

ALTHOUGH WE BE UNWORTHY:  
ANGLICANS, EUCHARISTIC SACRIFICE, AND THE  
PROTESTANT LOSS OF RITUAL



*Matthew S. C. Olver*

“And although we be unworthy (through our manyfolde synnes)  
to offere unto thee any Sacryfice: Yet we beseche thee to accepte  
thys our bounden duetie and service...”<sup>1</sup>

Holy Communion service, 1549 English *Book of Common Prayer*

INTRODUCTION

IN THE ARRAY OF CONTESTED QUESTIONS that continue to reverberate in the wake of the sixteenth-century reformations, Eucharistic sacrifice sits near the top of the list. I propose that one fruitful lens through which to view the Protestant-Catholic divide concerning the Eucharist and sacrifice is this: the attenuating view of Christianity as a ritual, cultic religion, whose act of worship is the very climax of a human doxology to Israel’s God whom Christians worship as the Blessed Trinity. My proposal is that this abatement is related to the rather lopsided emphasis in the medieval Latin West on the following topics: the objective character of Christ’s presence in the Eucharist, the means by which that change takes place, what Christians receive in the Sacrament, and the sacrificial character of the Eucharist. This constellation of theological concerns is related to components of popular piety that also motivated sixteenth-century calls for reform: the decline in lay reception of the Eucharist (which had already begun in the late fourth century as Chrysostom’s sermons indicate), the devotion to Christ in the Blessed Sacrament through adoration, the importance of Eucharistic miracles, the desire of the faithful

<sup>1</sup> Brian Cummings, ed., *The Book of Common Prayer: The Texts of 1549, 1559, and 1662*, Reprint edition (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013), 31–32.

to see the Blessed Sacrament in the Mass, and so forth.<sup>2</sup> One piece of evidence supporting this claim is that while the various non-Latin churches of the East maintain an unwavering and theologically rich belief in the reality of Christ's presence in the Sacrament that is no less robust than in the Latin West, the aspects of daily religious practice that were of such concern to many reformers are not present in the same ways in those churches. This may explain the amenability of Eastern anaphoras to many English and Scottish divines, regarded as expressing a full and catholic Eucharistic theology, even though their anaphoras are in substantial agreement with the Roman Canon.

Thus, my thesis goes, when the questions of reform rise to a fevered pitch in the sixteenth century, the reformers tend to work within the boundaries of the scholastic treatises in which they were trained. This naturally makes their counterproposals all similarly lopsided. When this is joined to a misreading of Catholic teaching on some points, the seeds were sown for a nearly intractable debate. These questions remain the central focus in much of Protestant theology, with repercussions that are still felt.<sup>3</sup> What was lost for much of Protestantism is the belief that the Christian "sacrifice of praise"—as the Roman Canon calls the Eucharis-

---

<sup>2</sup> For a history of both the official and unofficial piety connected with the Blessed Sacrament, see Nathan Mitchell, *Cult and Controversy: The Worship of the Eucharist Outside Mass* (Collegeville: Pueblo Books, 1982).

<sup>3</sup> I have observed a tendency when some free-church evangelicals begin to embrace a sacramentally-shaped Christianity by reading the Fathers, they often embrace a lopsided view of the sacraments that is precisely the sort of magical thinking that so animated many in the sixteenth century to call for reform. For example, a friend told me about his evangelical Anglican church which, for the summer, decided that to save time, they would alter the liturgy in the following way: in place of the normal Eucharistic liturgy from the American prayer book, they would have Morning Prayer and then distribute the pre-consecrated Sacrament at the end. Think of this: an Anglican, keeping a large supply of pre-consecrated Bread and Wine in some unknown location (which he consecrates in a private Mass?) in order to distribute it on Sundays to people who will not, for nearly three months, ever attend a Eucharistic liturgy. This demonstrates a limiting of the Eucharist to simply what a person *receives* without consideration of the Eucharistic action of the entire liturgy. This mechanistic approach motivates the work by Louis Marie Chauvet, *Symbol and Sacrament: A Sacramental Reinterpretation of Christian Existence* (Collegeville: Liturgical Press, 1995). I think, for many evangelicals, the objectivity of Christ's Eucharistic presence, in contrast to the rather subjective inclinations of much contemporary worship, provides great solace. But without the adequate framework within which to place a robust and historically recognizable sacramental theology, the integration of new information can be piecemeal and partial.

tic action and sacrifice (*sacrificium laudis*)—is a *spiritual* (λογική) sacrifice precisely because it is a *material* one. What is lost is the principle that undergirds this doxological vision of the Eucharist: that the cultic Eucharistic ritual is constitutive of the Christian faith.<sup>4</sup> What is lost is a belief that the Christian gathering on the Lord’s Day is a ritual that is a good in itself and not just a means to an end (such as pedagogy or the symbolic corollary to the verbal proclamation of the Word).

I will attempt to demonstrate this thesis with just one clear example: the English Prayer Book tradition. But it turns out that this example brings us to an interesting fork in the road almost immediately. Not only does a Eucharistic theology which is suspiciously Catholic and in profound tension with the theology of the prayer book of the time emerge in parts of the Church of England by 1600, but with the advent of the non-juring schism in England and Scotland (which I’ll discuss below), space was created for new liturgies that expressed this catholic doctrine and which are finally given an official imprimatur in the 1764 Scottish

---

<sup>4</sup> A number of studies have looked at some matters related to ritual and the reformations. Lori Branch’s study explores the rise of spontaneous prayer and general spontaneity in English and continental Protestants: see her *Rituals of Spontaneity: Sentiment and Secularism from Free Prayer to Wordsworth* (Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006). Susan Karant-Nunn’s study of ritual change in early reformation Germany offers helpful insights from the Lutheran context. She writes in *The Reformation of Ritual: An Interpretation of Early Modern Germany, Christianity and Society in the Modern World* (London: Routledge, 1997), 191: “The Reformers . . . condemned the entire field of manipulators of the unseen: both priests and folk practitioners. Scripture did not validate their purported powers. Above all, only God himself could control. Even as the leaders of the new churches insisted that they directed their cleansing fires at that which was unsubstantiated in the Bible, we readers of ritual cannot help but observe that they simultaneously disenfranchised the priesthood and every other category of ether-penetrating operative. They would doubtless agree with me, for all functioned without celestial approval. Within the Lutheran sphere, the process of desacralizing the pastorate was not complete until clerical exorcism ceased in most places by the end of the sixteenth century.” Alexandra Walsham describes well the remarkable change that the reformation brought to the spiritual landscape in Britain and Ireland and how this changed the ways that people perceived the very idea of religion in her work *The Reformation of the Landscape: Religion, Identity, and Memory in Early Modern Britain and Ireland* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011). Keith Thomas’s landmark study, *Religion and the Decline of Magic* (New York: Scribner, 1971), also cannot be overlooked, which explored many of the unofficial expressions of engagements with the supernatural that remained part of the life of many in England in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries but have all but disappeared now. I am grateful to Peter Leithart for his encouragement in this project and bringing a number of these resources to my attention.

prayer book. Thus, one of the most potent examples of the rejection of Eucharistic celebration as a ritual expression of praise somehow contained within itself the seeds of its own conquest. The result is two (and a half), conflicting Anglican theologies of the Eucharist.

I will proceed as follows. First, I will say something about this lopsided emphasis by walking through Thomas's treatise in the *Summa*. Second, I will describe the emergence of the English reformation theology on the Eucharist as expressed in the first two prayer books of 1549 and 1552. Third, I will describe the emergence of (what I will call with a wink) the "reform of the reform" which comes to fruition in the Scottish tradition. I will conclude with a brief consideration of Ratzinger's contribution to the question of Eucharistic sacrifice in *The Spirit of the Liturgy* and the possible subsequent emergence of a unified Anglican approach to Eucharistic sacrifice and rapprochement with the Catholic Church.

## THE EXAMPLE OF ST. THOMAS

There is general agreement, I think it is fair to say, that central to this story of Latin Scholastic Eucharistic theology<sup>5</sup> is the supposed conflict between the Carolingian Benedictines Ratramnus and Paschasius<sup>6</sup> in the

---

<sup>5</sup> For recent scholarship on the Eucharist in the medieval period, see Marilyn McCord Adams, *Some Later Medieval Theories of the Eucharist: Thomas Aquinas, Giles of Rome, Duns Scotus, and William Ockham* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012); Ian Christopher Levy, Gary Macy, and Kristen Van Ausdall, eds., *A Companion to the Eucharist in the Middle Ages*, Brill's Companions to the Christian Tradition 26 (Leiden: Brill, 2012); Enrico Mazza, *The Celebration of Eucharist: The Origin of the Rite and the Development of Its Interpretation* (Collegeville: Pueblo Books, 1999), 161–250; Miri Rubin, *Corpus Christi: The Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991); Gary Macy, *The Theologies of the Eucharist in the Early Scholastic Period: A Study of the Salvific Function of the Sacrament according to the Theologians, C. 1080–C. 1220* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984); Nathan Mitchell, *Cult and Controversy: The Worship of the Eucharist Outside Mass* (Collegeville: Pueblo Books, 1982); Henri de Lubac, *Corpus Mysticum: The Eucharist and the Church in the Middle Ages: Historical Survey*, Faith in Reason (London: SCM, 2006).

<sup>6</sup> These two figures are sometimes identified as combatants in a vigorous debate over the nature of Christ's presence and the change in the bread and wine; for example, see Justo L. González, *A History of Christian Thought*, vol. II (Nashville: Abingdon, 1979), 117, where he describes their two positions as a "controversy." While Jaroslav Pelikan uses the term "conflict," he is more careful to simply describe their different approaches in *The Growth of Medieval Theology (600-1300)* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1978), 74–80. Gary Macy, *Theologies of the Eucharist in the Early Scholastic Period*, 21–22, writes: "The juxtaposition of the two works [of Ratramnus

ninth century, along with the strange tale of the French theologian, Berengar of Tours<sup>7</sup> two centuries later and his (in)famous confession.

Ratramnus, it turns out, was the ancient source that served as the springboard for the new Eucharistic thinking of the English reformation theologian Nicholas Ridley. Ridley then convinced Thomas Cranmer (architect of the first two English prayer books and appointed Archbishop of Canterbury by Henry VIII in 1532) of the fault with late medieval Eucharistic theology and of his newfound approach. This new perspective is what is expressed in the English Articles of Religion, Cranmer's own Treatise on the Eucharist, and ultimately in the 1552 prayer book.<sup>8</sup>

---

and Paschasius, both titled *De sordore et sanguine domini*], both in time and space, has led most later commentators to speak of these authors as the principal protagonists in a ninth-century 'controversy' over the understanding of the Eucharist." He continues: "Jean-Paul Bouhot, in his recent study of the scholarly career of Ratramnus has suggested that the juxtaposition of these works does not necessarily indicate that the two scholars were the centre of any controversy. Certainly, there are indications that there was not a doctrinal conflict here of any major proportion. Paschasius's work existed, apparently available to Ratramnus, for some fourteen years before Ratramnus responded with his own work, and then Ratramnus's work does not seem to be a response to his abbot, but to certain quite specific questions addressed to him by the Emperor. Further, no councils were held or called for, and no condemnations appeared. The theology of Paschasius and Ratramnus seemed to have existed in relative harmony at the monastery of Corbie." For a more recent look at their positions and the lack of any formal controversy in their day, see Willemien Otten, "Between Augustinian Sign and Carolingian Reality: The Presence of Ambrose and Augustine in the Eucharistic Debate Between Paschasius Radbertus and Ratramnus of Corbie," *Nederlands archief voor kerkgeschiedenis* 2 (2000): 137–56. In a different essay, she is quite clear that "a real controversy [between these two figures] never erupted" (Willemien Otten, "Carolingian Theology," in *The Medieval Theologians*, ed. G. R. Evans [Oxford: Blackwell, 2001], 74). For a discussion of the different ways that both used the same terms, see Mazza, *Celebration of Eucharist*, 183–87.

<sup>7</sup> The profession prescribed for Berengar includes this: "that the bread and wine that are placed on the altar, after the consecration, are not only a sacrament, but also the true Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ and that they are sensibly, not only in sacrament but in truth, touched and broken by the hands of priests and ground by the teeth of the faithful" (DH 690). See Heinrich Denzinger and Peter Hünermann, ed., *Enchiridion Symbolorum: A Compendium of Creeds, Definitions, and Declarations of the Catholic Church*, 43rd ed. (San Francisco: Ignatius, 2012), 234. For a recent discussion of Berengar, see the two articles by Gary Macy, "The Theological Fate of Berengar's Oath of 1059: Interpreting a Blunder Become Tradition" and "Berengar's Legacy as Heresiarch" in Gary Macy, *Treasures from the Storeroom: Medieval Religion and the Eucharist* (Collegeville: Pueblo, 1999), 20–35, 59–80.

<sup>8</sup> Ridley writes: "This Bertram [i.e., Ratramnus] was the first that pulled me by the ear, and that first brought me from the common error of the Romish church, and caused

What makes this story even more interesting is that, in light of the appeal to Ratramnus, there was a long period of time during which some Catholics claimed that Ratramnus' work was the result of a Protestant forgery, a claim which seems to have begun with Pope Sixtus VI, who maintained that it was counterfeited by the Protestant reformer Oecolampadius.<sup>9</sup>

Thomas's treatment of the Eucharist serves as a particularly illustrative example of my thesis that Ratramnus, Paschasius, and Berengar are emblematic of a *tendency* in the Latin West for treatises on the Eucharist to focus almost exclusively on real presence, the means of the change, and what the Christian receives in the Sacrament. As with many topics in the *Summa*, one often must take recourse to one of Thomas's earlier discussions of a matter in order to see properly the whole vision of his thought on a subject. He addresses the question of worship, especially as it pertains to the Eucharist and the question of sacrifice, at three main junctures in the *Summa*: as they occur under the Old Covenant; as an aspect of the virtue of justice in the exercise of religion; and then in the treatise on the Sacrament.

In his discussion of the ceremonial precepts of the Old Law in the *Prima Secundae*, Thomas states that the "chief purpose of the whole external worship is that man may give worship to God" (I-II, q. 102, a.

---

me to search more diligently and exactly both the Scriptures and the writings of the old ecclesiastical fathers in this matter" (Henry Christmas, ed., *Works of Nicholas Ridley*, Parker Society for the Publication of the Works of the Fathers and Early Writers of the Reformed English Church 39 [Cambridge: The University Press, 1841], 206). Cranmer explains Ridley's role in the transformation of his own thought: "I grant that then I believed otherwise than I do now; and so I did, until my lord of London, doctor Ridley, did confer with me, and by sundry persuasions and authorities of doctors drew me quite from my opinion" (John Edmund Cox, ed., *Miscellaneous Writings and Letters of Thomas Cranmer*, Parker Society for the Publication of the Works of the Fathers and Early Writers of the Reformed English Church 16 [Cambridge: The University Press, 1846], 375).

<sup>9</sup> Otten explains: "This feat seems to have endeared this little treatise to the Reformers even more, with all parties except the Lutherans making use of it from time to time, mainly because it seemed to reject the doctrine of transubstantiation. Some reformers also seemed interested because it could serve a role in the reconciliation talks between the different religious parties. The Benedictine scholar Jean Mabillon changed its reception in Catholic circles by accepting its orthodoxy in 1689" (Otten, "Between Augustinian Sign and Carolingian Reality," 138n2). She points to the following source, which describes this history in great detail: J. N. Bakhuizen van den Brink, ed., *Ratramnus. De corpore et sanguine Domini: texte original et notice bibliographique* (Amsterdam: North-Holland Publishing Company, 1974), 71–137.

4, resp.).<sup>10</sup> Worship is constituted by means of four aspects: sacrifices, sacred things (the materials used in a sacrifice), sacraments (the means by which those materials or person are consecrated for use in divine worship), and observances, “for instance, in matters of food, clothing, and so forth” (I-II, q. 101, a. 4, resp.).<sup>11</sup> Divine worship “consists specially in sacrifices,” he emphasizes, “which are offered up to God” (I-II, q. 101, a. 4, resp.). Sacrifices are worship primarily because “in offering up sacrifices man made protestation that God is the first principle of the creation of all things, and their last end to which all things must be directed” (I-II, q. 102, a. 3, resp.). They also serve to discourage idolatry and order our minds toward God. Fundamental to the Old Covenant is that in the divine economy, those sacrifices “were offered up in order to foreshadow this one individual and paramount sacrifice [namely when Christ “delivered up himself to God for an odor of sweetness” (Eph 5:2)]—the imperfect forecasting the perfect” (I-II, q. 102, a. 3, resp. and ad 1). His basic definition of sacrifice is taken directly from Augustine’s famous discussion in the *De civitate Dei* 10 (a source to which he returns through the *Summa* on this topic): sacrifice is “any work done that we may cleave to God in holy fellowship” (II-II, q. 85, a. 3, obj. 1 and ad 1, citing *De civ. Dei* 10.6).

