men: We humbly beseech thee most mercifully [to accept our alms and oblations and] to receive these our prayers, which we offer unto thy divine Majesty; beseeching thee to inspire continually the universal Church with the spirit of truth, unity, and concord: and grant that all they that do confess thy holy Name may agree in the truth of thy holy word, and live in unity and godly love. We beseech thee also to save and defend all Christian Kings, Princes, and Governors, and specially thy servant CHARLES our King, that under him we may be godly and quietly governed; and grant unto his whole Council, and to all that be put in authority under him, that they may truly and indifferently minister justice, to the punishment of wickedness and vice, and to the maintenance of God's true religion and virtue. Give grace, O heavenly Father, to all bishops, pastors, and curates, that they may both by their life and doctrine set forth thy true and lively word, and rightly and duly administer thy holy sacraments. And to all thy people give thy heavenly grace, and especially to this congregation here present, that with meek heart and due reverence, they may hear and receive thy holy word, truly serving thee in holiness and righteousness all the days of their life. And we most humbly beseech thee of thy goodness, O Lord, to comfort and succour all them, which in this transitory life be in trouble, sorrow, need, sickness, or any other adversity. Grant this, O Father, for Jesus Christ's sake, our only Mediator and Advocate. Amen.

When the minister giveth warning for the celebration of the holy Communion (which he shall always do upon the Sunday or some holy day immediately preceding), after the sermon or homily ended, he shall read this exhortation following.

EARLY beloved, on — day next I purpose, through God’s assistance, to administer to all such as shall be religiously and devoutly disposed the most comfortable Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ; to be by them received in remembrance of his meritorious Cross and Passion; whereby alone we obtain remission of our sins, and are made partakers of the kingdom of heaven. Wherefore it is our duty to render most humble and hearty thanks to Almighty God our heavenly

* [Rubric in the margin:] If there be no alms or oblations, then shall the words of accepting our alms and oblations be left out unsaid.
Father, for that he hath given his Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, not only to die for us, but also to be our spiritual food and sustenance in that holy Sacrament. Which being so comfortable a thing to them who receive it worthily, and so dangerous to them that will presume to receive it unworthily; my duty is to exhort you in the mean season to consider the dignity of that holy mystery and the great peril of the unworthy receiving thereof; and so to search and examine your own consciences, (and that not lightly, and after the manner of dissemblers with God; but so) that ye may come holy and clean to such a heavenly Feast, in the marriage-garment required by God in Holy Scripture, and be received as worthy partakers of that Holy Table.

The way and means thereto is: First, to examine your lives and conversation by the rule of God’s commandments, and whereinsoever ye shall perceive yourselves to have offended, either by will, word, or deed, there to bewail your own sinfulness, and to confess yourselves to Almighty God, with full purpose of amendment of life. And if ye shall perceive your offences to be such as are not only against God but also against your neighbours; then ye shall reconcile yourselves unto them; being ready to make restitution and satisfaction, according to the uttermost of your powers for all injuries and wrongs done by you to any other; and likewise being ready to forgive others that have offended you, as you would have forgiveness of your offences at God’s hand: for otherwise the receiving of the holy Communion doth nothing else but increase your damnation. Therefore if any of you be a blasphemer of God, an hinderer or slanderer of his Word, an adulterer, or be in malice or envy, or in any other grievous crime, repent you of your sins, or else come not to that Holy Table; lest, after the taking of that Holy Sacrament, the devil enter into you, as he entered into Judas, and fill you full of all iniquities, and bring you to destruction both of body and soul.

And because it is requisite, that no man should come to the holy Communion, but with a full trust in God’s mercy, and with a quiet conscience; therefore if there be any of you who by this means cannot quiet his own conscience herein, but requireth further comfort or counsel, then let him come to me, or to some other discreet and learned Minister of God’s Word, and open his grief; that by the ministry of God’s holy Word he may receive the benefit of absolution, together with ghostly counsel and advice, to the quieting of his conscience, and avoiding of all scruple and doubtfulness.
Or, in case he shall see the people negligent to come to the holy Communion, instead of the former, he shall use this Exhortation.

Dear beloved brethren, on — I intend, by God’s grace, to celebrate the Lord’s Supper: unto which, in God’s behalf, I bid you all that are here present; and beseech you, for the Lord Jesus Christ’s sake, that you will not refuse to come thereto, being so lovingly called and bidden by God himself. Ye know how grievous and unkind a thing it is, when a man hath prepared a rich feast, decked his table with all kind of provision, so that there lacketh nothing but the guests to sit down — and yet they which be called, without any cause most unthankfully refuse to come. Which of you in such a case would not be moved? Who would not think a great injury and wrong done unto him? Wherefore, most dearly beloved in Christ, take ye good heed lest ye, withdrawing yourselves from this holy Supper, provoke God’s indignation against you. It is an easy matter for a man to say, I will not communicate because I am otherwise hindered with worldly business; but such excuses be not so easily accepted and allowed before God. If any man say, I am a grievous sinner and therefore am afraid to come: wherefore then do ye not repent and amend? When God calleth you, be you not ashamed to say that ye will not come? When you should return to God, will you excuse yourself and say that you be not ready? Consider earnestly with yourselves how little such feigned excuses shall avail before God. They that refused the feast in the gospel because they had bought a farm or would try their yokes of oxen, or because they were married, were not so excused but compted unworthy of the heavenly feast. I for my part am here present, and according to mine office I bid you in the Name of God, I call you in Christ’s behalf, I exhort you as you love your own salvation, that ye will be partakers of this holy Communion. And as the Son of God did vouchsafe to yield up his soul by death upon the cross for your health, even so it is your duty to receive the Communion together in the remembrance of his death, as he himself commanded. Now, if you will in no wise this do, consider with yourselves how great and injury ye do unto God, and how sore punishment hangeth over your heads for the same. And whereas ye offend God so sore in refusing this holy banquet, I admonish, exhort, and beseech you, that unto this unkindness ye will not add any more. Which thing you shall do, if ye stand by as gazers and lookers of them that do communicate, and be no partakers of the same yourselves. For what thing can this be accompted else than a further
contempt and unkindness unto God? Truly, it is a great unthankfulness to say nay when ye be called; but the fault is much greater when men stand by and yet will neither eat nor drink this holy Communion with other. I pray you, what can this be else but even to have the mysteries of Christ in derision? It is said unto all: Take ye and eat, Take and drink ye all, of this; do this in remembrance of me. With what face, then, or with what countenance shall ye hear these words? What will this be else but a neglecting, a despising and mocking of the testament of Christ? Wherefore, rather than you should so do, depart you hence and give place to them that be godly disposed. But when you depart, I beseech you ponder with yourselves from whom ye depart: ye depart from the Lord’s table; ye depart from your brethren and from the banquet of most heavenly food. These things if ye earnestly consider, ye shall by God’s grace return to a better mind; for the obtaining whereof, we shall make our humble petitions while we shall receive the holy Communion.

At the time of the celebration of the Communion, the communicants being conveniently placed for the receiving of the Holy Sacrament, the Priest shall say this Exhortation.

Dear beloved in the Lord, ye that mind to come to the holy Communion of the body and blood of our Saviour Christ must consider what Saint Paul writeth to the Corinthians, how he exhorteth all persons diligently to try and examine themselves, before they presume to eat of that bread and drink of that cup. For as the benefit is great, if with a truly penitent heart and lively faith we receive that holy sacrament (for then we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ and drink his blood; then we dwell in Christ and Christ in us; we be made one with Christ, and Christ with us): So is the danger great, if we receive the same unworthily. For then we become guilty of the body and blood of Christ our Saviour: we eat and drink our own damnation, not considering the Lord’s body; we kindle God’s wrath over us, we provoke him to plague us with divers diseases and sundry kinds of death. Judge therefore yourselves, brethren, that ye be not judged of the Lord. Repent you truly for your sins past; have an earnest and lively faith in Christ our Saviour; amend your lives, and be in perfect charity with all men: so shall ye be meet partakers of those holy mysteries. And above all things, ye must give most humble and hearty thanks to God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, for the redemption of the world by the death and passion of
our Saviour Christ, both God and man, who did humble himself even to the death upon the cross for us miserable sinners, which lay in darkness and the shadow of death, that he might make us children of God and exalt us to everlasting life. And to the end that we should alway remember the exceeding great love of our Master and only Saviour Jesus Christ thus dying for us, and the innumerable benefits which by his precious blood-shedding he hath obtained to us, he hath instituted and ordained holy mysteries, as pledges of his love and continual remembrance of his death, to our great and endless comfort. To him therefore, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, let us give, as we are most bounden, continual thanks, submitting ourselves wholly to his holy will and pleasure, and studying to serve him in true holiness and righteousness all the days of our life. Amen.

16 Then shall the Priest say to them that come to receive the holy Communion.

Ye that do truly and earnestly repent you of your sins to almighty God, and are in love and charity with your neighbours, and intend to lead a new life, following the commandments of God, and walking from henceforth in his holy ways: Draw near with faith, and take this holy sacrament to your comfort, and make your humble confession to almighty God, meekly kneeling upon your knees.

17 Then shall this general confession be made, in the name of all those that are minded to receive the holy Communion, by one of the ministers, both he and all the people kneeling humbly upon their knees, and saying.

Almighty God, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, Maker of all things, Judge of all men, we knowledge and bewail our manifold sins and wickedness, which we from time to time most grievously have committed, by thought, word, and deed, against thy divine Majesty; provoking most justly thy wrath and indignation against us. We do earnestly repent and be heartily sorry for these our misdoings; the remembrance of them is grievous unto us, the burden of them is intolerable. Have mercy upon us, have mercy upon us, most merciful Father; for thy Son our Lord Jesus Christ’s sake, forgive us all that is past, and that we may ever hereafter serve and please thee in newness of life, to the honour and glory of thy Name; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.
Then shall the Priest, (or the Bishop being present) stand up, and turning himself to the people, pronounce this Absolution.

**A**LMIGHTY God, our heavenly Father, who of his great mercy hath promised forgiveness of sins to all them that with hearty repentance and true faith turn unto him: Have mercy upon you, pardon and deliver you from all your sins, confirm and strengthen you in all goodness, and bring you to everlasting life; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Then shall the Priest say.

Hear what comfortable words our Saviour Christ saith to all that truly turn to him.

a Come unto me, all that travail and be heavy laden, and I shall refresh you. *St. Matth. xi.28.*

b So God loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, to the end that all that believe in him should not perish, but have life everlasting. *St. John iii.16.*

c Hear also what Saint Paul saith.

   This is a true saying, and worthy of all men to be received, that Jesus Christ came into this world to save sinners. *1 Tim. i.15.*

d Hear also what Saint John saith.

   If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is the propitiation for our sins. *1 John ii.1.*

After which the Priest shall proceed, saying.

Lift up your hearts.

Answer. We lift them up unto the Lord.

Priest. Let us give thanks unto our Lord God.

Answer. It is meet and right so to do.

Then shall the priest turn to the Lord's Table and say,

It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty, that we should at all times, and in all places, give thanks unto thee, O Lord, holy Father, almighty everlasting God. These words [Holy Father] must be omitted on Trinity Sunday.
Here shall follow the proper preface, according to the time, if there be any specially appointed, or else immediately shall follow,

Therefore, with angels and archangels and with all the company of heaven, we laud and magnify thy glorious Name; evermore praising thee and saying: Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of hosts; heaven and earth are full of thy glory: Glory be to thee, O Lord Most High. Amen.

**PROPER PREFACES**

23  *Upon Christmas Day, and seven days after*
Because thou didst give Jesus Christ, thine only Son, to be born as at this time for us; who by the operation of the Holy Ghost was made very man of the substance of the Virgin Mary his mother; and that without spot of sin, to make us clean from all sin. Therefore with Angels, &c.

24  *Upon Easter Day, and seven days after*
But chiefly are we bound to praise thee for the glorious resurrection of thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord; for he is the very Paschal Lamb which was offered for us and hath taken away the sin of the world; who by his death hath destroyed death, and by his rising to life again hath restored to us everlasting life. Therefore with Angels, &c.

25  *Upon Ascension Day, and seven days after*
Through thy most dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who after his most glorious resurrection manifestly appeared to all his disciples, and in their sight ascended up into heaven to prepare a place for us; that where he is, thither might we also ascend and reign with him in glory. Therefore with Angels, &c.

26  *Upon Whitsunday, and six days after*
Through Jesus Christ our Lord, according to whose most true promise the Holy Ghost came down, as at this time, from heaven, with a sudden great sound, as it had been a mighty wind, in the likeness of fiery tongues, lighting upon the Apostles, to teach them and to lead them to all truth, giving them both the gift of diverse languages, and also boldness with fervent zeal, constantly to preach the Gospel unto all nations; whereby we have been brought out of darkness and error into
the clear light and true knowledge of thee, and of thy Son Jesus Christ. Therefore with Angels, &c.

27 Upon the feast of Trinity only
Who art one God, one Lord, not one only Person, but three Persons in one substance. For that which we believe of the glory of the Father, the same we believe of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, without any difference or inequality. Therefore with Angels &c.

28 After each of which prefaces shall immediately be sung or said,

Therefore, with angels and archangels and with all the company of heaven, we laud and magnify thy glorious Name; evermore praising thee and saying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of hosts, heaven and earth are full of thy glory: Glory be to thee, O Lord Most High. Amen.

29 Then shall the Priest, kneeling down at the Lord's Table, say in the name of all them that shall receive the communion, this prayer following.

We do not presume to come to this thy Table, O merciful Lord, trusting in our own righteousness, but in thy manifold and great mercies. We are not worthy so much as to gather up the crumbs under thy Table. But thou art the same Lord, whose property is always to have mercy. Grant us, therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the flesh of thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink his blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by his body, and our souls washed through his most precious blood, and that we may continually dwell in him, and he in us. Amen.

30 When the priest, standing before the Table, hath so ordered the bread and wine that he may with the more readiness and decency break the bread before the people, and take the cup into his hands, he shall say the Prayer of Consecration, as followeth.

31 Almighty God, our heavenly Father, which of thy tender mercy didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption; who made
there (by his one oblation of himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world; and did institute, and in his holy gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory of that his precious death, until his coming again.

Hear us, O merciful Father, we beseech thee; and grant that we, receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine, according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ’s holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed body and blood: who, in the same night that he was betrayed,

(a) took bread, and when he had had given thanks, (b) he brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, Take, eat, (c) this is my body, which is given for you: Do this in remembrance of me. Likewise after supper (d) he took the cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this: for this (e) is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for you and for many, for the remission of sins: Do this, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of me. Amen.

32 Then shall the Minister first receive the Communion in both kinds himself, and then proceed to deliver the same to the bishops, priests, and deacons in like manner (if any be present,) and after that to the people also in order, into their hands, all meekly kneeling. And when he delivereth the bread to any one, he shall say,

THE Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life. Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith, with thanksgiving.

33 And the Minister that delivereth the cup to any one shall say,
THE Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life. Drink this in remembrance that Christ’s blood was shed for thee, and be thankful.

34 If the consecrated bread and wine be all spent before all have communicated, the priest is to consecrate more according to the form before prescribed, beginning at Our Saviour Christ in the same night, &c. for the blessing of the bread, and at Likewise after supper, &c., for the blessing of the cup.

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

36 Then shall the Priest say the Lord’s Prayer, the people repeating after him every petition.

OUR Father, which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy Name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done in earth, As it is in heaven. Give us this day our daily bread. And forgive us our trespasses, As we forgive them that trespass against us. And lead us not into temptation; But deliver us from evil: For thine is the kingdom, The power, and the glory, For ever and ever. Amen.

37 After shall be said as followeth.

a O LORD and heavenly Father, we thy humble servants entirely desire thy fatherly goodness, mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; most humbly beseeching thee to grant, that by the merits and death of thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in his blood, we and all thy whole Church may obtain remission of sins, and all other benefits of his passion. And here we offer and present unto thee, O Lord, our selves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto thee; most humbly beseeching thee, that all we who are partakers of this holy communion, may be fulfilled with thy grace and heavenly benediction. And
although we be unworthy, through our manifold sins, to offer unto thee any sacrifice; yet we beseech thee to accept this our bounden duty and service, not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences; through Jesus Christ our Lord, by whom, and with whom, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, all honour and glory be unto thee. O Father almighty, world without end. Amen.

Or this.

b ALMIGHTY and everliving God, we most heartily thank thee, for that thou dost vouchsafe to feed us, who have duly received these holy mysteries, with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ; and dost assure us thereby of thy favour and goodness toward us; and that we are very members incorporate in the mystical body of thy Son, which is the blessed company of all faithful people, and are also heirs through hope of thy everlasting kingdom, by the merits of the most precious death and passion of thy dear Son. And we most humbly beseech thee, O heavenly Father, so to assist us with thy grace, that we may continue in that holy fellowship, and do all such good works as thou hast prepared for us to walk in; through Jesus Christ our Lord, to whom with thee and the Holy Ghost, be all honour and glory, world without end. Amen.

38 Then shall be said or sung

G LORY be to God on high. And in earth peace, good will towards men. We praise thee, we bless thee, we glorify thee, we give thanks to thee for thy great glory, O Lord Hod, heavenly King, God the Father almighty. O Lord, the only begotten Son, Jesu Christ: O Lord God, Lamb of God, Son of the Father, that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us; thou that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us; thou that takest away the sins of the world, receive our prayer; thou that sittest at the right hand of God the Father, have mercy upon us. For thou only art holy, thou only art the Lord, thou only, O Christ, with the Holy Ghost, art most high in the glory of God the Father. Amen.

39 Then the Priest or the Bishop (if he be present) shall let them depart with this blessing.
The peace of God, which passeth all understanding, keep your hearts and minds in the knowledge and love of God, and of his Son Jesus Christ our Lord: And the blessing of God almighty, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, be amongst you and remain with you always.

40 Collects to be said after the Offertory, when there is no Communion: every such day, one or more. And the same may be said also, as often as occasion shall serve, after the Collects either of Morning Prayer or Evening Prayer, Communion, or Litany, by the discretion of the Minister.

a Assist us mercifully, O Lord, in these our supplications and prayers, and dispose the way of thy servants toward the attainment of everlasting salvation; that among all the changes and chances of this mortal life, they may ever be defended by thy most gracious and ready help; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

b Almighty Lord and everlasting God, vouchsafe, we beseech thee, to direct, sanctify, and govern both our hearts and bodies in the ways of thy laws and in the works of thy commandments, that through thy most mighty protection, both here and ever, we may be preserved in body and soul; through our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ. Amen.

c Grant, we beseech thee, almighty God, that the words which we have heard this day without outward ears, may through thy grace be so grafted inwardly in our hearts, that they may bring forth in us the fruit of good living, to the honour and praise of thy Name; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

d Prevent us, O Lord, in all our doings with thy most gracious favour, and further us with thy continual help, that in all our works begun, continued, and ended in thee, we may glorify thy holy Name and finally, by thy mercy, obtain everlasting life; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

e Almighty God, the fountain of all wisdom, which knowest our necessities before we ask and our ignorance in asking, we beseech thee to have compassion upon our infirmities; and those things which for our unworthiness we dare not and for our blindness cannot ask, vouchsafe to give us for the worthiness of thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

f Almighty God, who hast promised to hear the petitions of them that ask in thy Son’s name, we beseech thee mercifully to incline thine ears to us that have made now our prayers and supplications unto thee; and grant that those things which we have faithfully asked according to thy will, may effectually be obtained to the relief of our
necessity and to the setting forth of thy glory; through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

41 Upon the Sundays and other holy days, if there be no Communion, shall be said all that is appointed at the Communion until the end of the general Prayer For the Whole Estate of Christ’s Church militant here in earth, together with one or more of these Collects last before rehearsed, concluding with the Blessing.

42 And there shall be no celebration of the Lord’s Supper except there be a convenient number to communicate with the Priest, according to his discretion.

43 And if there be not above twenty persons in the parish of discretion to receive the Communion, yet there shall be no Communion except four, or three at the least, communicate with the Priest. And in cathedral and collegiate churches, where there be many priests and deacons, they shall all receive the Communion with the Minister every Sunday at the least, except they have a reasonable cause to the contrary.

44 And to take away all occasion of dissension and superstition which any person hath or might have concerning the bread and wine, it shall suffice that the bread be such as is usual to be eaten, but the best and purest wheat bread that conveniently may be gotten.

45 And if any of the bread and wine remain unconsecrated, the Curate shall have it to his own use. But if any remain of that which was consecrated, it shall not be carried out of the church, but the priest and other such communicants as he shall then call unto him, shall, immediately after the Blessing, reverently eat and drink the same.

48 The bread and wine for the Communion shall be provided by the Curate and the churchwardens at the charges of the Parish.

49 And note, that every parishioner shall communicate at the least three times in the year, of which Easter to be one. And yearly at Easter, every parishioner shall reckon with
his Parson, Vicar, or Curate, or his or their deputy or deputies, and pay to them or him all ecclesiastical duties accustomedly due then, and at that time to be paid.

50 After the divine service ended, the money given at the Offertory shall be disposed of to such pious and charitable uses as the minister and church-wardens think fit. Wherein if they disagree, it shall be disposed of as the Ordinary shall appoint.

51 Whereas it is ordained in this Office for the Administration of the Lord's Supper, that the communicants should receive the same kneeling; (which order is well meant, for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgement of the benefits of Christ therein given to all worthy receivers, and for the avoiding of such profanation and disorder in the Holy Communion, as might otherwise ensue;) yet, lest the same kneeling should by any persons, either out of ignorance and infirmity, or out of malice and obstinacy, be misconstrued and depraved; It is hereby declared, That thereby no adoration is intended or ought to be done, either unto the Sacramental Bread and Wine there bodily received, or unto any Corporal Presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood. For the Sacramental Bread and Wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored; (for that were idolatry, to be abhorred of all faithful Christians;) and the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's true natural body to be at one time in more places than one.
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1. Certain Sermons or Homilies to be declared and read by all parsons, vicars, or curates every Sunday in their churches where they have cure.

The Second Book (1571)

Sermon 15  An Homily of the worthy receiving and reverend esteeming of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ
Introduction

It was the ambition of all Protestant reformers to foster “a learned ministry,” a body of clergy in parishes as well as in the universities whose members would be thoroughly steeped in the Scriptures (and in the original languages of Hebrew and Greek), readily conversant in the writings of the ancient Fathers, completely au courant with contemporary theological discussion, and skilled in articulating and preaching the Word of God to the faithful, from the lowest tenant to the highest noble.

A couple of circumstances retarded the realisation of this ambition in England. First, the reformed Church of England inherited the clergy of the Catholic Ecclesia Anglicana; and the vast majority of parish clergy under Henry VIII, Edward VI, Mary I, and Elizabeth I never attended university.¹ Secondly, the Church of England was as much an instrument of the English Crown as it was the body of Christ in England. The Crown had no bureaucracy to speak of outside London and Westminster; it depended almost entirely on the landed nobility and gentry to police their own districts. The Church was, in fact, the only institution in the kingdom with branch-plants and officers in every village, town, and city and, even more importantly, with relatively sophisticated and very effective means of policing itself. This meant that, in an era long before the advent of mass-media, pulpits were the only medium with access to every subject of the Crown. So, quite apart from the ecclesiastical authorities’ concern that sound doctrine be preached, it was in the Crown’s interest to control the pulpits of the land, if only to ensure that sedition was not preached. This the Crown did by keeping very close tabs on the process by which bishops licensed clergy to preach. And, in fact, given the educational level of most Tudor- and Stuart-era clergy, it was rare for a parish priest to hold such a license; the vast majority were barred from preaching.

This fact was intolerable to the reformers. But their desire

¹ Roman Catholics began founding seminaries in the mid-sixteenth century; the Church of England did not have any seminaries – a.k.a. theological colleges – until the early nineteenth century.
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for sound preaching scotched any thought they may have had about issuing preaching licenses wholesale. Cranmer and his colleagues sought to remedy the problem by putting together an anthology of twelve sermons on topics of doctrine and morality. This anthology appeared in 1547 as Certain Sermons or Homilies to be declared and read by all parsons, vicars, or curates every Sunday in their churches where they have cure – commonly referred to as The Book of Homilies. Most of the sermons were divided into two or three parts. The idea was that unlicensed clergy should enter the pulpit, open the book, and read aloud a portion of a homily, continue with the next portion the following Sunday, and then begin the first part of the next homily the Sunday after, and so on through the year; when the priest had read through all twelve sermons, he was simply to return to the first homily and begin all over again.

Cranmer had planned a supplement to the Book, but other affairs, and then the accession of Mary I, prevented him. Shortly after Elizabeth I’s accession in 1558, however, her archbishop of Canterbury, Matthew Parker, got to work organising a second Book of Homilies. It was ready by 1563, but did not get final authorisation until eight years later. It contained another twenty-one sermons. The following “Homily of a Worthy Receiving” is fifteenth in this Second Book.

This Homily dilates upon “The Long Exhortation” in the Communion Order of BCP1552/1559 – the Exhortation which prefaced the liturgy of the Lord’s Supper proper, and which had to be read out at every celebration between the Prayer for the Whole Estate of Christ’s Church Militant and the Invitation to the General Confession. For convenience’ sake, I reprint this Exhortation here.

*  

Then shall the Priest say this Exhortation.

EARLY beloved in the Lord, ye that mind to come to the holy Communion of the body and blood of our Saviour Christ must consider what Saint Paul writeth to the Corinthians, how he exhorteth all persons diligently to

D
try and examine themselves, before they presume to eat of that bread and drink of that cup. For as the benefit is great, if with a truly penitent heart and lively faith we receive that holy sacrament (for then we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ and drink his blood; then we dwell in Christ and Christ in us; we be made one with Christ, and Christ with us): So is the danger great, if we receive the same unworthily. For then we become guilty of the body and blood of Christ our Saviour: we eat and drink our own damnation, not considering the Lord’s body; we kindle God’s wrath over us, we provoke him to plague us with divers diseases and sundry kinds of death. Therefore if any here be a blasphemer of God, an hinderer or slanderer of his word, an adulterer, or be in any malice or envy or in any other grievous crime: bewail your sins, and come not to this holy table, lest after the taking of that most blessed bread the devil enter into you, as he did into Judas, to fill him full of all iniquities and bring you to destruction both of body and soul.

Judge therefore yourselves, brethren, that ye be not judged of the Lord. Repent you truly for your sins past; have an earnest and lively faith in Christ our Saviour; amend your lives, and be in perfect charity with all men: so shall ye be meet partakers of those holy mysteries. And above all things, ye must give most humble and hearty thanks to God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, for the redemption of the world by the death and passion of our Saviour Christ, both God and man, who did humble himself even to the death upon the cross for us miserable sinners, which lay in darkness and the shadow of death, that he might make us children of God and exalt us to everlasting life. And to the end that we should alway remember the exceeding great love of our Master and only Saviour Jesus Christ thus dying for us, and the innumerable benefits which by his precious blood-shedding he hath obtained to us, he hath instituted and ordained holy mysteries, as pledges of his love and continual remembrance of his death, to our great and endless comfort. To him therefore, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, let us give, as we are most bounden, continual thanks, submitting ourselves wholly to his holy will and pleasure, and studying to serve him in true holiness and righteousness all the days of our life. Amen.
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and reverend esteeming
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THE great love of our Saviour Christ towards mankind, good Christian people, doth not only appear in that dear-bought benefit of our redemption and salvation by his death and passion, but also in that he so kindly provided that the same most merciful work might be had in continual remembrance, to take some place in us, and not be frustrate[d] of his end and purpose. For as tender parents are not content to procure for their children costly possessions and livelihood, but take order that the same may be conserved and come to their use: So our Lord and Saviour thought it not sufficient to purchase for us his Father’s favour again (which is that deep fountain of all goodness and eternal life), but also invented the ways most wisely whereby they might redound to our commodity and profit. Amongst the which means is the public celebration of the memory of his precious death at the Lord’s table. Which although it seem of small virtue to some, yet being rightly done by the faithful, it doth not only help their weakness (who be by their poisoned nature readier to remember injuries than benefits), but strengtheneth and comforteth their inward man with peace and gladness, and maketh them thankful to their redeemer, with diligent care and godly conversation.† And as of old time GOD decreed his wondrous benefits of the deliverance of his people to be kept in memory by the eating of the Passover, with his rites and ceremonies,² so our loving Saviour hath ordained and established the remembrance of his great mercy expressed in his passion, in the institution of

† [conversation: not only verbal discussion with others but also the whole style or manner of one's habitual dealings with them.]
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his heavenly Supper, where every one of us must be guests and not gazers, eaters and not lookers, feeding ourselves and not hiring other to feed for us, that we may live by our own meat and not to perish for hunger whiles other devour all.

To this, his commandment forceth us, saying, Do ye this, drink ye all of this. To this, his promise enticeth, This is my body which is given for you; this is my blood which is shed for you. So then of necessity we must be ourselves partakers of this table and not beholders of another person partaking.

So we must address ourselves to frequent the same in reverent and comely manner, lest as physic provided for the body, being misused, more hurteth than profiteth, so this comfortable medicine of the soul, undecently received, tendeth to our greater harm and sorrow. And Saint Paul saith: He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh his own damnation. Wherefore, that it be not said to us, as it was to the guest of that great Supper, Friend, how camest thou in, not having the marriage garment? – and that we may fruitfully use Saint Paul’s counsel, Let a man prove himself, and so eat of that bread and drink of that cup – we must certainly know that three things be requisite in him which would seemly, as becometh such high mysteries, resort to the Lord’s table. That is: First, a right and worthy estimation and understanding of this mystery. Secondly, to come in a sure faith. And thirdly, to have newness or

---


4 1 Corinthians 11.21.


6 1 Corinthians 11.24-25.

7 Matthew 26.28.

8 1 Corinthians 11.29.

9 Matthew 22.12.

10 1 Corinthians 11.28
pureness of life to succeed\textsuperscript{1} the receiving of the same.

But before all other things, this we must be sure of especially – that this Supper be in such wise done and ministered as our Lord and Saviour did and commanded to be done, as his holy Apostles used it, and the good Fathers in the primitive Church frequented it. For as that worthy man Saint Ambrose saith, he is unworthy of the Lord that otherwise doth celebrate that mystery than it was delivered by him. Neither can he be devout that otherwise doth presume than it was given by the author. We must then take heed, lest of the memory, it be made a sacrifice; lest of a communion, it be made a private eating; lest of two parts, we have but one; lest applying it for the dead, we lose the fruit that be alive. Let us rather in these matters follow the advice of Cyprian in the like cases – that is, cleave fast to the first beginning, hold fast the Lord’s tradition, do that in the Lord’s commemoration which he himself did, he himself commanded, and his Apostles confirmed. This caution or foresight if we use, then may we see those things that be requisite in the worthy receiver, whereof this was the first: that we have a right understanding of the thing itself.

As concerning which thing, this we may assuredly persuade ourselves: that the ignorant man can neither worthily esteem nor effectually use those marvellous graces and benefits offered and exhibited in that Supper, but either will lightly regard them, to no small offence, or utterly condemn them, to his utter destruction. So that by his negligence he deserveth the plagues of GOD to fall upon him, and by contempt he deserveth everlasting perdition. To avoid then these harms, use the advice of the wise man who willeth thee, when thou sittest at an earthly king’s table, to take diligent heed what things are set before thee.\textsuperscript{11} So now much more at the King of king’s table, thou must carefully search and know what dainties are provided for thy soul, whither thou art come, not to feed thy senses and belly to corruption, but thy inward man to immortality and life, nor to consider the earthly creatures which thou seest, but the heavenly graces which thy

\textsuperscript{1} [succeed: follow.]

\textsuperscript{11} Proverbs 23.1.
faith beholdeth. “For this table is not,” saith Chrysostom, “for chattering jays, but for eagles,” who flee “thither, where the dead body lieth.”¹² And if this advertisement† of man cannot persuade us to resort to the Lord’s Table with understanding, see the counsel of GOD in the like matter, who charged his people to teach their posterity not only the rites and ceremonies of the Passover but the cause and end thereof.¹³ Whence we may learn that both more perfect knowledge is required at this time at our hands, and that the ignorant cannot with fruit and profit exercise himself in the Lord’s sacraments.

But to come nigher to the matter: – Saint Paul blaming the Corinthians for the profaning of the Lord’s Supper, conclueth that ignorance both of the thing itself, and the signification thereof, was the cause of their abuse. For they came thither unreverently, not discerning the Lord’s body.¹⁴ Ought not we then, by the admonition of the wise man, by the wisdom of GOD, by the fearful example of the Corinthians, to take advised heed that we thrust not ourselves to this Table, with rude and unreverent ignorance, the smart whereof Christ’s Church hath rued and lamented these many days and years? For what hath been the cause of the ruin of GOD’s religion, but the ignorance hereof? What hath been the cause of this gross idolatry, but the ignorance hereof? What hath been the cause of this mummish Massing,† but the ignorance hereof? Yea, what hath been, and what is at this day, the cause of this want of love and charity, but the

¹² Matthew 24.28.

† [advertisement: a warning notice.]


¹⁴ 1 Corinthians 11.29

† [mummish Massing: the Roman Mass as mummeroy – i.e. a mime-show performed by people wearing outlandish or extravagant masks and costumes; hence a pretentious or hypocritical ceremony.]
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ignorance hereof? Let us therefore so travail† to understand the Lord’s Supper, that we be no cause of the decay of GOD’s worship, of no idolatry, of no dumb Massing, † of no hate and malice: so may we the boldlier have access thither to our comfort. Neither need we to think that such exact knowledge is required of every man, that he be able to discuss all high points in the doctrine thereof: But thus much we must be sure to hold, that in the Supper of the Lord, there is no vain ceremony, no bare sign, no untrue figure of a thing absent,15 but (as the Scripture saith) the table of the Lord,16 the bread and cup of the Lord,17 the memory of Christ,18 the annunciation of his death,19 yea, the communion of the Body and Blood of the Lord,20 in a marvellous incorporation which by the operation of the Holy Ghost (the very bond of our conjunction with Christ) is through faith wrought in the souls of the faithful, whereby not only their souls live to eternal life, but they surely trust to win their bodies a resurrection to immortality.21 The true understanding of this fruition and union which is betwixt the body and the head, betwixt the true believers and Christ, the ancient Catholic Fathers, both

† [travail: labour, work hard.]

† [dumb Massing: a slur related to “mummish Massing”: mummers perform mime – and thus are “dumb” in the sense of speechless. The Homily is slamming the Mass as a mimed extravaganza because, in the sixteenth century, the presiding celebrant said much of it – and all of the Canon – sotto voce, out of the people’s hearing.]


16 1 Corinthians 10.21

17 1 Corinthians 10.16.

18 1 Corinthians 11.24, 25.


20 1 Corinthians 10.16-17.

21 Irenaeus, [Adversus haereses.] Bk. 4, Chap. 34.
perceiving themselves and commending to their people, were not afraid to call this Supper, some of them, “the salve of immortality and sovereign preservative against death”; other, “a deifical communion”;† other, “the sweet dainties of our Saviour,” “the pledge of eternal health, the defence of faith, the hope of the resurrection”; other, “the food of immortality,” “the healthful grace,” and “the conservatory to everlasting life”.22 All which sayings both of the holy Scripture and godly men, truly attributed to this celestial banquet and feast, if we would often call to mind, O how would they inflame our hearts to desire the participation of these mysteries, and oftentimes to covet after this bread, continually to thirst for this food! Not as specially regarding the terrene and earthly creatures which remain, but always holding fast and cleaving by faith to the Rock whence we may suck the sweetness of everlasting salvation.23

And to be brief, thus much more the faithful see, hear, and know the favourable mercies of GOD sealed, the satisfaction by Christ towards us confirmed, and the remission of sin established. Here they may feel wrought the tranquillity of conscience, the increase of faith, the strengthening of hope, the large spreading abroad of brotherly kindness, with many other sundry graces of GOD. The taste whereof they cannot attain unto, who be drowned in the deep dirty lake of blindness and ignorance. From the which, O beloved, wash yourselves with the living waters of GOD’s word, whence you may perceive and know, both the spiritual food of this costly

† [“a deifical communion”: a communion which deifies, makes divine.]

22 Ignatius, Epistola ad Ephesios; [Pseudo-]Dionysius [the Areopagite]; Origen; Optatus; [Pseudo-]Cyprian, de Coena Domini; Athanasius, De Peccato in Spiritu Sancto [“On Sin against the Holy Spirit”].

23 Deuteronomy 33.4, 13, 15 [“The LORD… is the Rock, his work is perfect: for all his ways are judgment…. He made <Jacob> to suck honey out of the rock, and oil out of the flinty rock…. But Jeshurun waxed fat…; then he forsook God which made him, and lightly esteemed the Rock of his salvation.” (KJV)]
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Supper, and the happy trustings and effects that the same doth bring with it.

Now it followeth to have with this knowledge a sure and constant faith, not only that the death of Christ is available† for the redemption of all the world, for the remission of sins, and reconciliation with God the Father, but also that he hath made upon his Cross a full and sufficient sacrifice for thee, a perfect cleansing of thy sins, so that thou acknowledgest no other Saviour, Redeemer, Mediator, Advocate, Intercessor but Christ only, and that thou mayest say with the Apostle, that he loved thee, and gave himself for thee. For this is to stick fast to Christ’s promise made in his institution [of the Supper] — to make Christ thine own, and to apply his merits unto thyself. Herein thou needest no other man’s help, no other sacrifice or oblation, no sacrificing priest, no Mass, no means established by man’s invention. That faith is a necessary instrument in all these holy ceremonies, we may thus assure ourselves, for that, as Saint Paul saith, without faith it is impossible to please God. When a great number of the Israelites were overthrown in the wilderness, “Moses, Aaron, and Phinees did eat manna and pleased God, for that they understood,” saith Saint Augustine, “the visible meat spiritually. Spiritually they hungered it, spiritually they tasted it, that they might be spiritually satisfied.” And truly, as the bodily meat cannot feed the outward man unless it be let into a stomach to be digested, which is healthsome and sound, no more can the inward man be fed except his meat be received into his soul and heart, sound and whole in faith. Therefore, saith Cyprian, “when we do these things, we need not to whet our teeth, but with sincere faith we break and divide that whole bread.”

† [available: capable of availing, of obtaining something.]

24 Cf. Galatians 2.20.


26 1 Corinthians 10.5.

27 Augustine, In Johan. Hom. 6 [Discourses on the Gospel of John 26, § 11 – Theologies of the Eucharist, Readings II, 3 (p. 84).]
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seek for in this Supper is spiritual food, the nourishment of our soul, a heavenly refection and not earthly, an invisible meat and not bodily, a ghostly substance and not carnal, so that to think that without faith we may enjoy the eating and drinking thereof, or that that is the fruition of it, is but to dream a gross carnal feeding, basely objecting† and binding ourselves to the elements and creatures. Whereas by the advice of the Council of Nicene, we ought to “lift up our minds by faith” and, leaving these inferior and earthly things, there seek it where the Sun of Righteousness ever shineth. 29

Take then this lesson, O thou that art desirous of this Table, of [from] Emissenus, a godly Father, that “when thou goest up to the reverend communion to be satisfied with spiritual meats, thou look up with faith upon the holy body and blood of thy GOD, thou marvel with reverence, thou touch it with the mind, thou receive it with the hand of thy heart, and thou take it fully with thy inward man.”30

Thus we see, beloved, that resorting to this table, we must pluck up all the roots of infidelity, all distrust in GOD’s promises, that we make ourselves living members of Christ’s body. For the unbelievers and faithless cannot feed upon that precious body, whereas the faithful have their life, their abiding in him, their union, and as it were their incorporation with him. Wherefore let us prove and try ourselves unfeignedly, without flattering ourselves, whether we be plants of the fruitful olive, living branches of the true vine, members indeed of Christ’s mystical body, whether GOD hath purified our hearts by faith, to the sincere acknowledging of his Gospel, and embracing of his mercies in Christ Jesus, so that at this his table we receive not only the outward sacrament, but the spiritual thing also – not the figure, but the truth – not the shadow only, but the body – not to death, but to life – not to destruction, but to salvation. Which GOD

28 [Pseudo-]Cyprian, De coena Domini.

† [objecting: placing an obstacle or hindrance in the way; this sense of the word is now obsolete.]

29 Council of Nicene, Concilium [Council of Nicea, 325].

30 Eusebius Emissenus, Sermo de Eucharistia. [Eusebius, bp of Emesa (in Syria) ca. 340-ca. 359.]
grant us to do through the merits of our Lord and Saviour; to whom be all honour and glory for ever, Amen.

* 

The second part of the Homily of the worthy receiving and reverent esteeming of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ.

In the Homily of late rehearsed unto you, ye have heard, good people, why it pleased our Saviour Christ to institute that heavenly memory of his death and passion, and that every one of us ought to celebrate the same at his Table in our own persons, and not by other. You have heard also with what estimation and knowledge of so high mysteries, we ought to resort thither. You have heard with what constant faith we should clothe and deck ourselves, that we might be fit and decent partakers of that celestial food.

Now followeth the third thing necessary in him that would not eat of this bread nor drink of this cup unworthily, which is, newness of life and godliness of conversation. For newness of life, as fruits of faith are required in the partakers of this Table. We may learn by eating of the typical lamb,† whereunto no man was admitted but he that was a Jew, that was circumcised, that was before sanctified. Yea, Saint Paul testifieth that although the people were partakers of the sacraments under Moses, yet for that some of them were still worshippers of images, whoremongers, tempters of Christ, murmurers, and coveting after evil things, GOD overthrew those in the wilderness, and that for our example — that is, that we Christians should take heed we resort unto our sacraments with holiness of life, not trusting in the outward receiving of them, and infected with corrupt and uncharitable manners.31 For this sentence† of GOD must always be justified: I will have mercy and not sacrifice.32 “Wherefore,” saith Basil, 

† [the typical lamb: the Passover lamb considered as a “type” — a real foreshadowing — of Christ.]
31 1 Corinthians 10.1-11.
† [sentence: judgement.]
32 Hosea 6.1; Matthew 9.13.
“it behoveth him that cometh to the body and blood of Christ, in commemoration of him that died and rose again, not only to be pure from all filthiness of the flesh and spirit lest he eat and drink his own condemnation: but also to shew out evidently a memory of him that died and rose again for us, in this point, that ye be mortified to sin and the world, to live now to God in Christ Jesu our Lord.” 33 So then we must shew outward testimony, in following the signification of Christ’s death, amongst the which this is not esteemed least: to render thanks to Almighty God for all his benefits, briefly comprised in the death, passion, and resurrection of his dearly beloved Son. The which thing, because we ought chiefly at this table to solemnise, the godly fathers named it Eucharistia, that is, “thanksgiving”. As if they should have said, “Now above all other times ye ought to laud and praise God. Now may you behold the matter, the cause, the beginning and the end of all thanksgiving. Now if you slack, ye shew yourselves most unthankful, and that no other benefit can ever stir you to thank God, who so little regard here so many, so wonderful, and so profitable benefits.” Seeing then that the name and thing itself doth monish† us of thanks, let us (as St Paul saith) offer always to God the host or sacrifice of praise by Christ, that is, the fruit of the lips which confess his Name. 34 For as David singeth: He that offereth to God thanks and praise, honoureth him. 35 But how few be there of thankful persons, in comparison to the unthankful? Lo, ten lepers in the Gospel were healed, and but one only returned to give thanks for his health. 36 Yea, happy it were, if among forty communicants, we could see two unfeignedly give thanks. So unkind† we be, so oblivious we

33 Basil, De baptismo [“Concerning Baptism”]. Bk. 1, chap. 3.

† [monish: admonish, warn.