Thomas returns to sacrifice in the treatise on Justice in the *Secunda Secundae*, which begins with a discussion of devotion, prayer, and adoration, as each are proper to the exercise of religion. Here, he gets a bit more technical. Sacrifice is one of a number of external religious acts which demonstrate to us as sensible creatures the invisible things of the heart by means of that which is visible (II-II, q. 81, a. 7, resp., which he expounds in II-II, q. 84, a. 2). Again, he relies on Augustine, this time on his claim that “the visible sacrifice is the sacrament or sacred sign of the invisible sacrifice” (*De civ. Dei* 10.5, quoted in II-II, q. 81, a. 7, ad 2). This quotation from Augustine is also the authority he cites later at the outset of his treatise on the sacraments and defines them as “a sign of a sacred thing” (III, q. 60, a. 1, sc), and more specifically, “a sign of a holy thing so far as it makes men holy” (III, q. 60, a. 2, resp.). The invisible

---

<sup>10</sup> He states later that “sacrifice is a special act deserving of praise in that it is done out of reverence for God,” which is the reason that it is a virtue; see II-II, q. 85, a. 3, resp. All English translations are taken from St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa Theologica*, 5 vols., translated by the Fathers of the English Dominican Province (Westminster, MD: Christian Classics, 1981).

<sup>11</sup> Thomas points out that something can be both a sacrifice and a sacrament in I-II, q. 101, a. 4, ad. 2 and 3.

sacrifice that is to be joined to the visible is described with great clarity in Psalm 50[51]:9 (another source to which Thomas repeatedly returns): “a sacrifice to God is a troubled spirit; a broken and contrite heart, O God, you will not despise” (cited in II-II, q. 86, a. 2, resp.).<sup>12</sup> Thomas

---

<sup>12</sup> Thomas calls these “spiritual sacrifices” (*sacrificium spirituale*; II-II, q. 85, a. 2, resp.) in contrast to “outward sacrifices” (*exterior sacrificia*). The Roman Canon, however, uses the phrase “sacrifice of praise” (*sacrificium laudis* in the *Memento, domine*) as a name for the offering of the Eucharist. The context is quite clear: after the Sanctus, the *Te igitur* begins straightaway with an offering of the bread and wine, which makes the use of the term unambiguous: it refers not only to verbal praise but to the act of sacrifice that is the Eucharist being celebrated. Further, Thomas continues to use the term “spiritual” as a modifier in a way different than the Roman Canon. On the question of the minister of the sacrament, he explains why a layperson cannot offer the Eucharistic sacrifice but can nonetheless offer “spiritual sacrifice” (a la Ps 51:19): “A devout layman is united with Christ by spiritual union through faith and charity, but not by sacramental power: consequently he has a spiritual priesthood for offering spiritual sacrifices, of which it is said (*Psalm 50:19*): ‘A sacrifice to God is an afflicted spirit;’ and (*Romans 12:1*): ‘Present your bodies a living sacrifice.’ Hence, too, it is written (*1 Peter 2:5*): ‘A holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices’” (III, q. 82, a. 1, ad 2). Note that in Rom 12:1, the Vulgate speaks of a *hostiam viventem* (θυσίαν ζώσαν) while the term for sacrifice in 1 Pet 2:5 is *spirituales hostias*, even though the Greek term for sacrifice is the same (πνευματικᾶς θυσίας). Further, it is important to note that the adjective *rationabilem* is one of five in the *Quam oblationem* that the priest asks God to make applicable to the offering of bread and wine “so that it may be for us the Body and Blood of your dearly beloved Son, Jesus Christ our Lord” (“ut nobis corpus et sanguis fiat dilectissimi filii tui domini nostri Iesu Christi”). *Rationabilis* occurs only once in the New Testament, in Rom 12:1. The offering of the Christian’s body as a living sacrifice is described as “your spiritual worship” (*rationabile obsequium vestrum*; τὴν λογικὴν λατρείαν ὑμῶν.) Christine Mohrmann argues that the Latin term underwent a shift in meaning. At least through the time of Ambrose and Ambrosiaster, it shared its definition with its Greek derivative, *λογικός*, meaning “spiritual” in that it has been elevated to the sphere of the divine and in a sense that does not necessarily exclude the material. See Christine Mohrmann, “*Rationabilis-Λογικός*,” *Revue internationale des droits de l’antiquité* 5 (1950): 225–34; and Bernard Botte, “Traduction du Canon de la messe,” *La Maison-Dieu* 23 (1950): 37–53. Jungmann says that *λογικὴ θυσία* “is an exact description of the spiritual sacrifice proper to Christianity, a sacrifice lifted high above the realm of [only] matter” (*Mass of the Roman Rite: Its Origins and Development (Missarum Sollemnia)*, trans. Francis A. Brunner, 2 vols. [New York: Benziger, 1951], 2:189). But by the time of Leo the Great (440–61), Mohrmann explains, its meaning has narrowed and “signified merely what was suited to reason or the nature of things.” The use of the term “spiritual” can be misleading. The claims of Robert Daly and others on the “spiritualization of sacrifice” in Judaism and into Christianity have been widely accepted. See Robert J. Daly, *Christian Sacrifice: The Judaeo-Christian Background before Origen*, *Studies in Christian Antiquity* 18 (Washington, D.C.: Catholic University of America Press, 1978); Daly, *The Origins of the*



---

*Christian Doctrine of Sacrifice* (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1978); Daly, *Sacrifice Unveiled: The True Meaning of Christian Sacrifice* (Edinburgh: Bloomsbury, 2009); Frances M. Young, *The Use of Sacrificial Ideas in Greek Christian Writers from the New Testament to John Chrysostom*, Patristic Monograph Series 5 (Cambridge, MA: Philadelphia Patristic Foundation, 1979); Everett Ferguson, "Spiritual Sacrifice in Early Christianity and Its Environment," in *ANRW*, ed. Hildegard Temporini and Wolfgang Haase, vol. II.20.i (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1972– ), 1151–89. This general argument plays a significant role in Louie-Marie Chauvet's argument about the nature of sacrifice; see Chauvet, *Symbol and Sacrament*, 228–319. For an example of an appreciative response to Daly's approach, see John H McKenna, "Eucharist and Sacrifice: An Overview," *Worship* 76, no. 5 (September 2002): 387. But rightly, it has not been uncontested; for example, see Harold W. Attridge, "Christian Sacrifice (Book review)," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 100, no. 1 (March 1981): 145–147. The Jewish scholar Jonathan Kla-wans offers one such alternative argument: "When we look a little deeper into Paul's description of sacrificial worship, we find that Paul affirms many of the fundamental theological tenets upon which ancient Jewish sacrificial worship is based." And also: "All too often, Paul's discussions of Jewish sacrificial worship are understood as examples of the so-called spiritualization of sacrifice. . . . As I have been arguing all along, it is high time to abandon the term 'spiritual sacrifice' altogether" and instead "speak more neutrally of metaphorical uses of sacrifice language—a phenomenon that we can see in Paul, Philo, the rabbis, and even the Last Supper traditions. . . . Sacrificial metaphors operate on the assumption of the efficacy and meaning of sacrificial rituals, and hope to appropriate some of that meaning and apply it to something else" (*Purity, Sacrifice, and the Temple: Symbolism and Supersessionism in the Study of Ancient Judaism* [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006], 220). Andrew McGowan provides a focused critique of the "spiritualization thesis" from both a classical and Christian perspective. He suggests that what is sometimes called "spiritualization" is better described as "the application of sacrificial understandings and interpretations to a wider range of practices than was previously seen as cultic." This is different, he argues, from the tendency toward the interiorization of sacrifice that can be seen in someone like Philo. "Practices such as prayer and communal meals were already closely-related to sacrificial rituals, and in these cases to recast the relationships as organic rather than as merely adjacent is a subtle but important one" (Andrew B. McGowan, "Eucharist and Sacrifice: Cultic Tradition and Transformation in Early Christian Ritual Meals," in *Mahl und religiöse Identität im Frühen Christentum—Meals and Religious Identity in Early Christianity*, ed. Matthias Klinghardt and Hal Taussig, *Texte Und Arbeiten Zum Neutestamentlichen Zeitalter* 56 [Tübingen: Francke, 2012], 14–15). McGowan's argument indicates that the debate about the use of "spiritualization" is not simply a semantic disagreement but is instead about failing to understand how it was understood in the first few centuries in the ancient Near East. For more on how the relationship between food and sacrifice pervaded ancient Near Eastern culture, see G. Dorival, "L'originalité de la Bible grecque des Septante en matière de sacrifice," in *La cuisine et l'autel: les sacrifices en questions dans les sociétés de la méditerranée ancienne*, ed. Stella Georgoudi, Renée Koch Piettre, and Francis Schmidt (Turnhout: Brepols, 2005), 309–15. See also Dale B. Martin, *The Corinthian Body* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1995), 4–6; Derek Collins, "Nature, Cause, and Agency in

distinguishes sacrifice from oblations, first fruits, and tithes in this way: “a sacrifice, properly speaking, requires *that something be done to the thing which is offered to God*, for instance animals were slain and burnt, the bread is broken, eaten, blessed” (II-II, q. 85, a. 3, ad 3; emphasis added).<sup>13</sup> In other words, oblation is the genus within which sacrifice is one of a number of species. Later, he clarifies further that a sacrifice is an offering that has not just *anything* done to it, but something *sacred* done to it (*sacrum*; *ibid.*).

Thomas’s treatise on the Eucharist is presented in eleven questions (plus the scattered references to the Eucharist in the opening question on the sacraments: III, q. 60). Sacrifice is considered directly in the first question on the Eucharist in general, and also in the last question on the liturgical rite. The Eucharist is a sacrament because it signifies two holy things, namely, “Christ’s true body and Christ’s mystical body”

---

Greek Magic,” *TAPA* (1974–) 133, no. 1 (2003): 17–49. Much of the material in this footnote is also found in footnote 58 in Matthew S. C. Olver, “The Bavarian’s Surprise: Ratzinger’s Spirit of the Liturgy as the Spirit of the Council,” *Nova et Vetera* 15, no. 1 (2017): 200–201.

<sup>13</sup> In Gary Anderson’s entry on Old Testament sacrifice in the *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, he cites Victor Turner’s reading of Thomas. Turner writes: “I am rather inclined to the position of Saint Thomas Aquinas who held in the *Summa* that while “offering” or “oblation” is the genus, sacrifice proper is a species. Some addition must be made to oblation, which determines, specifies, and reserves the sensible thing offered to the deity or power to whom it is offered.” This is precisely what Thomas says in the passage just quoted. Turner goes on, however, to attribute the use of the term *immolare* to Thomas, which seems unjustified (and he does so without citation). Turner is correct that Thomas makes this exact distinction, but I have not found where Thomas applies the term *immolare* to that distinction, whether in II-II, q. 86, a. 3, ad 3, or elsewhere. Turner explains: “The ‘something done’ to the offered thing Saint Thomas calls immolation. Immolation is derived from the Latin *immolare*, which means to sprinkle a victim with sacrificial meal, but has come in English to assume a strong overtone of destruction and even killing, of ‘blood’ sacrifice. But in fact immolation is always defined according to the nature of the victim or offering. While animals may be killed, liquids may be poured out, and solids, including grain and flour, burnt. In Scholastic terminology, oblation can be taken as the matter (undifferentiated substance of reality or experience), immolation as the form (the arrangements of the parts of a thing that gives it its distinctive appearance) of sacrifice” (Victor W. Turner, “Sacrifice as Quintessential Process: Prophylaxis or Abandonment?” *History of Religions* 16, no. 3 [1977]: 190). See Gary A. Anderson, “Sacrifice and Sacrificial Offerings,” in *Anchor Bible Dictionary*, ed. David Noel Freedman, 6 vols. (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 5:873. In the Roman Canon, however, it uses a wide variety of terms as synonyms for the Eucharist: *dona*, *munera*, *sacrificia* (*Te igitur*), *sacrificium laudis* (*Memento, domine*), *oblationem* (*Hanc igitur & Quam oblationem*), and *hostiam* (*Unde et memores*).

(again, relying on Augustine; III, q. 60, a. 3, sc). This is noteworthy because Thomas is highlighting the ecclesial aspect of the Eucharist that is sometimes underdeveloped in later medieval treatises. The Eucharist is also a sacrifice, he explains, because in this sacrament a thing is offered to which something is done—bread and wine is offered and consecrated such that it becomes the Body and Blood of Christ. Thomas adds two more reasons why it is a sacrifice, relying now on Ambrose: the Eucharist is a sacrifice, first, because it is a sacrament of Christ's Passion,<sup>14</sup> and because it is also the instrumental means by which "we are made partakes of the fruit of the Lord's Passion."<sup>15</sup> It is also a sacrifice because, following Augustine, "the images of things are called by the names of the things whereof they are the images" (cited in III, q. 83, a. 1, resp.). Earlier, in the first question on the Eucharist, he discusses sacrifice as part of the "three-fold significance" of this sacrament which corresponds to the past, the present, and the future. As to the past, it is a sacrifice that "is commemorative [i.e., it is a 'signifying image'] of our Lord's Passion, which was a true sacrifice" (III, q. 73, a. 4, resp.), the fruits of which are applied to mortals not only "through faith and charity" but also by means of "the sacraments of faith" (III, q. 49, a. 3, ad 1). As it concerns the present, the Eucharist is concerned with ecclesiastical unity, which is indicated by the term "communion" (III, q. 73, a. 4, resp.).<sup>16</sup> "With regard to the future it has a third meaning, inasmuch as this sacrament foreshadows the Divine fruition, which shall come to pass in heaven,"

---

<sup>14</sup> Ambrose: "In Christ was offered up a sacrifice capable of giving eternal salvation; what then do we do? Do we not offer it up every day in memory of his death" (cited in III, q. 83, a. 1, resp.).

<sup>15</sup> Ambrose: "We offer not many victims, because Christ was offered but once: and this latter sacrifice is the pattern of the former. For just as what is offered everywhere is one body, and not many bodies, so also is it but one sacrifice" (cited in III, q. 83, a. 1, ad 1).

<sup>16</sup> He cites St. John of Damascus, *De fide Orthod.* 4 on this point: "It is called Communion because we communicate with Christ through it, both because we partake of His flesh and Godhead, and because we communicate with and are united to one another through it" (cited in III, q. 73, a. 4, resp.). The Catechism newly composed for the American prayer book of 1979 expresses a position very close to this. In response to the question, "Why is the Eucharist called a sacrifice?" (which is the second question in the section on "The Holy Eucharist," whose first question is, "What is the Holy Eucharist?"), this answer is given: "Because the Eucharist, the Church's sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, is the way by which the sacrifice of Christ is made present, and in which he unites us to his one offering of himself" (Episcopal Church, *The Book of Common Prayer [1979]* [New York: Seabury, 1979], 859).

because “it is called Viaticum, because it supplies the way of going there” (ibid.).

The vast majority of Thomas’s treatise on the Eucharist in the next ten questions concerns the bread and wine in some way, but very little is said about the *action* of the Eucharistic celebration as a whole or its purpose outside of what is given by God to those who partake.<sup>17</sup> Thomas does state in his opening question on the sacraments that they have a two-fold end, namely, the worship of God and the sanctification of man (III, q. 60, a. 5, resp.). He also highlights aspects of the liturgical rite which are explicitly doxological, such as the Introit, the Gloria, the Alleluia, and then later the Sanctus as part of the consecration.<sup>18</sup> Nonetheless, a couple of aspects of the treatise remain curious. First, very little of what is discussed in the earlier sections on the ceremonies of the Old Covenant and on sacrifice as part of the virtue of justice is repeated or referenced in the treatise on the Eucharist. Instead, the vast majority of the treatise is focused on the bread and the wine, the priestly minister, and what the faithful receive.<sup>19</sup> What this means is what while a careful reading of the entire *Summa* affords a rich and comprehensive vision of the Eucharist, a study of only the treatise in the *Tertia Pars* will leave one with a lopsided vision. Second, sacrifice is a surprisingly peripheral issue relative to the entire treatise and receives focused attention in only the first and last questions. This is noteworthy given how prominent sacrifice will become in Catholic Eucharistic theology, especially in the wake of the sixteenth-century reformations and the dogmatic teaching of Trent.

---

<sup>17</sup> This approach Chauvet describes as “mechanistic” and it was what animated his well-known tome, *Symbol and Sacrament*. This is despite the fact that Aquinas quite carefully and nimbly avoids all the pitfalls Chauvet attributes to him, a fact he later indicated in his lecture upon reception of an honorary doctorate at Louvain; see Louis-Marie Chauvet, “Une relecture de Symbole et sacrement,” *Questions Liturgiques/Studies in Liturgy* 88 (2007): 111–25.

<sup>18</sup> He quotes Eusebius about worship and the Eucharist, but the thrust of the quotation is that Christ is to be worshiped in his sacramental form, not that the celebration of the Mass is itself an act of worship (see III, q. 73, a. 5, resp.).

<sup>19</sup> After the first question, which concerns the Eucharist generally, the questions proceed as follows: matter of the sacrament (q. 74), the change of the bread and wine into Christ’s Body and Blood (q. 75), the way Christ is present in the sacrament (q. 76), the accidents (q. 77), form (q. 78), and effects (q. 79) of the sacrament, the use of receiving the sacrament in general (q. 79), how Christ used the sacrament in its institution (q. 80), the proper minister of the sacrament (q. 81), and finally the Church’s rite for its celebration (q. 81).

What is particularly curious is how Thomas interprets the liturgical text itself as it concerns sacrifice. After walking through the Mass of the Catechumens, he comes to “the celebration of the mystery, which is both offered as a sacrifice and consecrated and received as a sacrament” (III, q. 83, a. 4, resp.). This action is described as a three-fold process: “first we have the oblation; then the consecration of the matter offered; and thirdly, its reception” (ibid.). The oblation consists of two aspects: first, “the people’s praise in singing the ‘offertory,’ which expresses ‘the joy of the offerers’” (ibid.). This accords with his earlier distinction that oblation is anything offered; it is only a sacrifice if something sacred is done to it. The second aspect of the oblationary character of the Eucharist, he says, is “the priest’s prayer asking for the people’s oblation to be made acceptable to God” (ibid.; the prayer is known as the *Orate fratres*). Part two of the celebration of the mystery is the consecration, which begins in such a way as to excite the people to praise: in the exhortation, “lift up your hearts” and in the hymns of praise—the *Sanctus* praising his godhead and the *Benedictus* his humanity (ibid.). The consecration proper in the recitation of Christ’s words is prefaced, he explains, with a commemoration of the living (in the *Memento, domine*) and then of the saints (in the *Communicantes*), which conclude with a petition that “the oblation may be salutary to them for whom it is offered” (from the *Hanc igitur*; ibid.). But note: Thomas makes no mention of the two verbs of offering in the *Te igitur* and the *Memento, domine*, nor of the three requests for acceptance of the sacrifice (in the *Te igitur*, *Hanc igitur*, and *Quam oblationem*), all of which takes places before the “consecration.” In fact, he also makes no mention of the earlier verbs of oblation in the priest’s offertory prayers, which contain four explicit verbs of offering and three requests for acceptance, plus the aforementioned *Orate, fratres*, where the people pray for acceptance of the sacrifice offered at the hands of the priest. For someone who is attentive to the Eucharist as sacrifice, this lacuna is perplexing: Why does he pass over all those places where the Canon calls the offered bread and wine a sacrifice, where the priest actually offers these gifts, and where the priest asks that God might accept the sacrificial offering?

He further appears to pass over the plain sense of the third verb of offering in the *Unde et memores*, where the sacrifice is called a pure, holy, and immaculate *hostia*, a technical term that refers to an oblation to which something has been done (i.e., the distinguishing mark of the species of oblation that Thomas calls a sacrifice). The best translation for *hostia*, in fact, is probably “a sacrificial offering.” While Thomas does note the request that the sacrifice might find favor with God in the *Supra*

*quae*, he also makes no mention in his discussion of the Canon of the sacrificial character of the Eucharist that is highlighted in the connection made with the sacrifices of Abel, Abraham, and Melchizedek (he does mention this in the reply to objection nine<sup>20</sup>). He makes no comment on the fact that the priest is still asking for God to accept the sacrificial offering, now for the fifth time in the *Supra quae* and yet again by asking that the Angel (who is almost certainly Christ) transport the sacrifice from this earthly realm into the presence of his divine majesty (*Supplices te*). The purpose of this, the Canon states very clearly with the use of the coordinating conjunction *ut*, is that those who *receive* the sacrament may also be partakers of the *effects* of the sacrament, which the Canon names as being filled with heavenly benediction and grace.<sup>21</sup> Further, in the treatise itself, there is almost no reference to the Eucharist as divine worship or to the fact that the Canon twice indicates that all those present share in offering the sacrifice.

My questions are not about what Thomas does say but about he does not say. What I find perplexing is just how little of the text of the

---

<sup>20</sup> He discusses the *Supra quae* in a reply to an objection, and his interpretation is quite curious: “The priest does not pray that the sacramental species may be borne up to heaven; nor that Christ’s true body may be borne thither, for it does not cease to be there; but he offers this prayer for Christ’s mystical body, which is signified in this sacrament, that the angel standing by at the Divine mysteries may present to God the prayers of both priest and people, according to Apocalypse 8:4: ‘And the smoke of the incense of the prayers of the saints ascended up before God, from the hand of the angel.’ But God’s ‘altar on high’ means either the Church triumphant, unto which we pray to be translated, or else God Himself, in Whom we ask to share; because it is said of this altar (Exodus 20:26): ‘Thou shalt not go up by steps unto My altar, i.e., thou shalt make no steps towards the Trinity.’” The *haec* refers not to the bread and wine, described as *hostiam puram*, *hostiam sanctam*, *hostiam immaculatam* in the previous paragraph, but to the prayers of the faithful at the Mass. Curiously, Cranmer rewrites this part of the Canon in the 1549 prayer book to be interpreted in the same way, and makes the single angel plural: “commaunde these our prayers and supplications, by the Ministry of thy holy Angels, to be brought up into thy holy Tabernacle before the syght of thy dyvine majestie; not waiyng our merites, but pardonyng our offences, through Christe our Lorde.” Thomas continues in the reply with an alternative reading of the angel: “Or else by the angel we are to understand Christ Himself, Who is the ‘Angel of great counsel’ (Isaiah 9:6: Septuagint), Who unites His mystical body with God the Father and the Church triumphant” (III, q. 83, a. 4, ad 9). The quotation from the 1549 Canon is taken from Cuming, *Book of Common Prayer*, 31–32. Unless otherwise noted, all subsequent quotations of these three prayer books will be cited parenthetically from this volume.

<sup>21</sup> “Ut quotquot ex hac altaris participatione sacrosanctum filii tui corpus et sanguinem sumpserimus, omni benedictione caelesti et gratia repleamur.”

Canon is given a close reading, especially as it concerns the offering of the sacrificial oblation and the necessity of God's acceptance of it. In fact, as Dominic Serra demonstrated with great clarity, this is *the* central concern of the Roman Canon: God's acceptance of the sacrifice.<sup>22</sup> A plain reading of the text is that the bread and the wine become Christ's Body and Blood when the Father accepts our sacrifice.

Thomas's concern, however, is with consecration by Christ's words and the transformation of the gifts. This, I wish to suggest, is a somewhat perplexing example of extended theological reflection that is focused on issues related to the change of the bread and wine, without recourse to a plain reading of the sacrificial language of the Canon itself, let alone the means by which the anaphora indicates that the change occurs: the Father's acceptance of the Eucharistic sacrifice. This is not to say that there are not theologically defensible reasons for concluding that consecration actually takes place through the recitation of Christ's instituting words: Ambrose, Augustine, and Chrysostom make just this argument, and Thomas relies on them when he makes his own argument in Question 78 in discussing the form of the Sacrament. I take Thomas's treatise as emblematic of the particular set of concerns that are the focus in medieval Eucharistic treatises. This set of concerns, combined with the popular piety that is connected to them, is the milieu—which, no doubt, varied by location—and the content in which the various leaders in the reformations are working and which motivates the objections they raise with Catholic teaching.

## TRANSITION—CONTINUITY WITH SCHOLASTICISM

Oliver O'Donovan argues that the English church made no attempt to revive "the tradition of the mediaeval *summa*, such as the Reformed churches attempted" with their composition of various confessions and catechisms.<sup>23</sup> Rather, the English *Articles of Religion* stand out precisely because they are so different from their continental counterparts: they make no attempt to produce a comprehensive theological system. They instead focused on particular matters that were contested at the time

---

<sup>22</sup> Dominic E. Serra, "The Roman Canon: The Theological Significance of Its Structure and Syntax," *Ecclesia Orans* 20, no. 1 (2003): 99–128.

<sup>23</sup> Oliver O'Donovan, *On the 39 Articles: A Conversation with Tudor Christianity* (Exeter: Paternoster, 1986), 122.

of their composition,<sup>24</sup> not only by Catholics, but by non-conformists and Anabaptists (for instance, defending the “power” of the Church not only “to decree Rites and Ceremonies” but also “in Controversies of Faith”).<sup>25</sup> Their approach was, as O’Donovan puts it, to defend “as much of the developed scholastic doctrine of the sacraments [and much else] as they could” and alter “it only when they felt that had to. The difficulties and incoherencies which their sacramentology so often raises are usually attributable to their tenderness in guarding the shape of scholastic doctrine.”<sup>26</sup> Thus, the principal foci in Cranmer’s own treatise on the Eucharist and the aspects of it that appear in the Articles are the very same topics that were the focus of the medieval treatises.<sup>27</sup> The actual revision of the rites takes place in two main stages (1549 and 1552), the end of which is the clear rejection of any real presence and any notion of sacrifice.

## THE BACKGROUND TO THE ENGLISH PRAYER BOOKS

Seven years after the Council of Trent, in 1570, Pope Pius V promulgated the Apostolic Constitution *Quo primum*, which enacted what the Council of Trent had decreed was necessary, namely, to revise the Cate-

---

<sup>24</sup> Diarmaid MacCulloch writes that Elizabeth’s “Church was determined not to move with the continental times. Her Church was not destined to move further in its official formularies beyond what had been prepared by 1552; symptomatic of this was the statement on current doctrinal and dogmatic controversies adopted by the Convocation of Canterbury in 1563 and not further altered until after 1571 with a version, only slightly amended, of the Edwardian Forty-Two Articles issued in 1553: the Thirty-Nine Articles” (*The Later Reformation in England, 1547–1603* [Houndmills, Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave, 2001], 28).

<sup>25</sup> “XX. Of the Authority of the Church: The Church hath power to decree Rites or Ceremonies, and authority in Controversies of Faith: and yet it is not lawful for the Church to ordain any thing that is contrary to God’s Word written, neither may it so expound one place of Scripture, that it be repugnant to another. Wherefore, although the Church be a witness and a keeper of Holy Writ, yet, as it ought not to decree any thing against the same, so besides the same ought it not to enforce any thing to be believed for necessity of Salvation” (Episcopal Church, *BCP [1979]*, 871).

<sup>26</sup> O’Donovan, *On the 39 Articles*, 123.

<sup>27</sup> Cranmer identifies “four principal errors of the papists:” transubstantiation, the manner of Christ’s presence in the Eucharist, the belief that the evil eat and drink the true Body and Blood of Christ, and their doctrine of Eucharistic sacrifice” (Thomas Cranmer, *Archbishop Cranmer on the True and Catholic Doctrine and Use of the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper*, ed. Charles H. H. Wright [London: C. J. Thynne, 1907], 28–34).



chism, Missal, and Breviary.<sup>28</sup> The bull declared that this revised Roman Missal was the only rite to be used throughout the Church, but with an exception: if another rite had been in continuous use for at least 200 years and had previously been approved by the Holy See, “We in no wise rescind their above-mentioned prerogative or custom.”<sup>29</sup> A number of uses or rites (such as those of Hereford, Bangor, Exeter, Sarum, and so forth) were in use in England by the time Henry VIII ascended the throne in 1509. Sarum, the use associated with Salisbury Cathedral, began to exercise more and more influence in England, in part because of the cathedral’s distinguished care for liturgical propriety.<sup>30</sup> (The differences between these rites did not include the text of the Canon of the Mass itself, which was shared by all the uses). The break with Rome over Henry’s disastrous insistence on a divorce to produce a male heir occurs with the Act of Supremacy in 1534, seventeen years exactly after Luther’s run-in with the cathedral door in Wittenberg. The theological reform generally, and liturgical reform specifically, took place gradually in England under Henry.

Just six years before the first Book of Common Prayer, the Sarum Rite was formally adopted in 1543 for the entire southern province of England by Thomas Cranmer, already the archbishop of Canterbury. Nonetheless, while uniformity was being imposed in the Latin liturgy, the English tongue had already been introduced officially into the liturgy almost six years before. In one of the great ironic tragedies, just a year after the violent execution in 1536 of William Tyndale—the first man to

---

<sup>28</sup> Pius V, Apostolic Constitution, *Quo Primum* (1570), <http://www.papalencyclicals.net/Pius05/p5quopri.htm>.

<sup>29</sup> Pius V, *Quo Primum*. A number of rites remained in use: the Ambrosian rite of Milan; the Mozarabic rite in limited ways in Toledo and Madrid; some of the religious orders retained their own rites, such as the Carmelite, Carthusian, and Dominican. See Archdale A. King, *Liturgies of the Religious Orders* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1955); Archdale A. King, *Liturgies of the Primatial Sees* (London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1957).

<sup>30</sup> Philip Baxter explains, “It gained increasing value as an authoritative reference and source of proven customs and regulations for translating to other cathedrals, colleges and churches” (Philip Baxter, *Sarum Use: The Ancient Customs of Salisbury* [Reading: Spire Books, 2008], 46). Its influence reached beyond the island, spreading into France when a canon of the cathedral, John of Salisbury, was appointed bishop of Chartres, and also into Portugal, where its influence alongside of the Mozarabic rites resulted in the use of Braga in 1385. He goes on to note that many colleges adopted Sarum in the fifteenth century, including “Winchester, Eton, Kings’ College Cambridge, All Souls and New College Oxford” (*ibid.*, 47).

translate a Bible into English from Greek and Hebrew—the Archbishop of York ordered that the Epistles and Gospels in the Mass were to be read in the northern province of York using Tyndale’s translation. A year later, Cromwell placed an English Bible in every church, and a year after that (1539), the translation overseen by Miles Coverdale (whose Psalter was printed in every Anglican prayer book until the twentieth century) was issued by the Crown. By 1543, the same year Sarum was the single usage in the province of Canterbury, the Convocation of Canterbury ordered the reading of one chapter of the Bible (without sermon or exposition) after the *Te Deum* and *Magnificat* (at Lauds and Vespers respectively), and the following year (1544), an Exhortation and the Litany are published in English. This is a decisive moment, since it was the first official liturgical rite to be promulgated in English after the break with Rome. That Litany would turn out to be one of Cranmer’s most enduring compilations, being both a composition and a translation of various ancient sources.<sup>31</sup>

Four years later, Henry died on January 28, 1547 and his son, Edward VI, ascended the throne at the ripe old age of nine in a period of tremendous upheaval. Fourteen months later, in March of 1548, the first major step toward the English prayer book occurred with the publication of *The Order of the Communion*.<sup>32</sup> This was the first of what would be a long series of practices in England where one liturgical rite is somewhat unnaturally overlaid with another rite. The Sarum Rite remained, but the *Order of the Communion* directed that the priest, from time to time, should interpolate the following items in English just after the priest’s communion: an Exhortation; a bidding of the faithful to approach the Sacrament in penitence, which included a call for private confession and absolution from a priest if the conscience was so moved; a general confession with absolution in Latin and English, followed by five “Comfort-

---

<sup>31</sup> The history here is drawn from G. J. Cuming, *A History of Anglican Liturgy* (London: Macmillan, 1969), 15–65.