34 Hebrews 13.15.

35 Psalms 50.23.


† [unkind, unnatural.]
be, so proud beggars we be, that partly we care not for our
own commodity, partly we know not our duty to GOD, and
chiefly we will not confess all that we receive. Yea, and if we
be forced by GOD’s power to do it: yet we handle it so
coldly, so dryly, that our lips praise him, but our hearts
dispraise him; our tongues bless him, but our life curseth him;
our words worship him, but our works dishonour him. O let
us therefore learn to give GOD here thanks aright, and so to
agnise† his exceeding graces poured upon us, that they being
shut up in the treasure house of our heart, may in due time
and season in our life and conversation, appear to the
glorifying of his holy Name.

Furthermore, for newness of life, it is to be noted that
Saint Paul writeth that we being many, are one bread and
one body: For all be partakers of one bread – declaring
thereby, not only our communion with Christ but that unity
also, wherein they that eat at this table, should be knit
together. For by dissension, vainglory, ambition, strife,
envying, contempt, hatred, or malice, they should not be
dissevered, but so joined by the bond of love in one mystical
body, as the corns† of that bread in one loaf. In respect of
which strait knot of charity, the true Christians in the
primitive Church called this supper, Love. As if they should
say, none ought to sit down there that were out of love and
charity, who bare [bore] grudge and vengeance in his heart,
who also did not profess his kind† affection by some
charitable relief, for some part of the congregation. And this
was their practise. O heavenly banquet then so used! O godly
guests who so esteemed this feast.

But, O wretched creatures that we be at these days, who
be without reconciliation of our brethren whom we have
offended, without satisfying them whom we have caused to
fall, without any kind of thought or compassion toward them
whom we might easily relieve, without any conscience of
slander, disdain, misreport, division, rancour, or inward
bitterness. Yea, being encumbered with the cloaked hatred of

† [agnise. acknowledge.]
† [corns. kernels.]
† [kind. natural.]
Cain,\(^{37}\) with the long coloured malice of Esau,\(^{38}\) with the dissembled falsehood of Joab,\(^{39}\) dare ye presume to come up to these sacred and fearful mysteries? O man, whither ruhest thou unadvisedly? It is a table of peace, and thou art ready to fight. It is a table of singleness, and thou art imagining mischief. It is a table of quietness, and thou art given to debate. It is a table of pity, and thou art unmerciful. Dost thou neither fear GOD, the maker of this feast, nor reverence his Christ, the refection and meat, nor regardest his spouse his well-beloved guest, nor weighest thine own conscience, which is sometime thine inward accuser? Wherefore, O man, tender thine own salvation, examine and try thy good will and love towards the children of GOD, the members of Christ, the heirs of the heavenly heritage – yea, towards the image of GOD, the excellent creature thine own soul. If thou have offended, now be reconciled. If thou have caused any to stumble in the way of GOD, now set them up again. If thou have disquieted thy brother, now pacify him. If thou have wronged him, now relieve him. If thou have defrauded him, now restore to him. If thou have nourished spite, now embrace friendship. If thou have fostered hatred and malice, now openly shew thy love and charity – yea, be pressed and ready to procure thy neighbour’s health of soul, wealth, commodity, and pleasures, as thine own. Deserve not the heavy and dreadful burden of GOD’s displeasure for thine evil will towards thy neighbour, so unreverently to approach to this table of the Lord. Last of all, as there is here the mystery of peace, and the sacrament of Christian society, whereby we understand what sincere love ought to be betwixt the true communicants: So here be the tokens of pureness and innocency of life, whereby we may perceive that we ought to purge our own soul from all uncleanness, iniquity, and wickedness, lest when we receive the mystical bread (as Origen saith) we eat it in an unclean place, that is, in a soul

\(^{37}\) Genesis 4.8.

\(^{38}\) Genesis 27.41.

\(^{39}\) 2 Samuel 3.27.
defiled and polluted with sin. In Moses’s Law, the man that did eat of the sacrifice of thanksgiving with his uncleanness upon him should be destroyed from his people. And shall we think that the wicked and sinful person shall be excusable at the table of the Lord? We both read in Saint Paul that the church of Corinth was scourged of the Lord, for misusing the Lord’s Supper, and we may plainly see Christ’s Church these many years miserably vexed and oppressed for the horrible profanation of the same. Wherefore let us all, universal and singular, behold our own manners and lives, to amend them. Yea, now at the least, let us call ourselves to an account, that it may grieve us of our former evil conversation, that we may hate sin, that we may sorrow and mourn for our offences, that we may with tears pour them out before God, that we may with sure trust desire and crave the salve of his mercy, bought and purchased with the blood of his dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ, to heal our deadly wounds withal. For surely, if we do not with earnest repentance cleanse the filthy stomach of our soul, it must needs come to pass, that as wholesome meat received into a raw stomach corrupteth and marreth all, and is the cause of further sickness: so shall we eat this wholesome bread and drink this cup to our eternal destruction. Thus we and not other, must thoroughly examine, and not lightly look over ourselves, not other men: our own conscience, not other men’s lives – which we ought to do uprightly, truly, and with just correction. “O,” saith Chrysostom, “let no Judas resort to this table; let no covetous person approach.” If any be a disciple, let him be present. For Christ saith, With my disciples I make my Passover.

Why cried the deacon in the primitive Church: “If any be holy, let him draw near”? Why did they celebrate these mysteries, the choir door being shut? Why were the public penitents and learners in Religion commanded at this time to avoid? Was it not because this

---

40 1 Corinthians 11.29.


† [conversation. habitual manner of being and dealing with others.]

42 Matthew 26.18.
table received no unholy, unclean, or sinful guests? Wherefore, if servants dare not to presume to an earthly master’s table, whom they have offended: Let us take heed we come not with our sins unexamined into this presence of our Lord and Judge. If they be worthy [of] blame which kiss the Prince’s hand with a filthy and unclean mouth, shalt thou be blameless, which with a stinking soul, full of covetousness, fornication, drunkenness, pride, full of wretched cogitations and thoughts, dost breathe out iniquity and uncleanness on the Bread and Cup of the Lord?

Thus have you heard, how you should come reverently and decently to the Table of the Lord, having the knowledge of his word, of the thing itself, and the fruits thereof, bringing a true and constant faith, the root and wellspring of all newness of life, as well in praising God and loving our neighbour as purging our own conscience from filthiness. So that neither the ignorance of the thing shall cause us to contemn it, nor unfaithfulness make us void of fruit, nor sin and iniquity procure us God’s plagues; but shall by faith, in knowledge and amendment of life in faith be here so united to Christ our Head in his mysteries, to our comfort, that after we shall have full fruition of him indeed, to our everlasting joy and eternal life, to the which he bring us, that died for us and redeemed us, Jesus Christ the righteous, to whom with the Father, and the Holy Ghost, one true and eternal God, be all praise, honour and dominion for ever. Amen.
An Homily of the worthy receiving of the Sacrament
2. Selections from Jeremy Taylor

The Worthy Communicant: Or, A Discourse of the Nature, Effects, and Blessings consequent to the Worthy Receiving of the Lord’s Supper, and of all the Duties required in order to a Worthy Preparation: Together with the Cases of Conscience occurring in the Duty of him that Ministers and of him that Communicates: To which are added Devotions fitted to Every Part of the Ministration (1661)
Introduction

Jeremy Taylor was one of the supreme preachers of his day, a master of “the prose of thought” in the baroque style favoured through much of the seventeenth century, and a spiritual director whose writings united doctrine and practice in a way that made them classics of Anglican literature. He should have stuck with preaching, spiritual direction, and writing. Instead, the Church wasted him – and he ended up wasting himself – on a bishopric in northern Ireland.

Taylor was born in 1613 at Cambridge, where his father was a tradesman. This hardly made Jeremy a natural member of Stuart Cambridge’s *jeunesse dorée*, but his quick intelligence, combined with a willingness to please, gained him favour and promotion at a very early age. He entered Gonville and Caius,43 and became one of its Fellows before his twentieth birthday. That same year, 1633, he was also ordained deacon and priest, rather short of the canonical age. For both the Canons and the Prayer Book’s Ordinal stated that “none shall be ordained a Deacon, except he be a full twenty-three years of age unless he have a Faculty.” A “faculty,” in this case, is an bishop’s decree that an individual is to be exempted from a condition of canon law; and the twenty-year-old Taylor received such a faculty from the bishop of Ely. Soon afterwards, Taylor made an impressive debut as preacher at St Paul’s Cathedral in London The accolades which greeted this performance reached the ears of William Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury. Laud was always on the look-out for talent, and once he discovered a gifted individual like Taylor, he aggressively pulled strings to promote him. Laud happened to be chancellor of Oxford University as well as Archbishop of Canterbury. No accident, then, that in 1635 young Mr Taylor transferred from Caius College, Cambridge, to All Souls’ College, Oxford. All Souls had not yet become a research foundation without any undergraduates; but its fellowships were among the best endowed in either University.

43 Those who have seen the movie *Chariots of Fire* will remember that the second name is pronounced KEES.
Taylor continued in Laud’s favour and, apparently, spent as much time at Lambeth Palace advising the archbishop as in All Souls doing what dons did. After three years, however, he left All Souls to become Rector of Uppingham, a parish in the archbishop’s gift. A year later, in the spring of 1639, he married Phoebe Langsdale; not much is known about her except that, during their twelve-year marriage, she bore six children. (Phoebe Taylor died in 1651, perhaps while giving birth to a seventh child.)

The Taylors began their married life just as the reign of Charles I began to disintegrate. One mark of Charles’s inability to deal with the situation took place in 1641 when Parliament impeached Taylor’s patron, Archbishop Laud, and cast into the Tower of London. This made Taylor’s position at Uppingham somewhat dicey, not only because he could no longer count on Laud’s protection but also because his parish fell within easy reach of Parliament’s control of London and its vicinity. As soon as the King raised the royal standard in August 1642, Taylor left Uppingham to serve as chaplain in the Royalist forces. He and his young (and still-growing) family spent most of the next two years in and around Oxford, which Charles had made his headquarters.

Laud was beheaded in January 1645; the King and his army suffered their Waterloo outside the market-town of Naseby six months later. Somehow – we do not know how or why – Taylor had become a chaplain attached to the Royalist forces in South Wales. Parliament’s New Model Army made short work of those forces, and Taylor became a prisoner of war. His past association with Archbishop Laud made him specially obnoxious to his captors, and he endured a period of close confinement.

Shortly after his release, towards the end of 1645 or at the beginning of 1646, Taylor found refuge at Golden Grove, the great house of the Earl and Countess of Carbery. We know very little about Richard and Frances Vaughan; and though Taylor gave Golden Grove literary immortality in at least two of his books, the house itself became a ruin and was razed within a century of Taylor’s residence there. The Carberys were certainly committed to the Royalist cause, but the Earl himself seems not to have taken up arms and fought in any of the King’s armies. This explains why Carbery was left undisturbed by the commissioners of the victorious
Parliament, who levied crippling fines on those nobles and gentry who had fought on the losing side. It did not hurt that Golden Grove, though a great house with prosperous (and apparently well-managed) farms, was out of the way, even isolated, “far from the madding crowd’s ignoble strife”. Here Taylor settled with Phoebe and their children for the next eight years.

Lord Carbery appears to have been a sincere Christian of his time and class – faithful to the King, to “the sober principles and old establishment of the Anglican Church,” and to his Countess. It was primarily for her sake that he welcomed, housed, and generously supported Taylor; for Taylor had his main ministry at Golden Grove as Lady Carbery’s in-house spiritual director. She herself was anything but a flighty noblewoman who dabbled in spirituality as a fashion-statement. An intelligent and intensely devout woman, she seems to have acted as that rarest of all people in the world of spiritual direction – not only as Taylor’s employer and client but also as his muse, who enabled him to define more closely his own spirituality even as she received the benefits of his direction.

It was at Golden Grove that Taylor’s preaching ripened and came to full maturity. He himself seems to have recognised this, for his first great collection of sermons – *Eniatus; Or, A Course of Sermons for all the Sundays of the year* – appeared in 1651, while he was still residing at Golden Grove. English rhetoric does not get more exquisite than the sermons of this particular collection; not even John Henry Newman at his finest in the pulpit of St Mary’s, Oxford, during the 1830s matched Taylor for the sheer beauty of the sermons that he preached to Lord Carbery’s household in the domestic chapel of Golden Grove during the late 1640s.44

It was also at Golden Grove that Taylor produced his best books – *The Liberty of Prophesying* (1647), *The History of the Life and Death of the Holy Jesus; or, The Great Exemplar* (1649), *The Rule and Exercises of Holy Living* (1650), and

44 In the seventeenth century a “household” was still defined in feudal terms. Thus, the Carbery “family” did not consist of the Earl and Countess and their dependent blood-relations (children, aunts, uncles, cousins, in-laws) only, but also included their servants, retainers, clients, and tenants.
The Rule and Exercises of Holy Dying (1652). Over the next fifteen years, he would produce several works which are the equals of his Golden Grove period, among them The Worthy Communicant (1661). But if none of Taylor’s output had survived except The Rule and Exercises of Holy Living and The Rule and Exercises of Holy Dying, we would still have the full breadth of his spirituality – or rather, what he considered the elements of a spirituality which deserved the name of Christian. His time at Golden Grove was truly his golden age.

It did not last. Frances Vaughan, Countess Carbery, died in October 1650; the following April, Phoebe Taylor also died. Neither seventeenth-century religion in general, nor Taylor’s spirituality in particular, allowed any time for the sentimentality which, in the modern world, indulges grief and mourning. Earl Carbery married again sometime before 1653; Taylor himself took a second wife, Joanna Bridges, soon afterwards. Joanna lived at Mandinam, a country house in the neighbourhood of Golden Grove; this became Taylor’s new residence – but only for a short time. In 1655 he published a collection of prayers and meditations under the title of The Golden Grove. This work probably would have gone unnoticed by the censors, had it not been for the preface that Taylor attached to it. For Taylor there went out of his way to denigrate the military dictatorship of the Lord Protector, Oliver Cromwell, and to deplore the regime’s indulgence of “Independency,” as the proliferation of Protestant sects, more or less Congregationalist in structure, was collectively called, in opposition to any and every kind of Established Church. Taylor undoubtedly saw his preface as a matter of confessing the truth. The government saw it as sedition, and imprisoned him in Chepstow Castle.

That same year, even as he suffered the hostile hospitality of Cromwell’s regime, also saw the publication of Taylor’s Unum Necessarium.45 He seems to have regarded this work as his magnum opus. It is a systematic treatment of casuistry,

45 “The One Thing Necessary”. See Luke 10.41-42: “And Jesus answered and said unto her, Martha, Martha, thou art careful and troubled about many things: But one thing is needful: and Mary hath chosen that good part, which shall not be taken away from her.”
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a branch of moral theology which seeks to resolve “cases,”
that is, ethical dilemmas and perplexities posed by particular
situations in everyday life. In the course of setting forth the
first principles of casuistry, Taylor called into question the
validity of the classical doctrine of Original Sin and allowed
humans a greater measure of freedom (and personal
responsibility) than the consensus of English divines thought
orthodox. He was never tried for heresy, but word of mouth
among “Church-of-England-men” tarred him as – wink, wink,
nudge, nudge, say no more – “unsound”.

Winking and nudging someone’s reputation into the
sinkhole takes time. Taylor spent a year or eighteen months
in confinement, but when he emerged he still had friends
who were willing, and in a position, to take care of him.
Chief among these friends was John Evelyn (1620-1706), a
gentleman of means and parts, now almost exclusively
remembered for the diary that he kept from 1642 until his
final illness. Evelyn, a fierce Royalist, had chosen to go
abroad on the seventeenth-century version of the Grand Tour
soon after the outbreak of the English Civil War; but like
many who flee revolution at home – one thinks of Sergei
Prokoviev after the Russian Revolution – homesickness made
him return to England shortly after the judicial murder of
Charles I. He spent the next decade networking in the
Royalist and Anglican loyalist underground. He read Taylor’s
works and then made a point of seeking him out on one of
Taylor’s visits to London from Golden Grove. Their
relationship was akin to Taylor’s with Lady Carbery – Evelyn
became a patron who was also a client, a client who was also
a patron. After Taylor was released from Chepstow – and
before he was incarcerated again, on another charge, this
time in the Tower of London itself – Evelyn introduced him
to his friends Lord and Lady Conway. Lord Conway was a
magnate in Northern Ireland; his estate, Portmore, ranked
among the greatest in that part of the British Isles. In 1658,
Conway offered Taylor, now free from the Tower, a place at
Portmore. Taylor needed the relief. He and Joanna, with his
surviving children by Phoebe and their own offspring, crossed
the Irish Sea and took up residence on the Conway estates.

Soon after Taylor arrived in Northern Ireland, Cromwell
died. Without its caudillo, the regime that he had cobbled
together unravelled and, surprisingly for a military
dictatorship, went out with a whimper, not a bang. King Charles II returned to England in May 1660 amidst universal rejoicing. “The old establishment of the Anglican Church” also came back into its own. As it happened, the attrition of human mortality had left all but five bishoprics in England and Ireland vacant by the time Charles returned. The King moved fairly quickly (for him, that is) to bring the bishops’ bench up to strength.46

Taylor in Ireland expected to receive a call back to England and an English bishopric. Few in the Anglican underground of the Interregnum had “made the good confession” in print as consistently as he, and even fewer had been singled out and made to suffer the consequences. So his expectation (as opposed to ambition) of an episcopal reward was hardly out of line. But Gilbert Sheldon, newly appointed bishop of London and Charles’s eminence grise in matters ecclesiastical, had not forgotten Unum Necessarium and its taint of “unsoundness”. In his view, therefore, Taylor could not be trusted with a see in the restored Church of England. A see in the Church of Ireland was another matter. Taylor was already in Ulster; why not keep him there? In August 1660 the Crown announced Taylor’s appointment as bishop of the double diocese of Down and Connor. He was consecrated the following January.

In appointing Taylor to Down and Connor, the Crown tossed him not just one hot potato but into a field of Irish hot potatoes. For the largest (and best-organised) bloc of clergy in Down and Connor happened to be hard-core Presbyterians. They viewed his appointment as a calculated provocation, because if Taylor had any reputation at all, it was as an advocate of high, severe notions of episcopacy. The Presbyterian clergy proceeded to make their new bishop’s life a misery from the time his appointment was announced. Taylor certainly had received several “gifts of the Spirit”. Administration was not one of them. Nor did he display any talent for the more mundane – and, given the circumstances, perhaps more necessary – charismata of

46 From the Middle Ages until the late nineteenth century, all bishops of the Church of England sat ex officio in the House of Lords; and in that House they sat together on their own “bench” – actually the first two rows on one side of the Lords’ Chamber.
political life. The stiffer he got in his dealings with the Presbyterians, the stiffer they got in return. Taylor’s only reward was to be given charge – not as bishop, merely as administrator – of a third diocese, Dromore. He never learned the wisdom of the saying, “Don’t let the bastards wear you down.” And that is just what they did. Worn down and worn out, Taylor died on 13 August 1667. He was fifty-four.

The Worthy Communicant, Or, A Discourse of the Nature, Effects, and Blessings consequent to the Worthy Receiving of the Lord’s Supper, and of all the Duties required in order to a Worthy Preparation: Together with the Cases of Conscience occurring in the Duty of him that Ministers and of him that Communicates: To which are added Devotions fitted to Every Part of the Ministration appeared in 1661, a few months after Taylor had been consecrated bishop. It proved to be his most enduringly “popular” work, in the sense that it continued to sell consistently well, at least among educated readers (and Taylor never wrote for any but highly educated readers), into the nineteenth century. It not only met a “practical” or (as Taylor and his contemporaries would have put it) “experimental” need felt by the religious public; it also met this need in the most exquisite baroque English prose. Modern readers like you may feel that Taylor’s style is, if anything, too “literary,” perhaps even “over the top,” especially in his “devotions,” that is, the prayers and meditations that he provides at the end of each chapter. In this we may be proving the truth of L. P. Hartley’s great aphorism, “The past is a different country; they do things differently there.” Taylor’s rhetoric in this work met not only a religious need; it also satisfied a way of feeling as well as thinking which is a lot of what makes the past – especially the early-modern, pre-Enlightenment past – seem to us like a foreign country.

The Worthy Communicant was not the first, nor by any means the last, of its kind. It was simply the most highly wrought, and one of the most detailed, examples of a genre which had been around for at least a century beforehand and which booksellers would continue to find profitable for almost two centuries more after Taylor’s book was published. This genre, the manuals of “preparation to a worthy
communion,” had first begun to roll off English presses during the 1560s. Almost all of these early manuals of preparation were written by Calvinists. The reason? A central tenet of Calvinism – and, more broadly, of Puritanism - maintained that none but the elect, none but those predestined to eternal life, could receive the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper worthily. If one intended to receive the Sacrament, it therefore became a point of capital necessity that one know with assurance whether or not one was a vessel of God’s election. Lacking such assurance, one would eat and drink the Lord’s Supper unworthily – and “he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord’s body” [1 Corinthians 11.29]. But how could one know – or rather, how could one have such assurance of one’s election that one could be assured of one’s worthiness to receive the Sacrament? During the reigns of Elizabeth I, James I, and Charles I, most manuals of preparation to the worthy receiving of the Lord’s Supper addressed this knotty question and provided what might be called strategies and tactics whereby a communicant might win the assurance of a truly assured assurance.

You may well think that all this makes communion-worthiness sound like an advanced degree in solipsism. So long as communion-worthiness was tied to a predestinarian agenda, it could not help but feed a tendency toward narcissistic scrupulosity in “the introspective conscience of the West”. This may serve to explain in part why Calvinism was, and is still, the religious ideology of choice for so many Christians. It may also serve to explain, again only in part, why so many others have found Calvinism so exhausting.

Taylor’s The Worthy Communicant, like its Puritan predecessors, was designed for use by private individuals in the library or closet where they conducted their private devotions. What distinguished it from earlier manuals of communion-worthiness, apart from its literary quality and its spiritual sensitivity, was that Taylor jettisoned the predestinarian agenda. He did indeed seek to give individual communicants the means of discovering an “experimental assurance” of worthiness; but this assurance had almost nothing to do with one’s eternal status as doomed either to election or to reprobation. Instead, the assurance that Taylor sought to foster focused on one’s obedience to the law of the
Gospel both in intention and in action. Preparing for the Lord’s Supper thus became a microcosm of the whole life of faith – but in a way that took the eucharistic liturgy seriously as an event which had its own necessity and conferred distinctive blessings on the worthy communicant.


**Further Reading**


Daniel Brevint

The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice

(1673)
Daniel Brevint is now hardly known, even among scholars; his sole claim to fame is, that John and Charles Wesley based their Hymns on the Lord's Supper (1745) on the treatise reproduced here. But Brevint was one of the most prominent churchmen, and one of the most widely-read divines, in the Restoration Church of England.

Brevint was born in 1616 on Jersey, one of the Channel Islands belonging to England. The native tongue of Jersey's population was French, so it is not surprising that Brevint studied at the Huguenot academy of Saumur rather than Oxford or Cambridge. He received his M.A. from Saumur in 1624 and appears to have returned to Jersey. By 1637, however, he had made enough of a name for himself to be appointed to a fellowship at Jesus College, Oxford.

Archbishop Laud objected to this appointment on the grounds that Brevint "should be made to know the difference of a Master of Art at Oxford and Saumur" - a degree from Saumur being, of course, not quite the Right Stuff. The University fixed this little problem by granting Brevint its own MA.

Brevint resided at Oxford until the end of the English Civil War. Then commissioners of the victorious Parliament arrived and purged the University; Brevint was one of those deprived of their fellowships. He returned to Jersey, but not for very long. The military forces of the Commonwealth occupied the island in 1649, and Brevint thought it advisable to leave for France. He seems to have been the minister of a Huguenot congregation in Normandy for a short while; at some point he moved to Paris. There he was ordained deacon and priest by Thomas Sydserf, the exiled bishop of Galloway, on 22 June (Trinity Sunday) 1651. Why he sought Anglican orders is unknown; and though he had very good friends and patrons among the English Royalist exiles in Paris, and came to the attention of Charles II himself, he appears to have spent most of his time outside their circle, in the upper reaches of the French aristocracy. In particular, he became spiritual director to Madame la Duchesse de Turenne, whose husband was then Louis XIV's generalissimo, and her friend, Madame la Duchesse de Bouillon. It was for these two ladies, both ardent
Huguenots, that Brevint wrote the original version of what became *The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice*.

When Charles II "came into his own" in 1660, Brevint decided to settle again in England. He had been presented for ordination by John Cosin; and Cosin did not forget his erstwhile protégé when he was appointed bishop of Durham. Brevint was made a canon of Durham Cathedral and rector of Brancepeth, in which stood the principal palace (or country estate) of the Bishop-Palatine of Durham. These two offices, which Brevint held for the rest of his life, gave him an income which allowed him to live in the style to which every cleric should be able to become accustomed. In 1681, on the recommendation of William Sancroft, then archbishop of Canterbury, he received a bonus: he was made Dean of Lincoln.

Brevint was by no means as prolific an author as Jeremy Taylor or a great many other (definitely lesser) lights of later Caroline divinity. Besides *Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice*, his chief works consist of anti-Romanist polemics: *Missale Romanum; Or, the Depth and Mystery of the Roman Mass laid open and explained, for the Use both of Reformed and Unreformed Christians* (Oxford, 1672) and *Saul and Samuel at Endor: The New Ways of Salvation and Service which usually tempt Men to Rome and detain them there, truly represented and refuted* (Oxford, 1674). Neither need tempt or detain us here; they and unabashedly coarse. But in a nation whose Protestantism was more a matter of "No Popery!" than of doctrinal commitments and whose fear of the "Popish Plot" burst out, three years later in one of the ugliest instances of mass-hysteria ever seen in Europe — these two works by Brevint found a ready and wide readership.

The *Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice* is, by contrast, devoid of polemic, generous, delicate, and even lovely. It is also

---

47 Historically - that is, feudally - speaking, Durham was a County Palatine under the jurisdiction of the Bishop, as opposed to an Earl (or Count). At the time of the Restoration - and for another two centuries - it was the last and only county in England to have such a status and designation. This meant that the Bishop, as ex-officio Count-Palatine, had quasi-royal prerogatives and privileges, secular as well as ecclesiastical, within the county's boundaries.
more typical of the communion-manuals produced in post-
Restoration England than Taylor's *The Worthy Communicant*.

Brevint died in Lincoln on 10 May 1695, at the then
uncommonly ripe old age of seventy-nine. He was interred in
the floor of the retro-choir of Lincoln Cathedral.

The *Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice* is reproduced from
the first edition. It is a beautiful example of the printer's craft
in the latter part of the seventeenth century; the print is
generous in size, and the pages are small. You should have
little difficulty reading the text.
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 THEATER in OXFORD,
Anno Dom. 1673.
The

CHRISTIAN SACRAMENT

&

Sacrifice.

At the THEATER

in

OXFORD
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, 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 some other Persons of Quality, to their private 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 Ladyship.

Those great and holy Souls had no desire, more earnest than to contemplate and embrace Christian religion in its original beauty, and see it freed from the encumbrance which ordinary controversies most commonly throw upon it. And really though they did understand all these scholastic points as well or better than 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 flanked 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 been 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, whereby it could not be well expected that men thus taken up in raising fences, in
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planting thorns and quicksets against wild boars, could have much time to dress and improve better plants. Then came from Germany Anabaptists, and from other parts Socinians, who pretend that that best way of pruning luxuriant excrescencies, is to cut up by the roots.

Here, then, Madam, while the Romanists having made havoc of the vineyard and laid it waste, 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 empty 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 Fathers, who for several hundreds of years dressed it and made it bear excellent fruit. So here I take no more notice of Papists or Sectaries, no nor Protestants neither, than as if the former had never appeared in the world to trouble and spoil the Church of 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 blessings, as the ladder of Jacob did with ascending and descending angels. This may be soon perceived by any 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 curiously run over. But mysteries must be studied, or they cannot be well understood; and God knows how much more is here required at our hands besides bare understanding. Therefore I have added to the Discourse that refers to the advancing the mind in knowledge, Meditation and Prayer, the two usual attendants on devotion; which Discourse, Meditation, and Prayer being joined together, are the only probable means of dealing successfully with holy things, and of attaining by the use thereof to the true end of this Sacrament, which aims at nothing less than a mutual communion between us and Christ, even here on earth while we seem to be absent from him – and withal at such a reciprocal correspondency 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.
Daniel Brevint,  *The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice* (1673)

*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 have made bold to pure your name before this book: – Because it having been 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 acceptation and reading, who intimately knew the worth of those Princesses and walk after their steps at so near a distance as your Ladyship doth; to whom I am

MADAM,

a most humble and faithful servant,

DAN. BREVINT

Durham,

Jan. 24, 1673.
THE CHRISTIAN SACRAMENT
and Sacrifice.

By way of Discourse,
MEDITATION, and PRAYER,
upon
THE NATURE, PARTS,
and Blessings
Of the Holy Communion.

Section I.
The importance of well understanding the nature of this Sacrament.

The sacrament instituted by Christ at the eve of his Passion, which S. Paul calls the Lord’s 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 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, then the Holy Communion is not only a Sacrament that the worshipper is to come to for no other purpose than 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.

[For Reading: Daniel Brevint, The Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice (Oxford, 1673), 2-129]
1. As it is a Memorial of the Sufferings and Death of Christ

Hymn 1.

1. In that sad memorable night,
   When Jesus was for us betray’d,
   He left his death-recording rite;
   He took, and bless’d, and brake the bread,
   And gave his own their last bequest,
   And thus his love’s intent express’d.

2. “Take, eat, this is my body given
   To purchase life and peace for you,
   Pardon, and holiness, and heaven –
   Do this my dying love to show:
   Accept your precious legacy,
   And thus, my friends, remember me.”

3. He took into his hands the cup,
   To crown the sacramental feast,
   And full of kind concern look’d up
   And gave what he to them had bless’d.
   “And drink ye all of this,” he said,
   “In solemn memory of the dead.

4. “This is my blood which seals the new,
   Eternal covenant of my grace;
   My blood so freely spilt for you,
   For you and all the sinful race;
   My blood that speaks your sins forgiven,
   And justifies your claim to heaven.
5. “The grace which I to all bequeath,
   In this divine memorial take;
And mindful of your Saviour’s death,
   Do this, my followers, for my sake,
   Whose dying love hath left behind
   Eternal life for all mankind.”

Hymn 3

1. Then let us go, and take, and eat
   The heavenly, everlasting meat,
   For fainting souls prepar’d:
   Fed with the living bread divine,
   Discern we in the sacred sign
   The body of the Lord.

2. The instruments that bruised him so
   Were broke and scattered long ago,
   The flames extinguish’d were;
   But Jesu’s death is ever new:
   He whom in ages past they slew,
   Doth still as slain appear.

3. Th’oblation sends as sweet a smell,
   Even now it pleases God as well
   As when it first was made:
   The blood doth now as freely flow
   As when his side receiv’d the blow
   That show’d him newly dead.

4. Then let our faith adore the Lamb,
   Today as yesterday the same,
   In thy great offering join;
   Partake the sacrificial food,
   And eat thy flesh, and drink thy blood,
   And live for ever thine.
Hymn 5

88.88.88

1. O thou eternal Victim, slain
   A sacrifice for guilty man,
   By the eternal Spirit made
   An off’ring in the sinner’s stead:
   Our everlasting Priest art thou,
   And plead’st thy death for sinners now.

2. Thy offering still continues new;
   Thy vesture keeps its bloody hue;
   Thou stand’st the ever-slaughter’d Lamb;
   Thy priesthood still remains the same;
   Thy years, O God, can never fail,
   Thy goodness is unchangeable.

3. O that our faith may never move
   But stand unshaken as thy love;
   Sure evidence of things unseen,
   Now let it pass the years between,
   And view Thee bleeding on the tree,
   My God, who dies for me, for me!

Hymn 7

Common Metre

1. Come, Holy Ghost, set to thy seal,
   Thine inward witness give;
   To all our waiting souls reveal
   The death by which we live.

2. Spectators of the pangs divine,
   O that we now may be;
   Discerning in the sacred sign
   His passion on the tree.

3. Give us to hear the dreadful sound
   Which told his mortal pain,
Tore up the graves, and shook the ground,
And rent the rocks in twain.\(^{48}\)

4. Repeat the Saviour’s dying cry
   In every heart, so loud
   That every heart may now reply,
   This was the Son of God!\(^{49}\)

---

Hymn 18

77.77.77

1. Lift your eyes of faith, and look
   on the signs he did ordain”
   Thus the bread of life was broke;
   Thus the Lamb of God was slain;
   Thus was shed on Calvary
   His last drop of blood for me!

2. See the slaughter’d sacrifice;
   See the altar stain’d with blood!
   Crucified before our eyes,
   Faith discerns the dying God –
   Dying that our souls might live,
   Gasping at his death, “Forgive!”

---

\(^{48}\) Matthew 27.51-53 (KJV): “And, behold, the veil of the temple was rent in twain from the top to the bottom; and the earth did quake, and the rocks rent; and the graves were opened; and many bodies of the saints which slept arose, and came out of the graves after his resurrection, and went into the holy city, and appeared unto many.”

\(^{49}\) Cf. Matthew 27.54 (KJV): “Now when the centurion, and they that were with him, watching Jesus, saw the earthquake, and those things that were done, they feared greatly, saying, Truly this was the Son of God.”
II. As it is a Sign and a Means of Grace

Hymn 29

C.M.

1. O thou, who this mysterious bread
   Didst in Emmaus break,
   Return herewith our souls to feed,
   And to thy followers speak.

2. Unseal the volume of thy grace;
   Apply thy Gospel word;
   Open our hearts to see thy face,
   Our hearts to know the Lord.

3. Of thee we commune still, and mourn
   Till thou the veil remove:
   Talk with us, and our hearts shall burn
   With flames of fervent love.

4. Enkindle now the heavenly zeal
   And make thy mercies known;
   And give our pardoned souls to feel
   That God and love are one.

Hymn 30

C.M.

1. Jesu, at whose supreme command
   We thus approach to God,
   Before us in thy vesture stand,
   Thy vesture dipp’d in blood.

2. Obedient to thy gracious word,
   We break the hallow’d bread;
   Commemorate thee, our dying Lord,
   And trust on thee to feed.

3. Now, Saviour, now thyself reveal
   And make thy nature known;
Affix the sacramental seal,
And stamp us for thine own.

4. The tokens of thy dying love
O let us all receive,
And feel the quick’ning Spirit move,
And sensibly believe.

5. The cup of blessing, bless’d by thee,
Let it thy blood impart;
The bread thy mystic body be,
And cheer each languid heart.

6. The grace which sure salvation brings,
Let us herewith receive;
Satiate the hungry with good things,
The hidden manna give.

7. The living bread sent down from heaven,
In us vouchsafe to be;
Thy flesh for all the world is given,
And all may live by thee.

8. Now, Lord, on us thy flesh bestow,
And let us drink thy blood;
Till all our souls are fill’d below
With all the life of God.

Hymn 36

1. Amazing mystery of love!
While posting to eternal pain,
God saw his rebels from above
And stoop’d into a mortal man.

2. His mercy cast a pitying look,
By love, mere causeless love inclin’d;
Our guilt and punishment he took,
And died a victim for mankind.
3. His blood procur’d our life and peace,
   And quench’d the wrath of hostile heave;
   Justice gave way to our release,
   And God hath all my sins forgiven.

4. Jesu, our pardon we receive,
   The purchase of that blood of thine,
   And now begin by grace to live
   And breathe the breath of love divine.

Hymn 39

1. Sinner, with awe draw near
   And find thy Saviour here
In his ordinances still;
   Touch his sacramental clothes,
Present in his power to heal,
   Virtue from his body flows.

2. His body is the seat
   Where all our blessings meet;
Full of unexhausted worth,
   Still it makes the sinner whole,
Pours divine effusions forth,
   Life to every dying soul.

3. Pardon, and power, and peace,
   And perfect righteousness,
From that sacred fountain springs;
   Wash’d in his all-cleansing blood,
Rise, ye worms, to priests and kings;
   Rise in Christ, and reign with God.

Hymn 40

1. Author of life divine,
   Who hast a table spread,
Furnish’d with mystic wine,
   And everlasting bread;
Preserve the life thyself hast given,
And feed and train us up for heaven.

2. Our needy souls sustain
   With fresh supplies of love,
   Till all thy life we gain,
   And all thy fullness prove;
   And strengthen’d by thy perfect grace,
   Behold, without a veil, thy face.

Hymn 57

1. O the depth of love divine,
   Th’ unfathomable grace!
   Who shall say how bread and wine,
   God into man conveys?
   How the bread his flesh imparts;
   How the wine transmits his blood;
   Fills his faithful people’s hearts
   With all the life of God?

2. Let the wisest mortal show
   How we the grace receive:
   Feeble elements bestow
   A power not theirs to give;
   Who explains this wondrous way,
   How through these the virtue came?
   These the virtue did convey,
   Yet still remain the same.

3. How can heavenly spirits rise,
   By earthly matter fed;
   Drink herewith divine supplies,
   And eat immortal bread?
   Ask the Father’s wisdom how;
   Him that did the means ordain;
   Angels round our altars bow,
   To search it out in vain.
4. Sure and real is the grace,
   The manner be unknown;
Only meet us in thy ways,
   And perfect us in one;
Let us taste the heavenly powers,
   Lord, we ask for nothing more;
Thine to bless – ’tis only ours
   To wonder and adore.

/III. The Sacrament a Pledge of Heaven./

IV. The Holy Eucharist, as it implies a Sacrifice.

Hymn 116

88.88.88

1. Victim divine, thy grace we claim,
   While thus thy precious death we show:
Once offer’d up a spotless Lamb,
   In thy great temple here below,
Thou didst for all mankind atone,
   And standest now before thy throne.

2. Thou standest in the holiest place,
   As now for guilty sinners slain;
Thy blood of sprinkling speaks, and prays,
   All-prevalent for helpless man;
Thy blood is still our ransom found,
   And speaks salvation all around.

3. The smoke of thy atonement here
   Darken’d the sun and rent the veil,
Made the new way to heaven appear,
   And show’d the great Invisible;
Well pleas’d in thee, our God look’d down
   And call’d his rebels to a crown.

4. He still respects thy sacrifice;
   Its savour sweet doth always please;
The offering smokes through earth and skies,
   Diffusing life, and joy, and peace:
To these thy lower courts it comes,
And fills them with divine perfumes.

5. We need not now go up to heaven
   To bring the long-sought Saviour down;
   Thou art to all already given,
   Thou dost e’en now thy banquet crown:
   To every faithful heart appear
   And show thy real presence there.

Hymn 119

1. Father, God, who seest in me
   Only sin and misery,
   See thine own anointed One,
   Look on thy beloved Son.

2. Turn from me thy gracious eyes
   To that bloody sacrifice,
   To the full atonement made,
   To the utmost ransom paid;

3. To the blood that speaks above,
   Calls for thy forgiving love;
   To the tokens of his death,
   Here exhibited beneath.

4. Hear his blood’s prevailing cry;
   Let thy bowels then reply:
   Then through him the sinner see;
   Then in Jesus look on me.  

50 Compare the hymn by William Bright (1824-1901):

   1. And now, O Father, mindful of the love
      That bought us, once for all, on Calvary’s tree,
      And having with us him that pleads above,
      We here present, we here spread forth to thee
Hymn 121

888.888

1. Father, behold thy favourite Son,
   The glorious partner of thy throne,
   For ever plac’d at thy right hand;
   O look on thy Messiah’s face,
   And seal the covenant of thy grace
   To us who in thy Jesus stand.

2. To us thou hast redemption sent,
   And we again to thee present
   The blood that speaks our sins forgiven;
   That sprinkles all the nations round:
   And now thou hear’st the solemn sound
   Loud echoing through the courts of heaven.

3. The cross on Calvary he bore;
   He suffer’d once to die no more,
   But left a sacred pledge behind:
   So here! – It on thy altar lies,
   Memorial of the sacrifice
   He offer’d once for all mankind.

4. Father, the grand oblation see,
   The death as present now with thee
   As when he gasp’d on earth. Forgive!
   Answer, and show the curse remov’d;

That only offering perfect in thine eyes.
The one true, pure, immortal sacrifice.

2. Look, Father, look on his anointed face,
   And only look on us as found in him;
   Look not at our misusings of thy grace,
   Our prayer so languid, and our faith so dim.
   For, lo! between our sins and our reward
   We set the passion of thy Son our Lord.
Accept us in the well-belov’d,
And bid thy world of rebels live.
Theologies of the Eucharist II
The Anglican Tradition

6. Usages and Eucharistical Sacrifice

[1. The Non-juror (Usager) Liturgy of 1718]

[2. John Johnson of Cranbrook, The Unbloody Sacrifice and Altar, Unveiled and Supported (1714) (selections)]


[4. Scots Liturgy 1764]

5. AmerBCP 1789: “The Order for the Administration of the Lord’s Supper, or Holy Communion”
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To understand what animated the Usages Controversy and the debate over “the eucharistical sacrifice” in the Anglican tradition during the opening decades of the eighteenth century, we need to review the political as well as the ecclesiastical history of Britain in the last half of the seventeenth century. For the life of the Church of England was so thoroughly enmeshed and entangled with the secular politics of the Restoration and its aftermath that our Readings will make no sense without some knowledge of those entanglements.

1. Charles II had returned in 1660 to the pealing of the nation’s church-bells and a tidal wave of popular rejoicing. The Restoration did indeed have a lot in common with a Royal Wedding, and its honeymoon-period lasted longer than most. By 1667, however, the bloom was off the rose. There was a disastrously mismanaged naval war with Holland, which saw a Dutch fleet sail with impunity up the Thames to within sight of London’s steeples; that same year (1665) the populations of London and other cities were ravaged by bubonic plague;¹ and in the following year came the Great Fire of London. Charles and his government were not responsible for the latter two catastrophes; Charles himself and his brother James, Duke of York, showed exemplary presence of mind, courage, and leadership during the Great Fire. But superstition finds it all too easy to impute guilt by association; and the mere fact that Charles sat on the throne when these disasters befell made a good many of his subjects wonder if God were not punishing the nation for his sins. Oliver Cromwell may have committed the heinous sin of regicide; but the people remembered that “Old Noll” had never let the Dutch navy trounce and humiliate England – that, on the contrary, he had made England a power that trounced all its enemies, for the first time since Gloriana’s glorious reign. As Shakespeare had Henry V say on the morn of Agincourt, old men forgot, but they remembered with

¹ This turned out to be the last bubonic pandemic in Britain; nobody at the time, of course, could have known that it would be so.
advantages what deeds their compatriots did in Oliver’s day and their great-grandparents had done in Elizabeth’s.

Charles was hardly without sin. Most of his subjects had no notion how very corrupt the royal court was, but the ruling elites were by turns distressed, titillated, and seduced by its sybaritic cynicism. Charles himself is chiefly remembered as an assiduous lecher. His sexual voracity did not trouble the elites; it was his preference for Frenchwomen, almost all of whom were agents of Louis XIV’s ambassadors, that worried his courtiers and his best servants in government. It got worse. Beginning in the late 1660s, Charles and his most senior ministers were kept men, receiving large (and secret) cash subsidies from Louis XIV in return for English support of Louis’s policies, even to the extent of making English sailors and ships fight a third war with Holland (1672). At the time, very few outside the innermost circle at court knew that their own King was in the pocket of the King of France. Those who had dealings with Charles on government business, like the diarist Samuel Pepys (1633-1703) at the Navy Office, did not regard the King’s dalliances as his worst sin. It was his indolence. As a ruler, Charles never did today what he could put off until... whenever. He was a past-master of postponement.

This trait made the King look feckless; and a cabal of nobles, led by the Earl of Shaftesbury, counted on it when, in the late 1670s, they made their move. Shaftesbury himself had first come to prominence in Oliver’s day, and he had never renounced the republican ideals that Noll’s dictatorship had frustrated. Charles’s treasonous complicity with Louis XIV was known to Shaftesbury; but he had bigger fish to fry. He wanted to discredit the monarchy, not just Charles Stuart. His chance came when the murdered body of Sir Geoffrey Kneller, a magistrate, was discovered in London. The crime remains unsolved to this day; but Shaftesbury and his cabal moved quickly to pin it on the Roman Catholic community, as yet another and definitive proof of “The Popish Plot”. In this they were aided by the evidence of a defrocked clergyman of the Church of England named Titus Oates. His kind has become all too familiar in the modern world: he was a congenital liar who invented evidence in order to attract attention to himself and gain celebrity, if not power. Shaftesbury and the “Whig” cabal turned him into a professional perjurer, and his sworn testimony sent a dozen innocent men to the scaffold or the gallows as conspirators in a Popish Plot to murder the King. Oates alleged that Kneller
had been terminated with extreme prejudice because he had learned of the plot and was on his way to spill the beans.

True to form, Charles postponed taking any action; he seems to have thought that the less he did, the sooner the whole affair would blow over. But it did not; the Whig cabal made sure of that, and by the end of 1678 the affair had metastasized into mass-hysteria. The cabal then revealed its hand. It sought nothing less than to disrupt the succession of the Crown.

Although Charles had begotten several male children by various mistresses, he had carelessly forgotten to beget any child by his wife and consort, Catherine of Braganza. So his brother James, Duke of York, stood as heir-apparent. James was a walking constitutional crisis, for the simple reason that he had converted to Roman Catholicism sometime around 1672. He had made no secret of his Romanism, but neither had he flaunted it; on the contrary, he had taken great care not to interfere with the religion of his two daughters by his first wife, Mary and Anne, both of whom had been raised in the Church of England. But James’s discretion – to say nothing of his personal courage in battle and his abilities as Lord High Admiral of England – mattered not a whit. Shaftesbury’s clients in the House of Commons introduced a statute which not only excluded James by name from the succession but also claimed that it was Parliament’s right to settle the succession on whomever it pleased.

The Exclusion Crisis, as came to be called, threatened the dynastic principle and “the divine right of kings”. Even more to the point, it threatened the Stuart family, which three centuries before the current Royal Family regarded itself as “The Firm”. This combination of threats finally moved Charles to action; and it triggered all of his ruthlessness as a survivor. He mobilised the country gentry, committed Royalists almost to a man. Meanwhile, William Sancroft, Archbishop of Canterbury, took it upon himself to mobilise the clergy.

2.

It was during the 1670s that historic labels – “Tory” and “High Church,” “Latitudinarian” or “Broad Church” – first became descriptive of actual parties in Church and State. (Use of such labels to talk about earlier stages in the history of the English Church is egregious anachronism.) The etymology of the label “Tory” is obscure, but its meaning was not: “Tory” meant not just a political and social
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conservatism but a commitment to the Monarchy and in practical politics active, whatever-it-takes support for the Royal Court and its interests.2

“Latitudinarian” – the original label was “Latitude-men,” which subsequently morphed into “Broad-Churchmen” – referred to those divines of the Church of England who wished Church and State to adopt the widest possible “latitude” or breadth – today we would call it “inclusivity” – in doctrine, liturgy, and polity, to accommodate Protestant Dissenters, the sects which refused to accept episcopacy and the Prayer Book, that they might return to the fold of the Established (and national) Church.

The “High-Church” party asserted the divine origin and constitution of the Church of England as the one and only Catholic Church in England.3 On this ground, High-churchmen claimed unique and exclusive rights for the Established Church and its hierarchy. It was not that the Royal Supremacy vested by Parliament in the Crown granted these privileges to the Church, so much as that the Crown merely recognised and enforced privileges which inhered and belonged exclusively to the Church and its hierarchy jure divino, “by divine right”. Such a position made “right-thinking churchmen” view Latitudinarians as little different from Dissenters of whatever ilk – as abominations of desolation, as traitors to God and His Church.

2 In the strict sense, therefore, neither Margaret Thatcher nor Stephen Harper can be called Tories, except in the same twice-removed sense that many Anglo-Catholics can be called episcopalians. Anglo-Catholics assert the necessity of episcopacy in the apostolic succession, but on the whole have no use for bishops in particular. Just so, Mrs Thatcher and Mr Harper are Conservatives who tended, and tend, to treat the Monarchy as a constitutional nuisance to be endured rather than as a political reality to be treasured.

3 In the Restoration era, the High-church “Anglican” claim to be the “one holy catholic and apostolic Church” was not confined to England alone; it was able to take in the whole of the British Isles. For both the established Church of Scotland and the established Church of Ireland were (once again) “Anglican” churches, with bishops and the English Prayer Book. (The Church of Ireland had its own Prayer Book of 1604, which was all but identical with EngBCP 1559; the “restored” Church of Scotland used EngBCP 1662.)
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Traitors, too, to the King. For it was one of the paradoxes of High-churchmanshio that it paired, and even identified, a doctrine of the Church *jure divino* with a doctrine of monarchy *jure divino*, “the divine right of kings”. According to this doctrine, Charles II was the Lord’s Anointed. He did not rule by consent of Parliament, much less by the consent of his subjects. He held his sovereign authority and power directly from Almighty God, who had chosen and appointed him to rule England, Scotland, Ireland, and his Dominions beyond the Seas.4 The High-Church party – which in Charles’s time and for more than a century afterwards comprised the overwhelming majority of clergy in the Church of England – proclaimed as gospel the scriptural admonition, “Fear God, and honour the King.” In fact, the two terms were proclaimed as identical – a subject of the Crown did not fear God truly unless he or she honoured the King. And in High-Church teaching, honouring the King meant obeying the King in all matters, without question. This teaching was enshrined in the doctrine of Passive Obedience to the King – a doctrine which came as close as the Church of England has ever come, then or since, to promulgating an infallible dogma necessary to salvation.

3.

Charles sent his brother to Scotland, to be his Viceroy there – and to get him out of the way. James, though a Romanist, used his vice-regal powers to the uttermost in support of the Scots bishops against the Presbyterian “covenanter”; he thus earned the undying, yet ultimately fatal, allegiance of Scottish “Anglicans”. Meanwhile, in England, Charles used his network of gentry and clergy to undermine the Whig cabal. In 1680 he struck; Shaftesbury and Co. were destroyed as completely as politics ever allows. At the time, it looked as if Charles had fully and finally avenged his father’s execution.

---

4 In Charles’s day, these included the American colonies of Massachusetts Bay, Plimoth Plantation, New Hampshire, Connecticut, Rhode Island, New Jersey, New York (Nieuw Nederland until 1667; the conquest of the Dutch colony was Britain’s only success in the Third Dutch War), Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, and Carolina (later separated into North and South Carolina); in the Caribbean, Jamaica and the Bahamas; and in the Canadian Arctic, the “factories” (trading-posts) of the Hudson’s Bay Company.
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Vengeance is sweet, but in politics it is almost always short-lived. In this case it lasted less than a decade. Charles died in 1685, at the age of fifty-two. The Duke of York succeeded him as James II. Planning his coronation caused several exalted personages to fret, because James’s conscience would not let him receive the Sacrament at the celebration of the Eucharist which is supposed to crown the Coronation ceremony.\(^5\) But accommodations were made, and the ceremony went without a hitch.

Soon afterwards, however, James and his government had to deal with two armed rebellions, one in Scotland, the other in England. The Earl of Argyll, whose father had been tried and executed for his part in the Civil Wars, returned from exile and attempted to “raise the clans”; he had little success with his own clan, the Campbells, less with the other clan-chiefetains, and in short order lost his head on the block at Edinburgh. The other rebellion, led by James, Duke of Monmouth, posed – or seemed to pose – a greater threat to the government. Monmouth was one of Charles II’s bastard offspring; he was beautiful, charming, feckless, and a fool. He let dangerous adventurers convince him that he had a better title to the Crown than his uncle, because he was Charles’s natural son and, more to the point, a Protestant. These same adventurers managed to scrounge up a rabble of aggrieved farmers and labourers, which for a few weeks wreaked havoc in southwestern England. James’s bacon was saved by Sir John Churchill,\(^6\) who annihilated Monmouth’s rabble at the battle of Sedgemoor. Monmouth’s troops were summarily

---

\(^5\) The Coronation Eucharist has been the one and only time that the Monarch is seen to take communion in public – though in the Coronation Eucharist no one else is allowed to receive the Sacrament, apart from the Monarch’s consort, the Archbishops of Canterbury and York, and the Bishop of Durham, the three ministers of the coronation itself.

\(^6\) Later to be created Duke of Marlborough on account of his spectacular victory at Blenheim (1704) in the War of the Spanish Succession. Marlborough and his Duchess, the indomitable Sarah, had but one child who survived, a daughter. She married a son of Earl Spencer; the marriage contract stipulated that the Honourable Mr Spencer hyphenate his name, and that as Spencer-Churchill he should inherit the dukedom. Winston Leonard Spencer Churchill – the Winston Churchill – was a direct descendent of the first Duke through this marriage. He wrote a four volume celebratory biography of Marlborough (1933-1939).
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hanged or sentenced to “transportation,” that is, sent to the West Indies and sold into slavery. Monmouth himself was captured, tried, and sent to the block; he did not make a courageous death.

In private James II was affable and generous, and those in the upper reaches of government found him considerate, a friend of efficiency, and (what could never have been said of his brother) loyal to those who served him loyally. But in public he studied to be what the Prayer Book called him, “our Dread Sovereign Lord the King”; none of his subjects ever thought to call him, as they had called his brother, “the Merry Monarch”. Charles II had learned the easy charm and, when pushed into a corner, the ruthless cynicism necessary to win that ultimate reality-show, Royal Survivalist; James II had learned merely to be stubborn. This made him the most politically maladroit monarch ever to have sat on the English throne and worn the crown of the three British kingdoms.

James had an agenda. First, he wanted to end the English court’s subservience to French interests into which his brother had betrayed it. Secondly, he wanted to rehabilitate his Romanist co-religionists as full members of English civil and political life. Both were honourable policies; each required political skills of exquisite finesse. Finesse was not James’s strong suit. His clumsy diplomacy alienated Louis XIV; his handling of “Catholic emancipation” alienated the bishops of the Church of England.

Charles II had launched a Declaration of Indulgence in 1672, by which he suspended the enforcement of the Penal Laws against Roman Catholics and Protestant Non-conformists. Early in the following year, the House of Commons passed a resolution – not a statute – which denied that the King had any right or power to suspend Statutes of the Realm. Charles withdrew his Declaration rather than endure the political hassle. On his accession twelve years later, James chose to regard the Commons resolution as a non-binding slip of paper. But he moved with unwonted caution. He suspended the Penal Laws on an individual, case-by-case basis, mainly in the way of commissioning various Romanists as army officers or commanding Oxford and Cambridge colleges (those of royal foundation) to elect Romanists as Fellows. This practice caused a measure of

7 This episode became the basis of Raphael Sabatini’s historical novel Captain Blood – which in turn became the basis of the Warner Brothers film (1935) which made Errol Flynn a star.
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Squinty-eyed suspicion in the political nation, but nothing like the bloody-minded outcry which had killed the Indulgence of 1672. So James decided to take the next step. In February 1687 he issued a Declaration of Indulgence in Scotland; a month later, he informed his English Privy Council that it was his will to do the same in England. James realised, honourably as well as practically, that he could not grant toleration to Romanists without relieving the disabilities suffered by the Protestant sects. He also went out of his way to consult and rally the leaders of the Protestant sects. Many of them embraced his proposal with enthusiasm. James chose not to consult Archbishop Sancroft and the bishops of the Church of which he was (at least nominally) the Supreme Governor; he chose simply to inform them of his decision. The Declaration of Indulgence, decreeing that “the execution of all penal laws... in matters ecclesiastical be suspended,” was issued on 4 April 1687. James hoped this to be an interim measure, until such time – in his sanguine view, the near future – as Parliament repealed the Penal Laws altogether.

The response of the political and ecclesiastical elites disappointed the King. So in July he dismissed Parliament and issued writs for a general election. He also instructed his agents to make sure that the new Parliament would be “packed” with MPs to his liking. The campaign was botched and became a public-relations disaster for the regime; the election returned a Parliament almost the same as the one before. James compounded the disaster by inaugurating a wholesale purge of the county commissions of the peace,8 almost all of whose members were High-Church Tories, the very people who had ensured Charles’s victory in the Exclusion Crisis.

Unlike his brother, James clearly thought that religious valour was the better part of political discretion. He decided

---

8 From the Middle Ages into the early nineteenth century, Britain had no nation-wide bureaucracy of civil servants. The Crown, as chief magistrate and executive, had to rely on the aristocracy and, especially, the gentry to administer government “on the ground”. The Commissions of the King’s Peace thus consisted of the major landowners in each of England’s counties; the Crown appointed them to act as Justices of the Peace in their own districts and, collectively as a “bench,” to enforce the Statutes of the Realm throughout their county. The Commissions constituted what we call local or municipal government.
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to ignore the results of the 1687 election and re-issue his Declaration of Indulgence. This time around, James added another twist. Exercising his prerogative as Supreme Governor of the Church of England, he commanded the bishops to instruct their diocesan clergy to read it from their pulpits.9

Archbishop Sancroft and most of the other English (and Scots) bishops were willing to turn a blind eye to measures which relieved Roman Catholics, so long as it were done discretely. Protestant Dissenters were another matter. For the bishops did not forget, and would not forgive, that a generation earlier Protestant “sectaries” had persecuted – and had come very close to burying – the Church of England. They saw no reason to indulge arrant schismatics.

James issued his order to the bishops on 4 May. Sancroft and six other bishops decided that obeying their conscience was the better part of passive obedience.10 They petitioned the King to allow them “liberty of conscience” – the very thing that James wished to give Romanists and Dissenters – on the matter. In effect, they refused to issue the Declaration. James knew that their refusal put the royal prerogative, and his own credibility, on the line. Of all the measures that he could have taken to discipline the recalcitrant bishops, he chose the harshest and most public – the one which in politics most resembled “the Dead Man’s Hand” in poker, where the gambler plays a winning set of cards, only to lose the game of life. James ordered the Seven Bishops to be charged with sedition, that is, with the crime of conspiring among themselves, and of counselling others, to overthrow the government; those convicted of sedition were liable to a range of punishments, from death to physical mutilation to imprisonment “at the King’s pleasure”. On 8 June all seven were arrested and imprisoned in the Tower of London. Their trial began on 29 June. To avoid public demonstrations, the government had them transported from the Tower to Westminster Hall by barge on the Thames, not through the

---

9 The royal mandate staggered the Declaration’s reading: it was to take place on 20 and 27 May 1688 in London, and on 3 and 10 June everywhere else.

10 The Seven Bishops were Sancroft of Canterbury, William Lloyd of St Asaph, Francis Turner of Ely, Thomas Ken of Bath and Wells, John Lake of Chichester, Thomas White of Peterborough, and John Trelawny of Bristol.
streets. It made no difference. The people of the City and its suburbs lined the river and threw up cheer upon cheer as the barges bearing the Seven passed by. Their trial did not last very long; before noon of the next day the jury returned a verdict of Not Guilty. When the Seven emerged from Westminster Hall a few hours later, their coaches were mobbed by thousands upon thousands of cheering well-wishers, many weeping for joy, many trying to touch the bishops’ garments or holding up children to receive their blessing. It was, in short, an unmitigated fiasco for James II.

The Seven Bishops had no agenda to pursue beyond their High-church principles – which, however sore they might feel, forbade them even to entertain the notion of overthrowing him who was, by the Grace of God, their dread sovereign Lord and King. Others were not so loyal or so orthodox in their imaginations, but their opposition had remained little more than a scouting of “what-ifs” voiced sotto voce in the corners of great houses.

In June 1688, however, just before the Seven Bishops went to trial, the Queen – James’s second wife, Mary of Modena – gave birth to a healthy male heir, whom the happy couple named after his father. The prospect of a Romanist line of succession brought together a cabal of six English lords and one bishop, Compton of London, whose design was to overthrow James but not the monarchy. They appealed to the King’s son-in-law, William, Prince of Orange and Statholder (Head of State) of the United Provinces of the Netherlands, to invade England. William obliged. In September a Dutch fleet landed a small Dutch army which, though all but unopposed, set up camp and awaited events. James and his government had been taken totally by surprise. The King scurried to gather support. He even appealed to Sancroft. The archbishop, however, gave him a coolly non-committal reply. James panicked and attempted to flee England; his boat ran into difficulties off the east coast, and an English fishing-smack rescued him – then promptly turned him over to William’s forces. The situation was just too fraught with embarrassment for everybody, so William had his people “facilitate” his father-in-law’s escape to France by alternative means. Parliament decided that James’s flight constituted abdication, and offered the Crown to William
Introduction

and his wife Mary conjointly. 11 “Orange Billy” graciously accepted the offer on behalf of them both.

Whig historians from Gilbert Burnet in the early eighteenth century to George Macaulay Trevelyan and Winston Churchill in the mid-twentieth century would celebrate the accession of William and Mary as “the Glorious Revolution”. It was, in fact, merely a coup d’état papered over with legislative legerdemain, a military gamble which the winners made legal after the fact.

One of the more important legalities was the Oath of Allegiance to the new Sovereigns by name. All who held office were required to take the Oath. This included not only Members of Parliament, civil servants, and magistrates. It also included the clergy of the Established Church, from the Archbishop of Canterbury down to the lowliest curate in the most godforsaken hole-in-the-wall parish in the kingdom. Sancroft had eased the success of the Orange coup d’état by refusing to lend James the unprecedented popularity and prestige that he and the other bishops enjoyed. But the new Oath of Allegiance put him and several other bishops in an acute quandary. They had sworn allegiance to James on his accession in 1685; and James was still alive, insisting that he had not abdicated, that he was still the one and only rightful King of England, Scotland, and Ireland. If the bishops took the Oath of Allegiance to William and Mary, Sancroft and others believed, they would be forswearing themselves, going back on their word given not only to James but also to God. Sancroft and eight other bishops decided that conscience left them no option but to refuse the new Oath. 12 When the

11 Mary II, being a Stuart, guaranteed the dynastic legitimacy of William III. She and her sister Anne were James’s daughters by his first wife Anne, daughters of Charles II’s chancellor, Edward Hyde, Earl of Clarendon.

William, a gay man officially in the closet, physically and emotionally abused his consort everywhere but in bed; they had no children. The respective Parliaments of the three kingdoms therefore settled the succession on Anne, in the event of the surviving co-regnant monarch’s death. Mary II died in 1695; Henry Purcell produced one of his most gorgeous choral compositions for her State Funeral. William died in 1702. A horse he was riding reared and literally crushed his balls on the saddle’s pillion; this led to a fatal infection and Anne’s succession.

12 The nine non-juring Bishops were: Sancroft of Canterbury, Ken of Bath and Wells, Turner of Ely, White of Peterborough, Lake of
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Oath was presented to them, each of the nine declared, in Latin, *Non juror*, “I will not swear.” Some 400 clergymen, and well over a thousand laymen, followed their example.

William’s advisers saw that the Non-juror bishops still basked in popular opinion as heroes of the Protestant Faith. That made their refusal of the Oath a ticklish matter for the Crown. It also made getting them on side – or neutralising them – essential. The ministers of the Crown bent over backwards in their efforts to make it possible for the Archbishop and his eight colleagues to take the Oath, even to the extent of offering them secret codicils which would have allowed them to swear the Oath for the public record while giving them an “out” – to take the Oath in public, but “with reservations” in private which in effect would have negated the public act. Sancroft and his colleagues were honourable as well as moral men; they were also obdurate in their non-juring. In the end, they left the Williamite government no choice. The Statutes of the Realm were clear: No oath, no office. Toward the end of 1690 Parliament passed an Act which set a deadline for the bishops to juror the Oath or else be deprived of their sees. Bishops Thomas of Worcester and Cartwright of Chester died before the deadline passed. The remaining non-juror bishops – now once again restored to 1688’s heroical number of Seven – stood by their allegiance to James. They also stood by their High-Church conviction that they held their diocesan jurisdictions *jure divino*, directly from God and not by right of the Crown in Parliament. The deadline passed, and on 1 February 1691 the Seven were formally deprived; the Crown forthwith appointed new, Oath-taking bishops to the seven sees. Most of “the deprived Fathers” departed with dignity, if not in silence; Ken, for instance, read a protest from the episcopal throne in Wells Cathedral, then retired entirely from public life. Lloyd of Norwich caused rather more of a ruckus and had to be “escorted” out of the episcopal palace.

None of the Seven Bishops renounced their claim to be the bishop *jure divino* of their respective dioceses. Such a claim meant, of course, that their successors were usurpers – and that any other bishop, any priest or deacon, any layperson who accepted a usurping bishop’s jurisdiction was in schism.

Chichester (five of the Seven Bishops of 1688), William Lloyd of Norwich (not to be confused with the Lloyd of St Asaph who had been one of the Seven), Ralph Frampton of Gloucester, William Thomas of Worcester, and Thomas Cartwright of Chester.
It also implied that the Seven Deprived Fathers constituted the “true” Church of England. In 1692 Sancroft, knowing that his death was near (he died early the following year), chose to act on this implication. He delegated his right as Primate of All England to consecrate new bishops to Lloyd of Norwich, in order that the Non-juror line – in his and Lloyd’s view, the alone only guarantor of the Apostolic Succession in England – might continue. Two years later, after the conge d’élire (“instruction to elect”) required by the Act of Supremacy had been obtained from the exiled James II, Lloyd consecrated George Hickes, formerly Dean of Worcester, as “Suffragan” Bishop of Thetford, and Thomas Wagstaffe as “Suffragan” Bishop of Ipswich. These two consecrations marked the real beginning of the Non-juror schism – which the Non-jurors themselves, of course, did not consider schism at all.

In private Thomas Ken deplored Sancroft’s decision and, still more, Lloyd’s use of the delegated power, but said nothing in public out of loyalty to Sancroft’s memory. Many other Non-jurors felt the same way. James II died in 1701, still in French exile; and his death, some argued, freed the Non-jurors of their oath of allegiance to his person. The usurper William III remained a problem for them; but he died the following year and was succeeded by James’s second daughter Anne. The new Queen was Stuart pure laine; the claim of her step-brother, James “III,” trumped her own solely on the fact that he was a male and she a female. But Anne trumped her step-brother on the fact that she was a genuinely devout Anglican of decidedly High-church views. Indeed, from the very start of her reign, Anne made bringing the Non-jurors back into the communion of the Church of which she was Supreme Governor, one of her dearest aims. Her royal will did not have to wait very long. In 1704 Thomas Ken resigned his claim to be the true bishop of Bath and Wells and once again received the blessed Sacrament at the hands of ministers of the established Church. The example of one so widely honoured for his holiness of life, his political integrity, and his moral courage did much to ease the consciences of those Non-jurors for whom separation from the Church of England was a cause of grief, not a reason for pride and pride’s festering grievance. Ken’s example contributed to the decision of Robert Nelson, a Non-juring layman who was the C. S. Lewis of his day, to be reconciled – and to use his caché to convince the overwhelming majority of Non-juror lay-folk to follow him back into the communion of the established Church. This was in 1710. Ken died on 22
March of the following year. Queen Anne died three years later. His love for the peace of the Church, and her private wish and royal will to make that peace, had all but won the day.

There yet remained a body of irreconcilable Non-jurors. This remnant considered Anne to be just as much a usurper as William and Mary. For, they believed, the Oath of Allegiance that they had given to James II required them to transfer their allegiance to his son James III, “the King across the water,” in exile with his courtiers, a gaggle of disgruntled fantasists, at the palace of St Germain-des-Pres just outside Paris.

The Non-juror remnant in England might have died out due to the natural attrition of human mortality, had Anne’s only child (by her consort George of Denmark) been able to survive her. But the Prince of Wales died of a virus at the age of sixteen. By parliamentary statute, therefore, Anne was succeeded in 1714 by George, the Elector of Hannover.13 His accession gave the Non-jurors new blood and another generation of life.

4.

In Scotland, the situation was simpler and the result more draconian.

As part of the Restoration settlement, episcopacy was once again imposed on the Kirk, and EngBCP 1662 replaced the Presbyterian Book of Common Order. The Episcopalians who had survived the Covenanter purges of 1637-1639, the Scots Civil War, and the English occupation decided that it was pay-back time for the Presbyterians. They used their restored power to enforce a policy of retribution and brutal repression. Hard-core Presbyterians responded – this is to say, resisted – in kind. The following two decades in Scotland were little more than a blood-feud – in sunnier though no

---

13 George I was a Guelph – that was the Royal Family’s name until Queen Victoria married Albert of Saxe-Cobourg-Gotha in 1841 (George V changed the family name to Windsor in 1917, to show its solidarity with the British war-effort against Germany). George I did have Stuart blood. His mother Sophia, who would have succeeded Anne if she had not predeceased her by a year, was the only surviving child of Elizabeth, the daughter of James I; because Elizabeth had married Frederick, Prince of the Rhineland and, ever so briefly, King of Bohemia, she was “the Winter Queen of Bohemia”. George was thus Anne’s first cousin at two removes. He was also (officially) a Lutheran.
more enlightened climes known as *vendetta* – between ecclesiastical “clans”.

The Orange coup d’état brought the wheel of fortune full circle. Not just seven but all of the Scots bishops refused to renounce their allegiance to James II. So William cut a deal with the Presbyterian lords. In return for throwing their weight behind the Orangeist regime, the Crown let the Scots lords make the Kirk Presbyterian again.

From 1690 the re-Prebysterianised Kirk did all it could to ensure that the Episcopalians – in Scots parlance, “the Piskies” – paid the utmost penalties of a non-conformist sect. For instance, the Scots Parliament (Scotland being technically a separate kingdom until the Act of Union in 1707) banned Episcopalian clergy from conducting services of worship with more than five members of their congregation present *in the same room*. Piskies, like all persecuted groups, devised ruses which obeyed the letter of the law while subverting its spirit. An Episcopalian priest would celebrate the liturgy in one room with five of his congregation – but leave the door to the next room open, so that the rest of the congregation could hear the service. If the service were holy Communion, the congregation would move in and out of the room in clusters of five until all had received the Sacrament.

The Episcopal Church of Scotland was strongest in the Highlands and the Western Isles, where Piskies were second only to Roman Catholics in numbers of adherents. And they were strong in those districts because the clans of the Highlands and the Western Isles were Jacobite14 – that is, they gave their allegiance to “the King across the water”. But the Government assumed that each and every Episcopalian, wherever he or she lived, must be a Jacobite and therefore, by definition, a traitor. That is why the civil authorities (and agents of the Williamite/Presbyterian clan-chieftains) so ruthlessly enforced the penal laws against the Piskies. It became a vicious cycle. The Government persecuted the Piskies for being Jacobites, so a good many Piskies gave aid and comfort to the Jacobite rebellions of 1715 and 1745-46 – and then, in the wake of each rebellion’s defeat, the whole

14 “James,” as in James II and his son James III, is the English form of the name “Jacob”.
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Episcopalian community suffered a spasm of yet more intensive and brutal persecution.\(^{15}\)

Everywhere they lived as an underground organisation, in more or less isolated pockets.

The Piskies did not have even a single liturgy. During the reign of Queen Anne (1702-1714), English High-churchmen took pity on their persecuted brethren north of the Tweed and shipped crates and crates of EngBCP 1662 to them. This PrayerBookAid worked for Episcopalian parishes in Edinburgh, Glasgow, and the larger Lowland towns. It hardly supplied Piskies in the Highlands and the Isles. There, Episcopalian clergy and people relied on they called “wee bookies” – pamphlet-liturgy, sometimes printed but far more commonly hand-written. Some of these wee-bookie liturgies were the ephemeral inventions of clergy struggling to remember how the liturgy had been done in Good King Charles II’s Golden Time. But other wee bookies were nothing other than copies of the Communion Order of ScotsBCP 1637. There is no way of knowing how widespread its use in this wee-bookie form. Copies of the 1637 Book itself were also in circulation; enough have survived to the present

\(^{15}\) The second of these two Jacobite rebellions, known in Scotland as “The '45,” has received far more historical attention for a number of reasons. First of all, the '45 “rising of the clans” got further than the 1715 uprising; it actually defeated British forces in Scotland and crossed the border into England, before retreating again into Scotland, where the Jacobite army was annihilated at Culloden (1746). Secondly, it was led by Bonnie Prince Charlie – Charles Edward, the eldest son of James III. In 1745 the Bonnie Prince was a young man whose feckless, foolish, incompetent, and finally pusillanimous leadership became the stuff of Romanticism’s love of Lost Causes. Prince Charlie survived the debacle and made it back to his father’s court in France. His escape was the third reason why “The '45” made the history books. The fourth was the fate of the Highland clans: the Hannoverian regime sought to destroy the power of the clan-chieftains by “the Highland clearances” – by deporting the people of the Scots Highlands to America, whether or not they had taken up arms in the rebellion.

The Bonnie Prince produced no legitimate children. Neither did his younger brother Henry, who became a priest and eventually a cardinal of the Roman Catholic church. The Stuart dynasty was deemed to have expired when Henry died (of natural causes) in 1801.
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day to suggest that not a few survived the debacle of 1637 in private hands. Given the choice between a freshly imported and spanking new copy of EngBCP 1662, and a copy of Scots BCP 1637 bearing the stains of a century’s neglect and concealment, Episcopalian clergy seem to have preferred the latter just because it was Scots – and not Presbyterian.

By 1764 the Episcopal Church of Scotland had moved so far beyond the improvisations of a community under persecution that it was able to devise and adopt a common liturgy. But though it replaced the 1637 Communion Order, the latter rite served as a bridge. It gave the Episcopal Church of Scotland a continuity with its own liturgical past which English Non-jurors of the “Usager” faction did not possess when devising their liturgies of 1718 and 1734. For the 1637 Scots Communion Order not only renewed the link with EngBCP 1549; it also provided, through its Prayer of Consecration’s indebtedness to 1549, a direct and living link with the ancient Greek anaphoras which had all but exclusive authority as models of liturgical prayer for the architects of ScotsLiturgy 1764 as well as for the English Usager Non-jurors. The Usagers felt compelled to create new texts; the Scots Episcopalians had only to renew and revise what had been the actual lex orandi (“law of praying”) of their underground life and worship.

Something more than incipient Scottish nationalism governed the survival of the Scots Communion Order of 1637, and the revival of its use in various parts of the Episcopal Church of Scotland after 1690. It served as a bridge between EngBCP 1549 and the Scots (Episcopalian) Liturgy of 1764. For the Episcopal Church of Scotland – the Piskies – more than survived persecution; it recovered a common mind through forging a common eucharistic liturgy which moved beyond, even as it preserved, ScotsBCP 1637.

*  
The majority of Readings in this section come from W. Jardine Grisbrooke’s Anglican Liturgies of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries (Alcuin Club Collections No. XL, London: SPCK, 1958) – the Non-Juror liturgy of 1718, and the Scots liturgy of 1764, together with Grisbrooke’s historical-theological “commentary” on each of them. In addition, there is Daniel Waterland’s Distinctions of Sacrifice (1740), a statement by a conservative theologian highly critical of the Non-jurors and higher-flying High churchmen.
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Jardine Grisbrooke, the editor of *Anglican Liturgies of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, was the sort of person that the English call “difficult” – eccentric, yes, but without any of the winsome dottiness that the English like their eccentrics to display. He did not bear fools gladly or in any other way; and he made it clear, both in print and in private, that he regarded all but a handful of other scholars as fools and ignoramuses. His unwillingness to bear fools eventually came to embrace the entire Church of England. This led him to go beyond the *sobornost*16 that a sector of eighteenth-century Non-jurors had sought with the Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople. Grisbrooke became a member of the Greek Orthodox Church in Britain.

Nevertheless, in his chosen specialty, the history of the Non-juror movement, Grisbrooke’s scholarship was impeccable and his judgements all but impregnable. That is why I have included in this set of Readings not only his (modernised) versions of the 1718 Non-juror/Usager liturgy, and the 1764 Scots Communion Order, but also his introductory “commentaries” on each of these texts.

Grisbrooke’s “commentary” on the 1718 Non-juror/Usager liturgy is especially valuable because it sets that liturgy, and the so-called Usager Controversy within the Non-juror schism, in its historical-theological context. In particular, Grisbrooke takes account of – and gives extended quotations from – John Johnson of Cranbrook’s *The Unbloody Sacrifice and Altar* (1714, 1718).17

Johnson of Cranbrook (1662-1725) was not a Non-Juror; he took the oath of allegiance to William and Mary in 1689, then to Anne in 1702, then to George I in 1714. But he spoke

---

16 A Russian term which means something like “unity-in-diversity and diversity-in-unity”. In the early twentieth century it was the watchword of those Anglo-Catholics who wished to bring about intercommunion between the Church of England and the Eastern Orthodox churches. The Russian term was adopted because, at the time, many in Britain considered the Tsarist Empire and the British Empire to be “cousins,” just as Edward VII and his son George V were cousins of Tsar Nicholas II of Russia. (In fact, George and Nicholas looked like twins separated at birth.)

17 Johnson (1662-1724) became Vicar of Cranbrook, Kent, in 1710. At the time he was called “Johnson of Cranbrook,” as if his parish were part of his surname, in order to distinguish him from the dozens of other clergymen in the Church of England named John Johnson.
for that large sector of High-churchmen within the Established Church who sympathised with the Non-jurors and regarded them as immeasurably more “sound” than their own bench of bishops. His work on “the eucharistical sacrifice” had great influence on the Usager party of Non-jurors. That is why Grisbrooke pays so much attention to it.

Queen Anne had stacked the bench with High-churchmen. George I’s ministers set about stacking the bench with bishops with Whiggish connexions, which at the time invariably meant “Low” or “Broad” churchmanship. The overwhelming majority of English clergy in parishes and at the Universities (all Fellows at both Oxford and Cambridge had to take Holy Orders) were High-church and Tory.

This state of affairs had constitutional consequences. The Church of England has two ecclesiastical provinces, Canterbury and York. From the Middle Ages, each province had its own Convocation, which acted for the Church and its clergy much as Parliament acted for the political nation. (The Convocations usually convened at the same time as Parliament.) The Upper House of each Convocation consisted of all the bishops in the province; the Lower House, of representatives of all other clergy.

In 1717, the Lower Houses of both Convocations moved to condemn the Bishop of Bangor, Benjamin Hoadly, for heresy. (He had preached a series of sermons which advocated arrant Deism.) Hoadly, however, was a favourite of George I. So George, as Supreme Governor of the Church, issued a Royal Writ which prorogued (adjourned) both Convocations sine die. The Convocations thereafter met infrequently, with barely token attendance, to rubber-stamp decisions already made. The Convocation of Canterbury did not meet again as a truly legislative body exercising its constitutional rights in the governance of the Church until 1852; the Convocation of York, not until 1861.
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These two liturgies are separated by an ocean, a revolution, and 138 years, but they deserve to be paralleled because their very distances from one another marked a realignment of the Anglican consensus and a new basis of unity within the Communion.

In Readings 6 we had a look at the Scots “Piskie” Liturgy of 1764. At the time, it was an alone only exception in the English-speaking world to EngBCP 1662, as isolated in the nascent Anglican Communion as the Episcopal Church of Scotland was in its home and native land. AmerBCP 1790 broke that isolation; Proposed EngBCP 1928 turned the minority report of Scots and American Episcopalians into the majority report of Anglicanism.

In 1775, when the sporadic resistance of American colonists (especially in New England) to acts of the British Crown-in-Parliament became armed conflict, the Church of England in British North America was largely confined to the cities and towns of the seaboard colonies. There was not a single bishop resident in all the thirteen colonies, nor (for that matter) any diocese. Each and every parish of the Church of England in British North America was under the immediate jurisdiction of the bishop of London.

What is usually called the American Revolution changed all this. When the thirteen British colonies south of the 49th Parallel gained their independence in 1783, the Church of England in the

---

19 Historians debate just how revolutionary the American Revolution really was. At the “senior” levels of government there was indeed a revolution: a federal republic with a written constitution ordaining three co-equal branches of government (executive, legislative, judicial) replaced the British Crown in Parliament. But unlike the French or Russian revolutions, very little changed on the ground – the franchise remained limited to property-holders; slavery remained legal in all thirteen states; and the pre-revolutionary elites remained the post-revolutionary elites. “The American War” of 1775-1783 may thus prove the rule that mere rebellions, if they succeed, get romanticized as Revolutions after the fact.

20 Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and the northern shore of the Great Lakes (first called Upper Canada, then Ontario) remained British possessions. One of the several grudges which made New Englanders rebel against the Crown had been “the Quebec Act” (1767), which granted freedom of religion to Roman Catholics in all of French-speaking Canada. The rebels invaded Quebec in the winter of 1775-1776, partly with the hope
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United States found itself in a situation without precedent in the Anglican tradition. It was supposed to be governed by bishops, but had no bishops of its own; and it used a liturgy – EngBCP 1662 – whose text not only assumed but also enforced the Act of Uniformity and the Act of Supremacy. Long before the rebellion, both Acts had become dead letters even in those colonies (New York, New Jersey, Maryland, Virginia, the Carolinas, and Georgia) where the Church of England had been “as by Law Established”. Independence made the Prayer Book a problem – and, worse, an embarrassment.

The first embarrassment – being a bishopless episcopal church – got solved in a somewhat piecemeal, uncoordinated fashion. The “Anglican” clergy of Connecticut met in 1783 and elected not one but two candidates to seek consecration as bishop from the English bishops. The first candidate declined the honour and its attendant ardours; the second candidate, Samuel Seabury (1729-1796), a Loyalist clergyman who had served as a chaplain in the Royal Army during the rebellion, sailed for England. There the archbishops and bishops stonewalled his pleas for consecration. Their reason? The Act of Supremacy required all bishops to swear allegiance to the King; Seabury, a citizen of the United States, could not and would not swear the oath; therefore the English bishops could not and would not consecrate him. Seabury took advice and headed to Scotland. The bishops of the Episcopal Church did not live and move and have their being under the constraints of the Act of Supremacy; they negotiated a “concordat” with Seabury and consecrated him bishop of Connecticut on 14 November 1784. Two years later, when the bishops-elect of Pennsylvania and New York (William White and Samuel Provoost) sailed to England for consecration, the English episcopate had re-assessed their position and, dispensing with the oath of allegiance (by consent of the Supreme Governor of the Church of England), consecrated the candidates in February 1787.

That left the problem of the Prayer Book. Many in the newly independent Episcopal Church of the United States wanted as minimal a revision as possible – basically a political tidying which get rid of references to the King but leave everything else unchanged. Others wanted a far more extensive revision, one which would make the Prayer Book speak in the tongues of Enlightenment (and Deist) liberalism. And then there was Seabury. His concordat with the Scots bishops had contained this provision:

_________________________
of installing a less tolerant, Protestant colonial regime of their own. They also expected les Quebecois to welcome them as liberators. It was a bubble-brained scheme, and the invasion proved a miserable disaster. Americans do not like to remember it in their founding mythology, and the collective unconscious of les Quebecois has not forgotten it.
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As the celebration of the holy eucharist, or the administration of the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, is the principal bond of union among Christians, as well as the most solemn act of worship in the Christian Church, the bishops aforesaid agree in desiring that there may be as little variance here as possible. And though the Scottish bishops are very far from prescribing to their brethren in this matter, they cannot help ardently wishing that Bishop Seabury would endeavour all he can, consistently with peace and prudence, to make the celebration of this venerable mystery conformable to the most primitive doctrine and practice in that respect. Which is the pattern the Church of Scotland has copied after in her Communion Office; and which it has been the wish of some of the most eminent divines of the Church of England, that she also had more closely followed than she seems to have done since she gave up her first reformed liturgy used in the reign of King Edward VI – between which [EngBCP 1549] and the form used in the Church of Scotland there is no difference in any point which the primitive Church reckoned essential to the right ministration of the holy eucharist. In this capital article therefore of the eucharistic service, in which the Scottish bishops so earnestly wish for as much unity as possible, Bishop Seabury also agrees to take a serious view of the Communion Office recommended by them; and if found agreeable to the genuine standards of antiquity, to give his sanction to it and by gentle methods of argument and persuasion to endeavour, as they [the Scottish bishops] have done, to introduce it by degrees into practice, without the compulsion of authority on the one side or the prejudice of former custom on the other.

Seabury was true to his word and did indeed endeavour to introduce the Scots liturgy of 1764 into the American church – though he had trouble remembering to do so “by gentle methods of argument and persuasion”. At the first General Convention (1789) he only won his case for adopting a modified form of the Scots Prayer of Consecration by winning over William White (1747-1836), the bishop of Pennsylvania, one of the greatest – because most genuinely eirenic – ecclesiastical statesmen in the history of Anglicanism. General Convention authorized an American version of the Prayer Book whose Communion Order retained the structure and almost all of EngBCP 1662’s content except for the Prayer of Consecration, which honoured Seabury’s concordat with the Scots bishops. The new American Prayer Book, published in 1790, thus continued the Scots Episcopalian (and Non-juror) tradition of filtering the liturgical heritage of Catholic antiquity through the liturgical heritage of a Reformation church.

AmerBCP was revised in 1892, revised again in 1928, and totally reconstructed between 1969 and 1979. Thirty years on, most of those involved in the making of AmerBCP 1979 wish that
the process of revision had not been codified and closed quite so definitively. So ever since then ECUSA’s Standing Liturgical Commission has been “enriching” AmerBCP 1979 by means of “supplementary liturgical texts”. The most interesting – and for our purposes, the most relevant – feature of these “enrichments” is, that the new supplementary Eucharistic Prayers have all cleaved to the pattern of Scots 1764/AmerBCP 1790. ECUSA has not been re-inventing the wheel so much as re-designing its spokes.