<sup>32</sup> R. C. D. Jasper and G. J. Cuming, ed. *Prayers of the Eucharist: Early and Reformed*, 3rd rev. ed. (Collegeville: Pueblo Books, 1987), 226–31 (hereafter *PEER*). Spinks explains: “Much of this is taken from another of Cranmer’s favorite sources—*Simplex ac pia Deliberatio*—prepared by Martin Bucer and Philip Melancthon for Archbishop Hermann von Wied of Cologne” (Bryan D. Spinks, “German Influence on Edwardian Liturgies,” in *Sister Reformations: The Reformation in Germany and in England: Symposium on the Occasion of the 450th Anniversary of the Elizabethan Settlement, September 23rd–26th, 2009—Schwesterreformationen: Die Reformation in Deutschland Und in England: Symposium aus Anlass des 450. Jahrestages des Elizabethan Settlement, 23.–26. September 2009*, ed. Dorothea Wendebourg [Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2010], 181).

able Words” from the Scriptures; Cranmer’s lovely Prayer of Humble Access; words of administration (“The Body/Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given/shed for thee, preserve thy soul unto everlasting life”); and a final blessing. This interim measure remained in place for a mere fifteen months until the introduction of the first *Book of Common Prayer* in 1549 with the Act of Uniformity.<sup>33</sup> Cranmer’s two principal sources for this vernacular prayer book are the Sarum Rite and Reformation rites, primarily Lutheran ones.<sup>34</sup>

## THE ENGLISH PRAYER BOOKS

Bryan Spinks summarizes the revised order for the celebration of the Eucharist in this first prayer book as “a simplified Sarum mass, composed in a vernacular protestant key, and incorporating much of the material from the 1548 Order.”<sup>35</sup> While, as Gordon Jeanes points out, the 1549 Communion Liturgy “is totally unlike any provision in the Lutheran or Reformed churches,”<sup>36</sup> Spinks clarifies that “the overall shape of the rite has more affinities with Lutheran Orders—particularly those based on the Formula Missae—than the Reformed order, because like Luther, Cranmer here retained many parts of the Ordinary of the Mass.”<sup>37</sup> The language of sacrifice that is so prominent in the Roman Canon is retained but was artfully recast. Brightman describes it well: “The Canon is an eloquent paraphrase and expansion of the Roman Canon, adjusting it clearly to the conception of the Eucharistic Sacrifice as threefold:

---

<sup>33</sup> For a detailed history of the *Order*, see the Introduction by H. A. Wilson in *The Order of the Communion, 1548. A Facsimile of the British Museum Copy C. 25, F. 15*, Henry Bradshaw Society XXXIV (London: Harrison and Sons, 1908), vii–xliii. The complete rite used on Easter Day, 1548, with its Latin and English, is reproduced as Appendix III of the same volume (*ibid.*, 29–45).

<sup>34</sup> Spinks, “German Influence on Edwardian Liturgies,” 175. Spinks goes on to explain that the first sign of this Lutheran influence is “in certain primers that were published” in the 1520s, and it was these that “provided the vernacular backdrop to the later debates and ideas when circulated.” In fact, “as Geoffrey Cuming pointed out, the admiration usually lavished on Cranmer belongs to [George] Joye, and Cranmer’s only contribution was to refrain from altering Joye’s phrases” (*ibid.*, 176, 177). See G. J. Cuming, *The Godly Order: Texts and Studies Relating to the Book of Common Prayer* (London: SPCK, 1983), 28.

<sup>35</sup> Spinks, “German Influence on Edwardian Liturgies,” 184.

<sup>36</sup> Gordon P. Jeanes, *Signs of God’s Promise: Thomas Cranmer’s Sacramental Theology and the Book of Common Prayer* (London: T & T Clark, 2008), 196.

<sup>37</sup> Spinks, “German Influence on Edwardian Liturgies,” 185.

viz. (a) as a commemoration of our Lord's historical self-oblation in His Death upon the Cross; (b) as a [non-material] sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving for the benefits of redemption so secured; and (c) as the offering of the Church, [namely,] of ourselves, our souls and bodies: and concentrating all sacrificial language on these three moments."<sup>38</sup> It seems to reflect a number of different approaches to the Eucharist and likely was not an expression of Cranmer's own thinking, as he had already abandoned a belief in so-called "Real Presence" by 1546. And given how quickly he moves to further revision, the 1549 Book was not unlike the approach of many continental reformers, who took a first conservative step as a springboard to a subsequent and more radical second revision.<sup>39</sup> What is important to keep in mind is that while the structures of the medieval liturgy were tweaked in this two-fold process of revision in order to express one of a number of Reformation positions on the sacraments, Cranmer intended to reject any notion of the Eucharist as a ritual act of corporate worship. The purpose of the Communion rite is not primarily doxological but evangelical. Cranmer is clear that what is central is that a person come to "true and perfect knowledge" of God by faith, "which

---

<sup>38</sup> F. E. Brightman, *The English Rite, Being a Synopsis of the Sources and Revisions of the Book of Common Prayer, with an Introduction and an Appendix* by Frank E. Brightman. (London: Rivingtons, 1915), cvi. Starting on that page, Brightman provides a detailed discussion of every source from which Cranmer drew in his prayer. He occasionally makes a doubtful interpretation, such as his claim that the opening paragraph corresponds to the *Hanc igitur* "as must have been read before S. Gregory's addition of *diesque nostros* &c. (Bede *H.E.* ii i); but (i) substitutes for the oblation of the material gifts a commemoration of our Lord's Self-oblation and of the Institution, expressed in words corresponding to those of the *Antididagma Coloniense* . . . (2) alters the form of the petition ('oblationem . . . benedictam . . . acceptabilemque facere digneris') and makes it a prayer for the consecration of the 'gifts' (here not the *dona* of *Te igitur*, the  $\delta\acute{\omega}\rho\alpha$  of S. Basil, viz. our gifts to God, but the *tua dona ac data* of *Vnde et memores*) by the Holy Ghost (S. Basil) and the divine word (S. Aug. *Serm.* ccxxvii: '*sanctincatus per verbum Dei*'; cp. I Tim. iv 5); (3) renders *fiat* by 'may be' (but from Cranmer's comments on the passage ['Answer to Gardiner' in *Writings and disputations* ed. Parker Soc., pp. 79, 271] it does not appear that this has any special significance)" (*ibid.*). While this is the paragraph that follows in the Roman Canon, these changes are so significant as to make doubtful any connection to the *Hanc igitur*. Cuming agrees with regard to Frere's similar claim: "Frere prints *Hanc igitur* as a parallel to Cranmer's next section, to which it bears no resemblance" (Cuming, *History of Anglican Liturgy*, 78). Cf. Francis Procter and W. H. Frere, *A New History of The Book of Common Prayer with a Rationale of Its Offices* (London: Macmillan and Co., 1902), 450–58.

<sup>39</sup> Cuming, *History of Anglican Liturgy*, 80. He goes on to point out that his role as Archbishop and the fact that "a substantial portion of the bishops were against any change" no doubt served to temper his tendencies toward a more Reformed liturgy (*ibid.*, 81).

must be grounded upon God's most holy word and sacraments." The Scriptures are given so that "we may hear them with our ears" and "so likewise these elements of water, bread and wine, joined to God's word, do after a sacramental manner put Christ into our eyes, mouths, hands, and all our senses."<sup>40</sup>

The prayer itself is divided into a first section, known as the Prayer for the Whole State of Christ's Church, that restores the Prayers of the Faithful which had dropped out of the Roman Rite around the fifth century (Cranmer's version of the intercession will keep bouncing around the rite in the subsequent revisions of England and then Scotland). They contain elements found in the *Te igitur* (prayers for the church militant, bishops, all who believe, etc.) and the *Memento, domine* (prayers for those present), the *Communicantes* (a commemoration of the Blessed Virgin and all "the holy Patriarchs, prophets, Apostles, and Martyrs," though without any list of saints). The intercessions conclude with an almost direct translation of the prayers for the departed from near the end of the Roman Canon, the *Memento etiam*.

Cranmer then moves to what will be called "the prayer of consecration," beginning in the 1662 prayer book.<sup>41</sup> It recalls Christ's singular offering in language that has become classic: "who made there (by his one oblation once offered) a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction, for the sinnes of the whole worlde, and did institute, and in his holy Gospell commaund us, to celebrate a perpetuall memory of that his precious death, untyll his comming again." The repeated emphasis on the singularity of Christ's sacrifice is meant to contextualize any subsequent uses of the term. Cranmer follows this with a rather strange epiclesis—strange not only because it invokes both the Holy Spirit and the Word, but because it is situated *before* the institution narrative.<sup>42</sup> The latter is almost certainly Cranmer's interpretation of the

---

<sup>40</sup> Cranmer, *The True and Catholic Doctrine*, 18, 19.

<sup>41</sup> In 1662, this new rubric appears after the *Sanctus* and "We do not presume": "When the Priest, standing before the Table, hath so ordered the Bread and Wine, that he may with more readines and decency break the Bread before the people, and take the Cup into his hands, he shall say the Prayer of Consecration as followeth" (Cummings, *Book of Common Prayer*, 402).

<sup>42</sup> The only precedent for a "logistic" epiclesis is in the *Prayers of Sarapion*, though Cranmer would have had no opportunity to know of this source. See Bryan D. Spinks, "And with Thy Holy Spirite and Worde: Further Thoughts on the Source of Cranmer's Petition for Sanctification in 1549 Communion Service," in *Thomas Cranmer: Essays in Commemoration of the 500th Anniversary of His Birth*, ed. Margot Johnson

*Quam oblationem* as a veiled epiclesis, since the final sentence of each is nearly identical.<sup>43</sup> Here is one of a number of instances where Cranmer uses the language of the Roman Canon but with a different meaning. His epiclesis reads, “Heare us (O merciful father) we besech thee; and with thy holy spirite and worde, vouchsafe to bl~~esse~~esse and sanc~~tify~~tify these thy gyftes, and creatures of bread and wyne, that they maie be unto us the bodye and bloude of thy moste derely beloved sonne Jesus Christe.” But as Cranmer makes clear, he means that it is *in the receiving* of the Bread and Wine that Christ is in the communicant: “For they teach that Christ is in the bread and wine; but we say, according to the truth, that he is in them that worthily eat and drink the bread and wine.”<sup>44</sup>

After the institution narrative, the *Unde et memores* is recast such that the anamnesis and oblation are switched, and any actual offering of the gifts is made opaque: “we thy humble servauntes do celebrate, and make here before thy divine Majestie, with these thy holy gyftes, the memoryall whyche thy sonne hath wylled us to make.” The absence of any verb of offering is intentional. The prayer continues by incorporat-

---

(Durham: University of Durham, 1990), 94–102. There is an Egyptian tradition of a post-Sanctus, pre-institution narrative epiclesis, though it is usually non-consecratory: for example, the British Museum Tablet, the *textus receptus* of *The Anaphora of St. Mark* (“fill, O God, this sacrifice also with the blessing from you through the descent of your [all-] Holy Spirit”), and the Prayer of Sarapion; a few are actually consecratory, such as the Deir Balyzeh Papyrus and the Louvain Coptic Papyrus; see *PEER*, 56, 64, 77, 80, 81.

<sup>43</sup> While the *Quam oblationem* does ask that the gifts be blessed, it also asks that God make them “approved, ratified, worthy, and acceptable,” thus making the primary thrust of the request not change but acceptance *in order that* (the Latin is “ut”) they may be the Body and Blood of Christ.

<sup>44</sup> He continues: “They say that Christ is received in the mouth and entereth in with the bread and wine: we say that he is received in the heart, and entereth in by faith. . . . They say that Christ is really in the sacramental bread, being reserved an whole year, and so long as the form of bread remaineth; but after the receiving thereof, he flyeth up, say that, from the receiver unto heaven, and soon as the bread is chewed in the mouth, or changed in the stomach: but we say, that Christ remaineth in the man that worthily receiveth it, so long as the man remaineth a member of Christ” (Cranmer, *The True and Catholic Doctrine*, 98). Richard Hooker articulated a similar position: “The real presence of Christ’s most blessed body and blood is not to be sought for in the sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the sacrament” (Richard Hooker, *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, ed. Georges Edelen, 4 vols. (Cambridge: Belknap Press, 1977), 3: V, lxxvii, 6. Hooker explains earlier that the relationship between the elements and the receiver is one of instrumental causality: “The Bread and Cup are his Body and Blood, because they are causes instrumental, upon the receipt thereof, the Participation of his Body and Blood ensueth” (*ibid.*, V, lxxvii, 5).

ing the principal request of the *Supra quae* that God accept the offering, but it is modified so that what God is asked to accept is “our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving” yet drops any reference to the ancient sacrifices of Abel, Abraham, and Melchizedek. The “sacrifice of praise” appears in the *Memento, domine* of the Canon as a synonym for the Eucharistic sacrifice, a feature that is unique to the Western, Latin tradition.<sup>45</sup> But Cranmer uses it as a scriptural phrase to distinguish the proper form of Christian sacrifice from the “erroneous” notions of Popish Masses where Christ is re-sacrificed: “entierely desiryng thy fatherly goodnes, mercifully to accepte this our Sacrifice of praise and thankesgeving.”<sup>46</sup> Cranmer then introduces a rather novel oblation, one that is actually in accord with earlier Catholic thought, though it was never expressed quite so explicitly in earlier anaphoras, consciously echoing Romans 12:1: “And here wee offre and present unto thee (O Lorde) oure selfe, oure soules, and bodies, to be a reasonable, holy, and lively sacrifice unto thee.” This is given vivid expression in Augustine’s *City of God*, at the end of 10.20: “He wanted the sacrifice offered by the Church to be a daily sacrament of his sacrifice, in which the Church, which is the body of which he is the head, learns to offer its very self through him.”<sup>47</sup>

---

<sup>45</sup> See Geoffrey G. Willis, “Sacrificium Laudis,” in *The Sacrifice of Praise: Studies on the Themes of Thanksgiving and Redemption in the Central Prayers of the Eucharistic and Baptismal Liturgies: In Honour of Arthur Hubert Couratin*, ed. Bryan D. Spinks, Bibliotheca “Ephemerides Liturgicae” 19 (Rome: C. L. V. Edizioni liturgiche, 1981), 73–87; Robert F. Taft, “The Sacrifice of Praise (Studies in Honour of Arthur H Couratin), Review,” *Worship* 56, no. 2 (March 1982): 176–79.

<sup>46</sup> Cranmer explains this in detail in his treatise on the Sacrament: “And forasmuch as he hath given himself to death for us, to be an oblation and sacrifice to his Father for our sins, let us give ourselves again unto him, making unto him an oblation, not of goats, sheep, kine, and other beasts that have no reasons, as was accustomed before Christ’s coming; but of a creature that hath reason, that is to say, of ourselves, not killing our own bodies, but mortifying the beastly and unreasonable affections that would gladly rule and reign in us. So long as the law did reign, God suffered dumb beasts to be offered unto him; but now that we be spiritual, we must offer spiritual oblations, in the place of calves, sheep, goats, and doves. We must kill devlish pride, furious anger, lechery, deadly hatred and malice, foxy wiliness, wolvisch ravening and devouring, and all other unreasonable lists and desires of the flesh. And as many as belong to Christ must crucify and kill these for Christ’s sake, as Christ crucified himself for their sakes. These be the sacrifices of Christian men; these hosts and oblations be acceptable to Christ. And as Christ offered himself for us, so it is our duty after this sort to offer ourselves to him again” (Cranmer, *The True and Catholic Doctrine*, 242–43).

<sup>47</sup> Saint Augustine, *The City of God: Books 1–10*, ed. Boniface Ramsey, trans. William

Drawing on the image of the angel taking the sacrifice to heaven in the *Supplices te* and introducing the request with the humble, “And although we be unworthy (trough our manyfolde synnes) to offer unto thee and Sacryfice,” Cranmer recasts this paragraph also, so that multiple angels (not just one) are traversing the boundaries of heaven and earth, not with our offerings of bread and wine, but “our prayers and supplications” which are born “into thy holy Tabernacle before the syght of thy dyvine majestie.” The seeming attempt at what seems like a Roman Mass but absent its “detestable enormities” does not stop here.<sup>48</sup> Traditional vestments are to be used but nearly all rubrical instructions disappear, save for a cross at the invocation and taking the bread and wine in the institution narrative; there is no formal fraction and commixture; any elevation is strictly forbidden. The new ordinal that is published a year later is based on Bucer’s service of ordination for ministry, but “expanded . . . to make services for the major Orders—bishops, priests and deacons.”<sup>49</sup> Paul Bradshaw argues that the fundamental reason for Cranmer’s reliance on Bucer and the near complete absence of language of the medieval rite at critical points is based on “his rejection of the sacrificial priesthood.”<sup>50</sup> The position of 1552 is much more Reformed. Cranmer achieves this, Spinks suggests, not by jettisoning his Sarum and Lutheran sources but by reworking them to his own particular theological ends.<sup>51</sup>

The second revision began almost immediately after the 1549 book was published and took place as Cranmer attempted to convene the major continental reformers “to help draw up a united evangelical confession of faith.” When this did not materialize, some such as Spinks have wondered whether “the revision of the 1549 Book into its 1552 recession might be seen as trying to achieve something between Lutheran and reformed worship.”<sup>52</sup> The changes to the communion liturgy are enormous and Cuming suggests that they were of three kinds: “of structure,

---

Babcock (Hyde Park, NY: New City Press, 2012), 328.