I have spoken at some length in class about the circumstances which led the Church of England to revise its Prayer Book in the 1920s. The finished work went to the Church Assembly in 1927 and was approved by a commanding majority. Under the terms of the Act of Supremacy and the Act of Uniformity, the Revised BCP then had to be approved by Parliament. The enabling legislation passed easily in the Lords, but was defeated in the Commons. The Revision, with some slight modifications, was again brought before the Church Assembly in 1928, and again received a commanding majority – and again was defeated in the House of Commons. The two primates, Randall Davidson of Canterbury and Cosmo Gordon Lang of York, threw up their hands in disgust and issued plenary permission for clergy to alter EngBCP 1662 in accordance with the proposed revisions of 1928.21

The Revision did not supplant 1662; it simply inserted alternative forms and “permitted deviations” into 1662. Hence the title of the 1928 eucharistic rite, “An Alternative Order for the Administration of the Lord’s Supper”. So every community in the Church of England had a choice: it could use either the (unaltered) 1662 Order or the 1928 alternative Order. And the proposed alternative was itself full of alternative options, as you will see when you turn to the rite. Taken all in all, then, the proposed Revision signaled a recognition that the Act of Uniformity had become unworkable. The Church of England sought instead to enshrine the principle of diversity within the framework of the Prayer Book.

I could not possibly comment, but you may well think that, in effect, 1928 put new wine into an old wineskin (Matthew 9.17) – and the result was just what Jesus said it would be. Very few Anglicans could bring themselves to admit that the 1662 wineskin had burst, much less contemplate making an entirely new wineskin, until Dom Gregory Dix (1901-1952), that Benedictine enfant terrible of triumphal Anglo-Catholicism, published The Shape of the Liturgy in 1945. In the final chapter of this truly revolutionary work, Dix argued that the 1928 Revision had been misguided, wrong-headed, and perverse from start to finish, because it had

21 In practice, this usually meant that priest said the post-communion Prayer of Oblation immediately, without pause, after the Prayer of Consecration.
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tried to make Catholic silk out of the Cranmerian sow’s ear. It was, he said, “a thing unpossible”. He therefore urged the English Church to toss the Prayer Book baby out with the Reformation bath-water and start all over again from scratch. (I apologise for the commixture of metaphors.)

For Dix, “scratch” meant “the fourfold shape of the liturgy” that he had discovered. At the last supper, he argued, Jesus had performed seven distinct acts: he (1) took bread, (2) blessed it, (3) broke it, and (4) distributed it; then he (5) took the cup, (6) blessed it, and (7) gave it to his disciples. The Church subsequently streamlined these seven acts into four: (1) Offertory, (2) Consecration, (3) Fraction, and (4) Communion. Dix concluded that the Catholic Mass more truly represented what Jesus had done than the Reformers’ Abendmahlordnungen – including the Communion Order of the English Prayer Book.

Dix’s “fourfold shape” turned out to be the tipping-point of liturgical renewal in the Anglican tradition – and it had as great an influence on the reform of the Roman Rite which came out of Vatican II as Josef Jungmann’s Missarum Solemnia (1947). In a sense, the eucharistic liturgy of the Canadian Book of Alternative Services (1985) – both its “modern language” form and its “Form in the Language of the Book of Common Prayer 1962” – marks the victory of the Dixian “shape”.
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The Order for the Administration of the Lord’s Supper, or Holy Communion

Introductory Rubrics
Lord’s Prayer (optional)
Collect for Purity
Litany of the Ten Commandments
Summary of the Law (optional)
Prayer for Divine Help
Collect of the Day
Epistle & Gospel

Apostles’ or Nicene Creed
Notices & Sermon
Offertory with Sentences

Prayer for the Whole Estate of Christ’s Church Militant her in earth

Invitation (“Ye that do truly….”)
General Confession
Absolution
Comfortable Words

The Church of England 1928

An Alternative Order for the Administration of the Lord’s Supper, or Holy Communion

[Preparatory “Devotion” for Priest and People – optional]
Lord’s Prayer
Collect for Purity
Litany of the Ten Commandments or
Summary of the Law and/or Kyrie eleison

Collect of the Day (with salutation)
Epistle
Gospel (with acclamations)
Nicene Creed
Notices & Sermon
Offertory with Sentences
Rubrics regarding the preparation of the elements
The Intercession

Exhortation (“Dearly beloved in the Lord, ye that mind to come to the Holy Communion…”) (optional)
Invitation
General Confession
Absolution
Comfortable Words
Prayer of Humble Access
After which [Comfortable Words] the Priest shall proceed, saying,

Lift up your hearts.
Answer. We lift them unto the Lord.

Priest. Let us give thanks to our Lord God.
Answer. It is meet and right so to do.

Then shall the Priest turn to the Lord’s table, and say,

Priest. It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty, that we should at all times, and in all places, give thanks unto thee, O Lord, (‡ holy Father), almighty, everlasting God.

Here shall follow the proper Preface, according to the time (if there be any specially appointed); or else immediately shall be said or sung by the Priest and the People,

THEREFORE with angels and archangels, and with all the holy company of heaven, we laud and magnify thy glorious Name; evermore praising thee, and saying, Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of hosts: heaven and earth are full of thy glory. Glory be to thee, O Lord Most High. Amen.

‡ These words (holy Father) must be omitted on Trinity Sunday.

When the Priest, standing before the Holy Table, hath so ordered the Bread and Wine, that he may with the more readiness and decency break the Bread before the people, and take the Cup into his hands, he shall begin the Consecration, as followeth.

THE CONSECRATION

Turning himself to the people he shall say,

The Lord be with you.
Answer. And with thy spirit.

Priest. Lift up your hearts.
Answer. We lift them unto the Lord.

Priest. Let us give thanks to our Lord God.
Answer. It is meet and right so to do.

Then shall the Priest turn to the Lord’s Table, and say,

IT is very meet, right, and our bounden duty, that we should at all times, and in all places, give thanks unto thee, O Lord, Holy Father, Almighty, Everlasting God.

Here shall follow the proper Preface, according to the time, if there be any specially appointed;† or else immediately shall follow,

THEREFORE with angels and archangels, and with all the holy company of heaven, we laud and magnify thy glorious Name; evermore praising thee, and saying,

HOLY, holy, holy, Lord God of hosts: heaven and earth are full of thy glory. Glory be to thee, O Lord Most High. Amen.

† [Texts of the Proper Prefaces were printed in an appendix following this Order.]
Proper Prefaces
[As in EngBCP 1662, except for an alternative Preface in addition to the 1662 text “upon the feast of Trinity only”.*]

¶ Then shall the Priest, kneeling down at the Lord’s Table, say, in the name of all those who shall receive the Communion, this Prayer following.

We do not presume to come to this thy Table ….

¶ When the Priest, standing at before the Table, hath so ordered the Bread and Wine, that he may with the more readiness and decency break the Bread before the People, he shall say the Prayer of Consecration, as followeth.

All glory be to thee, Almighty God our heavenly Father, for that thou of thy tender mercy didst give thy only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the Cross for our redemption; who made there (by his one oblation of himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world, and did institute, and in his holy gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory of that his precious death and sacrifice, until his coming again. For in the same night that he was betrayed, (†)

* Or else this may be said, the words (Holy Father) being retained in the introductory Address.

For the precious death and merits of thy Son Jesus Christ our Lord, and for the sending to us of the Holy Ghost the Comforter, who are one with thee in thy eternal Godhead: Therefore with Angels, etc.

* Here the Presbyter is to take the paten in his hands:
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he took bread, and when he had given thanks, (') he brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, Take, eat; (') This is my body, which is given for you. Do this in remembrance of me. Likewise after supper ('d) he took the cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this, for (') This is my blood, of the new testament, which is shed for you, and for many, for remission of sins; do this as oft as ye shall drink it in remembrance of me.

The Oblation Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, according to the institution of thy dearly beloved Son Jesus Christ, we thy humble servants do celebrate and make here before thy divine majesty, with these thy holy gifts which we now offer unto thee, the memorial thy Son hath commanded us to make; having in remembrance his blessed passion, and precious death, his mighty resurrection, and glorious ascension; rendering unto thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits procured unto us by the same.

\[\text{b And here to break the Bread:}\]
\[\text{c And here to lay his hands upon all the Bread.}\]
\[\text{d Here he is to take the Cup into his hands:}\]
\[\text{e And here to lay his hand upon every vessel (be it chalice or flagon) in which there is any wine to be consecrated.}\]

The Church of England 1928

Who in the same night that he was betrayed, ('a) took bread, and when he had given thanks, ('b) he brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, Take, eat; ('c) This is my Body, which is given for you; Do this in remembrance of me. Likewise after supper ('d) he took the cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this, for this ('e) is my Blood of the New Covenant, which is shed for you and for many for remission of sins; Do this, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of me.

Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, we thy humble servants, having in remembrance the precious death and passion of thy dear Son, his mighty resurrection and glorious ascension; according to his holy institution, do celebrate, and set forth before thy Divine Majesty with these thy holy gifts, the memorial which he hath willed us to make; rendering unto thee most hearty thanks for the innumerable benefits which he hath procured unto us.

\[\text{a Here the Presbyter is to take the Paten into his hands:}\]
\[\text{b And here to break the Bread:}\]
\[\text{c And here to lay his hand upon all the Bread.}\]
\[\text{d Here he is to take the Cup into his hand:}\]
\[\text{e And here to lay his hand upon every vessel (be it Chalice or Flagon) in which there is any wine to be consecrated.}\]
The Invocation

And we most humbly beseech thee, O merciful Father, to hear us, and of thy almighty goodness vouchsafe to bless and sanctify, with thy Word and Holy Spirit, these gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may become the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son. And we earnestly desire thy fatherly goodness, mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, most humbly beseeching thee to grant, that by the merits and death of thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in his blood, we and all thy whole Church may obtain remission of sins, and all other benefits of his passion. And here we humbly offer and present unto thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto thee, beseeching thee, that whosoever shall be partakers of this holy Communion, may worthily receive the most precious body and blood of thy Son Jesus Christ, and be filled with thy grace and heavenly benediction, and made one body with him, that he may dwell in them, and they and they in him. And although we are unworthy, through our manifold sins, to offer unto thee any sacrifice: yet we beseech thee to accept this our bounden duty and service, not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences; Through Jesus Christ our Lord; by whom, and with whom, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, all honour and glory be unto thee, O Father almighty, world without end. Amen.

¶ Here shall be sung a Hymn, or part of a Hymn, from the Selection for the Feasts and Fasts, etc.
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Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee, and with thy Holy and Life-giving Spirit vouchsafe to bless and sanctify both us and these thy gifts of Bread and Wine, that they may be unto us the Body and Blood of thy Son, our Saviour, Jesus Christ, to the end that we, receiving the same, may be strengthened and refreshed both in body and soul.

And we entirely desire thy fatherly goodness, mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, most humbly beseeching thee to grant, that by the merits and death of thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in his blood, we and all thy whole Church may obtain remission of sins, and all other benefits of his passion.

And here we offer and present unto thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and living sacrifice unto thee: humbly beseeching thee, that all we, who are partakers of this holy Communion, may fulfilled with thy grace and heavenly benediction.

And although we are unworthy, through our manifold sins, to offer unto thee any sacrifice, yet we beseech thee to accept this our bounden duty and service, not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences;

Through Jesus Christ our Lord; by whom, and with whom, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, all honour and glory be unto thee, O Father Almighty, world without end.

And all the people shall answer Amen.

Here shall the people join with the Priest in the Lord’s Prayer, the Priest first saying,

As our Saviour Christ hath commanded and taught us, we are bold to say,
OUR Father who art in heaven….
¶ Then shall the Priest first receive the communion in both kinds himself, and proceed to deliver the same to the Bishops, Priests, and Deacons in like manner (if any be present), and after that to the People also in order, in their hands, all humbly kneeling: And when he delivereth the Bread, he shall say,

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

And here we offer and present unto thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and living sacrifice unto thee: humbly beseeching thee, that all we, who are partakers of this holy Communion, may fulfilled with thy grace and heavenly benediction.

And although we are unworthy, through our manifold sins, to offer unto thee any sacrifice, yet we beseech thee to accept this our bounden duty and service, not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences;

Through Jesus Christ our Lord; by whom, and with whom, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, all honour and glory be unto thee, O Father Almighty, world without end.

And all the people shall answer Amen.

Here shall the people join with the Priest in the Lord’s Prayer, the Priest first saying,

As our Saviour Christ hath commanded and taught us, we are bold to say,
¶ Then shall the Priest first receive the communion in both kinds himself, and proceed to deliver the same to the Bishops, Priests, and Deacons in like manner (if any be present), and after that to the People also in order, in their hands, all humbly kneeling: And when he delivereth the Bread, he shall say,

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

And the Minister who delivereth the Cup to any one shall say,

THE Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life; Drink this in remembrance that Christ's blood was shed for thee, and be thankful.

Then may the Priest say:
The peace of God be alway with you.
Answer. And with thy spirit.

When occasion requires, the Minister may, instead of saying all the above Words of Administration to each communicant, say first in an audible voice to the whole number of them that come to receive the Holy Communion,

DRAW near and receive the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ which was given for you. Take this in remembrance that Christ died for you, and feed on him in your hearts by faith, with thanksgiving.

And then in delivering the Bread to each communicant he shall say, either, The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given
¶ If the consecrated bread and wine be spent before all have communicated, the Priest is to consecrate more, according to the Form before prescribed, beginning at: All glory be to thee, Almighty God…. and ending with these words: partakers of his most blessed body and blood.
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for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life, or, Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee, and feed on him in thy heart by faith, with thanksgiving. And in delivering the Cup to each communicant he shall say, either, The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life, or, Drink this in remembrance that Christ's blood was shed for thee, and be thankful.

Or else, when occasion requires, the Minister may say the whole form of words to each row of communicants, or to a convenient number within each row, instead of saying them to each communicant severally.

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

¶ After shall be said as followeth.

Let us pray.

ALMIGHTY and everliving God, we most heartily thank thee, for that thou dost vouchsafe to feed us, who have duly received these holy mysteries, with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ; and dost assure us thereby of thy favour and goodness towards us, and that we be very members incorporate in the mystical body of thy Son, which is the blessed company of all faithful people, and are also heirs through hope of thy everlasting kingdom, by the merits of his most precious death and passion. We now most humbly beseech thee, O heavenly Father, so to assist us with thy grace and Holy Spirit, that we may continue in that holy communion and fellowship, and do all such good works as thou hast prepared for us to walk in, through Jesus Christ our Lord; to whom, with the Father and the holy Ghost, be all honour and glory, world without end. Amen.

Gloria in excelsis

The Blessing (The peace of God which passeth....)
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Then shall the Priest give thanks to God in the name of all them that have communicated, turning him first to the people, and saying,

Having now by faith received the precious Body and Blood of Christ, let us give thanks unto our Lord God. ALMIGHTY and everliving God, we most heartily thank thee, for that thou dost vouchsafe to feed us, who have duly received these holy mysteries, with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ; and dost assure us thereby of thy favour and goodness towards us, and that we be very members incorporate in the mystical body of thy Son, which is the blessed company of all faithful people, and are also heirs through hope of thy everlasting kingdom, by the merits of his most precious death and passion. We now most humbly beseech thee, O heavenly Father, so to assist us with thy grace and Holy Spirit, that we may continue in that holy fellowship, and do all such good works as thou hast commanded us to walk in, through Jesus Christ our Lord; to whom, with the Father and the holy Ghost, be all honour and glory, world without end. Amen.

Gloria in excelsis

The Blessing (“The peace of God which passeth all understanding....”)
Theologies of the Eucharist II
The Anglican Tradition

7. The Catholic Revival

1. Isaac Williams, *Indications of a Superintending Providence in the Preservation of the Prayer Book and in the Changes which It has Undergone* (Tracts for the Times, No. 86 – 1839)


Introduction

In the course of a century and a quarter, between 1730 and 1850, Christianity in Britain was seized by two great revivals and the controversies that each one bred.

The first was the Evangelical Revival. It began in the 1730s as a series of preaching missions led by George Whitefield, a clergyman of the Established Church with decidedly Calvinist views. The Wesley brothers, John (1703-1791) and Charles (1707-1788), became associated with the Revival from 1738, when they substituted for an ailing Whitefield at a mission outside Bristol. They turned the Revival into a Movement with a discipline – what they called “the Method” (hence the nickname “Methodist”) – and an infrastructure to sustain it. Their aim was to make the Established Church into a truly popular institution which throbbed with “religion of the heart” – and with sound doctrine. For the Wesleys were heirs of the High-Church tradition and deeply committed to its principles. But they had also learned from the Moravian Brethren that the best way to inculcate sound doctrine and make it the heart-religion of the common people was through hymn-singing. To this end, John Wesley wrote several hundred hymns – and Charles, some 8,000! In the beginning, the brothers and their movement met with intense suspicion, resistance, and obstruction from the bishops and parish-clergy of the Established Church. To them Methodism smacked of rank fanaticism – what was then called “Enthusiasm” – and tended toward subversion of hierarchy in Church and State. The movement’s weeknight “classes,” consisting of Bible-reading, lay-preaching, testimonials, hymn-

1 Their father, Samuel, had been raised in Dissent, but on his conversion to the Church of England became a stalwart High-churchman. Their mother, Susannah, went even further; she cleaved to the Non-jurors, for a time refusing to let her husband have his connubial rights because in the State Prayers of the BCP he named George I instead of James III. It may be regarded as a delicious irony, then, that a full-length portrait of Susannah Wesley hangs beside the portrait of her son John in the foyer of Emmanuel College.
singing, and “love-feasts.” looked to the establishment like temptations to sedition, acts which made the lower orders forget to know and keep their place. To deal with this problem, the Wesleys increasingly targeted their message to the middle-class and nobility. Their success was spectacular in quality if not (at first) in statistical quantity. By the fourth quarter of the eighteenth century, the Evangelical Revival had followers and very articulate advocates within the Church of England like the Countess of Macclesfield and William Wilberforce. Wilberforce (1759-1833) even wrote a book, *A Practical View of the Prevailing Religious System of Professed Christians* (1797), which established in the public mind the distinction between “real” and “nominal” Christians. He had already launched his parliamentary campaign to abolish the slave-trade with a view to abolishing slavery itself. By that same time, however, a large sector of the Methodist movement had gone into schism and become a separate church, a new sect of Dissenters. John Wesley himself, much to his brother Charles’s fury, had abetted the separation by laying hands on a layman named Thomas Coke and making him “Superintendent” – in effect, a bishop – with authority to “ordain” other superintendents for Methodist communities in the newly independent United States of America.

The Wesleys had an earnest commitment to the Lord’s Supper. As an undergraduate at Oxford, Charles and his pious pals had made weekly reception of the Sacrament a principal part of their “method” or devotional discipline – this at a time when most of their peers were content to take Communion only once a year, at Easter. This eucharistic “enthusiasm” was one of the points that earned Charles and his friends from other undergraduates, a full decade and more before the revival, the derisory title “methodists”. The brothers carried this eucharist-centred spirituality into their revivalist mission; the “love feasts” of the Methodist classes were not meant to supplant the Lord’s Supper but to heighten the class-members’ eucharistic consciousness and to encourage and prepare them to make worthy communions as

---

2 Methodist love-feasts (*agape*-meals) were pot-luck suppers designed to sustain a revivalist community between celebrations of the Lord’s Supper in their parish-church.
often as the Lord’s Supper was celebrated in their own parish-churches. And one of the greatest documents of the Methodist revival was their *Hymns on the Lord’s Supper* (1745), a collection of 200+ hymns devoted to eucharistic topics and themes.

The Wesleys, being good High-churchmen, had nothing—and did not wish to have anything—new to add to the doctrine of the Lord’s Supper. Their *Hymns on the Lord’s Supper* was itself a deliberate attempt to hymnodize (and popularize) the teaching of Daniel Brevint’s *Christian Sacrament and Sacrifice* (1671). And their efforts bore fruit. The Eucharist continued to be a touchstone of Evangelical piety into the nineteenth century, especially for those who remained in the Church of England.

But then something happened. In the Methodist sects which left the Church, it was teetotalism. The desire to conquer the besetting sin of working-class Britons, “Demon Drink” (mainly rum and gin), led to a suppression of the love-feasts and their eucharistic raison d’être—as well as the genuine merriment which they had afforded. In the Church of England, what happened was the second great revival of the age, the Oxford Movement. The Evangelicals in the Established Church made themselves the shock-troops of conventional Protestantism in reaction to the perceived “popery” of “the Oxford Malignants” and, later, of Ritualist “perverts”.

The Catholic (or Anglo-Catholic) Revival moved in two streams which often intersected but never entirely merged.

The stream flowing out of Oxford, the Tractarian Movement, got under way in 1833, reached the apogee of its influence (and notoriety) between 1836 and 1839, then suffered a string of catastrophic setbacks, culminating in the defection of John Henry Newman (1801-1890) to the Church

---

3 So called because the Movement’s primary vehicle and mouthpiece was a series called *Tracts for the Times*. The first *Tract*, written by John Henry Newman, appeared on 9 September 1833. It was a leaflet-length harangue to the clergy of the Church of England. The series ran to ninety numbers and ended in 1841. By that time, many of the *Tracts* had burgeoned into book-length (and in a couple of cases, multi-volume) treatises.
of Rome in 1845. The Tractarians were primarily concerned with doctrine, most especially with issues of ecclesiology and church identity. It was, for example, almost entirely thanks to Newman that “Anglican” became more than a fancy-pants Latinate synonym for “English,” but the descriptor of an ethos, of a Catholic via media between “Romanism and popular Protestantism”.

The other stream, called “Ritualism,” flowed out of Cambridge and was primarily concerned with the aesthetics of Catholic liturgical worship. Its chief spokesmen, John Mason Neale (1818-1866) and Benjamin Webb (1819-1885), had an incontinent lech for Gothic architecture, which (they maintained) was the only true form of church building. They then sought to revive the rituals – the ceremonies, the vestments, the whole “style” of mediaeval worship – which Gothic churches had been designed to express and enable. Neale, for instance, was probably the first Anglican priest since the Reformation to don a chasuble whenever he presided at the altar; and he was one of the first (if not the first) to stand at the centre of the altar, facing eastward, with his back to the congregation. The Tractarians of Oxford had a very high esteem for what they called “the sacramental principle,” but they had little interest in ritual, architecture, or ecclesiastical millinery. Newman to the end of his Anglican career, and John Keble (1792-1866) to the end of his life, celebrated the Eucharist at the north end of the altar. Edward Bouverie Pusey (1800-1882), who became the Tractarians’ leader after Newman’s defection, did not adopt the eastward position until the late 1850s, and even then with reluctance, simply because he thought he ought to show solidarity with the persecuted Ritualist brethren.

Together, both streams of the Catholic Revival aimed at staging an Anglican counter-Reformation. As Newman put it:

I had a supreme confidence in our cause; we were upholding that primitive Christianity which was delivered for all time by the early teachers of the Church, and which

---

4 Pusey, as Regius Professor of Hebrew and the scion of a noble family, had been the Tractarian best-known to the public. So, soon after his accession to the Movement in 1835, the hostile press began calling the Tractarians “Puseyites”.
was registered and attested in the Anglican formularies and by the Anglican divines. That ancient religion had well nigh faded away out of the land, through the political changes of the last 150 years [before 1833], and it must be restored. It would be in fact a second Reformation: – a better reformation, for it would be a return not to the sixteenth century, but to the seventeenth.5

The Tractarians and, even more dramatically, the Ritualists meant to overthrow the establishmentarian status quo of the day and restore what they conceived to be the status quo ante – in the Tractarians’ case, the pristine apostolicity of seventeenth-century Anglicanism;6 in the Ritualists’ case, the glorious mysteriousness of the mediaeval Mass.

Given how greatly the Tractarians valued “the sacramental principle,” it is curious that they wrote so little about the Eucharist during the Movement’s first twelve years. Newman wrote a scathing diatribe against the Lady Margaret Professor of Divinity, the Reverend Dr Godfrey Faussett, who had had the temerity to criticize Newman’s dearest (and recently departed) friend Hurrell Froude for maintaining the doctrine of the Real Presence.7 Newman defended the doctrine as part

---


6 Newman and his friends referred to themselves as “the Apostolical party” or “Apostolics”. They called their opponents “the Liberals”. Conservative – in their view, foot-dragging – High-churchmen they called “the Zs”. I have never been able to discover the reason for the latter designation. Before I came to Canada, I thought it might be a way of saying that establishmentarian High-churchmen were snoring – “taking their ‘zees’”. But soon after arriving here I was told, in no uncertain terms, that Britons (and all true British North Americans) pronounce “Z” as zed, not zee. None of William IV’s subjects ever snored zed-zed-zed. There went that theory.

7 Froude (pronounced *FROOD*) had never published his thoughts on the Eucharist during his lifetime. His remarks appeared in *The
of the Anglican deposit of faith. Pusey also upheld the doctrine of the Real Presence, a bit more obliquely, in a sermon entitled, *The Holy Eucharist a Comfort to the Penitent*, which he delivered in 1843. For this sermon he was summoned before the Heads of Houses and not only forbidden to preach in the University for five years but also forbidden to say anything at all about the action thus taken against him.

Newman’s defection to Rome in 1845 left the Tractarian party prostrate with grief, and in Oxford itself it looked as if the party were a spent force. But in twelve years the Tractarians had attracted not only notoriety but also a fair amount of sympathy among the clergy of the Established Church. Thus, just as Tractarians at Oxford sank into a grieving silence, Tractarianism began popping up here and there around the Church of England.

One of these places was in the diocese of Bath and Wells. The archdeacon of Taunton and Vicar of East Brent – and the diocesan examining chaplain – was George Anthony Denison. Owen Chadwick has written,

> A rugged personality, [Denison] stumped among the rocks of reality and arranged them into rows. Examining the candidates for the Wells ordination of Christmas 1852, he told them that before they became priests he would expect them to confess that the inward reality of the [eucharistic] sacrament was received by all, wicked as well as faithful.8

The bishop of Bath and Wells happened to be Richard Bagot – who had been bishop of Oxford during the Tractarian earthquake and had suffered a complete breakdown as a result. On being translated to Bath and Wells, he immediately took extended health-leave. His diocese was put in the care of G. T. Spencer, the retired bishop of Madras in India. One of the candidates examined

---

by Denison had qualms of conscience regarding the archdeacon’s fiat on the Eucharist. For it flatly contradicted the plain and literal sense of Article XXIX (“Of the Wicked which eat not the body of Christ in the use of the Lord’s Supper”). The candidate appealed to Spencer; Spencer interviewed Denison several times; and Denison, having arranged these particular rocks of reality into a row, declined in no uncertain terms to disarrange them. Spencer threw up his hands and resigned as Bagot’s suffragan. Denison demanded of Bagot that he prosecute him in court. Bagot declined. So Denison, who had taken up the weapons of Catholic righteousness on the right hand and on the left, preached a series of provocative sermons in Wells Cathedral, then published them. This moved Joseph Ditcher, the Vicar of South Brent and a strong Evangelical, to petition Bagot that he prosecute Denison for heresy. Bagot twice refused, then died. His successor, Lord Auckland, also refused Ditcher’s appeal. Then Ditcher discovered that a legal technicality actually placed any complaint against Denison, as Vicar of East Brent, under the jurisdiction of the Archbishop of Canterbury.

John Bird Sumner (1780-1862) was the first Evangelical churchman to be made Primate of All England. One hesitates to call any Archbishop inept; but one must say that Sumner’s performance in this case was not exactly ept, either. He granted Ditcher’s application and appointed a Commission of Enquiry consisting of five Evangelical clergy. It rather looks as if he happened to be vacationing on Pluto when he made this decision. For it had the rank odour of partisanship. Denison, rubbing his own partisan hands with glee, launched a suit in the Court of Queen’s Bench to quash the Commission. He lost, and the Commission of Enquiry went ahead. The commissioners conducted their enquiry as if they were an Evangelical kangaroo court, and surprised nobody by recommending that the Archbishop try Denison for heresy. Sumner underwent a sudden conversion to wisdom and tried to deep-six his own Commission’s report. Denison did not let him. He pursued the case through the Court of Queen’s Bench (again), and then through the Court of Arches.9 Each

---

9 The Court of Arches – so called because it originally convened in Bow Church, St Mary’s in Arcubus – was the Consistory Court of
of those two courts in effect ruled in Denison’s favour. In 1857 Ditcher appealed to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. He lost. Henceforward the doctrine of Christ’s Real Presence in the Lord’s Supper was a permissible opinion in the Church of England – and the Anglican Communion.

In hindsight, the dénouement of the Denison Case makes it look like a piece of Victorian topsy-turvydom – or, worse, an incompetent Punch-and-Judy show at a Christmas “panto” in the provinces. But very early on in its progress, Sumner’s failure to act as the Church of England’s chief minister and agent of unity, and a cabal of Evangelical clergymen choosing to pursue a legal campaign of blatantly partisan blood-lust against Denison, made the case a test-case, a case of do-or-die, for the Anglo-Catholics. As a Owen Chadwick has commented:

By November 1854 the question of Denison and his doctrine was becoming ominous. Few of the Tractarians believed that Denison was right, and many thought his behaviour silly. But Keble and Pusey worried whether if the opposite of Denison’s doctrine were defined the Church of England could still be called Catholic. ‘However much Denison may have provoked it,’ wrote Pusey to Keble, ‘the Low Church, I fear, mean a war of extermination against us.’

The battle had been right and truly joined – and joined on the question of Christ’s Real Presence in the Eucharist. The three remaining “Fathers” of Tractarian Anglo-Catholicism – Keble, Pusey, and Robert Isaac Wilberforce – rose the challenge.

Pusey preached, then published, The Presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist. A Sermon Preached before the University of Oxford (1853); he followed this up with a densely tendentious treatise of lengthy quotations from earlier

the ecclesiastical province of Canterbury. It is the institutional villain in Charles Dickens’s novel, Bleak House (1853). It was not abolished until 1964.

10 Ibid., p. 493.
Anglican divines, *The Real Presence of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ: The Doctrine of the Church of England* (1857). Neither work is successful or satisfying as theology; both are unreadable, even to Catholic-minded Anglicans.

Keble, as usual, took his time. He had been bred in an old-fashioned High-churchmanship which was more comfortable in asserting the sacrificial character of the Eucharist than in defending the Real Presence. But the Denison Case was where the rubber of Keble’s essential catholicity hit the road. A man generally portrayed as a hidebound conservative of almost pathological limitations broke with the High-church tradition and produced *On Eucharistical Adoration* (1857) – what Owen Chadwick has rightly called “a beautiful little book”.

And then there is Wilberforce’s *The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist* (1853). Robert Isaac Wilberforce (1802-1857) was the second son of William Wilberforce (1759-1833), by far the greatest Evangelical layman of his era, who led the parliamentary campaign for the abolition of the slave-trade and, eventually, the abolition of slavery altogether. Robert was elected a Fellow of Oriel College in 1826 and became the closest associate of Newman and Froude and, through them, of Keble. He left Oxford before the start of the Movement, but at its launch in 1833 he immediately made himself one of the Movement’s touchstones outside of the University. His learning was far greater than Newman’s, and far more critically sensitive than Pusey’s; and of all the Tractarians, Wilberforce was without question the most acute, the most systematic, and the most elegant theologian. In November of 1854, a widower in extreme distress over the death of his wife and the state of the Church of England, he submitted to the Roman obedience, and went to Rome itself; there he wasted away and died three years later. 11

11 There is no biography of Robert Wilberforce – which fact is a truly grievous blot on the Anglo-Catholic copy-book. The closest that one may come to an account of his life is David Newsome’s lovely and moving *The Parting of Friends. A Study of the Wilberforces and Henry Manning* (1966). Of William Wilberforce’s four sons – William, Robert, Samuel, and Henry – all but Samuel converted to Roman Catholicism. Samuel (1805-1873) was made bishop of Oxford in 1845; among other things, he founded Cuddesdon College (1854), the first seminary in the
principal works are: *The Doctrine of the Incarnation* (1848), *The Doctrine of Holy Baptism* (1849), and *The Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*.

This set of Readings includes Chapters IV – VI of Wilberforce’s treatise on the Eucharist (second edition, published the same year as the first edition), and the Preface, Chapter I, and Chapter 5 of Keble’s *On Eucharistical Adoration* (second edition, 1859).
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PART I.

Expressions of Repentance introduced into our Liturgy.

1. Whether a Divine purpose be ascertainable.

THE expression used by the Parliament of that day, respecting the first Book of king Edward, was, that it had been done “by the aid of the HOLY GHOST with mutual agreement.” Such we may suppose was as it were the echo of GOD’S voice in His Church, and that in these words that assembly, then perhaps to be considered Catholic, prophesied, though, in so doing, they like Caiaphas of old knew not the full meaning of their words. But these we may adopt in their amplest signification, nothing doubting but that, by the superintending care of CHRIST in His Church, there has been in that, and other circumstances of change, a controlling Power beyond the reach of man’s wisdom; provisions against future evils in the dark womb of time, and adaptations to the existing condition of the Church, beyond what entered into the thoughts of those concerned.

The object of the present enquiry is to ascertain whether, after the lapse of time, we may not obtain some slight clue to the object of such dispensations; whether there are not discernible some remarkable indications of such a presiding Hand, not only controlling the tide of popular changes which have come over the Church, so as to have preserved to us that dispensation under which we now live, but also regulating and directing those changes to meet the wants of succeeding ages.

Had these revolutions been produced by persons acting in the largeness of human wisdom, and by forethought directing their views to one great design, and that design peculiarly suitable to the wants of the Church, even in this case we should, have to acknowledge that superintending Hand in which are the hearts of men. But if this does not appear to have been the case, excepting on some particular occasions, yet, notwithstanding, at one time by the aid of persons supporting the Catholic Truth, at another by that of those opposing it, at one time by the care of reverential men, at another by the passions of the inconsiderate, there may be traced the predominance of one great and overruling
purpose. And if such a Providential Power, now converting and then controlling; now amalgamating, then neutralizing; in short, either by maturing or by frustrating the thoughts of men, has throughout, so far as we can discern, made all things to work to one great end, and that an end peculiarly suitable to our condition – if such be the case, then surely such an enquiry as the present may do something towards regulating the feelings with which we regard those events, and pointing out the line of conduct which our position requires.

I am aware that such an investigation demands the greatest circumspection and reverence, for although we have the promise that CHRIST shall be with His Church to the end of the world, yet therein, as in His natural Providence, “His ways are in the deep waters, and His footsteps are not known.”12 But if even in our lives as individuals, where we can still less comprehend in our view the lengthened bearing or end of the circumstances which encompass us, yet even in the short course of our existence on earth we may trace in past events manifest Providential leadings, and something of a design with respect to ourselves – much more may we suppose that such indications of GOD’S care may be discerned in the protection of His Church, where we have entire centuries through which to mark the footsteps of a Divine Governor. And if in the former case it he considered the part of wisdom and piety, in a review of our life, to divert the attention from persons and events, and thus divesting ourselves of human passions and prejudices, to acknowledge and discern the Hand of GOD and to look upon apparent contingencies only as the instruments which He uses in conducting the great ends of His wisdom; in like manner also, with regard to the history and position of our Church, to turn our thoughts from man to GOD, is one of the best means of learning to judge and to feel correctly: in short, we ought to be very cautious how we consider events without recognising therein His Presence.

One protest only it is necessary to make, that the argument is very distinct from that unreal eclectic system, which confounds truth, and degrades our sense of Providence, by looking on the different forms of error only as

12 Cf. Psalm 77.19 (KJV and EngBCP 1662 Psalter).
various modes of educing good under the Divine control. The cases are perfectly distinct, inasmuch as it is one thing, where GOD has promised to be present for our guidance, “to feel after Him, if haply we may find Him,”\(^{13}\) in order to know what that guidance is; and another to acquiesce in, and reconcile ourselves to, shapes of evil, on the ground that they will ultimately redound to His glory.

2. *Such an enquiry particularly necessary at present.*

The consideration which is here entered upon appears to be especially necessary at the present crisis; for the more our attention is turned to the ancient Liturgies and usages, the more, I suppose, shall we be convinced that such could have come from no other source than that from which the Holy Scriptures have themselves proceeded. This thought, indeed, is familiar to most of us, from what we have retained. And impressed with this awful sense of the sanctity of the ancient forms of worship, a reverential mind will naturally shrink from the idea of their being remodelled and altered by man. And the discovery that this has been to a certain extent the case in our own Liturgy may have a tendency to impair that (I may say) filial affection and respect, which is due to her from whom we have received our Spiritual birth in one Sacrament, and the bread of life in the other. And, indeed, obedience to her, as standing in the nearest of parental relations, is a part of that charity without which even the understanding of mysteries and knowledge avail not. When our thoughts revert to earlier and better times, we shall, of course, be filled with some sad reflections at the melancholy contrast, looking upon the later Church as “the second temple,” and in the words of holy Herbert, “deserving tears;” or in the more sacred words in the Prophet Haggai, “Is it not in your eyes in comparison of it as nothing?”\(^{14}\) But He who spake these words, and who now alloweth us to see this contrast, added to them, “Yet now be strong, for I am with you, saith the Lord of Hosts. According to the word that I covenanted with you, when ye came out of Egypt, so my

---

\(^{13}\) Acts 17.27.

\(^{14}\) Haggai 2.3.
Spirit remaineth among you.”15 It is on this promised presence of CHRIST, who hath covenanted to abide with His Church, that these observations are founded. With regard to the general principle, of course, the only question can be, whether our Church has done any thing to forfeit those promises. But this, we may confidently trust, is not the case. Strong judicial withdrawings doubtless there may have been, and withholdings of light, as indicating a threatened removal of that candlestick itself, in which the light is placed, if we repent not. But those essentials, to which the promise has been annexed, have not been forfeited, while we retain those mysteries which are “necessary to salvation”; and Divinely-commissioned stewards to convey them. And with regard to an Apostolic form of Liturgy, the Church in all ages has allowed, that, as long as the substance continues the same, circumstantial varieties are permitted to particular Churches. This, Mr. Palmer maintains, in his *Origines Liturgicae*, and Hooker implies the same. “No doubt,” says he, “from GOD it hath proceeded, and by us it must be acknowledged a work of His singular care and providence, that the Church hath evermore held a prescript form of common prayer, although not in all things every where the same, yet for the most part retaining still the same analogy. So that if the Liturgies of all ancient Churches throughout the world be compared amongst themselves, it may be easily perceived they had all one original mould.”16 So that in these things we have not forfeited the promise. And surely if the use made of the Septuagint version in the New Testament furnishes us with a Scriptural proof that this translation of the Scriptures was conducted under the control of that Spirit from which those Scriptures themselves proceeded, notwithstanding alterations made in the text, and the persons engaged in that work: in like manner may we regard even the alterations which have taken place in our Liturgy. It may be we do not approve of the persons, or of the motives which produced them. It may be that those changes took from us a part of our ancient inheritance; yet, should we not rather say, with a religious caution, that the same Hand which has mercifully afforded us 

15 Haggai 2.4-5.
16 Richard Hooker, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity* V.
so much beyond our deserts, has in justice withdrawn such
higher privileges for our unworthiness? And if we show
ourselves meet to receive them by a pious use of what
remains, then it may be we shall have them more fully
restored. Or may they not be withheld in mercy, no less
than in justice, as injurious to an age that cannot receive them
but to condemnation, according to the words of a Latin
hymn:

Quam nos potenter allicis?
Te, CHRISTE, quando detegis,
Te quando celas, providus
Nobis perque consulis.


To recur to the reference just made to the Septuagint. If,
as St. Augustine maintains, the same Spirit which was in the
Prophets when they spake, was in the translators of the
Septuagint when they interpreted, expressing the same things
differently, in the same manner that He does by different
Prophets in Scripture, and omitting, or adding, or altering, as
best suited the wisdom of His purpose; so also the omissions
and additions and alterations in our own Liturgy, we may
reverently trust, were ordered by the same Spirit under
whose control the first rites of Catholic worship were
ordained. For if the presence of CHRIST still continues in His
Church, in what circumstances can we conceive His Divine
control to be more exerted than in regulating these changes?
For rituals and forms of prayer, however unimportant in
human eyes, assume a very high character and value when
considered as the appointed means of access from man to
GOD; as methods of approach to Him which He has Himself
provided, and of which we are bound to make use, – for as
individuals we have no choice; – as moreover objects of
sacred association to which the affections of good men will
naturally become attached from use, and the more attached
the better they are; as instruments, however mean in man’s
estimation, which serve as vehicles through which healing and
virtue go forth from CHRIST to restore our soul’s maladies; as
moulds of thought and expression to those suits which, in the
majestic words of Hooker “the ALMIGHTY doth there sit to
hear, and angels, intermingled as associates, attend to further.”17

This consideration will afford a high value and importance to many changes in themselves apparently trivial; and it must be remembered that the lessons of Divine wisdom are often written in the very smallest characters, and that it is not from single letters or syllables, but from the combination of them, when carefully put together, that those lessons are to be understood. The proof will consist more in an accumulation of a number of little detached accidents, all tending collectively to one great purport or effect, than in any signal revolutions or events. It is necessary therefore to claim a patient attention to each, and assent is only required, if the evidence for the whole appears to bear out the case. Each point may be but slight in itself, yet all these in their connections one with another may be such as to form a perceptible and distinct chain, partially indeed interrupted by clouds from our view, yet such as may be seen to extend far beyond the reach of man’s contrivance, so as to shew that it can be no other chain than that which is suspended from the throne of GOD.

3. The three divisions of the argument.

These indications of a superintending Providence will be considered in regard to three points into which the subject naturally resolves itself in its various bearings. The first is, that these changes through a long course of time have one prevailing character, and that so deeply and so gently infused, as to prove no human intention, and so extensive as to imply a design beyond the limited range of man’s foresight.

Secondly, that they are replete with Providential remedies and warnings against those peculiar evils which have since arisen, and are likely to increase in the last days, as Scripture has foretold.

And, thirdly, that changes in the external condition of the Church, and its pervading peculiarities, harmonize with those that are internal, so as to indicate one controlling design and purpose.

17 Hooker, Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity V.
In all these cases it will, I think, appear that though in tracing historically these alterations, external circumstances were not such as we could have wished or approve, yet that notwithstanding there has resided in the Church a Divine life, a power of assimilating, and converting, and turning into nourishment, heterogeneous, and often hurtful substances. And thence it has happened that notwithstanding the worldly influences to which she has been subject, the King’s Daughter, though she has passed through the fire, has been in misfortune, and is in captivity, yet, under all changes, is still "glorious within," and "her clothing of wrought gold."

4. That we have given us the language of servants rather than sons.

The first point which I would wish to show is, that through these alterations there runs one prevailing tendency, to put into our mouths the language of servants rather than that of sons. Now, though it may be matter of doubt whether the Reformation was in all respects what the name imports, or whether it were brought about in general by motives of sincere repentance, yet it must be allowed that it was a call to repentance on the part of GOD, a call to the Church to return to her first love and repent. And that it was on the part of man a profession of repentance. Previously therefore to, and independently of, any proof, it seems not unreasonable to suppose, that as in the case of an individual, so also with the Church at large, He who sees the returning penitent afar off, and hastens to meet him, should also put those becoming words into his mouth, by which he confesses himself to have forfeited the claim of sonship, and to be willing to be received in a lower state.

5. The Collects.

First of all, to turn our attention to the Collects, and the alterations made respecting them. They are indeed not many, but consist either in the entire rejection of the older, and the substitution of a new form, or in the adaptation of another old one, or else in a slight change of expression, in the process of their passing into the English form. When we compare them, as they now stand, with earlier Liturgies, and
endeavour to ascertain the causes of the changes, we do not find, I think, that the rejections or alterations of the ancient prayers have taken place merely on account of "the interpolations of things false and superstitious" as is usually stated to be the case. But one thing I cannot but observe, that, whether designedly or not, these changes seem to have one drift, and bear one way, in the point alluded to, namely, that entire Collects, or expressions in them, which imply the privileges of the faithful, or spiritual rejoicing, as of sons, are dropped; and prayers substituted in a lower tone.

To take the first Collect in Advent. It is one newly introduced, and though it is mainly remodelled on the language of the Epistle and Gospel, Mr. Palmer gives a Latin prayer which he supposes it to resemble. The difference in the two forms consists in this—we find that in the ancient form there are the words "who rejoice according to the flesh for the coming of Thine only begotten Son." These are not in ours, but we have instead the sentence "in the time of this mortal life in which Thy Son JESUS CHRIST came to visit us in great humility.”

Proceeding to Christmas day, we find in King Edward’s First Book, there was a double service for this festival, and the Collect, which was afterwards omitted, is the following:
"GOD, which makest us glad with the yearly remembrance of the birth of Thy only Son JESUS CHRIST: Grant that as we joyfully receive Him for our Redeemer, so we may with sure confidence behold Him when He shall come to be our Judge.”—

Compare the more subdued prayer for renewal, in the Collect we have for this day, with this one which is now omitted, or with the Collect in the Parisian Breviary, which is thus:
"O GOD, who hast given the bread of angels to be the food of the faithful in the fold of the Church, grant us, we pray Thee, in this present world, a foretaste of the sweetness of the heavenly joys, that, in that which is to come, Thou mayest lead us to the fulness of everlasting rewards, through the same.”—

The object of Divine wisdom, in these changes, may have been that, as "leaping for joy," and being "exceeding glad," are commands given only, in Scripture, on occasions of external persecution and distress, such were not suited for the
times of worldly prosperity which our Church was to be tempted with beyond others. But I only speak now of the fact.

In like manner take the Sunday after Ascension Day; one cannot but at once inquire, why the former Collect for this day has not been retained? The present Collect I can only find used as an antiphone in the Roman Breviary on this day. The Collect in the Parisian Breviary alludes to the gifts poured on the Apostles, as if still continued in the Church. That selected for our use is, that we be not left "comfortless;" "ne nos derelinquas orphans."

The Collect for St. John the Baptist’s day is another instance; in the Sarum Missal and Parisian Breviary, it is, "O GOD, who hast made this present day honourable unto us by the nativity of the blessed John, grant unto thy people the grace of spiritual joys, and direct the minds of all the faithful unto the way of eternal salvation, through—."

Compare this with our own, of him who was "sent to prepare the way of our SAVIOUR, by preaching of repentance, that we may follow his doctrine and life, truly repent, and patiently suffer." There is in the Roman Missal another Collect for this day, which might be quoted, with the former as bearing on the same point of view.

For St. Bartholomew’s day the Latin form begins thus— "Almighty and everlasting GOD, who hast afforded unto us the reverend and holy joy of this day in the festival of Thy Blessed Apostle Bartholomew;" this is altered in ours, but the latter part is the same, which it may be observed is purely practical.

Add to this, that although we have indeed on Whit-Sunday retained the ancient prayer which speaks of "rejoicing" in the comfort of the Spirit, yet even at this season the daily Collects, which speak of the adoption and spiritual Joy, find no place in ours. Take for instance the following, which is found on Monday in Whitsun-Week in the Missals, (on Friday in the Parisian Breviary) .

"O GOD, who hast given unto Thine apostles Thy holy Spirit, grant unto Thy people the effectual obtaining of their petition, that upon those to whom Thou hast given faith, Thou mayest bestow peace also; through—"

The nearest petition which we have to this is perhaps the Collect, "that what we ask faithfully we may obtain
effectually;" where it is to be observed that the prayer in ours is hypothetical. Several other Collects at this season in the ancient liturgies are of the same, or even higher tone than the one above translated.

This tendency, in our own Prayer Book, to bring out, as it were by accident, the more humble and practical character in these changes, may be observed in the Collect, which we have for the first Sunday after Easter. Until the Review in 1662, the Collect, which occupied this place, was that which is the "Prefacet" at the Communion for Easter Day, the commencement of which, it may be remembered, is this—

"But chiefly are we bound to praise Thee for the glorious Resurrection of Thy Son JESUS CHRIST."—and the end "who by His death hath destroyed death, and by His rising to life again hath restored to us everlasting life."—

A form consisting entirely of thanksgiving. Instead of this, we have on this Sunday the modern Collect before used on Easter Tuesday, as we find it in the Scotch Prayer Book, containing the supplication, "That we may so put away the leaven of malice and wickedness, that we may serve Thee in pureness of living and truth."

The Collect for Ash Wednesday, again, although Mr. Palmer traces the beginning of it to a Latin one in the Sarum Missal, has for its own those earnest words of penitence, "create and make in us new and contrite hearts that we, worthily lamenting our sins, and acknowledging our wretchedness, may obtain of Thee, the GOD of all mercy, perfect remission and forgiveness."

6. Verbal alterations.

Sometimes, indeed, this change in the tone and spirit of our Church is indicated in the mere alteration of a word, as in the dropping of the expression "fidelium;" such, for instance, is the following, in the Collect for the 4th Sunday after Easter: the Latin was "qui fidelium mentes unius efficis voluntatis." This was at first literally rendered in our own, as we find it in the Scotch Prayer Book, as follows: "who makest the minds of Thy faithful people to be of one will." In the Review of the Liturgy in the year 1662, this was altered to "who alone canst order the unruly wills and affections of sinful men." Here a
prayer for love among faithful sons becomes imperceptibly one for ordering the unruly affections of sinful mankind.

If there is any force in this omission of the word "fidelium," there is the same in the frequent incidental adoption of that of "servant." In the Collect for the 3d Sunday in Lent the term "humilium;" that of "suppliantium," in that for the 10th after Trinity; in that of the 6th after Easter "suppliebus tuis:" and also in the daily Collect for grace that of "supplies tuos," are all rendered "humble servants," though the Latin is in other respects for the most part closely translated. In the 13th after Trinity the expression was "ut ad promissiones tuas sine offensione curramus." It was literally preserved in the expression, "that we running to Thy promises may be made partakers of Thy heavenly treasure;" and in the Scotch, "that we may so run to Thy heavenly promises that we fail not finally to attain the same." In 1662 the words were introduced "that we may so faithfully serve Thee." And, again, in the Litany, "O GOD, merciful Father," the words "we Thy servants," are entirely introduced into the translation in the Collect.

The same tendency may be traced through other changes, at first sight even apparently more trifling, as where in the Collect for Ascension Day the words are inserted "that we may thither ascend," in the original it is only that we may dwell in mind in heavenly places, "mente in coelestibus habitemus." It will be seen, that the prayer is, as it were, from a lower station; the ancient form, that we may continue to dwell in those heavenly places to which we have already arrived by baptismal privilege; the later, that we may arise as from an inferior state. In like manner it is curious to observe, that in the Collect for the 20th Sunday after Trinity, the words "liberis mentibus," in both of Edward's books "with free hearts," becomes in the last Review, "cheerfully," where the idea of freedom is lost.

With regard to the word "servant," it may be said that this term is more congenial to our language, or to the sober temper of our nation; but even were it so, (and perhaps similar reasons might be found for explaining the whole effect which is here traced,) yet such remarks only refer to secondary causes, and do not touch the main argument, that there is a Providential purpose to place us in this position. Nor, indeed, can they be attributed to any puritanical
influences studiously assuming the tone of humility; but the contrary. Indeed, it is curious to observe, from Hooker, that "abjection of mind," and this very term "servility" is one of the charges which the Puritans brought against the Prayer Book. Alluding to two Collects, the one for the 12th Sunday after Trinity, and the other a prayer after the Offertory, similar to it, the words of Cartwright are—"This request carrieth with it still the note of the Popish servile fear, and savoureth not of that confidence and reverent familiarity that the children of GOD have through CHRIST with their Heavenly FATHER." And yet from the instances already adduced in this treatise, it would seem that this "note of servile fear" is one peculiarly our own, as differing from the forms of prayer which we have in common with the Church of Rome.

7. Commencement of our Liturgy.

This subject of the Collects must be again resumed to set forth another view which will, also, I think, do much by the way to confirm and establish the present one. Perhaps enough has been said to afford us a clue to the spirit of these changes, a spirit not appearing so much on the surface as to imply purpose in the agents, yet on enquiry so manifesting itself as clearly to indicate a secret tendency one way. With the clue thus furnished let us take up the Prayer Book. We find on opening it that it commences in a manner perfectly different from any of the liturgical books immediately preceding it, those of Sarum, York, and Hereford, to which we may also add the First Book of Edward the Sixth. All these commence, I believe, with the LORD’S Prayer, and from thence proceed to the Creed. Instead of this we have the Sentences, the Exhortation, the Confession, and the Absolution, preceding that Prayer. And all and each of these points, in the place which they hold, are so little analogous to other Liturgies, that they may be considered peculiarly characteristic of our own.

Now, the LORD’S Prayer is well known to have been always considered as especially the "Prayer of the faithful," the peculiar inheritance of sons. So much so, that in Primitive Liturgies it is supposed not to have been used openly, as their assemblies were resorted to by the Catechumens and others
unbaptized, who, not having received the adoption, could not of course approach GOD as a Father. It is thought that their Prayers usually began with a Psalm. This objection to the public use of the LORD’S prayer was of course done away with, when the world became Christian. And it afterwards occupied the first place in the Breviaries. The position therefore that it holds with us speaks an emphatic language, as connected with the portions of the service which precede it, which are calculated to serve, as it were, for spiritual ablutions, preparatory to our being allowed to approach GOD with that filial prayer.

Each of the preceding parts of our worship is of this character. First of all, the Sentences. Fault is found with them for this very peculiarity; it is said that they go back to the Law, rather than abound in the privileges of the Gospel. They are calls to Repentance, or deep professions of Repentance throughout; three of them are from the most penitential of the Psalms (the 51st). And in fact they not only adopt the language of the Law and of the Baptist, the Preacher of Repentance, but the very words of the returning prodigal: "I will arise, and go to my Father, and will say unto Him, Father, I have sinned against Heaven and before Thee, and am no more worthy to be called Thy Son," and proceed in the same profession of humiliation, "Enter not into judgment with Thy servant, O LORD."

This character (which also pervades the sentences in the Scotch Prayer Book, though they are themselves different) will appear more strongly by looking at the American Prayer Book. Though the members of that Church have adopted our prefatory sentences, yet they have prefixed three additional ones of their own, which seem quite to lose sight of this bearing on the Confession, and are of another tone; the first of these is, "The LORD is in His holy temple: let all the earth keep silence before Him." The next from Mal. i. 11, "From the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same, My name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense shall be offered unto My name and a pure offering: for My name shall be great among the Heathen, saith the LORD of Hosts:" and the third "Let the words of my mouth, and the meditation of my heart, be alway acceptable in Thy sight, O LORD, my strength and my Redeemer."
Now these texts of Scripture in our Prayer Book are followed by the Exhortation, which, it is needless to observe, is of the same character, viz. that of a call to repentance. Indeed, how much exhortation and such appeals indicate a low and decayed state, as the natural remedies for it, will appear from the great tendency to Sermons since the Reformation. At the same time it should be observed, in the words of one whose sentiments are ever to be remembered with affectionate esteem, that such passionate appeals to the feelings, as these often are, would not be so objectionable in themselves, if they were given outside the Church, and not allowed to occupy the place of Religious Worship.

We then come to the Confession. It is needless to show how deeply it is pervaded with this penitential tone. It appears new in itself, and also new in this place in the service, in which it is not supported by much authority in antiquity, excepting perhaps a passage referred to by Bishop Sparrow, and other ritualists, from St. Basil, professing it to be their custom to begin with Confession. May we not trust that these strong words of preparatory humiliation are put into our mouths by Him who spake the same language in His Church of old, under circumstances not dissimilar to our own. For it may be observed, that in the time of the captivity, and in the return from it, the prayers of Daniel, of Ezra, and of Nehemiah, in behalf of their people, begin with a Confession, the very words of which might be put into our mouths at the Reformation. And these Prayers of humiliation may be contrasted with that of Solomon, which commences with blessing and thanksgiving.

But there is still something wanting before we are allowed to approach GOD with the Christian’s Prayer, and to use the language of the spirit of adoption; and this is the Absolution. A more merciful provision, than that it should have been preserved and occupied this place, can scarce be conceived.

Such a commencement therefore may prove the characteristic of our Church, as expressive of the position in which GOD has placed us. It might be said that these introductory parts were insertions in the 2nd Book of Edward, by the intervention of foreigners, who, having shorn and left us bare of so much that is holy and valuable, have necessarily put us into a degraded condition. But it must be
remembered, that our object is to divest ourselves of the consideration of secondary agents; to drop all consideration of individuals, as such, is the peculiar privilege and duty of all true members of the Catholic Church. Such depravations were doubtless judicial; but it may be shown hereafter, how overruling mercies blend with those judgments, frustrating the designs of men; and our purpose is to trace indications of our peculiar dispensation beyond the influences or intention of any set of persons.

8. The general tone and spirit of our Prayer Book.

The next point which may be observed, as showing the difference which pervades our own Prayer Book, is a certain spirit, which characterizes the whole tenor of it. We cannot look into Breviaries and Missals without observing their high choral tone in distinction from our own. To advert to particulars; we have the ancient Kyrie Eleison, but have not the Hallelujahs; which indeed, in the solemn accents of the ancient Hebrew form t are so frequent in other Churches, that they remind one of the high evangelical promises alluded to in the Apocrypha, "The streets of Jerusalem shall be paved with beryl,—and all her streets shall say Allelujah." The Introitus, or Psalm introducing the Communion, we have lost. The Hosannah, at the end of the Trisagion, the Gloria Deo at the Gospel, (excepting as observed by traditionary use) are omitted. In king Edward's first book were the words in the Communion, "Let us keep a joyful and holy Feast with the Lord;" these find no place in ours. But we have a penitential responsory on having broken each of the Commandments, and a peculiar prayer of humiliation as unworthy "to gather up the crumbs under the table." We have indeed the Gloria in excelsis, but removed to the Post-Communion, and usually said kneeling. Add to this, that we are even to this day without Canonical Hymns, notwithstanding all efforts to obtain them; but instead of Psalms and Spiritual Songs, even our Thanksgiving assumes the shape, and soon falls into the language of Prayer: like them of old in a condition in some degree analogous to our own, "we sit down and weep, when we remember thee, O Sion; as for our harps, we hang them up upon the trees that are therein." Of the few hymns which we have at the end of
the version of the Psalms, one is: the humble suit of a sinner," and two are "the lamentations of a sinner." With such a beautiful and touching adaptation to our position does the silence and the language of our Liturgy seem to conspire, all brought about by the influence of that unseen Hand, that changes night into day and summer into winter, by an imperceptible process that none can mark. The roll put into our hand has lamentation written on it. "Praise," says the Son of Sirach, "is not seemly in the mouth of a sinner, for it was not sent him of the LORD."

Again, from the Prayer "for the Church militant," we have excluded the more solemn commendation to GOD, and Prayer for the Dead; this is a moving thought, for may we not venture to consider it in this light, that we are by this exclusion, as it were, in some degree disunited from the purer communion of those departed Saints who are now with CHRIST, as if scarce worthy to profess ourselves one with them? For the dead who are the objects of prayer are such as are considered in a state of comparative if not complete blessedness; to pray for such in any condition, and for their perfection, is the privilege of saints rather than the office of servants. And in the Prayer of Oblation, the beautiful mention of Angelic ministries, as bearing our supplications into the presence of the Divine Majesty, is lost: as if thereby (to follow the former train of reflection) we were not to be considered meet to be of that sacred society, who are "come to the Mount Sion," to "the innumerable company of angels," any more than to that of "the spirits of just men made perfect." But instead of these—the higher and more inspiring commemoration of the spirits of the blessed, and the mention of good angels,—we have introduced into our offices an awful service of "Commination" to the living; and in it an appeal, combining the most fearful denunciations to be found in Scripture, forming an office peculiar to ourselves.

Moreover, other churches have had their Litanies in times of public calamity, when "GOD'S wrath lies hard upon them;" but to us our own is given as our weekly, nay our almost daily food. And not only so, but it has come to be that of our Sundays also, for it is remarkable, that it was first appointed only for the Wednesday and Friday. How much this contributes to the tendencies alluded to is very evident, in that it infuses so strongly penitential a tone into the Sunday
itself. But no intention of this kind is attributed to those who introduced it, but only that of a more solemn service. And the Litany itself, if it differs from former supplications of the kind, it is in this, that it appears to be a combination of every most moving petition, and a deprecation of every evil of body and mind to which guilty sinners are subject, and penitent sinners are brought to the sense of. This peculiar ethos of our own Church will be seen by a reference to the American. For the most part adhering to our own Prayer Book (excepting in the Communion Service, which is more primitive,) it will sometimes, by the mere influence of its own inherent difference of spirit, or led by the tendencies of later times, as it were inconsiderately, start aside from its parent’s hand. We find, by a slight direction inserted before the Kyrie Eleison, that the most moving part of the Litany from thence to the prayer, "We humbly beseech Thee," may be omitted at the discretion of the minister.

Another trifling circumstance may be noticed. Every body must have observed, how much the short prayer to be used after the occasional prayers, which speaks of our "being tied and bound by the chain of our sins," is of this penitential character. But observe, how it has crept, as it were, imperceptibly into its present position. It was first only to be used after the prayer in public sickness, on an occasion, that is, of public humiliation, but now it almost occupies a place in the general service, as coming after the Ember Prayers and others.


The next point which comes before us is that of the Sunday Lessons, and on this subject it will be sufficient to adduce the testimony of the "Tract for the Times" (No. 18.) In this the writer considers that there is a general principle, if not intended yet at all events evidenced by the selection, as running through it, and a key to which may be found in the 95th Psalm. It is curious to find that the American Prayer Book actually omits the latter part of this Psalm, which the writer considers as so expressive in implying this lesson. This general principle alluded to he shows to be one of admonition, by setting before us the conduct of GOD’S people of old, and GOD’S dealings with them: "that amidst
the daily experience we have of Christians behaving so very differently from what one should expect a priori in GOD’S elect, unworthy Christians might discern themselves, by anticipation, in the faithless demeanour of the Jews." Now, what is this but to remind us that we, like the Jews, have fallen back from our privileges, and that if we do not take heed we shall forfeit the final inheritance also. For it may be observed, that it is the analogy of the Jewish nation which arrests our attention to the fact, and explains to us the later appearances of Christianity as states of degradation.

And may not the compression of the seven canonical Hours into our two daily services be considered also of this character? The Psalmist, indeed, though a Jew, in the state of a servant, yet speaking in the Spirit, anticipates the privileges and language of a son, when he says, "Seven times a day do I praise Thee;" but we, as if having lost the glad spirit of adoption, which such frequent worship would imply, have come to nothing more than the morning and evening sacrifice of the Jew. Or, if the Litany be considered as a distinct service, to the three times a day of the Jews’ public prayers observed by Daniel and David. By the which change, that which had more the character of a spontaneous and free offering, as of the son who was "always with" his Father, becomes more like the forced returns of a servant, and an appointed task.


To pass from the matter of our Services themselves, there is a circumstance in the Rubric which will serve as a Comment on these changes in the Prayers.

In the time of Edward the Sixth, and sanctioned by his First Book, it seems to have been the custom for the Prayers to be said by the priest in the chancel, turning to the East. Although this was discontinued in the Second Book (where the Rubric spoke of the place where the people could best hear), during the year and a half of its duration, it seems to have been partially restored by that of Elizabeth, which prescribes "the accustomed place of the church, chapel, or chancel," which accustomed place cannot, one would think, allude to that of King Edward’s Second Book, as a year and a half before the intervening reign of Mary could not of course
then be the accustomed place. But to this it n as added, "except it be otherwise appointed by the Ordinary." Whatever the Rubric may have originally intended, the Morning and Evening Prayer seems gradually to have passed from the chancel to the outer church in Bishop Sparrow’s "Rationale," and a note there quoted of Bishop Andrews, the middle of the church is spoken of as the place for the Litany. Whatever may have occasioned it, the fact itself may serve as a practical illustration of what has been said on the substance of the prayers. That we seem thereby gently thrust as it were aside, and put off from a nearer approach to the Altar, bid to stand off awhile, and take the lower place, the position of suppliants, at the entrance of the chancel, and to "weep between the porch and the altar."

It may be noticed that this proceeding typifies, as it were, by external act, another circumstance of our spiritual condition. The mystical interpretations of Holy Scripture are spoken of by the Fathers as the peculiar privilege of sons, as the inner temple of sacred writ, the holier place. In the Breviaries, such spiritual and deep meanings are much brought before us by the verses which are made to answer each other in the responses, and in the lessons from the Fathers. But by our own church they seem scarcely at all openly taught or recognised; perhaps the most remarkable instance of it may be found in the penitential confessions attached to the reading of each of the commandments as broken, which, of course, must apply to the interior sense as explained by the Catechism; and indeed in the Rubric in the Scotch Prayer Book, it is said distinctly "according to the mystical interpretation." In both of these cases we are set afar off, but yet allowed to draw near, not prohibited from doing so; and indeed it is to be observed that in almost all the subjects that this view embraces, we are not actually excluded from the higher privileges, so much as that they are quietly withdrawn from our sight. And it may be perceived that, through them all, though we have put into our mouths the expressions of servants, yet the language of mercy is ever breaking forth, which, though we come as servants, is ready to receive us as sons. "Is Ephraim my dear son is he a pleasant child? for after I spake against him, I do earnestly remember him still."
In speaking of the Rubric, the substitution of the term "Table," "Holy Table," and in the Scotch of "GOD’S Board," for that of "Altar," which is in Edward’s First Book (as well as "GOD’S Board," ) is a strong instance of this our judicial humiliation. For what is it but to say that the higher mysteries which this word "Altar," represents are,—not taken away from us (me genoito), —but partially withdrawn from view; and doubtless, therefore, lost to many who "consider not the LORD’S body." To the participation, indeed, which the word "Table" implies, all are admitted, but the oblation which the term "Altar" indicates is more removed. Thus they are received at "GOD’S board" indeed, but not made so sensible of the presence of Him who admits them as His guests; and therefore, as the Jews of old, receive not equally the benefits of His presence. Such a loss is, therefore, doubtless a great one, which withholds the Altar from our due acknowledgment: but who reads not in this the visitation upon children’s children of the sacrilegious pollution it has undergone in this country! But still, as observed before, mercy is mixed with judgment, and the case so stands with us that it says, "He that can receive it, let him receive it." A great privilege, when it is considered that by the last Review, and the insertion of the word "oblations," we have that which prophets and kings have desired to see, what King Charles the First and Bishop Andrews had not. And perhaps what was made the subject of Bishop Andrews’ prayer, when for the Church of England his supplication was that "its deficiencies should be restored." And with regard to the Oblation itself, is not the case significative of our position, for it is not that no Oblation is made for we pray that "our oblations" may be accepted, but that the oblation is made in silence. Is not this silence expressive? May it not be considered eloquently significative, more than any words of our condition, that the higher part of the service, which look more like the privilege of sons, is performed in humiliation an silence? In the First Book, when the elements were placed on the Altar the priest was to say the lauds and anthem.


There is another circumstance now to be observed, of more importance than any which have been hitherto considered,
the entire omission of the use of oil at baptism and confirmation. The practice on both of these occasions appears to have been primitive, universal, and, possibly, apostolical. In the First Book of Edward, it was appointed that the white vesture or chrism should be put on the child baptized with these words:

"Take this white vesture as a token of the innocency, which GOD'S grace in this holy sacrament of baptism is given unto Thee."

After the above the priest was to anoint the head of the infant, saying—

"Almighty GOD, the FATHER of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, who hath regenerated Thee by water, and the HOLY GHOST, and hath given unto thee remission of all thy sins. He vouchsafe to anoint thee with the unction of His Holy Spirit, and bring thee to the inheritance of everlasting life."

It is probable that this anointing after Baptism was considered as preparatory to Confirmation, so as to supply the place of that anointing. And in the service for Confirmation there was a prayer that seemed to allude to this external anointing, in which it is said, "Confirm and strengthen them with the inward unction of the Holy Ghost, mercifully unto everlasting life. Amen."

Now it does not appear that even Bucer himself attempted to deny the ancient authority of this practice, though indeed he appears to have had but little real reverence for antiquity, but the ground for his having this practice rejected is, "because he thought they, (i. e. the chrism and anointing), carried more show of regard and reverence to the mysteries of our religion than men really retained."

Now, if it be allowed that there is the strongest Church authority for the use of this significative emblem, and also that in Christianity there is no such thing as a merely external and significative rite without being in some degree sacramental also; if it be also the case, that if a custom is found to be primitive, it can hardly be conceived, with any deference to the piety of those ages, but that it must have been apostolical: if we consider, moreover, the little likelihood that Apostles would have invented any thing of a sacramental nature of themselves; if, moreover, we call to mind the typical signification of oil in Scripture, so exceedingly high and holy, and the occasions of its use, viz. in
separating from others the most elevated stations which prefigured the Messiah; in its typical use applied (not as baptism administered to conforming heathens, but) to Prophets, Priests, and Kings of the sacred people.—When we consider these things, surely no one can say the greatness of the gifts which are here withdrawn; how much we have thereby fallen from the high appellations of "a royal priesthood, a holy nation, a peculiar people:" and we have together with it lost the white robe of baptism. The essentials, indeed, are not touched, but they are things of this kind which we have lost. The lessons of humiliation, of being "buried and crucified with Christ," it may be shown hereafter we have still retained. We may still get up to our lower dispensation, and have privileges restored on our repentance; but we cannot expect or wish it, I think, without "He that now goeth on his way weeping, and beareth good seed, shall doubtless come again with joy, and bear his sheaves with him."


There are three Omissions in the office for the "Visitation" of the sick since Edward’s First Book, which seem to me capable of the same construction as illustrative of the last subject; and perhaps not more so in themselves than in the reasons by which their disuse is generally supported by our English Ritualists. The first is the practice of Anointing the sick, if he required it. There is, I believe, no mention of this custom during the first centuries. But the ground on which its disuse is generally maintained is, that it applied, as mentioned by St. James, to miraculous cures, and therefore is not suitable to our days. Here therefore a broad line of distinction is drawn, between miraculous cures, and those to be now expected, as if we were not in a state to receive what our forefathers did.

Can this be warranted, except on the supposition that the faith required must be of this lower and ordinary kind? That the "grain of mustard seed," which is now borne by the tree whose branches fill the earth, is not of the quality of the first seed, which had the promise that it should "remove mountains." The next is a trivial omission, but of the same character. In the first of Edward there was this prayer for the sick:
"Visit him, O LORD, as Thou didst Peter's wife's mother, and the captain's servant; and as Thou didst preserve Toby and Sarah by Thine angel from danger, so restore unto this sick person his former health, if it be Thy will." The rejection of this prayer, it is worthy of observation, is usually approved of for the same reasons, that it refers to miraculous cures not to be now expected.

The other alteration is one apparently still more slight, but not unimportant, as bearing on this principle; in the last Review, (in the year 1662), the four last verses of the 71st Psalm, which is used in "the Visitation," are omitted. The grounds of this alteration are, that the psalm then turns to one of thanksgiving, beginning with this verse—

"O what great troubles and adversities hast Thou shewed me, yet didst Thou turn again, and refresh me, and broughtest me from the deep of the earth again." But it is observable, that most of the Psalms written under the pressure of affliction do thus turn from deprecation to thanksgiving. And what is this slight omission? Surely it may be considered as a silent and undesigned expression of misgiving respecting the existence of that faith required for the promise of prayer. For the promise is not future only, but present,—"Whatsoever ye desire, when ye pray, believe that ye receive them, and ye shall have them." (St. Mark xi. 24.) Another alteration is, that this office did begin with a Psalm, the 143d, but now with a Litany. We allow that these are not important changes in themselves, but it is not unimportant to notice that, wherever we find changes, they should speak to the same effect.
John Keble

On Eucharistical Adoration

(Selections)
Introduction

John Keble in his own day (1792-1866) enjoyed – and endured – the peculiar sort of celebrity that Mother Teresa and Jean Vanier have had accorded to them in our day, the celebrity of a “living saint” and sage. A very great deal of that celebrity came Keble’s way simply because he had composed *The Christian Year* (1827), a collection of devotional verse which provided a poem for each and every Sunday and Holy Day found in EngBCP 1662. For three generations or so, it was one of the perennial best-sellers of the Victorian book-trade, along with works by Tennyson and Dickens; and several of its poems have become standard hymns (a.k.a. “old chestnuts”) in all English-speaking churches – for example, “New every morning is the love” and “Blest be the pure in heart”. And then there was the common knowledge that he had renounced a brilliant career at Oxford in order to serve as his father’s curate in the Gloucestershire parish of Fairford, then as vicar of another rural parish, Hursley in Somersetshire, for the rest of his life. Authorship of a best-selling collection of verse & such self-denying vocational humility made Keble the Victorians’ ideal candidate for canonization. For the Anglican tradition, there was, and is, yet another – and, for some Anglicans, perhaps greater – reason to treat him as a saint: Keble was “ghostly father” and mentor, paragon and master, to Richard Hurrell Froude and John Henry Newman; and, by Newman’s own testimony, the Oxford Movement would not have happened unless he had heard Keble’s Oxford Assizes sermon, *National Apostacy*, on 14 July 1833.

Because he was the author of *The Christian Year*, Keble had an immunity that the Victorian public granted to no other leader of the Oxford Movement; his stature, his reputation as a living saint, was never tainted, impugned, or diminished by his association with the Movement. But modern historians have been puzzled whenever they have tried to say why he had such saintly stature and an immunity which no modern celebrity has enjoyed. Georgina Battiscombe’s *John Keble: A Study in Limitations* (1963 – still, alas! the only biography of Keble to have been published in
the last fifty years) embodied this puzzlement in spades. According to Battiscombe, Keble was emotionally stunted and intellectually hobbled by his ultra-conservative, reactionary views, so that (she implied) he ought not to have had the stature he unquestionably did have.

Perhaps the real rock of offence for moderns is that Keble demonstrated utter indifference towards his own celebrity. He did not disdain or scorn it; he simply paid no attention to it and never let it condition, compromise, or interfere with his convictions. And, yes, those convictions were very conservative indeed, in some respects downright reactionary. He was “on the wrong side of history” during the Reform Bill crisis of 1830-1832, when he and his father stood guard on the barns and hay-ricks of the local gentry, lest they be attacked and burned by rioting tenants. One may think that his single most notorious public statement, his sermon *National Apostacy*, in defence of the Irish Church against the depredations of the Whig government, was even more egregiously wrong-headed: the established – and determinedly Protestant – Church of Ireland was, after all, an arm of English suzerainty in a land whose people were overwhelmingly Roman Catholic; and the government’s plan to suppress twelve Protestant Irish dioceses and use their revenues to fund a Roman Catholic training college had at least this merit, that it sought to redress, however meagerly, some portion of English (and Protestant) injustice to the Irish.

On the other hand, Keble used the occasion of the government’s Irish Dioceses plan to raise some very basic questions of ecclesiology which had not been aired in the Church of England since the days of the Non-jurors more than a century before, or anywhere else in the Anglican communion since the formation of the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States of America almost fifty years earlier. That is: – Because the Church of England is By Law Established, does not the Crown-in-Parliament – that is, the Government – have an obligation to serve and protect the Church’s integrity? And if the answer to that question is “no,” is the game of Established Religion worth the candle of endorsement at a secular government’s convenience?

Keble himself had trouble accepting the logical consequences of his position, namely, Dis-establishment of the Church of England and Ireland. For he truly believed that
Establishment gave the Church a national mission and mandate. He also believed that the Church’s mission and mandate came from God, not from the secular State. So far as I or anybody else have been able to sort out Keble’s ecclesiology, he thought that, though the Church’s national mandate came exclusively from God, yet its missionary action was (or ought to be) **equipped** through the political engine of the State, which was itself, in the anointed “royal personages”¹ of King William IV and his niece and successor Queen Victoria, divinely instituted. So Keble’s argument in *National Apostasy* had to do with the Whig Government of William IV defying and sinning against the Crown’s – and, in particular, William IV’s – God-given responsibility to safeguard the integrity of the Church of England’s no less God-given mandate and mission.

Keble could never have been credited with that shibboleth of modernity, “thinking outside the box”. But his thinking within the box of a defiantly High-church version of Church-of-Englandism led him into a wider Anglicanism, into a view of the heritage that he had inherited and profoundly cherished, which developed far beyond the usual High-church mentality of the Seven Last Words of the Church, “But we’ve always done it this way”. In short, Keble learned that the “box” of High-church Anglicanism was much more Catholic than he had imagined – and he chose to pursue that developed understanding within the “box”, rather than stay put.

¹ This was the term used in the media (that is, newspapers and magazines) throughout the British Empire to refer to the reigning monarch, from the reign of Edward VII (1901-1910) through that of his grandson Edward VIII (1936). Victoria’s sixty-years + on the throne had bestowed such prestige on the monarchy, that the press felt obliged to employ this euphemism, rather than name the King-Emperor by name. Those of you who have read Dorothy Sayers’s Lord Peter Wimsey mystery-novels will have encountered in the one (I forget which one) where Wimsey solves a crime involving his brother, a duke, and in the end meets with the “royal personage” of George V (reigned 1910-1936).
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Second Edition
Oxford: John Henry and James Parker, 1859.

(Selections)

I wish here to say a few words, by way of explaining why this little book reappears with only such slight changes, as will be found on comparing the present with the First Edition.

Besides correcting a few oversights, – more, however, and less excusable than I could have wished, – those changes are mostly confined to that portion of the work which deals with the intention of the final revisers of the Prayer-book; on which point, as far as I have gone hitherto, all additional researches have tended only to strengthen our case.

I could not be without misgivings, when I found that some of those, whom I am bound on all accounts deeply to respect, thought the treatise incorrect in reasoning, and (what indeed I should most exceedingly deprecate) its conclusions, if not its general spirit, alien to those of the English Church.

I have therefore re-considered it to the best of my leisure and ability; and can only hope that it is not mere self-deceit which makes me feel unable to plead guilty to either of these very serious charges.

It has been said that the two first chapters of the Essay are irrelevant, – that they proceed on an ignoratio elenchi [ignorance of what constitutes a valid proof] – because they do not, it is conceived, of themselves prove, that our Lord’s Person is to be adored as present in the Eucharist by a Real Presence of His Body and Blood, – the Inward Part of that Sacrament. Waiving the question how far the negative is correct, the places there alleged will not, I imagine, seem irrelevant, if taken together they constitute a reasonable presumption in favour of that Presence, and the worship resulting from it: just as the fact, that everywhere in the Holy Scriptures we are encouraged to pay all honour and devotion to our Lord, and nowhere warned against excess in so doing, would constitute a strong presumption in favour of His proper Godhead, though there were no express texts to assert it; and is a strong reason for interpreting doubtful texts and ambiguous sayings of the Church in the higher rather than in
the lower sense concerning Him. This is, indeed, all that those two first chapters profess; (1) and if they do carry us so far, I cannot allow that they are irrelevant to the main argument; which, in this aspect, may be stated thus: –

If the general presumption from Scripture and from Natural Piety be in favour of Eucharistical Adoration, then doubtful passages in Scripture, in Fathers and Liturgies, and in our own Formularies, should be construed in that sense. But such presumption does exist, unquestionably, to a very great amount. Therefore such should be our rule of interpretation.

Proceeding to Christian Antiquity, the treatise alleges certain undeniable facts. 1. Writers of high credit in the fourth and fifth centuries affirm it to have been the custom of the whole Church in their time to worship in the Eucharist the Flesh which Christ took of the Virgin Mary. 2. They mention it as a primitive universal tradition. 3. They account for it by the Incarnation, and by the Real Spiritual Presence in the Sacrament. 4. The Christian world, during the whole time of which that worship is affirmed, had with one voice, both in Church and out of Church, been declaring its faith in such a Presence as no man could believe without adoring (2). (This I do not profess to demonstrate, but accept it as demonstrated by Dr. Pusey and others.) So that the historical statement is just what one might expect from the doctrinal: and there is nothing in antiquity to contradict either of them; and very much, as we have seen, both in Scripture and in man's natural heart, to bespeak our favourable acceptance of them.

It is thought, however, that men may safely disregard the historical evidence to the fact of Eucharistical Adoration, (a.) because, as here exhibited, it is comprised in only four or five passages; or, (b.) because these passages are referred to by

(1) See the last section of chap. ii. [Not included in these Readings].

(2) At least in heart; for I have stated in the outset of the argument, and I hope it will be borne in mind all along, that nothing external is necessarily implied; nothing indeed new or strange, nor more than pious Church people (unless they have been embarrassed by theories) habitually practise, though it may be with something of ignorance or indistinctness. No need to start back, as if one were teaching some new thing, instead of only helping Christians to approve to their own judgments what they have always felt devoutly in their hearts.
Roman Catholics for the same purpose: and as to the
doctrinal statements of the first five centuries, concurring as
they do entirely with the historical testimonies, it is by some
replied, (g.) that the Fathers and Liturgies teach a Virtual
Presence but Real Absence of the Body and Blood of Christ:
by others, not so many, (d.) that there is indeed full
testimony to the Presence, but that the worship does not
follow, seeing that His Body and Blood may be present apart
from His Divine Person, (e.) Cases (and they are very
numerous) to which neither of these statements can be made
to apply, are presently disposed of with the remark, That the
Ancients were writing rhetorically, not theologically, and
would have expressed themselves otherwise had they been
aware of the errors which should one day arise in the Church.
On each of these solutions I will say a few words, just to
indicate why they do not appear satisfactory.

(a.) To a public matter of fact, such as the custom of
Adoration, four or five contemporary witnesses,
circumstanced as those Fathers were, would be held by most
historians amply sufficient; unless there were strong counter
evidence, or an overpowering degree of intrinsic
improbability in their statements; neither of which can here
be alleged. All that has been said comes to, “There might
have been more evidence than there is.”

(b.) A moment’s thought will shew that the mere use of a
doctrine or an interpretation by the Roman Catholics is no
reason why we should reject it; unless we are prepared to
reject all points in our common Creed, which they prove, as
we do, by Scripture and Antiquity.

(g.) The question between a Real and Virtual Presence can
only be decided (as far as it depends on Ancient Consent) by
a thorough critical induction of passages. For the groundwork
of such a process, and something more, a person may well
avail himself of Dr. Pusey’s work above mentioned; and the
Liturgies, which do not enter into Dr. Pusey’s plan, are
happily being made accessible through the series in course of
publication by Mr. [John Mason] Neale. To these and other
like helps the readers of this Essay are referred: the Essay
itself, taking generally the doctrine of the Real Presence for
granted, tries to illustrate and enforce from it, and from the
Prayer-book which teaches it, the moral and devotional duty
of Adoration. I have used advisedly the term “Virtual
Presence but Real Absence,” believing the two phrases to be so connected, that they who limit themselves to the former do in effect teach the latter, however many of them may shrink from owning it to themselves; thereby giving a blessed token that their loving hearts believe more than their preoccupied reason discerns in this miracle of mercy. “They feel that they are happier than they know.” But this does not hinder the ill effect of such inadequate doctrine upon the average sort of those who teach and hear it.

In order to maintain their view, they are obliged to make out that those sayings of the Fathers, comparatively very few, which seem to deny the Real Presence, are the staple of the whole ancient doctrine. The Eucharistical thoughts and words of the great theologians, the very Anaphoræ of the primitive Liturgies, are to be toned down till they are in unison with that one saying of S. Augustine, “Sacraments, from their resemblance to the things of which they are the Sacraments, receive for the most part the names even of the things themselves;” and accordingly, whenever our Lord’s Body and Blood is so spoken of as to imply a Real Presence, we are to understand it, if we can, of the outward sign only, called by the name of the Inward Part: which appears to me no more reasonable than for a Socinian [i.e. Unitarian] to insist upon such a text as “I have made thee a God to Pharaoh,” by way of warrant for explaining away all the declarations of our Lord’s proper Divinity. It is a sad habit of thought for a theologian to train himself up in, — that of instinctively adopting, out of various expositions, the most earthly and least supernatural. The least harm that can be said of it is, that it is just contrary to what we should have looked for from the known analogies of God’s successive dispensations; it is more in harmony with Jewish than with Christian interpretations of the Old Testament. I fear that the Church is too likely to experience more and more of this.

(d.) In the face of such a tendency on the one hand, and of the pressure from Rome on the other, it is neither surprising nor uninstructional to find persons learned in the Liturgies especially, unable to hide their eyes from the unquestionable and unquestioning acknowledgment of a Real Presence there everywhere to be found, but equally unable to reconcile themselves to the inevitable corollary of that tenet, Adoration. And so they are driven, as I have said, to imagine
such a Real Presence of our Lord’s crucified Body and Blood shed, as shall not involve a peculiar Presence of His Divine Person. An imagination which every one, who will consider the force of the word adiairetoV in Church decrees on our Lord’s Incarnation, will allow to be untenable, since in logical consequence it could not stop short of plain Nestorianism.

(e.) There remains the common and popular allegation, that the Fathers (to whom must be added the compilers of the Liturgies) spoke rhetorically, not exactly, and would not have so taught had they known what was coming. It is not speaking too strongly to say, that this statement, in order to be effectual, must dispose of nearly the whole of what Antiquity has left us on the subject. Applied on such a scale, it sounds (I do not say is meant to be) very disparaging to the Fathers and to their authority. In itself it is most improbable. Considering the endless variety of individuals and of circumstances, comprehended in the one term, Christian Antiquity, it was very unlikely that with one consent, being left to themselves, all Churches and all writers should err in the same direction – by over-statement.

Compare, in this point of view, the patristical remains with the series of our own standard divines since the Reformation. You will find in those ancients little or nothing, as among us on this topic, of variety arising from school or section, – from the fancy, temper, or feelings of the several men. The plain inference is, that the Church, they thought, had settled the point for them.

We cannot (as has been alleged) account for this uniform tenor of their language, by the supposition that in those days there was no tendency to deny or forget the Real Humanity of our Mediator. For all through those ages, – from the Docetæ [i.e. Docetists] to the Monophysites, from S. John to the Fourth Æcumenical Council, – the Church had to deal distinctly with that particular phase of false doctrine. If the idea of a Real Substantial Presence does indeed contradict the truth of Christ’s Body, certainly the times of those dreamy Oriental heresies required especial care in the Church, not to encourage that idea by glowing language, as in S. Chrysostom and the Liturgies.