<sup>48</sup> One of the petitions in the Litany reads: “From all sedicion and pryve conspiracie, from the tyrannye of the bishop of Rome and all his detestable enormities, from al false doctrine and herisy, from hardnes of heart, and contempte of thy word and commaundemente: Good Lorde deliver us.” Queen Elizabeth removed the phrase about the bishop of Rome in the 1559 revision.

<sup>49</sup> Spinks, “German Influence on Edwardian Liturgies,” 186.

<sup>50</sup> Paul F. Bradshaw, *The Anglican Ordinal: Its History and Development from the Reformation to the Present Day* (London: S.P.C.K., 1971), 24.

<sup>51</sup> Spinks, “German Influence on Edwardian Liturgies,” 188.

<sup>52</sup> Spinks, “German Influence on Edwardian Liturgies,” 187.



of language, and of ambience.”<sup>53</sup> Kenneth Stevenson calls it a “series of negatives”: “We are *not* offering gifts, we are *not* offering Mass, but we *are* offering ourselves.”<sup>54</sup>

- The altar is presumed to be moved into the midst of the choir and turned, and celebration is to be at the north end.
- Eucharistic vestments are prohibited and only the rochet for the bishop and surplice for the priest are allowed.
- The introit, *Agnus Dei*, and communion sentences are all removed, each of which had been sung.
- The Kyries are absorbed as part of the litanal responses in the newly-introduced Decalogue.
- The music is almost all cut, save for the *Gloria in excelsis*, which disappears from the opening rites and is transferred as a thanksgiving at the conclusion.
- The congregation now joins in the recitation of the Creed and the Our Father.

There were a number of key structural changes. The desire to remove any possibility of a Catholic interpretation in the direction of Eucharistic sacrifice forced the following changes.<sup>55</sup> The Prayer for the Church is removed since they could suggest “a propitiatory sacrifice for living and dead,” and in its new placement right after the Offertory sentence, prayers for the departed and commemoration of the saints were excised. Anything between the end of the Eucharistic prayer and the reception of communion was removed in order to respond to Gardiner and Zwingli’s claim that these were a devotion paid to Christ in the Sacrament: thus, the Our Father was moved until after all had received; the Pax and the accompanying “Christ our Pascall lambe is offred up for us” is dropped; the Prayer of Humble Access is moved to after the *Sanctus*; the confession is moved earlier to follow directly the intercessions during the offertory. Language that could suggest real presence and/or transubstanti-

---

<sup>53</sup> Cuming, *History of Anglican Liturgy*, 105.

<sup>54</sup> Kenneth Stevenson, *Eucharist and Offering* (New York: Pueblo, 1986), 173.

<sup>55</sup> The Bishop of Westminster, Stephen Gardiner, was a Catholic and provocatively indicated that the Eucharistic doctrine of the 1549 Book was “not distant from the Catholic faith, and would have been prepared to use it, if incarceration in the Tower had not prevented him.” When Gardiner was on trial for his response to Cranmer’s treatise on the Eucharist, he took the “ingenious and irritating” approach of picking “out various passages in 1549 which appeared to express the Catholic doctrine rather than Cranmer’s, and warmly commended them” (Cuming, *History of Anglican Liturgy*, 96, 101). Brightman provides the text in *The English Rite*, cxlv.

ation is also removed: new words of administration are given that speak only of taking and eating by faith; the phrase “in these holy Misteries” was removed from “We do not presume,” so as to sever any connection between the material gifts and Christ’s presence; all manual acts disappear; in the Canon itself, the request is no longer that the bread and wine “may be unto us the body and blood,” but only that we “maye be partakers of his most blessed body and blood;” the epiclesis is removed completely; the *Benedictus* is removed from the end of the *Sanctus*; the bread and wine are no longer “gifts;” only regular bread can be used, and it must be put in communicants’ hands, not in their mouths. Maybe most radical, the entire section after the institution narrative—which includes the anamnesis, a prayer of self-oblation, and request that God accept our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving—is removed from the Canon and given as an alternative to the Postcommunion prayer of thanksgiving, the angels taking our prayers also being cut.<sup>56</sup>

Cranmer’s revisions in the second prayer book of 1552 were short-lived. This is because of the death of Edward and the accession of the Catholic princess Mary to the throne in July of 1553. This second prayer book is the second step in his reform process and now clearly reflect the teaching both of his own treatise, *On the True and Catholic Doctrine and Use of the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper* and the Articles of Religion, which he composed and were first published in May 1553.<sup>57</sup> In his trea-

---

<sup>56</sup> This is drawn from my own study of the texts and Cuming’s discussion in *History of Anglican Liturgy*, 105–109. One attempt to explain the order that began in 1552 is to expand the notion of the Canon, as Colin Dunlop does: “Though the Prayer Book contains almost all the features of the Canons of classic Christian liturgies, it is unique in its inclusions within its Canon of the Communion of Priest and People, which it usually whole precedes” (*Anglican Public Worship* [London: S.C.M. Press Ltd, 1953], 97). As generous as this is, there is no historical basis for it, as my discussion of Cranmer thus far makes clear. Dunlop breaks down the Canon into three parts: the Prayer of Consecration (which is the dialogue through the institution narrative); the Lord’s Prayer; and the Prayer of Oblation (the portion of the prayer that is moved out of the Canon and made an optional post-communion prayer). “These three prayers represent for us the Canon of the Eucharist, the term being originally used to describe the fixed rule of the Eucharist which is never altered” (*ibid.*, 96).

<sup>57</sup> Cranmer first drew up ten articles in 1536 that were slightly Protestant in nature; then six Articles in 1539, which were much more Catholic in nature; then, under Edward VI, the forty-two Articles were drawn up that leaned in a very Reformed direction. But when Mary came to the throne, the Articles were relegated to the dust. After Mary’s death, they served as the basis for the thirty-nine Articles, revised under the leadership of then Archbishop of Canterbury, Matthew Parker, and were passed by Convocation in 1563. See Charles Hardwick and Francis Procter, *A History of the*

tise, he outlines the “four principal errors of the papists”<sup>58</sup>: Transubstantiation (addressed in Article XXVIII<sup>59</sup>), the nature of Christ’s presence in the Eucharist (also referenced in Articles XXVIII), the belief that the evil eat and drink the true Body and Blood of Christ (addressed in Articles XXV<sup>60</sup> and XXVIII), and their doctrine of Eucharistic sacrifice

---

*Articles of Religion: To Which Is Added a Series of Documents, from A.D. 1536 to A.D. 1615, Together with Illustrations from Contemporary Sources* (London: George Bell, 1890). Cf. “Ten Articles,” “Six Articles,” “Forty-Two Articles,” “Thirty-Nine Articles” in F. L. Cross and E. A. Livingstone, *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, 3rd rev. ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 1587–88, 1507, 625, 1611. Henceforth ODCC.

<sup>58</sup> Cranmer, *The True and Catholic Doctrine*, 28–33.

<sup>59</sup> “XXVIII. Of the Lord’s Supper: The Supper of the Lord is not only a sign of the love that Christians ought to have among themselves one to another, but rather it is a Sacrament of our Redemption by Christ’s death: insomuch that to such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same, the Bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ; and likewise the Cup of Blessing is a partaking of the Blood of Christ. Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of Bread and Wine) in the Supper of the Lord cannot be proved by Holy Writ; but is repugnant to the plain words of Scripture, overthroweth the nature of a Sacrament, and hath given occasion to many superstitions. The Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper, is Faith. The Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper was not by Christ’s ordinance reserved, carried about, lifted up, or worshipped” (taken with modernized spelling from *Book of Common Prayer [1979]*, 873). Andrew McGowan argues that the term “Lord’s Supper,” while it came into vogue in the Reformation period and remains a term of preference for a number of Christian traditions because of 1 Cor 11:20, does not appear to have been a proper or technical term for the Eucharist in the first few centuries of the Church. See Andrew McGowan, “The Myth of the ‘Lord’s Supper’: Paul’s Eucharistic Meal Terminology and Its Ancient Reception,” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 77, no. 3 (July 2015): 503–21.

<sup>60</sup> “XXV. Of the Sacraments: Sacraments ordained of Christ be not only badges or tokens of Christian men’s profession, but rather they be certain sure witnesses, and effectual signs of grace, and God’s good will towards us, by the which he doth work invisibly in us, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirm our Faith in him.

There are two Sacraments ordained of Christ our Lord in the Gospel, that is to say, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord.

Those five commonly called Sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction, are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel, being such as have grown partly of the corrupt following of the Apostles, partly are states of life allowed in the Scriptures, but yet have not like nature of Sacraments with Baptism, and the Lord’s Supper, for that they have not any visible sign or ceremony ordained of God.

The Sacraments were not ordained of Christ to be gazed upon, or to be carried about,

(addressed in Article XXXI<sup>61</sup>). Interestingly, it is not long until principal figures in the Church of England begin to articulate a Eucharistic theology that is entirely at odds not only with Cranmer's view, but with the Articles and the very text of the Prayer Book.

## THE PENDULUM SWINGS BACK

Two Anglican divines<sup>62</sup> who serve as quintessential examples of this "reform of the reform" on the issues of both sacrifice and presence are Lancelot Andrewes (1555–1626) and John Cosin (1594–1672). Andrewes, a towering figure in the period, served as Dean of Westminster and later Bishop of Chichester, then Ely, and finally bishop of Winchester. Already in the early part of his career he advocated for auricular confession.<sup>63</sup> But much of the most salient information on his views on the Eucharist

---

but that we should duly use them. And in such only as worthily receive the same, they have a wholesome effect or operation: but they that receive them unworthily, purchase to themselves damnation, as Saint Paul saith" (*Book of Common Prayer [1979]*, 872).

<sup>61</sup> "XXXI. Of the one Oblation of Christ finished upon the Cross: 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" (*Book of Common Prayer [1979]*, 874).

<sup>62</sup> Eric Mascall writes: "When we turn to the great Anglican divines [of the seventeenth century] we find ourselves in an atmosphere of thought which is much less clear-cut than is that of either continental Protestantism or of continental Catholicism. It would be easy to explain this as merely an example of the well-known Anglican genius for woolliness and compromise, but I doubt whether such a judgment would be altogether fair. I suspect that their hesitations arose largely from the fact that they had much more respect than the continental reformers for the writings of the Fathers; and although they failed to locate the root weakness of late mediaeval Eucharistic theology in its exclusive identification of sacrifice with death, they seem to have realised fairly clearly that the error had lain not in the view that the Eucharist was a sacrifice but in an inadequate and restricted view of sacrifice itself" (E. L. Mascall, *Corpus Christi: Essays on the Church and the Eucharist* [London: Longmans, Green, and Co., 1953], 84).

<sup>63</sup> Bryan D. Spinks, *Sacraments, Ceremonies, and the Stuart Divines: Sacramental Theology and Liturgy in England and Scotland, 1603–1662* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2002); Spinks, *Stuart Divines*, 45; see Kenneth W. Stevenson, "'Human Nature Honoured': Absolution in Lancelot Andrewes," in *Like a Two-Edged Sword: The Word of God in Liturgy and History: Essays in Honour of Canon Donald Gray*, ed. Martin Dudley (Norwich: Canterbury, 1995).

comes from Andrewes's comments on the 1559 Elizabethan Prayer Book (the third of the English prayer books), which John Cosin incorporated into his "Durham Book."<sup>64</sup> On the two controversial matters of transubstantiation and sacrifice, Andrewes sees little in the Church of England's position that is different from Rome. "Remove transubstantiation, and there will not long be any strife with us about sacrifice," he writes to Cardinal Bellarmine.<sup>65</sup> The actual differences regarding transubstantiation he also seems to find minimal: "We believe no less than you that the presence is real. Concerning the method of the presence, we define nothing rashly."<sup>66</sup> His use of material from the Eastern liturgies of St. Basil and St. John Chrysostom indicates that he finds what is expressed in those ancient liturgies to be in accord with his own belief and that of the

---

<sup>64</sup> His comments were not written publically "but as private notes about how he actually used it liturgically." Peter McCullough explains: "These are his 'Notes on the Book of Common Prayer,' first printed with other notes, principally by John Cosin, in William Nicholl's 1710 *Comment on the Book of Common Prayer*. Nicholls was working with one of four transcriptions of Andrewes's own notes now known today. Those that survive are, first, that made by Cosin in his heavily annotated 1619 copy of the Prayer Book, now known as 'The Durham Book'; second, a copy discovered by Archbishop Tenison among papers belonging to Laud, now still at Lambeth; and third, a copy found in a 1625 Prayer Book, now in the British Library. All four attest that they were copied, as Cosin put it, 'out of my Lord of Winchester's, Bishop Andrewes' Service book, written with his own hand.'" In the nineteenth century Nicholl's printed text was collated with the manuscripts for the final volume of Andrewes's *Works* in the Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology. See Peter McCullough, "Absent Presence: Lancelot Andrewes and 1662" in Stephen Platten and Christopher Woods, ed., *Comfortable Words: Polity and Piety and the Book of Common Prayer*, SCM Studies in Worship and Liturgy (London: SCM Press, 2012), 49, 53. See Lancelot Andrewes, *Works*, vol. 11, Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1854); G. J. Cuming, ed., *The Durham Book: Being the First Draft of the Revision of the Book of Common Prayer in 1661* (London: Oxford University Press, 1961). One of Andrewes' suggestions was to alter the offertory sentences in order to de-emphasize "precious prayer books' calls for alms for the poor" and instead to "drive home the obligation of giving to God alone" and "on the spirit in which offerings are given" (*ibid.*, 65). His idea was to have the congregants make their offering to the poor after they had received Communion, thus not violating the rubrics of the prayer book but nonetheless recasting the Offertory such that what is offered materially is conceived as part of the entire act of offering that includes the bread and wine. None of these were taken up in 1662, but five were included in Laud's 1637 Scottish book (McCullough, "Absent Presence," 63-66).

<sup>65</sup> Quoted in Spinks, *Stuart Divines*, 46. On sacrifice, he writes: "And that sacrifice but once actually performed at His death, but ever before represented in figure, from the beginning; and ever since repeated in memory, to the world's end. That only absolute, all else relative to it, representative of it, operative by it" (*ibid.*).

<sup>66</sup> Spinks, *Stuart Divines*, 46.

Church of England. His detailed instructions on ceremony and subtle contradictions of the prayer book rubrics (using wafer bread, a thurible, using an eastward altar, railing off the altar) indicate a different approach to that of Cranmer, a posture toward the Eucharist which assumes that it “must be celebrated with dignity and suitable ceremony.”<sup>67</sup> In his *Private Preces*, Andrewes clearly articulates a belief that the Eucharist may be offered for particular people or ends.<sup>68</sup> Andrewes offers a rich Eucharistic theology that is intentionally in continuity with the patristic and medieval traditions and that is seen primarily, not as the parallel to the scriptural proclamation of the Gospel, but as an act of adoration and worship.

John Cosin, bishop of Durham from 1660–72, is sometimes characterized as a “Tractarian before his time” and was certainly “a seventeenth-century precursor of the Ritualists.”<sup>69</sup> He knew the Breviary and Roman Missal well and was one of the most knowledgeable of his day of the prayer book. Thus, when he writes, “The Mass Book hath no more than we have here,” he both reveals his position in the Church of England (one that scandalized the Puritans) and the mental gymnastics necessary to make such a statement.<sup>70</sup> As he indicated elsewhere, even

---

<sup>67</sup> Spinks, *Stuart Divines*, 47, 65. Peter McCullough’s judgment is that in light of how Andrewes describes the placement of vessels and other items needed for divine service, it would have been “impossible for the consecration to have been done from the north side,” and thus instead is done in the center, facing east (McCullough, “Absent Presence,” 66–67).

<sup>68</sup> In his Preparation for Holy Communion, this petition is found: “Come Thou to sanctify the gifts which lie before Thee, and those in whose behalf, and by whom, and the things for which, they are brought near Thee” (Newman’s translation of the *Preces* in John Henry Newman, *Prayers, Verses, and Devotions: The Devotions of Bishop Andrewes, Meditations and Devotions, Verses on Various Occasions* [San Francisco: Ignatius, 2000], 95–96). Bouyer notes in his introduction that, “to the end of his long life, Newman quite believed that in these exercises of Andrewes he had discovered that form of prayer which springs directly from the Word of God and leads to a life fully lived in Christ. Not only as a priest, but later as a cardinal of the Roman Church, he would keep the *Preces privatae* on his kneeler for his daily preparation and thanksgiving before and after Mass and for his most personal meditations” (ibid., Introduction, xvii).

<sup>69</sup> “The Anglicanism of John Cosin,” in Cuming, *Godly Order*, 123–41. See also Percy Herbert Osmond, *A Life of John Cosin, Bishop of Durham, 1660–1672* (London: A. R. Mowbray, 1913); C. W. Dugmore, *Eucharistic Doctrine in England from Hooker to Waterland, Being the Norrisian Prize Essay in the University of Cambridge for the Year 1940* (London: S.P.C.K., 1942).