And here it must be asked, Have people seriously considered what a thing it is to set down the Prayer-books of the ancient Church as incorrect vehicles of sacred truth; to
separate, in this case, the “Lex Credendi” [the law of believing] so entirely from the “Lex Supplicandi” [the law of praying]? It is just what gave so great offence eight or ten years ago, when the doctrine of Baptism was disturbed by the sentence of the Privy Council in a certain cause. Is it not indeed somewhat shocking, for a person saying his prayers to be told that he is not to understand them exactly as they speak? that in the highest act of Divine communion, both God’s words spoken to him, and the words put into his mouth by the Church whereby to pour out his devotion to God, are to be taken as it were at a discount? that instead of lifting up his belief and feeling to his prayers, the truth requires him to lower his understanding of the prayers to something else, which ought to be his feeling and belief? Yet so it was, according to this hypothesis, with all Christians who at any time have worshipped with the ancient Church in her Liturgies: to say nothing of our own. They have had to keep themselves on their guard, lest they should be misled by the Formularies in which they were joining with the whole Church. Would not S. Chrysostom have dismissed such a thought at once with an “Apage --away with it – it cannot be” (3)?

But the mischief goes even deeper, if possible, than this. If on this one doctrine the Fathers and the whole undivided Church, not excepting the great Æcumenical Councils, are to be regarded as habitually overstating the truth, – either unadvisedly, in a kind of enthusiasm, or (for so it has been stated) advisedly, by way of counteracting the irreverence to which heathen converts had been accustomed in celebrating sacrifices, – who shall warrant us that the same authorities are to be trusted, even in their general consent, on other doctrines and interpretations coming under dispute? And

(3) The same topic has been applied to the construction of the Scottish Communion Office: which is supposed to negative the Real Presence, because, in common with most of the normal Liturgies of antiquity, it places the Offering before the Invocation. But this argument assumes what out to be proved.--that the word prosferomen in the Liturgies must be limited to that particular moment in the Service in which it first occurs: unsuitably, as it seems to me, to the natural force of the word in such a case, and also to the fact that the word is repeated again and again after the consecration is undoubtedly completed.
what then becomes of the Consensus Patrum ["agreement of the Fathers"], the rule of primitive Tradition, hitherto supposed to be accepted by our branch of the Church, in contradistinction to all developments, as God’s special gift for helping us to the right and scriptural conclusion on every point needful to the integrity of the Gospel of our salvation? Here is an absolute unsettling of the standard of faith, especially as between us and Rome. If we should say, “The ancients mistook our Lord’s meaning when He said, ‘This is My Body,’ or however, knowingly or unknowingly, they promulgated a mistaken interpretation of it;” why might not a Romanist say the same of “On this Rock I will build My Church?” [Matthew 16.18] or of “The fire shall try every man’s work?” [1 Corinthians 3.13]: why not some Calvinist or Zwinglian [say the same] of “Ye must be born again of water and of the Spirit?” [John 3.5]; why not some bolder speculator, of the Nicene Creed itself, or of the Inspiration of the very Scriptures of God? No language, as it seems to me, can exaggerate the evil tendency of all this, especially under present circumstances. In itself, though not so intended, it is far more undutiful than demurring to the authority of this or that Anglican divine; or even (should it so chance) of all. For it is disturbing the whole basis of the Anglican system; it is cutting our cables and setting us all adrift, each one to find his own separate course as he may.

We must claim, therefore, for our mother the Church of England, as well as for each of her sons, however unworthy, to have whatever is ambiguous in her doctrinal sayings interpreted in the sense most agreeable to primitive Antiquity; Holy Scripture, of course, being paramount over all. And we may feel sure that such interpretation, though not, perhaps, so put forth as to exclude every other, was intended at least to be tolerated within our pale.

The fourth section of the following Essay is an attempt to apply this principle to the Rubric touching Adoration at the Holy Communion; and the drift of the quotations there made from Anglican divines, more or less concerned in the adoption of that Rubric, is simply to shew that, at the very least, they could not have intended to exclude from the Church of England and her ministry persons adoring Christ as the Inward Part of that Sacrament. This has not always been adverted to by objectors. They have cited passages from
some of the revisers themselves, or from others of like
authority, really or apparently taking the opposite view, as if
such citation were fatal to the argument: whereas the most
that can be inferred from both sorts taken together is, that
the matter was not understood to be positively and expressly
ruled either way. And the fifth section assigns a reason why
such “neutrality” (so to call it) should not be regarded as
damaging our claim to be a true living portion of the Catholic
Church.

Under these circumstances, I see no disingenuousness in
adopting words, from Ridley *(e. g.) or any other, to express
one’s own view, without stopping to enquire whether, on
other occasions, the same author might not have employed
different or even contradictory language.

But, indeed, when we have deducted from the testimonies
of Anglican writers alleged against us, such as in reality touch
only (1.) Transubstantiation, or (2.) the notion of a gross
carnal Presence, [*d] or (3.) the Ubiquity maintained by some
Lutherans, or (4.) the necessity of believing not only in the
 fact  but in the mode of the Real Presence (“whether Trans,
Sub, Con,” &c.), or (5.) the Adoration of the outward
Elements: and when we have duly weighed those many
sayings of theirs, both controversial and devotional, which
tell entirely on our side; the remainder of difficulties we have
to deal with in that kind will be found in comparison very
moderate; nothing, nothing at all, to the work we should
have in reconciling any other doctrine than ours with the
Liturgies and standard writers of the holy Church from the
beginning. This is our conviction, only the more confirmed
when we come to examine carefully the Catenæ * put forth
from time to time against us.

But be our Anglican authorities many or few, nay, were
there (as we have been lately told) no instance at all, since

[* Nicholas Ridley, bishop of London 1550-53; deposed, tried,
burned at the stake (1555) for denying the dogma of
transubstantiation.]

[*d] I may perhaps be excused for exemplifying this by the
expression sometimes quoted from The Christian Year: “present
in the heart, not in the hands:” cf. S. John vi. 63; 1 Cor. xv. 50.

[* Catenæ – Latin, “chains”. A string of “proof-texts,” usually from
non-scriptural authorities, on a given topic.]
the last Review, of an English Divine teaching exactly the

tenets now so keenly opposed, we should still have a claim
to be tried, not by any partial development, domestic or

foreign, but by our own Formularies, interpreted by Scripture

and Antiquity. And if those standards did not condemn us,
we might justly feel ourselves acquitted before God and man.

Such I believe to be our position, such our appeal. I will
venture to add one word more on the real extent of the

question.

Unless I am greatly mistaken, the real point at issue in most
of the controversies which have troubled us all along in the
Reformed English Church, might be expressed in words like
the following: – “Is the Church, mingled as we see it of good
arid bad, a supernatural body, separated off from the world
to live a supernatural life, begun, continued, and ended in
miracles – miracles as real as any of those which befell the
Israelites in the wilderness – as real, but infinitely more
gracious and awful? or is it only a body providentially raised
up to hold the best and purest philosophy – helped as all
good things are from above, but in itself no more than the
heroical and Divine phase of this present life?” It is plain at
first glance which side of this alternative brings with it the
more intense obligation to holiness, and represents sin as
“more exceeding sinful;” –which, therefore, would be most
hated and disparaged by the Hater of God and goodness:
unless, indeed, he can persuade those who hold it to
contradict it in their lives. It is plain also that the doctrine of
the Real Presence in the Holy Eucharist is strictly in unison
with the supernatural view; whereas that of a Virtual
Presence and Real Absence might be accepted by one who
believed that miracles invisible, as well as visible, have
entirely ceased.

Here is a prima facie reason why religious and reverent
persons should be slow to accept that or any other theory
which interferes with simple acquiescence in the words of
Scripture and of the ancient Church: and here is also (if
possible) a yet stronger reason why those who profess such
acquiescence should be more and more on their guard against
all that is unmeet for His Presence, – more and more fearful
as they “enter into the cloud.”

So be it: and may our good Lord forgive whatever may
have been here or elsewhere written, said, or thought
unworthily of this His most holy and ineffable Mystery; and may He grant this to be the last time that the present writer shall have to deal with It in a controversial way!

HURSLEY,
*Conversion of St. Paul*, 1859.
CHAPTER I.

Promptings of Natural Piety.

§1. THE object of this Essay is to allay, and, if possible, to quiet, the troublesome thoughts which may at times, and now especially, occur to men’s minds on this awful subject, so as even to disturb them in the highest act of devotion. For this purpose it may be well to consider calmly, not without deep reverence of heart, First, what Natural Piety would suggest; Secondly, what Holy Scripture may appear to sanction; Thirdly, what the Fathers and Liturgies indicate to have been the practice of the Primitive Church; Fourthly, what the Church of England enjoins or recommends.

§ 2. For the first: is it not self-evident that, had there been no abuse, or error, or extravagance connected with the practice, all persons believing and considering the Real Presence of our Lord in Holy Communion, in whatever manner or degree, would in the same manner or degree find it impossible not to use special worship? – the inward worship, I mean, and adoration of the heart: for that, of course, is the main point in question; the posture and mode are secondary and variable, and may and must admit of dispensation.

The simple circumstance of our Lord Christ declaring Himself especially present would, one would think, be enough for this. Why do we bow our knees and pray, on first entering the Lord’s house? Why do we feel that during all our continuance there we should be, as it were, prostrating our hearts before Him? Why is it well to breathe a short prayer when we begin reading our Bibles, and still as we read to recollect ourselves, and try to go on in the spirit of prayer? And so of other holy exercises: in proportion as they bring with them the sense of His peculiar presence, what can the believer do but adore? I firmly believe that all good Christians do so, in the Holy Sacrament most especially, whatever embarrassment many of them may unhappily have been taught to feel touching the precise mode of their adoration.
And this may well be one of the greatest consolations, in the sad controversies and misunderstandings among which our lot is cast. It is as impossible for devout faith, contemplating Christ in this Sacrament, not to adore Him, as it is for a loving mother, looking earnestly at her child, not to love it. The mother’s consciousness of her love, and her outward manifestation of it, may vary; scruples, interruptions, bewilderments may occur; but there it is in her heart, you cannot suppress it. So must there be special adoration and worship in the heart of every one seriously believing a special, mysterious presence of Christ, God and man, expressed by the words, *This is My Body.*

§ 3. I say a special adoration and worship, over and above what a religious man feels upon every occasion which helps him to realize, what he always believes, that God is “about his path, and about his bed, and spieth out all his ways;” that in Him he “lives, and moves, and has his being”. And this for very many mysterious and over-powering reasons. I will specify three, the most undeniable and irresistible. First, the greatness of the benefit offered; next, its being offered and brought home to each one personally and individually; thirdly, the deep condescension and humiliation on the part of Him who offers the benefit.

§ 4. When Joseph went out over all the land of Egypt, “they cried before him, Bow the knee.” When Moses delivered the first message from God to the Israelites in Egypt, concerning their deliverance, and the second message, concerning the Passover, “the people bowed their heads and worshipped”. Would it not have been very strange, if, when the great promises were realized before their eyes, and they actually saw the token of the Lord’s Presence, the fire coming down and consuming their first offering, – that fire which continued until it was quenched by their sins before the first captivity, – they had scrupled to own His Presence by like adoration? They did the same, and much more, when Aaron, for the first time after his consecration, “lifted up his hand toward the people and blessed them, . . . and the glory of the Lord appeared unto all the people. And there came a fire out from before the Lord, and consumed upon the altar the burnt-offering and the fat: which when all the people saw, they shouted, *and fell on their faces.*” (Levit. ix.22-24.) There was no one at hand to say to them, “Take care: people will
call it fire-worship.” And just in the same way did they acknowledge the finishing of the old dispensation by the building of the Temple. When David had completed his preparations, he said to all the congregation, “Now bless the Lord your God. And all the congregation blessed the Lord God of their fathers, and bowed down their heads, and worshipped the Lord and the king.” (1 Chron. xxix. 20.) When, upon the day of consecration, “Solomon had made an end of praying, and when all the children of Israel saw how the fire came down, and the glory of the Lord upon the house, they bowed themselves with their faces to the ground upon the pavement, and worshipped, and praised the Lord.” (2 Chron. vii.1, 3.) The outward act of worship was more lowly, and no doubt in religious hearts the inward adoration was deeper and more fervent, as the mighty blessing made its approach more manifest.

§ 5. So, and much more, in the Christian Church. If we kneel, and bow the knees of our hearts, to receive a blessing in the Name of the Most High from His earthly representatives, Father, Priest, or Bishop, how should we do other than adore and fall prostrate, inwardly at least, when the Son of Man gives His own appointed token that He is descending to bless us in His own mysterious way? And with what a blessing! – “the remission of our sins, and all other benefits of His Passion!” His Flesh, which is meat indeed, and His Blood, which is drink indeed! mutual indwelling between Him and us; we living by Him, as He by the Father! Surely these are gifts, at the very hearing of which, were an Angel to come and tell us of them for the first time, we could not choose but fall down and worship. And now it is no Angel, but the Lord of the Angels, incarnate, coming not only to promise, but actually to exhibit and confer them.

§ 6. Further, the Eucharist is our Saviour coming with these unutterable mysteries of blessing, coming with His glorified Humanity, coming by a peculiar presence of His own divine Person, to impart Himself to each one of us separately, to impart Himself as truly and as entirely as if there were not in the world any but that one to receive Him. And this also, namely, the bringing home of God’s gifts to the particular individual person, has ever been felt by that person, in proportion to his faith, as a thrilling call for the most unreserved surrender that he could make of himself, his
whole spirit, soul, and body: i.e. of the most unreserved Worship.

Look at the saints of God from the beginning. God made a covenant with Abraham, He promised to give him a son of Sarah, and both times Abraham “fell on his face.” (Gen. xvii. 3, 17). His servant Eliezer “bowed the head and worshipped,” when he found that he was miraculously guided to the person whom God had chosen to be Isaac’s wife; and again, when her kinsmen had consented to the marriage. (Gen. xxiv. 26, 52). God descended in the cloud on Mount Sinai, and stood with Moses on the mount, in token that he had found favour in His sight, and He knew him by name: Moses “made haste, and bowed his head toward the earth, and worshipped.” (Exod. xxxiv. 8.)

The captain of the Lord’s host appeared unto Joshua, and Joshua “fell on his face to the earth, and did worship.” (Josh. v. 14). The angel of the Lord went up in the flame of Manoah’s altar, and Manoah and his wife looked on it, and “fell on their faces to the ground.” (Judges xiii. 20.) When young Samuel was solemnly “lent to the Lord,” Eli performed a solemn act of adoration, and Hannah accompanied it with an adoring hymn. (1 Sam. ii. 1.) The Shunammite, when her child had been raised by Elisha, “fell at his feet, and bowed herself to the ground.” (2 Kings iv. 37. Cf. 2 Chron. xx. 18; Dan. ii. 19.)

§ 7. If we go on to the New Testament, and take a few instances out of many, we shall still find that it is the nearness as well as the greatness of the blessing which prompts the special worship or thanksgiving. “Whence is this to me, that the mother of my Lord should come unto me?” “Mine eyes have seen Thy salvation.” [Luke 1.41, 2.30.] The leper worshipped Him, saying, “Lord, if Thou wilt, Thou canst make me clean. And Jesus put forth His hand and touched him.” On His walking on the sea, and quieting the storm, after the miracle of the loaves, those who were in the ship came and worshipped Him; so did Jairus, so did the woman with the issue of blood: some of them before, some after the mercy received. So did the woman of Canaan; so the father of the demoniac, after the transfiguration; so the poor slave, overwhelmed with debt, in the parable of the unmerciful servant; so the mother of Zebedee’s children, asking the great wish of her heart; so the holy women, holding Him by the
feet, when, being risen, *He met them, and said, All hail!* so the eleven, meeting Him by appointment in Galilee. So S. Peter, after the draught of fishes, “Fell down at Jesus’ knees,” (S. Luke v. 8.) the more overpowered by the greatness of the miracle, because of the nearness of Him who wrought it; coming into his boat, and directing him where and when to cast the net. So Magdalene, drawn to Him by His presence in the Pharisee’s house; so the grateful leper, turning round to Him before He was out of sight; and the eager, rich young man. So Zaccheus, at His coming into his house; so the blind man in S. John ix., “Thou hast both seen Him, and it is He that talketh with thee’ . . . . and he worshipped Him.” So S. Thomas, on His specially addressing him; (for invoking Him as his Lord and God was surely an act of worship;) so Cornelius to S. Peter; so the jailor to S. Paul and Silas; so S. John to the Angel.

§ 8. But three cases there are, which bring out this law of devotion (so to call it) in a peculiar and very wonderful way. To Mary of Bethany it was said, “The Master is come, and calleth for thee;” for thee in particular – for thee by name: what else can Mary do but hasten and throw herself at Jesus’ feet? Not so Martha, who had not been sent for. And again, either of the same holy woman, or of another very like her, we read, “Jesus said unto her, Mary:” it was that, His calling her by name, His coming to herself personally and individually, which had the thrilling effect upon her. She had heard before that He was risen, – she had heard of Him “by the hearing of the ear,” – but now she heard Him actually speaking, and speaking to her; and so her eye, which before only saw without resting on Him, came clearly to discern Him. It was the personal application to her by name which drove away for ever her melancholy dream that He was absent, and caused her to turn herself and cry out “My Master!” with an adoring voice and gesture, as the context shews; for the saying, “Touch Me not,” implies an attempt on her part to embrace His knees, or hold Him by the feet, or some such action: and even if it had not been written, who could have doubted it?

And may we not here, too, remember that other Mary, her whom all generations shall call Blessed, when she not only saw and heard the Angel declaring the message of salvation to her, and to us all, but knew in herself that the
Holy Ghost was come upon her, and the Power of the Highest overshadowing her, and that the Holy Thing that should be born of her was to be called the “Son of God”? What her feelings were we partly know by that hymn in which, as we may reverently believe, she even now joins with the Church continually: which hymn is surely as perfect an act of adoration as ever was performed on earth by any but her divine Son Himself. We know that her *Magnificat* begins with owning the Lord and God as *her* Saviour; with amazedment that He had regarded “the lowliness of His handmaiden;” that He had marked *her* out for a perpetual blessing, and had done to *her* great things. In respect of the Incarnation itself, then, it was not only the immensity of the Gift, but its inconceivably near approach also to the Receiver, which she was taught of the Holy Ghost adoringly to acknowledge. Why or how should it be otherwise in respect of that which divines have truly called “the extension of the Incarnation” – the participation of the Incarnate One by His true members, in and through the spiritual eating and drinking of His present Body and Blood?

§ 9. Thus it would appear that God’s holy Word from beginning to end abounds in examples to sanction those natural instincts of the devout and loving heart, which prompt to deeper and more intense adoration, in proportion to the greatness of the gift, and the directness with which it comes straight to the receiver from Almighty God.

Now the gift in the Holy Eucharist is Christ Himself – all good gifts in one; and that in an immense, inconceivable degree. And how can we conceive even Power Almighty to bring it more closely and more directly home to each one of us, than when His Word commands and His Spirit enables us to receive Him as it were spiritual meat and drink? entering into and penetrating thoroughly the whole being of the renewed man, somewhat in the same way as the virtue of wholesome meat and drink diffuses itself through a healthful body: only, as we all know, with this great difference, (among others,) – that earthly meat and drink is taken up and changed into parts of our earthly frame, whereas the work of this heavenly nourishment is to transform our being into itself; to change us after His image, “from glory to glory,” from the fainter to the more perfect brightness; until “our sinful bodies be made clean by His Body, and our souls
washed through His most precious Blood; and we may evermore dwell in Him, and He in us:”† “we in Him,” as members of “His mystical Body, which is the blessed company of all faithful people;”‡ “He in us,” by a real and unspeakable union with His divine Person, vouchsafed to us through a real and entirely spiritual participation of that Flesh and Blood which He took of our Father Adam through the Blessed Virgin Mary; wherewith He suffered on the Cross, wherewith also He now appears day and night before His Father in heaven for us. So that a holy man of our own Church was not afraid thus to write of this Sacrament:—

“But by way of nourishment and strength
Thou creep’st into my breast,
Making thy way my rest,
And thy small quantities my length;

[† The Prayer of Humble Access, EngBCP 1662 Communion Order: “We do not presume to come to this thy Table, O merciful Lord, trusting in our own righteousness, but in thy manifold and great mercies. We are not worthy so much as to gather up the crumbs under thy Table. But thou art the same Lord, whose property is always to have mercy. Grant us, therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the flesh of thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink his blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by his body, and our souls washed through his most precious blood, and that we may continually dwell in him, and he in us.”]

[‡ Prayer after Communion 2, EngBCP 1662 Communion Order: “Almighty and everliving God, we most heartily thank thee, for that thou dost vouchsafe to feed us, who have duly received these holy mysteries, with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ; and dost assure us thereby of thy favour and goodness toward us; and that we are very members incorporate in the mystical body of thy Son, which is the blessed company of all faithful people, and are also heirs through hope of thy everlasting kingdom, by the merits of the most precious death and passion of thy dear Son. And we most humbly beseech thee, O heavenly Father, so to assist us with thy grace, that we may continue in that holy fellowship, and do all such good works as thou hast prepared for us to walk in; through Jesus Christ our Lord, to whom with thee and the Holy Ghost, be all honour and glory, world without end.”]
§ 10. The sum is this. Renewed nature prompts the Christian, and Holy Scripture from beginning to end encourages him, to use special adoration to Almighty God at the receiving of any special gift: – adoration the more earnest and intense as the gift is greater, and the appropriation of it to the worshipper himself more entire and direct. So it is with all lesser, all partial gifts; how then should it not be so when we come to the very crown and fountain of all, that which comprehends all the rest in their highest possible excellency, and which is bestowed on each receiver by way of most unspeakable participation and union, – that gift which is God Himself, as well as having God for its Giver? “Christ in us,” not only Christ offered for us; a “divine nature” set before us, of which we are to be made “partakers.” [2 Peter 1.4.] Must we cease adoring when He comes not only as the Giver, but as the Gift; not only as the Priest, but as the Victim; not only as “the Master of the Feast,” but as “the Feast itself?” (Bp. Taylor, Holy Living: Works, iv. 310, Heber’s edition.) Nay, but rather this very circumstance is a reason beyond all reasons for more direct and intense devotion.

§ 11. This brings us to the third circumstance, mentioned above as an obvious motive of adoration in the Holy Eucharist. For consider, – to take the lowest ground first, – when men are receiving a favour from a superior, is not a sense of his condescension a natural ingredient in their loving acknowledgements? and if there is any thing generous and grateful in their hearts, do they not honour and revere him the more for every suffering, humiliation, debasement, indignity which he may have incurred in doing them good? and can they well endure to hide and repress their veneration for him? are they not the more bent on avowing it, the more

they see him slighted by others, possibly on this very account, that he had not spared so to demean himself for their sake?

Caleb “stilled the people before Moses,” when the spies were setting them against him. (Numbers xiii. 30.) Joshua was jealous for Moses’ sake, when some appeared to be prophesying without commission from him. (Numbers xi. 28.) It is plain that their loyalty to him was quickened by the reproach they saw him enduring. So all the dark feelings and speeches of the unhappy Saul concerning David, served but to settled Jonathan’s heart in loving and honouring him more than ever. So Shimei’s cursing David in his affliction kindled the zeal of his soldiers and servants [2 Samuel 16].

And our Master, when he was with us in the flesh, more than once gave token of especial approbation and blessing to those who confessed Him the more unreservedly for the wrong that was done Him; as to the sinful woman, who, unconsciously or not, supplied the Pharisee’s discourtesy by a washing, anointing, and salutation of her own; to Simon Peter, speaking out before the rest, to own as the words of eternal life those sayings about Holy Communion, which had just driven away many of the disciples in disgust [John 6.66-69]; and very significantly to man born blind, when he in dutiful and pious gratitude had stood up for Christ, his Restorer, against the Pharisees, and had incurred their scorn and hatred. “Thou wast altogether born in sin, and dost thou teach us? and they cast him out. Jesus heard that they had cast him out; and when He had found him, He said unto him, Dost thou believe on the Son of God? he answered and said, Who is He, Lord, that I might believe on Him? And Jesus said unto him, Thou hast both seen Him, and it is He that talketh with thee. And he said, Lord, I believe. And he worshipped Him.” (S. John ix. 34-38). The Pharisees’ reviling of Christ, [9/10] and of himself for Christ’s sake, led him not only to belief, but to adoration.

And what shall we say of the Thief on the Cross? It may appear by the tenor of the sacred history, that the providential instrument of his conversion was the revilings of the crowd and of his fellow-malefactor, – in which he himself at first ignorantly joined, – so meekly and majestically borne by the holy Jesus. When he saw that, he perceived at once that “This Man hath done nothing amiss;” and he became the first to know and own Christ, “and the power of His
resurrection, and the fellowship of His sufferings, being made conformable unto His death” [Philippians 3.10]. The deep veneration he had conceived for our Lord, as for an innocent Man receiving the due reward of such wicked deeds as his own, was rewarded with an adoring faith in Him as Lord and Judge of the whole world; and he became the first example of those who should be saved by the blessed Cross. And beholding his Lord’s glory through the veil of His extreme humiliation, and taught from above to understand that for that very humiliation’s sake he was to surrender himself entirely to Christ, – to worship Him with all the powers of his soul, – he became also a pattern for all who would be worthy communicants. For what is that which we remember specially, and on which we fix our mind’s eye in Holy Communion, but the same which he then saw with his bodily eyes? – the Body and Blood of Christ, i.e. Christ Himself, offered up by Himself for that thief and for each one of us? And if he worshipped, and was blessed, why not we?

We seem to have been drawn up unawares, by this enumeration of examples, from the contemplation of a high moral sentiment to that of a cardinal principle in the kingdom of heaven; for such undoubtedly has ever been the rule of acknowledging Christ’s Incarnation, and all His condescensions and humiliations consequent upon it, by special and express acts of homage and worship, inward and outward, according to the time and occasion. …
CHAPTER V.

Duties of Churchmen in respect of this Case.*

§ 1. THERE remains the very serious practical inquiry, how the position of persons so believing within the Church of England was or is affected by these proceedings. I call it a “practical” inquiry, because, although that particular case is at an end, the points involved in it may at any time be mooted in some other instance: and in the present unhappy state of parties, are too likely to be so. It is, indeed, two questions in one; for it may be taken as relating either to our legal or to our moral and spiritual position. With regard to the former, it is useless now to speculate. We can but leave it to receive solution, if need be, from the proper authorities in due course of law. But should it again arise, and be finally decided as it was the other day in the Court of Arches, then (as the judgment on appeal will be legally binding at least on the diocesan courts of England,) the other question will arise, How shall we stand, morally and spiritually, as clergymen bound by certain Articles, when the legal interpreters of those Articles have declared them to be, by implication, contrary and repugnant to a tenet which we hold as a vital doctrine of the Gospel?

§ 2. But before going on to this, it may be worth while to say one word more on the comparatively immaterial question of our legal position. Speaking under correction, I believe that, as a matter of course, until the legislature decree otherwise, the decision of the highest court of appeal rules all subsequent decisions. Therefore every clergyman from that day forward will understand, that if he be known in any way to hold the duty of worshipping Christ, “in and with the Sacrament, as the Thing signified of the Sacrament,” his place and benefice in the Church of England will be at the mercy of any one choosing to exhibit articles against him. And since it is known that there is a numerous and powerful, and in these

* this Case.... these proceedings.... that particular case: I.e. the Forbes Case (see Introductions).
matters (may we not say it?) an unscrupulous section of the Church, watching to see whom they may take at such an advantage; there can be small doubt, humanly speaking, what will become in a few generations, not only of the custom of adoration, but of the doctrine inseparable from it—the doctrine of the Real Presence among us.

Again; it is doubtless true that legally the act of Elizabeth, under which the judgment has been obtained, would not, taken by itself, constitute the Articles [of Religion as] the sole test of doctrine. But those who have expressed a fear of such a result were thinking not of that act only, but of its effect taken conjointly with the Gorham decision. The latter seemed to rule that nothing should be held obligatory, unless it were affirmed in the Articles. The former, that nothing, however plainly affirmed in Holy Scripture, or the Prayer-book, should be so much as allowed, if it appeared at first sight contrary to the Articles; assuming thereby that that one document had nothing in it ambiguous, nothing equivocal, nothing which could need to be interpreted by comparison with other documents of co-ordinate authority. What more could be desired by any one who might wish to escape from Holy Scripture and the Prayer-book, and make the Thirty-nine Articles our sole standard? If a man were minded, for instance, to deny the Inspiration of Scripture, the Eternity of hell-torments, or the personal existence of the Evil Spirit, he would have only to point out that they are not affirmed in the Articles. If he wished to deny S. James’s doctrine of Justification by works, or to enforce his way by quoting the letter of the eleventh and seventeenth Articles.†

If it be really the mind of the present English Church so materially to narrow her pale of admissible doctrine on one side, and enlarge it on the other; would it not be wiser, better, more seemly, to do it once for all, deliberately, and in the face of day, that all men might know what themselves and others are about, rather than go on in this unhappy, vexatious course; watching for seasons when an adversary happens to be unwary or unpopular, or when sympathy may be hoped for from a prime minister or a judge; and disposing

of deep and high points of theology by a side-wind, *et quasi aliud agenda* ["and as if there were a hidden agenda, some extra requirement besides the public formularies"]?

§ 3. But be that as it may, the question will remain for individuals, supposing the sentence confirmed, What ought they to do, who have gone on hitherto believing the Real Presence, and adoring accordingly, in no undutifulness to the English Church, but in full conviction that they were but carrying out what they had learned in the Catechism and Communion Office? They cannot give up their convictions, they cannot cease to believe and adore, in deference to a mere affirmation, even from the highest human authority, the reasons (for whatever cause) being withheld; nor yet upon such reasons as have hitherto been alleged. Neither is the matter an abstract one, such as one may withdraw his mind from, and exclude it from his teaching, or even in a way suspend his belief of it, in a dutiful wish to obey those whom God’s providence has set over him. Such cases are conceivable; perhaps (e. g.) a person’s view of predestination may admit of being so treated; but whether or no Jesus Christ the Son of Man is specially present in the Holy Sacrament, as the Inward Part thereof, and whether to worship Him accordingly or no, – these are thoughts which cannot be put by; they come before the mind and heart as often as you go to His altar. And if you believe them to be essential parts of Christian truth and duty, you must teach them to all entrusted to your care.

The only question will be, Is a person continuing so to believe and teach bound to resign any privileges which he may enjoy in virtue of his subscription to the Articles? ‡ or is he free in conscience to retain them as long as he can, if he consider it otherwise his duty to do so?

Now this question seems to resolve itself into another and a more general inquiry. It being allowed that human laws bind the conscience of the subject to obey them according to the intention of the legislature, if not contrary to the law of

[‡ Under the 1661 Act of Supremacy, all clergymen of the Church of England were required to “subscribe the Articles” – i.e. read aloud and then sign a copy of the XXXIX Articles of Religion – on taking up a new position in the Church, whether a bishopric, a deanship, a canonry, a prebend, a university fellowship, or a parochial appointment (rector or vicar or curate).]
John Keble, On Eucharistical Adoration

God; we are to consider whether the like submission is absolutely due to *the judicial interpretations* of the same laws? For example: certain goods of foreign manufacture are, or were lately, prohibited in this country, and no doubt it was a moral duty to abstain from importing what were unquestionably known to be goods of that description; but let us suppose that in a particular instance a question had arisen, whether such and such a fabric came under that description, and the judges had determined it in the affirmative, while the merchant, from his technical knowledge, was thoroughly convinced of the negative; was he bound in conscience to abstain from importing the like in time to come? or might he innocently risk the transaction if he thought it worth while? Other imaginary cases might be put, but this one will be sufficient to explain what is meant.

Now, as I can hardly conceive any one imagining that the tradesman in this instance was morally guilty of breaking the law, so neither, or rather much less, would the same guilt seem to attach to a clergyman retaining his cure, if he could, after his opinions and teaching had been condemned, supposing him sincerely and seriously convinced before God that the condemnation proceeded on a mistake in the law. It would be a question, not of right or wrong, but of expedient or inexpedient; and surely, in the event we are now contemplating, (may God avert it! but if it *should* happen,) truth and charity, and loyalty and devotion, the honour of God Incarnate, and the salvation of the souls of our brethren – all the motives that can be imagined going to make up the highest expediency – would render it the duty of every Catholic clergyman to abide in his place until he was forcibly expelled from it, either by a like prosecution, ending in like manner, or from inability to bear up against the worry and expense of the proceeding.

If any misgiving occurred to a right-minded person in adopting this course, it would probably be on the ground that there was some appearance of breach of trust, in respect of those under whose authority he was taking the benefit of his subscription, conscious all the while that he was subscribing in a different sense from what they might be willing to allow. But this scruple might at once be met, by taking care to give sufficient notice of your mind and purpose
to the persons concerned, and so enabling them, if they thought proper, to put you also on your trial.

§ 4. So much may suffice with respect to our legal difficulties: but there are others more serious, connected with our ecclesiastical position. We know too well, by very sad experience, that some earnest persons regard the Church of England as distinctly committed by the sentences of that which may happen practically at a given time to be her supreme Court of Appeal. So that if the late judgment against adoration (e. g.) had been unhappily affirmed by her Majesty in Council, there would have been, according to them, no help for it: the Church by law established would have denied the faith, and believers must have sought another home where they might.

Now many will feel as if this saying refuted itself by its very extravagance. To suppose that for one sentence, once promulgated and enacted, by a court constituted as that of which we are speaking, every one’s faith and practice remaining just what it was before, by far the greater number of our communicants knowing nothing at all of the matter, not even aware that there was any trial going on, and ready, for aught any one can tell, to disclaim the doctrine implied in the sentence, if it were duly explained to them, from the very bottom of their hearts: – to suppose, I say, that by one such decision all these believing multitudes were fairly turned out of God’s Church on earth, and left with the heathen to the forlorn hope of incurable ignorance, – all this would be intolerable, nay, impossible, unless some unquestionable word of some infallible authority were shewn for it. Compare it with the known dealings of the Almighty towards either Churches or individuals. See how it looks when judged of by the analogy of the faith. No doubt there are fearful instances of one person falling in a moment, and drawing after him in ruin thousands, themselves at the time unconscious, or not yet existing. We do not forget Adam in Paradise, nor Esau selling his own and his children’s birthright, nor Saul when Samuel turned away from him, nor Jeroboam when he made Israel to sin; nor the several ringleaders of heresy and schism among Christians, and how their unhappy followers were cast out with them: nor (in a word) how the fathers’ sins are by the Divine law visited on the children: and it is, of course, possible that any particular instance of
transgression and misleading may prove to be one more in that list; but who at the time shall declare it so? Surely none may do that with authority but the Judge Himself; and when He has done so, He has constantly done it by signs unequivocal – miracles or prophecies, or the consenting voice of His Church; and even then not until after long endurance and repeated warnings. But for private Christians to take upon themselves to pass that sentence, – which a man would in effect be passing, if he forsook the Church’s communion for any such proceeding as is now dreaded, – this would seem not unlike the error of those who were warned that they knew not what manner of spirit they were of. One mortal sin, we know, deliberately consented to, is enough to destroy a soul; but we know also how long and how tenderly He whose name is Merciful as well as Jealous has borne with whole years of transgression and has not destroyed; we know that His mercy is over all His works; that it extends to the thousandth generation, while He is said to visit iniquity upon children only and children’s children. The antecedent probability therefore is, in every case, until the Church has examined and ruled it, that the error complained of, however real and deadly in itself, does not bring such a taint of heresy over those communicating with its professors, as to separate them, ipso facto, from the Church.

§ 5. Secondly, in this particular case, the error coming out not in the shape of a synodical or legislative enactment, but of a judicial decision; as it is no part of the law of the land, of force to bind the conscience of the subjects, so is it no part of the law of the Church, (the provincial Church, of course, I mean,) with power to bind the conscience of its members. It betrays, indeed, a sad want of discipline, and threatens and forebodes an eventual corruption of doctrine; but it leaves the formularies of the Church and the faith of its present members just where they were. If any one doubt this, let him consider one or two parallel cases. Suppose, from some epidemical delusion, (we have seen such things at no great distance,) it had become morally impossible to obtain a verdict of guilty against a murderer in a particular country – would any one think of laying it to the charge of that country that it had no law against murder? Or what if, at any time, by connivance, corruption, or indolence, it should appear
that the slave-trade is still being carried on in English vessels, or slavery practised in some English colony — would it be fair to say that slavery and the slave-trade had again become part of the laws and institutions of England? Or again, — to put a case nearer the actual one, — if we imagine the days of Arian ascendancy returned, and, by some such combination as we read of under Constantius, a judicial body formed which had a leaning that way, and skill more or less to carry with it the popular feeling, and thus a sentence obtained against orthodoxy: would such a decision, or a hundred such, prove the English Church to be in its essence really Arian? They would certainly cause great anxiety lest it should quickly become such; but instead of their affording any excuse or reason for separation, every heart that was truly loyal to our Saviour would assuredly feel called on to cling to its profession the more earnestly, and take away the reproach from Israel: and if any made that state of things an argument for withdrawing himself and joining some other Christian body, how very sure should we feel that he was either indulging temper, or but availing himself of the first excuse he could find for carrying into effect what for other reasons he had before determined on! [167/168]

The matter may be put in this light. Casuists are agreed that the proper authorities to determine the meaning of documents subscribed to, are the same by whom the subscription is enforced; i. e., in this case, the Church and State of England. There can be no reasonable doubt that when these bodies last legislated on the subject, in 1661, they meant to receive subscriptions in the sense now condemned. If they have changed their mind and will, let them declare it in the only way in which it is competent for them to do so: namely, by fresh legislation corrective of the former. Until they shall have so done, they must be taken to be of the same mind as before, and the old interpretation to stand good. Any court of justice interpreting the document on any other principle narrower than this, must be presumed to be mistaken, and cannot bind the conscience by its decision. Nothing can do that, short of the voice of the legislature, distinctly enacting the new interpretation. The synod or convocation so decreeing may bind us as Churchmen; the parliament as Englishmen; until they have spoken we are free.
§ 6. It would appear, then, that by the decision, simply as a decision, we really need not feel ourselves or our Church in any degree bound or committed. It may be a great scandal and a bad precedent, but no man is pledged as a Churchman or as a clergyman to abide by it, and therefore no man need think of retiring on account of it. But there is one circumstance connected with it which yet requires grave consideration; it presents, indeed, as far as I see, the only real difficulty of the case, in the view of a conscientious Churchman, knowing and wishing to hold by the rules of antiquity. That circumstance is the share which the Metropolitan has had, and is likely to have, in the whole transaction; and the difficulty which it raises is incurred already: we have not to wait for it until some fresh appeal shall have been dealt with: we have been burdened with it ever since the first solemn declaration of the Court at Bath in the case of Archdeacon Denison. It is simply this: that if there be any soundness in the statements and arguments set down above, the proposition of the Court touching [168/169] worship in Holy Communion would seem, even by the existing law of the English Church, to be heretical, or verging on heresy; and of course the question might occur, Can Christians knowingly go on in communion with a spiritual superior who has publicly so committed himself, and not be partakers of the ill? This question I should answer, without hesitation, in the affirmative, and that for reasons strictly ecclesiastical. I will endeavour to explain, as briefly and clearly as I can, the grounds both of the difficulty and of the solution.

For the primâ facie suspicion of heresy: the measure and extent of that evil, as is well known, are legally determined among us by the statute, 1 Eliz. i. 56, where it is ruled that persons commissioned by the Crown to determine ecclesiastical causes "shall not in any wise have authority or power to order, determine, or adjudge any matter or cause to be heresy, but only such as heretofore have been determined, ordered, or adjudged to be heresy, by the authority of the canonical Scriptures, or by the first four general Councils, or any of them, or by any other general Council wherein the same was declared heresy by the express and plain words of the said canonical Scriptures, or such as hereafter shall be ordered, judged, or determined to be
heresy by the high court of parliament of this realm, with the
assent of the clergy in their convocation;" and "it hath been
since generally holden, that although the High Commission
court was abolished by the statute 16 Chas. I. c. 11, yet those
rules will be good directions to ecclesiastical courts in relation
to heresy." [Burn’s Eccl. Law, ii. 277. 5th ed.]

Now the third Œcumenical Council, that of Ephesus, A.D.
431, gives the full authority of the Church to the following
paragraph of the remonstrance sent to Nestorius a little
before by S. Cyril and the Synod of Alexandria.

“And there is another point which we must of necessity
add; how that, setting forth the death after the flesh of
the Only-begotten Son of God, that is, Jesus Christ, and
confessing His resurrection from the dead, and ascension
into the heavens, we celebrate in the Churches the
unbloody [169/170] Sacrifice. And thus we draw nigh to
the mystical Eucharists, and are sanctified by becoming
partakers of the holy Flesh and the precious Blood of
Christ the Saviour of us all. And not as common Flesh do
we receive it, (God forbid!) nor yet as that of a Man
sanctified, and united unto the Word as having one and
the same dignity, or as having received God to dwell in
Him, but as truly life-giving, and the very Flesh of the
Word Himself. For being, as God, in His nature, Life, in
that He became One with His own Flesh, He manifested
it to be life-giving. So that, although He say to us, ‘Verily,
verily I say unto you, Except ye eat the Flesh of the Son
of Man, and drink His Blood,’ – we are not to infer that
it (like the rest) is the flesh of a man, one of those who
are such as we are; (for how shall the flesh of a man be
life-giving, according to its own nature?) but that it has
truly become the very own Flesh of Him who for our
sake both became and is entitled as well a Son as a Man.’’

Here it is plain, first, that the Council, adopting the
phraseology of the Liturgy then in use at Alexandria, gives
distinct sanction to the doctrine contained in that and all the
ancient Liturgies, of the unbloody Sacrifice offered in all
Churches continually. Next, that it attributes our participation
of Christ’s Body and Blood, and our consequent
sanctification, not to the whole action, including the prayers
and the rest, but to that which we do when we draw nigh to
that which has been sacramentally blessed, and partake of it. Thirdly, that what we so draw nigh to receive and to partake of is not “common flesh,” (God forbid!) but the “very own Flesh of the Word, Who, as God, being by nature Life, because He had made Himself one with His own Flesh, declared it to be life-giving.” It is for those who deny the Real Presence, and forbid adoration, to reconcile these sayings, if they can, with their own views; or else to shew some reason why they are not to be accounted so far heretical, according to the standard of heresy in the Church of England.

§ 7. Consider, again, in connection with the foregoing, what follows, and observe how it is sanctioned; it is not a statement made incidentally with a view to establish something else, but was regarded by the Æcumenical Council as so necessary a portion of our holy faith, that they guarded it with a special anathema: [Ibid. § xi. p. 32] “If any one confess not the Flesh of the Lord to be life-giving, and the very own Flesh of the Word Himself who is of God the Father, but [regard it] as belonging to some other beside Him, however closely knit unto Him in dignity – i. e. as having simply received an indwelling of the Deity, and not rather as life-giving, (to repeat the expression,) because it hath become the very own Flesh of the ‘Word who hath power to quicken all things’ (or ‘to make all His living progeny’) – let him be anathema.”

Observe that the life-giving quality is declared to depend on its being “the very Flesh of the Word who hath power to quicken all things;” which implies that it is life to us not simply by its merit as a Sacrifice on the Cross, but also by a real participation of it on our part. That Flesh, the Council means, which we approach and partake of in the Eucharist: no one, if he fairly compare the two passages, can avoid seeing this. Or if there were any doubt, it would be settled by the use of the same phrase, “the mystic Eucharist.” in the following dictate of S. Cyril: “I hear that some affirm that the mystical Eucharist avails not for sanctification, if any relic of it remain unto another day. But in so saying they are beside themselves. For Christ is not estranged [therefrom], neither will His holy Body admit alteration. But the power of the blessing, and the life-giving grace, do therein continue.” [Ep. ad Calosyrium: cf. Cosin’s Works, v. 130.] The particular idea denoted by that word “objective” could scarce be set forth
more distinctly. Can we help recognising it, when the same phrase, “mystic Eucharist,” is employed by the Council itself, over which the same S. Cyril was presiding, and in a document of which it is impossible to doubt that he was himself the author? And this document has been in such sort adopted by the Church of England, as that any contradiction of it is enacted to be positive heresy.

§ 8. Nor may it be omitted that the first Nicene Council so far encourages the same notion, as not only to call the holy Eucharist in three several canons a Gift and an Offering, but also to imply that the giving and receiving of it is giving and receiving the Body of Christ. In the fifth canon they say, (and surely it is an enactment not unseasonable to be brought just now to our recollection,) – “At the provincial synod twice in the year inquire into the causes of the excommunicate, lest some narrowness of mind or party-spirit, or other uncomfortable feeling, should have caused the exclusion; and let one of the synods be holden before Lent, that all such ill-temper being done away, the Gift may be offered pure unto God.” In the eleventh, certain penitents are directed, without offering, to communicate in the prayers only. The eighteenth runs thus: “It hath come before the holy and great synod, that in some places and cities the deacons give the Eucharist to the presbyters, a thing transmitted to us neither by canon nor custom, that such as have no authority to offer, should give to those who offer the Body of Christ. And of this, too, we have been informed, that certain of the deacons approach the Eucharist even before the Bishops. Wherefore, let all this be done away. . . . Let them receive the Eucharist in their own order, after the presbyters, at the hands either of the Bishop or the presbyter.” Here is a distinct recognition of the Eucharist, as a sacrifice in which the Body of Christ is offered by Bishops and presbyters, and cannot be offered, in the same sense, by deacons and laymen.

§ 9. No one who really reflects upon these sayings of the great councils, and is at all aware of the mass of undesigned testimony, diffusing itself through all antiquity, to the same effect, can doubt what sort of a decree would have been passed at Nicæa or Ephesus, had the doctrine of the Eucharist required synodical assertion in those days. But whether it be that the sacramental system does not require to be doctrinally known in order that its benefits may be received, any more
than a person need be able to analyze what he eats and
drinks before he can have it for “food and gladness.”
[172/173] or for other causes unknown to us; it pleased
Providence that the Church should enter on its era of sad
division without any oecumenical decision primarily and
directly pronounced on that subject. And therefore that
portion of Christ’s truth has not come down to us in distinct
dogmatical assertions guarded by anathemas, as the
statements concerning the Trinity and Incarnation have. And
it is consequently a more adventurous thing, and more
largely partaking of the boldness of private judgment, to
denounce any person as a heretic in respect of the former
class of errors. It is not so plainly our duty to withdraw from
his communion, as it would be if he had been distinctly
excommunicated by the Church. Materially he may be in
heresy, but formally he is not yet so, – a distinction
acknowledged by all theologians. “Simple error is not heresy,
without the addition, 1. of something in the matter of it, viz.
that it take place in somewhat appertaining to the faith; and,
2. of something in the erring person, i. e. pertinacity, which
alone makes a heretic. And this pertinacity arises from pride;
for it cometh of great pride, when a man prefers his own
sense to the Truth Divinely revealed.” And S. Augustine says,
“Though men’s opinion be false and perverse, yet if they
maintain it not with any obstinate wilfulness; and especially if
it be one which they have not daringly and presumptuously
engendered for themselves, but have received it of parents
misled and fallen into error; and if with careful anxiety they
are seeking the truth, and are ready, as soon as they have
found it, to receive correction; such are by no means to be
accounted among heretics.” [Epistle 43. 1.] “Because” (as
Aquinas, quoting the passage, adds) “they have no choice –
no set purpose – of contradicting the doctrine of the Church.
In this way.” (he proceeds to say,) “certain doctors appear to
have differed, even in some things appertaining to the faith,
which had not yet been determined by the Church. But after
they had been determined by the authority of the universal
Church, if any one kept obstinately resisting such an
ordinance, he would be accounted a heretic” [Summa
theologiae, llae, 11 ad 3].

In the case before us, the determination of the whole
Church is so far less unequivocal than it might be, in that it
has never been sealed with an anathema by an Æcumenical Council. Nor is there any proof of its having been so distinctly set before those who have denied it, that they can be rightly and at once accused of heretical pravity in resisting it. And even if they might, that were no excuse for separating from the hundreds of thousands of simple Christians who go on believing our Catechism and partaking of our Eucharist, with or without any definite perception of the doctrine of the Sacraments, vital though it be. “For” (to quote again the same author [In 3 Sent. dist. 25. qu. 2.]) “the simple are not condemned as heretics for not knowing the Articles of the faith, but because they obstinately maintain things contrary to those Articles; which they would not do, if they had not their faith corrupted by heresy.”

In sum: heretical as this or any similar decision may appear to a well-instructed private Christian, it cannot, under existing circumstances, so taint with heresy those who pronounce or favour it, as to render it his duty to break communion with them, and with all, sound or unsound in faith, who abide in the same body with them. It might and would be his duty, had they been pronounced heretics by sufficient authority; but such is not now the case. For example: were there now a Chrysostom or an Aquinas in the Roman Church, he might perchance upon good grounds seriously apprehend that the recent decree touching the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin does in fact promulgate a material heresy,* and that a true Æcumenical Council, were such an one ever to meet and decide upon that doctrine, would assuredly condemn it with an anathema. But it does not follow that a person so convinced ought to withdraw himself from the present Roman Catholic Communion. It might be his duty to

[* Pius IX (Pope 1846-1878) issued the decree *Ineffabilis Deus* on 8 December 1854. This decree proclaimed that the BVM had been free of the stain (*macula*) of Original Sin from the moment of her conception, and made belief in this her stainlessness (*Immaculata*) a dogma which the faithful had to believe if they wished to be saved. *Ineffabilis Deus* was the very first exercise of Papal Infallibility, as it was to be formally defined and promulgated by the First Vatican Council sixteen years later. (The second, and so far only other, exercise of this power came in 1950, when Pius XII issued his decree *Munificentissimus Deus*, which promulgated the dogma of the Bodily Assumption of the BVM into Heaven.)]
make such a profession of his faith as would probably involve him in serious ecclesiastical penalties.

[174/175] But excommunication or deprivation incurred for conscience’ sake is one thing, voluntary separation is quite another thing. The application to our own case is evident.

There are, indeed, instances in Church history of private persons, lay or clerical, refusing to communicate with heresiarchs; as Eusebius of Dorylæum, and others separating themselves from Nestorius, in the beginning of the movement which led to the Council of Ephesus: but they did not thereby break communion with the mass of believers at Constantinople; and it seems not to have been so much from an apprehension of contracting the heretical taint from him, as because such separation was the received mode in that time of bringing such questions to a legitimate issue: as if one should say, “Either he must be excommunicated or I.” It is not longer so, now that the holy discipline is so generally, alas! in abeyance.

§10. But is there, then, no remedy? nothing for clergymen or faithful laymen to do, who may feel with the whole Church for so many ages, that he who touches the doctrine of the Real Presence after Consecration, touches – to use sacred words – the very “apple of their eye,” – whether it be by prohibition of worship or in any other way? Yes, surely; they have first and chiefly hearts to lift up night and day in prayer to the Most Holy Trinity, and they have the commemorative Sacrifice of their Lord, in union with which to present their intercessions. As towards men they have tongues and pens, wherewith to protest and appeal; they have influence with more or fewer of their brethren; they have more or less substance, of which they may give to such as are suffering in any way for the same truth, (of whom not a few may be found, if they are well looked after). And in the present instance there is something yet more to be done, by all subscribers to the Articles at least; their protests and appeals need not be mere words, as on other occasions the like may have appeared; they may be so worded, and so publicly notified, as to make them liable to the same molestations and penalties which others for the same teaching have incurred. Such sayings are real doings, and if God [175/176] give them grace to utter them not rashly or in the way of challenge, but in the serious discharge of a painful duty, they may be
blessed, if trouble ensue, with somewhat of the peculiar blessing of Christ’s confessors.

§ 11. One word more to point out why the way of Appeal as well as Protest is recommended. Protest, strictly speaking – i.e. a mere ‘solemn declaration against a thing’ – appears to be the course of those who feel themselves aggrieved, but know of no legal remedy. But to appeal, taken also strictly, is to apply to another, a superior judge; it assumes that there is a grievance, but supposes also a constitutional corrective. A protest, as such, simply relieves the mind and conscience of those who take part in it; an appeal adds to this a call upon certain others who are supposed to have power to redress the wrong.

A protest in any juridical matter supposes the final authority to have spoken; an appeal, of course, supposes the contrary.

For which reason, among others, it seems a matter of regret that the term protestant rather than appellant was adopted by those who, not intending schism, were cut off from the Church of Rome in the sixteenth century; especially as the former term arose from the mere political accident of their representatives forming the minority in the Diet of Spires, 1529, whereas the latter would have kept in mind Luther’s appeal long before to a general council: a much more legitimate and ecclesiastical ground to stand on, were it only that by simply protesting we do in some sense admit he paramount authority of Rome, by appealing we assert Rome herself to be under authority.

However, in our own position--I mean, the position of English Churchmen – it seems to be of the very last importance that we should keep in our own minds, and before all Christendom, the fact that we stand as orthodox Catholics upon a constant virtual appeal to the oecumenical voice of the Church, expressed by the four great Councils, and by general consent in all the ages during which she continued undivided. And if that voice be disputed, is there any conceivable way of bringing the dispute to an issue, except only another true Oecumenical Council, when such by God’s grace [176/177] may be had? In the meantime, what can we do but continue as we are in those points of our creed which other portions of the Church dispute, (unless we can be proved to be wrong:) not denying their life and
catholicity, but maintaining our own, with submission to the whole Church? The position may be called unreal or chimerical, but it is that which has been claimed for the Church of England by two great men (to mention no more) whose names may as fairly as any be taken to represent the great schools or sections in this Church: Cranmer, when drawing towards his martyrdom, and Bramhall in his exile, expressly asserting not simply the truth, but the Catholicity of the English Church. And they were not either of them persons apt to take up with a chimerical, unreal view.

Nay, the question may well be asked – much more easily asked than answered – whether, in the present divided state of Christendom, all who believe in the holy Catholic Church must not in reality, however unconsciously, be going on under this very appeal: at least, as against other claimants? The Greek will say, “I go by the voice of the present Church diffusive;” the Latin, “I go by the infallible voice of the See of S. Peter;” the English, “I go by what has been held fundamental every where, always, and by all;”‡ but who is to decide between them, which of these measures is right? Yet all, one may hope, would agree to defer to the decision of such a Council as has been specified, were it obtainable. It is our common position; and we in England have so much the more reason to acquiesce in it, as it does not force us to “unchurch” (as it is termed) either of the other great sections of Christendom, as they do mutually one another and us.

Many a devout and loving heart, I well know, will rise up against this view of our case. To be on this conditional, temporary footing, will strike them as something so unsatisfactory, so miserably poor and meagre, so unlike the glorious vision which they have been used to gaze on of the one Catholic Apostolic Church. And poor, indeed, and disappointing it undoubtedly is, but not otherwise than as the aspect of Christianity itself in the world is poor [177/178] and disappointing, compared with what we read of it in the Gospel.

[‡ Keble is citing the so-called Vincentian Canon, the rule of faith laid down by Vincent of Lérins (d. ca. 450) in his Commonitorium II, 3: Quod ubique, quod semper, quod ab omnibus creditum est (“what is believed everywhere, always, and by all”). The Tractarians made this “canon” – especially its quod semper – their definition of catholicity.]
Men will not escape from this state of decay by going elsewhere, though they may shut their eyes to the reality of it. Rather, whatever our position be in the Church, since God Almighty has assigned it to us for our trial, shall we not accept it and make the best of it, in humble confidence that according to our faith it will be to us?

This (please God) is the way of truth and peace, and therefore in it we may hope for a blessing; the rather, if it should prove to be the way of the Cross also. But to engage oneself, by a strong act of the will, to the whole system of a body new to us, not upon the proper evidence of that system, but because some in temporary authority among ourselves have denied our holy doctrine--this has something in it so very unreal, that it can hardly agree with truth; and so like ill-temper, that it gives but a bad omen for peace. This is said, not from any special apprehension of such evil in store for us now, but from sad remembrance of what has occurred in former misinterpretations of our Church’s doctrine.

But we may hope for better things. If only two kinds of people would be patient with one another – those who have hitherto worshipped Christ in the Eucharist undoubtingly, and those who for vague fear of certain errors have shrunken from owning, even to themselves, that they worshipped Him; if both sorts would pray and strive to be helped to take simply the plain words of Holy Scripture and the Church, as they do in respect of other mysteries;--then this Sacrament of peace, ceasing to be to believers a Sacrament of contention, would be free to work its Lord’s work among men: being, indeed, that wonder-working Fire which He came to kindle on the earth, of power to transform and subdue all to itself.

Should what has been here set down contribute towards that blessed end but in one single instance, God be thanked! it will not have been written in vain.
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8. Realigning the Consensus

[1. Nathaniel Dimock, Charles Gore, et. al., The Report of the Fulham Conference (1901)]

2. Charles Gore, The Body of Christ (1902) (selections)
Charles Gore

The Body of Christ
An Inquiry into the Institution
and Doctrine of Holy Communion
3rd edition
(London: John Murray, 1902)

[Selections]
Charles Gore (1853-1932) was the most public of later Anglo-Catholicism’s public intellectuals. Others, like Henry Scott Holland (1847-1918) and Robert Moberly (1845-1903), were much finer theologians (and far better preachers). But Gore came to be seen as the leading voice in an Oxford-based circle of Anglo-Catholics who sought to engage contemporary thought and scholarship in peaceful dialogue, not polemical confrontations. This circle wanted to wed doctrinal orthodoxy with critical philosophy. They called themselves “Liberal Catholics”.

The circle first gained celebrity – and notoriety – in 1889, with the publication of a collection of essays, edited by Gore, under the title Lux Mundi (“The Light of the World”). These “studies in the religion of the Incarnation” distressed and appalled many in the older generation of Anglo-Catholics. Gore in particular looked to them like a traitor, not only because he edited Lux Mundi but also because his own contribution, “The Holy Spirit and Inspiration,” had called into question the omniscience of the incarnate Word.1

1 The offending passage was in a footnote, not in the body of the essay. Gore noted that Jesus ascribed the Psalms to David (Mark 12.35-37) – which he never would have done, if he had been omniscient. Gore suggested that this ignorance of the “assured results” of modern biblical criticism belonged to the kenesis, the self-emptying (Philippians 2.7), of the divine Son on becoming human. The furor over this almost off-hand suggestion forced Gore to produce a couple of books on the Incarnation, in which he tried (not altogether successfully) to defend and develop what has since been called “kenotic Christology”.
In 1892 Gore became the founding “Senior”\(^2\) of the Community of the Resurrection, a society of Anglican priests committed to celibacy, communal living, and Catholic scholarship.\(^3\) A restless soul, Gore liked to create, to be in on the beginning of something new – and then move on to another new adventure. And so, having founded CR, he left the Community two years later to become a residentiary Canon of Westminster Abbey, a position which gave him a high profile and the freedom to crisscross Britain on the lecture and preaching circuit. He was made bishop of Worcester in 1902, then the first bishop of Birmingham in 1905; he was translated to Oxford in 1911.

Gore stayed bishop of Oxford for eight years – the longest he ever remained in one place. His tenure was difficult, in large part because of Ritualist clergy in the diocese. Many of them insisted on Reservation of the Blessed Sacrament, and on practicing devotions to the Sacrament (such as Benediction) which the rubrics of the Prayer Book did not countenance and the Articles of Religion outright forbade. The fact that the Prayer Book had been appended to the 1662 Act of Uniformity had made a lot of Low and Evangelical churchmen think that the Prayer Book’s rubrics had the force of statutory law. They therefore regarded the actions of Ritualist clergy as illegal.\(^4\)

\(^2\) Gore insisted on this title, as opposed to “Superior,” because it seemed to him more like “first among equals”. After he left the office, his successors assumed the title of “Superior”.

\(^3\) Among the founders – and most famous – of CR was Walter Howard Frere (see next Reading). Another CR priest of fame was Trevor Huddleston (1913-1998), whose missionary labours in South Africa turned him into one of the most articulate and forceful opponents of apartheid; the South African government threw him out of the country in 1954. His intensely moving testament, *Naught for Your Comfort*, appeared two years later. Huddleston eventually became Archbishop of Mauritius.

\(^4\) This mentality led to the Public Worship Regulation Act of 1874. The Act set up a separate ecclesiastical court with its own judge to try clergy for liturgical behaviour contrary to the rubrics and/or the XXXIX Articles. It also allowed the diocesan bishop to veto
Under the Act of Supremacy, Bishop Gore was an officer of the Crown and therefore bound to enforce the rubrics of the Prayer Book. But even as an Anglo-Catholic, he himself had reservations about reserving the Sacrament. He affirmed the Real Presence of Christ – but insisted that Christ is present only for the sake of communion. It was legitimate to reserve the Sacrament in order to communicate the sick and dying; it was illegitimate to reserve the Sacrament for the purpose of worshipping and adoring it. All Ritualists and a great many other Anglo-Catholics thought Gore’s position inconsistent, incoherent, and just plain stupid; but the more they resisted, the more stubborn he became. Frustrated, fed up, and profoundly unhappy, he resigned the see in 1919 and went into retirement. He soon recouped his sanguine temper and energies, resumed writing and lecturing, and before his death in 1932 was honoured throughout the Anglican Communion as A Great Churchman.

We shall be reading selections from Gore’s *The Body of Christ*. The first edition appeared in 1901, while he was still a Canon of Westminster. In his Preface, Gore noted that “this book is in part the result of an attempt to clear up my own thoughts on eucharistic subjects in view of the ‘Round Table proceedings before it went to trial. Between 1877 and 1882 four Ritualist priests were prosecuted and jailed for contumacy. The Church Association, an Evangelical body, instigated many more proceedings, but the respective bishops vetoed them – not because they supported Ritualism (most of them emphatically did not) but because they saw no reason to make martyrs. After 1882 all the bishops automatically vetoed proceedings against Ritualist clergy. Wisdom is vindicated by all her children (Luke 7.35). The Church Association attempted an end-run around the episcopal veto by lodging a complaint against the bishop of Lincoln, Edward King (1829-1910), in 1888. In a visit to one of his parishes, King had conformed to its Ritualist usages. The Public Worship Regulation Act did not take the possibility of a bishop’s “contumacy” into consideration. So the Archbishop of Canterbury, Edward Benson, claimed exclusive jurisdiction. His claim was allowed, and in what became known as “the Lincoln Judgement,” substantially vindicated Bishop King. The Act became a dead letter, never again enforced, though it was not repealed until 1963.
Conference’ to which I had been summoned by the late Bishop of London.” 5 This “round table,” known as the Fulham Conference, 6 was chaired by Nathaniel Dimock (1825-1909), the premier theologian of the Evangelical party. In his opening presentation Dimock maintained that the Christ who is present in the eucharistic sacrament – however he might be present – was the dead Christ, Christ as the corpse on the cross. All agreed with this position – all except Gore. He took his cue from Romans 6.9: “Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more; death hath no more dominion over him.” To Gore’s mind, this could mean only one thing – there is now no other Christ but the Crucified Risen-Again, whose sole reality is that of being “the Resurrection and the Life”; therefore, the Body of Christ that we receive in the holy Communion cannot be dead; it is, and must be, the risen Body. Gore evidently felt that he had not articulated his argument at the Fulham Conference as well as he wished; hence, The Body of Christ. It became for many generations one of the standard textbooks in Anglican seminaries.

The following selections are photocopied from the third edition (1902), which came out between Gore’s appointment as bishop of Worcester and his consecration.

5 The bishop in question was Mandell Creighton (1843-1901), one of the finest church-historians in the late-Victorian era, who was made Bishop of Peterborough in 1891 and then translated to London in 1897.

6 Fulham Palace is the official residence of the Bishop of London, just as Lambeth Palace is the official (London) residence of the Archbishop of Canterbury. York, Winchester, Salisbury, Worcester, and other “senior” sees also had episcopal palaces in London or Westminster in addition to palatial housing in their respective dioceses.
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9. “That which is old has been made new again”: Liturgical Renewal


[2. EngBCP 1927-1928.]

[3. ScotBCP 1929.]


5. CanBCP 1918.


Liturgical Renewal 2.

[1. Gregory Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy* (1945), Chapter XVI.]


[3. AMerBCP 1979.]

[3. New Zealand BCP.]

[4. ENGASB 1980.]

[5. CanBAS 1985.]

Walter Howard Frere

Some Principles of Liturgical Reform
A Contribution towards the Revision of the Book of Common Prayer

(London: John Murray, 1911)
Introduction

Walter Howard Frere (1863-1938) was one of the founding members of the Community of the Resurrection. He served two terms as Superior of CR (1902-1913, 1916-1922); in his first term he oversaw the Community’s move to Mirfield, Yorkshire, and the founding of Mirfield College, which became one of the premier seminaries of the Anglican Communion. In 1923 Frere was appointed and consecrated Bishop of Truro, a diocese basically coterminous with Cornwall. His appointment came, at the time it came, because of his services to the process as well as to the content of Prayer Book Revision.

The Revision had begun almost twenty years earlier, with the Royal Commission on Ecclesiastical Discipline (1904-1906) and the Royal Letters of Business (1906). The Commission had been charged with the Augean task of recommending a solution to the often flagrant disdain that Ritualist clergy showed toward the rubrics of EngBCP 1662. Those clergy might, with justice, complain that many Evangelical and Modernist clergy, from very different motives, showed no less disdain for the rubrics in their conduct of public worship. But the Ritualists were commonly regarded as the sanctuary-slippered foot-in-the-door which allowed indiscipline of every sort to scurry in and run rampant in the Established Church. Great War had led the Church to place Revision on a back burner; but by 1923, work had resumed and was going ahead at quite a clip. Much of this quick recovery of momentum was due to Frere’s quiet work both in scholarship and in “networking” during the War and its immediate aftermath. So his appointment to Truro was like an elevation to the peerage – reward for meritorious service to Frere’s true native land, the Church of England, and its Supreme Governor.
The Prayer Book Communion Order in Canada

1918 – 1962

The Church of England in the Dominion of Canada became an autocephalous (self-governing) church in 1893. Three years later, at the second General Synod, a memorial from Huron diocese requested a revision which would adapt and enrich EngBCP 1662 “in order that it might meet more fully the needs of the Church in this land”. The House of Bishops resisted this proposal. In 1911, however, General Synod mandated just such a revision. Most of the “enrichments” came in the Daily Office, together with a number of additional “occasional offices”. General Synod specifically forbade any changes to the 1662 Communion Order. The Revision was approved by General Synod in 1918 and came into official use on Easter Day 1922.

The Communion Order of CanBCP 1918 was, in every respect, the Last Stand of 1662. For the 1920s turned out to be the Decade of Prayer Book Revision for the Church of England, the Episcopal Church of Scotland and of the United States, and the Church of the Province of South Africa; England and South Africa substantially altered “the received text” of EngBCP 1662’s Communion Order in such a way as to bring their eucharistic liturgies into closer accord with the Scots-American Prayer Book tradition. This led several Canadian Anglicans to urge General Synod to allow further “adaptations and enrichments” in CanBCP 1918; but the standing committee of General Synod responsible for the Prayer Book quashed such calls until 1937, when it was instructed to report on the desirability and/or feasibility of a new Revision. Then the Second World War broke out, and General Synod did not meet again until 1943. The Prayer Book Committee reported that, in its considered opinion, a new Revision was undesirable for the foreseeable future. General Synod received this report – and then passed a motion which told the Committee to begin a new Canadian Revision.

The Committee did not try to produce a complete revision all at once. It worked in stages: a draft proposed
revision of the Order for Holy Baptism appeared in 1948, then of the Order for Holy Matrimony in 1950. General Synod authorized each rite for “trial use.” The first draft proposed revision of the Communion Order appeared in 1952; General Synod authorized it “for study only,” not for use. The Committee produced a draft proposed Revision of the whole BCP, including the Communion Order, in 1955; this was authorized for trial use, so long as a parish applied to its diocesan bishop and received his permission. The Committee issued a revision of this revision in 1959. General Synod received Revised BCP 1959 as the Committee’s final report and determined that it should become the one and only authorized Liturgy of the Anglican Church of Canada as of Whitsunday (Pentecost) 1962.

The Canadian Church seems predestined to be on the reverse cusp of liturgical change. In 1955, we were on the cutting edge of liturgical renewal. Seven years later, CanBCP 1962 had become the Old Fogey of Prayer Book Anglicanism. In the meantime, Lambeth 1958 had dis/enthroned “the Cranmerian changeling” by recommending “principles” of liturgical renewal in place of adherence to the historic text of the Prayer Book. With the publication of The Book of Alternative Services in 1985, we imagined that we had finally caught up with the cutting edge. We had – except that the BAS was supposed to have been revised three years later, revised again in another three years, and then resulted in the new Canadian Prayer Book by 1991. We still are stuck with the BAS – and waiting.

The following reading prints the Communion Orders of 1918, 1952, 1955, and 1959/62 in four parallel columns over two pages.

When next we meet, please bring your own copy of The Book of Alternative Services to class.

* “The Church of England in the Dominion of Canada” became “The Anglican Church of Canada” at General Synod 1955. It was the very first time that any province of the Anglican Communion made the word “Anglican” part of its official designation.
The Order for the Administration of
THE LORD’S SUPPER
or
HOLY COMMUNION

Introductory Rubrics

First this salutation may be said:
Grace be unto you and Peace from God our Father and from the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

Lord’s Prayer (Priest)
Collect for Purity (Priest)
The Ten Commandments OR (CanBCP 1918) Summary of the Law

Collect for the King (choice of two)
Collect of the Day
Epistle & Gospel
Nicene Creed
Sermon (or Homily) and Notices
   Offertory Sentences and Collection (Preparation of Bread and Wine)

Prayer for the Church militant
Exhortations (3)
Invitation (“Ye that do truly….”)
General Confession
Absolution
Comfortable Words

Offertory Acclamation (optional)
THE INTERCESSION

Invitation (“Ye that do truly….”)
General Confession
Absolution
Comfortable Words
Canada – Draft BCP 1955
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Introductory Rubrics

Lord’s Prayer (Priest)
Collect for Purity (Priest)
The Ten Commandments OR Summary of the Law
Kyrie eleison (optional)
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Collect of the Day
Epistle & Gospel
Nicene Creed
Sermon (or Homily) and Notices
Offertory Sentences, Collection, and (Preparation of Bread and Wine)
Offertory Acclamation (optional)
THE INTERCESSION

Invitation (“Ye that do truly….”)
General Confession
Absolution
Comfortable Words
After which [Comfortable Words] the Priest shall proceed, saying,

Lift up your hearts.
Answer: We lift them up unto the Lord.
Priest: Let us give thanks unto our Lord God.
Answer: It is meet and right so to do.

Then shall the priest turn to the Lord’s Table and say,

It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty, that we should at all times, and in all places, give thanks unto thee, O Lord, Holy Father, Almighty, Everlasting God.

Here shall follow the proper preface, according to the time, if there be any specially appointed, or else immediately shall follow,
The Priest shall then proceed with the holy Eucharist in THANKSGIVING AND CONSECRATION as followeth:

The Lord be with you.
Answer: And with thy spirit.
Priest. Lift up your hearts.
Answer. We lift them up unto the Lord.
Priest. Let us give thanks unto our Lord God.
Answer. It is meet and right so to do.

Then shall the Priest turn to the Lord's Table, and say:

It is very meet, right, and our bounden duty, that we should at all times, and in all places, give thanks unto thee, O Lord, Holy Father, Almighty, Everlasting God.

Here shall follow the proper Preface, according to the time, if there be any specially appointed; or else immediately shall follow:

---

1 At the end of the Proper Prefaces, this supplement is provided:

Upon any day for which there is no Proper Preface, the Priest may say or sing:
The Creator and Preserver of all things, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Therefore, with Angels, &c.
Therefore, with angels and archangels and with all the company of heaven, we laud and magnify thy glorious Name; evermore praising thee and saying:
Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of hosts; heaven and earth are full of thy glory; glory be to thee, O Lord Most High. Amen.

Then shall the Priest, kneeling down at the Lord's Table, say in the name of all them that shall receive the communion, this prayer following.

We do not presume to come to this thy Table, O merciful Lord, trusting in our own righteousness, but in thy manifold and great mercies. We are not worthy so much as to gather up the crumbs under thy Table. But thou art the same Lord, whose property is always to have mercy. Grant us, therefore, gracious Lord, so to eat the flesh of thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink his blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by his body, and our souls washed through his most precious blood, and that we may evermore dwell in him, and he in us. Amen.

When the priest, standing before the Table, hath so ordered the Bread and Wine, that he may with the more readiness and decency break the Bread before the people, and take the Cup into his hands; he shall say the Prayer of Consecration, as followeth.
Therefore with Angels and Archangels, and with all the company of heaven, we laud and magnify thy glorious Name, evermore praising thee, and saying:

Holy, holy, holy, Lord God of hosts, Heaven and earth are full of thy glory:
Glory be to thee, O Lord Most High.

After the Sanctus the Priest and people may say or sing:

Blessed is he that cometh in the Name of the Lord: Hosanna in the highest.

Then shall the Priest say the Prayer of Consecration as followeth:

Then shall the Priest proceed with the Prayer of Consecration and the Breaking of the Bread before the people.
ALMIGHTY God, our heavenly Father, which of thy tender mercy didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption; who made there (by his one oblation of himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world; and did institute, and in his holy gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory of that his precious death, until his coming again. Hear us, O merciful Father, we beseech thee; and grant that we, receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine, according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ’s holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed body and blood: who, in the same night that he was betrayed, took bread, and when he had given thanks, brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, Take, eat, this is my body, which is given for you: Do this in remembrance of me. Likewise after supper he took the cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them,

BLESSING and glory and thanksgiving be unto thee Almighty God, our heavenly Father, who of thy tender mercy didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ to suffer death upon the cross for our redemption; who made there (by his one oblation of himself once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world; and did institute, and in his holy Gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memory of that his precious death, until his coming again. Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee; and grant that we receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ’s holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood; who, in the same night that he was betrayed, took bread; and, when he had given thanks, brake it; and gave it to his disciples, saying, Take, eat; this is my Body which is given for you: Do this in remembrance of me. Likewise, after supper he took the cup; and, when he had given thanks, he gave it to them,

---

a Here the Priest is to take the Paten into his hands;  
b And here to break the Bread;  
c And here to lay his hand upon all the Bread.  
d Here he is to take the Cup into his hands;
BLESSING and glory and thanksgiving be unto thee Almighty God, our heavenly Father, who of thy tender mercy didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ to take our nature upon him and to suffer death upon the Cross for our redemption; who made there, by his one oblation of himself once offered, a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sins of the whole world; and did institute, and in his holy Gospel command us to continue, a perpetual memorial of that his precious death, until his coming again.

Hear us, O merciful Father, we most humbly beseech thee; and grant that we receiving these thy creatures of bread and wine according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ’s holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood; who, in the same night that he was betrayed, took Bread; and, when he had given thanks, brake it; and gave it to his disciples, saying, Take, eat; this is my Body which is given for you: Do this in remembrance of me. Likewise, after supper he took the Cup; and, when he had given thanks, he gave it to them,

\[\text{a} \text{ Here the Priest is to take the Paten into his hands;}\]
\[\text{b} \text{ And here to break the Bread;}\]
\[\text{c} \text{ And here to lay his hand upon all the Bread;}\]
\[\text{d} \text{ Here he is to take the Cup into his hands;}\]
saying, Drink ye all, of this; for this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for you and for many, for the remission of sins: Do this, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of me. Amen.

And here to lay his hand upon every vessel (be it Chalice or Flagon) in which there is any Wine to be consecrated.

saying, Drink ye all of this; for 'this is my Blood of the new Covenant, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins: Do this, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of me.

Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, in union with all thy holy Church we do this in remembrance of him who died, and rose again, and ever liveth to make intercession for us, presenting unto thy divine Majesty this our thank-offering and service, through the merits and mediation of thy beloved Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, by whom and with whom, in the unity of the Holy Spirit, all honour and glory be unto thee, O Father Almighty, world without end. Amen.

^ And here to lay his hand upon every vessel (be it Chalice or Flagon) in which there is any Wine to be consecrated.
saying, Drink ye all of this; for this is my Blood of the new Covenant, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sins: Do this, as oft as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of me.

Wherefore, O Father, Lord of heaven and earth, in union with all thy holy Church, we thy humble servants remember before thee the precious death, the mighty resurrection, and the glorious ascension of thy beloved Son; And looking for his coming again in glory, we present unto thy divine Majesty this holy Bread of eternal life and this Cup of everlasting salvation; And we entirely desire thy fatherly goodness mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, most humbly beseeching thee to grant, that by the merits and death of thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in his blood, we and all thy whole Church may obtain remission of our sins, and all other benefits of his passion; And we pray that by the power of thy Holy Spirit, all we who are partakers of this holy Communion may be fulfilled with thy grace and heavenly benediction; through Jesus Christ our Lord, by whom and with whom, in the unity of the Holy Spirit, all honour and glory be unto thee, O Father Almighty, world without end.

*And here all the people shall say or sing:* Amen.

*And all the people shall answer:* Amen.

^c And here to lay his hand upon every vessel (be it Chalice or Flagon) in which there is any Wine to be consecrated.
The Communion

Then shall the Minister first receive the Communion in both kinds himself, and then proceed to deliver the same to the Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, in like manner, (if any be present,) and after that to the people also in order, into their hands, all meekly kneeling. And when he delivereth the bread, he shall say,

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

And the Minister that delivereth the Cup to any one shall say:

And the Minister that delivereth the Cup shall likewise say:

Then the Priest kneel down at the Lord’s Table, and after a short period of silence shall, together with all that shall receive the Communion, humbly say this prayer following:

We do not presume....

The Communion

Then shall the Priest first receive the Communion in both kinds himself, and then proceed to deliver the same to the Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, in like manner, (if any be present,) and after that to the people also in order, into their hands, all meekly kneeling. And as he delivereth the Bread, he shall say,

The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ … unto everlasting life.
Take and eat this … and feed on him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving.

And the Minister that delivereth the Cup shall likewise say:
Then shall the Priest say:
The peace of the Lord be always with you;

People: And with thy spirit.

Then shall the Priest kneel down at the Lord's Table, and after a short period of silence shall, together with all that shall receive THE COMMUNION, humbly say this prayer following:

We do not presume....

The Communion

Then shall the Priest first receive the Communion in both kinds himself, and then proceed to deliver the same to the Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, in like manner, (if any be present,) and after that to the people also in order, into their hands, all meekly kneeling. And as he delivereth the Bread, he shall say,

The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ ... unto everlasting life.
Take and eat this ... and feed on him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving.

And the Minister that delivereth the Cup shall likewise say:

After a short period of silence the Priest shall say:
The peace of the Lord be always with you;
People: And with thy spirit.

Then shall the Priest kneel down at the Lord's Table, and shall, together with all that shall receive the Communion, humbly say this prayer following:

We do not presume....

The Communion

Then shall the Priest first receive the Communion in both kinds himself, and then proceed to deliver the same to the Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, in like manner, (if any be present,) and after that to the people also in order, into their hands, all meekly kneeling. And as he delivers the Bread, he shall say,

The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ ... unto everlasting life.
Take and eat this ... and feed on him in thy heart by faith with thanksgiving.

And the Minister that delivers the Cup shall likewise say:
The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was shed for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life: Drink this in remembrance that Christ’s Blood was shed for thee, and be thankful.

[Concerning a supplementary consecration]
If the consecrated bread and wine be all spent before all have communicated, the priest is to consecrate more according to the form before prescribed, beginning at Our Saviour Christ in the same night, &c. for the blessing of the bread, and at Likewise after supper, &c., for the blessing of the cup.

The Lord’s Prayer
The Prayer of Oblation or The Prayer of Thanksgiving or (CanBCP 1918) both Prayers in succession
[Prayer of Oblation]
O Lord and heavenly Father, we thy humble servants entirely desire thy fatherly goodness, mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; most humbly beseeching thee to grant, that by the merits and death of thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in his blood, we and all thy whole Church may obtain remission of sins, and all other benefits of his passion. And here we offer and present unto thee, O Lord, our selves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto thee; most humbly beseeching thee, that all we who are partakers of this holy communion, may be fulfilled with thy grace and heavenly benediction. And although we be unworthy, through our manifold sins, to offer unto thee any sacrifice; yet we beseech thee to accept this our bounden duty and service, not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences; through Jesus Christ our Lord, by whom, and with whom, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, all honour and glory be unto thee, O Father almighty, world without end. Amen.

The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ … unto everlasting life: Drink this in remembrance … and be thankful.

[Concerning a supplementary consecration]
If the consecrated bread and wine be all spent before all have communicated, the priest is to consecrate more according to the form before prescribed, beginning at Our Saviour Christ in the same night, &c. for the blessing of the bread, and at Likewise after supper, &c., for the blessing of the cup.

The Lord’s Prayer
The Prayer of Oblation or The Prayer of Thanksgiving or both Prayers in succession
[Prayer of Oblation]
O Lord and heavenly Father, we thy humble servants entirely desire thy fatherly goodness, mercifully to accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving; most humbly beseeching thee to grant, that by the merits and death of thy Son Jesus Christ, and through faith in his blood, we and all thy whole Church may obtain remission of sins, and all other benefits of his passion. And here we offer and present unto thee, O Lord, our selves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto thee; most humbly beseeching thee, that all we who are partakers of this holy communion, may be fulfilled with thy grace and heavenly benediction. And although we be unworthy, through our manifold sins, to offer unto thee any sacrifice; yet we beseech thee to accept this our bounden duty and service, not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences; through Jesus Christ our Lord, by whom, and with whom, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, all honour and glory be unto thee, O Father almighty, world without end. Amen.
The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ … unto everlasting life:
Drink this in remembrance … and be thankful.

[Concerning a supplementary consecration]
If the consecrated bread and wine be all spent before all have communicated, the priest is to consecrate more according to the form before prescribed, beginning at Our Saviour Christ in the same night, &c., for the blessing of the bread, and at Likewise after supper, &c., for the blessing of the cup.

The Lord's Prayer

The Prayer after Communion
When all have communicated, the Priest shall say

ALMIGHTY and everliving God, we most heartily thank thee that thou dost graciously feed us, in these holy mysteries, with the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood of thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ; assuring us thereby of thy favour and goodness towards us; and that we are living members of his mystical body, which is the blessed company of all faithful people; and are also heirs through hope of thy everlasting kingdom.

In the Communion time, Hymns or Anthems such as the following may be used:

O Lamb of God, that takest away the sin of the world, have mercy upon us.
O Lamb of God, that takest away the sin of the world, have mercy upon us.
O Lamb of God, that takest away the sin of the world, grant us thy peace.

[Concerning a supplementary consecration]
If the consecrated bread and wine be all spent before all have communicated, the priest is to consecrate more according to the form before prescribed, beginning at Our Saviour Christ in the same night, &c., for the blessing of the bread, and at Likewise after supper, &c., for the blessing of the cup.

The Lord's Prayer

The Prayer after Communion
When all have communicated, the Priest shall say

ALMIGHTY and everliving God, we most heartily thank thee that thou dost graciously feed us, in these holy mysteries, with the spiritual food of the most precious Body and Blood of thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ; assuring us thereby of thy favour and goodness towards us; and that we are living members of his mystical body, which is the blessed company of all faithful people; and are also heirs through hope of thy everlasting kingdom.
**CANADA BCP 1918 (= EngBCP 1662)**

*Prayer of Thanksgiving*

ALMIGHTY and everliving God, we most heartily thank thee, for that thou dost vouchsafe to feed us, who have duly received these holy mysteries, with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ; and dost assure us thereby of thy favour and goodness toward us; and that we are very members incorporate in the mystical body of thy Son, which is the blessed company of all faithful people, and are also heirs through hope of thy everlasting kingdom, by the merits of the most precious death and passion of thy dear Son. And we most humbly beseech thee, O heavenly Father, so to assist us with thy grace, that we may continue in that holy fellowship, and do all such good works as thou hast prepared for us to walk in; through Jesus Christ our Lord, to whom with thee and the Holy Ghost, be all honour and glory, world without end. Amen.

Gloria in excelsis

The Blessing

---

**CANADA — DRAFT PROPOSAL 1952**

*Prayer of Thanksgiving*

ALMIGHTY and everliving God, we most heartily thank thee, for that thou dost vouchsafe to feed us, who have duly received these holy mysteries, with the spiritual food of the most precious body and blood of thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ; and dost assure us thereby of thy favour and goodness toward us; and that we are very members incorporate in the mystical body of thy Son, which is the blessed company of all faithful people, and are also heirs through hope of thy everlasting kingdom, by the merits of the most precious death and passion of thy dear Son. And we most humbly beseech thee, O heavenly Father, so to assist us with thy grace, that we may continue in that holy fellowship, and do all such good works as thou hast prepared for us to walk in; through Jesus Christ our Lord, to whom with thee and the Holy Ghost, be all honour and glory, world without end. Amen.

Gloria in excelsis

The Blessing
And here we offer and present unto thee, O Lord, ourselves, our souls and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and living sacrifice unto thee. And although we are unworthy, yet we beseech thee to accept this our bounden duty and service, not weighing our merits, but pardoning our offences; through Jesus Christ our Lord, to whom, with thee and the Holy Ghost, be all honour and glory, world without end. Amen.

Gloria in excelsis
The Blessing
Theologies of the Eucharist II
The Anglican Tradition

10. Appendix

1. Stephen Reynolds,
   *One Priest’s Meat*

2. Stephen Reynolds,
   A Eucharistic Prayer
One Priest’s Meat
(may be another Christian’s poison)

It is time for your instructor to put his money where his mouth has been. This entry contains two documents that I myself composed.