<sup>70</sup> Quoted in Cuming, *The Godly Order*, 128. The full quotation is this: “The Mass Book hath no more than we have here, so that to make a controversy here betwixt us, where none is, sounds more of the evil spirit—the desire of contradiction, than of the good

while he dressed up the Prayer Book with “new stone altars, pre-Reformation copes, eastward position, elaborate church music, and above all, crossings,” kissing the altar, and bowing towards it and the sacrament as Andrewes had directed, he was convinced that the Prayer Book needed serious revising.<sup>71</sup> Nonetheless, he claimed that the belief of the Church of England was thoroughly unoriginal. We teach “the presence of Christ’s body and blood in the sacrament,” he writes. “It is confessed by all divines that upon the words of consecration the body and blood of Christ is really and substantially present, and so exhibited and given to all that receive it; and all this, not after a physical and sensual, but after a heavenly and invisible and incomprehensible manner.”<sup>72</sup> We do not believe like the Calvinists, he goes on, that Christ is “present only in the use of the sacrament and in the act of eating, and not otherwise.” To believe so is to, he says, “depart from all antiquity.”<sup>73</sup> This was the ground of this thought: “Let the schools have what opinions and doctrines they will,” he writes: “Read a whole army of Fathers. We . . . prefer to err with so many and great authors than to speak the truth with the Puritans.”<sup>74</sup>

He was also unequivocal that the Eucharist is a sacrifice. One of the features likely to surprise the modern reader is that Cosin relies significantly throughout his comments on the Prayer Book, and quite extensively in the sections on consecration and Eucharistic sacrifice, on the Spanish Jesuit, Juan Maldonado (1533–1583)<sup>75</sup> as well as Georg Cassander. Here is a salient quote from Maldonado that Cosin introduces with-

---

Spirit—the desire of peace and unity” (John Cosin, *The Works of the Right Reverend Father in God John Cosin, Lord Bishop of Durham.*, vol. V, *Notes and Collections on the Book of Common Prayer* [Oxford: John Henry and James Parker, 1855], 106).

<sup>71</sup> Cuming, *The Godly Order*, 130.

<sup>72</sup> Cosin, *Works*, V:131. Earlier, in his discussion the words, “this is my body,” he simply titles these “the words of Consecration” and cites for reference the Liturgies of St. James, St. Basil, St. John Chrysostom, *Apostolic Constitutions VIII*, Justin Martyr, Irenaeus, Augustine, Cyprian, Ambrose, and Chrysostom. The footnotes supplied by the editor give the sources for each of his citations of the ancient authors (*ibid.*, 109–10).

<sup>73</sup> Cosin, *Works*, V:131.

<sup>74</sup> Cosin, *Works*, V:120.

<sup>75</sup> Maldonado was quite learned, receiving his doctorate in Salamanca, after which he was appointed to teach in Paris, where his lectures drew large crowds. His command of languages was impressive: Greek, Latin, and Hebrew, of course, but also Syriac, Chaldean, and Arabic. He was attacked by the Sorbonne for heresy but vindicated by the bishop of Paris. See ODCC, 1024. Cuming (writing in 1983) probably overreaches somewhat when he suggests that Maldonado “no doubt was as eagerly read in progressive circles as any work of de Chardin and Rahner today” (Cuming, *The Godly Order*, 127).

out attribution: Christ's self-offering "to take away the sins of the world" must be applied to a person, and this occurs in various ways: "by faith, by good works, by the unbloody offering up of the same sacrifice, by the receiving of His most precious Body and Blood."<sup>76</sup> It is unlike Christ's sacrifice because in the Eucharist there is no death or destruction.<sup>77</sup> "But if we compare the Eucharist with Christ's sacrifice made once upon the cross, as concerning the effect of it, we say that that was a sufficient sacrifice; but withal that this is a true, real, and efficient sacrifice, and *both of them propitiatory for the sins of the whole world*."<sup>78</sup> He goes on to explain that the Eucharistic sacrifice is properly called "propitiatory" because the "force and virtue" of Christ's sacrifice is not "applied and brought into effect by this Eucharistical sacrifice, and the other holy Sacraments, and means appointed by God for that end."<sup>79</sup>

In order to express this best, he commended the practice of his Laudian master, John Overall, bishop of Lichfield (previously Regius Profes-

---

<sup>76</sup> Cosin, *Works*, V:107.

<sup>77</sup> It is interesting to note that here Cosin espouses an erroneous conception of sacrifice in the estimation of Mascall, the sort of late medieval error that was one source of the confusion about what a true doctrine of sacrifice entailed. Andrew McGowan's examination of five of the earliest identifications of the Eucharist with sacrifice in apostolic literature reveals that none of the sources (*Didache*, Ignatius, Irenaeus, Justin Martyr) assumed that death was intrinsic to the broad category of sacrifice. McGowan helpfully points out the ways in which, during the first few centuries, the concept of sacrifice was in a state of flux, not only in Christianity, but also in Judaism and in the Greek religious sphere. See McGowan, "Eucharistic and Sacrifice."

<sup>78</sup> Cosin, *Works*, V:107 (emphasis added).

<sup>79</sup> Cosin, *Works*, V:107–108. He goes on to say that both sacrifices have "both force and virtue in them, to appease God's wrath against this sinful world" (*ibid.*, 108). One of his suggestions for the 1662 Prayer Book regards the direction that the Priest lifts up the bread and wine at the Offertory. It was not taken up in 1662, but such a rubric is found in the 1637 Scottish Book: "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, he 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*" (James Cooper, ed., *The Booke of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments: And Other Parts of Divine Service for the Use of the Church of Scotland, Commonly Known as Laud's Liturgy (1637)* [Edinburgh: William Blackwood and Sons, 1904], 117–18).



sor at Cambridge<sup>80</sup>) whose practice was to restore the so-called “prayer of oblation” back into the Canon in 1549.<sup>81</sup> “I have always observed my lord and master Dr. Overall to use this oblation in its right place, when he had consecrated the Sacrament to make an offering of it (as being the true public sacrifice of the Church) unto God, that by the merits of Christ’s death, which was now commemorated, all the Church of God might receive mercy.”<sup>82</sup> If we were simply to recognize, he continues,

---

<sup>80</sup> Overall was early a chaplain-in-ordinary to Queen Elizabeth I, dean of St. Paul’s Cathedral, London, from 1601–1614, bishop of Coventry and Lichfield from 1614–1618, and then bishop of Norwich from 1618 until his death on May 17, 1619.

<sup>81</sup> Bryon Stuhlman claims that Andrewes actually introduced a prayer from an Eastern rite after the institution narrative when he would celebrate Holy Communion: “There is evidence, however, that some celebrants of the English rite recited the prayer of oblation (which is really a prayer of self-oblation) immediately after the institution narrative as a way of providing a more adequate eucharistic prayer. Others, like Lancelot Andrewes, addressed the problem by privately reciting a prayer drawn from the Eastern rites after the institution narrative” (Byron D. Stuhlman, *Eucharistic Celebration, 1789–1979* [Church Hymnal Corporation, 1980], 23). He provides no source for this claim, and after extensive searching, the only source I could find to possibly support this claim is a prayer in Andrewes’ *Private Preces* to be said “After the consecration,” and which reads as follows: “We then remembering, O sovereign Lord, in the presence of Thy holy mysteries, the salutary passion of Thy Christ, His life-giving cross, most precious death, three days’ sepulture, resurrection from the dead, ascent into heaven, session at the right hand of Thee, the Father, His fearful and glorious coming; we beseech Thee, O Lord, that we, receiving in the pure testimony of our conscience, our portion of Thy sacred things, may be made one with the holy Body and Blood of Thy Christ; and receiving them not unworthily, we may hold Christ indwelling in our hearts, and may become a temple of Thy Holy Spirit. Yea, O our God, nor make any of us guilty of Thy dreadful and heavenly mysteries, nor infirm in soul or body from partaking of them unworthily. But grant us until our last and closing breath worthily to receive a hope of Thy holy things, for sanctification, enlightening, strengthening, a relief of the weight of my many sins, a preservative against all satanic working, a riddance and hindrance of my evil conscience, a mortification of my passions, an appropriation of Thy commandments, an increase of Thy divine grace; and a securing of Thy kingdom” (Newman, *Prayers, Verses, and Devotions*, 97–98). This has a number of features of the portions of early anaphoras that follow the institution narrative: an anamnesis, certainly; a prayer for the fruit of communion. But there is no verb of offering the gifts, which means that if this is the source of the claim, it is no evidence at all.

<sup>82</sup> The full quotation is as follows: “In King Edward’s first Service-book, this prayer was set before the delivery of the Sacrament to the people, and followed immediately after the consecration; and certainly it was the better and the more natural order of the two; neither do I know whether it were the printer’s negligence, or no, thus to displace it. For the consecration of the Sacrament being ever the first, it was always the use

that this sacrament is the Christian sacrifice, we could not help but put the prayer in “in its right place.”<sup>83</sup> His final sentence is startling: “We ought first to send up Christ unto God, and then He will send Him down to us,” meaning that because the consecration precedes the oblation, the Priest offers Christ to the Father, who then returns the Son to us to be received in the Sacrament.<sup>84</sup>

These two figures represent the approach of a part of the Church of England that was radically rethinking some of the central Reformation reforms regarding the Eucharist that are expressed in the English prayer book. This “reform of the reform” would be given liturgical expression in two phases over the course of the century, first in Scotland and then, as an export to the United States.

## THE SCOTTISH MINORITY REPORT

The story of the emergence of a minority and alternative liturgical tra-

---

in all liturgies to have the oblation follow (which is this), and then the participation, which goes before, and after all, the thanksgiving, which is here set next before the *Gloria in Excelsis*; in regard whereof, I have always observed my lord and master Dr. Overall to use this oblation in its right place, when he had consecrated the Sacrament to make an offering of it (as being the true public sacrifice of the Church) unto God, that by the merits of Christ's death, which was now commemorated, all the Church of God might receive mercy, &c, as in this prayer; and when that was done he did communicate the people, and so end with the thanksgiving following hereafter. If men would consider the nature of this Sacrament, how it is the Christian's sacrifice also, they could not choose but use it so too; for as it stands here it is out of his place. We ought first to send up Christ unto God, and then He will send Him down unto us” (Cosin, *Works*, V:114–15).

<sup>83</sup> Cosin, *Works*, V:114. He made this suggestion formally in the list of corrections he suggested for the revision that was published in 1662, but it also was not included. No. 61 is printed as “Appendix, No. 1” in *ibid.*, 517. The editor notes that not only did Cosin place the Prayer of Oblation before the reception of the Sacrament, he also placed the Lord's Prayer there, following the “Amen” of the Eucharistic prayer (it had been moved from this location beginning in 1552, to be said after all had received Communion. Earlier in his notes, Cosin cites Jerome (*Pelag.* III.15), Ambrose (*Sacr.* V.4.24) and Augustine on the consecratory power of the Lord's words and then Gregory the Great's famous letter to Bishop John of Syracuse, where he explains that he placed the Our Father immediately after the “prex,” i.e., the Canon of the Mass (*ibid.*, 113–14). See also Gregory the Great, *Ep. IX, 26 ad Joannem Syracusanum* (CCSL CXL A, 586); English: John R. C. Martyn, trans., *The Letters of Gregory the Great*, 3 vols., *Mediaeval Sources in Translation* 40 (Toronto: Pontifical Institute of Mediaeval Studies, 2004), 2:562.

<sup>84</sup> See Cosin, *Works*, V:115.

dition is directly related to Andrewes and Cosin. That story centers on Scotland. The first phrase, which occurred under James I, returned (broadly speaking) to the Eucharistic theology of 1549, ambiguous as it was. The second phrase was over a century in the making, fuelled in large part by the non-juring schism after the deposition of James II. The fruit of this that is expressed in the second Scottish prayer book of 1764 was a recognizable Catholic liturgy made up of both Western and Eastern elements. This development in Eucharistic theology was not simply a return to 1549 but a return to something much older. It was, in fact, an explicit claim that the English prayer books were theologically deficient, and that the common teaching of pre-sixteenth-century theology was instead the standard.

### *The 1637 Scottish Book*

One of the principal figures that connect Andrewes and Cosin to the Scottish prayer book tradition is William Laud, a controversial churchman who was fortunate to live under monarchs who shared his High-Church sacramental and ceremonial leanings. James I introduced the episcopacy in Scotland and tried to enforce kneeling at Communion. Being largely Presbyterian, the Scots wanted nothing to do with such popery. When James died in 1625, his son, Charles I took the throne. Less than a year later, Andrewes died and Laud was appointed to succeed him as the Dean of the Chapel Royal; he was made Bishop of London a few years later, and then finally, in 1633, Archbishop of Canterbury. Charles decided to frame a Scottish Prayer Book and did just that, apparently with the assistance of Laud, though the main framers are John Maxwell (1591–1647), Bishop of Ross, and James Wedderburn (1585–1639), Bishop of Dunblane.<sup>85</sup> Charles Hefling suggests that the Scottish book of 1637 “can be construed as a deliberate effort, for better or worse, to undue Cranmer’s later, more ‘Protestant’ or ‘continental’ alterations, which had remained untouched when the Prayer Book was reissued in 1559 [under Elizabeth I] and 1604,” under James I.<sup>86</sup>

The principal alterations to the 1604 “Jacobian” English BCP in the

---

<sup>85</sup> Spinks, *Stuart Divines*, 95. The definitive history of the first Scottish Book is Gordon Donaldson, *The Making of the Scottish Prayer Book of 1637* (Edinburgh: University Press, 1954).

<sup>86</sup> Charles C. Hefling, “Scotland: Episcopalians and Nonjurors” in Charles C. Hefling and Cynthia L. Shattuck, ed., *The Oxford Guide to the Book of Common Prayer: A Worldwide Survey* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 168.

1637 Scottish Book are theologically significant, but do not yet express a robust theology of Eucharistic sacrifice and of true transformation of the bread and wine. After the Offertory, the Priest “shall then offer up and place the bread and wine prepared for the Sacrament upon the Lord’s Table.” The altar is not placed “at the uppermost part of the Chancel or Church.”<sup>87</sup> The Prayer for the Whole State speaks of “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 to it are restored the Prayer for the Dead and Commemoration of the Saints from 1549. The term “sacrifice” is added to the Canon at a number of points. The epiclesis is restored to its position in 1549 before the institution narrative, but in a combination of the 1549 and 1552 wordings. This still allows for a receptionist interpretation (despite the fact that the exact language is found in the Roman Canon): “that they may be *unto us* the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son.”<sup>88</sup> Manual acts are added to the institution narrative and there is no longer any rubric prohibiting elevations or showings to the people. The so-called “Prayer of Oblation”<sup>89</sup> of 1549 was restored (which includes the Anamnesis, prayer for acceptance of our “sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, the self-oblation, and request for acceptance of sacrifice), save for the portion about the angels. Two communion devotions are restored between the “Amen” and reception: the Our Father and “We do not presume.”<sup>90</sup>

The introduction of this Scottish prayer book was a complete disaster. The first service with it took place in St. Giles Cathedral and it turned into a full-scale riot that included one Jenny Geddes, a vegetable seller, throwing a stool at the bishop’s head. Byron Stuhlman explains: “It was a book imposed by episcopal authority in a country where the royal imposition of bishops on the church had not been popular and where more radical Puritans sought to abandon any fixed text for a lit-

---

<sup>87</sup> *PEER*, 258.

<sup>88</sup> *PEER*, 262.

<sup>89</sup> I say “so-called” because the English books never contained an oblation of the gifts of bread and wine, which is not only present in all the early extant anaphoras, but is also the term used to designate the offering of the gifts. Thus, to speak of a prayer of oblation that does not contain the offering of the gifts is quite misleading, though quite common in literature about the English prayer books.

<sup>90</sup> There were a few concessions to certain Puritan concerns, notably the use of the word *Presbyter* instead of “priest” and no use of the *Apocrypha*.

urgy.”<sup>91</sup> The generations that followed this were tumultuous in both England and Scotland. The 1662 revision of prayer took place after the restoration of the monarchy with Charles II in 1660. He was succeeded by his son, James II. As a Catholic (and the last Catholic monarch in England), he aroused a host of suspicions and was deposed three and a half years later in what is known as the Glorious Revolution, after which his Protestant daughter Mary and her Dutch Calvinist cousin and husband, William, became joint sovereigns. This historical event is what ends up making possible the liturgical minority report in Anglicanism.

### *The Non-Jurors*

Because James II was still alive, and the bishops took the Oath of Supremacy to “bear faith and true allegiance to the King’s Highness, his heirs and lawful successors,” seven English bishops, nearly 400 English clerics, and most of the Scottish bishops refused to swear an oath of allegiance to William and Mary, and thus the nonjuring schism began. In Scotland, William responded by reinstating Presbyterianism as the established church there, and this remains the case to this day.<sup>92</sup> Further, “[w]hereas in England printers were obliged to see that their prayer books conformed to a standard text, no such regulation applied to Scottish Episcopalians, and there were never ‘sealed books’ to conform to, as there were for the 1662 Prayer Book.”<sup>93</sup> This fact, combined with the sort of theological concerns seen in Cosin about the Catholic orthodoxy of the 1662 Prayer of Consecration, led to liturgical experimentation. Four principal concerns can be distilled in these various Scottish practices or “uses”: the so-called “mixed cup,” where water is added to the wine; public prayer for the departed; the offering of the gifts in the oblation; and the invocation of the Holy Spirit on the gifts.<sup>94</sup> One of the major authorities that served as a basis for the so-called “Usagers” (i.e. those

---

<sup>91</sup> Byron D. Stuhlman, *A Good and Joyful Thing: The Evolution of the Eucharistic Prayer* (New York: Church Publishing, 2000), 124.

<sup>92</sup> The website for the same Cathedral of St. Giles indicates that Queen Elizabeth worships in the Presbyterian Church of Scotland while in Scotland: <http://www.stgiles-cathedral.org.uk/queen-church-scotland/>.

<sup>93</sup> Hefling, “Scotland,” 169.

<sup>94</sup> Hefling, “Scotland,” 170. For a detailed look at these “usages,” see Chapter IX in Thomas Lathbury, *A History of the Nonjurors: Their Controversies and Writings: With Remarks on Some of the Rubrics in the Book of Common Prayer* (London: W. Pickering, 1845).

who followed these practices) was the work of a priest serving in the established church, John Johnson, and his book, *The Unbloody Sacrifice*.<sup>95</sup> While many pamphlets (known as “wee bookies”) with variations on the 1637 liturgy circulated, one semi-official attempt took place by two English and two Scottish non-juring bishops to draw up an acceptable rite in 1718.<sup>96</sup> The ante-Communion is quite obviously from the Prayer Book tradition, but the Canon is based on the liturgy in Book VIII of *Apostolic Constitutions* (often referred to as the Clementine Liturgy or Clementine Heptateuch), whose structure follows what is known as the West Syrian or Antiochene structure (salutation and Sursum corda; praise and thanksgiving with *Sanctus*; institution narrative; anamnesis and oblation; pneumatic epiclesis; intercessions; concluding doxology).<sup>97</sup> After

---

<sup>95</sup> John Johnson, *The Theological Works of the Rev. John Johnson, M.A., Vicar of Cranbrook in the Diocese of Canterbury*, Library of Anglo-Catholic Theology 49–50 (Oxford: John Henry Parker, 1847). Hefling’s summary of Johnson’s position is very helpful: “On this difficult and much-disputed point, the Usagers relied above all on the authority of a learned member of the established church, John Johnson of Cranbrook. In *The Unbloody Sacrifice*, his chief work, Johnson argued that the Eucharist is truly sacrificial and therefore, like all sacrifice, propitiatory. But he also argued that the slaying of a victim is not in itself the rite by which sacrifice is offered. Thus the ‘sacrificial solemnity’ of Christ’s self-oblation did not consist in crucifixion alone; it began with his institution of the Eucharist and was not complete until his entry into heaven, the Holy of Holies, as high priest. One sacrifice, in other words, took place at the Last Supper and on Calvary and in the ascension. For Johnson, ‘distinguishing the oblation in the eucharist, from that on the cross, and that afterwards in heaven, is really a confounding or obscuring of the whole mystery, and rendering it perplex and intricate’. On this understanding of sacrifice, an unusual one for its time, Christ’s crucified body and shed blood were offered by Christ himself, but they were offered actively and voluntarily, though ‘in mystery’, as represented by bread and wine. Such an offering the church too makes, in its eucharistic oblation. But it was by Christ’s own act of offering, dedicating himself to God, that bread and wine were consecrated at the Last Supper, and no agency less than his could have brought about so great a blessing. For that reason, only the Holy Spirit can be the principal agent of consecration at the church’s Eucharist. Not until the Spirit has been invoked is consecration complete, and not until it is complete can intercession for the living and the dead be made, not only in Christ’s name, as is done whenever Christians pray, but with Christ’s sacramental body and blood on the altar before God” (Hefling, “Scotland,” 170–71).

<sup>96</sup> See Thomas Deacon, ed., *A Communion Office, Taken Partly from Primitive Liturgies, and Partly from the First English Reformed Common-Prayer-Book: Together with Offices for Confirmation, and the Visitation of the Sick [Compiled by T. Deacon]* (London: Smith, 1718).

<sup>97</sup> In the canons amended to Book VIII of the document, canon 85 indicates that Clement is the author, though the consensus is that this is not historically reliable. For the current scholarship on the document, see Paul F. Bradshaw, *The Search for the Origins*

preparing the altar, a collect is introduced, drawn almost verbatim from the anaphora in *Apostolic Constitutions* 8.12 and including the request that “we may be worthy to offer unto thee this reasonable and unbloody Sacrifice for our Sins and the Sins of the People.”<sup>98</sup>

### *The 1764 Scottish Book*

Finally in 1764, an edition was published and put forth by the Scottish Primus and bishop that, while never officially authorized, owed much of its authority “to a gradual and almost entirely informal process of reception.”<sup>99</sup> This book steps back from the direct use of the Clementine Liturgy and takes as its basis Cranmer’s language and structure from 1549 (and thus aspects of the Roman Canon), but to which a number of important changes are made.<sup>100</sup> First, new introductory language is composed that emphasizes the doxological character of the Eucharistic action: “All glory be to thee, Almighty God, our heavenly Father, for that thou of thy tender mercy didst give thy only Son Jesus Christ.”<sup>101</sup> Second, the epiclesis is moved from Cranmer’s relatively unique position before the institution narrative to the typical West Syrian location, after

---

*of Christian Worship: Sources and Methods for the Study of Early Liturgy*, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2002), 73–77, 84–86.

<sup>98</sup> “O Almighty God, who has created us, and placed us in this ministry by the power of thy Holy Spirit; may it please thee, O Lord, as we are ministers of the New Testament, and dispensers of thy holy mysteries, to receive us who are approaching thy Holy Altar, according to the multitude of thy mercies, that we may be worthy to offer unto thee this reasonable and unbloody Sacrifice for our Sins and the Sins of the People. Receive it, O God, as a sweet smelling savour, and send down the grace of thy Holy Spirit upon us. And as thou didst accept this worship and service from thy Holy Apostles: so of thy goodness, O Lord, vouchsafe to receive these Offerings from the hands of us sinners, that being made worthy to minister at thy Holy Altar without blame, we may have the reward of good and faithful servants at that great and terrible day of account and just retribution; through our Lord Jesus Christ thy Son, who, with Thee and the Holy Ghost, liveth and reigneth ever one God, world without end. Amen” (W. Jardine Grisbrooke, ed., *Anglican Liturgies of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* [London: S.P.C.K., 1958], 286).

<sup>99</sup> Hefling, “Scotland,” 172.

<sup>100</sup> While a few items are not present in the 1718 non-juror liturgy (prayer for worthiness before the canon, exchange of peace, and “Christ our Paschall lamb” [from 1549]), the presence of the items just mentioned indicates that these absences are not of enormous consequence.

<sup>101</sup> See Appendix A for a reproduction of the range of post-*Sanctus* introductory language from related and historic liturgies.

the oblation of bread and wine. The epiclesis is also explicitly consecratory (“vouchsafe to bless and sanctify, with thy word and Holy Spirit, these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, that they may become the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son”).<sup>102</sup>

Third, the oblation is now an explicit oblation of the bread and wine, whose presence is emphasized by placing it in all caps: “Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, according to the institution of thy dearly beloved Son our Saviour Jesus Christ, we thy humble servants do celebrate and make here before thy divine majesty, with these thy holy gifts, WHICH WE NOW OFFER UNTO THEE.”<sup>103</sup> Fourth, this makes the interpretation of the request following the epiclesis to “accept this our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving” one that finally agrees with the Roman Canon from whence the phrase arises: the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving is the Eucharistic offering of bread and wine, along with the verbal offering of praise and thanksgiving and the self-oblation of the people, “our souls and bodies.”<sup>104</sup> Fifth, the Prayer for the Whole State is placed between the “Amen” of the Canon and the Our Father, a placement without precedence in the English or Scottish Books but which basically aligns them with the intercessions in the West Syrian anaphoras. This follows Johnson’s argument that only after the consecration are intercessions most appropriately made, a position that accords with a wide number of early anaphoras, where the intercessions are introduced with words like, “We offer to you for . . .”<sup>105</sup> These intercessions are no

---

<sup>102</sup> PEER, 306.

<sup>103</sup> PEER, 306.

<sup>104</sup> Hefling adds an additional note about the change of just two words: “Every Prayer Book since 1549, after mentioning the crucifixion, had continued with a clause referring to Christ, ‘who made there, by his one oblation of himself once offered, a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice, oblation, and satisfaction.’ In the Scottish office of 1764, this clause reads: ‘who, by his own oblation of himself once offered, made a full, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice,’ and so on. The eucharistic prayer, thus modified, is open to an interpretation of Christ’s sacrificial self-offering as embracing the Last Supper and the Eucharist together with the cross, but does not exclude an interpretation that would identify his one sacrifice with one event, the crucifixion” (Hefling, “Scotland,” 172).

<sup>105</sup> This is the introductory language of the long series in intercessions in *Apostolic Constitutions* 8 moves back and forth between “And we entreat you also for . . .” and “And we offer to you also for . . .” The *Liturgy of St. John Chrysostom* also uses the phrase “We offer you this reasonable [λογικὴν] service also for . . .” (PEER, 111–12, 133). Anton Hänggi, *Prex eucharistica: textus e variis liturgiis antiquioribus selecti*, Spicilegium Friburgense 12 (Fribourg: Éditions universitaires, 1968), 228.



longer simply for the “Church militant here on earth”: those last three words are struck and the prayers for the departed and the commemoration of the saints remains, as in 1637 and 1718. Finally, the series of communion devotions before reception are also retained: the Our Father (as in 1549, 1637, and 1718) and the invitation, confession, absolution, and comfortable words, plus “We do not presume” (as in 1549 and 1718; 1637 places everything except “We do not presume” in the offertory after the intercessions).

### *The American Church*

The fledgling American Episcopal Church could not receive episcopal consecration in England since the English church had no canonical provision for an ordination rite that did not include a vow of submission to the crown. As such, the Americans turned to the Scottish non-juring bishops, who consecrated Samuel Seabury in November 1784. They asked Seabury to do his best to ensure that the celebration of Communion in his own diocese would be “conformable to the most primitive doctrine and practice” by following “the pattern the Church of Scotland [*sic*] has copied after in her Communion Office.”<sup>106</sup> To what degree Seabury argued that the entire American church adopt the Scottish rite is not totally clear, but the American church ended up doing so, with a few amendments that nodded to the English 1662 Book. For example, the intercessions and penitential material was placed in the Offertory rather than after the Canon.<sup>107</sup> “We do not presume” was also placed in its 1662 position, after the *Sanctus* instead of directly before reception. Maybe most significantly, the Prayer of Consecration is from the 1764 Scottish rite but with one unfortunate exception. The language of the epiclesis steps back from the objective transformation language of the 1637 prayer. Instead of the language “become the body and blood of Christ” (1764) or “be for us the body and blood” (1549), the American epiclesis “inserted an abbreviated form from the Wee Bookies which preceded the 1764 printing, a form which omitted “that they may be unto the body and blood of thy most early beloved Son.”<sup>108</sup> The following

---

<sup>106</sup> Cited in Hefling, “Scotland,” 173.

<sup>107</sup> This reflects a concern that these so-called “communion devotions,” when placed after the prayer of consecration, indicated that devotion was being done to Christ in the Sacrament. Placing them in the Offertory avoids this concern.

<sup>108</sup> Marion J. Hatchett, *Commentary on the American Prayer Book* (New York: Seabury, 1980), 370.

table provides the language of the epiclesis from the English, Scottish, and American books:

Table 1 The English, Scottish, and American epicleses in parallel

1549	1552/1662	1637 (Scottish)	1718 Non-Juror	1764 (Scottish)	1789 (American)
<p>“Heare us (O merciful father) we besech thee; and with thy holy spirite and worde, vouchsafe to</p> <p>blesse and sanctifie these thy gyftes, and creatures of bread and wyne,</p> <p><u>that they maie be unto us the bodye and bloude of thy moste derely beloved sonne Jesus Christe.”</u></p>	<p>Heare us O mercyefull father wee beeseche thee; and graunt that wee, receyving these thy creatures of bread and wyne, accordinge to thy sonne our Savioure Jesus Christ's holy institucion, in remembrance of his death and passion,</p> <p><u>maye be partakers of his most blessed body and blood.”</u></p>	<p>“Heare us, O mercifull Father, we most humbly beseech thee, and of thy almighty goodnesse vouchsafe so to blesse and sanctifie with thy word and holy Spirit these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, <u>that they may bee unto us the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son;</u>”</p>	<p>“and send down thine Holy Spirit, the witness of the passion of our Lord Jesus, upon this Sacrifice, <u>that he may make this Bread the Body of thy Christ, and this Cup the Blood of thy Christ;</u></p>	<p>“And we most humbly beseech thee, O merciful Father, to hear us, and of thy almighty goodness vouchsafe to bless and sanctify, with thy word and holy Spirit, these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine, <u>that they may become the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son.”</u></p>	<p>And we most humbly beseech thee, O merciful Father, to hear us; and, of thy almighty goodness, vouchsafe to bless and sanctify, with thy Word and Holy Spirit, these thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine; <u>that we, receiving them according to thy Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's holy institution, in remembrance of his death and passion, may be partakers of his most blessed Body and Blood.</u></p>

*Anglican Eucharistic Theologies*

The story of Anglicanism's various Eucharistic theologies is not straightforward. In fact, it is more accurate to say that historically there were not just two Anglican liturgical strains, but two and a half: the English, the Scottish, and the American. The English strain intentionally avoids any sense of Eucharistic sacrifice, or an objective presence tied to the elements, and emphasizes a Reformation principal that the Sacrament is the material correlative to the immaterial Word that together proclaim the Gospel. This is because the two (not seven) sacraments came to be viewed as the second movement of the proclamation of the Gospel. Oliver O'Donovan describes this approach: for the first generation of English reformers, the "performance of the sacraments gives a *concrete public form* in which the gospel is made known and done its work, not only quickening faith but strengthening and confirming it. . . . [T]he normal and normative function of the Sacrament [of Holy Communion] is as a proclamation of the gospel, and it is as such that the effects of proclamation can be confidently ascribed to it."<sup>109</sup>

What deserves more careful attention is exactly how and why a rather robustly Catholic approach to Eucharistic presence and sacrifice was able to re-emerge out of this tradition. I think at least part of the reason a more Catholic approach was able to re-emerge in the Church of England was out of a concern to give patristic thought a real seat at the table. I wonder also to what degree the maintenance of a monarchy that remains the head of the Church preserves cultural space for a true embrace of cult and ritual. Both are retained in much that pertains to the way the sovereign engages with its subjects, but most especially in the coronation liturgy of each new sovereign, which has often retained features of an ordination, such as anointing with sacred chrism.<sup>110</sup> Further, as the Decree on Ecumenism puts it, among "the many Communion, national or confessional, [who] were separated from the Roman See" in whom "Catholic traditions and institutions in part continue to exist, the Anglican Communion occupies a special place,"<sup>111</sup> by which they certainly mean at least

---

<sup>109</sup> O'Donovan, *On the 39 Articles*, 130.

<sup>110</sup> Wesley Carr, "This Intimate Ritual: The Coronation Service," *Political Theology* 4, no. 1 (November 2002): 11–24; Ian C. Bradley, "The Shape of the Next Coronation—Some Tentative Thoughts," *Political Theology* 4, no. 1 (November 2002): 25–43; Paul F. Bradshaw, "On Revising the Coronation Service," *Theology* 96, no. 770 (March 1993): 130–37.