The first document comes from the column that I do for The Gathering, the parish magazine of the Church of the Redeemer, which appears five times a year. My column is called “Holy Mysteries: Your Questions about Faith and Worship”. (This title makes me itchy, because it makes me sound like Sister Wendy or, worse, The Theological Guru in Residence.) The following entry was published in the Pentecost 2003 issue. I reprint it here, because it is the closest I have ever got to formulating a somewhat coherent account of my own theology of the Eucharist.

The second document is a eucharistic prayer that I composed for a Lutheran/Anglican Joint Liturgical Conference, Breaking Bread, Breaking Boundaries, held in July 2004. Over the years I have tried my hand, off and on, at writing a eucharistic prayer; none of my attempts got very far, until the conference’s organisers asked me to compose one specially for the conference. It was used at the conference’s opening Eucharist. Its recitation by the presider (a Lutheran pastor) was accompanied by a single liturgical dancer, Emma Taman; hence the prayer’s allusions to music and dance. The conference took the Supper at Emmaus (Luke 24.13-35) as its theme. That is why the prayer’s institution narrative is drawn almost exclusively from Luke’s account of the Last Supper. To my knowledge, no other Eucharistic Prayer in the Christian tradition has done the same. The prayer itself has had only sporadic use since its debut at the opening Eucharist of that Liturgical Conference in 2004 – and even then, only at the Church of the Redeemer and only when I myself, being the appointed presiding celebrant, have remembered its existence and chosen it.

Anglicans, Please Note! A Eucharistic Prayer other than those contained in the Anglican Church of Canada’s authorised books of worship (CanBCP 1962 and The Book of
Alternative Services, and supplements to the BAS authorised by General Synod), ought not to be used without the express permission of the diocesan bishop. For, by canon law, the granting of such permission is reserved solely to the diocesan bishop. In practice, however, it has become customary for bishops to overlook infractions of this law, so long as the Eucharistic Prayer in question has been authorised by a sibling-church in the Anglican Communion or, here in Canada, by the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Canada. My version of the Great Thanksgiving does not have any canonical authorisation from the Bishop of Toronto (or any other bishop), nor any permit of custom outside of the Lutheran/Anglican Joint Liturgical Conference 2004 and the Church of the Redeemer.

* * *

1. The Bread of Christ’s Body, the Wine of Christ’s Blood

Q. In your last column you spoke of “the bread of Christ’s body and the wine of Christ’s blood”. Just what does that mean?

You have caught me committing an ambiguity. For I admit that the phrase, “the bread of Christ’s body and the wine of Christ’s blood,” can mean either:

1. that Jesus Christ himself is so really present in the Holy Eucharist that the bread we share is in truth his body and the wine we drink is in truth his blood; OR

2. that the body and blood of Jesus Christ “nourish” our souls and/or our faith in something like the way that bread and wine nourish our physical bodies.

Option (1) is a basic, no-frills way of expressing what is meant by the term “the Real Presence”. Option (2) is what I call “the metaphor of manducation,” after the Latin word (manducatio) for the chewing, eating, consuming of food.
Since you have driven my ambiguity out into the open, I must 'fess up and acknowledge that (1) is what I myself intend the phrase to signify. At the same time, I do not think that (2), the metaphor of man ducation, is incompatible with (1), the Real Presence – depending, of course, on how (2) is unpacked and applied.

1.
Belief in the Real Presence has been worked out in a number of ways, in teachings which seek to explain, in greater or lesser detail, how Jesus’ body and blood are truly present in the eucharistic sacrament. More specifically, these different teachings seek to construe the nature of Christ’s presence in relation to the signs of bread and wine. In the Catholic tradition at large – and, within it, the Anglican tradition in particular – these explanations of the Real Presence have been based on the principle known as metabolic realism.

The term “metabolic” comes from a Greek word which means “a change (from one state or condition to another)”. The same word gave us “metabolism,” which nowadays we most often encounter in relation to the way a body digests food. We eat and drink, and our digestive systems metabolise the food – that is, convert the food into the sorts of energy that our bodies need. In eucharistic theology, metabolic realism maintains that, “by the word of the Creator and the power of the Holy Spirit,” the bread is changed or converted into the body of Jesus Christ and the wine is changed or converted into his blood. This is where the “realism” comes in. The body and blood of Jesus which this conversion makes present are his real body and his real blood. As St Ambrose (ca. 339-397) put it in his treatise On the Mysteries:

This body which we produce [on the altar] is the body born of the Virgin. Why do you seek the order of nature here in the body of Christ, when the Lord Jesus himself was born of the Virgin in a manner above and beyond nature? It was certainly the actual flesh of Christ which
was crucified and buried. The sacrament, then, is truly the sacrament of his flesh.¹

Some five centuries after Ambrose, a monk named Pascasius Radbert put the case even more strongly in his very influential treatise On the Body and Blood of the Lord (ca. 833):

Because [the Lord] willed that these things be so, we believe with all our heart that after consecration, even though the elements are still in the form of bread and wine, they are nothing other than the flesh and blood of Christ. Truth himself said to his disciples: “This is my flesh for the life of the world” [John 6.51]. To speak still more wonderfully, this flesh is none other than the flesh which was born of Mary and suffered on the cross and was raised from the tomb. It is this very same flesh, I say.²

But how can these things be so? Ambrose and Pascasius pointed to the words that Jesus spoke over the bread and the wine at his last supper: “Take, eat; this is my body that is [given] for you,” “Drink this, all of you; this is my blood of the new covenant.” Here Ambrose and Pascasius, followed by most other teachers in the metabolic tradition, liked to cite Psalm 33.9: “For the LORD spoke, and it came to pass; / God commanded, and it stood fast.” The word of Christ was, and is, the word of the creator Word through whom “all things came into being” [John 1.3]. The words of institution, then, are of the same order of almighty power as the command by which God spoke all things into being.

2.

Metabolic realism presumes, of course, that the words of institution are to be taken “in the literal and grammatical

¹ De mysteriis 9.53.

² De corpore et sanguine Domini I, § 4.
This literalism has been, and is, contested by several Christian denominations. (The Anglican communion is not one of them.) The grounds for contesting a literal understanding of the words of institution have varied considerably. By far the most cogent of these criticisms works from the premise that the words of institution are an example of metaphorical discourse.

As I understand it, a metaphor is a figure of speech, a linguistic manoeuvre, by which we seek to make sense of one thing by comparing it with something else. The comparison works on the basis of a similarity of action and a dissimilarity of being. You might say of a wily colleague, “He’s a real fox.” You do not mean that your colleague literally is a mammal of genus *Vulpes*, with reddish-brownish fur, upright, pointy ears, a narrow, sharp snout, and a bushy tail. All you mean is that this colleague *acts like* a fox insofar as his behaviour exhibits

---

3 “We will, that all further curious search be laid aside and these disputes [be] shut up in God’s promises, as these be generally set forth to us in the holy Scriptures, and the general meaning of the Articles of the Church of England according to them: And that no man hereafter shall either print or preach to draw the Article aside any way, but shall submit to it in the plain and full meaning thereof: and shall not put his own sense or comment to be the meaning of the Article, but shall take it in the literal and grammatical sense.” [Charles I.] “His Majesty’s Declaration prefixed unto the Articles of Religion” (1628). This Declaration prefaces the text of the XXXIX Articles in all editions of EngBCP 1662. (The Articles, with the Declaration, are attached to the text of the BCP in a separate appendix: neither document is an intrinsic part of the BCP itself, because neither was included in the copy of the BCP Attached to the Act of Uniformity 1662.) Charles I intended his Declaration to stop hardline Calvinists from exploiting the Articles for their own ideological purposes; but it was this Declaration which allowed anti-tractarians to tear strips off John Henry Newman when, in *Tract XC* (1841), he tried to argue that the Articles were not inconsistent with the canons of the Council of Trent.
certain characteristics which are commonly associated with canines of genus *Vulpes* in the wild.

Critics of a literal interpretation of the words of institution have pointed to several passages in John’s Gospel where Jesus clearly employs metaphors in this sense. In John 10, for example, “Jesus used this figure of speech,” and said to the disciples: “Very truly, I tell you, I am the gate for the sheep” [John 10.6-7]. A little further on, he changed the comparison and described himself thus: “I am the good shepherd” [John 10.11]. In neither case could he be construed as speaking literally: Jesus in fact *is not* a gate of a sheepfold, nor in fact *is* he a shepherd; it is just that in certain respects he *acts like* a gate, while in certain other respects he *acts like* a shepherd. Likewise when John’s Gospel has Jesus say: “I am the true vine, and my Father is the vinegrower…. I am the vine, you are the branches” [John 15.1, 5a]. These sayings do not mean that God the Father is literally a vinegrower, that Jesus is literally a vine, and that the disciples are literally branches of this vine; all they mean is that, in certain respects, the Father *acts like* a vinegrower, Jesus *acts like* a vine, and the disciples *act like* vine-branches. And finally, in the Johannine saying which has the closest bearing on the Eucharist, Jesus is heard to say: “I am the living bread that came down from heaven. Whoever eats of this bread will live for ever; and the bread that I will give for the life of the world is my flesh…. This is the bread that came down from heaven, not like that which your ancestors ate, and they died. But the one who eats this bread will live for ever” [John 6.51, 58]. This is undoubtedly metaphorical speech: it means that Jesus’ flesh *acts like* – exhibits certain characteristics which are commonly associated with – bread or any other food when we eat it. Just so, when Jesus at his last supper pronounced concerning the bread, “Take, eat: This is my body,” the metaphorical interpretation would have it that he was using exactly the same figure of speech. Thus, again, his body only *acts like* bread; it *is not* bread.

The metaphorical interpretation is very plausible. In my opinion, however, it suffers four shortcomings: –

1. Scholars of the New Testament have taught the Church that we cannot interpret Jesus’ sayings in the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke by the discourses that Jesus is made to deliver in John’s Gospel. Jesus’ manner of speaking
in John is quite different. In the first three Gospels, Jesus’ sayings tend to be pithy, pointed, and in parables. In the fourth Gospel, Jesus’ speech tends to be expansive and oracular; it sounds rather as if he had obtained a master’s degree in rhetoric. For that reason alone, using John to expound a pronouncement of Jesus in the other three Gospels (and in Paul’s first Letter to the Corinthians) is like using an apple to describe an orange.

2. The terms of a metaphor are not always automatically reversible. For instance, you cannot say (unless you are Yoda in *Star Wars*), “A real fox is my colleague,” without changing the entire meaning of the metaphor. But this is precisely what the metaphorical interpretation does: it reverses the terms of the words of institution. Jesus said, “This is my body.” If we were to insist on a metaphorical reading, we would have to interpret this pronouncement as saying: “This [bread] acts in something like the way that my body acts.” By contrast, those who have treated the pronouncement as a metaphor have implicitly taken it to say: “My body is this [bread]” – meaning, “My body acts in something like the way this bread acts.” Which is not quite the same thing. In the former interpretation, the body governs the metaphor and determines the way in which we understand the bread. In the latter interpretation, it is the bread which performs this function: we think of Christ’s body in terms of the bread, rather than of the bread in terms of Christ’s body. But the body’s the thing; and if we persist in a metaphorical understanding of Christ’s word, we should be asking how the bread may be said to act like his body.

To be sure, the reversal of the institution’s terms does not, in itself, discredit the metaphor of manducation as an explanation of communion. It provides a very serviceable way of understanding how or in what sense the body and blood of Jesus may be said to “feed” us when we receive the eucharistic sacrament. Catholic theologians have employed the metaphor of manducation for just this purpose as routinely as Protestant theologians have done. But that very fact should give us pause. For if Catholic theologians, committed to the principle of metabolic realism, can use the metaphor in good conscience with respect to communion, we can hardly say that the metaphor itself necessarily excludes a doctrine of the Real Presence. We may still take
Jesus’ pronouncement as literally as we like, and then attach a metaphorical embolism, in this way: “‘This is my body’—which, when you receive it, acts on your soul and/or faith in something like the way that bread acts in your own body.” In other words, we can have the metabolic cake and eat a metaphorical interpretation, too.

3. In many (though by no means all) uses of the metaphor of manducation, a curious dichotomy has tended to arise between spiritual benefits and material elements. The soul’s nourishment by Christ and the body’s nourishment by the bread are seen as happening in two different spheres, parallel to one another but in every other respect unrelated and even mutually exclusive. This is a form of dualism, which exalts the spiritual order (the soul and/or faith) and either downplays or denies the value of the physical order (the body, the bread and wine). It is the witness of the Catholic tradition (to which Anglicanism gives its allegiance) that dualism is not an option in the Eucharist or in any other sector of Christian doctrine. Jesus Christ is the Saviour of the body as well of the soul. Thus Pascasius Radbert could write that the flesh and blood of Christ had to be present in the eucharistic sacrament, so that our body and soul (or spirit) might be preserved as a single whole for life in Christ. No one doubts that our flesh is prepared for life by this mystery, by which the whole human being is redeemed. Flesh is indeed spiritually fed by flesh, since “the Word became flesh” [John 1.18], while the soul is restored by the blood of Christ.4

I call Pascasius’s closing assertion – Christ’s flesh is present for the salvation of our bodies, his blood for the salvation of our souls – “the dual-function motif”. This motif is reflected in that most Anglican of all prayers, the Prayer of Humble Access in the Communion Order of The Book of Common Prayer. There we asked that “our sinful bodies may be made clean by his [Christ’s] body, and our souls washed through his most precious blood”. (A question arises here: Why should the body be stigmatised as “sinful,” when it is the soul that commits sin? Again, one has to suspect that a “closet” dualism

4 Pascasius Radbert, De corpore et sanguine Domini XI, § 6.
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is at work.) What saves the dual-function motif from the tradition’s strictures on dualism is that it regards the totality of the human person as the object of Christ’s saving work. Not just the soul but “the whole human being is redeemed” through sharing the mystery of Jesus’ body and blood in eucharistic communion.

4. The metaphor of manducation, especially when it serves an implicit dualism, truly becomes a problem when it is made the sole sufficient basis of discourse concerning the Eucharist. Then communion is, so to speak, left hanging in the air. For the metaphor by itself does not account for the one thing necessary if Christ’s body is to act like, nourish like, bread – namely, his body’s presence. A body cannot act like bread or anything else unless the body in question is somehow there to be partaken of.

One way to deal with this difficulty is to collapse communion into the act of faith. That is to say: – My believing in Jesus, my faith in the all-sufficient atoning merit of his death upon the cross, is my communion with him in his body and blood. As Augustine of Hippo (354-430) once said: “Why do you prepare teeth and stomach? Believe, and you have eaten.” So I should be able to partake of Christ’s body and blood anywhere and at any time – in the shower, while driving to work, over a beer at the Duke of York, or just before I go to sleep at night – so long as I am believing in the word of Scripture that he addresses to me right now. And for as long as I am believing in that word, my faith is “eating” Christ’s body and “drinking” his blood.

This teaching is an extreme version of what the Catholic tradition knows as “spiritual communion”. In the Catholic account, spiritual communion is an act whereby your faith perceives the presence of Christ in the sacrament and your will goes out to him in love, but you do not actually receive the sacraments of his body and blood. This practice outside of celebrations of the Eucharist can be very valuable indeed, as I myself can attest. But when it is used within a eucharistic celebration as a substitute for receiving the sacrament, something screwy is going on. For it privileges private experience over against communal celebration – and that, in the midst of the community’s supreme enactment of its common life. The extreme version of spiritual communion, whereby believing in the atoning merits of Christ’s death is
taken to be the same as sharing in the body and blood of Christ, is even more troubling. For in making non-sacramental (or extra-sacramental) spiritual communion the norm of communion, it renders the liturgy supererogatory, if not altogether otiose and irrelevant. If believers can have communion with Jesus whenever and wherever each one alone is exercising his or her faith, why go to the trouble of gathering together to consume bread and wine? The standard response to this objection has been: “We do so because... well, just because Jesus commanded us to do so.” This assumes that Jesus issued decrees which have no other point but that we should obey them. In other words, Jesus makes us jump through meaningless hoops, just for the almighty fun of it. Such an image of God in Christ is not worth the pencil it is sketched with. Jesus must have had a reason for calling us to gather as a community in order to celebrate the mystery of his body and blood.

That reason, I suggest, may be found in another of Jesus’ sayings: “Where two or three are gathered in my name, I am there among them” [Matthew 18.20]. Being “there” is, of course, a matter of presence – not only in the sense of a physical mass displacing atoms and occupying a location, but also (and much more) in the sense of presence to and for others. You can be physically present in a room but in every other respect absent to the people sitting on either side of you or to the person facing you; as the saying goes, you are “not really there”. Presence, then, includes the willingness, even the readiness, to be accessible to others and to engage their presence in the situation that you and they share. Needless to say, such accessibility and engagement presumes a bodily presence. This is what a doctrine of “the Real Presence” is all about: Jesus himself is bodily present to us in the Eucharist, for the sake of being accessible to us and for the sake of engaging us just as we are.

3.

This is where the rubber hits the road. “So Jesus is really there, ‘bodily present,’ eh?” you might say to me. “All I see is a morsel of bread or a white wafer, and all I taste is wine. So how is bread supposed to be Christ’s body? and the cup, or
rather what the cup contains, how is it supposed to be his blood?"

Within the Catholic tradition, the Roman church presents the single most formidable answer, one which enshrines the principle of metabolic realism in the dogma of transubstantiation. This name for the conversion which consecration brings about was formally endorsed by the Fourth Lateran Council in 1215. Lateran IV did not provide any clear-cut definition of the term, but the explanation set forth by Thomas Aquinas (1224-1274) became, and has remained, the exposition officially endorsed by the Roman communion. Thomas maintained that “transubstantiation” means the following: – As soon as the priest recites Christ’s words regarding the bread, the *substance* of the bread is miraculously converted or changed into the *substance* of Christ’s flesh; likewise, as soon as the priest recites Christ’s words regarding the wine in the chalice, the *substance* of the wine is miraculously converted or changed into the *substance* of Christ’s blood. I emphasise the word *substance* because it is the linchpin of Thomas’s teaching. The word has a specific meaning, derived from the categories of the ancient Greek philosopher Aristotle (384 BCE – 322 BCE). *Substance* is that underlying reality which constitutes something as what it is – for instance, what makes bread be *bread* and not a stone (nor anything else), what makes blood be *blood* and not Cherry Coca-Cola (nor anything else), what makes a human being be *human* and not a raccoon (nor anything else). Substance is a wholly spiritual reality; as such, it is absolutely invisible and cannot be measured or quantified in any way. So, in Thomas’s account of transubstantiation, the underlying reality which makes bread be *bread* is entirely converted into the underlying reality which makes Christ’s flesh be *his* flesh; and the same thing happens to the wine – its substance is entirely converted into the underlying reality which makes Christ’s blood be *his* blood. It is not that Christ becomes present in all his physical dimensions; it is the *substance* of his flesh and the *substance* of his blood that become present. The physical attributes of the bread and wine remain – size, shape, taste, and smell, what Aristotle called the “accidents”. But their proper substances are no longer there to sustain those accidents, because Christ’s words of institution have converted the substance of each element into the substance of
his flesh and the substance of his blood. It is the substances of Christ’s flesh and blood that now sustain the accidents of bread and wine.

Historically, the Anglican tradition rejected transubstantiation because the doctrine “is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions”. Thus the twenty-eighth of The Thirty-Nine Articles of Religion (1571). Anglicanism has come a long, long way since 1571, most especially on the issue of transubstantiation. The Anglican protest against Romanism on this point is now confined to the Vatican’s insistence that all the faithful must believe the doctrine of transubstantiation in order to be saved. It is, however, permissible for Anglicans to believe it, if it helps them to have fuller and more secure communion with Jesus in the eucharistic sacrament. This permission, of course, entitles no Anglican to make transubstantiation a necessary article of faith. The Anglican consensus affirms the Real Presence of Christ in the sacrament, and then insists even more strongly that the how of Christ’s eucharistic presence is an absolute mystery of salvation. In this light, Anglicans may happily sing a piece of doggerel attributed to the late Defender of the Faith and Supreme Governor of the Church of England, Queen Elizabeth I (1533-1603):

’Twas Christ the Word that spake it.
The same took the bread and brake it.
And as the Word did make it,
So I believe and take it.

Gloriana’s ditty is just a tad disingenuous. For what exactly did the word of Christ the Word make the bread to be? His body? Well, yes, that does seem to be the plain meaning of the doggerel. But Christ’s body in what sense? For that is the point at issue. Calvinists and Catholics have regarded each other’s understanding of the Eucharist as clean contraries; and yet a Calvinist could recite Elizabeth’s doggerel with as clear a conscience as a Catholic – which was, no doubt, the Virgin Queen’s intention. But that is like papering over a great big crack in the plaster; it does not deal with the problem so much as pretend that the problem is not there at all.
4.

“Enough already!” you may say to me. “What do you mean when you say that Jesus Christ himself is so really present in the Holy Eucharist that the bread we share is in truth his body and the wine we drink is in truth his blood?”

First of all, I assume that the Holy Eucharist is a sacrament of salvation. This means that the Eucharist not only represents salvation, in the way that one thing is designated as a symbol or sign standing for or indicating another (otherwise absent) thing. The bread and wine of the Eucharist certainly do act as signs – but not only or merely in the way that a road-sign that you see while driving along the 401 in Oshawa or along the QEII in Oakville indicates the (so far actually absent) presence of the city of Toronto. For even as the bread and wine signify the saving presence of Christ, they also convey to us the salvation whom they signify. Before we consider how it does so, though, I should say what I understand by “salvation”.

We commonly think that “being saved” is a matter of being saved from something bad, for example, from an accident, from a defeat or a loss, from sin, from damnation. In this way of thinking, salvation becomes privative – it is defined by what it takes away, or avoids, or prevents from happening. The Catholic tradition does not deny or downplay this dimension of salvation; it does indeed affirm that Christ Jesus saves us from our sins (and their eternal consequences). But the tradition goes on to insist that salvation involves a “much more” – that it also (and much more) involves being saved for eternal happiness. By faith in Jesus, we are set apart for glory, a glory which infinitely surpasses, even as it includes, the forgiveness of sins and the taking away or cancellation of the guilt incurred by those sins. The double thrust of salvation – privative from and positive for – is expressed in 2 Peter 1.4: “Thus [God] has given us... his precious and very great promises, so that through them you may escape from the corruption that is in the world..., and may become participants of the divine nature.” We, and all humans, were created to share in God’s own life – and to do so precisely as human beings. We are not to be absorbed into divinity, without any remainder or trace of our humanity surviving. Instead, we are to be what God always designed our humanity to become – creatures who are
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delighting in full and intimate communion with the three-personed Creator.

It is the witness of the Catholic tradition – and, within that tradition, of Anglicanism – that Jesus of Nazareth is himself this salvation. Not only the Saviour, but also the condition of salvation itself. The Church confesses that he was, and is,

truly God and truly human...; of one being with the Father with respect to his divinity, of one being with us with respect to his humanity.... [He] is to be acknowledged in two natures
without confusion,
without change,
without division,
without separation.
The difference between the natures is in no way removed because of the Union, but rather the qualities of each nature are preserved. And both natures co-exist in one presence and one person.

Thus the Decree of the council of Chalcedon (451) – one of the four councils of the Church which Anglicanism has always acknowledged to be truly ecumenical and whose doctrinal decrees are therefore binding. The basic point of this decree is that the one person Jesus Christ is, in himself, the communion of divinity and humanity – not a sort of divine-human purée, but the one in whom each nature has its proper integrity because of their union. That very diversity of divine and human in union and communion with one another is what constitutes our salvation.

Since this is so, our communion with Jesus is not only a means to salvation; it also makes us participants in the salvation that he is. By sharing in his life, the life of the one person who is truly God and fully human, we anticipate in ourselves, even now, the humanity that we are to become in eternal communion with God’s three-personed glory. But here is the nub of the theological point: – Just as the divine Word became one with us through our own humanity, so we become one with the divinity of the Word through the humanity he shared (and shares) with us. Hence the tradition’s insistence that the body and blood of Jesus – his human nature – are really present in the sacrament. For the
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economy of the Incarnation continues in the eucharist: – As his humanity mediated his divinity in the days of his sojourn on earth, so must his human body and blood be available at the Holy Eucharist in order to mediate his divinity to us now.

Thus, the conversion of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ is ordered to an even greater conversion – that of mortal human beings into immortal participants and sharers in the life of the three-personed God. St Paul suggested just such a conversion in his teaching about the resurrection:

What is sown is perishable, what is raised is imperishable. It is sown in dishonour, it is raised in glory. It is sown in weakness, it is raised in power. It is sown a physical body, it is raised a spiritual body. If there is a physical body, there is also a spiritual body. Thus it is written, “The first man, Adam, became a living being”; the last Adam became a life-giving spirit…. The first man was from the earth, a man of dust; the second man is from heaven…. Just as we have borne the image of the man of dust, we will also bear the image of the man of heaven. What I am saying, brothers and sisters, is this: flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God, nor does the perishable inherit the imperishable. Listen, I will tell you a mystery! We will not all die, but we will all be changed, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trumpet. For the trumpet will sound, and the dead will be raised imperishable, and we will be changed. For this perishable body must put on imperishability, and this mortal body must put on immortality.

[1 Corinthians 15.42b-45, 47, 49-53]

“We will all be changed” – the Greek verb that Paul uses here (allagesometha) means “to change something from what it is, to alter something’s nature”. In short, the Apostle was
already deploying the principle of metabolic realism with respect to our salvation.

Another way of expressing the metabolic motif is to be found in the *Confessions* of Augustine. In Book 7, he recounts a vision of light that he had during his struggle back into Catholic Christianity. Even as he saw the pure light of God, he realised that he was lost in a region of unlikeness to God – and he trembled. But then it was as if God’s voice spoke and said to him: “I am the food of grown-ups. Grow, and you will feed on me. Not that you will change me into yourself, as you change food into your own flesh; but you will be changed into me.” This is metabolic realism in spades, for it applies the metabolic principle to the salvation of humans. Moreover, it is very easy to catch a eucharistic resonance in the message that Augustine received. Indeed, this use of the metaphor of manducation to speak of a change of our created nature almost begs for application to the Eucharist. And this suggests that the conversion of our mortal humanity allows us – and may even require us – to speak of metabolic realism with respect to the Eucharist. The conversion of bread and wine into the body and blood of Jesus Christ, truly divine and fully human, permits us to taste now the communion who is himself our salvation, our conversion to glory.

5.

Such, then, is my account of how the Eucharist is a sacrament of salvation. We partake of Jesus’ human body and blood, through which we attain to – and are enfolded by – his divinity, which in turn gives us access to the life of God the most holy Trinity. But here I must finally deal with what many people (sincere Christians among them) regard as the “scandal” of the eucharist – namely, that we eat the body (or, still more offensively, the flesh) of Jesus and drink his blood. Such a conviction sounds an awful lot like an endorsement of cannibalism.

Those of us who stand in the tradition of metabolic realism are not unaware of this charge’s plausibility. The doctrine of transubstantiation has one advantage: it allows a metabolic realist to do an end-run around the charge. For it deploys the metaphysical concept of “substance” in such a way as to
maintain that we do not eat Christ’s flesh as such, nor drink his blood as such. Instead, what we take is the substance of his flesh, the substance of his blood – the underlying reality which makes flesh and blood be what each is, but which is itself wholly spiritual and (logically speaking) prior to any “accidents” such as dimensions, colour, and spatial location. According to the doctrine of transubstantiation, then, you receive the real body of Christ, but “eat” it in a non-material form.

I find myself wondering whether this teaching is not too clever by half. What kind of sense does it make to speak of eating immaterial flesh and drinking unbloody blood? At least a frankly cannibalistic account would have the virtue of being more readily intelligible, however vile and repugnant most people in our culture find the very idea of making a meal of another human. Perhaps we need to go back to the words of Jesus himself – “This is my body,” “This is my blood” – and consider what “body” and “blood” might have signified in the context of the ancient Jewish culture that Jesus grew up in and shared.

The first thing to be said is that ancient Judaism did not make as sharp a distinction between a person’s outer appearance and inner self as we tend to do. We are heirs to a philosophical (and theological) tradition which described human beings as “embodied souls” – the soul is the thing which defines us, the body merely its shell. The Hebrew Scriptures (a.k.a. the Old Testament) reflect another approach: human beings are “inspired bodies” – the body is what we know, and we know the body to be living because it breathes. (The Hebrew word for “breath,” ruah, can also mean “spirit” or “wind”.) This perspective works from the assumption that the body is more than just flesh and bones; the body is how each of us is present in the world and present to each other. This point of view also implies that the body is virtually indistinguishable from your self. Thus, the body is more than your physical appearance or your material form occupying space-and-time; it is matter of how you are there for others, how you relate to them – and, of course, they to you. So when Jesus designated and identified the bread as his body, he was talking about his self as present to
his disciples. In giving us his body, then, he is giving us not just his flesh; he is giving us his whole self.

Jesus added a word which designated and identified the wine as his blood. In the religion of ancient Israel, blood had a special significance. It was the seal of the covenant between YHWH and the Israelites:

Moses came and told the people all the words of the LORD and all the ordinances; and all the people answered with one voice, and said, “All the words that the LORD has spoken we will do.” And Moses wrote down all the words of the LORD. He rose early in the morning, and built an altar at the foot of the mountain, and set up twelve pillars, corresponding to the twelve tribes of Israel. He sent young men of the people of Israel, who offered burnt offerings and sacrificed oxen as offerings of well-being to the LORD. Moses took half of the blood and put it in basins, and half of the blood he dashed against the altar. Then he took the book of the covenant, and read it in the hearing of the people: and they said, “All that the LORD has spoken we will do, and we will be obedient.” Moses took the blood and dashed it on the people, and said, “See the blood of the covenant that the LORD has made with you in accordance with all these words.”

[Exodus 24.3-8.]

We can hear an echo of this text in Jesus’ word over the cup: “This cup is the new covenant in my blood” [1 Corinthians 11.25]. Matthew’s variant of this word makes the echo, if anything, even louder: “Drink from it, all of you; for this is my blood of the covenant, which is poured out for many for the forgiveness of sins” [Matt. 26.27b-28].) The new covenant was to be sealed, not with the blood of oxen or sheep, but with the outpouring of his own life.

And that indeed is the significance of blood in ancient Israelite religion. The book of Leviticus, the third book of Torah (the Law of the Covenant), prohibited the Israelites from eating any blood, and gave this reason: “For the life of the flesh is in the blood; and I have given it to you for making atonement for your lives on the altar; for, as life, it is
the blood that makes atonement” [Lev. 17.11]. Jesus not only gave his flesh; he also gave “the life of his flesh” – and, “as life, it is his blood that makes atonement”. When we share the cup, then, we share what made Jesus’ humanity alive – and thus, what has power to make us truly alive to God. This would seem to be the point of John 6.53, where Jesus says: “Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood, you have no life in you.”

To be sure, Jesus’ word over the cup, heard with Leviticus 17.11 in the background, poses a problem. The Lord commanded us to drink from the cup of his blood; and such a command appears to violate the Law’s prohibition about the eating of blood. Even if we could assume that Jesus intended his word to be metaphorical (“for this is kind of sort of like my blood of the covenant”), the offence would still be there, for the Law makes no distinction between eating blood in fact and eating blood in metaphor. The latter is tantamount to the former, because the metaphor takes a leap into a zone forbidden by the Law insofar as it invites the mind to imagine the eating of blood. Whether we take the saying in a realist or in a metaphorical sense, then, Jesus’ command regarding the cup breaks the Levitical commandment regarding the eating of blood, even as it assumes the rationale for that prohibition. But it does make sense in terms of cultic sacrifice. If the pouring out of his own blood, in which is his life, makes atonement, what better way is there for his disciples to take hold of that atonement, than by sharing in the atoning life’s-blood itself, in the life of the atoning Sacrifice himself?

6.

It would no doubt remove some of the offence if we could replace “body” by the less concrete notion of “self” and substitute the more abstract term “life” for “blood”. Such a manoeuvre, however, leaves the significance dangling in the air without its signifiers. It is like having the meaning of a word without the word itself. In any case, the old scholastic adage may be invoked here: “The more difficult reading is to be preferred.” Paul and the four evangelists all agree that Jesus identified the bread as his body and the wine as his blood; and though we should try to keep in view the
meanings and associations which “body” and “blood” had for first-century Jews like Jesus and his disciples, we are not faithful to his command if we cut those meanings and associations adrift from the words which anchor them. When Jesus spoke of his body, he first and foremost meant his body, the frame and form of his flesh and bones which met the eyes of those whom he met; and when he spoke of his blood, he first and foremost meant his blood, the fluid which coursed through his veins.

But at once I must qualify this last statement. It used to be a convention, almost a cliché, in Christian doctrine that when we approach the eucharistic sacrament, “we go even ad cadaver,” to the corpse, the dead body of Christ. This convention worked on the assumption that the crucifixion and death of Jesus constituted the sum of our redemption. Christ crucified is our Saviour; Jesus dead is our salvation. Such a view had its critics such as Erasmus (1469-1536), the paladin of humanism in the Northern Renaissance. But the criticism did not lodge itself in the Church’s mind until the early twentieth century, thanks to the witness of the Anglican theologian and bishop Charles Gore (1853-1932) and a number of later Roman Catholic theologians and liturgists on the European continent. None of these teachers disputed the atonement that Jesus wrought by his crucifixion and death. But Gore in particular raised the not altogether impertinent question, “What about the resurrection of Jesus?” He had on his side no less an authority than St Paul, who had argued: “If Christ has not been raised, your faith is futile and you are still in your sins. Then those also who have died in Christ have perished. If for this life only we have hoped in Christ, we are of all people most to be pitied” [1 Corinthians 15.17-19]. Gore went on to maintain that there is now no other Jesus but Jesus risen and glorified. So the body of Christ present in the Eucharist is not a cadaver, a corpse; it is the body of the same Jesus who, on the third day after his crucifixion, made himself known to his disciples “in the breaking of the bread” [cf. Luke 24.28-35].

The New Testament accounts of Jesus’ appearances to the disciples after his resurrection were written by people conscious of a certain awkwardness. They had a story to tell; and stories have to fit into the space-time continuum of creation. Only, the evangelists keep sending signals that they
know Jesus no longer fits into that continuum in any ordinary way. It is as if, bursting the tomb, he burst through space and time. St Paul came the closest to giving an explanation of what the resurrection involved for Jesus and will involve for us and all who have believed in him. I have already quoted the relevant passage from 1 Corinthians 15. “We will be changed,” he wrote. By this he meant a metabolisation, a conversion through which one kind of body becomes a different kind of body – through which “a physical body” becomes “a spiritual body”. The term “a physical body” may sound to us like tautology, because we assume that a body is, by definition, physical; while “a spiritual body” may sound to us like an oxymoron, because we also assume that “spirit” and “body” are mutually exclusive entities. This is one of those moments in Paul’s Letters when we wish that the Apostle had been a little more expansive. “A physical body” we know, sometimes only too well; but what is “a spiritual body”? It means, I think, a body no longer constrained by the laws of space and time, a body which has been made to transcend the condition of matter; but a body in which our individual selves will be so continuous with who we were, that each of us will be recognisable to one another. The risen Jesus who appeared to the disciples on the first Easter day and afterwards was a “spiritual body” in something like this sense.

This, I suggest, is the body of Jesus that is present to us in the eucharistic mystery. He is the new creation that is to come engaging us in and through the conditions of creation’s now, by means of elements familiar to us in this world. So the bread and wine which we take, bless, break, and share, mediate to us the risen humanity of Jesus – his body and his blood, his risen self and his glorified life – just as his humanity mediates to us his divinity so that we may participate in the union and communion that he is.

7.

But why bother to talk about the conversion of the bread and wine? Cannot those elements mediate Jesus, be means or instruments of his presence, without undergoing any change? I suppose so, in principle; Martin Luther (1483-1546), the original Protestant reformer, certainly insisted that nothing
happened to the bread and wine in themselves, even as Jesus used them to convey his real body and blood. But if the purpose of Jesus’ presence is to convert (or to sustain and advance the conversion of) our humanity, the means must also undergo a similar conversion of their proper reality. The reason is suggested by one of Thomas Aquinas’s most important axioms: “Grace does not destroy but fulfils nature.” I would add a corollary: Salvation does not undercut creation but fulfils the reason for which God made it. God created human beings in order that we should participate, precisely as humans, in the divine life. This understanding, I have argued, is the rule and canon of our discourse about the Eucharist. But I would go on to argue that this same rule and canon includes all the rest of creation. God in Christ seeks to bring the whole of the created order, not just human creatures, into the new creation.

And so it is with bread and wine, “which earth has given and human hands have made”. God does not make bread and wine; humans do. But for that very reason, bread and wine signify both our dependence on the earth and our stewardship of it. If we need to be converted in order to bear “an eternal weight of glory beyond all measure,” so do our works, precisely as things which have an objective reality of their own. It seems to me that this point is what makes the doctrine of transubstantiation problematic. The doctrine proposes that the creatures of bread and wine cease to be what they are in their proper “substances”. To that extent, transubstantiation subverts Aquinas’s own axiom, “Grace does not destroy but fulfils nature.” Bread and wine, therefore, precisely as fruits of the earth and works of human hands, are fulfilled by God’s conversion of them into instruments or vehicles which mediate to us the body and blood, the self and life, of Christ Jesus, in order that we ourselves may mediate the truth and reality of Jesus to the world.

This response may have turned out to be all – and rather more than all – you ever wanted to know about Stephen Reynolds’s theology of the Eucharist. My brief was to explain what I meant by a turn of phrase regarding the eucharistic presence of Jesus; but beyond such a turn of phrase or a piece of Tudor doggerel, there is no way to be brief about the
matter. For, as I hinted in the course of my explanation, the question of Christ’s eucharistic presence (or absence) has been one of the most controversial and deeply divisive points in the history of western Christendom. So I did not feel that I could fob you off with anything less than the explanation that I have tried to give. In matters of faith and doctrine, snappy answers are shoddy goods; and though the argument I have made here may not satisfy you, I hope to have provided you with a statement full enough, and frank enough, to let you argue back. Let me emphasise that what I have written here is merely Stephen Reynolds speaking; it is not the official teaching of the Anglican Church of Canada, much less that of the whole Anglican Communion – though I pray that I have been faithful to the mind of our tradition.

*    *    *
2.

A Eucharistic Prayer

Presider     The Lord be with you.
People      And also with you.
Presider     Lift up your hearts.
People   We lift them to the Lord.
Presider     Let us give thanks to the Lord our God.
People      It is right to give our thanks and praise.

Presider  Thanks and praise are yours by right, 
          Source and Partner of the eternal Word, 
          with whom you move in ceaseless harmony, 
          embracing and embraced by the Spirit, 
          one being in the communion of three persons. 
          Into the music of your triune life 
          you invite all that you have made, 
          that the whole creation, in all its diversity, 
          may come to delight in your glory 
          and reflect your perfect unity, 
          where none is greater or lesser, 
          none is higher or lower, 
          none is before or after.

Most especially do we give you thanks 
for this fragile earth, 
which you set in orbit around the sun 
and made to abound 
with so great a variety of creatures. 
From its dust you fashioned humankind 
and, breathing life into our frame, 
made us but little lower than the angels.\(^5\) 
At all times you have been faithful to us, 
though time after time 
we proved unfaithful to you; 
you did not abandon us, 
the works of your hands, 
but like a potter with clay 
you refashioned and renewed

---

\(^5\) Cf. Psalm 8.6.
your covenant with us,
that the earthen vessel of our humanity
might bear the treasure of your grace
and come to shine
with the light of the knowledge of your glory
in the face of Jesus Christ.  

Therefore with angels and archangels,
and with every creature
who has borne witness to your sovereign love,
we raise our voices in praise and thanksgiving
as we proclaim the glory of your name.

All  
Holy, holy, holy Lord,
God of power and might.
Heaven and earth are full of your glory.
Hosanna in the highest.
Blessed is the One
who comes in the name of the Lord.
Hosanna in the highest.

Presider  
Blessèd indeed is Jesus Christ,
your co-eternal Word made flesh,
who did not regard equality with you
as something to be exploited,
but emptied himself
and, by the grace of the Holy Spirit
and the glad consent of Mary,
was conceived and born in human likeness,  
that he might fulfill your promises
to the children of Abraham and Sarah,
and accomplish all that the Spirit
had spoken by the prophets.

He had no form or majesty
that we should look at him,
nothing in his appearance
that we should desire him;
he passed through this life

---

6 Cf. 2 Corinthians 4.6.

7 Cf. Philippians 2.6-7.
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as one from whom others hide their faces, and we held him of no account. But he was wounded for our transgressions and crushed for our iniquities; upon him was the punishment that makes us whole. By his blood he reconciled us, by his wounds we are healed.  

On the night that he was handed over to suffering and death, a death he willingly accepted, Jesus took his place at the table with his disciples, and said to them, “Eagerly have I desired to eat this Passover with you before I suffer; for I tell you, I will not eat it again until it is fulfilled in the kingdom of God.” Then he took a loaf of bread, and when he had given thanks, he broke it and gave it to them, saying, “This is my body, which is given for you. Do this to recall my presence.” And he did the same with the cup after supper, saying, “This cup that is poured out for you is the new covenant in my blood. As often as you drink it, do this to recall my presence.”

Mindful of the saving mystery of Christ and giving thanks for the fulfillment of his passover through suffering and death in the glory of his resurrection,  

---

8 Cf. Isaiah 53.2b-3, 4b-5.


10 Here the prayer tries to deal with the words that Jesus spoke at the beginning of Luke’s account of the Last Supper: “I tell you, I will not eat [this Passover] again until it is fulfilled in the kingdom of God.” Jesus’ resurrection fulfills “this Passover.”
we are now gathered at (or around) this table
to offer you our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving.

Therefore, Dayspring of all mercy,
send forth the Holy Spirit to bless and sanctify
these gifts of bread and wine,
which earth has given
and human hands have made,¹¹
that they may be for us the body and blood
of your dearly beloved Son.
May we all be one
as you and he are one in union with the Spirit,¹²
one in our witness to your truth and love,
one in our service to each other,
one in bearing your justice and peace
into the world;
that with the ever-blessèd Virgin Mary,
blessèd N. and all your saints,
past, present, and yet to come
we may enter into the music of your glory
and take up the eternal song that is your being.

Through Christ, and with Christ, and in Christ,
in the unity of the Holy Spirit,
all glory is yours,
now and for ever.

People Amen.

The priest is to lift the paten holding the bread, then again in turn
the chalice containing the wine, and say over each a prayer which
blesses God quia de tua largitate accepimus panem (vinum) quem (quod) tibi offerimus, fructum terrae (vitis) et operis manuum hominis – “because, thanks to your generosity, we take the bread
(wine) which we offer to you, fruit of the earth (of the vine) and
work of human hands”.

¹² Cf. John 17.10-11: “All mine are yours, and yours are mine; and I
have been glorified in them. And now I am no longer in the
world, but they are in the world, and I am coming to you. Holy
Father, protect them in your name that you have given me, so
that they may be one, as we are one.”
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