<sup>111</sup> Vatican II, Decree on Ecumenism, *Unitatis Redintegratio* (1964), §13. A critical question that this raises is whether the Scottish-American strain teaches a fundamentally

the retention of the three-fold order of bishops, priests, and deacons, as well as liturgical expression to all seven sacraments (even if they were amended and not all called sacraments as such). Out of this, along with the political space created by the non-juring schism, the Scottish and English non-jurors were able to look honestly at their liturgy and conclude (in my words) “this is so deficient as to be unrecognizable to the Church with whom we desire to be in continuity.” And thus, there was able to emerge the “reform of the reform” in the Scottish tradition that espoused a fully robust confession of real presence, that the bread and wine become the true and substantial Body and Blood of Christ, and that the Eucharist includes an act of offering the gifts to God as part of the act of worship. Are there possible resources to bring about a substantial unity within Anglican Eucharistic liturgies?

#### RATZINGER'S BRIDGE IN *THE SPIRIT OF THE LITURGY*

Ratzinger's use of the frame “sacrifice of the word/Logos” in *The Spirit of the Liturgy* provides an intriguing possibility for dialogue with the heirs of the Reformation. Chapter 3 is a meditation on the decisive place of Jesus in the transition from worship under the Old Covenant to worship “in Christ” in his New Covenant.<sup>112</sup> As he is elsewhere, Ratzinger is relentlessly scriptural and Christological: “When we look at the cultic history of Israel more closely, we run up against a second characteristic, which leads finally, by its inner logic, to Jesus Christ, to the New Testament.”<sup>113</sup> In his presentation, the worship that Christ offers in his flesh on the cross and in the resurrection is “the center of the heavenly liturgy, a liturgy that, through Christ's sacrifice, is now present in the midst of

---

different doctrine of the Eucharist than that of the Church of England.

<sup>112</sup> I think there are problems with aspects of Ratzinger's scholarship in this chapter, both about sacrifice in general (he suggests, for instance, that all of the world's sacrificial systems concern a misplaced expression of atonement, which seems to preclude whole categories of Jewish sacrifice that are concerned with expressions of thanksgiving and praise) and on the supposed “spiritualization” of sacrifice in Judaism (see footnote 12 above for a discussion of the problems with such a view). On the question of sacrifices of praise in Judaism, see James Swetnam, “Zebach Tôdâ (Zbh Twdh) in Tradition : A Study of ‘Sacrifice of Praise’ in Hebrew, Greek and Latin,” *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 15 (2002): 65–86. *Filologia Neotestamentaria* 15 (2002)

<sup>113</sup> Joseph Cardinal Ratzinger, *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, trans. John Saward (San Francisco: Ignatius, 2000), 37.

the world and makes replacement liturgies superfluous (see Rev 5).<sup>114</sup>

His presentation of Christian worship gathers the Reformation idea that the sacrament is a symbolic proclamation of the Word of God but takes it further by diving into its scriptural implications. Ratzinger drills down into the concept of the Word of God, which refers not simply to the Scriptures but most fully to Jesus Christ himself. Part of this vision includes a recognition of a certain sort of critique of temple worship in Jesus's prophesy that when the temple is destroyed, he will raise it up in three days (John 2:19). "This is a prophecy of the Cross," Ratzinger explains, since "he shows that the destruction of his earthly body will be at the same time the end of the Temple. With his Resurrection the new Temple will begin: the living body of Jesus Christ, which will not stand in the sight of God but *be the place of all worship*."<sup>115</sup> This last claim is key: all Christian worship is actually in Christ, not metaphorically, but truly. "Into this body he [Christ] incorporates men. It is the tabernacle that no human hands have made, the place of true worship of God, which casts out the shadow and replaces it with reality."<sup>116</sup>

Ratzinger highlights how, in a real way, cultic activity truly does end with Christ:

Worship through types and shadows, worship with replacements, ends at the very moment when the real worship takes place: the self-offering of the Son, who has become man and "Lamb," the "Firstborn," who gathers up and into himself all worship of God, takes it from the types and shadows into the reality of man's union with the living God.<sup>117</sup>

Yet cultic activity, in the form of Christian worship, continues, but in a way that is turned "inside out." Christian worship, like Jewish worship, has a discernible ritual form (words, gestures, etc.) and is constitutive of the people's identity as belonging to the one true God. In contrast to the way that Ratzinger's narrates the trajectory of Jewish worship, Christian worship also conforms to Jewish worship in that it is only truly acceptable when the outward sacrifice conforms to the inner disposition

---

<sup>114</sup> Ratzinger, *Spirit of the Liturgy*, 38.

<sup>115</sup> Ratzinger, *Spirit of the Liturgy*, 43 (emphasis added).

<sup>116</sup> Ratzinger, *Spirit of the Liturgy*, 43.

<sup>117</sup> Ratzinger, *Spirit of the Liturgy*, 43–44.

(the “broken and contrite hearts” of Psalm 51).<sup>118</sup> But what distinguishes Christian worship from the Jewish types which preceded it is that it is a participation in the true and real act of the one sacrifice and worship which took place in the earthly life of Jesus and continues in the heavenly temple where Christ the priest eternally pleads Himself on our behalf as the sacrificed Lamb, slain and yet living. Christian worship is entirely λογική (usually translated “spiritual;” cf. Rom 12:1), not because it is immaterial and thus “spiritualized” but because it is a true participation in the worship that Christ offered in the flesh, which is entirely *gratia plena*. The inner and the outer that struggled to find unity in Israel’s worship “becomes a full reality only in the *Logos incarnatus*, the Word who is made flesh and draws ‘all flesh’ into the glorification of God. . . . In Jesus’ self-surrender on the Cross, the Word is united with the entire reality of human life and suffering. . . . Now the vicarious sacrifice of Jesus takes us up and leads us into that likeness with God.”<sup>119</sup> Christian worship by way of the Eucharist is the means by which we join in the Incarnation’s fruit.

Ratzinger’s conclusion needs just a slight modification, however. The “spiritual worship” (cf. John 4:23–24) is not only found in the “sacrifice of the word,” which he conceives as only “the word of prayer, which goes up from man to God, embodying the whole of man’s existence and enabling him to become ‘word’ (*logos*) in himself” (i.e., through faith, as Ratzinger goes on to explain).<sup>120</sup> It is true that in witnesses like Justin Martyr (see *Dial. Tryph.* 117), one might say (as Ratzinger does) that the Fathers “saw the Eucharist as essentially *oratio*, sacrifice in the Word.”<sup>121</sup> But this true *logikē latreia* (spiritual worship) is “the mystery made known in the Mass.” Why? Because, as he puts it, “the body of Christ is sacrifice and precisely as sacrifice is living.”<sup>122</sup> Yet, in this instance the adverb “essentially” is a bit misleading because the pinnacle of Christian worship in the Eucharist is also necessarily material as well, just as Romans 12:1 indicates (though Ratzinger does not make this point in all his discussion

---

<sup>118</sup> Ratzinger discusses this psalm in *Spirit of the Liturgy*, 46–47, and notes that it encapsulates the tension in Israel’s worship and even claims that the psalms “could not reconcile” the two themes of the physical, material act and the inner disposition. But, in fact, it seems that the psalm actually does provide a resolution, namely, that the outward act is only pleasing when it conforms to the disposition of the offerer.

<sup>119</sup> Ratzinger, *Spirit of the Liturgy*, 47.

<sup>120</sup> Ratzinger, *Spirit of the Liturgy*, 46.

<sup>121</sup> Ratzinger, *Spirit of the Liturgy*, 46.

<sup>122</sup> Ratzinger, *Spirit of the Liturgy*, 43.

of λογική): “I appeal to you therefore, brethren, by the mercies of God, to present your bodies as a living sacrifice [θυσίαν ζώσαν], holy and acceptable to God, which is your spiritual worship [λογικὴν λατρείαν].” From a Christological perspective, the Eucharist is spiritual precisely because it is a participation in the Logos who became incarnate, where, for the first time, a human, material life was also simultaneously fully divine.

Does Ratzinger’s biblical, Christocentric approach gather up the evangelical approach to the Eucharist in the Reformers and deepen it in a truly biblical manner that makes rapprochement possible? It would seem that the Episcopal Church’s catechism in its current prayer book expresses just such an approach. The second question in the section on the Holy Eucharist is, “Why is the Eucharist called a sacrifice?” Answer: “Because the Eucharist, the Church’s sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, is the way by which the sacrifice of Christ is made present, and in which he unites us to his one offering of himself.”<sup>123</sup> Whether this could be said to accurately reflect the wider teaching of the Anglican Communion is another question. Whether or not the Eucharistic sacrifice of praise necessarily includes the material offering of bread and wine is no small matter. What is remarkable is that the sort of theological difference that remains amongst various Anglican Eucharistic liturgies is precisely the sort of distance that Catholics have understood to exist between them and the various Protestant churches and which for Catholics are church-dividing.

## CONCLUSION

One of the great difficulties in bilateral dialogue with Anglicans at the international level is that our interlocutors wonder: “Whose Anglicans and which liturgies?” It is unfortunate that the American church dropped the epicletic language that articulated a belief in the real transformation of the bread and wine into Christ’s Body and Blood because it is this rejection that forces us to acknowledge not just two, but two and a half, historic Anglican traditions. The Scottish tradition also confesses that the Eucharist is a sacrifice because it is the means by which Christ’s sacrifice is made present and applied to Christians and is thus a truly propitiatory sacrifice. This Scottish strain also indicates that, while it does not reject the claim that the Eucharist is a proclamation of the Gospel (who would?), it has returned to the theological

---

<sup>123</sup> Episcopal Church, *BCP [1979]*, 859.

assumption that the Christian “sacrifice of praise”—as the Roman Canon calls the Eucharistic action and sacrifice—is a *spiritual* sacrifice precisely because it is a *material* one. As Ratzinger expresses it at the end of Part I of *The Spirit of the Liturgy*, “we must regard St. Paul’s concept of *logikē latreia*, of divine worship in accordance with *logos*, as the most appropriate way of expressing the essential form of Christian liturgy.”<sup>124</sup>

The most perfect worship, the spiritual sacrifice on earth, was the sacrifice offered in the body of the incarnate Son that came to its consummation and telos when he was lifted up in glory and offered himself to the Father for the life of the world on the altar of the Cross. The consistent confession of Christians until the sixteenth century was that God has ordained a principal means by which the fruit of his Passion is applied to Christian souls. That means is the Christian rite of the Eucharist, where our oblation of that which earth has given and human hands have made, and even of the bodies to which those hands are attached, is united to Christ’s one offering of himself. This is the worship with the reverence and awe of which the Epistle to the Hebrews speaks (Heb 12:28). The Eucharist is the Church’s realization that “when we have the urge to pray, there is only *one* prayer in heaven or earth which prevails with God, the prayer of Him ‘who in the days of his flesh . . . offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears unto him that was able to save him from death’ [Heb 5:7].”<sup>125</sup> And when we pray this prayer (that is, when we offer this logistic sacrifice), our sacrifice is made one with his, and the Father returns our sacrifice to us as nothing less than his very self: the ecclesial and sacramental bodies of Christ.

---

<sup>124</sup> Ratzinger, *Spirit of the Liturgy*, 50.

<sup>125</sup> Dunlop, *Anglican Public Worship*, 25.



APPENDIX A

Post-*Sanctus* Language from Related and Historic Liturgies<sup>126</sup>

Roman Canon	1549, 1552,	1637 (Scottish) 1662 (English)	Typical West Syrian link to Sanctus (“Holy”)	1718 Non-jurors liturgy	1764 (Scottish), 1790 (American)	Typical Egyptian link (“full”)
<i>Te igitur:</i> “Therefore, we humbly pray and entreat you, most merciful Father, through your Son Jesus Christ our Lord, to accept and bless these gifts...”	“O God, heavenly Father, which of thy tender mercy...”	“Almighty God, our heavenly Father, which of thy tender mercy...”	“Truly you are holy and all-holy, most high and exalted above all for ever. Holy also is your only-begotten Son...” (From <i>Apostolic Const.</i> )	“Holiness is thy nature and thy gift, O Eternal King; Holy is thine only-begotten Son...”	“All glory be to thee, Almighty God, our heavenly Father, for that thou of thy tender mercy...”	“Full in truth are heaven and earth of your holy glory through the appearing of our Lord and God and Savior Jesus Christ: fill, O God this sacrifice with the blessing from you through the descent of your [all-] Holy Spirit...”

<sup>126</sup> The texts are all taken from *PEER*.

JOSEPH RATZINGER AND THE  
HEALING OF THE  
REFORMATION-ERA  
DIVISIONS

edited by

Emery de Gaál and Matthew Levering



EMMAUS  
ACADEMIC

Steubenville, Ohio

[www.EmmausAcademic.com](http://www.EmmausAcademic.com)



**EMMAUS**  
A C A D E M I C

Steubenville, Ohio

[www.emmausacademic.com](http://www.emmausacademic.com)

A Division of The St. Paul Center for Biblical Theology

Editor-in-Chief: Scott Hahn

1468 Parkview Circle

Steubenville, Ohio 43952

(c) 2019 Emery de Gaál and Matthew Levering

All rights reserved. Published 2019

Printed in the United States of America

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Gaál Gyulai, Emery de, editor.

Title: Joseph Ratzinger and the healing of the Reformation-era divisions /  
edited by Emery de Gaal and Matthew Levering.

Description: Steubenville : Emmaus Academic, 2019.

Identifiers: LCCN 2018053606 | ISBN 9781949013269 (hc) | ISBN 9781949013276  
(pb)

Subjects: LCSH: Christian union--Congresses. | Papacy and Christian  
union--Congresses. | Benedict XVI, Pope, 1927--Congresses. | Fries,  
Heinrich. Einigung der Kirchen--reale Möglichkeit--Congresses.

Classification: LCC BX9 .J67 2019 | DDC 280/.042--dc23 LC record available at [https://lccn.  
loc.gov/2018053606](https://lccn.loc.gov/2018053606)

Unless otherwise noted, Scripture quotations are taken from The Revised Standard Version Second Catholic Edition (Ignatius Edition) Copyright c 2006 by the Division of Christian Education of the National Council of the Churches of Christ in the United States of America. Used by permission. All rights reserved.

Excerpts from the Catechism of the Catholic Church, second edition, copyright (c) 2000, Libreria Editrice Vaticana—United States Conference of Catholic Bishops, Washington, D.C. Noted as “CCC” in the text.

Cover design and layout by Emily Feldkamp

# TABLE OF CONTENTS



ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....I

ABOUT THE CONTRIBUTORS.....III

INTRODUCTION: MATTHEW LEVERING:  
DOCTRINE AND ECUMENISM.....IX

CHAPTER 1.....1

Bishop Rudolf Voderholzer: Joseph Ratzinger's Martyrological Understanding of Papal Primacy: A Key for Unsolved Ecumenical Problems

CHAPTER 2.....19

Thomas A. Baima: Principles for the Ecumenical Future

CHAPTER 3.....53

Mariusz Biliniewicz: Reformation-Era Exegesis and the Contemporary Situation in Roman Catholic Worship in the Thought of Joseph Ratzinger

CHAPTER 4.....77

Stephen Bullivant: The Thames Flows into the Tiber: Benedict XVI, Performative Ecumenism, and the Place of Christians in a Secular Society

CHAPTER 5.....93

Emery de Gaál: Mariology as Christology and Ecclesiology: Professor Joseph Ratzinger's Only Mariology Course

CHAPTER 6.....121

Timothy Larsen: Joseph Ratzinger on the Nativity of Our Lord: Protestants and Catholics Reunite for Christmas

CHAPTER 7.....137

Peter J. Leithart: Ratzinger and Public Theology

CHAPTER 8.....151

David Luy: Joseph Ratzinger's Ecumenical Christocentrism

CHAPTER 9.....169

Mickey L. Mattox: Ratzinger and Luther Revisited in Light of Some Recent Research

CHAPTER 10.....	191
Kenneth Oakes: Joseph Ratzinger on Divine Love	
CHAPTER 11.....	209
Matthew S. C. Olver: Although We Be Unworthy: Anglicans, Eucharistic Sacrifice, and Ratzinger's <i>Spirit of the Liturgy</i>	
CHAPTER 12.....	259
Willemien Otten: Joseph Ratzinger and the Medieval Paradigm of Creation: From Bonaventure to Eriugena	
CHAPTER 13.....	281
Jacob Phillips: Joseph Ratzinger and Dietrich Bonhoeffer on Heteronomy and Conscience during the Third Reich	
CHAPTER 14.....	297
Aaron Pidel, S.J.: The Church of the "Few" for the "Many": Ratzinger's Missiology of Representation	
CHAPTER 15.....	319
Michael Root: Ratzinger and the Doctrine of Justification	
CHAPTER 16.....	333
Tracey Rowland: Joseph Ratzinger and Radical Orthodoxy	
CHAPTER 17.....	349
Douglas A. Sweeney: Ratzinger on Scripture, Tradition, and Church: An Evangelical Assessment	